JAN 7 1949

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 94—PART 6

JUNE 3, 1948, TO JUNE 14, 1948
(PAGES 6991 TO 8228)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, as we pray for Thy blessings upon the Members of the Senate, we are not unmindful of those in the gallery who join us in this prayer. We give Thee thanks for the youth of America, the leaders of tomorrow, the young people who shall someday take our places. We thank Thee for their faith in America and we pray that nothing done or said in this place shall cause them to think any less of the institutions we cherish. Challenge them, we pray Thee, with the vision of good citizenship and a love for all that is good in America and a desire to make it even better, that this land that we love may become in truth and in fact God's own country. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, June 2, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 154) authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry business in the United States.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BATES of Massachussets, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. SASSCER, and Mr. BROOKS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 5816. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, pursuant to law, appointed Mr. SPARKMAN a member of the Senate Office Building Commission to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator John H. Overton, of Louisiana.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 168)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $408,000, fiscal year 1949, in the form of an amendment to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 166)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $14,395,000 and proposed contract authorizations in the amount of $15,610,000 for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1949, in the form of amendments to the budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (S. DOC. NO. 165)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Military Establishment, Department of the Navy, amounting to $50,000,000 and contract authorization in the amount of $66,500,000, fiscal year 1949, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, MILITARY FUNCTIONS (S. DOC. NO. 167)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Military Establishment, Department of the Army, military functions, amounting to $121,000,000 and contract authorization in the amount of $60,000,000, fiscal year 1949, in the form of an amendment to the budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (S. DOC. NO. 164)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Military Establishment, Department of the Navy, amounting to $9,000,000, fiscal year 1949, in the form of an amendment to the budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give effect to the International Wheat Agreement entered into by the United States and other countries relating to the stabilization of supplies and prices in the international wheat market, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of April 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 5888. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11,

1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1458).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 843. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1467).

By Mr. KEM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2028. A bill to amend the law relating to the possession, carrying, and acquisition of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1459).

By Mr. HAWKES (for Mr. BREWSTER), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2466. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1460); and

S. 2644. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1461).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 6110. A bill to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1462).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2366. A bill to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1465).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 239. A bill relating to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and postgraduate school; with amendments (Rept. No. 1464); and

S. 2670. A bill to amend section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1463).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3883. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1466).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 3, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 252. An act for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy;

S. 314. An act for the relief of Robert E. Lauritzen;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Ern Wright;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irma M. Pierce and Charles Z. Pierce;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves;

S. 1588. An act for the relief of E. W. Strong;

S. 1729. An act for the relief of Gudrun Emma Ericsson;

S. 1771. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Powell Townsite, Wyo., Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the James S. McDonald Post 5054, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Powell, Wyo.;

S. 1886. An act for the relief of William M. Looney;

S. 1941. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 2060. An act for the relief of Edgar Wikner Percival.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to Federal personnel, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement presented by Mr. BYRD were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941, ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, MARCH–APRIL 1948

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, APRIL 1948, AND COMPARISON WITH MARCH 1948

(The following report is compiled from signed, official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown, in adjoining columns.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures the total Federal personnel for the month of April increased 19,559 from the March total of 2,030,861 to the April total of 2,050,420. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was an increase of 11,893 from the March total of 1,184,916 to the April total of 1,196,809.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed an increase of 7,666 from the March figure of 845,945 to the April figure of 853,611.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 76 from the March figure of 751 to the April figure of 827.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 4,594 from the March figure of 389,956 to the April figure of 394,550. Inside continental United States the Army increased its civilian personnel 4,169; outside continental United States it increased 425.

The Department of the Air Force increased civilian employment 1,974 from the March figure of 115,331 to the April figure of 117,305. Department of the Air Force figures cover civilian personnel within the United States only.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 1,022 civilian employees, from the March figure of 339,907 to the April figure of 340,929.

Inside continental United States

Federal personnel within the United States increased 18,305 from the March total of 1,801,989 to the April total of 1,820,294. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside the United States increased 10,873 from the March total of 1,130,417 to the April total of 1,141,290.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for April was 679,004, an increase of 7,432 over the March total of 671,572.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 76 from the March figure of 751 to the April figure of 827.

Department of the Army personnel within the United States increased 4,169 from the March figure of 259,601 to the April figure of 263,770.

The Department of the Air Force increased civilian personnel within the United States by 1,974 from the March figure of 115,331 to the April figure of 117,305.

The Navy Department within the United States increased its civilian employment by 1,213 from the March figure of 295,889 to the April figure of 297,102.

Outside continental United States

Outside continental United States, Federal personnel increased 1,254 from the March total of 228,872 to the April total of 230,126. (See table II.)

An increase of 1,020 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the March total of 54,499 to the April total of 55,519.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment increased 234 from the March total of 174,373 to the April total of 174,607.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 425 civilian employees overseas, from the March figure of 130,355 to the April figure of 130,780.

The Department of the Navy decreased its overseas civilian employment 191 from the March figure of 44,018 to the April figure of 43,827.

Industrial employment

Total industrial employment during the month of April increased 5,857 from the March figure of 558,585 to the April total of 564,442. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies exclusive of the National Military Establishment, increased their industrial employment by 1,218 from the March figure of 20,577 to the April figure of 21,795.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 4,639 from the March total of 538,008 to the April total of 542,647.

The Department of the Army increased its industrial employment 2,339 during the month of April from the March total of 233,144 to the April total of 235,483. Of this net increase 2,728 was within the continental United States, while outside continental United States industrial employment of the Army Department decreased 389.

The Department of the Air Force industrial personnel inside United States, reported separately this month for the first time, increased 1,327 from the March total of 67,899 to the April figure of 69,226.

The Department of the Navy increased its industrial employment 973 from the March figure of 236,965 to the April figure of 237,938.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as air-

fields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1948, and comparison with March 1948*

Department or agency	March	April	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	69,917	73,656	+3,739
Commerce	36,575	37,346	+771
Interior	43,189	44,568	+1,379
Justice	26,030	25,836	−194
Labor	4,583	4,496	−87
Post Office	480,030	486,474	+6,444
State	7,665	7,572	−93
Treasury	88,968	89,477	+509
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	223	222	−1
Bureau of the Budget	605	612	+7
Executive Mansion and Grounds	78	91	+13
National Security Council [1]	14	18	+4
National Security Resources Board	107	150	+43
Council of Economic Advisers	43	44	+1
Office of Government Reports	18	18	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	44	47	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration [2]		113	+113
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,482	4,529	+47
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	
Philippine War Damage Commission	7	6	−1
War Assets Administration	25,259	23,743	−1,516
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	
Atomic Energy Commission	4,952	4,987	+35
Civil Aeronautics Board	576	579	+3
Civil Service Commission	4,092	4,091	−1
Export Import Bank of Washington	113	116	+3
Federal Communications Commission	1,323	1,324	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,129	1,119	−10
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	374	369	−5
Federal Power Commission	804	803	−1
Federal Security Agency [3]	33,081	33,333	+252
Federal Trade Commission	558	557	−1
Federal Works Agency	22,163	21,904	−259
General Accounting Office	9,302	9,262	−40
Government Printing Office	7,312	7,223	−89
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,767	11,681	−86
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,265	2,250	−15
Maritime Commission	7,006	7,170	+164
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,235	6,204	−31
National Archives	345	344	−1
National Capital Housing Authority	292	288	−4
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	24	23	−1
National Gallery of Art	311	319	+8
National Labor Relations Board	1,365	1,602	+237
National Mediation Board	116	115	−1
Office of Selective Service Records	690	704	+14
Panama Canal	536	534	−2
Railroad Retirement Board	2,759	2,755	−4
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,745	5,615	−130
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,122	1,111	−11
Smithsonian Institution	505	503	−2
Tariff Commission	219	221	+2
Tax Court of the United States	125	126	+1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,326	14,697	+371
Veterans' Administration	201,032	200,327	−705
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,130,417	1,141,290	+14,164 / −3,291
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+10,873
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of Secretary of Defense	751	827	+76
Department of the Army	259,601	263,770	+4,169
Department of the Air Force	115,331	117,305	+1,974
Department of the Navy	295,889	297,102	+1,213
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,801,989	1,820,294	+21,596 / −3,281
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+18,305

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Established pursuant to Public Law 472, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Apr. 3, 1948.
[3] Includes 1,278 employees of Howard University and 95 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1948, and comparison with March 1948*

Department or agency	March	April	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,724	1,695	−29
Commerce	2,714	2,800	+86
Interior	4,711	5,208	+497
Justice	423	434	+11
Labor	79	82	+3
Post Office	1,582	1,585	+3
State	13,703	14,304	+601
Treasury	637	640	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Office of the Housing Expediter	27	25	−2
Philippine Alien Property Administration	163	157	−6
Philippine War Damage Commission	685	778	+93
War Assets Administration	441	420	−21
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	115	111	−4
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	19	19	
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	36	37	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	1,337	1,327	−10
Federal Works Agency	357	398	+41
Housing and Home Finance Agency	40	42	+2
Maritime Commission	98	91	−7
National Labor Relations Board	6	8	+2
Office of Selective Service Records	16	16	
Panama Canal	23,976	23,721	−255
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	20	19	−1
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	
Veterans' Administration	1,571	1,583	+12
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	54,499	55,519	+1,355 / −335
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+1,020
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	130,355	130,780	+425
Department of the Navy	44,018	43,827	−191
Total, including National Military Establishment	228,872	230,126	+1,780 / −526
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+1,254

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1948, and comparison with March 1948*

Department or agency	March	April	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	71,641	75,351	+3,710
Commerce	39,289	40,146	+857
Interior	47,900	49,776	+1,876
Justice	26,453	26,270	−183
Labor	4,662	4,578	−84
Post Office	481,612	488,059	+6,447
State	21,368	21,876	+508
Treasury	89,605	90,117	+512
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	223	222	−1
Bureau of the Budget	605	612	+7
Executive Mansion and Grounds	78	91	+13
National Security Council [1]	14	18	+4
National Security Resources Board	107	150	+43
Council of Economic Advisers	43	44	+1
Office of Government Reports	18	18	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	44	47	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration [2]		113	+113
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,509	4,554	+45
Philippine Alien Property Administration	165	159	−6

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1948, and comparison with March 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	March	April	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
POSTWAR AGENCIES—CON.			
Philippine War Damage Commission	692	784	+92
War Assets Administration	25,700	24,163	−1,537
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	118	114	−4
Atomic Energy Commission	4,955	4,990	+35
Civil Aeronautics Board	595	598	+3
Civil Service Commission	4,097	4,096	−1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	115	118	+3
Federal Communications Commission	1,359	1,361	+2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,132	1,122	−10
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	374	369	−5
Federal Power Commission	804	803	−1
Federal Security Agency [3]	24,418	24,660	+242
Federal Trade Commission	558	557	−1
Federal Works Agency	22,520	22,302	−218
General Accounting Office	9,302	9,262	−40
Government Printing Office	7,312	7,223	−89
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,807	11,723	−84
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,265	2,250	−15
Maritime Commission	7,104	7,261	+157
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,235	6,204	−31
National Archives	345	344	−1
National Capital Housing Authority	292	288	−4
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	24	23	−1
National Gallery of Art	311	319	+8
National Labor Relations Board	1,371	1,610	+239
National Mediation Board	116	115	−1
Office of Selective Service Records	706	720	+14
Panama Canal	24,512	24,255	−257
Railroad Retirement Board	2,759	2,755	−4
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,765	5,634	−131
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,122	1,111	−11
Smithsonian Institution	511	509	−2
Tariff Commission	219	221	+2
Tax Court of the United States	125	126	+1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,326	14,697	+371
Veterans' Administration	202,603	201,910	−693
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,184,916	1,196,809	+15,308 −3,415
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			11,893
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of Secretary of Defense	751	827	+76
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	259,601	263,770	+4,169
Outside continental United States	130,355	130,780	+425
Department of the Air Force	115,331	117,305	+1,974
Department of the Navy	339,907	340,929	+1,022
Total, including National Military Establishment	2,030,861	2,050,420	+22,974 −3,415
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			19,559

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Established pursuant to Public Law 472, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Apr. 3, 1948.
[3] Includes 1,278 employees of Howard University and 95 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1948, and comparison with March 1948*

Department or agency	March	April	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,372	1,448	+76
Interior	5,189	5,968	+779
State	366	365	−1
Treasury	3,652	3,689	+37
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Atomic Energy Commission	239	236	−3
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	2	
Panama Canal	2,134	2,083	−51
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,623	8,004	+381
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	20,577	21,795	+1,273 −55
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+1,218
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	134,040	136,768	+2,728
Outside continental United States	99,104	98,715	−389
Department of the Air Force [1]	67,899	69,226	+1,327
Department of the Navy	236,965	237,938	+973
Total, including National Military Establishment	558,585	564,442	+6,301 −444
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+5,857

[1] Industrial personnel of the Department of the Air Force is shown separately beginning this month. Air Force personnel inside United States only is reported in these figures; personnel outside continental United States is still reported by the Department of the Army.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

The number of employees on the civilian pay rolls of the Federal Government increased at the rate of 650 a day during the month of April. The net increase for the month was 19,559 bringing the total civilian employment for the month to 2,050,420.

These figures were revealed today by the April Personnel Report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in which reports from the Federal Departments and Agencies are compiled.

In March the rate of increase was 500 a day; in February it was about 400 a day, and in January it was a little more than 200 a day. The net increase in the current calendar year through April was 54,951, or a daily average of more than 450.

Of the April increases 5,857 were in so-called industrial employees, while 13,702 were in other categories including the classified civil service.

Civilian agencies of the Government accounted for 11,893 of the increase, while the civilian employment in the national military establishment increased 7,666.

Agencies reporting the larger increases in April included Agriculture with 3,710, Commerce 857, Interior 1,876, Post Office 6,447, Treasury 512, Economic Cooperation Administration 113, Federal Security Agency 242, Maritime Commission 157, National Labor Relations Board 239, Tennessee Valley Authority 371, Army (civilian employees) 4,594, Air Force (civilian employees) 1,974, and Navy 1,022.

Agencies reporting larger decreases during April were Justice with 183, War Assets Administration 1,537, Federal Works Agency 218, Panama Canal 257, Reconstruction Finance Corporation 131, and Veterans' Administration 693.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2791. A bill to provide for the reappointment to the retired list of officers of the Navy of Henry Eastin Rossell, former commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. HILL):

S. 2792. A bill to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2793. A bill to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; and

S. 2794. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 2795. A bill to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2796. A bill for the relief of certain witnesses at the trial of Harold Christoffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2797. A bill to exempt certain employees of irrigation companies from the wage and hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ella U. Sankey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2799. A bill to provide for ascertaining the economic justification for proposed improvements to the inland waterways of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 2800 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MAGNUSON) introduced Senate bill 2801, to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER (for Mr. BUSHFIELD):

S. 2802. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Goldie Garneaux Janis a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 2803. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winfred DeCoteau a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 2804. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joshua

Standing Elk a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 227, providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 248), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress (providing for a study of the problems of American small business enterprises), as supplemented by Senate Resolution 153 and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, is hereby increased by $50,000.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 17, line 2, strike out "$9,574,709" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$9,587,709, of which not less than $30,000 shall be available for tuition, care, and other expenses of Indian pupils attending public schools at Winnebago, Nebr."

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2655) supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REVISION OF TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6712) to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2744) to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendment, and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop naval installations and facilities by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities; or by the completion of such construction, installation, or equipment specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy and heretofore undertaken as follows:

"CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

"Naval air station, Alameda, Calif.: Test cells for turbine engines; $230,000.

"Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Facilities for flight indoctrination, including the acquisition of land (2,400 acres); $12,000,000.

"National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.: Chapel; $205,000.

"Marine training and replacement command, Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif.: Acquisition of land, 575 acres; $46,500.

"David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md.: Wind tunnels and associated facilities; $1,410,000.

"Naval amphibious base, Little Creek, Va.: Acquisition of land, 4,000 acres, on Bloodsworth Island, Dorchester County, Md.; $120,000.

"Naval supplemental radio station, Dupont, S. C.: Radio operating building; $74,000.

"Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, Calif.: Acquisition of land, 60,000 acres; aerodynamics field laboratory (aerodynamics range), ground range, external ballistics, and electronics experimental installation; 115 duplex houses (230 family units); $3,670,500.

"Naval air station, Key West (Boca Chica), Fla.: Acquisition of land, approximately 1,000 acres; $60,000.

"Naval ammunition depot, Jersey City, N. J.: Liquid fuel rocket test laboratory; $306,000.

"Naval Reserve Armory, Lawrence, Mass.: Acquisition of land, 5.7 acres; $100.

"Naval Reserve Armory, Lowell, Mass.: Acquistion of land, 4 acres; $800.

"Naval air station, Mojave, Calif.: Acquisition of land, 28 acres; $500.

"Naval magazine, Montauk, Long Island, N. Y.: Acquisition of land, 44 acres; $53,300.

"Naval auxiliary air station, Oceana, Va.: Acquisition of avigation easements over approximately 400 acres of land; $46,000.

"Naval air station, Patuxent River, Md.: Facilities for bombing target; $309,000.

"Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Sea test range, and test and evaluation facilities, including supporting facilities, services, and accessory construction; $30,000,000.

"Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Acquisition of land and improvements, 62.45 acres; $150,000.

"Naval electronics laboratory, Point Loma, San Diego, Calif.: Laboratory supply and utility buildings, including services and accessories; $1,590,000.

"Norfolk naval shipyard, Portsmouth, Va.: Acquisition of land, 4.857 acres; $4,370.

"Naval radio station, Skaggs Island, Sonoma, Calif.: Addition to radio operating building; $315,000.

"Naval supply annex, Stockton, Calif.: Acquisition of land (small island), 3.88 acres; $1,800.

"Aeronautical turbine laboratory, Trenton, N. J.: Laboratory buildings and facilities, including collateral equipment and accessory construction; $22,750,000.

"Naval ordnance laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Completion of supersonic wind tunnels and aerodynamics range; explosives research facility; $2,275,000.

"Naval unit, White Sands Proving Ground, Las Cruces, N. Mex.: Additional housing facilities; instrumentation of the 100-mile range and camp facilities; facilities for pilotless aircraft test range; $6,194,730.

"Radio transmitting station (location to be determined): Radio transmission facilities, including collateral equipment and accessory construction; $7,000,000.

"Naval research laboratory (location to be determined): Underwater sound reference laboratory; $1,120,000.

"For correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto within the continental United States, for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949; $3,000,000.

"OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

"Naval operating base, Adak, Alaska: Ship-repair facilities; cold-storage building, ice-cream plant and milk facilities; two storehouses; dispensary; utility distribution systems, including water, sewer, electric power, heating plant, roads, walks, and drainage; $11,296,000.

"Naval supplementary radio activity, Adak, Alaska: Operations building and associated facilities; $2,500,000.

"Naval radio station, Adak, Alaska: Consolidated communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $2,395,000.

"Naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland: Facilities for fixed operation of mobile ground approach unit; water-treatment plant; $109,200.

"Naval radio station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Consolidated communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $2,385,000.

"Naval radio station, Greenland: Consolidated communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $1,020,000.

"Naval operating base, Guam: Dredging and filling at Apra Harbor; utility distribution systems, including electric transmission, steam-generating plant, island water supply system, water storage and distribution, sewage and drainage systems, and extension of roads; barracks, messhall, and galley; $21,000,000.

"Naval medical center, Guam: Development of hospital facilities, including buildings and accessories; $25,000,000.

"Naval air station, Guam: Facilities for fixed operation of mobile ground control approach unit; $16,500.

"Naval ammunition depot, Guam: High explosive storage facilities and accessories; $10,000,000.

"Naval radio station, Guam: Permanent communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $5,750,000.

"Naval supply center, Guam: Permanent facilities, including storage buildings, fuel pipe lines, and accessories; $14,675,000.

"Fleet Marine Force Base, Guam: Development of facilities, including buildings, service depot facilities, and accessories; $5,823,000.

"Submarine base, Guam: Marginal bulkhead, including base site preparation and accessory construction; $1,670,000.

"Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, Hawaii: Acquisition of land, 520 acres at Waikele and Kipapa Gulches; acquisition of land at West Loch for barricaded sidings, 159.14 acres, $270,000.

"Naval air station, Kodiak, Alaska: Facilities for fixed operation of mobile ground control approach unit; $16,500.

"Naval radio station, Kodiak, Alaska: Consolidated communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $2,225,000.

"Naval shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Fire protection for drydock No. 2; modernization of water-front lighting; $143,700.

"Naval base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Water pumping station at Waiawa Gulch; $3,575,000.

"Naval station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Acquisition of land, Culebra Island; $110,000.

"Naval operating base, Saipan: Air intercept training facilities; facilities for fixed operation of mobile ground approach unit; $165,000.

"Naval radio station, Summit, Canal Zone: Increase transmitter power output; $612,000.

"Supplementary naval radio activity, Wahiawa, Hawaii: Permanent facilities for supplemental radio activity and accessories; $3,000,000.

"For correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto outside the continental United States, for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949; $3,000,000.

"SEC. 2. To accomplish the above authorized construction the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, or otherwise.

"SEC. 3. Family quarters for personnel of the Navy constructed on or subsequent to the effective date of this act whether heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized shall not be of greater net floor area per unit than the following:

"For flag officers, 2,100 square feet.

"For captains, 1,670 square feet.

"For commanders and lieutenant commanders, 1,400 square feet.

"For warrant officers, commissioned warrant officers, and commissioned officers through the rank of lieutenant, 1,250 square feet.

"For enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers, 1,080 square feet.

"For the purposes of this act net floor area is defined as all floor space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement (or service space in lieu of basement), attic, garage, and porches: *Provided*, That no family quarters for personnel of the Navy shall be constructed with the funds authorized for appropriation herein in excess of a net floor area of 1,080 square feet per unit: *Provided further*, That family quarters constructed with the funds authorized for appropriation herein shall be of the multiple type (generally eight families to a unit) or apartment type (generally six families to a unit) except where tropical or desert climates render the use of multiple-type dwellings deleterious to health and welfare and except where one, two, or three two-family units are necessary to provide the exact number of family quarters authorized herein for construction at a station.

"The above area allowances shall supersede the limitations contained in the act of July 8, 1946 (Public Law 492, 79th Cong.), and may be increased by not to exceed 10 percent for all quarters outside continental United States and by not to exceed 10 percent for quarters of commanding officers of stations or installations over and above that to which his rank would entitle him. Quarters for civilians shall be limited to conform to the allowances for officers or men of comparable status according to responsibility, rating, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be appropriate.

"SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but not to exceed $69,800,000, for public works in continental United States during the fiscal year 1948, and $59,971,160 for public works outside continental United States during the fiscal year 1948. With respect to projects within and without continental United States, the approximate cost for each project enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward 10 percent, but the total cost of projects in continental United States authorized by this act shall not exceed $91,949,950, and the total cost of projects outside continental United States authorized by this act shall not exceed $116,532,953. Any such appropriation shall be available under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for expenses incident to construction including administration, overhead, planning, and surveys, and shall be available until expended."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

STAMPS COMMEMORATING ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF POULTRY INDUSTRY—JOINT RESOLUTION INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair would like to enter an order. The House having returned to the Senate, pursuant to its request, Senate Joint Resolution 154, authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry business in the United States, in lieu of which House Joint Resolution 246 has been passed by both Houses, without objection, the vote on the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 154 will be reconsidered, and the joint resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

THE ROLE OF OIL IN THE WORLD—SPEECH BY EUGENE HOLMAN

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "The Role of Oil in the World Today," delivered by Eugene Holman, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, before the National Press Club, at Washington, D. C., on June 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION—ADDRESS BY ELVIN H. KILLHEFFER

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "International Trade Organization," delivered by Elvin H. Killheffer at the third national textile seminar, at Shawnee-on-Delaware, Pa., on May 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANTIMONOPOLY LEGISLATION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials on antimonopoly legislative proposals, which appear in the Appendix.]

SOUTH CAROLINA AGAIN EXCEEDS ARMY QUOTA—EDITORIAL FROM THE ANDERSON INDEPENDENT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "South Carolina Again Exceeds Army Quota," published in the Anderson Independent, of Anderson, S. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—EDITORIAL BY M. A. HUBBARD

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Should Know Better," by M. A. Hubbard, executive secretary of the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation, from the Virginia Farm Bureau News, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCHOOL LUNCHES—EDITORIAL FROM THE FAIRMONT (W. VA.) TIMES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "School Lunches," published in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of June 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—ARTICLE BY ALFRED WINSLOW JONES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The National Science Foundation," written by Alfred Winslow Jones, and published in the June 1948 issue of the Scientific American, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRO-MARSHALL-PLAN PRESS, FILMS TO GET FIFTEEN MILLIONS—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pro-Marshall Plan Press, Films To Get Fifteen Millions," written by William Edwards, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR PEACE—INTERVIEW BETWEEN SENATOR WILEY AND CHARLES FARMER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview between himself and Charles Farmer on the subject, A Positive Program for Peace, conducted over the radio, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF HIGH TAXES—ADDRESS BY ROBERT R. McCORMICK

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, on the subject of high taxes, published in the Chicago Tribune of May 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

A DEMOCRATIC FORMULA—EDITORIAL FROM THE ALEXANDRIA (VA.) GAZETTE

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Democratic Formula," published in the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of June 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EXPENDITURES—STATEMENT BY GEORGE E. IJAMS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the reduction in Veterans' Administration expenditures made by George E. Ijams before the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on April 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEOPLE LOSE A FIGHTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NATIONAL UNION FARMER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The People Lose a Fighter," written by Charles W. Ervin, editor, the Advance, and published in the National Union Farmer, issue of May 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the close of tonight's session I have permission to absent myself from the Senate until Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Without objection, the leave is granted.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF NOBLE J. JOHNSON TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 9, 1948, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. NOBLE J. JOHNSON, of Indiana, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Hon. Oscar E. Bland, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION ON JOSEPH J. HANCOCK TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE OF THE CANAL ZONE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 9, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Joseph J. Hancock, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone, vice Hon. Bunk Gardner, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR O'CONOR AND BALTIMORE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in view of the far-reaching effects of contemplated action by the Congress affecting reciprocal trade agreements, I submit that the fullest discussion of this important proposal should be encouraged.

I am in receipt of a communication from the Baltimore League of Women Voters, sent by Mrs. John B. Ramsay, Jr., president. This organization is composed of outstanding citizens, conversant with important issues in current affairs, and who are active in furtherance of those undertakings of government which will redound to America's welfare.

I ask that the letter from Mrs. Ramsay and my reply thereto be included in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
May 28, 1948.

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: It is obviously unnecessary for us to tell you how distressed we in the league are over what took place in the House of Representatives on Wednesday last. It is hard to understand how a weak and crippling bill such as the Gearhart bill could have been passed by such a large vote when farmers, labor, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and all our outstanding economists and diplomats have been urging the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act which has served us so satisfactorily for the past 14 years.

The action of the House has certainly raised doubts in the minds of people throughout the world as to our sincerity in trying to rebuild world trade and further international economic recovery. We look to the Senate to save the United States from the ignominy of having our promises and our stated policies repudiated by our Congress. Nations, like individuals, cannot talk big and act small and maintain the respect of their fellows.

Sincerely yours,
CAROLINE R. RAMSAY
(Mrs. John B. Ramsay, Jr.),
President.

JUNE 2, 1948.

Mrs. JOHN B. RAMSAY, Jr.,
President, Baltimore League of Women Voters, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MRS. RAMSAY: Permit me to acknowledge with appreciation your letter of recent date, in which you convey the sentiments of the Baltimore League of Women Voters with respect to the pending proposals for renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form.

So that there may be no possible misunderstanding of my position in this matter, let me give you definite assurance here and now that I will give my fullest support and efforts toward renewal of the act, unamended, for the 3-year period proposed by the President of the United States and approved by Secretary of State Marshall.

Certainly, if American policies, which mean so much to the world, are to be maintained and our prestige preserved, it is essential that we give assurance to all the struggling democratic peoples everywhere that what we are proposing to do in the matter of foreign relief will not be negated by changes of policies already established, and on the continuance of which they have been counting heavily.

The primary purpose of the Economic Cooperation Act is to assist the recipient nations to regain national economic stability. The only possible way they can ever hope to achieve favorable trade balances with the United States, to whom they must look now and for some time to come for vital machinery and other supplies, is to have access to our markets from which to draw the dollars which are the lifeblood of world trade today.

The evidence given by the majority in the House of Representatives of a return by the majority party to out-moded isolationist policies poses a threat to our whole program of international assistance and good will. I sincerely trust that the Senate will decide in favor of a 3-year renewal of the act as it is now in effect, and that the Congress will not take a short-sighted position, thus impairing the chances of betterment for all nations through international trade and commerce.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the distinguished Senator from South Dakota shall have concluded his remarks, and after whatever colloquy may ensue on the unfinished business, the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1493, House bill 6500, the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question or two, and make a few brief observations of my own on the military bill, and it would add greatly to whatever value the debate might have if I could do that as soon as the Senator from South Dakota had concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my request was that the unfinished business be temporarily set aside after the Senator from South Dakota had concluded his remarks, and after any colloquy which might follow on the bill. Does the Senator desire the floor in his own right?

Mr. LODGE. I might want 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I withdraw my objection. I merely desired to serve notice that I might wish to speak for 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not intend in any way to cut any Senator off.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts can be recognized on the bill when it is taken up.

Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nebraska is granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bridges	Hill	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Reed
Byrd	Jenner	Revercomb
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Feazel	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, during the early part of the year the Senate Armed Forces Committee began consideration of the over-all problem which faces our Military Establishment. After numerous meetings, beginning early in March, we came to an agreement that we would start hearings on the question then before us, of the necessity for universal military training. I believe our meeting was on March 10 or 12. We scheduled hearings for March 17.

A few days before that time we had noticed that the President would come before the Congress with a special message on March 17. On March 17 he came before a joint session of Congress and recommended a renewal of the Selective Service Act, and universal military training.

Since that time our committee has been almost continuously engaged in studying the military needs, in view of the present world situation. We reported a bill to the Senate on May 12. That bill has been described to some extent in the newspapers. It includes compulsory training for 18-year-olds. This was later changed by committee action on May 24, to provide for training of 18-year-olds only on a voluntary basis. The bill now on Senators' desks is the bill which we recommend to the Senate. It includes the training of 161,000 18-year-olds for a period of 12 months each year, all on a voluntary basis.

Mr. President, I present to the Senate today a major piece of legislation which the Armed Services Committee has carefully considered for more than a year.

The need for military manpower legislation has been apparent ever since the early months of last year, when we found that the volunteer system was not bringing in the necessary numbers of men each month to replace those who were being discharged.

All students of our military policy have been seriously disturbed over the fact that our forces are scattered thinly all over the globe with only a pitifully small number of Reserves available in the United States to support the overseas forces.

All who have made a study of this problem are determined to do something about it. They believe that, in consideration of our responsibilities in Europe and the Far East, it is tragic—yes, criminal—for us to require these forces to serve in distant lands without proper mobile Reserves at home, and without a guaranty that continuing effort will be made to provide replacements.

Every Member of the Senate today remembers that during the war and for a very short time thereafter we had a Selective Service System which guaranteed replacements when needed. Since March 31, 1947, when the 1940 act, the Draft Act, expired, we have relied on the volunteer system. We thought the inducements offered to volunteers were great enough to attract replacements. We continued the high rates of pay and the policy of rapid advancement to those who would join our armed forces. We offered short-term enlistments for as brief periods as 18 months. Our pay scale in the armed forces is much above the pay scale offered those in the uniform of any other armed force in the world. A realistic appraisal of our fiscal situation indicates that further pay increases cannot be considered.

Our committee has approached the manpower question for the armed services in a calm and deliberate manner, always with the question in mind as to whether or not our proposals were absolutely necessary, and always with the firm conviction that any measure we recommend must be a measure for peace. We have been determined to fashion a bill which reflects calm deliberation and not hysteria.

Mr. President, the bill which I am presenting falls within the limits of this measuring stick.

If America is to be influential in the peace councils of the world we must lead from strength and not from weakness. Therefore we must build and maintain military forces capable of breaking up any attack against us. We must have it understood that we are capable of instantly launching a counteroffensive so devastating that no enemy will dare to make war on us.

Further, our committee realizes that we must guard against a military structure so heavy as to cause a break-down in our own economy. We must secure full value for our defense dollar, just as surely as we must conserve and make effective use of our manpower. We must keep our economy sound in order to maintain stability at home.

Our committee is not convinced that any attack will be made against us in the near future. We feel that such an attack may be delayed for a long time; but we do believe that we must show the world that we intend, as insurance for lasting peace, to finance a sound defense program—a program which can be re-evaluated each year in view of the then present world situation. Therefore, it has been our desire to present to the Senate a program that is flexible; and I say that the bill which we are presenting to the Senate today is flexible.

In the first part of the bill we have set up the maximum numbers for each branch of the armed forces. We recommend at the same time a small training program. Please bear in mind, in considering this legislation, that the pay of six trained men in the Reserves pays only one man in the Regular Establishment.

Our committee is convinced that there is a need for the recommended legislation reinstating the Selective Service System. The Regular Establishment must, this year, have a total maximum strength of approximately 1,800,000 men. Our committee knows that to increase the Regular Establishment above that point, or even indefinitely to keep it at that point, will impose a tremendous financial responsibility on our country. Therefore we must and do offer at this time an alternate program, incorporated within the same bill—a program which will build up our strength outside the Regular Establishment. We recommend the inauguration of a training program—a program that will not merely bring untrained civilians into our National Guard and other Reserve components, but which will bring trained men into all of the Reserve components. We must remember that it is these Reserve components upon which we must rely in the future, if we decrease the size of the Regular Establishment.

In the past two wars we have witnessed the distressing length of time it has taken our country to mobilize. This was because, in bringing in our Reserve components for service, we found that they were not composed of trained men. In past emergencies the front line has been held for us until we could mobilize and train our men. The speed of modern war will virtually eliminate the buffer of training time. Therefore we must, in the opinion of our committee, concentrate on building a trained Reserve. Two paramount reasons support this position:

First, because of the excessive cost, we cannot continue to support the present large Military Establishment indefinitely; and

Second, because we do not wish permanently to saddle a selective-service system on the youth of our Nation.

Therefore, we propose that as each subsequent Congress reviews the world situation and our military needs, we can, through this legislation, lower the numbers in the Regular Establishment and add to the training program at any time when the calculated chances would seem to justify such a move.

Our committee believes that we must try in every conceivable way to bring about world understanding and permanent peace. One of the ways of doing this is to convince the nations of the world of the utter futility of acts that disturb peace, and which, if continued, will engulf the world in another terrible conflict.

May I say again, the Armed Services Committee presents this legislation as a measure for peace; its enactment will have a stabilizing influence throughout the world, and it will give all of us some relief from the feelings of uncertainty, anxiety, and insecurity which now pervade the globe.

The responsibilities which our position in the world of today has pressed on our country—and whether or not we accept them willingly, we cannot avoid them—call for commitments of our armed forces on every continent except Australia. In attempting to meet these responsibilities we have stationed overseas some 260,000 of the Army alone, or approximately 50 percent of the entire Army strength. This number is woefully inadequate to meet these widespread requirements, yet is so great a proportion of our total strength in service that it leaves our security forces at home incapable of affording this Nation the protection to which we are entitled. We must increase this strength to a minimum of 1,795,000 in our armed forces—Army, Air, and Navy. This amounts only to 1.3 percent of our total population, 6 percent of all males of military age—13 to 45.

No other nation of consequence in the world today has a military force which represents such a meager percentage of the total population.

Today our armed forces are composed entirely of volunteers—one million and a quarter of them—and we are the only major nation on earth whose forces are entirely voluntary. No other nation in the history of the world has ever attempted such a program. Despite the relatively high rates of pay and liberal allowances, it simply is not possible under present conditions of civilian employment to attract by voluntary means alone enough men of the caliber necessary to uphold our peacetime requirements. Monetary inducements would have to be raised so high as to be out of all proportion or reason. It is therefore necessary to invoke the obligations of citizenship through selective service.

The greatest requirement is for an increase in our ground—or field—forces. It is this part of our Military Establishment which must bear the greatest burden of our foreign occupation commitments, and meeting those with our present forces has left far too few to provide the structure we should have at home to insure our national safety. We must at all costs be able to prevent an enemy from establishing himself in positions from which he could attack us at will, and at the same time we must be able to secure for ourselves those bases from which we can retaliate against his aggression if we are to have any hope of stopping it. To do this we need efficient forces in being, ready to move; time will not be available to mobilize and build them.

A force totally adequate to insure this on full-time duty would impose a tremendously costly burden on our national economy. Therefore, we must be willing to accept a calculated risk. In preparing this legislation we have provided only for the minimum essential forces in the regular services—forces which could act quickly in seizing and denying to an enemy the areas most vital to his launching an attack against us, and for securing for ourselves the minimum areas necessary for our initial offensive. Our small regular forces must be able to hold these critical areas and maintain the communication routes thereto until our reserve components can mobilize and until the utilization of our vast potential of citizen forces can begin.

One of the determining elements in the calculation of this risk is the speed with which our reserve components can be made ready for service. Unless our reserves are in a state of readiness, precious time will have to be used to train them—time which we may not have. Therefore, this legislation attempts to provide a practical means of making young men with basic training available to the reserve components immediately after the occurrence of an emergency.

If this risk is to be a reasonable one, each individual in service, either active or Reserve, must be capable of bearing his full share of responsibility, not only in his immediate duties, but in facilitating an emergency mobilization to the utmost. This the slow and dull cannot be relied upon to do, for there must be no loss in effort or in time when an emergency occurs. This legislation must provide quality in manpower. Modern equipping of such a force must of necessity follow, for this bill can by no means provide the quantity to match the forces which can easily be brought against us. It is, therefore, essential that the standards under which men are selected for service provide the Nation with the fairest return in that service. The criteria under which volunteers are accepted for service today represent the minimum by which the efficiency of our small forces in being can be maintained. There must be sufficient mobility of assignment throughout the entire structure to insure a cadre for expansion for war.

The standards required by the Air Force are somewhat higher than those of either the Army or the Navy, yet the percentage of applicants being rejected by the recruiting services is nowhere nearly as large as critics would maintain. For example, under its present recruiting system the Army rejects about 29 percent of applicants for enlistment, for reasons as follows: 13 percent fail the mental tests; 13 percent fail to meet physical standards, including age limits; 2 percent fail on psychiatric standards; 1 percent fail on administrative standards.

The mental standards are determined by means of aptitude tests which measure an individual's ability to absorb training. These tests are not a measure of formal education, although experience shows that individuals with a fifth-grade education can easily pass them with a score eligible for enlistment. These tests have been standardized over a larger range of population than has any other known personnel test, and they are designed to measure mental levels from the highest to the lowest over the entire range of population. They consist of multiple-choice questions, and include some which any individual can answer and some which can be answered only by the exceptional; hence, each individual's actual ability is determined.

The cutting score on this test has been set at 80 for acceptance by the Army and Navy, which means that from 150 questions the applicant must answer only 31 correctly. This score excludes only 13 percent of the present applicants, therefore it represents a level which covers 85 percent of the inductable population of the Nation. It represents the level of aptitude for instruction which experience shows is required for satisfactory training in the vast majority of jobs in the modern military service in peacetime, many of which require specialized school training. It excludes the levels in which were found the largest group of disciplinary, maladjustment, and venereal cases during the last war. Hence, the present standards provide the services with personnel who can be trained without the costly necessity of establishing special or separate training facilities for large numbers of substandard individuals.

Physical standards have been established at their present levels to provide the services with manpower having sufficient general assignment mobility to serve their peacetime purposes as well as to provide a wartime cadre and to keep the incidence of medical treatment and hospitalization within the limits of medical facilities and medical personnel authorized and available to the services.

Psychiatric standards are set to exclude only those persons whose emotional instability or personality defect is so marked on initial examination as to justify their immediate exclusion from service. Doubtful cases are accepted, requiring the separation of many during the early part of their basic training.

Administrative standards must exclude the social misfits, felons, habitual drunkards, drug addicts, deserters, and persons with poor records of previous service. The services cannot afford to accept individuals who during their service would provide so many problems of discipline and adjustment and eventual separation.

Maximum age standards are necessary to preclude acceptance of individuals

whose gainful service would be interrupted too early by physical or age retirement to warrant a long-range investment in their enlistment. While a small percentage of positions could be filled with men in middle or advance age, these positions are generally available only to men in advanced grades who have made the service their career. It would be unfair both to the experienced soldier and to an individual over 35 years of age to permit initial enlistments over that age.

This legislation is intended to provide national security within reasonable limits of economy. Only by maintaining our present standards to insure the maximum of efficiency from all individuals in service, by increasing the strength of our regular armed forces to the point where they can meet the requirements of occupation and provide a small but effective mobile force in readiness, and by providing the means whereby a flow of young men with basic training is available to our first-line reserves, can we maintain our national security.

If we think back over the events of the past 3 years, we may recall an incident which took place on the deck of a famous ship of the United States Navy. It was the signing by the Allied Governments of the victorious armistice which ended the long and bitter war against the Japanese. Only a few months previously the supposedly invincible German Army had been routed and beaten and the war in the west had ended. It seemed that the civilized world could now wearily lay aside the weapons of war.

As a nation we turned our eyes to the future and the hope that a new era was at hand. We began the task of building the United Nations. Our magnificent Military Establishment was promptly and almost completely demobilized. All of us sincerely felt that peace had finally come to a world which had all but destroyed itself by a savage and ruthless war, and that we, as a peace-loving nation, could now live harmoniously in a community of nations—a community from which the lawless and destructive forces of aggression had been driven forever.

As we set about the difficult task of reconstruction, we carried out our commitments and responsibilities with complete good faith. The United States demanded no tribute from its defeated enemies and it sought no recompense from its allies. Our people sincerely felt that the nations of the world had at last broken the vicious curse of international aggression and selfishness which has plagued humanity for countless generations.

I shall not undertake the dreary task of pointing out how badly we misjudged the pattern which actually was to unfold, nor shall I recount the series of disturbing events which has marked the deterioration in what the world had hoped was to be a wholesome and temperate standard of international conduct. The impact of these tragic happenings has been so severe that we have been forced to recast our ideas and to cope with the blighting effects of political obstruction and territorial expansion which we and the other free nations of the world have met almost continuously during the past 3 years.

It is not necessary at this point to examine any more in detail this rather grim picture of trouble and unrest. All the thinking people of our Nation are as familiar with it as we are. Nor is it my intention to point with alarm to the dark clouds of suspicion and distrust which darken great areas of our national horizon.

But as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services I must emphatically call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Nation's postwar military program originally was formulated in anticipation of a climate far more temperate than has been the case during the past 2 years. The Committee on Armed Services has a major responsibility to the Senate and to the Nation for assuring that our national freedom and well-being are not menaced through adherence to a military program which is either inadequate or unwise. It therefore becomes my grave and solemn duty to present to the Senate a committee bill for the strengthening of our National Defense Establishment by a reviving of the Selective Service System.

The committee has come to this decision only after long hearings and exhaustive study. On March 17, within an hour after the close of the President's message asking for a temporary reenactment of selective service and for universal military training legislation, the committee began its open hearings. A total of 149 witnesses were heard, among whom were representatives of 125 political, religious, social, and professional organizations. The printed report of these hearings, to be found on Senator's desks, covers over a thousand pages, and contains more than half a million words.

Immediately after these 3 weeks of open hearings, the committee began an equally exhaustive series of executive hearings. The responsible heads of the Defense Establishment and their advisors and assistants were heard in detail. Thereafter, the committee worked in executive session in formulating and refining the specific legislation which we consider will best meet the security needs of the Nation today. The committee's decision is embodied in the bill which I am about to discuss, and which was reported to the Senate on May 12, having been given thorough study and sincere daily consideration by every member of our committee for almost 2 months.

Prior to the close of the public hearings, the Defense Establishment, acting on behalf of the administration, submitted to the committee a proposed bill which would implement the two requests made in the President's message. First, the proposed bill called for the reenactment of selective service. Second, it provided for a system of universal training. The legislation proposed by the administration served as the basis from which the committee finally developed the bill which was reported on May 12. The pending bill is, therefore, an evolution from the basic administration proposal. In the bill, the committee has substituted for the original universal training plan a program for the training of a limited number of 18-year olds for a period of 1 year with the Regular forces, followed by their transfer to the Reserve components.

As reported by the committee, Senate bill 2655 seeks to accomplish three broad purposes. First, it provides for an increase in the personnel strengths of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Next, it seeks to provide the men necessary to meet these increases by means of a selective-service program calling for the 2-year induction from the 19-to-26-age group, 19-through-25, of such numbers as are necessary to supplement the normal flow of enlistments and reenlistments. Finally, it provides a plan for the enlistment of young men in the 18-to-19-age group for a period of 1 year of training and service with the active forces, followed by their transfer to the Reserve components. The bill does not change the other enlistment programs now existing in the armed services.

The bill becomes effective on the date of enactment and expires 5 years later, unless sooner terminated by a joint resolution of the Congress. Notwithstanding the termination date, Senate bill 2655 is not recommended to the Senate as a stop-gap proposal. The selective-service provisions are sufficiently flexible to operate effectively either in a major mobilization or in the present case of a relatively small expansion. Further, the program for the 1-year trainee is not regarded as being inconsistent with the original UMT proposal recommended by the Compton Commission. The original concept of UMT called for separate installations, separate instructors, and a 6 months period of active training. At its height, the program would have trained approximately 850,000 young men annually, although initially the number would have been much smaller.

It is true that the program for the 1-year trainee recommended in Senate bill 2655 does not utilize separate facilities nor separate instructors. This is because the armed forces cannot meet their expansion requirements and overseas commitments and, at the same time, provide the corps of instructors needed to implement the training program, except on a very limited scale. Furthermore, the cost of providing the separate facilities, added to the other huge expenditures for military purposes, would result in an increased military budget.

The 1-year training period, rather than 6 months, is recommended in Senate bill 2655 because the shorter period is impractical, under the conditions now facing us. The young man who completes 1 year of service spends the last part of the period actually serving as part of a unit located or based in the United States. During that time he takes the place of a regular member of the unit who has been sent overseas, or who is required for duty at a training center, or is otherwise absent. On the other hand, the young man who serves only 6 months must of necessity spend it all at a training center. He, therefore, never serves in an active unit, and as a consequence he drains away instructors and overhead from the active units without compensating for it by serving a second 6 months.

The committee is convinced that ultimately the present recommended 1-year training program for 18-year-olds can be adjusted to conform to the basic annual needs of the armed forces. An adjustment in each subsequent year must, of course, be anticipated, for we cannot now predict the length of time it will be necessary to maintain a large Regular Establishment actually in being. This large Regular force is made necessary today partly because we do not have a trained reserve available; and unless we start at once to do something positive to build such a reserve, we shall continue for years to wander in this aimless circle. We feel that Senate bill 2655 provides a workable plan which will correct a vital weakness in our military structure. As rapidly as the reserve is increased in size and effectiveness, so can corresponding reductions be made in the size of our Regular Establishment. In the meantime, the program for the 1-year trainee can be progressively modified in the direction of whatever goal the Congress may decide upon. Yet the simple and obvious fact that the individual member of the full-time regular service must be paid nearly six times as much in salary alone as the individual who serves only part time in an organized unit of the Reserve components, cannot fail to convince us that further delay in steps looking toward an effective Reserve, in preference to a large Regular Establishment, is a luxury which even this Nation cannot afford.

The astonishing criticism has been made that the plan proposed in Senate bill 2655 would enlist only 161,000 from the 18-year-age group, as against a net available pool of 640,000. This ratio of approximately 1 to 4 is of course a fact. A very similar ratio would initially have been the case had the original universal training plan been adopted, because the plan would have been started on a relatively small scale, and later expanded as the instructors and facilities became available. But as regards utilization for military purposes, it must be borne in mind that no age group can be, or ever has been, used on an all-or-none basis. The important point is that liability for service must be shared generally, and on a completely fair basis. But the number actually to be enlisted or inducted from any age group must always be determined solely on the basis of the number actually required. To bring in every individual of a particular age group simply to satisfy the rather mystifying theory that it must be all or none would not only be a shocking waste of manpower, but would bring into the armed forces numbers of men for whom no duty could be found, and from whom the necessary facilities could be provided only at great expense.

As to the active-duty strengths of the Regular forces alone, Senate bill 2655 provides an increase of 349,000 over present strengths. This increase has been allocated as follows, and of course does not include the 1-year trainees, or any of the requirements of the Reserve components: 250,000 to bring the Army from 540,000 to 790,000, 33,000 to bring the Navy from 427,000 to 460,000, 10,000 to bring the Marines from 82,000 to 92,000, 56,000 to bring the Air Force from 397,000 to 453,000.

The committee feels that these strengths are adequate for the Regular forces under the present program, to include the fiscal year 1949. The program contemplated in Senate bill 2655 comes within the original 1949 budget, increased by the $3,481,000,000 supplemental estimate presented to the Congress during the second week of April. The estimates for personnel strength made by the armed services to fulfill needs several years in the future are highly fluid, and have been subjected to almost constant revision during the past few weeks, even by the services themselves. The committee has therefore adopted the more conservative approach of first meeting only our 1949 requirements, with the thought that further increases can be made on an evolutionary basis, as their necessity is clearly demonstrated. The committee has an abiding faith in the proposition that our Regular forces ultimately can be reduced by creating a strong Reserve, and is reluctant to provide long-range increases in the permanent strength of the Regular components at this time.

The fixing of these increased strengths naturally poses the problem of securing the personnel necessary to meet them. That, in turn, raises the question as to whether the committee merely accepted the principle of selective service, or whether it carefully analyzed the necessity for it. I can assure the Senate that the subject received the most careful and painstaking consideration.

Evidence presented to the committee shows conclusively that it is not possible either to gain or to maintain the increased personnel strengths of all three Regular services by voluntary enlistment alone. At the present time both the Navy and the Air Force are capable of maintaining on a purely voluntary basis the strengths authorized for fiscal year 1949. On the other hand, the Army, notwithstanding one of the most vigorous and productive recruiting efforts in the peacetime history of any nation, is not only actually unable to attain its authorized strength, but is losing ground at an alarming rate. Between July 1, 1947, and March 1, 1948, the enlisted strength of the Army decreased by a total of 125,000. It is evident that the top limits obtainable through sound and practical voluntary means already have been reached in the Army. In the Navy and Marine Corps, voluntary enlistment can maintain the present force, and could probably support a slight increase. In the Air Force, voluntary enlistment can maintain the present force, and could probably support a considerable increase. Actually, with the strengths recommended in S. 2655, and with selective service in effect, the committee feels that the Air Force will be able to meet all its requirements by voluntary enlistment, that the Navy and Marine Corps probably will be able to meet their requirements by voluntary enlistment, but that the Army can meet only approximately half of its requirements by voluntary enlistment, and must rely upon selective service for the remainder.

The fact that the Army is the only one of the three services which needs selective service to maintain itself has brought forth accusations of bad leadership, bad disciplinary procedures, and a failure to make the service as pleasant and as interesting as the other services. The committee feels that these contentions are without foundation. The relationships between officers and men, the disciplinary procedures, and the efforts to make the duty attractive, are generally on a par among all three services. On the other hand, more than half of the Army is serving overseas—a factor with which the other services are not forced to contend. Furthermore, many of the overseas garrisons are faced with realities which tend to make living less pleasant than is the case here in the United States. Finally, it is true in peace, as in war, that the daily life of the Ground Force soldier contains very little of either the glamour or the comparative luxury of the other services. I say that based upon my own experience, and with the feeling that this observation may be borne out by wartime experiences of many of my colleagues sitting in the Senate today. And it is, of course, fair to add that the Army today is actually maintaining, by voluntary enlistment, a force far larger in size than either the Navy or the Air Forces.

In order to gain and maintain the personnel strength of 1,795,000 authorized in S. 2655 for the Regular forces, it will be necessary to secure a total of 903,000 men by the end of fiscal year 1949. This will provide the 349,000 necessary to fill the new positions created by the expansion and 554,000 to replace losses resulting from the normal turnover of personnel. Based on past experience, it is estimated that these 903,000 individuals will be secured from the following sources: 190,000 reenlistments; 200,000 voluntary enlistments of men under age 19; 57,000 volunteers from the inactive Reserve, mostly officers accepting active duty; 206,000 volunteers from the 19–26 age group; and 250,000 men to be inducted from the 19–26 age group.

The 456,000 individuals to be withdrawn from the 19–26 age group are regarded as a minimum. Measured against this requirement the pool of 840,000 eligibles available by January 1, 1949, would appear to be more than adequate. However, when deferments for occupational and educational reasons are taken into consideration, the net effect will probably approximate the taking of two out of every three nonveteran, unmarried, physically fit individuals in this age group to meet the requirements of the Regular services alone.

Current budget estimates call for a total personnel strength of 1,520,000 in the organized units of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force by the end of fiscal year 1949. This will require 454,000 individuals to fill new positions created by this expansion of the Reserve components and 151,000 to replace losses resulting from the normal turn-over of personnel. This total requirement of 605,000 for the organized units of the Reserve components is greatly in excess of the number of availables remaining in

the 19-to-26 group after the requirements of the Regular forces have been met. The committee recognizes that this Reserve requirement does not have the same urgency, or priority, as the large requirement for the Regular forces. On the other hand, the committee is determined that some prompt, definite, and positive action must be taken if our Reserve components are ever to have actual men in actual units rather than paper men in paper units. That reasoning accounts for two important provisions of this bill which I will discuss later.

There are a number of specific provisions of this bill which merit consideration at this particular point.

With regard to registration, the bill provides that every male citizen and every other male person residing in the United States who is between the ages of 18 and 26 on the day fixed for his registration, shall register. As a matter of definition, "between the ages of 18 and 26" refers to persons who have attained their eighteenth birthday, but not their twenty-sixth. Statistics presented to the committee indicated quite clearly that age 26 was the minimum top age which would provide the number of physically fit, unmarried, nonveteran young men necessary to meet the personnel requirements of the next fiscal year.

Liability for induction extends to all registrants between the ages of 19 and 26 unless the individual is eligible for exemption or deferment under criteria established elsewhere in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator refers to the ages between 19 and 26. Does he not mean to include those who are more than 18? Will not a young man become eligible for draft as soon as he is 18?

Mr. GURNEY. No; he will not become eligible for draft until he has had his nineteenth birthday.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand.

Mr. GURNEY. I repeat: Liability for induction—not registration, but induction——

Mr. CONNALLY. I see.

Mr. GURNEY. Liability for induction extends to all registrants between the ages of 19 and 26 unless the individual is eligible for exemption or deferment under criteria established elsewhere in the bill. A citizen of a foreign country residing in the United States may—as was the case under the 1940 act—avoid this liability by making application for relief prior to his induction. However, in the event he makes such application, the bill provides that he shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. Inductions, as is true of enlistments, are contingent upon the individual's being mentally and physically qualified. Consideration has been given to the rather intriguing thought that a lowering of the mental standard would make a large number of qualified additional men available, and might even render selective service unnecessary. Testimony offered during the hearings shows quite clearly that there is no substance to that argument. The general impression seems to exist that the classification tests used by the services are I. Q. tests, which tend to skim off the men having the best formal education. As a matter of fact, the tests have no relation to the individual's formal education. They are purely tests of his ability to absorb instruction—his native ability to learn. An individual with a score of 150 would be theoretically perfect. The national average, based upon millions of tests, is 100. At the present time the services require a minimum score of 80, except that in the case of ex-service men with good records a score of 70 is acceptable. It has been suggested that the score be lowered to the wartime minimum of less than 60. Although it is true that large wartime forces—15,000,000—can absorb a number of these low-score individuals, they cannot be assimilated in a small and supposedly highly-trained peacetime force.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us what score was required before the war? I understand it was 59 during the war and is 80 at the present time. What was the score required previous to the war?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall have to secure that information. I do not know. We had a very small army at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know whether it was less than 80, or was it 80? I ask that question because of the complaints which we have all received that the Army was holding its requirements so high that volunteers could not qualify, and therefore it was impossible to fill the ranks with volunteers.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall try to secure the information to show what it was prior to World War II.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it should appear in the RECORD.

Mr. GURNEY. Such a force requires men with at least average mental qualifications and has relatively few day-labor positions. Moreover, the fact that the present rejection rate because of too low a general classification score approximates something less than 13 percent would indicate quite clearly that lowering the present minimum would in no way solve the recruiting problem.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that partially answers the question I just asked the Senator which was: "To what extent is the high score preventing enlistments in the Army?"

Mr. GURNEY. Thirteen percent.

Mr. AIKEN. We have all heard stories of 50 percent being rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. The figure is 13 percent, I can assure the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to know that it is only 13 percent.

Mr. GURNEY. With regard to the period of active training and service required by Senate bill 2655, it has previously been pointed out that the 19-to-26 age group is liable for service in the armed forces for a period of 24 consecutive months.

Special registration of, and calls for, members of the medical and dental professions who have not reached age 45 at the date of their induction is provided for. In view of the complex structure of sciences allied to the broader fields of medicine, surgery, and dentistry, similar authority is provided with respect to specialist categories which are an integral part of the machinery needed to meet the health needs of the armed forces.

Full cognizance has been taken of the very serious effects which would eventuate if excessive numbers of doctors and dentists were to be withdrawn from civilian communities for service in the armed forces. Nevertheless, no restrictive numerical limitations have been placed upon the executive departments in this particular connection. The day-to-day responsibility for safeguarding the health of the armed services is primarily an executive matter, as is the responsibility for the proper utilization of critical manpower categories in meeting civilian needs. The committee feels that the determining of a proper balance in allocating this type of personnel between the armed forces and the civilian communities comes within the functions assigned the National Security Resources Board and its Medical Advisory Committee, and that the fixing by statute of definite numbers of practitioners to be taken into the armed forces could conceivably result in a serious imbalance within either the armed forces or the civilian population, in the event emergencies not foreseeable at this time should come to pass.

However, as a specific safeguard for communities having few doctors in relation to their medical needs, the bill makes special provision that no doctor or dentist shall be called from a community in which the local board shall determine that his induction or call to active duty would unduly jeopardize the public health. This limitation will not apply to doctors who were deferred from service in World War II to complete their education, or to those who received their education under the Army specialized-training program, or similar programs, and who have had less than 90 days of commissioned service, exclusive of time spent as internes. It will be noted that no special registration or special calls are authorized for veterinarians, osteopaths, pharmacists, and several other groups. The committee believes that this special registration and call should be limited to categories which, in World War II were found to be in critical short supply. The shortage of doctors and dentists left in civilian communities was acute—the same cannot be said to have been true as regards the others.

In line with a consistent policy of attempting to build a strong reserve, the bill imposes definite obligation for service in the Reserve components to be performed after the individual completes his service with the Regular Establishments. Upon completion of his period of active training and service each person in the 19-to-26 age group inducted for the normal period of 24 months is transferred to a Reserve component of the force in which he served. He is required to re-

tain his membership in the Reserve for a period of 5 years, unless he is sooner discharged, but he is not required to join an organized unit. He may, however, elect to fulfill this basic 5-year Reserve obligation by remaining for an additional year in the Regular service, or by enlisting in an organized unit of a Reserve component of any of the forces for a period of 2 years. Upon the completion of his combined active and Reserve obligation he is thereafter relieved from further liability for service, except in time of war or of emergency declared by Congress.

The Reserve obligation imposed upon the 1-year trainee is materially heavier than that imposed upon the individual who has been required to serve on active duty for 2 years. We feel that it is enough heavier to equalize the marked differential in the period of active service, and results in the combined active and Reserve requirement of the short-term enlistment equaling the combined active and Reserve requirement imposed upon the individual who has been inducted and required to serve 2 years.

The 18-year-old who volunteered, upon completing the 12-month period of training and service, is transferred for a period of 6 years to a Reserve component of the force in which he served, and is liable to be ordered to active duty for training purposes for not to exceed 1 month in any calendar year. Inasmuch as the primary objective of the program for giving a year of training to individuals in the 18-year age group is to provide trained replacements for organized units of the Reserve components, strong compulsion is placed upon the individual to insure that this objective is accomplished, subject, of course, to the existence of vacancies and a policy of not subjecting the individual to undue hardship. Accordingly, the individual is required to accept a 4-year enlistment in an organized unit of the force in which he served, or in the ROTC or similar program, whenever a vacancy exists. The determination as to whether a vacancy exists and can be filled without undue hardship is made by the Secretary of the force concerned.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to inquire whether the 4-year enlistment which the individual is required to accept in an organized unit of the force in which he served or in the ROTC is during the 6-year period to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. He must sign up immediately on completing his 12-months' training.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me give an illustration, to see if I correctly understand the Senator's statement. Suppose he has completed his 12-month period of training. Then he is transferred for a period of 6 years to the Reserve component of the force in which he served. Suppose that he is in that reserve component for 5 of those 6 years. Then he is required to accept enlistment in an organized unit of the force in which he served, or in the ROTC, he having served already 5 of his 6 years in the reserve component. Does he then serve only 1 year of his enlistment in the organized unit of the force in which he served, or the ROTC, so that his service expires at the end of the 6 years, or must he accept a 4-year enlistment, of which 1 year would be in the 6 years, and 3 years would be thereafter?

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator has selected quite a hypothetical case. To cover peculiar cases in which, for example, a man gets his 12 months' training, serves for a certain time in the unorganized reserves, and then may want to go to college and take training, there is a provision in the bill so that the Secretary can issue an order which would allow him to do what he wants to do. I mentioned in my statement that undue hardship is not placed upon the individual.

Mr. DONNELL. If I am wrong in my understanding, I trust that the Senator will correct me.

Mr. GURNEY. He would not have to serve another year or 2 years in the ROTC; when he had completed his 6 years' service in the Reserve, that would be all.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, he takes 12 months' training. Then he takes his 6 years, some of which may be before the enlistment, and some during the enlistment. But when he finishes the 6 years he is through. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Suppose a man, instead of waiting to be drafted, should volunteer for 2 years. He would thereby escape the Reserve service, would he not?

Mr. GURNEY. A little explanation is necessary. A man cannot volunteer for a 2-year period of service. He can volunteer in the Regular forces only for 3 years, under the provisions of the bill. Under the provisions of existing law he can volunteer only for 3 years' service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is under regulations.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. It is under regulations. He can ask to be inducted for a 2-year period.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But if he volunteers for a 3-year period, he escapes the Reserve obligation.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. If he is inducted for 2 years, and wishes to do away with any further responsibility in the Reserve, he can ask to stay in the Regular Establishment for another year, and then he will be out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator proceed a little further with the explanation? If a man is drafted for 2 years and serves 2 years, is there a provision in the bill which permits him to enlist for another year, and then escape from Reserve service?

Mr. GURNEY. That is a provision which is definitely stated in the bill. I think I covered that point at the beginning of the presentation.

Speaking of vacancies in the Reserves, the individual is required to accept a 4-year enlistment in an organized unit of the force in which he served, or in the ROTC or similar program, whenever a vacancy exists. The determination as to whether a vacancy exists, and can be filled without undue hardship, is made by the Secretary of the force concerned. The procedures announced in S. 2655 will permit transfers to and from units of the National Guard, as well as other components of the Reserve, and will permit a system of adjusted service credits to provide for cases where individuals serve part of their time in organized units and part in unorganized units, as might occur in the case of change of residence, occupation, physical condition, or other contingencies. Should the individual decline to accept enlistment in an organized unit, or should he fail to serve in a satisfactory manner, he may be ordered to active service for an additional period of not more than 12 months.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If a young man enlists in the ROTC for 4 years, does that qualify him for deferment after the end of his service?

Mr. GURNEY. It qualifies him for deferment while he is in the ROTC program and performing satisfactorily. If he is just starting in the ROTC, he signs up to take active duty on completion of the ROTC junior and senior courses of 4 years, when he gets his Reserve commission. He signs up at the start of the program to take active duty when he completes the course.

Mr. AIKEN. For 2 years?

Mr. GURNEY. For 4 years.

Mr. AIKEN. Four years after he completes the course?

Mr. GURNEY. For a 2-year period of time after he completes the course. That would be the length of active duty, to compensate for the deferment of 4 years which he has received.

Mr. AIKEN. So he is really getting 6 years' training, but he is qualified for a commission.

Mr. GURNEY. He qualifies during the 4 years' ROTC training for a Reserve officer's commission. He has been deferred. Therefore he must take, not two more years in the Reserve, but he must sign up at the start of the ROTC program for 2 years' active duty with the Regular Establishment.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that there is deferment for members of the National Guard. Will the Senator explain that?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall come to that shortly.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has not reached that subject?

Mr. GURNEY. I have not reached it yet. It is quite complicated.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator mind reverting to the point where he was 20 minutes ago? I did not know that he was willing to be interrupted. Am I to understand that it is anticipated that it will be necessary to draft about 250,000 men above the number which will be found among volunteers in the ROTC and other units?

Mr. GURNEY. No one can state exactly how many will be necessary and absolutely guarantee the estimate. At one time the committee was convinced

that no more than 190,000 would be necessary. I think the provisions in the bill are such that we shall have many more volunteers than we think we are going to get. I still believe that the 190,000 figure may be the maximum, but, to be conservative, I said 250,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Much of the opposition to the draft has arisen from those who feel that it is injurious to a young man to have his education interrupted, and that if he leaves for for 1 year or 2 years he will never go back to complete his college course, or even a high-school course. Is it possible for a boy in college to enlist in the National Guard and obtain deferment, so that he may complete his education? Would he then be subject to 2 years' active service after finishing his education?

Mr. GURNEY. The answer is that if he enlisted in the National Guard prior to the date of enactment of this legislation, he would be exempt.

Mr. AIKEN. If he enlisted after the bill became a law, he would obtain no deferment as a member of the National Guard.

Mr. GURNEY. He would not be deferred after the bill became law, if he then joined the National Guard, unless he was under the age of 18½. He could still join at any time up to the time he reached the age of 18½.

Mr. AIKEN. Could he sign up for the ROTC after the passage of this bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Then he could complete his 4-year college course, but would be subject to 2 years' active military service at the completion of the college course.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

The permanent assignment to posts, camps, or stations outside the continental United States is prohibited insofar as the 1-year trainee is concerned.

The committee recognizes that modern equipment and training methods require cruises, flights, exercises, and maneuvers which may involve relatively short periods of absence from permanent United States stations, and it is not intended that the advantages of these types of training should be denied to individuals enlisted for the 12-month period. It is intended, however, that individuals of this category shall be excluded from assignments of an operational, as contrasted to a training, nature outside the continental United States.

The provisions of Senate bill 2655 with regard to deferments and exemptions parallel those of the 1940 act as closely as present-day conditions will permit. Persons who are now on active duty with the armed forces, the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, or who are cadets or midshipmen, or who are foreign diplomatic representatives or attachés or officials of similar classification, are not required to register or serve, so long as they retain their present status.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there a possibility that the deferment for the boys in the ROTC will result in having so many of them take the ROTC training that there will not be room for them as officers in the Regular Military Establishment after the completion of their course, if they are required to serve 2 years?

Mr. GURNEY. Let me say that in passing the military appropriation bill every year, Congress establishes the size of the Reserve components. Therefore, there must be a vacancy in an ROTC unit in a college before a boy can enter the ROTC there. If the boy gets in the ROTC program in a college, then presumably Congress has authorized only those who are needed or will be needed in the future.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the number who could obtain deferment through taking the ROTC training would be restricted.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; by the appropriations made by the Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Then it is possible that if they were not accepted by the ROTC, they would be drafted, and thereby would lose 2 years of college training. That is why I asked whether training in the National Guard might enable them to complete their courses of education.

Mr. GURNEY. Of course there are limits which we must provide in the bill; but I wish to say that they are to be deferred until the end of the college year they presently are in.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

I understand that there are deferments for students who are taking technical courses.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. If they can justify to their local boards, under the regulations permitted and stated in this bill, the necessity for their deferment in order to permit them to take such technical courses, and the necessity for their serving the Nation as scientists—scientists of all kinds, including medicos and what not—then they can obtain deferment; and the provisions of the bill in that respect are definitely set forth, and I believe are much more liberal and are based on a more complete understanding regarding the need for such students than was the case under the old law.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any provision for deferment for students in teachers' colleges?

Mr. GURNEY. No.

Mr. AIKEN. I should expect that there might be a heavy registration in courses for which deferments are permitted. I wonder what the over-all effect would be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In listening to the testimony and in working on the bill, the thought that strongly appealed to me in connection with the point the Senator from Vermont has raised is that there are 161,000 who can possibly volunteer as 18-year-olds for training. They can take the 1 year of training between high school and college, and then can return to their respective localities and go into the Reserves. Anyone who is less than 18 years and 6 months of age can enter the National Guard, provided he can get into an organized National Guard unit in his locality, and can continue his education. Those are great inducements for boys to volunteer in the Reserves.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it anticipated that the promise of enacting this bill will result in more nearly filling the ranks of the National Guard?

Mr. GURNEY. I am quite sure the ranks of the National Guard will be filled up. Certainly this bill provides rather fine inducements, and also the appropriations passed by the Congress contemplate a larger National Guard. Certainly the recruiting should show a spurt this summer.

Mr. AIKEN. If a boy enters the National Guard before the 1st of July, or whenever this bill takes effect, and if he remains a member of the National Guard for 6 years, then will he be subject to deferment even though he has not reached the age limit?

Mr. GURNEY. They must stay in the National Guard or in a similar reserve unit until they are 26 years old, in order to maintain deferment status.

Mr. AIKEN. Will that be so, regardless of the age at which they enter?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in knowing whether the committee heard testimony relative to what is known as the classification test or what may be called the mental test for enlistees in the Army. Was any testimony on that subject taken?

Mr. GURNEY: Yes; there was a great deal of testimony.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is it in the record?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; I am sure it is in the record.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator have information as to the page of the record at which the testimony appears, or can the Senator tell us the names of the persons who testified on this subject?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to furnish that information to the Senator. I do not know the page number at the moment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Was there any discussion regarding a change of the classification test given by the Army in 1945?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; we discussed that thoroughly. We came to the conclusion that the job to be done now requires good men in all branches of the service. We also came to the conclusion that the mental test rejects only 13 percent. If we cut down that requirement considerably we would not gain enough more men to overbalance the need for active and alert people in the regular forces. That is the conclusion of the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be very much interested in knowing, as early as possible, if the Senator will be kind enough to give me the information, the

names of those who testified on that subject and the references in the record.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to provide the information.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask what the percentage of rejections among volunteers is for all causes.

Mr. GURNEY. For all causes?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, for all reasons. I am speaking of the report, which has been circulating, that 50 percent of the volunteers are rejected. The Senator has said that 13 percent are rejected as a result of the mental test.

Mr. GURNEY. Twenty-nine percent are rejected for all reasons.

Mr. AIKEN. For all reasons?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. That would include emotional, physical, and other reasons; would it?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. Only 13 percent are rejected for mental reasons.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I think he is giving us the answers to a number of questions which have been in our minds.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota will recall that after the fall of Japan and after the Congress had passed a voluntary enlistment bill, the Army changed its passing mark on that test from 59 to 70, in the fall of 1945. Does not the Senator recall that?

Mr. GURNEY. That is absolutely correct, and I mentioned that in the first part of my presentation of this bill. The requirement was a score of 59.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from West Virginia must realize that in a large force—and we had approximately 15,000,000 in all branches of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces during the war—there are many jobs that almost anyone can do. There were many of what might be called day-labor jobs.

In the present Army, which is smaller, it is not possible to absorb so many who might have a 59 score. The 80 score indicates the equivalent of a fifth-grade education.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator further yield, Mr. President?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator will realize that the 59 passing mark did not come into being during the last World War, but that was the passing mark for the Army prior to the war. At that time the Regular Army was smaller than the Army now contemplated or even the Army as it is today.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The 59 passing mark which was set as the mental test was the basis used even prior to the war when the Army was smaller than it is today, was it not?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. I completely agree with the Senator. I merely maintain that the committee feels that the 80 score is necessary. It only rejects 13 percent. In a force of the size contemplated it is necessary to have good men. There is no conclusion on the part of the committee that by lowering the score sufficient advantage would be obtained to overcome the disadvantages.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the passing mark today?

Mr. GURNEY. Eighty.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When was it raised from 70 to 80?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not know the exact date. The Senator will find that very thoroughly covered in the record of the testimony given the committee, beginning at page 1001.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator for the reference. If I may conclude upon the point made in this early discussion, the first passing mark and the one upon which the war was fought, the passing mark for the small Regular Army, or the Army of the size we had prior to the war, was 59. When the voluntary enlistment bill was passed and volunteers began to come in, the mark was raised from 59 to 70, in the fall of 1945. We now learn that the mark has been increased and raised even higher, to 80. The original passing mark was 59, and now it is 80.

Mr. GURNEY. To reply once again, the committee is convinced it is impossible to absorb in a highly specialized and trained Regular Establishment, for use of modern equipment, those who cannot stand up to at least an 80 score. One hundred is average; 150 is perfect.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Could the Senator give us any information as to whether the hearings disclosed that the armed services have been cooperating in an effort to make the voluntary recruitment system work in peacetime or whether there has been some evidence of reluctance to having it succeed, or actual sabotaging of the volunteer recruitment system up to this time?

Mr. GURNEY. The committee is unanimously convinced, I am sure, that the recruiting program established by the services was a sincere program. The proof of the pudding is the fact that the recruitment campaign brought in a larger number than had ever before come into any force of any country in the world through a volunteer system. We have secured astounding results. I think the Senator knows that in some months as many as 30,000 men have joined the colors. Anyone who says it is a failure is not, I think, on good ground. Results have been secured. Short-term enlistments have been offered. Replacements will have to be made, so that it makes it necessary continuously to bring in large numbers of men.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have heard reports that short-term enlistments have been discouraged, and that 3-year terms have been required. What information can the Senator give us on that point?

Mr. GURNEY. I can say that it costs about $3,500 a year to maintain a soldier. If they are taken in for a short time, after they are trained and sent to their posts of duty. It soon becomes necessary to start bringing them back prior to the end of the enlistment period. It comes to a point where a soldier on occupation duty in Japan, for instance, costs an excessive amount of money.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. For occupational duties, it would appear that those planning Army careers would be sufficiently numerous to take care of the demand, and that if there is a desire to create a huge reservoir of military strength, it would be advisable to have twice as many men trained for a year or 18 months each, than it would be if the number were smaller for a 3-year-enlistment period. Is not that true?

Mr. GURNEY. That is why it is provided in the bill that on a straight year's training program, the men would all be used in the United States. Men who are inducted for a longer time can be used overseas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate the fact that a young man may elect to secure his training through the National Guard, if he enlists in the National Guard before the bill is enacted and takes effect as a law.

Mr. GURNEY. And he can continue to enlist in the National Guard after the bill is passed and the law becomes effective, providing he enlists prior to reaching the age of 18½ years.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, but I also notice that the bill would take effect on its passage. It seems to me that most of the young men of this country between the ages of 18 and 25 who have not served in the Army would probably be unaware of the fact that they could elect to take their training through the National Guard. I wonder if the committee at any time gave consideration to allowing them 30 days, or any period of time at all, after the passage of the bill. Otherwise, it seems to me the provision permitting a young man to elect to take training through the National Guard would be meaningless, since that avenue of training would be closed to him the instant the President signed the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. The committee of course is endeavoring by this bill to get trained men into the reserve. It is felt that during the hearings the complete story was given to the press. I think it will be found that the Nation was advised almost daily of provisions going into the bill. I am sure every National Guard organization throughout the United States knows all the provisions of the bill. I think they have had due notice.

I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that there are only about 100,000 places left in the National Guard to be filled during the next fiscal year;

that is, new places. They lose each year about 30 percent of their strength, so that will make another 80,000 places available.

Mr. AIKEN. What will be the total strength of the guard?

Mr. GURNEY. It will be 150,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. How does that compare with the earlier strength of the National Guard?

Mr. GURNEY. The strength today is 235,000. It is contemplated over a 6-year period to get up to a total strength of 690,000. If I may, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the National Guard is not the only reserve component in which the 18-year-olds or any other age group may enlist. There are the Naval Reserve, the Marine Reserve, and other groups.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator for the information. I want him to understand I am not trying to be critical.

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to have the Senator ask questions.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the committee has done an exceptionally good job of revising the bill. I do not think it is possible to be too careful about watching bills presented to us from outside sources for passage. I compliment the committee on its work. In view of the explanation made by the chairman, I have no criticism thus far of what the committee has done.

Mr. GURNEY. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator. I hope he will continue to ask questions. I shall try to answer them to the best of my ability.

Mr. AIKEN. I am really seeking information. I am not trying to delay passage of the bill. I merely want to know what it contains.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to correct a statement I made a few moments ago in respect to the date of the change in the passing mark upon the classification of mental tests. I believe I said it occurred in the fall of 1945. I now believe the correct date is some time in the spring of 1946. In other words the voluntary enlistment bill was passed in October 1945, and it at once became quite successful. The men who were enlisted were enlisted upon a passing mark of 59, the same mark which was used during the war and prior to the war. In the spring of 1946, as I recall, the mark was raised from 59 to 70, and subsequently, I am now advised, to 80.

Mr. GURNEY. I think the Senator is absolutely correct. The only answer to that question is that if the armed forces go down in numbers their ability to absorb the lower mental group is continuously decreased.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The only thing that disturbs me with regard to the Senator's answer on that point is that prior to the Second World War, when we had great experience in military matters, the passing mark was 59, when we had an Army which was very much smaller in numbers.

Mr. GURNEY. I think it went down to approximately 400,000. It was poorly equipped with World War I weapons. The weapons were not complicated, as they are now. Certainly, anyone who has seen the complicated machinery of modern warfare will admit that it requires a pretty good man to operate some of the equipment. I should hate to try to operate a radar net, or a device of that kind, without a great deal of training. I know that if I had a boy in the fifth grade I should not expect him to go in and learn to operate such mechanisms. The Army has done its level best to call in all the men who could possibly qualify.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has used very aptly the illustration of radar, and the men who handle complicated mechanical weapons. However, there are still many men needed for other service who do not require the training, education, and technical skill necessary to handle the complicated weapons and instruments.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The point which I have in mind—I shall later discuss it at length, but not today—is why must the very high passing mark of 80 be applied to all enlistees, regardless of the work to which they are assigned? There are many who are not called upon to perform these highly technical services. There are many who perform the same kind of services as do those who served in the Army during the war and those who served prior to the war.

Mr. GURNEY. I will say to the Senator that even the man in the infantry, who does not have anything to take care of but his rifle and himself, must be of the highest quality. That is the danger point. If he is not highly qualified and capable, of reasonable intellectual ability, and alert, he does not have a chance to come back. I am convinced of that.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to point out, in reference to the question raised by the Senator from West Virginia, that on page 1001 of the hearings General Eisenhower testified as follows:

> My memory is sometimes tricky, but I thought I had directed, before I left as Chief of Staff, to drop, for the ground forces at least, the figure back to 70, and I thought there is where it was, so we could fill up certain places where we could do this, but that is basically the answer to that which I have given you.

So, apparently General Eisenhower at least thought he had ordered the figure back to 70 before he left. Has someone changed it since then?

Mr. GURNEY. If we are speaking of ex-servicemen, there is a score of 70, I think. My memory is not positive about that, and if it is found wrong I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. BROOKS. I am speaking with reference to the general situation in connection with the 70 mark.

Mr. GURNEY. We have had notice in the newspapers today that civilians employed by armed services have been increased approximately 40,000 in number. I do not know whether that is the exact figure, but I do know that there is an immense number of civilians in the United States and overseas who take care of many day-labor jobs. But the men who come into the Army are supposed to be qualified to handle the modern equipment. They are supposed to be there for combat duty and be available for that kind of a job. They must be qualified. If we have unqualified men in the combat line we jeopardize the others in the same unit who are qualified. Therefore I contend that the score of 80 is fully justified. I shall be glad to answer any further questions on that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call attention to page 1002 of the hearings, subparagraph (f) at the bottom of that page. I read:

> (f) Essentiality of a higher intelligence level in combat arms: Wartime experience did much to dispel the myth that the combat soldier needs only a strong back. It became obvious that the intelligence, the wits, and the skill of individual riflemen, scouts, tankers and small unit commanders, usually operating in semi-isolation, determined not only the individual's chance of survival in combat, but the outcome of the battle as well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me at that point?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In view of what has been said by the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to inquire who made the statement. Whose statement is that? It is General Paul's statement, I believe, is it not?

Mr. GURNEY. The information came to us from General Paul, Chief of Personnel.

Mr. REVERCOMB. General Paul is what is known as G–1, or was G–1, was he not?

Mr. GURNEY. He is still G–1; he is Chief of Personnel.

Mr. REVERCOMB. He says that wartime experience has taught us that the individual riflemen, scouts, tankers and small unit commanders must have special training. Of course, they must. That is very specialized work. A tank commander or a small unit commander has a very high responsibility. But the language does not cover the great bulk or a large proportion of the men needed in the armed services, particularly in the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. Another answer to the Senator is that the total maximum strength of all the armed forces is figured on so many units, so many air groups, so many ships in the Navy, and what not. If the men available are not capable of performing the necessary jobs more men must be taken in. We shall have to raise the maximum strength, I am convinced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like further to answer the Senator from West Virginia on the point which he raised, because I think it is a very essential point and is one on which the committee spent a great deal of time. I

believe it is a question of self-preservation. I had sons in the war. The men who are able to pass aptitude tests of between 55 and 70 are capable only of manual labor and performing only the simplest tasks. During the World War, if my memory is correct, such men averaged approximately 15 percent of the total, and it was found that the volunteers coming in were falling below the minimum of 80, and the number became so much greater in proportion over the 15 percent that they could not be safely used. I look upon it as a matter of self-preservation. When our sons go into the Army we want them to come out alive, well, healthy boys. We want them to survive. If a boy is assisted in an airplane or in a tank by a man who is not mentally up to his task, his chances of survival are that much less. It is better to have selective service to keep the men up to a higher grade of aptitude than to let them down and let them kill themselves off. We went into that subject at considerable length, and I think that is a substantially correct answer.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if the mental requirements were eliminated altogether, we would get 13 percent more men in the Army. If we lower the mark from 80 to 70, we simply decrease the percentage of rejections a little. I do not think that the advantage to be gained by lowering it to 70, 60, or 59, would give us enough more men so that it would change the picture at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I realize the value of the observations made by the Senator from Massachusetts and the chairman of the committee with respect to having in the Army persons of understanding and a good degree of intelligence. It is a question solely of degree. When we talk about fixing a passing mark of 80 when we fought the war with a passing mark of 59, when the Army prior to the war was based upon a passing mark of 59, we cannot but stop and wonder if the military is not raising the passing mark too high. What is the effect? They have raised the mark while the voluntary enlistment law was in effect. It prevented a number of men from enlisting. The figure given us this morning—and I know it has been given to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee—was that lowering the mark would bring in only 13 percent more men.

Everyone wants a necessary degree of intelligence in the Army; certainly those who are put in places of command and who direct the operation of troops do; but the Senator must realize that we are caused to wonder and to think of the subject. The passing mark would be raised 21 points under the enlistment law, and as a result in comes the Army and says the enlistment law has failed because the number needed has not come in. Did it fail?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, does the Senator have a question to ask? I think we should go on with the argument. If the Senator has a question, I shall attempt to answer it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator, and I shall not interrupt him further at this time.

Mr. GURNEY. I am convinced that even though the marks were lowered we would gain so few that it would make hardly any difference, and the committee came to that conclusion.

The bill also provides exemptions and deferments to certain ex-servicemen. Those who served the United States in its armed forces, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service for a period of more than 18 months between the date of enactment of the 1940 act and the date of enactment of this bill are required to register, but are exempt from further service, except in time of any future war or emergency declared by the Congress. This exemption also applies to persons who served in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States during World War II prior to VJ-day.

In an effort to insure that the men who served between Pearl Harbor and VJ-day—that is, during the so-called shooting war—are not again called upon, those who served between those dates for a period in excess of 90 days are exempted on the same basis as those having over 18 months total service. Although it is conceded that this 90-day shooting war provision exempts some men who had no actual combat service, it is looked upon by the committee as the most equitable way to give credit to those whose very presence in uniform during the combat phase of World War II made them liable for immediate orders to whatever type of duty was necessary to win the war. This method has been given preference over other proposals, which would seek to recognize only those who actually participated in combat, since the individual himself had no choice as to the type of wartime service he was called upon to perform.

A conditional deferment is authorized for men who served 18 months or less, in recognition of the fact that subsequent to the closing months of World War II a large number of men served in the postwar armed forces. It originally was the hope of the committee that such of the men who had served for a year or more during the postwar period could be exempted from the service required in this legislation. However, three important considerations intervened. In the first place, a careful analysis of the combined personnel requirements of the armed forces and the Reserve Components clearly shows that a portion of this group will be required to meet the needs of the organized units of the Reserve components, as contemplated under this program. This condition is a result of the fact, previously pointed out, that the 19-to-26 group does not contain enough nonveterans to meet the combined requirements both of the active and of the Reserve components.

In the second place, it is imperative that a substantial number of trained men be made available to the Reserve components. In the third place, the bill requires that those who hereafter are to be inducted for 2 years of service shall be transferred to the Reserve components for a period of not more than 5 years, and the committee feels that such a requirement would be unfair to this future group unless a similar one were imposed on those individuals who have served actually for shorter periods, in the postwar Military Establishment, prior to the date of enactment of this legislation.

In view of these considerations, S. 2655 requires, in principal effect, that an individual who served not more than 18 months—but more than 90 days—since VJ-day shall be required to enter the Reserve components, and remain there until he attains age 26, as a condition for his deferment. The bill provides that local boards shall be the agencies to determine whether positions in organized units are available to these individuals. In case a vacancy is available, the individual is required to join the unit. In case assignment to an organized unit is not available, the individual is offered assignment requiring a lesser degree of inactive-duty training. In case the local board finds that neither type of assignment is available, the individual shall be deferred until such time as a vacancy shall occur, or until he attains age 26.

S. 2655 contains specific provisions for the deferment of persons who are members of organized units of the Reserve on the date of enactment. As has been stated previously, the committee places great emphasis on the necessity not only for building a strong Reserve but also maintaining it. It therefore would quite obviously be both illogical and dangerous to embark upon any plan for increasing the strength of our armed forces if such a plan would at the same time drain away strength from the very elements of the Reserve which we are seeking to build up. The organized units of the Reserve components as they exist on the date of enactment must be left intact. The bill, therefore, provides that any individual who is a member of an organized unit on the date of enactment shall be deferred so long as he satisfactorily performs the drill and other training prescribed for his unit.

With respect to those components of the Reserve which are administered solely by the Federal Government, the bill provides that no person who joins subsequent to the date of enactment shall thereby be deferred. It previously has been pointed out that a large number of men having up to 1 month's prior service have been deferred on condition that they accept available enlistments in organized units of the Reserve components. It also has been pointed out that membership in an organized unit of a Reserve component on the date of enactment is grounds for deferment. Provision also has been made for a program for 12 months of training for 161,000 persons yearly, followed by their transfer to Reserve components, with strong compulsion to join organized units. In the opinion of the committee, this gives the Military Establishment and the governors of the several States a situation far more favorable for maintaining a strong Reserve than has ever been the case previously. For that reason, subsequent to the date of enactment of this bill, the enlistment of a nonveteran in a Reserve unit administered solely by the Federal Government is not made grounds for deferment.

With respect to the National Guard, however, the committee feels that the governor of the State concerned should make the final decision as to whether enlistments of nonveterans in the National Guard should be continued and should be accepted as grounds for deferment. The National Guard is primarily the responsibility of the States and the committee does not feel justified in prescribing any limitation which might unduly interfere with the exercise of this responsibility. Senate bill 2655 therefore provides that where the governor of the State proclaims that the authorized strength of his National Guard cannot be maintained by the other means provided in the bill, he may thereupon enlist—and the local boards will defer—individuals who have not yet attained the age of 18 years and 6 months. It is recognized that this is a very broad authority, but it is also regarded basically as a matter of sound administration within the several States, subject to no greater amount of Federal control than is necessary to protect the national interest.

The bill also provides for a number of other deferments, which follow the 1940 act very closely, but which I shall not discuss at this time.

No group deferments are authorized in agriculture, industry, or other occupations. However, the bill contains provisions which authorize the President to defer individuals whose status with respect to their occupation or employment makes their deferment necessary for reasons of national health, safety, or interest. This procedure conforms to the 1940 act. A new clause is contained in the bill to provide the authority needed by the President to defer individuals whose activity in study, research, or other endeavor renders their deferment necessary, again for reasons of national health, safety, or interest.

As has been mentioned previously, the National Security Resources Board, created by the National Security Act of 1947, maintains surveillance over manpower as well as over material needs and resources, and is viewed by the committee as correcting what was a serious deficiency in our machinery for utilizing manpower during World War II. The committee believes that the provisions of subsection 6 (h) of the bill, coupled with the National Security Act of 1947, will provide the executive department with both the authority and the machinery necessary to maintain a correct balance between the military needs and the civilian and industrial needs, and to insure that proper safeguards are placed to prevent any blocking of the flow of trained personnel into the industrial, scientific, technological, agricultural, or other fields of endeavor.

Much detailed consideration was given by the committee to the proposition of spelling out in detail the criteria necessary to provide for the deferment of the numerous critical manpower groups engaged in science, research, development, engineering, manufacturing, and the large number of other endeavors which go to make up the complex pattern of our national life. Following a very careful study of this very involved question, the committee is of the opinion that the establishing of detailed criteria and specific numerical limitations is wholly impracticable, and would result in legislation which would be so ponderous and inflexible as to be unworkable, and wholly unresponsive to the constantly changing requirements. In view of the importance of this problem, I should like to call attention to the fact that the committee's position on the matter is discussed in considerably more detail on page 5 of the report.

Provisions governing reemployment rights are contained in section 9 of the bill. This section, which contains 11 subsections, is similar to, but not identical with, section 8 of the 1940 act. The committee has taken the position that as a matter of policy, no reemployment rights should be granted to personnel discharged after serving under this legislation which would contravene, or take precedence over, the reemployment rights now enjoyed by men who already have been in the services, and who are receiving benefits under the 1940 act. For that reason, no important major changes have been made in the provisions of the 1940 act. Several procedural changes, which seem to be justified by past experience and recommended by the administration, have been introduced.

The provisions for the operation of the Selective Service System are contained in section 10 of S. 2655, and are discussed in detail in the committee report, beginning on page 17. Here again the pattern of the 1940 act has been followed closely, and no changes have been introduced which do not seem to have been justified by experience in the operation of the 1940 act. As was the case during World War II, the local and appeal boards are strictly civilian, and are on a purely voluntary basis.

Section 18 of the bill deals with the utilization of industry, and replaces section 9 of the 1940 act. This section authorizes the placing of compulsory orders where such action is necessary to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials, the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the armed forces. The section also imposes a duty to comply with these compulsory orders, and provides authority to seize plants for failure to do so. Adequate provision is made for the payment of fair and just compensation in such cases, and for the maintenance of appropriate employment standards in such plants while they are in the possession of the United States.

Mr. President, I have gone into considerable detail to explain some of the more important and technical provisions of this bill. A number of the other provisions I have not even touched upon. Any piece of legislation which so vitally affects the lives of thousands of our young men, and their families, and their future, must of necessity be far more detailed than a discussion in this short time permits. Although I am not taking the time to discuss these other provisions, I do not want to leave the impression that they are unimportant or routine. Every line of this bill is important and merits the same careful consideration, and has been given the same careful consideration, as the portions which I have discussed in detail.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that the committee is not here before the Senate today with any contention that war is in the offing, or even that it is inevitable. Nor have we stooped to any tactics which might even remotely be construed as war mongering. But we are here on the floor of the Senate of the United States to say, with all the sincerity we have in our hearts, that this Nation today is gambling with its own security. This Nation is foolishly gambling with the future safety and well-being of its people and of its way of living. We have no armed forces in being which are capable of protecting those things which we as a nation hold to be sacred, nor which are strong enough to uphold the dignity and the position of the United States on the distant ramparts which we must watch if we are to continue as a free nation. The Committee on Armed Services is therefore presenting a bill which we think will end this desperate gamble. We feel that we have reported to the Senate a bill which will assure a strong Military Establishment, and which will do it in a manner wholly consistent with our national ideals and way of life.

Every Member of this body, every good citizen of this country, fervently hopes for permanent international peace and harmony. Unfortunately, however, we cannot accept the philosophy that wishing will make it so. We must accept the realities of life today and recognize that we can contribute most to world peace and to our own security by restoring to our protective forces a reasonable degree of military effectiveness. The cost of this restoration of military effectiveness is the premium on our peace insurance policy. We have already drifted into the period of grace, and the time to redeem the policy is now—by the passage of Senate bill 2655.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before recognizing the Senator from Massachusetts, the Chair, under the unanimous-consent order agreed to today, lays before the Senate House bill 6500, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me first congratulate the Committee on Armed Services for having reported a bill which I think so well meets the needs of the situation. To me the bill is practical, carefully considered, and is so drawn as to cause a minimum of dislocation in the lives of the young men of this country.

Let me also congratulate the Senator from South Dakota personally for the comprehensive nature of his speech, for the convincing reasons which he gave, and, above all, for the tone of moderation and maturity which characterized his remarks. I think it is very much to his credit that he did not stoop to the tactic of conjuring up some foreign enemy by name in order to make votes for the bill. I say this because I am frequently grieved to read in the newspapers that certain—not all, but certain—leaders of our armed services, both civilian and in uniform, see fit to mention certain nations by name as potential enemies. It grieves me to see this, because I think it is a dangerous procedure which can react against our interests. It grieves me because it leads me to the conclusion that those who resort to this method think that the only way Congress and the people can be persuaded to maintain armed forces is by either angering them or frightening them. I am glad that the Senator from South Dakota made his argument on such an adult and mature basis.

I hope that this bill is not merely a flash in the pan, that it is not something which we are passing simply because we are angry or frightened. I hope that it is a forward step in a coherent, well-thought-out military policy. If I did not entertain that hope, I would not ask the questions which I am about to ask. I would let the bill go along as it is. But because I think this is one important step in a process which has a long future to it, I believe that we should try to see this bill in its true perspective and in its real background.

My first question to the Senator from South Dakota refers to page 1, paragraph (b), line 5:

> The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

I hope that the word "insure" is not used in an exclusive sense, because it seems clear that more than armed strength is required to insure the security of this Nation today. Armament will not stop communism. To do that we must build an organization which can prevent the threatening Communist encirclement by effective political and economic means. Without such an organized effort we cannot be secure. Therefore, my first question to the Senator from South Dakota is, Does he not agree that the armed services alone cannot insure our security?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I brought that out forcibly, I thought, in my presentation of the bill. I told how our committee had carefully looked first at the manpower needs, and how to secure them, and reached a conclusion based upon a study of the fiscal needs of the Government. That was not all I said. More than armed services are required to insure the safety of our country, by a long way. The morale of our people, the belief that the Government is being properly conducted, and the way the people support the program adopted by Congress will go a long way toward keeping our country strong.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

On page 2, line 6, subparagraph (d), the Congress declares that—

> It is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

I am convinced of the great potential of the National Guard for modern war. But my friends in the guard have told me how dangerous it is to make unfair demands on the National Guard and to expect it to perform functions which do not lie within the National Guard's special capabilities. I believe that those members of the guard are right in insisting that the demands made on them should be of a sort which they can meet. Let me add parenthetically my contention that there are certain tasks which the National Guard can discharge better than can any other component. So in this spirit I ask the Senator from South Dakota, What is the meaning of the words "first line"? Do they mean that on D–day a National Guard division will be required to make an air drop at some distant point, of the type which we properly would expect an organization like the Eighty-second Airborne to make?

Mr. GURNEY. Absolutely not. We have put in writing the policy of the Military Establishment of the United States ever since the National Guard was organized. The National Guard has always been the first line of defense after the Regular Military Establishment. We put that policy in writing, just as we did in the Selective Service Act of 1940.

Mr. LODGE. To answer my question specifically, does this mean that on D-day we would expect the National Guard to make an air drop of the type which we would expect the Eighty-second Airborne to make?

Mr. GURNEY. The quick answer is "No," because there are no National Guard units equipped, trained, and maintained at that degree of efficiency. The National Guard Air Force is equipped and is training with almost modern planes. Modern planes are provided in the bill which the Senate passed not long ago. There is provision for jet fighters. They would be expected to take their place in an actual combat defense of the United States, and they would be expected to be ready on D-day. I can visualize a National Guard parachute group being organized. I do not think I would advise it. Nevertheless, the National Guard has its place in the picture. If through this bill and other programs we can make of the National Guard a trained unit, and if we do not have to wait for it to screen out its officers for age and physical disability, then we can expect the National Guard to take its place in the defense line on D-day.

Mr. LODGE. I echo the desire of the Senator from South Dakota to do everything possible to build up and strengthen the National Guard, but it seems to me that we should not expect the National Guard to beat the Regular Army at its own game.

Mr. GURNEY. Absolutely not.

Mr. LODGE. As I have previously stated, I believe that there are definite military tasks which the National Guard can perform better than can the Regular Army. The National Guard ought to be encouraged to perform such functions.

Subparagraph (d) also refers to "such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force."

How many of such Reserve units are there? Can the Senator give me that information? As I understand, that language refers to Reserve units, and not to National Guard units. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct; the Reserve units as authorized in the appropriations which we make each year. They are maintained through such appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. Does this language exclude individuals from being called?

Mr. GURNEY. Oh, no. Anyone with a Reserve commission can be called, as the Senator knows.

Mr. LODGE. Is it the thought here to develop Reserve divisions—infantry divisions and armored divisions—or is it the thought to have the Reserve units composed of technical troops, such as signal troops? To what type of reserve units does this refer?

Mr. GURNEY. Of course, class A units in the Reserves are mainly technical units at the present time. How they will be developed during the years ahead I do not know. But this section of the bill sets forth the congressional policy of first saying that there shall be a Regular Establishment, and then the class A units, including the National Guard, and then the other Reserve units, as they fall into place. Whatever state of efficiency they may attain will depend upon how the Congress supports them, and, of course, that will depend on how the country needs them.

Mr. LODGE. I was wondering whether it was the thought to develop other reserve units, in addition to the technical units.

Mr. GURNEY. Not in this bill.

Mr. LODGE. Because it would seem to me that if that were done, there would be a duplication of the National Guard, and that might entail some lost motion. I do not know, but I was wondering what that phrase meant.

Now I should like to call the Senator's attention to page 3 of the report. The statement is made that the ceiling of young men 18 years of age is 161,000. How will those 161,000 young men be apportioned as between the Army, Navy, and Air?

Mr. GURNEY. 110,000 for the Army; 36,000 for the Navy, including 6,000 for the Marines; and 15,000 for the Air.

Mr. LODGE. Does that ratio reflect the ratio which we might expect to have in the event of a total deployment, in the event of a total mobilization? Do those figures—110,000 for the Army, 36,000 for the Navy, and 15,000 for the Air Force—reflect the apportionment of the Nation's available supply of military manpower in case of total mobilization?

Mr. GURNEY. They do not.

Mr. LODGE. What do they reflect?

Mr. GURNEY. They reflect the kind of jobs the men have to do and the ability of the troops, without bringing on additional instructors, to absorb trainees in those particular numbers, without increasing the budget.

Mr. LODGE. The men I am talking about now are for training. I refer to the 161,000 18-year-olds, for training.

Mr. GURNEY. The Army can absorb, without increasing its establishment, the total number authorized in this bill. The Army can take care of an additional 110,000 in the first year. Similarly, the Navy can take care of 36,000, and the Air Force can take care of 15,000 within the present budget, because after they are trained for 6 months of basic training, then in the last 6 months the trainees can do jobs, and can release combat soldiers to mobile units. Therefore, the different services get some good from the 161,000 trainees who are expected to volunteer.

Mr. LODGE. And they are apportioned, then, not on the basis of the relative importance of the services for future mobilization, but on the basis of the training facilities which exist at the present time, is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. So we are not producing 110 ground soldiers for every 15 aviators because we think the ground soldiers are that much more valuable than the aviators; are we?

Mr. GURNEY. Of course not. The Ground Forces need more than 110,000 trainees to go into the Reserve units. We would like to offer them more. Personally, I believe we are faced with the necessity of giving training to all youths as they become 18 years of age. The Air Force could use 50,000 a year.

Mr. LODGE. Then let me leave the matter of the 161,000 18-year-olds, and try to reach this point in another way. What sort of apportionment of our military manpower resources in case of a total mobilization is reflected in this bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Does the Senator mean in manpower?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, in case of mobilization. We have just so much military manpower in this country, and we are supposed to have unification under a Secretary of Defense. In case of mobilization, what percentage will go to the Ground Forces, what percentage will go to the Air Forces, and what percentage will go to the naval forces?

Mr. GURNEY. In case of mobilization in an emergency, depending on the kind of emergency and the direction from which it comes, we would have to rely on the Secretary of National Defense, and he would be advised by the Chiefs of Staff.

The recommendations are set forth on page 3 of the bill, section 2, as follows: For the Army, 790,000; for the Navy, 588,000; for the Air Force, 453,000, which will be the total force necessary to operate 66 groups. They will reach that point by the end of 1949. The Army says it needs so many men for ground operations, so many for overseas operations, so many for operations in this country, so many for the Reserves. The Navy says it needs so many ships. The program has been agreed upon and recommended by the Chiefs of Staff.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. LODGE. Not entirely, because this bill is not for total mobilization. I realize very well that we cannot plan too far ahead, and I also realize that the way we plan depends on how the threat comes. But I also realize that we must have plans.

I should like to know whether we have a strategic plan; and, if so, how does it apportion the manpower of the country as between land, sea, and air forces, over the next 2 years?

I realize we cannot plan beyond 2 years, because we do not know what scientific developments may occur. But for total mobilization during the next 2 years, is it planned to take section 2 of this bill and simply blow it up?

Mr. GURNEY. I must say to the Senator that this bill does not reflect any strategic plan. In no way does it attempt to reflect a strategic plan.

Mr. LODGE. Is there a strategic plan?

Mr. GURNEY. Of course.

Mr. LODGE. Is there a unified one, on which everyone agrees, and about which they are not all pulling and hauling?

Mr. GURNEY. As I understand, this bill does not attempt to have those of us here in Congress take over the job for which the Chiefs of Staff are responsible. This bill is for the purpose of providing the manpower for our immediate defensive forces and our occupation forces, and the bill does not contemplate providing men for carrying out a strategic plan.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to my dear friend the Senator from South Dakota, for whose ability I have such high regard, that he knows very well that if we are going to take the young men out of their homes in the United States—which is a rather drastic thing to do to anyone—we have a right to expect that the heads of the armed services shall have a unified and agreed upon strategic plan.

Mr. GURNEY. The Committee on Armed Services has been assured many times that the plans are there.

Mr. LODGE. That the plan is there?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The defense forces in toto have given us the estimated manpower requirements which they will need in the fiscal year 1949, starting with what they have now, what they want to build from on July 1, 1948, and what they hope to build to on July 1, 1949. That is the total. In the Regular Army, and with the trainees, the National Guard, the Organized Reserves, and the ROTC, there will be a total of 3,476,000 men, divided into various categories.

Mr. LODGE. That is for the Army?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the total: For the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, including the marines—regular troops and all others—a total of 3,476,000 men, which is estimated to be the requirement, what they would like to have on July 1, 1949.

Mr. LODGE. That has nothing to do with what I am trying to ascertain. I am trying to find out whether there is a strategic manpower plan which assigns the manpower of the United States as between land, sea, and air forces.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These figures show the assignments between the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, and the numbers in the National Guard, in the Organized Reserves, and in the ROTC. I shall be glad to put the figures in the RECORD as an exhibit, if the Senator wishes to have that done; but it would take too long to read all these detailed figures now.

Mr. LODGE. Has that been agreed to by everybody? Has the Air Force agreed to that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These are the figures submitted to us by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces in the course of their testimony, which, so far as I know, was unanimously in favor of the bill as now proposed.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand—I have never heard of this before—that is for the disposition of 3,400,000 men. Of course in a major effort we would mobilize 12,000,000 men. I should like to know whether in a case of emergency we are going to try to build up to 100 ground divisions as we did in World War II and in World I, or whether we are going to put our manpower into other things and build up to 25 divisions. Can the Senator give me a rough estimate on that?

Mr. GURNEY. I think I can give the Senator an answer. It would not be known at this point what plan would be needed in case of an emergency. It would depend on where the emergency is and how serious it is, and what kind of forces are necessary to get to the theater of operations—the Air, Navy, or what not.

Mr. LODGE. I understand.

Mr. GURNEY. Certainly the chiefs of staff have a flexible plan on hand, which is changing all the time in view of world conditions. I am sure the Senator does not expect me to know just how many hundred thousand men should go into each branch of the service in case of an emergency.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not expect the Senator to know that, and I should deplore very much anybody in Congress trying to fix details and trying to decide how many buttons there shall be on the blouse of a marine. There was a time when Congress had to legislate on how many soldiers were to go into an Infantry company, and so on. I do not want to do that at all, but I also know that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, just like the United Nations, operates by unanimous consent, and one veto can stop everything. I am not talking about papers, I am not talking about studies that have been made, because I know there are many brilliant officers in the three services who have made many brilliant plans and many brilliant projects. But what I am talking about is, Where is the machinery to

shake this thing down and get a unified organization? If, for example, the Army is going ahead on a plan of mounting 64 divisions in the next 2 years, if an emergency should come in the next 2 years, how are they going to get the 64 divisions, except at the expense of the Navy and Air or industry, and vice versa?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The unified request came to the Congress from the Defense Establishment, not for 64 divisions of the Army, but for 790,000 men for the Army, and a similar number, the exact number, came for the Navy and Air.

Mr. LODGE. I know that.

Mr. GURNEY. It was a unified request.

Mr. LODGE. I know that. I am not talking about the requests as reflected in section 2. I am talking about how ready we are to be organized in case the worst should happen. That is what I am trying to get at. I am trying to find out whether our military leaders are thinking of our armed services, as one of them has said, as a three-legged stool—we have heard that parallel—of which the Army and Navy and Air are each one leg; or whether they are thinking our armed services as a spear of aviation is the war head. What is the thought? I ask the Senator that question because that is a question that must be decided, and if this legislation is, as I hope it is, an important step forward in an attempt to mature a military policy, and if we are to put the young manhood of this country to the inconvenience to which we are going to put them, we have the right to insist that there be some clear thinking and some meeting of issues on a question like that. It is not the responsibility of the Senator from South Dakota to settle that question. I want him to tell me whether he thinks that the question is being settled, or will soon be settled, and how, and what the trend of thought is. Is it the three-legged stool, the Army, Navy, and Air, or are we thinking in terms of a spear with aviation as the warhead?

Mr. GURNEY. In my opinion the question was answered by Congress when the Unification Act was passed last year. At that time we set up a defense establishment and put a man at the top of it as Secretary of Defense. We set up joint chiefs of staff. We set the responsibilities all down through the Military Establishment. Congress can hold the Military Establishment to performance under the provisions of that act. They have performed under the provisions of that act, as I see it, by now coming to us with a request, a unified request, for manpower to take care of their responsibilities. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. LODGE. I cannot say that it answers me completely, because I do not think there is really effective unification.

Mr. GURNEY. I am completely in agreement with the Senator. I think it will take a long time to complete unification as we envisioned it when we passed the Unification Act.

Mr. LODGE. Unless there is a little sign on the part of the Representatives of the people in Congress that we would like to see unification, it is going to take even more time.

Let me read to the Senator an editorial that was sent to me by Henry L. Shattuck, a prominent citizen of Boston, written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, of the Christian Science Monitor. I should like to read this to him:

> The public is not yet being allowed to know the full failure of the attempted unification of the armed services.
>
> The public is not yet being allowed to know how disunited the Army, Navy, and Air Force have become at a time when the need for unity was never greater.
>
> The public is not yet being allowed to know that beneath the facade of unification there is greater disunity among the armed services today than before the Unification Act was passed.
>
> Obviously, this condition is not going to get corrected until the facts are faced frankly. Since they are not being faced frankly by the military leaders, since they are being concealed as much as possible from public view, it is evident that the facts must be brought out into the open by those who have access to them. Congress and the country will have to resolve the most grievous service disunities as long as the service leaders themselves are proving either unwilling or unable to do so.
>
> Here are the bald facts which for the most part are being covered up by a screen of military double talk and by fancy words from the civilian heads of the Defense Department:
>
> 1. Despite words, the armed services have achieved nothing, in fact, remotely approaching a unified concept for an over-all strategic defense plan by which the United States would be able either to defend itself at home or carry an offense to a potential enemy.
>
> 2. There is yet no agreement whatsoever on the respective tactical roles which the Air Force, Navy, and Army shall play in the common defense. There is not only no joint operation in sight, no single command in sight, but no agreement on the assigned role which each should play separately.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Does the Senator know about the agreement reached at Key West?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I do.

Mr. GURNEY. Was that agreement along the lines of unification?

Mr. LODGE. I know what happened to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would merely say to my colleague that from the testimony in executive sessions we have heard from the Army, the Navy, and Air Force Chiefs of Staff, while there is not unification as we know it in the full sense of the word so far as the tactical defense of the country is concerned, there is a very considerable degree of unification and a considerable unity of ideas as to the part that each service is to play. Naturally, that cannot be said on the floor of the Senate, but I can assure my colleague that as one individual who I think has attended every one of those conferences I have considerable confidence and hope that that will be reached.

I agree with my colleague absolutely that there is under the law no strict unification in the full sense of the word. That was evidenced, if we may say so, by the disagreements of the services and by their supporters in the House and in the Senate, and, through their supporters, certain strategic jobs were given to one force or the other which perhaps should be united. But unification must come with time, with a greater understanding by the people of the country and ourselves, who are the representatives of the people. It must come from the leadership and comradeship of the tops of the services themselves. I agree that it is not there. I agree that the recent 70-group air force has accelerated differences of opinion, but I have every hope and confidence that they will gradually work together.

The men who are leading those services are high-type men. The Secretary of National Defense has had a great deal of experience and is a man of intelligence and force of character. He is limited in his personnel and in his authority under the law. But that also is being worked out. As one member of the committee who has listened to everything he can listen to, I have hope that there is much more chance for unification than is expressed in the editorial by Mr. Drummond, which the Senator has been reading.

Mr. LODGE. I share my colleague's hopes, but I am not so optimistic as he is. It is a matter with which I have tried to keep in very close touch. The fact is that we do not know what would be the employment of American manpower if we had to have a major mobilization of 12,000,000. If we had a figure at the present time, with the present lack of authority of the Secretary of Defense, it would be only a study.

I shall continue to read the article written by Mr. Drummond, because I think it is very challenging, and I believe this is the time to be thinking about these matters, while we are passing this bill:

> 3. Furthermore, there is no mechanism within the armed services which assuredly can produce a unified strategic plan of defense and assign the respective roles of each service because the unification bill did not provide a unified command to run the "unified" Army, Navy, and Air Force. The present Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot assuredly produce such a unified plan of defense because, just like the Security Council of the United Nations, it can act only when it is unanimous. Thus, the Navy, Army, and Air Force each has a veto over any plan the others might wish to adopt, and stalemate is the result. Stalemate has been the result for more than a year.
>
> 4. Today, instead of the Department of Defense presenting a unified military program and a coordinated military budget to Congress, each of the armed services is competing for money from Congress by presenting to Congress competitive military programs loaded in its favor. In consequence, congressional laymen are being called upon to judge between the competing services and to attempt to devise something of a coordinated military program because the military leaders of the separate armed services are unable to coordinate it themselves. Thus far, there has been no coordination either in the armed services or in Congress.
>
> 5. Finally, in face of such disunification at the top, the armed services today are

riddled with internecine jealousy, knifing, mutual belittlement, and grand-scale noncooperation.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. With reference to unification, I shall now read from the report of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, reporting to the House the military functions appropriation bill, 1949, under date of June 2, 1948:

In accordance with the terms of the act there has been appointed as chairman of the Munitions Board Mr. T. J. Hargrave, who has an outstanding record as a business executive, and under his leadership the Board has undertaken the performance of some of the duties imposed upon it. Mr. Hargrave reports that from a study of 53 commodities susceptible to single service procurement, the Board has assigned purchase responsibilities for 28; and that to date of the hearing has made assignments affecting approximately 65 percent by dollar volume of the total purchases of the armed forces.

I cite that as strong evidence that there is unification to that extent, in purchasing.

To continue:

The committee is encouraged with this showing which seems to reflect the efficiencies to be expected under the unification of the services.

I am glad to cite that report and to bring it to the attention of the Senate It is not my statement; it is a conclusion of the House committee. I admit it does not speak at all of an over-all strategic plan agreed to by all the services, but it shows some accomplishment which has been brought about in a year since the act has been in effect.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much obliged to the Senator for giving us the benefit of that statement. I want to be entirely fair. I think great progress has been made. After all, we have passed a unification bill and have set up a Secretary of Defense. The kind of progress to which the Senator refers will certainly save us a great deal of money and will be very helpful. I should like to see them go a little further, to the point where we would save a great deal of manpower. While it is important to save money, it is even more vital not to waste manpower. If another emergency comes we shall have just so much manpower. Some of it must be in industry and agriculture, and the rest of it will be in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and we cannot afford to waste it. Anyone who was in the service knows very well how much wasted manpower there was in the last war. When we meet anyone from any branch of the service he speaks of the wastefulness in manpower. I have the greatest admiration for Mr. Forrestal, Mr. Symington, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Royall, General Vandenberg, General Bradley, and Admiral Denfeld. They are all splendid men, and they are all working conscientiously. But I simply say we want to go a little further and faster. If we take a young man and put him into the srevice, he has a right to expect to be in the service in accordance with a sound strategic plan in which he is part of a unified team which is going along in the light of the latest discoveries of modern science and in which his efforts will count and will not be wasted by overlapping, duplication, and old-fashioned performance.

I shall conclude the article by Mr. Drummond of the Christian Science Monitor:

This is not a pleasant sight. But it is worse than that. It is a dangerous state of affairs.

It deserves to be understood that the present disunification of the armed services does not spring from the so-called unification bill. It is simply that the unification bill has not brought unification because the legislation permitted but did not compel unification.

There is a reason for the prevailing jealousy and disunity between the armed services, primarily between the Air Force and the Navy. The reason is that one of the most delicate, difficult, and far-reaching decisions has to be made right at this time. That decision is which of the armed services—in this instance, whether the Air Force or the Navy—shall be the real, agreed, all-powerful striking force in the plan of American defense.

The nature of this decision explains, though it certainly does not justify, the present state of almost total disunity in the armed services. No decision is being made today. The attempt to do so, when Secretary of Defense Forrestal took the generals and admirals and figuratively locked them up together at Key West a few weeks ago, was a fiasco.

The development of a unified American defense plan, the necessary integration of the armed services to carry out a unified defense plan, and an intelligent allocation of funds based upon a unified defense plan are today all going by default.

Mr. President, I do not say that I agree with every single word in the article, but it is significant that as seasoned and as careful a journalist as Mr. Drummond should have written such an article, and that so much of it, if not all, is obviously true.

Mr. President, I see that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has left the Chamber. Is there anyone here who can respond to some questions on the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall do my best.

Mr. LODGE. I gave notice I was going to ask these questions, and I should like to finish them.

Is it correct that any individual who is a member of an organized unit on the date of the enactment of the pending bill shall be exempt so long as he satisfactorily attends drill and other training prescribed by the armed force concerned?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is, yes.

Mr. LODGE. Is the committee sure that the Reserve components are fully capable of conducting real, effective, and well-run training?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I reply that the National Guard facilities in the States today are not adequate to take care of the National Guard that will be built up. They must be increased.

The Navy is building so-called Quonset huts for training its Reserves throughout the country. I think that perhaps at the present time the Navy is in better shape to build up its Reserves, and to give them adequate training, than is the Army.

So far as the Army Reserves are concerned, there is much work to do and many facilities which must be provided before the training program can be adequately and efficiently carried out.

Mr. LODGE. I am sure the Senator appreciates how serious it would be if the young men to be taken in entered the Reserve components and then the program was not well considered, they were allowed to loaf around and do nothing and get bored to death, and be submitted to this great inconvenience without getting the training to which they were entitled. I just asked that question because it seems to me vital that the Reserve components realize the challenge which they confront. If it does not work out well, the results may be very serious.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. We have in my State one air National Guard unit set up primarily for defense of the great iron industry of Minnesota and of the Sault Ste. Marie locks. The airport hangar and facilities is now totally inadequate to take care of the volunteers in that area. There is no heat provided for the hangar, men are housed in temporary shacks built during the war, and practically all the planes stand outside. There is no provision to properly care for the planes in the winter. I got a very unsatisfactory answer from General Vandenberg on my request in regard to what the Air Force planned in the future to provide adequate training for these volunteers.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is very important that the services realize what a challenge they will confront when they get the young men now being sought, and they had better be ready to do a good job, because the young men are going to be critical, and are not going to put up with things which men do stand for in time of war.

My next question is, Is the committee satisfied that the relationship between the Reserve components and the Regular Army is sufficiently efficient and harmonious?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The relationships between the Reserves and the Army as they appear before our committee are entirely harmonious. I think the Reserves want their facilities and their equipment built up.

I may say to my colleague, in further answer to his previous question, that the figures which are given and the plans which are worked out are conceived with a view to what will be available in the coming year. So that the Reserve strength by July 1, 1949, and the equipment for those Reserves, will be quite well built up. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; it does. It leads me to this next question: Are there in the Reserve components a sufficient number of officers who are well trained and

young? The trouble has always been that there are men who have the knowledge but they are getting a little old to go out into the field with the young men as they come along. Then there are the younger men who have not had the experience. Does the Senator think there are enough well-trained young men?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed by one of the committee's experts, and by my own experience, that the answer to the Senator's question should be in the affirmative, that the men who are available to give training to the Reserves today are better equipped with knowledge and better equipped with experience than ever before in the history of our country. Of course, that is due to the last war.

Mr. LODGE. Is the committee satisfied that the full potentialities of the National Guard for future war are thoroughly understood? Or does the committee think we are to go along more or less in the rut of World War II thinking?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the pending bill shall be passed and shall become the law, I believe that the National Guard will get more trained men in it and more men with experience, either from actual combat or from training, than ever before in our history. It will not be a question of constant recruiting and constant drilling in the very elementary aspects of military training of the men who have been in the National Guard for a longer time.

Mr. LODGE. I did not quite mean that. I referred to the employment of the National Guard, whether the scheme is to have them organized in pretty much the way the Regular Army is organized or whether the plan is to give them certain special tasks to perform, which they can perform, in my opinion, better than the Regulars.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. General Bradley has acquainted the committee with some very definite ideas he has with relation to the National Guard, if they should have to be called into the Federal service. General Spaatz has shown us some conceptions of the Air Force with relation to the Air National Guard. Because of the lack of equipment, I do not think the air part of the program can be as well developed as the ground part in the coming year.

Mr. LODGE. Is the committee satisfied that under the pending bill every possible use has been made of civilians by the services, wherever it is possible to have a civilian do a job which is now done by someone in uniform?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have lifted the ceiling for the civilians. I do not think that is yet thoroughly worked out by any means. We cut down the civilian personnel in the Army and the Navy last year, and, in view of the build-up of the armed forces now, undoubtedly the civilian component is not great enough.

Mr. LODGE. I say it is a great mistake to cut down the number of civilian employees in the services because there are a great many jobs in the services which are being done now by uniformed personnel which could be done by civilians. If they were performed by civilians, it would very greatly reduce the need for drafting young men into the service, and if they were done by civilians, incidentally, it would be a great deal cheaper in terms of dollars because it costs much less to hire a civilian to do these particular jobs than it does to have a soldier do them. I should like to set it down as my opinion that as many civilians as possible should be taken into the services. It is an economy in dollars; it is an economy in manpower.

Was the committee satisfied that effective steps were being taken to get rid of the deadwood in the Regular services?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I reply to my colleague that we have a bill presently before the committee on that subject. One title of that bill is for the purpose of carrying out just what the Senator suggests.

Mr. LODGE. We passed a bill just before we adjourned last June, as I recall, which I thought provided the necessary authority to get rid of the deadwood. I had hoped that now, a year later, we would have a little report of progress on getting rid of some of these characters, and I say again that if we draft the young manhood of America and put them in contact with some of those eight-balls it is just going to be too bad.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill that is presently before the Senate is one for immediate action. I am informed that the bill which was passed last year has that effect over a period of years. The pending bill supplements the one which was passed last year.

Mr. LODGE. Can some information be obtained as to what was done under the bill which was passed last year? Has no action been taken?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that approximately 250 officers have been skipped over in the promotion grades so far under the terms of the bill passed in the last session.

Mr. LODGE. Is that in the Army, or in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is in the Army.

Mr. LODGE. That is a creditable report of progress. Are there any provisions to eliminate waste of personnel through overlapping, duplication, assignment to unnecessary functions, and so forth?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer to that question is in the negative. There is nothing in the bill with relation to that. Of course we have to rely on the Secretary of Defense and the Unification Act which was passed last year to carry out that idea.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator tell me why it is necessary to exempt those who serve in the Public Health Service?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to my colleague that they serve with the armed forces, and I believe that provision is the same as in the former Selective Service Act.

Mr. LODGE. Let me put a case now which was presented to me in a letter, of a young man who will be 18 in August. The courses that are now open to him, as I understand, are as follows: First of all he can enlist in the Regular Army for 3 years. The next course is that he can be drafted for 2 years. Assuming he wants to go in the Army, the third thing he can do is enlist in the National Guard before the bill is passed. The fourth thing is that he can volunteer for this 1 year's training. Are those the four alternatives open to him?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For one who is 18 years old?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; he will be 18 in August; so he can enlist in the Regular Army for 3 years; he can wait until he is 19 and be drafted for 2 years; he can go into this voluntary training period for 1 year; or if he goes into the National Guard before the bill is passed then he will not be drafted? Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Or he can go into the National Guard after he becomes 18 years old, provided he does it before he is 18 years and 6 months old, and there is a spot in the National Guard in his community which is open to him.

Mr. LODGE. And there is a vacancy; yes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. But if he would want to go into the National Guard, he would have to enlist in the Guard before the bill is passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is also a fifth opening to him. He may not be drafted at all, even if he does not do any of the four things open to him to do, because there may be a sufficient number obtained in the service before he is called.

Mr. LODGE. But is it not expected that 80 percent of the young men in these brackets will be taken before the year is up?

Mr. TYDINGS. In what bracket? In that of those 18 years old?

Mr. LODGE. Or of those 19 to 25 years old.

Mr. TYDINGS. Only 161,000 of the 18-year-old personnel are likely to be drafted during the first year, and if the voluntary enlistments hold up it is my understanding that a lesser number than the 80 percent possible to be taken in the other categories will be drafted. That is an imponderable. No one knows whether the voluntary enlistments will increase, decrease, or remain as they are.

Mr. LODGE. The chances are, however, that 80 percent of the men in the category 19 to 25 years old will come under the terms of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Two out of every three, or upwards of 80 percent will.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. And if an individual wants to be in the National Guard he must get into it before the bill becomes law in order to be sure that he can get into the National Guard.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One of the purposes of the bill was to provide an incentive to young men to go into the National Guard and into the Organized Reserve.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. So it is quite possible that if a young man waits until the bill becomes law he will find the National Guard is all filled up, and that he cannot get into the Guard. Is not that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I have one more question. I introduced a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enlist certain selected aliens to the number of 50,000 and, of course, if that plan were adopted it would reduce the number of men to be drafted by 50,000, and if on top of that we had a program to increase the number of civilians it would reduce the amount still further. Can the Senator tell me what disposition was made of my suggestion?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I reply to my colleague by saying that that proposal was considered by the committee in executive session after my colleague had given a very clear presentation of what was in his mind. After that presentation it was considered, but no action was taken on it by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. I am interested to hear that. I made a presentation—I do not know how clear it was—of the 13 members of the committee I think there were 4 present—and I am going to offer that bill as an amendment to the pending bill hoping there will be a few more members present when I do so, and that I may have a chance to make another clear presentation.

Now, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill which would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enlist these aliens, and I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table, and I will call it up at the proper time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. That concludes my questions.

I want to thank my colleagues very much for being so responsive. Let me say what I said at the outset, that I congratulate the committee on the job it has done. I think the bill is a practical one. I think it has been well presented, without resorting to any unfair tactics, and I shall support the bill and do everything I can to press for its enactment.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of House bill 6500 be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Senate—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 21, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$306,815" and insert "$311,515: *Provided*, That the basic lump sum for additional clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the disbursing office is increased by $3,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Committee employees," on page 3, after line 3, to insert:

Public Law 4, approved February 19, 1947, is hereby amended by inserting in the paragraph relating to the clerical staff of the Appropriations Committee after the words "one assistant chief clerk" the words "and two assistant clerks."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators," on page 3, line 17, after the word "Senators", to strike out "$4,482,555" and insert "$4,565,980: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or laws the basic compensation of one employee other than the administrative assistant in the office of a Senator may be fixed by such Senator at any multiple of $5 per month which is not in excess of $5,700 per annum: *Provided further*, That any such increase shall be made by certification in writing to the disbursing office of the Senate before the first day on which compensation at such increased rate is to be effective: *Provided further*, That the basic amount available to each Senator for clerical assistance is hereby increased by $660."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper," on page 4, line 5, after the word "Doorkeeper", to strike out "$822,225" and insert "$843,655"; in line 8, after the word "Congress", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the salaries of pages shall cover the periods from July 1 to July 31, 1948, inclusive, and from January 1 to June 30, 1949, inclusive, at the basic salary rate of $1,800 per annum each"; and in line 11, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following provisos: "*Provided*, That hereafter the pay of pages shall be at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum and shall continue until the end of the month during which the Congress adjourns sine die, or recesses, or the 14th day after such adjournment or recess, whichever is the later date: *Provided further*, That the following position is abolished: Messenger for service to press correspondents, $1,920: *Provided further*, That the rates of basic annual compensation for the following positions shall be: Assistant superintendent of the press gallery, $2,400; assistant superintendent of radio press gallery, $2,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 6, after line 2, to insert:

Automobile for the President pro tempore: For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 20, after the word "Senate", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$42,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 8, to strike out:

Stationery: For stationery for Senators and for the President of the Senate, including $7,500 for stationery for committees and offices of the Senate, $46,300.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Stationery: For stationery for Senators and for the President of the Senate, including $10,000 for stationery for committees and offices of the Senate, $58,500: *Provided*, That commencing with the fiscal year 1949 the allowance for stationery for each Senator and for the President of the Senate shall be $500 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 17, in insert:

The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided*, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding $900 per annum for each Senator.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of the Legislative Counsel," on page 17, line 23, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$160,000" and insert "$180,000"; and in line 24, after the words "of which", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Buildings and Grounds," on page 20, line 10, after the words "the Capitol", to strike out "$536,000" and insert "$543,990"; and in the same line, after the words "of which", to strike out "$49,000" and insert "$52,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 12, after the words "in all", to strike out "$523,200" and insert "$558,620, together with the unobligated balance on June 30, 1948, of the appropriation carried under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Library of Congress," on page 25, line 4, after the word "Librarian", to strike out "$2,450,000" and insert "$2,474,571."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Copyright Office," on page 25, line 11, after the word "services", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$713,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Distribution of printed cards," on page 26, line 11, after the words "in all", to strike out "$376,000" and insert "$400,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government Printing Office—Office of Superintendent of Documents," on page 26, line 25, after the words "in

all", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 39, line 2, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947"; in line 16, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947"; and on page 40, line 2, after the word "violence", to strike out "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

Commencing with the fiscal year 1949, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who thinks it is proper to accept it. The purpose of the amendment is to make certain that the funds, aggregating $13,000,000 annually held under the management and jurisdiction of the Disbursing Office, shall be properly protected.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am glad to accept the amendment. I think it is a provision long overdue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6500) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. CHAVEZ conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6355, making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement prior to consideration of the committee amendments.

The bill should be considered in the light of the prior bill dealing with the Labor Department and the Federal security agencies, which was passed some time ago. Normally the two bills would be handled together, but because of the President's reorganization plan number 1 the House committee felt that it should hold up this section of what would have been one bill, to see what the action of the Congress was on the reorganization plan, and to make a further detailed study of certain other factors relating to the Federal Security Administration.

Briefly, the first bill reported by the committee and passed by the Senate was under the amount recommended by the House, in the sum of $14,653,810. The pending bill, House bill 6355, is over the amount by $14,177,319, so the net for the two bills, taken together, is under the House amount by $476,491.

The Senate committee made a rather basic change in the theory of the bill as passed by the House. Both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have been concerned over a considerable period of time—certainly for a year—with some of the overhead agencies in the Federal Security Administration and have been trying in their reports to indicate that economy should be effectuated wherever it is possible to do so.

The House passed a bill and made some rather basic changes in the entire administrative organization, with which the Senate committee did not agree. We changed the bill back pretty much to the status quo so far as the administrative organization is concerned, but again we have admonished the Federal Security Administration to consolidate wherever it can be done satisfactorily from an administrative point of view.

One of the main changes in the House bill relates to the United States Employment Service, which the House consolidated with the Unemployment Compensation Administration, creating a separate bureau outside the Social Security Administration. The Senate committee proposal is that the United States Employment Service be left under the Department of Labor at this time. Our reason is that when the President's reorganization plan was before the Senate there was considerable discussion on the floor. One of the major points made at that time was that the two Houses of Congress had passed the Lodge-Brown resolution for the creation of a commission to study the executive branch of the Government, which commission is now functioning under the chairmanship of Mr. Hoover. It has been instructed to report to Congress not later than 10 days after the Eighty-first Congress meets in January. It was felt that if that reason was valid at the time the President's reorganization plan was before the Senate, it is still a valid reason why this change should not be made, because in the event the Commission should make other recommendations, a considerable amount of confusion would be created in this agency. Hence we leave the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor. In addition, we have made some rather substantial increases in the appropriations for that agency, which we felt were necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the United States Employment Service, including a Director at not to exceed $10,000 per annum and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $5,000,000, of which $2,265,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

For grants to the several States (including Alaska and Hawaii), in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49–49l), and for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, including, upon the request of any State, the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, $68,000,000, of which not to exceed $757,000 shall be available to the United States Employment Service for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia and for use in carrying

into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in Puerto Rico: *Provided,* That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, prior to July 1, 1950: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 (a) and section 6 of the act of June 6, 1933, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the act of June 6, 1933, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its public employment offices.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 7, to insert:

In carrying out the provisions of said act of June 6, 1933, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of said act; such methods and the methods required pursuant to section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be promulgated jointly by the Secretary and the Federal Security Administrator and both such methods shall be administered in a manner which assures consistency in their application.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 18, to insert:

Whenever funds are paid to the same State agency under this heading and title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, (1) such State agency may, if it so elects, submit to the Secretary and the Federal Security Administrator a joint budget covering both the functions for which grants are made under this heading and the functions for which grants are made under such title III; in such a case, the Secretary of Labor shall, if the State agency so elects, certify to the Federal Security Agency the amounts to be paid to the State under this heading and upon receipt of such certification, the Federal Security Agency shall certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the amount, if any, payable by said Agency under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended. Any additional amounts so certified by the Federal Security Agency shall be paid to the State by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the appropriation herein made available; and (2) the State agency may commingle such funds and account therefor by such accounting, statistical, sampling, or other methods as may be found by the Secretary of Labor and the Federal Security Administrator, respectively, to afford reasonable assurance that the funds paid to the State agency under this heading and the funds paid to the State agency under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, are expended for the respective purposes of this heading and of such title III.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 19, to insert:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. The authorities, restrictions, and prohibitions specified under the head "Department of Labor—General Provisions" in title I of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be applicable to this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 1, to change the title number from "I" to "II."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 5, line 8, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which not to exceed $132,000 shall be available until expended, for demonstrating the effectiveness of a scholarship program to provide doctors for practice among underprivileged groups in areas where the need for doctors is most acute, through the award of undergraduate medical scholarships (including maintenance)."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the language of this amendment needs clarification. To that end I offer to the committee amendment the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from California to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 8, in the committee amendment, after the numerals "$1,000,000", it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "of which not to exceed $132,000" and insert ": *Provided,* That not to exceed $132,000 of the total sum appropriated under this head."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the committee amendment on page 5, line 8.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 20, after the word "patients", to strike out "$10,278,000" and insert "$9,028,000"; and on page 7, line 3, after the words "total of", to strike out "$2,720,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 10, to strike out:

Emergency disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service; activities necessary to assist the Territory of Alaska in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services for the purposes set forth in sections 301, 311, 361, 363, and 704 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft and the objects specified in the preamble paragraph under the heading "Public Health Service" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, $700,000, of which such amounts as the Surgeon General may determine may be transferred to the appropriation "Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth," without regard to the limitation on the number of regular active commissioned officers carried in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949: *Provided,* That in making apportionments pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, the entire sum herein appropriated may be apportioned for obligation prior to March 1, 1949.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (e), (g), and (i) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft and the objects specified in the paragraph immediately following the caption "Public Health Service" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, $1,100,000, which amount shall be in addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere for the same purposes and shall be available for transfer to the appropriation "Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth," in such amounts as the Surgeon General may determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 9, to strike out:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants to the several States (including Alaska and Hawaii) in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-491), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. III), including, upon the request of any State, the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, $123,000,000, of which not to exceed $600,000 shall be available to the Federal Security Administrator for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia and for use in carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in Puerto Rico: *Provided,* That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, prior to July 1, 1950: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 5 (a) or section 6 of the act of June 6, 1933, or in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Federal Security Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the act of June 6, 1933, and with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further,* That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Federal Security Agency and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

In carrying out the provisions of said act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall apply.

Reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen: For payments to seamen as authorized by title XIII of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. XIII), $750,000.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $5,312,000, of which $2,265,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Grants to States, fiscal year 1950: For making, after May 31, 1949, payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1950, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for the fiscal year 1950.

Effective July 1, 1948, the United States Employment Service, including its functions under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is transferred to the Federal Security Agency, and on and after such date the functions of the Secretary of Labor with respect to the United States Employment Service are transferred to the Federal Security Administrator and shall be performed by him or, under his direction and control, by such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as he may designate. There are transferred to the Federal Security Agency, for use in connection with the functions transferred by the provisions of this paragraph, the personnel, property, and records of the United States Employment Service, and the balances of such prior appropriations, allocations, and other funds available to the United States Employment Service as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine. The provisions of section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong.) shall apply to the transfer effected by this paragraph in like manner as if such transfer were a reorganization of the agencies and functions concerned under the provisions of that act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 12, line 23, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$1,246,000" and insert "$1,417,993."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 23, to insert:

Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: For grants to States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. III), $68,500,000, of which such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Federal Security Agency and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the unemployment compensation administration of States receiving grants herefrom

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 8, to insert:

Reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen: For payments to seamen as authorized by section 306 of the act of August 10, 1946 (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. XIII), $750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 12, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employment Security: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; and printing and binding, including purchase of reprints; $1,196,671.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 22, after the word "than", to strike out "$36,244,300" and insert "$36,000,000"; and on page 14, line 11, after the word "and", to strike out "$55,000" and insert "$80,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 25, after the word "distribution", to strike out "$1,385,000" and insert "$1,524,737."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 9, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$166,000" and insert "$302,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 17, line 11, after "titles I," to insert "III."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator," on page 18, line 5, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$1,533,000" and insert "$1,855,000"; and in line 6, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That after June 30, 1948, the position of Federal Security Administrator shall be in the special executive grade established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and the salary of the Administrator shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum as authorized by such act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 15, after the word "field", to strike out "$815,000" and insert "$822,418"; in line 20, after the words "purchase of", to strike out "duplicating"; and in line 21, after the words "performance of", to strike out "duplicating."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 5, to strike out:

Terminal leave: For payment of accrued annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of transfers or consolidation of functions, or reductions of appropriations provided herein, $150,000, to be available until September 30, 1948: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not be so construed as to affect the availability of any other appropriation for such purpose.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Terminal leave: On request of the Federal Security Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed a total of $300,000, from unexpended balances of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1948, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of transfers or consolidation of functions, or reductions of appropriations provided herein, to remain available until December 31, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 19, line 24, to change the section number from "102" to "202."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 5, to change the section number from "103" to "203."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 9, to change the section number from "104" to "204."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 16, to change the section number from "105" to "205."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 22, to change the section number from "106" to "206."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 21, to strike out:

SEC. 407. The Federal Security Administrator, if he finds it necessary for the more practical and efficient operation of the Agency, shall have the authority to transfer funds between the appropriations "Salaries, Office of the Administrator," "Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations," "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner," and "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employment Security," but no appropriation shall be either increased or decreased more than 5 percent by such transfers: *Provided*, That no such transfers shall be used for the purpose of creating new functions or for the purpose of effectuating the transfer of functions between appropriations.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 207. In order that the Administrator may effectuate reorganization plans submitted and approved pursuant to the Reorganization acts of 1939 and 1945 he may transfer to the foregoing appropriations under this title from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency such sums as represent a consolidation in the Office of the Administrator of any of the administrative functions of said constituent units: *Provided*, That no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation of administrative functions will result in a reduction of administrative salary and other expenses and such reduction is accompanied by savings in funds appropriated to the Federal Security Agency which savings shall not be expended for any other purpose but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 4, to change the section number from "108" to "208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 17, to change the section number from "109" to "209"; on page 23, line 3, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; in line 17, after the word "violence," to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947," and on page 24, line 6, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an explanation of this particular language. This was a rider which was put in for the first time in the House of Representatives. It added to the language which appears in the present appropriation bill, as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salaries

or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

That is a part of the existing law carried in the appropriation bill, and we make no change in that.

However, the House for the first time has added the following language:

Or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

It was the feeling of the subcommittee and of the full Appropriations Committee that such a provision would work an injustice upon a number of Federal employees, including practically all, if not all, the employees at the Government Printing Office who are members of the International Typographical Union, because the officers of that union have not complied with that particular provision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

We felt it would be unfair to those employees, inasmuch as the individual employee himself might be much opposed to the position taken by his officers, and might desire to have them comply with that law; and yet he would be caught in a squeeze play, and would be penalized because the officers of the union have not done something which they are not required to do under the law unless they wish to take advantage of certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

For that reason, the committee recommends the striking out of the language inserted by the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 16, to strike out:

TITLE II. REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. Amounts made available in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1949, are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act:

Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses, $22,000;

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor, $28,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 1, to change the section number from "202" to "210"; and in line 2, after the word "Supplemental", to insert "Labor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6355) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have now returned to the unfinished business; have we not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6430, the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short statement explaining the changes made in the District of Columbia appropriation bill by the Senate committee, with a reduction of $1,597,000 under the amounts included in the bill by the House.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amount of bill as passed House	$101,164,983
Amount of reduction by Senate (net)	1,597,000
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	99,567,983
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates for 1949	101,897,283
Amount of appropriations, 1948	95,936,229
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the estimates for 1949	2,329,300
Exceeds the appropriations for 1948	3,631,754

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I now ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 17, after the words "water funds", to strike out "reclamation of Anacostia flats."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, after the word "payable", to strike out "for" and insert "from."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General administration," on page 3, line 24, after the word "investigations", to strike out "$232,600" and insert "$224,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 14, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$245,600" and insert "$236,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fiscal service," on page 4, line 22, after the word "advertised", to strike out "$594,000" and insert "$589,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 10, after "36 Stat. 967)", to strike out "$316,000" and insert "$311,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 14, after "Auditor's office", to strike out "$418,400" and insert "$408,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Regulatory agencies," on page 6, line 22, after "Department of Insurance", to strike out "$62,800" and insert "$78,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 2, after the word "measure", to strike out "$148,200" and insert "$145,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public schools—Operating expenses," on page 8, line 9, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$586,000" and insert "$582,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 16, after the word "children", to strike out "$13,864,500" and insert "$13,764,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 7, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$2,662,000" and insert "$2,632,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Capital outlay," on page 11, line 1, after the word "School", to strike out "$477,600" and insert "$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 20, to insert:

SURVEY OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

For a complete survey of the public-school system of the District of Columbia with respect to the adequacy of the present plant and personnel, as well as educational meth-

ods and practices, to serve the District, said survey to be conducted under the supervision of a person qualified by training and experience in the field of public-school education to be appointed by the chairmen of the subcommittees on District of Columbia appropriations of the respective appropriation committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives at a salary of $1,000 per month and $300 per month for expenses, $100,000: *Provided*, That the person so appointed to supervise the said survey is authorized to employ necessary assistants at rates of pay to be approved by the chairmen of the said subcommittees, and the said director may request and be entitled to obtain such clerical assistance as he may deem necessary from agencies of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the said director shall make a full report to the aforesaid chairmen prior to March 1, 1949, setting forth the results of the survey and his recommendations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Library," on page 17, line 10, after the numerals "1945", to strike out "$1,221,000" and insert "$1,201,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Recreation Department," on page 18, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$1,077,000" and insert "$1,072,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 10, after "(58 Stat. 791)", to strike out "$296,000" and insert "$281,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Metropolitan Police," on page 20, line 2, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "$6,357,000" and insert "$6,232,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fire Department," on page 21, line 11, after the word "grounds", to strike out "$3,703,000" and insert "$3,653,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 14, to insert:

Capital outlay, Fire Department: For an additional amount for the acquisition of sites for fire-engine houses in the vicinity of Forty-ninth and East Capitol Streets SE., and in the vicinity of Twenty-fourth and Irving Street SE., and for the purchase of fire-alarm systems, $15,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Courts," on page 22, line 11, after "Juvenile Court", to strike out "$255,200" and insert "$257,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Health Department," on page 25, line 22, after the word "and", to strike out "not to exceed $312 per annum for each automobile, for dairy-farm inspectors" and insert "4 cents per mile but not more than $480 per annum for each automobile for dairy-farm inspectors."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 16, to strike out:

Capital outlay, Gallinger Municipal Hospital: For an additional amount for the construction of new pediatrics building, $300,000, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for such building at a total cost not to exceed $1,610,000; for an additional amount for the construction of an incinerator, $15,000; in all, $315,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Capital outlay, Gallinger Municipal Hospital: For an additional amount for the construction of an incinerator, $15,000; and for the preparation of plans and specifications for a new psychiatric building, $30,000; in all, $45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $620,000 contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, for the construction of a new pediatrics building is made available for a combination pediatrics and crippled children's building, including $60,000 for additional construction services, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of such combination pediatrics and crippled children's building at a total cost of not to exceed $2,050,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 11, to insert:

Not to exceed $5,340 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $190,000 contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, for the construction of a laboratory building is made available as an additional amount for the preparation of plans and specifications for a laboratory building, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of such laboratory building at a total cost of not to exceed $478,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 16, after the figure "$400,000", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the in-patient rate shall not exceed $9 per diem and the out-patient rate shall not exceed $2 per visit."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Corrections," on page 30, line 15, after the word "sentence", to strike out "$2,631,000" and insert "$2,606,000", and in line 23, after the word "parolees", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $23,000 of the amount appropriated for 'Operating expenses, adult correctional services,' District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947, and the unexpended balance of the amount of $116,600 appropriated for 'Capital outlay, structural improvements at the jail,' District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947, are continued available until June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public welfare," on page 33, line 7, after the word "building", to strike out $3,535,200" and insert "$3,485,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 9, after the words "Training School", to insert "Temporary Home for Former Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines"; and on page 35, line 2, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$2,219,700" and insert "$2,244,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 11, after the figures "$36,600", to strike out "the construction of a residence for employees at the District Training School, $250,000; the construction of a residence for the medical staff at the District Training School, $115,000 and a preliminary study for the construction of a children's center, $5,000; in all, $406,600" and insert "beginning the construction of a residence for employees and a residence for the medical staff at the District Training School, $180,000, including $10,950 for construction services; and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of such residences at a total cost of not to exceed $365,000; and a preliminary study for the construction of a children's center, $5,000; in all, $221,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 23, to strike out:

St. Elizabeths Hospital: For support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law: *Provided*, That hereafter the funds of the District of Columbia shall not be available for the care in St. Elizabeths Hospital of any person who has been a resident of the District of Columbia for less than 1 year, $6,682,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

St. Elizabeths Hospital: For support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law, $6,682,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the funds of the District of Columbia shall not be available for the care of any person admitted hereafter to St. Elizabeths Hospital who has not lived in the District of Columbia for more than 1 year immediately prior to application for voluntary admission or the filing of the petition provided for in the act approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public works," on page 39, line 25, after the word "each", to strike out "$112,900" and insert "$106,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 16, after the word "dumps", to strike out "$3,285,000" and insert "$3,265,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48 after line 22, to strike out:

Capital outlay, Division of Sanitation: For continuing construction of refuse transfer station and a garage and shops building, $400,000, together with not exceeding $875,200 of funds previously appropriated for construction of proposed incinerator number 3; and the limit of cost for construction of a garage and shops building specified in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby increased to $1,375,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Capital outlay, Division of Sanitation: Not exceeding $875,000 of funds previously appropriated for construction of proposed incinerator numbered three is made available for continuing construction of refuse transfer station and a garage and shops building, of which amount $36,586 may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation account "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services," for the preparation of

plans and specifications, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the construction of a garage and shops building at a total cost of not to exceed $1,375,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 2, after the figures "$5,400", to strike out "$1,172,000" and insert "$1,152,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 12, after the figures "$25,000", to insert "in all"; in line 17, after the word "Plant", to strike out "be" and insert "is", and in line 24, after the word "Plant", to strike out "in all, $2,661,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 54, to strike out:

RECLAMATION OF ANACOSTIA RIVER FLATS

For continuing the reclamation and development of Anacostia Park, in accordance with the revised plan as set forth in Senate Document No. 37, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, $20,000, to continue available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Guard," on page 55, line 3, after the word "range", to strike out "$95,200" and insert "$85,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Parks," on page 56, line 6, after the word "wagons", to strike out "$1,522,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Zoological Park," on page 57, line 2, after the word "keepers", to strike out "$502,600" and insert "$492,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 57, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided herein, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this act shall be audited before payment by or under the jurisdiction only of the Auditor for the District of Columbia and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the Disbursing Officer without countersignature.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Vouchers in payment of obligations incurred by the Health Department and Public Welfare pursuant to the appropriations contained in this act shall be certified as lawfully payable in the department, board, or office responsible for the incurring of the obligations; thereafter the vouchers shall be audited before payment by or under the jurisdiction only of the the Auditor for the District of Columbia and the vouchers as approved may be paid by checks issued by the Disbursing Officer without countersignature.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, on page 58, line 16, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; on page 59, line 6, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; and in line 18, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 12. The District of Columbia is authorized to purchase typewriters for educational purposes at not to exceed the lowest price paid for typewriters for such purposes by schools in the States of Maryland and Virginia.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1949, the District of Columbia is authorized to purchase typewriters for educational instruction purposes at not to exceed the lowest price paid for typewriters for such purposes by schools in the States of Maryland or Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no other amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6430) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CAIN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. GREEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on House bill 6407, the International Aviation Facilities Act. The report has previously been submitted, and is now on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6407) to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes, which report had been submitted by Mr. BREWSTER on May 28, 1948, and ordered to lie on the table.

(For text of conference report, see p. 6971, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House proceedings of June 2, 1948.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what is the conference report?

Mr. HAWKES. It is a conference report unanimously agreed to between the House and the Senate, on the International Aviation Facilities Act, the purpose of which is to arrange so that the armed services may handle certain facilities outside the borders of the United States in such a way as to promote the extension of our international aviation. The Civil Aeronautics Board will handle the facilities.

Mr. HATCH. Was there any difference among the conferees?

Mr. HAWKES. No difference whatever. The report is a unanimous agreement. The subject received careful consideration.

Mr. HATCH. I remember that after the bill was passed someone—I do not recall who—said to me that it would give one of the departments, perhaps the Commerce Department, power and authority to enter into the communications business overseas.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not think so, in any way. Only airway communications are involved.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Department have authority to go into the subject of communications generally?

Mr. HAWKES. No. I may say also to the Senator from New Mexico that the conference report has already been approved by the House. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MAINTENANCE OF STATUS QUO OF EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily set aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration Calendar 1298, House Joint Resolution 296.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not seeking to delay the consideration of business. I want to be as cooperative as possible in getting all essential legislation enacted. There are Members of the Senate who I am told have not had an opportunity to study carefully the report on the joint resolution. By letting it go over until tomorrow, it would give them that opportunity, and I would not interpose any further request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the unfinished business, the draft legislation, will be the unfinished business tomorrow. I hope the Senator from Colorado can agree to let the House joint resolution go over until tomorrow. It will take no more time tomorrow, perhaps not so much as it would take this afternoon. I see no disadvantage that the Senator would suffer if that course were pursued.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, nothing would please me more than to be accommodating in the matter, but we have had to go through a great many arrangements and understandings in order to bring ourselves to this point. I have no assurance we could bring the joint resolution up tomorrow if it were postponed until then. We have the position the resolution now occupies by virtue of the cooperation of those in charge of the unfinished business. It was distinctly understood we would proceed with the resolution today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the minority leader will let me make an observation, the plan that worked out for a unanimous consent order was that the draft bill should be made the unfinished business; after the presentation of that bill by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, it was a part of the order that then the unfinished business would be temporarily laid aside and the three appropriation bills and this joint resolution would be taken up for consideration. It is a part of the program. The minority leader well knows how difficult it is to arrange the program when there is unfinished business and other measures intervene. I am very well satisfied that the proponents of the draft legislation are not prepared to go on and complete the unfinished business before tomorrow. I should deeply appreciate it if we might proceed at this time on the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. The draft legislation I may say has been pending longer than has the joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. Of course the minority leader was necessarily absent and it was during his absence that the arrangement was entered into. I am very well satisfied that the joint resolution is a part of the order, but I do not want to insist upon the order. I do say it will expedite matters. I agree that it will not take any more time for consideration of the joint resolution on one day than on another, but it is very important to continue with it this afternoon, in view of the fact that all Senators, with the exception of the minority leader, have made arrangements to follow that procedure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the unanimous consent is granted, I wish to make a point of no quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I was going to do that anyway

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us do it now.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. GURNEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bridges	Hill	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Reed
Byrd	Jenner	Revercomb
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Feazel	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The pending question is the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 296. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I shall oppose the joint resolution, but under the circumstances under which it comes before the Senate I shall not object to its present consideration. I think it will involve some discussion and will take some time, but I shall not interpose any objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social security coverage, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, this joint resolution poses several issues. One is whether the Treasury Department, by regulation, shall be permitted to expand the coverage of the Social Security Act contrary to the existing law of Congress.

Another issue is whether the Federal Security Agency shall be permitted to dissipate the trust fund from which the benefits to those who properly have coverage must be paid and which has been built up by the wages of those who have legitmate coverage under the system.

I believe that I should describe, first, the type of persons who would be swept into coverage by the proposed regulation of the Treasury Department. These are typical. They are persons who buy goods and sell them from door to door, retaining for themselves the difference between what they can get for the goods and what they pay for them; solicitors who take orders, retaining for their services the deposits they collect when they write the orders; manufacturers' representatives; commission agents; insurance salesmen who represent several companies, who work only when they want to, and who may be engaged in several other and different lines of business; newspaper and magazine solicitors, artists, entertainers, writers, mine lessees, timber cutters, lessees of sawmills, bulk oil distributors, certain filling station operators; many subcontractors in the construction field, home workers, taxicab operators, truckers, and others who occupy themselves, full time or part time, in a variety of activities some of whom are truly in the employer-employee relationship and some of whom or not.

Frequently these services are performed where supervision is impracticable, where the person who supplies the goods can have no possible control over the person who sells the goods, and could not, if he wanted to, make intelligence reports necessary to satisfy the requirement of a sound social security system. They are not employees under the usual common-law rules, which is the rule laid down, as I expect to demonstrate fully, by the Social Security Act.

The present existing Treasury regulation gives a very good definition of who is an employee under the Social Security Act. I quote it:

> Who are employees: Every individual is an employee if the relationship between him and the person for whom he performs services is the legal relationship of employer and employee.
>
> Generally such relationship exists when the person for whom services are performed has the right to control and direct the individual who performs the services, not only as to the result to be accomplished by the work but also as to the details and means by which that result is accomplished. That is, an employee is subject to the will and control of the employer not only as to what shall be done but how it shall be done.

Mr. President, that is the interpretation of the usual common-law rule now in effect under regulations of the Treasury Department, and, as I shall show later, it has become a part of the fixed law on the subject.

The act itself merely refers to "employee." It does not define "employee," except that we may gather that when it included the officers of corporations, it meant that to be the sole exception to the usual interpretation of the term.

The Treasury, unless stopped, will put into effect a regulation which will sweep into the coverage of social security from 500,000 to 750,000 of these independent contractors, or self-employed.

Let me describe to the Senate the rule of law which the Treasury proposes to make effective in this field. The following shall be considered: The integration of the individual's work in the business to which he renders service, investment by the individual in facilities for work. Opportunities of the individual for profit and loss, permanency of relation, skill required of the individual, and the degree of control over the individual, shall be considered.

I am quite sure that under the usual common-law rule, realistically applied, in determining the degree of control which the alleged employer has over the alleged employee, it would be entirely pertinent to examine into the integration of the individual's work in the whole business, the investment by the individual in his facilities for work, his opportunities for profit and loss, the permanency of the relations, and the skill required of the individual. As I shall show later, there is no limit to the field of inquiry in determining whether the usual common-law rule has been met. Any fact which will throw pertinent light on the question is admissible, and may be considered.

The Treasury, however, falls into a fatal error under this proposed regulation. It takes the usual common-law test of control and adulterates it, and tosses it in with half a dozen other tests, so that under its own definitions the usual common-law rule which is a part of the social-security law may become entirely obscured, indeed, may be lost altogether.

Let me proceed and read further a part of the proposed regulation so that I can make that completely clear. The regulation goes on to say:

Just as the above-listed factors cannot be taken as all-inclusive so too the statement of facts or elements set forth in (an amplifying) paragraph * * * cannot be considered complete. The absence of mention of any factor, fact, or element in these regulations * * * should be given no significance.

No one factor is controlling. The mere number of factors pointing to a particular conclusion does not determine the result. All the factors are to be weighted for their composite effect. It is the total situation in the case that governs in the determination.

One fact or element may establish or tend to establish the existence of more than one factor, and may even have an independent value of its own * * *. The weight to be given [the] factor in a particular case depends upon all the facts of that case.

Thus it is made clear that the Department is not confined even to the factors which it lists. It can give any weight it chooses to anyone of them, and it can import any factor which it chooses to, out of its own invention, to meet the exigencies of any particular case. In other words, the proposed regulation is usurpation by an executive agency of the law-making power of the Congress.

As I said before, all the things it mentions might pertinently be considered to determine the end law point, namely, Have the requirements of the usual common-law rule, realistically applied, been established in this case? But, I repeat, they have subordinated that which is the law into one of an indefinite number of unweighted factors which may or may not be considered.

The proposed regulation would have the following practical effects—and I am reading from the report on page 19:

Persons having no right of direction or control over "employees" constituted such by the proposed regulation would nevertheless have to assume the responsibilities imposed by the act for accurate records showing the amount and time within which the services were performed and specifying exactly the remuneration received by such "employees." Reports on the withholding tax would have to be made and filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue by such persons with respect to such "employees." Timely tax remittances, and supply of other information would be required.

In instances of failure to comply with the procedures of the law and regulations, persons assigned the status of "employers" by the proposed regulation—but having no right and no practical means to direct or control those who, under the new concept, would become their "employees"—would nevertheless be subject to the penalties that apply to employers generally, including delinquency assessments and civil and criminal penalties, the latter involving imprisonment for felony.

This was from the testimony of a witness who said:

We are at a loss to know how it would be within our power—no matter what expense we might be willing to undergo—to obtain accurate records on 12,000 or more individual salespeople, because we have no way of knowing what any individual receives from the sale of our hosiery.

We do not know whether she raises or lowers the suggested commission, or whether she waives the commission entirely. We have no right to compel salespeople to report to us, nor any way to check the accuracy of such reports if * * * made.

A considerable percentage of our salespeople would have difficulty in preparing a properly informative report.

If a salesperson carries lines other than ours, we have no way of knowing what portion of her business expenses are properly allocated to our line.

As a matter of fact, we seriously doubt the ability of the salesperson properly to make this allocation herself.

Our salesperson may choose to sell as many orders or as few orders as she pleases, or for which she has the disposition, time, or energy. She may suspend or resume her operations when and if she chooses * * *. There are many instances where * * * we are out of touch with her for long periods of time.

The substance of this testimony was repeated time and time again by other witnesses before the committee.

Now another practical effect, and again I read from the report:

To sustain the obligations of an "employer," changes would be forced in long-standing relationships that are natural in their industrial environment and which are, as the Supreme Court observed in Silk, a part of the surroundings with a view to which the act was drawn. This is another way of saying that businesses long established and which have been built up by distribution of their products through relationships other than those of employer and employee would have to change their distribution systems so as to use those who truly are employees, or if this is not feasible, to go out of business.

I digress to say that the Supreme Court itself in decisions which I shall bring to the attention of the Senate, has said that there was no intention in the Social Security Act to interrupt long-standing relationships of that kind. Yet the proposed Treasury regulation would sweep into social-security coverage hundreds of thousands of persons, who under long-standing relationships, are not "employees."

Then we must think of the levy of the Federal employment tax. I continue to read from the report:

About 25 States have standards for inclusion in their unemployment-insurance laws which, if applied, might embrace some or all of the activities which the proposed regulation would bring under the act. But according to testimony presented at hearings few, if any, of the persons who would be embraced by the proposed regulation are now covered under State unemployment-insurance laws. In these circumstances the proposed regulation will serve to levy a Federal tax, unrelated to the provision of Federal old-age and survivors insurance, exceeding the tax imposed for the latter purpose on both employer and employee combined—a tax imposed upon employers alone.

The proposed regulation would bring about increased litigation and appeals for litigation. It would result in uncertainty. I have shown its unweighted and amorphous character. I have shown that there are no definite number of factors; that those which exist have no specific weighting; that newly invented factors serving temporary purposes may be imported into the situation.

A regulation of that kind would inject a whole new Pandora's box of questions, uncertainty, and litigation far exceeding any we have known under the old regulation. One of the reasons why the Treasury Department wants new regulations is to get rid of uncertainty. I repeat that by the very nature of the proposed regulation uncertainty and confusion would be multiplied.

In some aspects of it, the most serious feature of the proposed regulation is the dissipation of the trust fund which would be involved. At the present time there is a trust fund made up of the taxes which are collected and put into it to pay the social-security benefits. Those who are rightfully covered into the system have paid for their right to the benefits. Yet under the proposed regulation from 500,000 to 750,000 persons who are not now in the system, who under the law have no place in the system, would be brought into the system retroactively, on a free-ride basis, at the cost to the trust fund of more than $100,000,000. This means at the cost of the 30,000,000 employees who have rightful coverage and who have paid for it.

I think it is interesting to understand that very thoroughly, because I doubt whether any matter which has come before the Senate for a long time has been subjected to greater misrepresentation. The impression has been given to the country that we are taking benefits away from 500,000 to 750,000 persons. The fact of the matter is we are by this joint resolution not taking benefits away from a single person who is receiving them. We are providing, as a matter of fact, that persons who are now receiving benefits and who have not paid for their coverage, who have had a free ride shall continue to receive those benefits. We are doing that because those people were led to change their positions by erroneous construction of the act by the Federal Security Agency. We are doing it as an act of governmental grace, governmental amelioration of hardship

which would result if those benefits were taken away.

In contrast with the statements which have been made over the country, let me make this clear: We are keeping in the system persons who have been erroneously included, but whose position in the system is supported by tax payment. Logically they ought to be dropped from the system and be given a refund of their taxes. But we are blinking the fact that they have no rightful place in the system. We let them stay in because they are pulling their weight in the boat.

I wish to make it as emphatic as I can that not a single person is being deprived of benefits to which he is entitled. What are we doing? We are preventing between 500,000 and 750,000 coming in and getting a free ride on the contributions which have already been made by employees who are rightfully in the system.

What is the proper test for determining whether one is an employee under the law, under the existing regulations, and under the history of the subject in the Congress? As I have said, the law mentioning the word "employee," must have meant "employee" in the usual sense at the time the act was passed, which means the usual common-law conception, realistically applied. Shortly after the enactment of the Social Security Act, the Treasury put out its regulation interpreting the law—interpreting the meaning of "employee." In connection with revisions of the act, this interpretative regulation has been before the Congress on several occasions and has never been disturbed and thus has been congressionally affirmed.

Every lawyer knows that when that is the case, when a regulation of that type has been promulgated, has been repeatedly before the Congress, and has survived numerous revisions of the act, that regulation has become law just as though it had been written in the statute itself.

Let me read from the existing regulation. I have read two paragraphs of it, including the paragraph which sets up the usual common-law control test. I read further:

> The right to discharge is also an important factor indicating that the person possessing that right is an employer.

I do not think anyone would complain of that.

> Other factors characteristic of an employer, but not necessarily present in every case, are the furnishing of tools and the furnishing of a place to work to the individual who performs the services.

I do not see how anyone could complain of that. Sometimes the furnishing of the tools may indicate the employer-employee relationship. Sometimes it may not. Sometimes furnishing the place of work may indicate the relationship; sometimes it may not. For example, there is a case which I shall discuss a little later, in which the Supreme Court held that the employer-employee relationship existed because, among other things, the person finally determined to be an employee worked in the production line of the factory. In the West we have the lessee system in our mines. In one part of a mine employees, in the true sense of the term, are working. In another part of the mine independent contractors and lessees may be found working. The place of work has been provided for both. We must look at the facts of our cases.

> In general, if an individual is subject to the control or direction of another merely as to the result to be accomplished by the work and not as to the means and methods for accomplishing the result, he is an independent contractor. An individual performing services as an independent contractor is not as to such service an employee.
>
> Generally, physicians, lawyers, dentists, veterinarians, contractors, subcontractors, public stenographers, auctioneers, and others who follow an independent trade, business, or profession, in which they offer their services to the public, are independent contractors and not employees.

It is easy to visualize cases on both sides. The regulation gives leeway to study the facts of the particular case and reach an intelligent decision as to whether the common law control test has been met. Normally a lawyer would not be an employee; but a man could be a lawyer with but one client and have a relationship of such a nature that he would be an employee, would not have the independence of a general practicing lawyer. On the other hand, a man could have but one client, and yet preserve a relationship of complete professional independence, and not be an employee.

Reading further from the regulation:

> Whether the relationship of employer and employee exists will in doubtful cases be determined upon an examination of the particular facts of each case.

That makes sense to me.

> If the relationship of employer and employee exists, the designation or description of the relationship by the parties as anything other than that of employer and employee is immaterial.

That is the law. I respectfully suggest that it should be the law. A man who is really an employee should not be deprived of coverage, because a fictitious contract calls him something else. Under this regulation we can penetrate the heart of the substance of the matter and reach a decision according to the way the facts point.

Reading further from the regulation:

> The measurement, method, or designation of compensation is also immaterial, if the relationship of employer and employee in fact exists.

In other words, a man may work in a factory as an employee, and work on a piecework basis. His pay corresponds to his energy and skill. On the other hand, a man may work as a private independent contractor, as a self-employed man, at a job for which he is paid according to his output. However, he would not be an employee.

I should like to double-rivet the proposition that these regulations are law, just as though they had been written into the statute, and that there is no authority in the Social Security Administration or in the Treasury to write a law of its own. There is no such authority—and I say this most respectfully—even in the United States Supreme Court. I shall give some interpretations of the decisions of that Court which will reconcile themselves with our theory of this case. But if we are wrong, if we have misinterpreted the Supreme Court decisions, if the Supreme Court decisions have themselves made new law, or if they authorize the Treasury Department to make new law, then the purpose of this resolution is to halt the effect of such decisions.

Back in 1939 we made some fundamental revisions of the Old-age and Survivors Insurance Act. At that time the Congress considered the definition of "employee," and it rejected a social-security suggestion which runs along the line of the proposed regulation.

The proposal was to broaden the word "employee", so that it would "cover more of the persons who furnish primarily personal services. The intention of such an amendment would be to cover persons who are for all practical purposes employees but whose present legal status may not be that of an employee. At present, for example, insurance, real-estate, and traveling salesmen are sometimes covered and sometimes not. The Board believes that all such individuals should be covered"—Hearings, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 1939, page 8.

In answer to questions submitted in writing to the Board the Board's proposal was further defined, and limited as follows:

> Question. Do you mean by the inclusion of salesmen the inclusion of those people who are now classified as independent contractors?
>
> Answer. The intention of this proposal is to clarify the employee relationship of certain persons who are now on the border line of coverage. There is no intention to include all so-called independent contractors (id., p. 2300).

After hearings the House Ways and Means Committee decided that it would recommend increased coverage. It said:

> The tests for determining the (employer-employee) relationship laid down in cases relating to tort liability and other common-law concepts of master and servant should not be narrowly applied. In certain cases even the most liberal view as to the existence of the employer-employee relationship will fall short of covering individuals who should be covered. For example, certain classes of salesmen. In the case of salesmen it is thought desirable to extend coverage even where all the usual elements of the employer-employee relationship are wholly lacking—

Mind you, please, Mr. President, this is a report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives accompanying a proposed amendment to enlarge the coverage, just as the proposed Treasury regulation would enlarge coverage at this time; and the report said:

> In the case of salesmen it is thought desirable to extend coverage even where all the usual elements of the employer-employee relationship are wholly lacking and where, accordingly, even under a liberal application of the law the courts would not ordinarily find the existence of the master-and-servant relationship. It is the intention of this amendment to set up specific standards so

that individuals performing services as salesmen may be uniformly covered without the necessity of applying any of the usual tests as to the relationship of employer and employee (Rept. 728, 76th Cong., 1st sess., p. 61).

What happened to that? The bill with that amendment came to the Senate, and the Senate Finance Committee considered the matter.

In reporting its conclusion to the Senate, the Senate Finance Committee said:

The House proposal to extend coverage to salesmen who are not employees has been stricken out by the committee. It is believed inexpedient to change the existing law, which limits coverage to employees. (S. Rept. 734, 76th Cong., 1st sess., p. 75.)

In the debate the late Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, who then was chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said:

There is a proposal in the House bill for the extension of coverage to salesmen. Under the present law, whether a salesman is covered depends upon the test of whether he is an employee in the legal sense, and your committee believes that it would be unwise at this time to attempt any change.

Briefly, Mr. President, that amendment, as proposed by the House, similar to that which is proposed by the new regulation, was knocked out in the Senate. It went to conference. The conference did not restore it, and thus it never became the law.

That, Mr. President, is one of the reasons why I say this regulation as it exists is the law, and that attempts to do the very things which are now proposed in the new regulation have been expressly rejected by the Congress.

It may be asked, Should not this category of 500,000 to 750,000 persons be given the benefit of social-security coverage? Mr. President, I think they should. Personally, I believe that every employee should be given coverage. From my personal standpoint I think there is an outrageous discrimination in the fact that we cover some employees, but do not cover all of them. However, my personal views are not important.

The point is that Congress has declined to add coverage in the way proposed by these regulations, and Congress has the sole authority to decide what additional coverage it wishes to give.

Let me say again something which I believe probably is known to all Senators: The Senate is deeply interested in this subject of social security, and last summer the Senate Committee on Finance, in bipartisan cooperation, set up, pursuant to a bipartisan resolution of the Senate, a council, advisory to the Senate Committee on Finance, to go over the whole range of social security and to give us advice and recommendations as to what should be done. We appointed that council. The members of the council represent every geographical section of the United States. The council is composed of distinguished men and women. They have been working diligently at that job. They have been sending their reports to us as they have finished them. This is not something we are going to do; this subject of coverage is something we are working on now, and we have adopted an intelligent method for doing a good job.

Two years ago, as I recall, the House of Representatives evolved the famous Calhoun report on the same subject. The House of Representatives, I understand, may send over here a limited coverage bill. I have my own opinion of approaching the matter from a limited coverage basis. I believe it could be argued—although I am not making anything of it now—that the Senate has committed itself to an over-all revision of the system. But the duty and the only power to give that added coverage, to give added benefits, to change that law, is here in the Senate and over in the House of Representatives, not in the Treasury Department, not in the Supreme Court.

The Treasury insists that this new regulation is compelled by several Supreme Court decisions. They are concisely analyzed in the report, on several pages, and I should like to read from the report. I think this is rather important; because if the Treasury Department does not have the authority of the Supreme Court to make this proposed regulation, it has no authority at all; and if the Supreme Court is making new law in order to give support for the regulation, then I respectfully say the Supreme Court has exceeded its proper authority.

But as I intimated a while ago, the theory of the committee is that the new regulation is not consistent with the Supreme Court's decisions, and that the existing, present regulation is entirely consistent. Of course, it is our duty, when we can reconcile the decisions of the Supreme Court with the law of Congress and the history of Congress in a particular matter, to do so; and those who take upon themselves the burden of saying that the Supreme Court has departed from the law of Congress and has a right to do so are taking on a very unhappy and difficult burden.

In June 1947 the Supreme Court—

I am now reading from page 13 of the report—

considered the applicable standards for the determination of employees under the Social Security Act in *U. S.* v. *Silk* and *Harrison* v. *Greyvan Lines, Inc.* (331 U. S. 704); and in *Bartels* v. *Birmingham* (332 U. S. 126).

The Silk and Greyvan cases were considered together, and are the leading decisions.

Prefacing its decisions in Silk and Greyvan with the statement that application of social-security legislation "should follow the same rule that we applied to the National Labor Relations Act in the Hearst case (*Board* v. *Hearst Publications* (322 U. S. 111))" the Court observed that "as Federal social-security legislation is an attack on recognized evils in our national economy, a constricted interpretation of the phrasing by the courts would not comport with its purpose."

No one is advocating a constricted interpretation of any kind. It goes on:

And that when the problem (of differentiating between employer and independent contractor) arose in the administration of the National Labor Relations Act * * * we rejected the test of the technical concepts pertinent to an employer's legal responsibility to third persons for acts of his servants.

No one has contended that such technical concepts should be followed. The existing regulation of the Treasury Department expressly gets away from technical concepts, and recalled:

We concluded that, since the end was the elimination of labor disputes and industrial strife, "employees" included workers who were such as a matter of economic reality.

I do not know of anyone who would object to making an employee who is truly an employee under the common law control test, where that test is satisfied by economic reality, eligible for coverage under social security. Economic reality, of course, is a test available to those who must make the decision as to whether the common law controls are present.

The Treasury would make economic reality the new and exclusive law for its proposed regulation. I think, with scarcely any reflection we can see that without more it cannot serve to determine any issue. Who in this whole world is not economically dependent on someone else or some other business? The independent grocer, in his little corner store, as a matter of economic reality, is dependent on his customer, on his banker, on his supplier. Obviously that, Mr. President, cannot be set up as a completely determinative test or rule of law. The thing to do, I respectfully suggest, is to determine whether a person meets the test of being an employee under the usual common law rule, realistically applied, by using the facts of "economic reality," and all other factors pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield gladly.

Mr. DONNELL. I have been greatly interested in the discussion by the Senator of the test applied in the proposed rule. The complete sentence, as I have observed from the rule, is:

In the application of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the regulations in this part an employee is an individual in a service relationship who is dependent, as a matter of economic reality, upon the business to which he renders service, and not upon his own business as an independent contractor.

I notice also in the report, at page 10, it is stated:

We repeat, the usual common-law rule is well stated in the existing Treasury regulations:

Who are employees—Every individual is an employee if the relationship between him and the person for whom he performs services is the legal relationship of employer and employee.

Obviously, I take it, Mr. President, that the statement in the last-mentioned rule sounds reasonable, and I believe most lawyers would agree it is reasonable.

The question to which I wish to invite the Senator's attention is, Where does the Treasury Department find any decision of any court or any law in support for changing the definition in the existing Treasury regulation and using instead a definition to the effect that in the application of the regulations an employee is no longer to be considered as one who bears the legal relationship of employer and employee, but is one who is

"dependent as a matter of economic reality upon the business to which he renders service." Where does the Treasury Department find any authority anywhere for thus changing the meaning of statutory language?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very grateful to the Senator for raising the question. In brief, the Treasury Department looks at three or four decisions of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court several times uses the words "economic reality," so the Treasury Department seizes upon the words "economic reality" to make a new rule of law, which it cannot do because Congress has established the rule of law, which the Supreme Court itself could not do, because we have a congressional rule of law which requires the existence of the legal relationship to which the Senator is referring.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask another question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is there anything the Senator has observed in any decision of the Supreme Court which says that in the interpretation of the law respecting which the proposed regulation is to apply, the well-established definition of employer and employee shall be abandoned and the economic reality definition proposed by the regulation be applied instead?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say to the Senator, there are random and prefatory expressions which, in my opinion, do not constitute a part of the moving principles of the decision which can be seized upon out of context to make a flimsy argument of that kind. Let me show the distinguished Senator how the Supreme Court has protected itself in the Silk and Greyvan cases. After referring to the application of the rule which it followed in the Hearst case, which, by the way, was repudiated by the Congress in the Taft-Hartley Act, the Supreme Court then went on to say:

> This, of course, does not leave courts free to determine the employer-employee relationship without regard to the provisions of the act. The taxpayer must be an employer and the man who receives wages an employee.

That is precisely what the distinguished Senator has been talking about.

> There is no indication that Congress—

Please mark this well, Mr. President, because it is a part of the moving principles of the decision:

> There is no indication that Congress intended to change normal business relationships. Few businesses are so completely integrated that they can themselves produce the raw material, manufacture and distribute the finished product to the ultimate consumer without assistance from independent contractors. The Social Security Act was drawn with this industrial situation as a part of the surroundings in which it was to be enforced. Where a part of an industrial process is in the hands of independent contractors, they are the ones who should pay the social-security taxes.

In every one of these cases—and I am frank to say that there are some random expressions which could be seized upon out of context to make an argument, not to make a law—when the court comes to the moving principle of decision, it is the usual common-law rule realistically applied. And, I add, in not one of these cases has the Supreme Court of the United States declared invalid the existing regulations of the Treasury Department, which have become law in the manner I have stated.

I add also that the Supreme Court did not have fully before it, the legislative history which I have recited and which gives force of law to the existing Treasury regulation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to ask whether or not he agrees with the interpretation which would appear at least to me reasonable, of one of the sentences he read a moment ago. That sentence, from the observation of the Supreme Court, reads:

> Where a part of an industrial process is in the hands of independent contractors, they are the ones who should pay the social-security taxes.

My understanding, from what I have read—I have not read the case—is that the Court is indicating, in effect, that in such an instance the independent contractor should pay the social-security taxes, not the person who engages the services of independent contractors.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. DONNELL. Which, as I understand, is precisely in line with the argument being presented by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator is completely correct.

The decisions of the Court in Silk, Greyvan, and Bartels, and the tests, the moving principles by which the Supreme Court reached those decisions, were the usual common-law tests and principles realistically applied.

In the Silk and Greyvan cases the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had proceeded under the existing Treasury regulation in the assessment of social-security taxes, and the cases were brought for recovery. The lower courts held for the taxpayers and against the Commissioner.

The Silk case involved: First, unloaders of coal who made themselves available in coalyards at a waiting shed, some of them floaters who came only intermittently. As carloads of coal were delivered by the railroad, the unloaders unloaded them into assigned bins at an agreed price per ton; also, second, truckers who owned their own trucks, paid their own operating expenses, were free to work for others, and delivered coal for Silk at a uniform price per ton.

The Greyvan case involved a formal contract between Greyvan Lines, Inc., a common carrier licensed under the Motor Carrier Act, and local operators who performed the actual service of carrying the goods. The operators were required to haul exclusively for the company, furnished their own trucks, paint the designation "Greyvan Lines" on them, hire their own truckmen, pay all expenses, provide insurance, indemnify the company for losses, and to operate subject to the control of Greyvan dispatchers and under a manual of instructions which regulated in detail the conduct of the truckmen in the performance of their duties.

In the Silk case, where the employment arrangements were informal, the moving ground for the lower court's decision was:

> The undisputed facts failed to establish such reasonable measure of direction and control—

Please note, direction and control is the ultimate test:

> The undisputed facts failed to establish such reasonable measure of direction and control over the method and means of performing the services performed by these workers (the unloaders and truckers) as is necessary to establish a legal relationship of employer and employee between the appelle and the workers in question.

That is precisely what the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] was referring to a while ago. The Supreme Court squarely planted itself upon the necessity for establishing the legal relationship of employer and employee.

In the Greyvan case—the moving-van case, where it was found that the truckers put "Greyvan" on their own trucks and had to take out insurance and operate under a manual of instructions supplied by Greyvan—the Supreme Court said:

> The company cannot be held liable for employment taxes on the wages of persons over whom it exerts no control and of whose employment it has no knowledge.

See the applicability of that to the hundreds of thousands of door-to-door salesmen of the type which I described a while ago. There is no opportunity for the supplier of the goods to keep track of the activities of the person who sells them.

> While many factors in this case indicated such control as to give rise to [the employer-employee] relationship we think the most vital one is missing because of the complete control of the truckmen as to how many, if any, and what helpers they make use of in their operations.

I believe I should mention this. The Treasury has been very much disturbed over the diversity of opinions, in closely related cases in this subject matter, of our lower Federal courts. Many of those Federal courts, in the earlier days of the subject, would look only to the contract. If the contract seemed to establish the employer-employee relationship, it was established. If the face of the contract did not establish it, it was not established. In other words, they applied narrow, strictly technical concepts to reach their decisions.

Thus, in many cases, undoubtedly they excluded from coverage men who deserved coverage as employees.

Many Federal courts, following the rule which is common in connection with many subjects, would accept the differing interpretations of different States as the controlling feature of whether there was an employer-employee relationship. Of course that would cause a great diversity of opinion.

The opinions of the Supreme Court to which I have referred and as interpreted perform, in my opinion, a constructive service, because they all emphasize that

we are dealing with a national law which is intended to extend its power and influence all over the United States and which should be interpreted nationally and not provincially. With the guidance of the Supreme Court, we now should have uniform application of a national law.

Let me summarize what the resolution, under the proposed amendments, will do. We have set it out on pages 1 and 2 of the report:

1. The joint resolution would reaffirm the unbroken intent of Congress that the usual common-law rules, realistically applied, shall continue to be used to determine whether a person is an "employee" for purposes of applying the Social Security Act.

I would say at the outset that several thousand persons have been swept into coverage who are not entitled to coverage. We are not taking them out; we are keeping them in, if they are 65 or more years of age and are receiving benefits. Also we are keeping them in even though logically they should be out, if they are carrying their weight in the boat by paying taxes.

2. The resolution would maintain the status under the act of those who, prior to the enactment of the resolution, have been given coverage by erroneous construction of the term "employee" (as defined in the resolution) if social-security taxes have been paid into the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund with respect to the covered services.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough to point out, if he has it immediately at hand, the portion of the joint resolution which accomplishes the result of assuring continued benefits to those who will have attained the age of 65, and so forth, as the Senator has just stated?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the attention of the Senator to the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3. I am referring now especially to the words occurring after "(2)" on line 24:

Wage credits with respect to services performed prior to the close of the first calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this act in the case of individuals who have attained age 65 or who have died, prior to the close of such quarter, and with respect to whom prior to the date of enactment of this act wage credits were established which would not have been established had the amendment made by subsection (a) been in effect on and after August 14, 1935.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am glad the Senator raised the question. I repeat, no person now receiving benefits, whether or not he is entitled to them, is taken out of the coverage and the benefit status of the act by the joint resolution.

The resolution would assure continued benefits to those who will have attained age 65, and to the survivors of those who will have died prior to the close of the first calendar quarter which begins after the enactment of the act and who have coverage under the system because of misconstruction of the term "employee"—as defined in the resolution—even though social-security taxes have not been paid by them or in their behalf.

The resolution would stop extension of coverage of the act to between a half and three-quarters of a million persons who have not been, are not now, and should not be under the act, until coverage is provided by act of the Congress.

The resolution would stop the plan of the Treasury Department to give to these 500,000 to 750,000 persons free, retroactive coverage, and thus would stop a more than $100,000,000 impairment of the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund which has been built up out of taxes collected on the wages of those who are truly employees and who have paid for their coverage under the system.

The pending resolution would not disturb the existing Treasury regulation which construes the term "employee" in the Social Security Act harmoniously with the usual common-law rules.

The pending resolution will maintain the moving principles of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the Silk, Greyvan, and Bartels cases where, in the opinion of your committee, the Court realistically applied the usual common-law rules. But if it be contended that the Supreme Court has invented new law for determining an employee under the social-security system in these cases, then the purpose of this resolution is to reestablish the usual common-law rules, realistically applied.

The resolution preserves the integrity of the trust fund by limiting payments out of the fund to persons who are employees under the act by the usual common-law rules, realistically applied. It leaves to Congress the opportunity to provide coverage for independent contractors and the self-employed, who are not employees under the act or to those who are employees and are now expressly excluded from the coverage of the act.

There is no more reason for bringing under the act one class of persons who are not now employees by interpretation or by the invention of law by executive agencies than there is to bring in farm hands and domestic employees, and the great class of persons who are not now covered. It is the job of Congress to determine who shall have coverage under the act, and, as I have said before, I favor the Congress doing a liberal job in that, when it gets around to it, and I do not believe it will be long before it does get around to it.

The resolution would restore to the trust fund by appropriation moneys which have been paid out of the fund in the form of social-security benefits to persons not employees under the act and who have not contributed social-security taxes to the fund.

Mr. President, that is our obvious duty. This fund has been impaired by the giving of benefits to people who have not paid for them. It is our duty to restore that fund by congressional appropriation, and the authority to do it is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, after the word "any", it is proposed to strike out "determination respecting eligibility for, or amount of, benefits of any individual under title II of the Social Security Act made prior to January 1, 1948, or of preventing any such determination so made from continuing to apply on or after January 1, 1948," and to insert "(1) wage credits reported to the Bureau of Internal Revenue with respect to services performed prior to the enactment of this act or (2) wage credits with respect to services performed prior to the close of the first calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this act in the case of individuals who have attained age 65 or who have died, prior to the close of such quarter, and with respect to whom prior to the date of enactment of this act wage credits were established which would not have been established had the amendment made by subsection (a) been in effect on and after August 14, 1935.

"(c) (1) The Federal Security Administrator is directed to estimate and report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date (A) the total amount paid as benefits under title II of the Social Security Act which would not have been paid had the amendment made by subsection (a) been in effect on and after August 14, 1935, and (B) the total amount of such payments which the Administrator estimates will hereafter be paid by virtue of the provisions of subsection (b).

"(2) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts reported to the Congress under paragraph (1)."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, when House Joint Resolution 296 was first called to my attention, when it was pending in the House of Representatives, and was represented to me to be a measure which would be in effect a prohibition directed against departments in the executive branch of the Government to make regulations under existing law, and that it would also have the effect of maintaining the status quo as it existed prior to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, I was seriously disturbed, for it seemed to me that if that were the effect of the resolution, the Congress itself was doing that which it was forbidden by the Constitution to do, in that it was actually invading not only the executive branch of Government, but also the judicial branch, and that we were being asked to construe and interpret not only regulations of the executive branch of the Government, but also judicial decisions, as the courts of the land had applied the law to existing regulations, clearly a thing which the Congress had not and does not have the right to do.

As this matter is presented in the Senate committee amendment, under the argument which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, it now appears to me that the resolution attempts to amend existing law, and to set forth in the law of the land that which Congress does have

the right to do. No person can doubt the right of Congress, whether by joint resolution or by other legislative act, to set forth what the law of the land is according to legislative enactment. The legislative power is vested in the Congress of the United States. I believe and I hope that is the purpose of the joint resolution.

However, the argument made does approach judicial interpretation of laws, and also a direction or prohibition against an executive department of Government making rules and regulations which it believes to be in conformity with the law and with the decisions of the courts. I do not say that such regulations have to be in conformity with law or with the decisions of the courts. A department in the executive branch of the Government has as much right to be wrong as to be right. Congress has no more right to interfere with the powers vested in the other branches of Government than they have the right to interfere with the legislative branch.

The question before us, Mr. President, is a serious one, a difficult and complicated one. A proper consideration of it requires familiarity with the decisions of the courts and the proper interpretation of those decisions. It requires familiarity with the regulations of the Treasury Department and the Federal Security Agency, and a proper interpretation of the power of those agencies to make regulations.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, in the stress of business which confronts all of us no one has the time to make that careful, detailed study of these decisions which should be made when we enter upon such a complicated case. Although I shall refer to regulations and court decisions respecting them, I shall not lay down rules of finality and complete decision on my own part, because I realize how complicated the field is and how wrong any of us may be. However, I do want to present to the Senate today some considerations with regard to existing law, the decisions of the courts, and the regulations.

Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Colorado when he said—and I was happy to hear him say it—that the coverage of the social-security laws should not be narrowed and restricted, but, if anything, should be enlarged and expanded. I think it most necessary that we preserve the laws we now have on these subjects, and provide for their extension, so there will not exist, as the Senator from Colorado has said, unfair and unjust discrimination in social benefits.

This morning I picked up the Washington Post and read a brief but interesting editorial which has some bearing on what I have just said. The editorial is entitled "A Word in Time." I read from it as follows:

> The Reverend Edmund A. Walsh of Georgetown University, speaking on communism the other day at the annual meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board, made some telling points that ought to be pondered by the advocates of the Mundt bill.

I abandon the quotation for a moment to say that it is not my purpose now to discuss the Mundt bill, which I believe is pending before a Senate committee of which the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is a member and which it is now considering. Probably they hear enough of it in committee, without listening to a discussion of it on the floor at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator that we of the committee are seeking advice and counsel, and will be glad to have it from the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I shall continue to read from the editorial, and it might be helpful in that connection:

> He said the best way to meet the Communist menace "is to wage war in terms of the economic and social needs of the moment, strengthen our domestic economy, assist other people to do the same" and to "expose the hollowness of the Communist claim that Soviet Russia is the champion of human freedom." At present, Congress appears to be following the opposite course. Essential reforms and progressive measures languish while the reactionary Mundt-Nixon bill is pushed. The inescapable effect is to give communism an attractive issue and democracy a shabby record.

Mr. President, the editorial bears on what I said, which was that I was concerned when I learned that it was thought by some, not by a committee of the Senate, but by others, that the joint resolution would have the effect of narrowing and restricting the social security benefits under existing law. I submit, Mr. President, that instead of being restricted and narrowed, those laws should be expanded and enlarged until there can exist and will exist no discrimination against any person in this land of ours. I was happy to hear the Senator from Colorado make the statement he did in his address, and I hope—of course it is impossible before the present session of Congress ends—that before long our whole system of social-security laws will be revised and extended until no injustice and no discrimination shall exist anywhere.

I proceed now to a discussion of the joint resolution itself. Its sponsors are attempting, as I read it, to write into the Social Security Act and the related sections of the Internal Revenue Code a provision which they believe would provide for a clear, reasonable, and even an automatic test for determining under what circumstances an individual can be classed as an employee and under what circumstances he becomes an independent contractor and therefore not subject to social-security laws. If the joint resolution would accomplish that purpose, or even if it would be a forward step toward that purpose, then indeed much could be said in its support.

However, Mr. President, defining an employee as one who is an employee under the usual rules of common law does not, to my mind, clarify the situation at all. On the other hand, to me at least, the important effect of the joint resolution would be not to clarify but further to confuse the situation. I am afraid it would have the effect of depriving several hundred thousand employees of benefits under existing interpretations of the law.

The construction given the "usual common-law rules" by the courts varies from complete dependency on the legal right to control the performance of service to an interpretation as broad as that proposed by the Treasury Department and the Social Security Administration in their new regulations. Whether the joint resolution would enact a broad or a narrow common-law rule it is now impossible to determine. The administrative agencies and the courts are left to guess, with only such guidance as the committee reports and congressional debates may give to them. Yet the gap between a broad and a narrow common-law rule is about as wide as the whole twilight zone of coverage.

The report of the Finance Committee has a great deal to say about the Supreme Court decisions and their relation to the common-law rules. If the joint resolution is not intended to change the rules announced by the Supreme Court—and that is what the committee appears to say—then the joint resolution is unnecessary. Its enactment would serve no good purpose and could only confuse.

If, on the other hand, the resolution is intended to incorporate a narrow definition of the employer-employee relationship, it would result in serious inequities. The control test is subject to manipulation to avoid tax liability. It also would exclude from coverage several hundred thousand individuals who are easily recognized as employees in fact. But perhaps it is easier to understand the implications of this resolution by tracing the history of the Social Security Act.

In 1936 the Treasury Department and the Social Security Board issued regulations in which standards were set up for determining what constituted an employer-employee relationship. These standards, based on a current interpretation of the usual rules governing these relationships, place emphasis on the legal right to control the performance of services, but also enumerate other factors which might influence decisions. These regulations do not place a narrow construction on common-law rules. The regulations state that:

> Generally such relationship exists when the person for whom services are performed has the right to control and direct the individual who performs the services, not only as to the result to be accomplished by the work, but also as to the details and means by which that result is accomplished. That is, an employee is subject to the will and control of the employer not only as to what shall be done but how it shall be done. In this connection, it is not necessary that the employer actually direct or control the manner in which the services are performed; it is sufficient if he has the right to do so. The right to discharge is also an important factor indicating that the person possessing that right is an employer. Other factors characteristic of an employer, but not necessarily present in every case, are the furnishing of tools and the furnishing of a place to work to the individual who performs the services.

Although these regulations do not draw a definite line of demarcation between employees and independent contractors, they did produce logical, equitable, and

consistent results in most cases. However, there remained an area of employment where the line was indistinct, in which each case had to be carefully weighed to determine in which group it fell.

The Treasury Department and the Social Security Board in the first years of operation under the regulations issued a consistent series of decisions in which the ordinary meaning and the common-law meaning of the term "employee" was properly interpreted as not being wholly restricted to instances in which the legal right of control was present. The Treasury Department in 1937 and 1938 ruled that truck owner-drivers were employees of the company for whom they worked. Outside salesmen who were an integral part of a company's distribution system were held to be employees, even though they worked solely on a commission basis and were relatively free from ordinary controls.

It was found, however, that the working agreements between employers and outside salesmen were so varied that generally applicable precedents could not be established. Consequently, when the general amendments to the Social Security Act were being considered in 1939, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives suggested the adoption of a rule of thumb for determining the coverage of salesmen. This proposal, which was ultimately rejected by the Senate and the Congress, would have brought salesmen under the law who were not employees; all salesmen would have been included unless they were brokers or factors selling on behalf of more than one company and employing at least one assistant salesman in their brokerage or factoring business or unless the selling was "casual service" not in the course of the salesman's principal occupation. This approach would have brought under the law all salesmen in the twilight zone of employment relationship and in addition a large number obviously self-employed.

The failure of Congress to enact this proposed amendment does not indicate any congressional intent to narrow the definition of employer-employee relationship. All that the action indicated, and all that the Finance Committee said, was that they did not want to go beyond employees. They said absolutely nothing about how the term "employee" should be defined, and any argument that by its failure to adopt the provision Congress intended that future determinations should be narrowly construed is erroneous. Since the term was left entirely undefined, just as it was in the 1935 act, it is subject to reasonable administrative and judicial interpretation in the light of the purpose of the statute.

The first narrowing of the definition of employee-employer relationship in practice occurred in 1941. Certain Federal circuit courts issued a series of decisions against the Government, beginning with the case of the Texas Co. against Higgins, decided on April 4, 1941. In the Texas Co. case and several of the following lower court decisions the court was guided by the language of the contracts between the parties. Apparently the real substance of the arrangements was not considered. As a result of the decisions, the Treasury Department felt that it was forced to adopt with respect to employment taxes under the Internal Revenue Code a narrower interpretation of the term "employee" than it had used in the past, although it never reached the point of placing sole emphasis on the control test. The Social Security Board on the other hand continued to use the broader interpretation for its determinations on benefit rights under title II of the Social Security Act. The decisions of the two agencies therefore at times were at a variance on the same set of facts, the Treasury Department holding that there was no tax liability and the Social Security Board holding that benefits were payable. Of course, that was a perfectly impossible situation.

A more serious result of these lower-court decisions was the encouragement it gave some persons to write contracts with many of their employees for the specific purpose of avoiding Federal unemployment and old-age and survivors' insurance taxes. The contracts usually did not substantially alter the economic relationship between the parties. The testimony given at the hearing before the Finance Committee and the reports issued by the Ways and Means Committee of the House on this resolution cite several examples of this practice. In a court decision, Nevins, Inc., against Rothensies, it was brought out that a chain drug company converted former branch managers into licensees, yet the company advanced all necessary equipment and inventories to each store. The licensees were held to be independent contractors, despite the fact that the economic relationship with the drug company remained virtually the same as it had been before.

Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing testified that his agency had seen a job in a factory, right in the assembly line, contracted out to a so-called independent contractor. Tax services advised their subscribers on how to write contracts that would get by the courts. A great many companies that employed full-time salesmen on a salary or commission basis attempted to change those men into independent contractors by means of purchase-and-sales arrangements which gave them title to goods on credit and allowed the return of all unsold articles. A typical agreement usually guaranteed the salesman a minimum profit, gave him a territory, and retained the right to terminate the contracts on short notice if sales fell below expectations. This type of sales arrangement would be the company's regular distribution method. The company could make price adjustments as it saw fit, and it could control the amount and kind of merchandise made available to the salesman. It also would furnish the salesman the leads and the advertising materials. Usually the salesman had no capital investment of any consequence. He was, in fact, an employee of the company; yet some of the lower courts held that a salesman of this type was an independent contractor.

Of course the elements establishing the actual degree of independence or control vary in every case and in every type of business relationship. The essential thing is that the statement in a contract that a particular individual is or is not an employee cannot govern the determination. The substance of the agreement must be examined in every case. As the Federal Security Administrator said in his testimony to the Senate Finance Committee in opposing House Joint Resolution 296:

> One needs no profound knowledge of the ways of the world to know that a man who depends for his bread and butter on his earnings from the job will generally take orders from the boss no matter what clauses may have been written into his contract.

Judge Cardozo, in Glielmi against Netherland Dairy Co., a workman's compensation case in New York, said:

> If he (the employee) does anything at variance with the will of his employer, its policy or preference, he knows that his contract of employment may be ended overnight.

After the first few lower court decisions holding for a narrower interpretation of employer-employee relationship the legal situation became more chaotic. In 1944 and 1945 several of the courts held for the Government, while others followed the 1941 precedents. To date about 250 cases have been taken to the courts. Interpretations of the common-law rule have varied in each jurisdiction. For example, it was held in the Jones against Goodson case that taxicab operators are employees. In the United States against Wholesale Oil Company, a filling station operator was held to be an employee. In the United States against Vogue, Inc., a seamstress was held to be an employee. In Grace against Magruder, coal hustlers were held to be employees. Several of the lower courts, on the other hand, took a more restrictive view. In Magruder against Yellow Cab Co., the taxicab operators were held to be independent contractors. In Glenn against Standard Oil Co., a bulk plant operator was held to be an independent contractor. In Glenn against Beard, a home worker was held to be an independent contractor. In United States against Mutual Trucking Co., a truck operator as held to be an independent contractor. All those cases, which were in the lower courts, involved almost identical facts; yet one of them would be decided in one way, and the next would be decided in the other. In short, as Mr. Justice Rutledge said:

> The assumed simplicity and uniformity resulting from "common law standards" does not exist.

It was the welter of conflicting opinions of lower courts that persuaded the Supreme Court to review a series of cases involving the proper interpretation of employer-employee relationships. In June 1947 in three decisions which already have been discussed by the Senator from Colorado—United States against Silk, Harrison against Greyvan Lines, Inc., and Bartels against Birmingham—the Supreme Court decided that within the meaning and intent of the social-security legislation, the employment relationship should be determined on the

basis of the worker's relationship in fact with the persons for whom he performed services, rather than on the basis of his technical relationship under common law. The court further stated that all relevant factors in a given relationship should be considered. Relevant factors include the degree of control which is or can be exercised over the performance of services, the permanency of the relationship, the skill required in the performance of the work, the investment in facilities for work, and the opportunity for profit and loss from the activities, giving to each such weight as it properly deserves in the light of the statutory aims.

These decisions affirmed, in the main, the position taken by the Social Security Administration, and indicated that the Treasury Department should in the future look to the economic reality of an employment relationship. The decisions involve no sharp break with the past. Many courts, avowedly following the common law, have found that they must look behind any formal or informal agreement that technically does away with the right to supervise the performance of service, and must see what control is actually exercised, what investment the independent contractor must make, and what opportunity there is for his profit or loss. The court did not step into the legislative field, as has been alleged. It simply set up guides for interpreting common-law rules as applied to social-security legislation.

Mr. President, it is too early to tell for sure whether these guides will finally furnish the answer to the major problems in determining who are employees under Federal social insurance laws. However, as Federal Security Administrator Ewing stated in his testimony on this resolution:

> Let me hazard this prophecy: That if these new regulations are allowed to become effective, administrative rulings under them will quickly build a body of precedent that will be more informative to the public than the rules we have tried to operate under in the past.
>
> In support of this prophecy I can offer you one item of evidence. Since the Supreme Court decisions last June, 15 cases involving this question have been decided by the Federal district and circuit courts, 10 in favor of the Government and 5 against it. In all these cases, of course, the courts have been bound to give effect to the rulings of the Supreme Court. In most of them the results have been in accord with our interpretation of those rulings, even where the holdings were against the Government.
>
> Of greater importance than uniformity of result is the fact that the courts have already begun to show a better record of uniformity of approach in applying the tests of employment set forth by the Supreme Court.

May I suggest, and would it not be wiser, that we permit the Treasury Department and the Social Security Administration to publish their new regulations and operate under them for a sufficient period of time, to see if the answer to this troublesome problem has been found?

If Congress should pass this joint resolution, it could easily destroy what progress has been made toward defining the employer-employee relationship. Who knows what the usual common-law rules governing such relationships are? Apparently the courts have not known in the past. Would not this joint resolution simply reenact the conflict which the decision of the Supreme Court attempted to resolve? The joint resolution itself gives us no guide. Would the test be confined to the legal right of control? Is it designed to revitalize the restrictive decisions of the lower courts after 1941, or to substantiate the more liberal decisions in 1944–45? Both types of decisions apparently were rendered under what were considered to be the rules of the common law. Court decisions, even in the limited field of tort liability, are no guide, because there has been a great variety of applications and conflict in results as between States and even within the same State.

If the common-law rules are ambiguous, passage of this resolution will not clarify them. It is true that nearly if not quite all persons who are covered under the Supreme Court decisions would be held to be "employees" under a liberal application of common-law rules. If that is the purpose of the committee, the purpose could be better served by rejecting the resolution and permitting the Court decisions to operate without impairment. And if this is the committee's intention, the old Treasury regulations, which the committee would continue in effect, are certainly misleading to the public. Fortunately, there is no need to spend time analyzing the argument. It has already been answered in the 15 circuit and district court cases decided in the 12 months since the Supreme Court decisions were rendered. The lower Federal courts have not found in the Supreme Court opinions a mandate to apply the "usual common-law rules," but on the contrary have found in them a direction to apply the very principles set forth in the proposed new Treasury regulations. In *Fahs, Collector*, v. *Tree-Gold Cooperative Growers of Florida, Inc.* (166 F. (2d) 40), for example, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, in reversing a lower court's decision which had held that an employer-employee relationship did not exist, said:

> At the time of the decision below, the common-law tests of master and servant were widely thought to be controlling upon the courts.

That is, in determining whether an employer-employee relationship existed. After referring to the Supreme Court's decisions in the Silk, Greyvan, and Bartels cases the decision continues:

> The statutory coverage is not limited to those persons whose services are subject to the direction and control of their employer, but rather to those who, as a matter of economic reality, are dependent upon the business to which they render service. * * * There is no rule of thumb that defines precisely the relationship between the employer and the employee.

This being the consistent view of the Federal courts about the effect of the Supreme Court decisions, it seems futile to argue that those decisions merely reaffirmed the common-law control test.

Equally unfounded is the charge that the proposed regulations would give a free rein to the administrative agencies to include or exclude whom they will.

I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Colorado that that is a field in which the decision is to be made by the Congress, and no administrative agency has a right to determine who should or should not be included within the coverage, which certainly is the sole prerogative of the Congress.

If the lower courts have shown themselves able, as they have, to draw practical rules of decision from the opinions of the Supreme Court, the administrative agencies are equally able to do so. And on both tax and benefit sides of the system administrative decisions are subject to judicial review. There is no more danger of uncontrolled administrative action under the new regulations than under the old.

The control test standing alone might even cover some employees, such as the owner-driver of trucks involved in the Greyvan Lines case, whom the Supreme Court held not to be presently covered because of the investment in equipment and the opportunity for profit or loss. Since the resolution is worded in the negative it might mean that employees must meet both the control test and the rules laid down by the Supreme Court.

This resolution as it stands is not clear in its intent and would only cause additional confusion and litigation. It would inject a new set of legal conditions in a complicated legal situation that for the first time show signs of clearing up. Above all, it would deprive many persons of benefits who now have social-security protection under the present law, benefits which a reasonable Congress and a realistic Supreme Court have seen fit to give them.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4721) to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1676) to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2359) to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act

to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6659) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. JUDD, and Mr. COURTNEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

NATIONAL LITERACY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I send to the desk a bill entitled "National Literacy Education Act of 1948." This is a bill "to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes."

I realize that the leaders of both the Senate and the House of Representatives are anxious to conclude this session of Congress at the earliest possible date. However, I believe the problem of adult illiteracy is of such grave national importance that the Congress should give it immediate attention. In my opinion, this proposed legislation offers a constructive, inexpensive solution to a problem that can only be described as a national disgrace.

EXTENT OF ADULT ILLITERACY

Mr. President, the extent of adult illiteracy is shocking. The 1940 Census disclosed that there were more than 10,000,000 adults in the United States, 25 years of age and over, who were functionally illiterate, that is, who could not read and write at all, or whose reading and writing ability was insufficient to be of practical use. The statement becomes more meaningful when made to read that there are more than 10,000,000 people who cannot read the newspapers, who cannot read printed directions of any kind, or who cannot pass the simplest literacy tests. The facts about illiteracy can be stated in still another way.

One of every seven adults in the United States, 25 years of age and over, can read only with difficulty a label which says: "Poison—for external use only." One of every seven adults in the United States, 25 years of age and over, cannot read the headline in the newspaper which says: "City to go on daylight time April 25."

One in every seven adults in the United States, 25 years of age and over, probably cannot read the word "freedom" or spell the word "peace."

During World War II, the Selective Service System found that 350,000 total illiterates made their mark with an "X"; 350,000 men, between the ages of 21 and 45, willing and ready to serve their country, actually sat down beside recording officers and had the fact legally certified that they were unable to sign for themselves. Of this number, 130,000 were white and 220,000 were Negroes.

The selective-service system also estimated that of 433,000 men liable to rejection because of functional illiteracy, at least 150,000 were physically able to serve in the Army and were lost to the service of their country wholly because of educational disqualifications. One hundred and fifty thousand men unable to serve because they could not read and write meant a loss of approximately 15 divisions.

WHO ARE ILLITERATES?

Contrary to popular conception, the men and women in the United States who are now in the darkness of functional illiteracy are not all foreigners or Negroes, or members of other underprivileged groups. Four million two hundred thousand of them are native-born whites. Three million one hundred thousand of them are foreign-born whites. Approximately 2,700,000 are Negroes, and another 100,000 are classified by the Census as "Other"—including those of Latin-American or oriental birth or parentage.

Educators have long known that a grim percentage of our native-born white citizens have had little or no schooling. These figures lay wide the unpleasant truth before the general public.

Every illiterate citizen is being denied one of his fundamental rights as long as no effort is being made to offer him the opportunity to obtain the minimum amount of knowledge necessary for him to take his place as an effective member of the social group to which he belongs.

Our country is being denied the benefit of any contribution he might be able to make as a citizen if he must sign his name with an "X". He may have exceptional native intelligence, but functionally he remains a primitive man in a complex, modern civilization.

There are today more than 5,000,000 registered aliens in this country. More than 3,000,000 of them are shut off from contact with the literate world and 1,500,000 are functionally illiterate in any language. We cannot reach them, we cannot make good American citizens of them until we can communicate with them through the medium of the printed page. It is imperative that they know what made America and where they and we are headed in the common cause of progress under the banner of democracy.

Negroes cannot be made to feel that they have a vital part to play in our democracy if approximately one-sixth of the adult Negroes in this country have never attained even a fourth-grade education.

One of the greatest contributions to the maximum solution of the Negro problem must surely be the development of literacy in all those capable of receiving it.

WHERE ARE THESE ILLITERATES?

The 1940 census report on the educational attainment of the population 25 years old and over discloses a set of facts which is contradictory to most preconceived notions about illiteracy—that it flourishes exclusively in the States of the South. There are, for example, over a million illiterate adults in New York. Four hundred and sixty-two thousand adults in the State of Illinois can barely read and write. Six hundred and ninety-six thousand men and women over 25 years of age in Pennsylvania would fail on a simple literacy test, and in California, where some of the most modern institutions in the entire public school system are to be found, 385,000 adults are either sheer or near illiterates. But this does not tell the entire story.

It is not sufficient to say that there are only 14,000 adult illiterates in Idaho. We must know what percentage of the total population of the State this represents. In Idaho, it represents 5 percent of the population. The 1,000,000 and more adult illiterates in New York State represent 12 percent of the population. The 430,000 adult illiterates in Louisiana represent 36 percent of the entire population of that State—the highest illiteracy percentage in the Union. At the other end of the scale, Iowa's 61,000 adult illiterates represent only 4.1 percent of the total population—a figure which is still too high. No matter how low an illiteracy rate obtains in any one section of the United States, the challenging fact cannot be overlooked that there are more than three times as many illiterates as college graduates in this land of opportunity.

ILLITERACY WEAKENS DEMOCRACY

The man who does not understand is always a dangerous man. He cannot go along with his social group, because he cannot grasp their motives or their goals. He cannot go along with his country, because he fails to grasp his country's aims. The 10,000,000 functional illiterates in America today cannot read the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States. They will not get the significance of what they hear on the radio—their only contact with national and world affairs. It is primarily to this group of illiterates that international communism has directed, on a level which can be understood, its floods of propaganda, including among other things, distorted facts about America.

Talk about "democracy" and "our way of life" is largely unintelligible to illiterates. They cannot understand democracy just by hearing about it. They cannot understand democracy even by living in it. It takes the written word to make the past, the present, and the future of democracy a vital and realistic truth. Our people must, down to the last man and woman, be able to understand fully the meaning of democracy if this Nation of free and independent people is to survive. Each individual must be equipped to use that fundamental tool, the written word.

ILLITERACY AND INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

The need for trained industrial workers is great. But industry opens its doors reluctantly to the illiterates. They are the last to be hired, and the first to be fired. They are a menace to themselves and to their fellow workers, because they cannot read safety rules and signs. They cannot read the foreman's simple written directions. Micrometers, calipers, and blueprints are undisclosed mysteries to them. Manual dexterity cannot make up for lack of knowledge. No saw or hammer will take the place of the most essential tool—literacy.

Even verbal instructions will in many cases not be understood by them. They have not had enough exercise in the use of the language. Foremen do not want them; their fellow workers are rightfully unwilling to be too close to them because they represent a potential danger. Employers cannot afford to trust precious materials to them. No matter how intelligent they may be, the only things left for them are drudgery jobs, the pick and shovel, hauling and digging. Low mentality and illiteracy are not synonymous.

ILLITERACY AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION

The 1940 census figures show that out of 14,792,836 rural farm dwellers 25 years of age and over in the United States, 693,332 individuals are totally illiterate. More than 2,000,000 adult farm dwellers have had only from 1 to 4 years of schooling, and may be classed as functionally illiterate. They cannot read Government bulletins telling them of new and improved farming methods. They cannot read directions on seed packages, directions for the mixture of spray materials, or instructions for the operation and proper maintenance of tractors and other farm machinery.

The advice and help from their county agents and farm bureaus cannot be fully utilized. Their government's efforts to help with planting, fertilizers, and spray are futile.

These nearly 15,000,000 farm dwellers are the backbone of our recovery program. Today 4.7 percent of them are totally illiterate, and 15.7 percent are functionally illiterate. With all of western Europe on short rations, with many of the conquered countries literally starving and depending on every crumb and shred of food that we can send them, our Nation cannot afford to let the crushing disadvantage of illiteracy impair the effectiveness of the one-eighth of our farming population.

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF ACTION NEEDED

In order to make a concerted frontal attack upon the problem of adult illiteracy, a national program is needed. Such a program is proposed in the attached draft of a bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults. This bill provides for a cooperative program of action as between the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and the State Departments of Education in the several States. It authorizes an appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal 1949; rising to $10,000,000 for fiscal 1950; $15,000,000 in each fiscal year from 1951 through fiscal 1957; and decreasing to $5,000,000 in 1958–59, when the program of Federal aid would terminate.

Each State on which a State application had been received and approved by the Commissioner would be entitled to an allotment of Federal funds in the proportion that the number of adults in the State who had not completed the fifth grade of school, as reported by the Bureau of the Census, bears to the number of such adults in all of the States. The funds so allotted would be used under the direction and supervision of State departments of education for the purpose of stimulating the organization of classes for adults designed to develop the ability to read, write, speak, and understand the English language, to perform elementary arithmetical computations, and to understand the main features of our constitutional republican form of government and of our American way of life. Funds might be used by the States in stimulation and support of the organization and conduct of classes of adult illiterates, for the training of teachers and supervisors for such classes, and for the fostering of research, experimentation, and demonstration in educational institutions of improved methods and materials for use in such classes.

It should be noted that the plan does not contemplate a continuing program of Federal support or aid to the States for adult education, but rather a temporary 10-year program of stimulation and assistance to the States in making a concerted attack upon the problem of adult illiteracy. The eventual and complete solution of that problem will only result from a program to strengthen basic education which will prevent, in large part, the development of illiteracy in the future.

Meanwhile, it is urgently desirable that such efforts be undertaken to eliminate, insofar as possible, the present backlog of educational illiteracy resulting from previous educational neglect and underprivilege. The United States is contributing more than $3,500,000 next year to the projects undertaken by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. One of the major projects of this organization had to do with the development of educational programs designed to encourage the establishment of programs of "fundamental education" for the citizens of a number of member nations of the United Nations, in which there is a high rate of adult illiteracy. Surely while contributing to this worthy stimulation of basic educational programs for adults in other countries, the United States has the responsibility to attack with vigor its own problem of adult illiteracy.

Only by so doing, can we hope to develop to the full our manpower potential for peace or for war; only by so doing, can we remove the drag on our body politic and our economy, resulting from widespread illiteracy; only by so doing, can we hope to present to all nations of the world an example of democracy in action which will be worthy of their emulation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2801) to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Literacy Education Act of 1948."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that:

(a) Whereas according to the 1940 census more than 10,000,000 of the adult citizens of the United States had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling and were accordingly to be accounted as functionally illiterate; and

(b) Whereas the United States was by reason of this widespread adult illiteracy deprived of the fullest use of its military and industrial manpower during World War II; and

(c) Whereas the lack of basic elementary education among these millions of citizens, both native and foreign-born, constitutes a continuing national problem of great magnitude and urgency in time of peace, as well as war, because it increases the amount of ill health and poverty, retards economic development, and impedes the personal growth and social contribution of citizens in a democracy; and

(d) Whereas the United States has made provision in law for assisting in the education of students of foreign countries by utilizing the proceeds from the sales of excess war properties abroad; and

(e) Whereas the United States is contributing through the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to the development of educational programs designed to encourage the development of basic elementary education for citizens of all member nations of the United Nations;

(f) Now, therefore it is declared to be the policy of the Congress in the promotion of the general welfare and in the interest of the national security to assist the several States in removing adult illiteracy in the United States by establishment and maintenance of programs of basic elementary education for adults.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of this act, the term "State" means several States and the District of Columbia;

(b) The term "basic elementary education" means education designed to develop the ability to read, write, speak, and understand the English language, to perform elementary arithmetical computations, and to understand the main features of our constitutional republican form of government and of our American way of life;

(c) The term "adult" means any person beyond the compulsory school age who is not enrolled in a regular full-time day school;

(d) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Federal Security Agency;

(e) The term "State educational agency" means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar

officer); or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia, it shall mean the board of education.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. In order to promote the development and maintenance by the several States of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the sum of $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for each succeeding fiscal year through June 30, 1957, the sum of $15,000,000; and for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958 and 1959, the sum of $5,000,000. The funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to the States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner applications for funds as set forth in section 5 hereof for carrying out the purposes of this act.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) In order to be approved by the Commissioner, a State application for funds shall—

(1) Designate the State educational agency to be responsible for the administration or for the supervision of the administration of a program of basic elementary education for adults within the State.

(2) Outline the State plan for a program of basic elementary education for adults to include: provisions for the organization and conduct of classes for adult illiterates, for the training of teachers and supervisors for such classes, and for the fostering of research, experimentation and demonstration in educational institutions of improved methods and materials for use in such classes.

(3) Provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official shall act as custodian of funds made available to the State under this act and shall expend the same only on warrant of the State educational agency.

(4) Provide that the State educational agency shall make reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and give the Commissioner upon demand access to the records upon which such information is based.

(5) Provide for the designation of a State Advisory Council to consult with the State educational agency in planning and promoting the State program of basic elementary education for adults.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State application for funds which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Each State for which a State application under section 5 has been approved shall be entitled to an allotment of such proportion of any appropriation made pursuant to section 4 as the number of adults in such State, who have not completed the fifth year of school grade as reported by the Bureau of the Census, bears to the number of such adults in all the States; *Provided*, That no State's entitlement shall be less than $10,000. The Commissioner shall, before August 15 of each fiscal year, estimate the sum to which each State is entitled under this section during that fiscal year and shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated, reduced, or increased as the case may be, by any sum by which the Commisioner finds that his estimate for a prior year was greater or less than the amount to which the State was entitled for such year. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amount so certified.

(b) Any funds paid to a State under this section and not expended for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States. Sums allotted to a State for any fiscal year for the purposes of this act and unencumbered at the ends of such year shall remain available to such State for the next fiscal year (and for such year only) in addition to sums allotted to such States for the next fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

SEC. 7. (a) This act shall be administered by the Commissioner. The Commissioner is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations and to perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, nothing in this act shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee the right to exercise any supervision or control over the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods, or materials of instruction in any State with respect to which any funds had been or may be expended under this act.

(c) The Commissioner shall annually report to the Congress upon his administration of this act, including the progress made by the several States in the removal of adult illiteracy and any related matters.

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself, I introduce a joint resolution, providing for the commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of Washington and Lee University at Lexington, Va.

I ask that the rules be suspended to the extent that the joint resolution be not referred to a committee, but that it may be taken up at this time and considered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I ask the Senator how long the consideration of the resolution will take.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There will be no speeches on it, I assure the Senator, and its consideration will take but a few minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Colorado that no appropriation is involved. The resolution merely provides for the naming of commissioners on behalf of the Congress to attend the bicentennial celebration.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the understanding that its consideration shall extend no further than that, I withhold objection.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 227) providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas during the year 1949 there will be celebrated the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Washington and Lee University as Augusta Academy; and

Whereas George Washington made this institution the beneficiary of the gift which the Commonwealth of Virginia tendered him for his services in the Revolution; and

Whereas Robert E. Lee, declining easier and more lucrative positions, gave the last years of his life to the service of education in that college; and

Whereas the contributions of these two eminent citizens, joined with those of a long roll of others devoted to the public good, have forged an institution which has served the Nation for two centuries in maintaining and promoting the ideals of constitutional American liberty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Government and people of the United States unite with Washington and Lee University and with the Commission on the Washington and Lee University Bicentennial authorized by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia in the appropriate observance of this anniversary.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the United States Washington and Lee University Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), to be composed of 15 Commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States and 4 persons to be appointed by him, the President of the Senate and 4 Members of the Senate to be appointed by said President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 4 Members of the House to be appointed by said Speaker.

SEC. 3. The Commission, on behalf of the United States, shall cooperate with representatives of Washington and Lee University and the Commonwealth of Virginia in appropriate observance of this anniversary and extend appropriate courtesies to the delegates of foreign universities and other foreign learned bodies or individuals attending the celebration as guests of Washington and Lee University.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number, but the President of the United States shall be designated as the Honorary Chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 5. Any vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments to such Commission are made.

The preamble was agreed to.

MAINTENANCE OF STATUS QUO OF EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the joint resolution now under consideration purports to remove three quarters of a million people from social security coverage under the law. These people are salesmen, miners, lumberjacks, journeymen tailors, industrial house workers, and a number of other workers in miscellaneous activities. It is argued that they are not employees as contemplated by the act, and should be classed as independent contractors and covered as self-employed.

In the hearings and debate on House Joint Resolution 296 there has been con-

siderable testimony on the legal aspects of the problem of determining when a man is an employee and when his work shades off into self-employment. The legal aspects under the present statutes, of course, have been settled by the Supreme Court. We can change the law if we desire. But in deciding whether we ought to change it, we should give proper emphasis to the effect of this joint resolution on the men and women who would be deprived of their old-age benefits, and benefits for their widows and children.

Some of the men and women who would have their social security coverage destroyed have been paying into the fund since 1937, and many more have been paying in for a shorter time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the question whether a person entitled to coverage will be deprived of the coverage, I suggest to the Senator he would not be under the amendment if he has been paying in.

Mr. MURRAY. If he has been paying in?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. The joint resolution as it passed the House would have wiped out wage credits even in cases where the employees had been taxed to establish them. I understand that is one of the effects of the joint resolution as it is worded.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has been amended, so that even though a person who is in the system has no right to be there, if he has been paying his taxes, he will continue to be in the system.

Mr. MURRAY. If the amendment has accomplished that effect, of course, that is fine.

The Finance Committee proposes an amendment apparently meant to avoid this most obvious inequity. But the committee has overlooked a more fundamental inequity. To take coverage away from people who have paid contributions into the system will mean in all too many cases that they will never get any benefits in return for what they have paid. One of the weaknesses of the system, because of its present limited coverage, is that too many people make contributions without working long enough to establish full insurance rights. Even with the Finance Committee amendment, this joint resolution would for a multitude of people make it impossible to continue to contribute, and would thus make it impossible for them to realize on what they have already invested in the system.

The men and women who would be denied social-security coverage by this resolution are found in all walks of life. The largest single group are outside salesmen in the manufacturing and wholesale trades. These are the men who sell the products of manufacturers to retail outlets throughout the Nation. According to Treasury Department estimates, there are at least 440,000 persons in this group who might be affected by the resolution. Actually the number might be even larger. The National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., estimates the total number of salesmen in the industry to be almost one and one-half million.

These are the men and women whose work keeps the channels of commerce open. They sell every conceivable product made in the United States. Although their arrangements with their employers differ, most of them are given a territory to work. Some carry a single line, others carry two or more lines. Generally the term of their employment is one ending at will, subject to termination or discharge without notice. A comparatively small group of wholesale salesmen are independent sales agents, brokers, and factors. They are real independent contractors both in the legal and economic sense. However, the majority of wholesale salesmen are, in fact, employees. Some of them would not be affected by the resolution since the degree of control exercised by their employers is sufficient to establish the relationship under the narrowest of definitions. However, the bulk are in danger of losing their social-insurance protection.

These men are not taking House Joint Resolution 296 lightly. The National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., a central body for various salesmen's associations and clubs, alerted its member groups throughout the Nation. Such organizations as the Associated Millinery Men, the Allied Textile Association, Inc., Fur Garment Traveling Salesmen's Association, Inc., Garment Salesmen's Guild of New York, Inc., Luggage and Leather Goods Salesmen's Association, Inc., Cotton States Fashion Exhibitors, National Paint Salesmen's Association, Western Textile Association, the Shoe Club, New York-Penn-Ohio Travelers, Inc., the Southeastern Shoe Travelers, and many others, have jumped into the fight against the resolution.

The National Paint Salesmen's Association wired:

> You are assured of our full cooperation and this telegram is your credentials to represent us at the hearing, for which we thank you.

The National Association of Men's Apparel Clubs wired:

> National Association will go along with you wholeheartedly in fighting passage of GEARHART'S Resolution 296.

The Cotton States Fashion Exhibitors called a general meeting in Memphis and passed a resolution opposing the Gearhart bill, which was forwarded to Members of Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to repeat that anyone who is in the system and whose position in the system is being supported by tax payments is not removed from the system by the joint resolution, whether or not under any interpretation he should properly be in the system. The alternative is that certain people should be in the system and have a free ride. The joint resolution, except as provided by the amendment, will not give anyone a free ride, and they should not have a free ride, because the free riders take it out of the hides of the 30,000,000 workers who have built up the trust fund which pays the benefits.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand that these associations of salesmen I have mentioned have made a study of the measure and feel that it deprives them of rights which they are entitled to enjoy under the act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Many persons in sales activities are already in the system and their position in it is being supported by tax payments, and the joint resolution will not deprive them of their coverage. But anyone, whether a salesman or in any other occupation, who is in the system and is not entitled to be in it, and is not paying for his ride, will not be covered and should not be covered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Senator from Colorado on that point whether other persons in the same situation as those who have been paying taxes into the fund, and who are covered under the amendment the committee adopted, would be deprived hereafter of qualifying to pay the taxes and be taken in under the system and on the same basis as those who are already in?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The same rule would apply to everyone. The joint resolution does not set up any discrimination against the type of persons the Senator from Kentucky is speaking of.

Mr. BARKLEY. Those who are in this category, who have already paid in, would not be turned out, but it would bar others in the same category who have not paid taxes from qualifying and paying taxes and coming into the system?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct, because, under the theory of the joint resolution, they are not employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. They would be just as much employees in the Senator's theory of the word, as those who are in the categories now of having paid the taxes, who, according to the interpretation, would not be employees, but because they have come in and are paying the taxes are kept in?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We put that provision in the joint resolution as a practical measure so as not to do any injustice to people who have already changed their positions in their reliance on coverage and who are paying for it. That was our theory.

Mr. MURRAY. At any rate, these organizations I have referred to feel that they are entitled to come in under the act, and whether or not they have already qualified seems to me not to be important. If the joint resolution as it is now worded would prevent them from qualifying later, it seems to me it would be doing an injustice to these people who might be entitled to qualify.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that out of that whole category of salesmen the

Senator has referred to, many of them are truly employees, and therefore would be entitled to come in. But those who are not truly employees would be disqualified from coming in, because the present law does not intend that persons other than employees should be in the system.

Mr. MURRAY. Then the question will be whether or not they are employees, and if they are in a vague sort of a position it might be contended that under the joint resolution they are wiped out, and would be precluded from having their rights under the law.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course some of these cases are difficult to decide. But the decision has to be made, and there is a presumption that when made it will be made right, even though difficult to make.

Mr. MURRAY. Cannot that decision be made without the necessity of the joint resolution? Why is it necessary to have the joint resolution affect these people if the Senator acknowledges now that any one of these salesmen who is really an employee could qualify under the system?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Because, I say respectfully to the Senator, the Treasury Department under its new regulation intends to bring persons into the system who are not truly employees, and that is what we are striving to prevent, because we consider that as a raid on the trust fund which has been built up by 30,000,000 workers.

Mr. MURRAY. The National Council of Salesmen's Organization, Inc., has submitted a brief to the Finance Committee outlining their objection to the resolution. I suppose that brief discusses these questions, and has already been before the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator will yield I should like to make it very clear that anyone in any of these fields of activity to which the Senator has referred, who can qualify as an employee, is entitled to stay in the system, if he is already in it. He is entitled to get into the system if he is not in it. But if he is an independent contractor or if he is self-employed he is not entitled to come in, because the law does not provide for that.

Mr. MURRAY. The brief to which I have referred declares that the joint resolution "would serve to deny them the social-security coverage which they otherwise would receive."

The National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., submitted a brief to the Finance Committee outlining their objection to the resolution.

The brief declared that—

> The Gearhart resolution would serve to deny them the social-security coverage which they otherwise would receive.
>
> If that be the purpose or ultimate effect of House Joint Resolution 296, and we believe it is, then the wholesale salesmen of America raise their voices in most vehement objection to this resolution and urge that it not be approved by the Senate committee and not be passed by the Senate.

It declared the resolution would circumvent the Supreme Court decision which interpreted the intent of Congress, in enacting the Social Security Act, to extend coverage to many hitherto not eligible; and these, the council maintained included wholesale salesmen exclusive of independent contractors.

The brief stated that the contributory old-age provisions of the Social Security Act, the Supreme Court has held, should apply to—

> Any person who is dependent as a matter of economic reality upon the business to which he renders service and not upon his own business as an independent contractor.

The council contended that with the exception of independent contractors, wholesale salesmen are employees under the Social Security Act in "every realistic, sound, genuine and practical sense of the word" and expressed the hope not only that the Gearhart resolution would not be passed but ultimately that the Congress, by means of an appropriate amendment, may expressly include wholesale salesmen and thereby remove any question of their rights to the benefits under the act.

The brief concluded with a plea that the Senate committee would give careful consideration to the problem of wholesale salesmen. It said:

> In a peacetime economy he is the key to the business and industrial prosperity in our country. When prosperity is with us he is among the last to share its benefits, yet in those recurrent periods of economic distress he is among the first to suffer. He is in many respects the "forgotten man" of both business and industry.
>
> Is he also to be denied the full benefits and protection afforded by the Social Security Act?

The National Council of Salesmen's Organizations next called a general meeting of all wholesale salesmen's organizations in New York on April 16. The secretary reporting on the meeting said that no circumstance within recent years has so aroused the wholesale salesmen of this country nor had any instance so served to draw them together to work for the welfare of the entire group.

A resolution adopted at the meeting and unanimously declared that—

> Whereas the various associations comprising 30,000 salesmen in various lines of industry in the country are firm in the belief that wholesale salesmen of America should and were intended to be afforded the benefits and protection granted by the Social Security Act; and
>
> Whereas they believe House Joint Resolution 296 may serve to deny social-security coverage to many thousands of wholesale salesmen whose status under the act has been made certain and clear by recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court; and
>
> Whereas we further believe House Joint Resolution 296 will promote further confusion and diversity of interpretation as to the status of wholesale salesmen under the act and with it place those employers who do accept their social responsibility to the wholesale salesman under serious economic disadvantage as against those other employers, who, by legal technicalities or subterfuge, refuse to do so; and
>
> Whereas we believe that in all events, any proposed amendment of the social-security coverage should be deferred until the report of the Senate Advisory Committee on extended social-security coverage has been completed and rendered: Now be it unanimously
>
> *Resolved*, That the National Council of Salesmen's Organization, Inc., be, and it hereby is authorized and directed to oppose passage of House Joint Resolution 296 and apprise members of the Senate Finance Committee and of the Senate of the same; and it is further
>
> *Resolved*, That the undersigned associations continue to remain in session as a body, subject to call by the president of the national council, for the further purpose of such other and further action as may be deemed necessary in order to defeat H. J. Res. 296 and to effectuate a complete and definite inclusion of the wholesale salesmen of America under the Social Security Act.

The resolution is supported by 55 sales organizations and clubs.

Such resolutions, letters, and telegrams have come from other persons affected by House Joint Resolution 296. They have come from individuals in the borderline group of 200,000 journeyman tailors, subcontractors, and contract filling station operators, most of whom are covered under the existing law. They have come from individuals among the 40,000 industrial home workers; the 70,000 house-to-house salesmen, the 10,000 mine lessees, the 36,000 entertainers, and the 17,000 contract loggers—all of whom may have their right to social security credits wiped out or endangered. In addition, other groups who have an interest in the resolution are the thousands of taxicab operators who do not own their own cabs, commercial oil plant operators, and above all, insurance salesmen.

Commercial insurance agents are more aware of the dangers of House Joint Resolution 296 than any other single group with the possible exception of the wholesale salesmen, because they know from their day-to-day work how desirable it is to have protection under old-age and survivors' insurance. The letters and telegrams which they have sent to all branches of the Government show their fear that this Congress will snatch away their retirement protection and the protection their families have in the event of their death. This is protection they have earned and depend upon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to emphasize again that, as to any protection which any of those folks have earned and paid for, they will not be deprived of it. Even if they have not earned and paid for it, but if they are in the system and have reached the age of 65, they will continue to receive benefits. But as to the future the test will be as to whether they are employees. If they are employees, they will be qualified to enter. If they are not employees, they will not be.

In that connection, I should like to suggest that undoubtedly many of these salesmen are employees in the true sense of the word. I presume that some of them would take the status of being self employed, or of independent contractors. But I do not believe that we can generalize and say that all the wholesale salesmen are employees, or that all of

them could be called either self-employed or independent contractors. The facts of the situation must be looked into.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course the facts of each situation must be looked into. These men feel that they are entitled to come in under the Social Security Act. They feel that they may be deprived of that right as a result of the passage of this joint resolution. It seems to me that they are justified in taking that position, because if it leaves them in an uncertain position, where they may be deprived of the right, they certainly should have the law made clear and distinct.

So great is the interest of commercial insurance agents that the National Association of Life Underwriters at its midyear meeting in Louisville, Ky., on March 16 to 19 devoted a large portion of the meeting time to the problem. The association adopted the following strongly worded resolutions:

RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMPENSATION

This committee recommends to the national council that it suggest to the companies that the independent contractor status be reexamined to the end that, except where the facts indicate an independent contractor relationship, they may consider the advisability of recognizing their agents as employees. (Approved March 17, 1948, as an amendment to committee report.)

MOTION PASSED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

The national council recommends to the board of trustees that, at its meeting on March 19, 1948, it consider favorably the report of the committee on compensation relative to the proposal that the companies be requested to consider the advisability of recognizing their agents as employees, except where the facts indicate an actual independent contractor relationship. (Passed March 19, 1948.)

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Whereas the ordinary commission agents who are members of NALU have repeatedly expressed their desire to enjoy the benefits of the old-age and survivors' insurance section of the Social Security Act; and

Whereas the efforts of this association to secure an amendment to the Social Security Act to extend benefits to all gainfully employed have not been successful and, even if successful, would have applied only to those agents who are actually independent contractors; and

Whereas it appears unlikely that the recently issued amended Treasury regulations will be promulgated in the event the Gearhart resolution (H. J. Res. 296) becomes law, thus leaving our members in a probably less favorable position to secure determination of wage credits by the Social Security Administration; and

Whereas grave problems confront our members with regard to income-tax liability upon the vesting of company contributions to pension plans, most of which plans cannot properly qualify under section 165A so far as ordinary commission agents are concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of trustees of NALU respectfully requests the life-insurance companies to consider favorably the advisability of recognizing their ordinary commission agents as employees, except in those instances where the facts clearly indicate an independent contractor relationship. (Adopted by unanimous vote of board of trustees, March 19, 1948.)

The National Association of Life Underwriters, seeing Congress' quick action to exclude news vendors from the Social Security Act, is putting forth every effort to protect the existing coverage of insurance agents. They, like many others, are aware that if this resolution should become law, the tendency of employers would be to write more and more contracts which would place employees outside of the social-insurance laws.

In my opinion there is absolutely no justification for taking three-quarters of a million people out of the social-security system. Only the wholesale salesmen and the insurance agents are sufficiently organized to take concerted action against the resolution, but every single wage earner who is aware that Congress may wipe out his wage credits is angry. Even the groups that would not be directly affected have regarded House Joint Resolution 296 as another move to undermine our social-security structure. In direct contradiction of the pledges of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties this Congress seems to be following a course which will undermine our social-insurance program. House Joint Resolution 296 must be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona, for himself and other Senators, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1948, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan with respect to each needy individual who at the time of such expenditure is 65 years of age or older and is not an inmate of a public institution, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any such individual for any month as exceeds $50—

"(A) three-fourths of such expenditure, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $20 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose."

(b) Section 403 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to dependent children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1948, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under such plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $30, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $27 with respect to one such dependent child and $18 with respect to each of the other dependent children—

"(A) three-fourths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $12 multiplied by the total number of dependent children with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to dependent children, or both, and for no other purpose."

(c) Section 1003 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1948, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan with respect to each needy individual who is blind and is not an inmate of a public institution, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any such individual for any month as exceeds $50—

"(A) three-fourths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $20 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the blind for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator

for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the blind, or both, and for no other purpose."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1948.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bridges	Hill	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Reed
Byrd	Jenner	Revercomb
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McGrath	Umstead
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Feazel	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the amendment I have proposed on behalf of myself and other Senators, is the same as the one which was submitted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] for himself and a group of us last March, except the present amendment cuts in half the increases provided for in the Stewart amendment.

Mr. President, 2 years ago the Congress increased the amount of Federal aid for the aged, the blind, and dependent children as follows: The amount of the monthly payments for the aged was increased $5 a month, and the increase was to be accomplished in this manner: Of the first $15, the Federal Government would put up $10 and the State would put up $5; thereafter, the State would match the Federal funds on a 50–50 basis, up to a maximum of $45.

This amendment would change the provisions of that law, in that it would increase the amount to be paid. The Federal Government would put up $15 of the first $20, and thereafter the State and the Federal Government would match each other's payments, on a 50-50 basis, up to a maximum of $50 a month. The same provisions would be made in regard to the amount provided for the blind. The amount provided for dependent children would be increased $3 a month.

Mr. President, 2 years ago, when this matter was up for consideration, it was stated that general consideration would be given to broadening the social-security laws and particularly to increasing the amounts paid to the aged, the blind, and the dependent children. We expected that study to be completed last year, but it has not been completed to this date.

The law which was passed in 1946 was a temporary measure which extended until only December 31, 1947. A year ago we passed a measure extending that date to December 31, 1949, a period of 2 years. In the meantime, Mr. President, the cost of living has continued to soar. The Bureau of Labor Statistics informs me that the cost of living rose 69 percent from the base period—1939-40—to 1946, and that from April 15, 1946, to April 15, 1948, it rose 29.17 percent.

In other words, Mr. President, the cost of living has increased approximately 100 percent since we passed this old-age assistance law. But what have we done about it? We have done nothing, except 2 years ago we increased the amount of Federal assistance $5—a little, measly $5 a month. This was the result of an amendment, proposed by the junior Senator from Arizona, to a House bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Have not there been, during that time, greater pay increases for Federal employees and other beneficiaries, such as veterans; and also have not there been increases in the salaries of Members of Congress?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. There have been increases in the pay of Federal employees. There have been increases in the salaries of the Members of Congress. There have been increases for practically everyone except the aged, the blind, and the dependent children. They are the forgotten people.

Mr. President, this is a temporary measure. We do not propose by this amendment to change the effective terminal date of December 31, 1949; and I am hopeful that in the meantime the study, which the distinguished Senator from Colorado said was being made of the social security law, will be completed, and that these aged and blind persons and the dependent children may have what they so richly deserve. We have voted aid to practically everyone in the world except the aged, the blind, and the dependent children. I trust and hope, Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept the amendment. It is only a temporary proposition.

I know someone will probably ask what it is going to cost the United States Government. I have obtained that information. As of February 1, 1948, there were 81,750 blind persons in the United States receiving assistance; of the aged there were 2,340,862; and of dependent children, 1,096,609. That would represent a total monthly cost of $15,402,887, or a total annual increase because of this amendment of $184,834,644.

Surely, Mr. President, when we can afford to vote money for everything else, we can afford to pay that sum in order to take care of the old people, the blind, and the dependent children in our own country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that we are now voting to spend several hundred million dollars a year in order to underwrite the deficit of Great Britain?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. If we are doing that, what possible argument could there be against giving bread and the other necessities of life to the aged people of this country?

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, but he will have to ask someone other than the junior Senator from Arizona, because I do not think there is any argument against it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, under the amendment the Federal Government would put up 75 percent of the first $20, would it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. As the law stands now, the Federal Government puts up two-thirds of the first $15, does it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think the amendment would tend to correct a great injustice. It is a monstrous proposition that an old man in the State of New York may receive more money from the National Government than an old man in the State of Mississippi or in some other State. It is a monstrous proposition that the poorer States are penalized because there is poverty in those States. The point should be made that the Federal Government should pay the aged of every State the same amount of money from the Federal Treasury. While the amendment does not correct that situation it is certainly a step in the right direction, and I think it should be adopted.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the Senator. I have previously stated on the floor of the Senate that I feel that old-age assistance and assistance to the blind and to dependent children should be paid entirely by the Federal Government in order that equal amounts would be received in every State, and in order that the aged might travel and reside wherever they desire. If they had relatives in another State and they could live there cheaper, they could move. But under the present law they cannot. Another reason is that as people approach an age when they are going to have to retire, when they know they will no longer be employed, they move to the State furnishing the greatest benefit. That places an undue burden upon the States giving proper aid to the aged.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator feel that $50 a month is adequate for an aged person?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; the Senator from Arizona does not feel that $50 a month is adequate, but this measure would provide a maximum of $30 to be paid by the Federal Government. I am hopeful the States would match that $30, making it $60. The increase proposed by

the previous amendment, in which the Senator from Arizona was joined by others of his colleagues, has by the present amendment been reduced from $10 to $5, not because the latter figure is deemed adequate but because of the dire need for an increase; and it is thought that there is a considerably greater chance for the adoption of the $5 increase, which is better than none at all. We have come almost to the end of this session, and there has been no increase. I would rather have $5 than nothing; I would rather have half a loaf for these people than none.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is making exactly the same argument that was made last July when the amount was increased $5. On that occasion the salaries of Representatives and Senators were increased. Both the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Michigan rose and stated they thought the increase was not sufficient, but they wanted to make a study. The Senator will remember they were put at the head of the joint committee. Since that time the cost of living has risen very greatly.

At that time I offered an amendment fixing the amount at $100. The amendment was voted down. I still think the 4-year amendment does not go far enough. I think it should go very much further than it does.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the Senator, and that is the reason I have not tried to make the increase proposed by the amendment become a permanent law. I am hopeful that a general study will be made and that a report will come from the committee, increasing the benefits much more than the amount now proposed, but I feel that such amount is the least we could possibly provide by way of increase until more permanent benefits become feasible. As I stated—probably the Senator did not hear me—the cost of living has increased approximately 100 percent since the law was originally passed. The Federal Government has only increased the amount it is giving these individuals by $5 a month.

Mr. President, I think Members of the Senate are familiar with the necessity for this law and for the increase.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that the beneficiaries of the system comprise the only great group in this country whose standard of living is actually lower today than before the war?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator statistics to show that with the present tax, as the rate is now fixed, there is available sufficient money to pay the increase and still leave a surplus in the Treasury?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that is true, but I do not have exact figures.

Mr. TYDINGS. So that the Senator may understand my question, if the rate remains frozen as it is, to what extent will that rate furnish the money to pay the increase for which the Senator asks? Will it be sufficient? My information is it will.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand it will. I understand there is sufficient money now and that there will be for some time to come.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up too much of the time of the Senate in discussing the amendment. I believe the Senate is well informed as to the importance of the amendment. I am hopeful that the Senate will adopt this amendment. It is, as has been stated, the least we should do. We should not try to save money at the expense of our own flesh and blood who are in need. Certainly the Congress of the United States cannot afford to turn its back on needy people at this time, when we have voted billions of dollars for other countries, and particularly at a time, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] when there is money in the Treasury to meet the increase.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in case this debate should not be concluded this afternoon, I certainly should appreciate it, and I dare say there are other Senators who share my sentiments, if the able chairman of the Finance Committee would consider and advise us of his reaction to a proposal tomorrow, if the matter should go over, that the maximum figure be $75 a month. That is, in case the States wish to raise the amount, the Federal Government would match the States, so that the total amount, from Federal and State contributions, upon the ratio suggested in the amendment, might be $75 a month. I wanted to give notice to the chairman of the Finance Committee, and request that he give consideration to that proposal, because it may be brought up tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I had understood that there might be a possibility of the joint resolution going over until tomorrow. Is it desired to dispose of it at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is evident that we cannot dispose of this joint resolution today, unless the Senators desire to hold a night session. I said this morning that we would not have a night session unless it should become necessary. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has been very cooperative in permitting us to displace the selective-service bill to take up the joint resolution which the Senate is now considering. I do not want any longer to impose upon the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I feel, however, that inasmuch as we had a session last night which lasted until 11:30, and many of the Members are tired today, possibly we could expedite the consideration of the joint resolution and come to a vote on it tomorrow through a unanimous-consent agreement, if every Senator is in a receptive mood. It is my intention, if it is agreeable to the Members of the Senate, to move that when the Senate takes a recess it be until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m. I am wondering if we could not vote on the amendment which is now pending, on all amendments to the joint resolution, and on the joint resolution itself at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, dividing the time equally between 11 o'clock and 1 o'clock. I make such a unanimous-consent request. If it is desired to modify it, I shall be glad to listen to any suggestions. I suggest that the hour set at 1 o'clock and that the time be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the joint resolution from the time the Senate convenes tomorrow until 1 o'clock p. m.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the desire of the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators to expedite business. I want to cooperate. I realize the embarrassment which has been caused the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. It is obvious that we cannot finish today without running very late. I think, if we meet at 11 o'clock, have 2 hours' debate, and vote at 1 o'clock on the joint resolution and all amendments, every Member will be accommodated. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has indicated his agreement, as has the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Some Senators would like to have the hour fixed at 2 o'clock.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know that there is much difference between fixing the hour at 1 o'clock or at 2 o'clock. The Senator from Nebraska suggested voting on the resolution itself, as well as on all amendments. If the proposal to which I referred is included, it is doubtful that the entire matter can be disposed of by 2 o'clock. I shall be satisfied to have it debated until 2 o'clock. If the other Members are agreeable to voting earlier, that would also be agreeable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder if I might inquire whether any other amendments will be offered to the resolution tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. I shall offer one.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is possible that there will be other amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield ?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I suggest the hour of 1:30 p. m.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] if he is agreeable to the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, at the time we were requested to delay action on the selective-service bill it was said that this joint resolution might be passed

within an hour, that there were a few appropriation bills to be passed, and that we would return to the consideration of the selective-service bill in the middle of the afternoon. We now come to a point where we talk about the middle of tomorrow afternoon. Then we might as well recess over the week-end. I am very reluctant even to agree to the hour of 1 o'clock for a vote. We might as well agree not to return to the consideration of the selective-service legislation until next week. I am sure we all agree that the selective-service legislation is of paramount importance. If there are only a few more amendments to the pending joint resolution why not remain in session tonight and finish them? I am very reluctant to agree to the request. I am certainly reluctant to agree to the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator comes from a section of the country where everyone cooperates. I suggest that the hour be fixed at 1:30. By the time a quorum is called there will be 2 hours in which to debate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator's request preclude additional amendments?

Mr. WHERRY. I suggested that the Senate vote on all amendments and on the bill itself. We will start to vote at 1:30 p. m. Amendments can be offered at any time. We can remain here tonight for a time, if necessary, to receive any amendments which may be offered. I should like to have the request agreed to. It meets the desires of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the desires of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The only question is with regard to fixing the time at 1:30.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator modify his unanimous consent request to require that any amendments offered be germane to the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. If it is agreeable, I do not know why I should not modify it in that way. I see what the Senator means. I modify the unanimous consent request to include provision that the amendments which may be offered be germane to the subject matter of the joint resolution, and that a vote be taken at the hour of 1:30 o'clock p. m.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may the unanimous consent request be stated for the information of those who were out of the Chamber at the time it was suggested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule requires a quorum call before such a unanimous consent request can be agreed to. In view of the recent quorum call, is there objection to waiving the quorum call? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was on my feet. I should like to have the request stated, because several of us came into the Chamber after the request was submitted and do not know what it is about. It may be that I shall not ask for a quorum call, but I ask that the unanimous consent request be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk does not have the request at the desk.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will restate the proposed unanimous consent agreement. It is that the Senate reconvene tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., and that the vote be had on the pending amendment and on all amendments which may be offered to the joint resolution——

Mr. LODGE. Which joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. House Joint Resolution 296, relating to social security benefits; that a final vote be had at 1:30 o'clock p. m., and that the time be divided equally, from 11 o'clock a. m. when the Senate meets until 1:30 o'clock p. m., between the proponents and opponents of the joint resolution, and that all amendments which are offered shall be germane to the subject matter of the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest to the Senator, inasmuch as the amendment which is now pending, and other amendments to the joint resolution, may be disposed of before 1:30 o'clock, that the Senator designate who is to control the time for and against the joint resolution, and not necessarily for and against an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly thought that would be clear, that the time for the proponents of the joint resolution be in the control of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the time of the opponents in charge of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. BARKLEY. I take it that if the amendment of the Senator from Arizona shall be agreed to, he will not be opposed to the joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the minority leader like to take charge for the opponents?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Would some other Senator like to take charge of the time for the opponents?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think we can arrange that.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to make one statement. I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request, but some of my distinguished friends have complained to me that I did not give them opportunity to have their names appear on the amendment as sponsors. Senators who were included as sponsors were those who came around my desk. I will welcome any Senator who wishes to put his name on the amendment. And if there is any Senator who desires to join us, we will be glad to have him do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to waiving the quorum call for the consideration of the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the quorum call is waived. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to call attention to the fact that the discussion which has just taken place illustrates the utter futility of attempting to drive through the Congress of the United States important legislation by the 19th of June. This will require the Members of the Senate to neglect many of the important measures to be considered.

I wish to point out that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, having before it the Interior Department appropriation bill, has been called in session for 7:30 o'clock this evening. There will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock to conduct additional hearings on a resolution to provide for an inquiry into the basing point system.

The appropriation bills, the pending joint resolution, the draft bill, and many other bills which are on the calendar, all demand the very best attention of every Member of the Senate. But if we persist in going through night sessions of the Senate and morning and night sessions of committees, just for the purpose of adjourning the present session of the Congress by the 19th of June, the country should know that it will be physically impossible for the Members of the Senate to give adequate attention to the measures which are before it.

Everyone who has any experience at all in a legislative body knows that it is under such circumstances that riders and jokers are put through on measures. I submit that there are very few Members of the Senate here this evening.

Mr. HATCH. A parliamentary inquiry. Who has the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have the floor. If I do not have the floor, I shall take my seat and wait until I have it.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was recognized in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming was recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that I am certain there is no rider or joker in the amendment which is now pending to the joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is utterly mistaken if he thinks I mean any such implication. As a matter of fact, if I understand what the amendment is, I shall be very glad to support it.

Mr. MAYBANK. It should be supported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let no one misunderstand that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to make a constructive suggestion in line with what the Senator from Wyoming has said, that is, for the Republican Party to

call off its national convention, and leave the country in good Democratic hands. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Maryland has made an eminently good suggestion.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to repeat that I am certain that there is no rider or joker in the amendment. It is a measure of justice.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course; I was not speaking about any amendment. I came upon the floor from a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations. I have not the slightest idea what the particular amendment is, and I submit that my position is no different from that of most of the other Members of the Senate. They have had no opportunity either to read the report which is before us, read the joint resolution which is before us, or read the amendment which is before us. The result is going to be that we will be passing legislation without the due consideration which it should have at the hands of the Members of this body.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am standing now in an effort to get the floor in my own right.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was the Senator from Nebraska about to ask a question?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I should like to have action on my unanimous-consent request. Did the Senator object?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, but I reserved the right to object.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will not object. I am quite as anxious to get to the committee meeting as he is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is why I wanted to have the joint resolution go over until tomorrow, and have a final vote tomorrow rather than tonight, because if the Senate continues in session, it will be impossible for me to attend the meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considering the Interior Department appropriation bill, which covers reclamation, in which I am intensely interested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator is intensely interested in it, and I am also, so I shall be present, too. I am merely pointing out that neither the Senator from Nebraska nor the Senator from Wyoming can distribute himself into two or three places at the same time, but that is what is being required of the Members of the Senate by the procedure which is being forced upon us in order that we may drive through certain legislation by the 19th of June.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to bring about an arrangement whereby we can attend the session of the Committee on Appropriations tonight, then return to the Senate tomorrow afternoon and vote upon the joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not object.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am taking this time in order to make it clear to all who may listen that we are doing an improper thing. We are depriving ourselves, as Members of this body, of the opportunity to study important legislative proposals, and, more than that, we are depriving our constituents of the right which they have that Members of this body should have the time to consider the bills that are presented before us.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish I could agree with the able Senator from Wyoming, but in my humble opinion the best interests of the Nation would be served and will be served by our adjourning on June 19. I think we will save the taxpayers a great deal of money by doing so. I think the country will be much better off by our adjourning than by our remaining here and continuing to spend literally hundreds of millions of dollars, and passing a great deal of legislation which possibly is not needed, which could well remain on the docket until next year. I am thoroughly convinced that the best interests of the Nation lie in Congress adjourning on June 19.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I call attention to one situation which has been developed by the submission of the amendment by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] for himself and other Senators. I do not suppose there is a single Member of the Senate who would oppose what is sought to be achieved by the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. Unfortunately, the situation with which we are confronted in considering an amendment of this nature may present complications, and I am sure do present complications, which were not dreamed of by the Senator from Arizona at the time he offered the amendment.

Probably the Senate is going to adopt the pending joint resolution, but there are many serious objections to it. One of those objections is that the adoption of the joint resolution will have the effect of removing from the social-security rolls several hundred thousands of persons now receiving social-security benefits.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the proposed joint resolution will not remove a single person who is receiving social-security benefits under the system; not one.

Mr. HATCH. I understood the Senator's argument, and I wish to repeat, that what I said was that it was seriously contended it would have that effect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Well, the amendment which is in the bill, which can be read by all Senators, makes it very clear that not a single person who is receiving benefits will be deprived of them, even if he has a free ride in the system, has not paid a penny of taxes to get there.

Mr. HATCH. Then I will also add, in addition to what I have said, that it is seriously argued and contended that if the joint resolution is passed, it will prevent several hundred thousands of persons from receiving social-security benefits who would receive them if the contemplated regulations are permitted to go into effect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield

Mr. MILLIKIN. The passage of the joint resolution will result in keeping several hundred thousand people from qualifying in the future for social-security benefits until the Congress, by act of Congress, qualifies them, and who at the present time are not entitled to qualify for social security under the laws which exist.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am not arguing the merits of the proposal now, but I do insist that what I said was exactly correct, that it is seriously believed and argued that the joint resolution will have the effect I said it would have.

Mr. President, the point I rose to make is that if the amendment of the Senator from Arizona is adopted it will absolutely assure the passage of the joint resolution. The joint resolution, as thus amended, giving necessary assistance to the aged, would make possible, if the construction placed upon it is correct, the complete elimination or prevention of several hundred thousands from receiving social-security benefits.

The point I am driving at is the inadvisability of legislating in this manner, of accomplishing certain results, desirable as they may be, but actually destroying benefits to many thousands of others.

Mr. President, I will not be here tomorrow. It is necessary that I leave, and I will not be permitted to vote on this matter. But if I were present, for the reasons I have stated—and I want to make my record on the matter now—I would vote against the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, even as I would also vote against the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, June 4, 1948, at the hour of 1:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits, and upon the final passage of the joint resolution: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter shall be received.

Ordered further, That the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 1:30 o'clock p. m. on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the joint resolution and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion with reference to the remarks made by the

Senator from Wyoming. One of the difficulties before us, of course, arises out of the fact that the Appropriations Committee must almost continuously be in session, and it has the permission of the Senate to be in session while the Senate is considering legislation. That deprives the Senators on that committee of the opportunity to hear the discussions on the floor of the Senate. That condition would not be remedied by a night session, either tonight or on any other night, whenever that committee must be in session to complete appropriation bills. So the same difficulty which the Senator from Wyoming very properly complains of, would arise if the Senate were to continue in session tonight. It is a situation which always arises toward the end of a session when the Appropriations Committe is striving to get appropriation bills through by the end of the fiscal year. I hope we shall be able to continue to facilitate legislation and at the same time give way, when necessary, to the appropriation bills which must be passed in order that the Government's expenses may be paid.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEEFE, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahama, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HENDRICKS, and Mr. FOGARTY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER FLOODS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment or two of the Senate's time to make a very brief statement respecting the Pacific Northwest floods, as they have been reported to me in recent minutes. First I want to read a letter which I received from the editor of the Oregon Journal, of Portland, Oreg., Marshall N. Dana, who is one of the outstanding citizens of my State:

OREGON JOURNAL,
Portland, Oreg., June 1, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: In answer to your wire to Don Sterling, I am sending you some of the Journal's coverage in text and pictures of the flood and today's editorial page.

May I add that a first consideration should be some legislative means of reimbursing residents of Vanport for personal losses in flood, if not under existing tort laws, then by special legislative appropriation. Most of the victims are former shipyard workers or GI's attending Vanport college, all living in a FPHA project supposedly protected by dikes under Army engineers' supervision.

Second, Federal housing should be provided immediately, preferably at other locations, to replace the 6,600 units destroyed at Vanport. All other public-housing projects in the Portland-Vancouver area are from 90- to 100-percent full. It would be impossible to supply privately constructed housing within reach of the flood victims.

Third, Federal-State aid will be necessary to take care of the 4,000 grammar-school, 800 high-school, and 1,400 college students at Vanport. Portland schools are already jammed, and the Oregon colleges likewise, as you well know.

Obviously, existing legislation is not adequate. Surely there ought to be, in addition to any aid to the flood victims, prevention of future flood victims by a substantially stimulated flood-control program. Isn't it remarkable that we must pay out practically the cost of an improvement in what turns out to be dead loss? Doesn't it again illustrate the economic axiom, "If you need a thing you pay for it, whether you get it or not?"

If you need anything, please wire.

Most sincerely,

MARSHALL N. DANA,
Editor, Editorial Page.

Mr. President, I trust and hope—and I am sure that both my trust and hope will be fulfilled that before Congress adjourns on June 19 legislation of the type recommended by Mr. Dana in this letter may be enacted. As of tonight, it appears that in the Vanport area alone, between 25,000 and 30,000 flood victims are without any housing.

One constructive suggestion, I think, can be made to those in charge of this disaster area, and that is that a disaster coordinator should be appointed by the President, through whom all relief and all steps taken to alleviate the terrible conditions which exist in my State and in the State of Washington would be cleared. In a series of telephone conversations this afternoon with officials and leading citizens of my State, I was told in each instance, without exception, that although every Federal agency and every State agency is doing everything it can within the terms of its powers and jurisdiction, there is some activity going on at cross-purposes, and some duplication. What seems to be needed above all else is a disaster coordinator, through whom all relief activity could be cleared and funneled. I respectfully use this forum to make that suggestion to Federal officials, because I think it would greatly speed up relief activity in connection with this flood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Let Refugees of Ruined Vanport Learn Real Meaning of Word 'Neighbor,'" published in the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., on June 1, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET REFUGEES OF RUINED VANPORT LEARN REAL MEANING OF WORD "NEIGHBOR"

A city drowned!

Now, we who never before realized it, know the power of the Columbia.

The river turned destroyer has created this community's greatest disaster. Vanport is the city drowned.

Sunday afternoon the sun was bright on Vanport. Children were playing, couples were strolling, many—mercifully—were away on recreation bent.

The old people were confident. Hadn't a poster, just distributed, told them to be calm, that trouble was unlikely, and that due notice would be given if danger became ominous?

Where are some of those old people now—those who hadn't time in their slow moving to get away when the flood came roaring? Those who hesitated perhaps too long to save some of their precious possessions?

And where are some of the children who could only cry when the wave swept upon them, cries only half uttered before they were chocked into silence?

The questions are not rhetorical. They are not exploitation of grief. At this writing no one can tell. No one can tell what dread secrets are hidden by some of the lightly built houses and apartments, lifted from their bases by terrific hydraulic power. No one can tell whether tragedy is concealed in the clover-leaf underpass leading from Vanport to the highway and into which refugees jammed in their efforts to escape.

But this unparalleled and numbing catastrophe has exerted an equally great claim upon the sympathy and compassion of all the people dwelling upon higher ground. Their doors opened to flood refugees to such an extent that the group-housing burden of the Red Cross was measurably reduced. Those helped were "people." There was little evidence of the color line.

The Red Cross came to the fore in such heroic fashion as will never be forgotten. In a way, incidentally, that should bring some uncomfortable moments to those whose feet dragged in the recent Red Cross financing drive.

When the water goes down, let the Red Cross have an emergency drive. There will be a lot of people who didn't care much, before, who will come to the forefront without urging in another appeal.

The Salvation Army performed splendidly in asembling food and milk, and has its claim on public gratitude.

They have courage, and grit and gumption—those residents of Vanport City. At the scene of the tragedy, at the Red Cross, at the Armory, at the schols, they showed it:

A mother with four children, her husband away, smiled bravely with, "Oh, I feel we were lucky after all."

A mother and her child, separated from her husband and other child—were they drowned in the watery horror of Vanport?—the thought's racing through her mind were written in grief and anxiety on her face.

A family—washed out—only posession left in one litle duffel bag. "Well, we're all here and healthy, anyway."

Men carrying children and old people before the rushing water, caring for the injured, taking their losses with chins high—even the ones who waited with numbed minds to learn the final word whether their loved ones perished.

The first shock and hurried emergency care of the Memorial day tragedy at Vanport City have passed. But now we are faced with a problem of the greatest magnitude. Portland and a great section of its citizens have been dealt a major blow. We who are fortunate not to have been hit so tragically are to be tested for our citizenship, generosity and helpfulness for months to come.

Consider these problems:

Housing: The 18,500 persons driven from their homes must have decent housing as fast as technology will allow. This is a tremendous job in which it should be expected all governmental bodies, all relief agencies, all private industry and individuals should cooperate. Fortunately, it is summer, but there is no time to wait. Families cannot live in schools, churches, armories, and tents, or in jammed quarters for any length of time. A central emergency housing committee should be set up immediately to plan permanent housing.

Personal possessions: Most of the persons from Vanport lost all their personal possessions, rescuing only a meager amount of clothing. This alone will run into several millions of dollars. Clothing, baby supplies, kitchen equipment, furniture, bedding—all

these must be supplied, because very few will have the money to replace personal possessions. Our hearts and our pocketbooks must be wide open.

Vanport residents who lost everything in the flood should make a complete list of their personal belongings while memory is fresh. It will be invaluable if it develops that the Government accepts responsibility (up to $1,000), or in case the Congress acts to reimburse victims of the flood.

Jobs: Because of the confusion, the personal losses, many wage earners may have an extremely difficult time being steady on their jobs. Every consideration should be given by employers to these people, because it is a job—money coming in every week—that will put them back on their feet the fastest and in the best way. Immediate relief and help is, of course, necessary, but jobs are all-important.

Vanport College: Hundreds of GI's were receiving their education at Vanport College. Now its seven main buildings are wrecked, and possibly cannot be replaced in time for the fall term. All other colleges are jammed. The State system of higher education should make provisions for obtaining public-school buildings to continue during the summer session, and start immediately to make provisions for those students. The war did not stop them from getting their education—this flood must not, either.

The manner in which Portland citizens responded to calls for help was little short of marvelous. Cots, food, blankets, and helping hands appeared magically in every neighborhood, concentrating at the schoolhouses. Portlanders stood ready and did offer anything—their services, food, blankets, cars, anything they had.

That spirit should not be allowed to fade away, because it is going to be needed more and more as the days pass into weeks, and the weeks into months.

No finer memorial could ever be erected in the heart of Portland than the fact that we met the emergency and saw it through to the very end until all our people are reestablished in homes, jobs, and a normal way of life again. It is a big order, but Portland is a "big town."

Vanport, the $25,000,000 war-born miracle city that sprang from the mud flats, once housed 42,000 persons. Its 10,000 units, mostly 2-story, 14-apartment buildings, were rushed to completion by the United States Maritime Commission and the Kaiser Co. when more than 100,000 shipbuilders poured into the area to work in 7 major shipyards.

Part of a great $100,000,000 public housing program in the Portland-Vancouver area, congested Vanport City became the greatest single housing project in the West, if not the United States, complete with all city government services, schools, commercial facilities, playgrounds, and entertainment projects.

When the war boom subsided, Vanport, together with matching facilities on the Vancouver side of the Columbia, became the last great cushion against the postwar housing shortage. That cushion is no more.

When raging flood waters reduced the city to rubble, approximately 6,000 of the original 10,000 housing units were still in use, and these 6,000 units now become the measure of the emergency housing shortage thrust upon the city of Portland.

Add to this the immediate question of providing school facilities for the 4,000 Vanport grammar school children, the 800 high and junior high school students, and the 1,400 who were doing undergraduate work at Vanport College—third largest institution of higher learning in Oregon—and the problem assumes huge proportions—proportions that indicate that not only State but Federal aid will be necessary.

Relief and rescue units and townspeople of Portland and Vancouver are doing a magnificent emergency job. But the long range aftermath problems—housing, education, sanitation and rehabilitation—are national in scope.

Why did it happen? It is useless and avails nothing at present to argue and discuss that point—there is too much work to be done. Col. O. E. Walsh, district engineer, said his men made inspections of the dike area around Vanport as many as two and three times a day—in fact an inspection was made earlier in the afternoon.

He points out that it was a railway fill that literally "blew." There was no evidence of gradual slipping or crumbling—it "blew." An investigation, of course, should be made, but mass armchair engineering after the event is no help now. Work, planning, generosity, helpfulness are the need of the day.

Vanport was an island, a depressed island, its shores the dikes that encircled it; and these dikes were counted upon to hold as the Columbia rose to a height of 15 feet above the floor of Vanport.

The trouble is that no one can trust such shores. Fifty-nine years ago the people of Johnstown, Pa., were comfortable and confident on May 30. But on May 31 a wall of water swept down upon them from the broken dam on the south fork of the Conemaugh River.

Like Vanport, many who escaped had no time to retrieve personal belongings, and gave thanks that their lives were spared, for 2,200 died in the Johnstown flood in 1889.

An amazing feature of the local flood is the swiftness with which rescue forces mobilized, both official and volunteer. The Red Cross, the police, the firemen, the National Guard, the engineers, the harbor patrol, the radio hams, the teachers, the truck and bus drivers, the dock workers, and countless unbadged civilians moved in as soldiers of the common weal do. No one will ever know how many medals for heroism were earned at flooded Vanport.

Unfortunately there are always the others whose idle curiosity causes them to disregard pleas to stay away and whose congestion of automobiles and bodies hinder rescue efforts and block the movement of emergency vehicles.

Vanport, born of war emergency, located in low ground because of convenient nearness to shipyards and other war industries, has been condemned by the flood so far as the future is concerned. The housing units probably will not be replaced. Another location must be found for Vanport College and its students who are veterans. Plans for industrial development of the tract must be revised.

The Vanport tragedy overshadows other flood disasters only because it is nearer home. But the Columbia from its source rivers, past Vancouver and Portland to Woodland and other endangered places, is a terrible picture of a river gone mad with power. We who feel deeply the hurt that hits us here can the more readily sympathize with the losses and the panic elsewhere.

And all of those who live in the Columbia Basin will say thank you to America for such sympathy and help.

The problem created by the Vanport disaster can only be met by the combined resources of the city and county, State and Federal Governments.

Otherwise, too great to meet is the loss of homes, schools, college, businesses, personal possessions, and jobs. Also too great to meet otherwise are the imperative demands of salvage, reconstruction, permanent housing, sanitation, and reemployment. Nor may we forget the tremendous potential of individual generosity.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard B. McEntire to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. George L. Russell to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate now take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Claude G. Bowers, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile, to serve concurrently and without

additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Latin America established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, February 25, 1948.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Henry J. Tasca, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Garland S. Ferguson, Jr., of North Carolina, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1948.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. (Judge Fennell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 7, 1948.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Howard C. Gilmer, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia, vice Frank S. Tavenner, whose term will expire June 5, 1948.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Bernard Fitch, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 29, 1948.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Lucy Torreano, Marvel, Ala., in place of B. F. Roden, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Frederick G. Zittleman, Cloverdale, Calif., in place of B. A. Williams, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Margaret H. Burke, Litchfield, Conn., in place of M. J. Donahue, removed.

FLORIDA

Arrie R. Royal, Brewster, Fla., in place of Edith Boyles, removed.

GEORGIA

Benjamin L. Robertson, Jr., Byron, Ga., in place of M. C. Aultman, retired.

INDIANA

Lawrence S. Miller, Griffith, Ind., in place of R. C. Beck, declined.

KANSAS

Warren W. Nye, Harper, Kans., in place of D. M. Bear, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Lora C. Birmingham, Hardburly, Ky., in place of Elizabeth Godsey, resigned.

John R. Craig, Rockholds, Ky., in place of Stella Creekmore, retired.

MARYLAND

Patrick J. Byrne, Berwyn, Md., in place of T. R. Burch, resigned.

Thomas F. Conlon, Cumberland, Md., in place of J. C. Shriver, resigned.

H. Lester Long, Jr., Ellicott City, Md., in place of M. J. Sullivan, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Grace S. Whippee, Barre, Mass., in place of H. L. Pierce, retired.

Lawrence J. O'Brien, East Bridgewater, Mass., in place of J. F. Currie, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Robert J. Buller, Interlochen, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSISSIPPI

Conway F. Dickey, Alligator, Miss., in place of R. W. Burton retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Walter E. Hill, Fitzwilliam Depot, N. H., in place of S. E. White, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Jerome L. Becker, Jr., Hightstown, N. J., in place of J. B. Braun, Jr., deceased.

Robert G. Young, Port Monmouth, N. J., in place of M. B. Naughton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW YORK

Mary A. Burns, Andover, N. Y., in place of J. D. Chessman, deceased.

Paul E. Carrigan, East Rockaway, N. Y., in place of A. A. Crary, deceased.

James V. Corrigan, Gardenville, N. Y., in place of Albert Werner, deceased.

Charles W. Schmitt, Montgomery, N. Y., in place of W. J. Devitt, transferred.

Andrew A. Wulforst, New Hyde Park, N. Y., in place of John Flinn, deceased.

OHIO

Willis D. Kay, Anna, Ohio, in place of M. L. Sollmann, transferred.

Anna Gilmer Love, Basil, Ohio, in place of J. F. Shell, deceased.

Harley G. Butler, Bryan, Ohio, in place of G. H. Smith, deceased.

William Henry Jenne, Elyria, Ohio, in place of C. J. Sartor, resigned.

Harold L. LaFountaine, Helena, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Russell M. Powell, New Vienna, Ohio, in place of T. H. Rice, transferred.

OREGON

Ardis E. Bradley, Aumsville, Oreg., in place of V. R. Bradley, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert N. Eisenhart, Aspers, Pa., in place of C. A. Plank, resigned.

Robert A. McNaul, Curwensville, Pa., in place of W. K. Wrigley, resigned.

Victor Lescovitz, Midway, Pa., in place of Rebecca Campbell, resigned.

Michael J. Pagani, New Galilee, Pa., in place of Rose Guzzetti, resigned.

Anna V. Eichlin, Ottsville, Pa., in place of H. M. Fabian, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rennie W. Baird, Lake City, S. C., in place of R. B. Cromer, transferred.

Pearsall LeRoy Rogers, Mullins, S. C., in place of Gertrude Parrish, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Jefferson C. Roberts, Jr., Hilham, Tenn., in place of J. R. Carmack, retired.

Harvey H. Bozeman, Mascot, Tenn., in place of R. M. Cobb, resigned.

Paul F. Brooks, Portland, Tenn., in place of W. S. Moore, resigned.

Vernon A. Poole, Savannah, Tenn., in place of J. H. Sevier, resigned.

TEXAS

Sidney R. Malone, Devine, Tex., in place of J. F. Griffin, retired.

VERMONT

Susie M. Eastman, East Hardwick, Vt., in place of A. L. Boudreau, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Abram C. Turner, Jr., Clover, Va., in place of N. A. Chisholm, retired.

Lemuel W. Houston, Fredericksburg, Va., in place of H. F. Crismond, deceased.

Edward C. Taylor, Hanover, Va., in place of E. K. Taylor, deceased.

A. Biedler Heltzel, Harrisonburg, Va., in place of N. H. Keezell, deceased.

Clinton Webb, Jr., Hillsville, Va., in place of J. T. Hylton, resigned.

Arlene H. Bane, Vernon Hill, Va., in place of N. G. Dunn, resigned.

REGULAR ARMY AND REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

REGULAR ARMY

Lonn E. Harrington, Jr.	Wilmer C. Marvin
Walter N. Higgins	Graham A. Penniman, Jr.
John W. Hodnett, Jr.	Lynn L. Pesson
John C. Littlejohn	Walter Redd
Albert L. Loth, Jr.	Robert P. Reder
James W. Mann	Jack R. Sadler
Robert W. Martin	John R. Tilden

REGULAR AIR FORCE

Stanley W. Ahrends	Thomas J. Mathews
James M. Burdette, Jr.	Robert F. Saydah
George W. Mathews, Jr.	Ofus L. Slayton, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be colonels

Col. James Lendsey McKinnon, O15426, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Willis Glenn Cronk, O15428, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Leslie Lee Hittle, O15430, United States Army.

Col. Eugene Desire' Regad, O15436, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Donald Taylor Beeler, O15437, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Creswell Blakeney, O15438, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mason Hoke, O15441, United States Army.

×Col. Elvin Hamilton Burger, O15444, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Freeland McGraw, O15446, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Searl Marr, O15447, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leonard James Greeley, O15449, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Kingsley Sherman Andersson, O15450, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Frishe Dean, O15453, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ben. Early Cordell, O15455, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dalies Joshua Oyster, O15456, United States Army.

Col. George Phillips Privett, O15459, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Mitchell England, O15468, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Floyd Cornelius Devenbeck, O15469, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Black Forse, O15470, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wallace Homewood, O15472, United States Army.

Col. James Vestie Collier, O15474, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Edwin Kennedy Wright, O15475, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Glore, O28758, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Tuttle Owen, O15488, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Thomas Gallagher, O28759, United States Army.

Col. Donald Robert Van Sickler, O38585, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Ford Trimble, O28761, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jules Krafft French, Jr., O28760, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Harold Thomas Lentz, O28766, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Gordon Edmund Textor, O15524, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Clinton Frederick Robinson, O15530, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robin Bernard Pape, O15547, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clyde Massey, O15551, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Ward Berry, O15554, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Ward Berry, O15554, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gen. William Howard Arnold, O15558, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Charles Truman Lanham, O15568, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Haydon Lemaire Boatner, O15641, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Harry Stadler, Jr., O15731, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Laurence Knight Ladue, O15750, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Armistead Davis Mead, Jr., O15767, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Thaddeus Sexton, O15777, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Edwart Hart, O15788, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Emil Lenzner, O15810, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Winfered Smythe, O15816, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Archer Elmore, O15823, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Ralph Parker Eaton, O15871, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix, O15897, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Henry Decker, O15950, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Perry Willey, O15954, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, O15968, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, O15970, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Leonard Harrold, O16051, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Robert Milchrist Cannon, O16163, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Murphy Willems, O16176, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Nelson Gillmore O16196, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Sayles Bowen, Jr., O16434, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Charles Draper William Canham, O16496, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, O16755, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. James Francis Collins, O16819, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gen. Robert Tryon Frederick, O17196, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Frank Dow Merrill, O17638, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul Frailey Yount, O18022, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 516 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels

Col. Leon Jacob Livingston, O39512, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Earl Rucker, O41381, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George William McClure, O28794, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Aaron Steele Guthrie, O50894, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Leo F. Kelly, O50895, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glen Arthur Webster, O41383, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tyler Davis Barney, O28795, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry George Gerdes, O39513, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nelson Leclair, Jr., O28797, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence James Nelson, O50942, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Crawford Knox, O50897, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lindsay Patterson Caywood, O50898, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Potter, Jr., O28798, United States Army.

Col. Earl William Heathcote, O28800, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Graydon Wilson, O41384, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Troutman Balke, O38592, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Herman Haas, O41385, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Clifford Allen Kaiser, O28801, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Thomas Joseph Kane, O41386, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Randolph Currier, O50901, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Lawrence Marshall, O38593, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wellington Dallas Dillinger, O50902, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Whitfield Wannamaker Watson, O28802, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Leslie Wright Stanley, O38594, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Martin Greene, O28803, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Elisha Hoyne, O28804, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfred Harold Anderson, O28805, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randolph Gordon Norman, O39515, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alan Francis Stuart Mackenzie, O28806, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Samuel Johnson Taggart, O41388, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Burkholder Oxrieder, O16042, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Gerald Edward Galloway, O16043, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harrod George Miller, O16044, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Rueben Dutton, O16048, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Kenyon Withers, O16049, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Leonard Harrold, O16051, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Kenneth William Treacy, O16052, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Lee Howze, Jr., O16055, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Leland Berrel Kuhre, O16056, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Amos Tappan Akerman, O16060, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Carl William Meyer, O16071, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. David Henry Tulley, O16075, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Warren Nourse Underwood, O16078, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Miles Merrill Dawson, O16079, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Parsons Nicholas, O16080, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Warren Holcomb, O16082, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Armand Hopkins, O16083, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Timothy Lawrence Mulligan, O16084, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Cobb Fowlkes, Jr., O16087, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Wilson Huyssoon, O16088, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Gilbert Fraser, O16090, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Frank Andrew Pettit, O16092, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Walter William Hodge, O16094, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Henry Nutter, O16095, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Ralph Augustus Lincoln, O16097, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Gilbert Edward Linkswiler, O16098, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Aubrey Strode Newman, O16099, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Ernest Victor Holmes, O16100, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Ronald Montgomery Shaw, O16103, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army)

Col. Conrad Stanton Babcock, O16104, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Truett Bowers, O16107, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Henry Bigelow, O16110, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Lewis Ackley Riggins, O16111, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Lamborn Wright, O16114, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Frederick Gamber, O16115, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Andrew Barlow, O16116, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Loomis Chamberlain, Jr., O16117, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Frederick Tischbein, O16119, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Joseph Deery, O16123, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Milo Howard Matteson, O16127, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Henry Randolph Westphalinger, O16130, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Cecil Conder, O16131, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Arthur Bliss, O16134, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Holmes Wood, O16135, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lucien Eugene Bolduc, O16137, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfred Boyce Devereaux, O16138, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Maurice Seleen, O16139, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Henry Ewell Strickland, O16140, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wilmer George Bennett, O16141, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Hubert Merrill Cole, O16144, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Gustavus Wilcox West, O16146, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Peter Berilla, Jr., O16147, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Branner Pace Purdue, O16149, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Arthur Grayeb, O16152, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Haydon Young Grubbs, O16154, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Lynds Johnson, O16158, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Clyde Eugene Steele, O16159, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Robert Milchrist Cannon, O16163, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Cavelli, Jr., O16165, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Byrd Whitted, Jr., O16167, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Wilbur Mosteller, Jr., O16168, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Meredith Cornwell Noble, O16169, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Henry McManus, Jr., O16170, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Emmett Burns, O16172, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Amos Hall, O16173, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Janser Bailey, O16174, Army of of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nicholas Joseph Robinson, O16175, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Murphy Willems, O16176, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Franklin Bird, O16179, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Beane Margeson, O16181, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Claude Franklin Burbach, O16184, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Miller Barton, O16185, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Lloyd Burbank, O16186, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Nelson Gillmore, O16196, Army of the United States (major, U. S Army).

Col. Marcel Gustave Crombez, O16198, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Gaddis, O16200, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Everton Pheris, O16202, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Alexander Andrew Dobak, O16203, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Clifton Larter, Jr., O16206, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Wayne Carleton Smith, O16207, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Godwn Ordway, Jr., O16208, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Robert Pepper Clay, O16212, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ira Kenneth Evans, O16215, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Samuel Adrian Dickson, O16219, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dwight Harvey, O16220, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Eldred Long, O16221, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John William Davis, O16223, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William O'Connor Heacock, O16093, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Edwin Bascum Kearns, Jr., O16224, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Rinaldo Van Brunt, O16225, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Patrick Lynch, O16226, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Durward Barnett, O16234, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Claude Aubrey Black, O16235, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Russell Thomas Finn, O16237, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Harry Wells Crandall, O16238, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Enoch Joseph Scalan, O16240, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Bateman Peploe, O16246, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Curtis D. Renfro, O16248, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Blair Daugherty, O16252, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Haskell Hadley Cleaves, O16253, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Aaron Horner, O16254, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Mitchell Alonzo Giddens, O16256, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Leif Neprud, O16257, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Theodore Lamar Dunn, O16258, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Floyd Ellsworth Dunn, O16261, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Michael John Geraghty, O16263, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Dunford, O16267, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Superior Peterson, O16268, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Randolph Sears, O16269, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Avner Suttles, O16275, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. August William Farwick, O16276, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Samuel Mason Lansing, O16277, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Pierre Bacet Denson, O16278, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ray Carl Milton, O41390, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Doane Fred Kiechel, O28810, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis William Anderson, O50904, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Earl Richardson Chase, O28811, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Walter John Rosengren, O41392, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robin Ellis McCormick, O50905, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Percy Walter Thompson, O16315, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Clarence McCurdy Virtue, O16322, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Howard Valentine, O16325, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Julian Henry Baumann, O16326, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Judson MacIvor Smith, O16270, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Donald Hubbell Smith, O16334, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Luther Gordon Causey, O16336, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Meade, O16338, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Andrew Weddell, O16340, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Randolph Jeter, O16342, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Theodore Anderson Seely, O16344, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. George Avery Chester, O16345, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Wheeler O'Connor, O16348, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Hoyt Kennett, O16352, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Joseph Claron Grubb, O41393, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ragnar Edwin Johnson, O28813, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sidney Peter Kretlow, O50908, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Albert Harvey, O39516, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Elwyn Thornber, O41396, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfred Russell Marcy, O38597, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Frederick Rouillard, O38598, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Vincent Mills, O28816, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Stevens Lee, O39518, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Nicholas Purcell, O41397, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Clifford Vernon Oje, O39519, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Wilbert August Speir, O41398, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nelson McKaig, Jr., O28818, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Belden, O28819, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Garland Wheeler, O39520, United States Army.

Maj. Elmer Gwynne Brown, O39521, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Montgomery Chamberlayne Jackson, Jr., O28820, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Elmer Peter Hardenbergh, O28940, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. D. R. Hutchinson, O28822, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Earl Lewis Mickelson, O28823, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John William Fitzpatrick, O50911, United States Army.

Maj. Gustav Leonard Seligmann, O41400, United States Army.

×Maj. Henry William Zinnel, O39522, United States Army.

Lt. Col. George Bradley Buell, Jr., O38599, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Wayne Trone, O39523, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rene Odilon Quenneville, O39524, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Edward Field Sauer, O50912, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Menagh, O50913, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Willard Allen Whittet, O28824, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Modisett, O39526, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ralph Brewer Cummings, O39527, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Guy Lionel Pace, O28826, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George G. Wolfe, O38600, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Dillon Swindler, O28827, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Frederick Straub, O39528, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nebinger Wright, O38601, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roy Henry Hall, O39529, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Halbert Ernest Fillinger, O41403, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Roland Browne, O28831, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James William Fraser, O38602, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Wesley Kittrell, O41404, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alexander Rawlins Helms, O41405, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Myron Benjamin Tauer, O28834, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harold Newell, O28835, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Joseph, O28836, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Dickerson Durst, O28837, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Wendell Welby Fertig, O41406, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Philip Moss, O28838, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Frederick Titus, O38604, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Richter Young, O28839, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Wiltz Gardes, O28840, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gay Ewing Miller, O28842, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Preston Brooks Mayson, O39532, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Urban Franklin George, O28845, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Elliott Jeff Barnette, O28847, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Douglas Ingraham, O28848, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Howard Schultz, O38605, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Henry Walsh, O41408, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Leslie Ellis Griffith, O41409, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Werner Eugene Jones, O28850, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harman Delavan Swits, Jr., O41411, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Stephen William Benkosky, O28852, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice John Fitzgerald, O28851, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thomas Whiting, O28855, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Le Grand Borom, Jr., O50918, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Mathew Rund, O38606, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. La Vell Irvin Cooley, O28858, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Edmond Tarrant, O28859, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Haberle Bloss, O41416, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil James Smith, O28860, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Dawson, O39534, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harwood Leon Marshall, O28862, Army of the United States (major U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Blanchfield Brown, O41418, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Hudson Lawrence, O41420, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Avery Moore, O50919, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Raymond Thayer Bunker, O28864, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Patrick Welch, O41422, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harrold Franklyn Osborne, O28865, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold George Osborne, O28866, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carleton Eugene Merritt, O28867, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Van Keuren, O50921, United States Army.

Col. Robert Curtis Lutz, O28868, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald M. Forney, O38607, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Forbes Seals, O41423, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Andrew Shields, O41424, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Matthew Ruddy, O41426, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Orville Charles Word, Jr., O50922, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Claudius Oscar Wolfe, O39536, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Quenna Allen Pearson, O50923, United States Army.

Lt. Col. John Henry Fritz Bittner, O28870, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Clyde Baker, Jr., O16371, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Livingston Bayer, O16372, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Hunt Mills, O16376, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Keith Richard Barney, O16377, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Elvin Ragnvald Heiberg, O16378, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Anthony Brusher, O16381, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Richard Wyman Pearson, O16384, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Preston Corderman, O16387, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Clerin Rodney Smith, O16388, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Fiorre John Stagliano, O16389, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Parker Montrose Reeve, O16390, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Harry Warren Johnson, O16391, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Kinzie McDonough, O16394, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur August Gerhart Kirchhoff, O16396, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Murlin Creasy, O16397, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Morris Osborne, O16399, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Norman Arthur Matthias, O16400, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Malcolm Raymond Kammerer, O16403, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Eugene Mousseau Des Islets, O16405, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Edward House, O16406, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Easton Thurston, O16408, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold McClure Forde, O16409, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Alexander Walker, O16410, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Lewis Sherrill Griffing, O16413, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Waldo Eugene Laidlaw, O16414, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Hamer Pace Ford, O16417, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ensor Perman, O16419, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George William Hickman, Jr., O16420, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Earl Jerome Murphy, O16421, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Holger Nelson Toftoy, O16422, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Doud, O16423, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. David Louis Van Syckle, O16425, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Wallace Hayden Barnes, O16426, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Richard Walden Mayo, O16430, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Earl Lewis Ringler, O16431, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Walter Clement Stanton, O16433, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Sayles Bowen, Jr., O16434, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Malcolm Dudley Jones, Jr., O16435, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., O16436, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Samuel Pickens Collins, O16444, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Cline Strickler, O16445, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Theodore Charles Wenzlaff, O16448, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Jesse Deyo, Jr., O16449, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Peter Heiser, O16450, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., O16451, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Egon Rowland Tausch, O16452, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Randolph Sewall, O16453, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Hamilton, O16455, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Clifford Sloane, Jr., O16456, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. James Russell Wheaton, O16458, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Malcolm Hobson Harwell, O16460, Army of the United States (major U. S. Army).

Col. Roy Silverman, O16462, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Tyler Calhoun, Jr., O16463, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Hanson Grinder, O16464, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Ross, O16467, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Purnell Storke, O16468, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Edward Pickett Barbour, O16469, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Robert Davidson, O16476, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Freeman Miter, O16477, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Thomas Edward de Shazo, O16479, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Frease March, O16481, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Sylvester Nourse, O16484, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Sieba Roosma, O16486, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Anthony McFarland, O16489, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Charles Draper William Canham, O16496, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Harold McDaniel, O16497, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Willet John Baird, O16499, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul John Black, O16500, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifton Coleman Carter, O16501, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Paul Leroy Carroll, O16502, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Prall Munson, O16505, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Howard James, O16506, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Robert Burns, O16509, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Benjamin Hawthorne, O16512, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roy Jacob Herte, O16516, Army of of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Oka Wade, O16518, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Brookner West Brady, O16519, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harry McNeill Grizzard, O16521, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Armin Leo Tenner, O41428, United States Army.

Col. Grant Albert Williams, O16567, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Norman Mahlon Winn, O16567, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland McKinley Buffington, O41429, United States Army.

×Maj. Hugh Delvin McGaw, O39537, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. John Norvell Green, O28871, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lawrence Wendall Adams, O33608, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Robert Lee Miller, O16575, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Osman Taylor, O16577, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Neuman Leakey, O16578, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. George Olaf Norman Lodoen, O16580, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Richard Curtis Ward, O16585, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Oliver Wolcott van den Berg, O16586, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Noble Theodore Haakensen, O16589, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Crawford D. Bridges, O16597, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Joseph Wheaton, O16598, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George John Zimmerman, O16600, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Albert Dabney, O16602, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Emmett Walker, O16603, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Rothwell Hutton Brown, O16604, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Irvin Schindler, O16605, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Jerome Thackston, Jr., O16607, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Arthur Hodgkins Bender, O16611, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army.

×Col. Cleo Zachariah Shugart, O16618, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Preston Grace, Jr., O16619, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Claude Augustus Billingsley, O16620, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Fiske, O16623, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jonathan Dean Hawkins, O16629, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Mason Harley Lucas, O16633, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Gallatin Franklin, Jr., O16642, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Walter Byron Larew, O16647, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Coffin Holbrook, O16654, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Newell Edward Watts, O16657, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles William Stratton, O16661, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Albert Sheldon, O16662, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Stewart Yeo, O16664, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Jones Moulton, O16665, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Trimble Brown, O16666, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Weller McCarthy, O16667, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Branche Talley, O16668, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Gibson Van Houten, O16669, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Albert Samuel Baron, O16674, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Edwin Steinmeyer, Jr., O16675, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army)

Col. Henry Louis Luongo, O16683, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Herbert Butler Powell, O16684, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Layton Allen Zimmer, O16688, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Jay B. Lovless, O16689, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Byron Colson, O16691, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hans Brunke, O16692, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Beverley Harper, O16693, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul August Jaccard, O16694, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Burnham Nelson, O16698, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Henry McKie Salley, O41430, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Anthony Carrigan, O28874, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Donald Herbert Hale, O41432, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John William Donnell, O41431, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Madigan, Jr., O39538, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Francis Donahue, O41435, Army of the United States, major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Marion Lydick, O41436, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. George Emmett Campbell, O41437, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Allan Benjamin Charles Nash, O41438, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Alfred Garvin Texley, O39539, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ivan George Walz, O28876, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Lee Gaines, O41439, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Leo Macsalka, O28877, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. LeRoy Hanson Barnard, O39540, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Camille Henry Du Val, O41440, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Randolph Stadfield, O39541, United States Army.
×Maj. Howard Pixley McCormick, O50928, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Eugene Stayton Hicker, O41441, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Archibald Baird Barrett, O28880, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Russell Whipple, O39542, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Henry Derrick, O41443, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Albert Glick, O41444, United States Army.
Maj. Frederick Smith Stratton, O39544, U. S. Army.
×Lt. Col. Joseph Porter Moore, O50929, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Robert Vernon Lee, O28882, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Richard Edward Reichmann, O39545, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William McKewn Albergotti, O28883, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Crawford Paul, O50930, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Francis Nee, O50933, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Frederick Erich Bruhn, O50932, United States Army.
×Maj. Frank Ervine Hankinson, Jr., O28884, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Henry Lee Shafer, O28885, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Donald Melville Jacques, O50934, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Marshall Hahn, O38609, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. Robert Thomas Conner, O38622, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Mark Alexander Herbert Smith, O41447, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Robert Daniel Miller, O41448, United States Army.
Col. Henry Carlton Ahalt, O28886, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elmer James Willson, O41449, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Ernest Benjamin, O28887, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Edward Rudolph Ott, O50935, United States Army.
×Col. Loren William Potter, O28888, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Theodore Trower King, O28889, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. John Kenneth Miller, O28890, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Dixon, O28892, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Laurel Lee Chambers, O39547, United States Army.
×Col. Preston Joseph Cornelius Murphy, O50936, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Russell Bruce Fontaine, O39548, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Francis McDonnell, O39549, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. Eskil Milburn Johannes Alenius, O41452, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Pooley Davis, O28895, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest Glenn Doyel, O41453, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lester James Burbidge, O50938, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Morris Edwin Milner, O41454, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Murray Mann, O39550, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Taber, O50940, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Russell Thomas Boyle, O28900, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ralph Julius Schuetz, O50941, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Wade Hampton Heavey, O28901, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Victor Woodruff Phelps, O41455, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frederick DeMont Biggs, O41456, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Nelson Hornish, O41457, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Kenneth Idris Davis, O39552, United States Army.
×Col. Thomas Coleman Green, O50944, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Shayer O. L. Robinson, O28902, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army.)
Maj. Jay Howard Freaman, O41458, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Edwin Arthur Smith, O41459, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Walter Charles Heinel, O50947, United States Army.
Maj. Herman Railey Fleming, O28903, United States Army.
×Maj. Walter Lothian Maclachlan, O50948, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Joseph Darmody, O28904, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Rura Oswald Ball, O28905, United States Army.
Maj. Adolph Edwin Schonberger, O41461, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Francis Kirby, O28906, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Burleigh Follett Hillman, O28907, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Frederick Harlan, O50949, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Thomas Herman Sills, O28909, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. William Jay Fleming, O28910, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Harvey Albert Johnson, O41462, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Arthur Williams Belden, O50950, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack P. Campbell, O38610, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Marlin Sheridan Moody, O28911, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Francis Anthony Kreidel, O39553, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clarence Quarles Graham, O41463, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Gerald Peterson, O28912, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Doherty, O28913, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Russell Oscar Utke, O28915, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Clarence Fowler, O28916, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Elmer Joseph Collins, O50952, United States Army.
Col. John Bruce Medaris, O39554, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Fredrick Schultz, Jr., O41465, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Melville Freeman Noyes, O39555, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Augustus Houston, O28919, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. James Harold Banville, O28921, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carl William Siegert, O50953, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Stuart Dwinell, O41467, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Glenn Gilmer Dickenson, O50954, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Paul Otto Langguth, O28923, United States Army.
Col. Ottmar Frank Kotick, O28924, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Hans William Holmer, O16734, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Harold Albert Kurstedt, O16735, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Edward Grow Daly, O16736, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Donald Chamberlin Hawkins, O16737, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Theodore Addison Weyher, O16738, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Robert Hammiell Naylor, O16739, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Paul Dunn Berrigan, O16741, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Henry Gordon Douglas, O16742, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. George Townsend Derby, O16744, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Max Sherred Johnson, O16745, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. John Leonard Hines, Jr., O16749, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Charles H. McNutt, O16751, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Herman Walter Schull, Jr., O16752, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Loren Davis Pegg, O16754, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, O16755, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cecil Winfield Land, O16759, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frederick Everett Day, O16760, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Harry Oliver Paxson, O16764, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Henry Joseph Hoeffer, O16765, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Fred Wallace Kunesh, O16768, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Alexander Macomb Miller 3d, O16769, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Gerald Francis Lillard, O16770, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Fenton Peirce, O16771, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Hamilton Hunter, O16772, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Parmer Wiley Edwards, O16775, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Elliot Howard, O16776, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Perry Pence, O16779, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Thomas Morgan Watlington, O16780, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Lewis McNamee, O16781, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, O16782, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Raymond Lovell, O16783, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Wiley Curtis, O16784, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Reynolds Condon, O16786, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Brundy Brown, O16787, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Gilbert Farrand, O16788, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Willard Burton Carlock, O16790, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. George Lucien Richon, O16794, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Richard Hutchison, O16796, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Graham Lowe, O16800, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. George Edward Martin, O16802, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Milton Burdge, Jr., O16803, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Bertram Arthur Holtzworth, O16804, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Andrew Granholm, O16805, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Pennoyer Bixel, O16808, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Griffith Turner, O16809, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Alex Norwood Williams, Jr., O16810, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Jeremiah Paul Holland, O16812, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward James Francis Glavin, O16815, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Howard Gilbreth, O16817, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. James Francis Collins, O16819, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Lee Roy Williams, O16821, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Virgil Thompson, O16826, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Henri Anthony Luebbermann, O16827, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Edwin Meredith, O16829, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Olaf Helgesen Kyster, Jr., O16830, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harry Forrest Townsend, O16832, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Scoon Gardner, O16833, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Walter Morris Johnson, O16835, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Stanley Isaacson, O16836, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Webb Whelchel, O16837, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Harvey Dickerson, O16838, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Leander LaChance Doan, O16839, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Arthur Edwin Solem, O16840, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charlie Wesner, O16842, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Henry Magruder Zeller, O16843, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Layton Cobb, O16845, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Lewis Hinchman Ham, O16848, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Virgil Miles Kimm, O16849, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Curtis White, O16851, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Jordan Verbeck, O16852, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Aloysius Joseph Lepping, O16853, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Stuart Wood, O16857, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Edward Shaw, O16858, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nathan Alton McLamb, O16860, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Thomas Ostenberg, O16863, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harold Kochevar, O16867, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Benjamin Gray, O16868, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Joy Thomas Wrean, O16871, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Joseph Holst, O16872, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Roth, O16874, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Sherman Graybeal, O16875, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Wise Zwicker, O16878, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Woodson Finch Hocker, O16879, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Edward Williams, O16882, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Vachel Davis Whatley, Jr., O16886, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Harry Ellery McKinney, O16888, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Elliott Lundquist, O16889, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Antulio Segarra, O16890, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy William Axup, O16894, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Earle Bell, O16897, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Boal Ewing, O16900, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Barney Avant Daughtry, O16902, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Philip DeWitt Ginder, O16904, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Edwin Doty, O16905, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Howell Hopson Jordan, O16906, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Elmer Matthew Webb, O16908, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Prame Kaylor, O16909, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Christian Gotthard Nelson, O16910, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Calvin Louis Whittle, O16913, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Emericus Bender, O16914, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Jack Henry Griffith, O16915, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Campbell Aloe, O16916, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Nelson Irving Fooks, O16919, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawton Butler, O16921, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Smyly, Jr., O16928, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Raymund Gregory Stanton, O16929, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Willis Small Matthews, O16932, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Fred Leroy Thorpe, O16935, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bienvenido Mobo Alba, O16939, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Joseph Lawrence Dark, O16979, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Felber, O16984, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earnest Kemp, O41469, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wiley Benjamin Tonnar, O50955, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Earl Clarence Bergquist, O16998, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Chase, O16999, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Neil Hickey, O17000, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Alfred Disney, O17004, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Louis Howard Foote, O17010, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Martin Joseph Morin, O16911, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Sumner Pinkham Tufts, O28926, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Hamilton Fish, O28928, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Daniel Alexander, O50959, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Soule, O50960, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Forest Sheldon Rittgers, O39557, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Dean Collar, O39558, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Justus William Kranz, O28933, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lowell Allen Yost, O39559, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Fulton G. Thompson, O50965, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fred Shomaker Hanna, O38612, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Whitehouse, O28941, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hal Randall, O50969, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Elwood Ela, O41483, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Streicher, O41485, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Arthur Duerr, O28944, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Samuel Wallace Fisk, O28945, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Dryden Hodge, O39563, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester DeForest Silvers, O39564, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Philip Maher, Jr., O41490, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Robert Wingate Skinner, O50971, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roland Stuart Watts, O50972, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Francis Ellsworth Morawetz, O28947, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard White, O41491, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Christian Masters, O28950, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Millen Jarvis, O50975, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Allison Jennings, O28953, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Frederick Klinck, O28955, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Don Stevens, O28954, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Phillip Perlett, O28956, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Somerville Ware, O28957, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Arthur Loy Dickey, O28961, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rosewell Howard King, O28962, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Hugh McDonald, O28963, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Stephens Meader, O28964, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Marvin Welsh, O41498, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Alphonsus Gould, O28968, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Frederick Stanford-Blunden, O50978, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Louis Wilson, O28969, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Darremoore Mage, O28971, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Everett, Jr., O39573, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ferdner Scarborough, O41504, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Bradford Torrey Schantz, O39575, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Bliss Freeman, O28973, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Coffey, O28974, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Olney Stone, O28975, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roy Clifton Ulmer, O41507, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew William Roth, O28980, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Leon Augustus Brock, O41508, United States Army.

Col. Rudolph Waldemar Nuss, O28981, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Charles Barnes, O50983, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Ford Ebbs, O39579, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert George Theiring, O28982, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wade Levan Shankle, O28984, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Keyes Jackson, O50986, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hull Adams, O28985, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maxwell Emerson, O41514, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Hill Robinson, O28988, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joy Roosevelt Bogue, O28990, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Littleton Adams Roberts, O28991, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney Stanley Sogard, O41518, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Moody Rudolph Tidwell, Jr., O39581, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Max Nathaniel Cizon, O50989, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Burdette Shaw, O28994, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Victor Owen, O41526, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Floyd Sebastain Fix, O50990, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erwin Arthur Jones, O41528, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Norman Edgar Youngblood, O28996, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Armin Linn, O41530, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Raymond Johnson, O39584, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Callaway Sinsel, O28998, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Terence John Smith, O39585, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Orin B. Sykes, O29003, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Glen Clovis McBride, O29004, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Stokes Shelor, O50994, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Laffeter Green, O17074, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Theodore Scott Riggs, O17076, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Roland Clough Brown, O17080, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel Roberts Browning, O17081, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Lyle Edward Seeman, O17082, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Dixon Smith, O17085, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Fraley Van Natta 3d, O17086, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. David Andrew Watt, Jr., O17088, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Rudolph Ethelbert Smyser, Jr., O17090, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Francis Howard Falkner, O17092, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Alan Johnstone McCutcheon, O17093, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. David William Heiman, O17094, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Smith Shute, O17097, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Everett Potter, O17098, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edmund Koehler Daley, O17099, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Webster Anderson, O17101, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Duncan Sloan Somerville, O17109, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. David William Traub, O17110, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Jennings Wells, O17111, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Ross Currie, O17115, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Walter Godley Donald, O17118, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Henry Hennig, O17122, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Blanchard Grinstead, O17134, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Paul Breden, O17135, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel McCoy Wilson, O17144, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Frank Quincy Goodell, O17147, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Garrison Barkley Coverdale, O17148, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Mercer Christie Walter, O17151, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Theodore John Dayharsh, O17152, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Briant Thayer, O17156, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Cogswell Oakes, O17160, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Roger Woodhull Goldsmith, O17163, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Elmo Stewart Mathews, O17167, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Amos Gavan, O17169, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Honeycutt Hinrichs, O17174, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Marion George Pohl, O17176, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Archibald Sawyer, O17177, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Southworth Upham, Jr., O17178, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Albert Howard, Jr., O17182, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ephraim Hester McLemore, O17184, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Easton Holley, O17185, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick G. Stritzinger, 4th, O17186, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Dabney Billingsley, O17188, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Joseph Cody, O17190, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Robert George Butler, Jr., O17191, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Herman Sturies, O17192, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Joseph Anthony Michela, O17193, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gen. Robert Tryon Frederick, O17196, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, O17198, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Cassel Reber, O17201, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Allison Richard Hartman, O17204, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Douglas Glen Ludlam, O17207, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Legare Kilgore Tarrant, O17208, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Mattingly Breckinridge, O17210, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. James Lowman Hathaway, O17215, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Walter Emerson Finnegan, O17219, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Augustus Cummings, O17222, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Lionel Charles McGarr, O17225, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. James Melvin Lamont, O17226, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Montgomery Breck Raymond, O17227, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Noble James Wiley, Jr., O17228, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Wilhelm Paul Johnson, O17229, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Carl Ferdinand Fritzsche, O17234, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Ralph Joseph Butchers, O17242, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Everett Davenport Peddicord, O17245, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Gallagher Bain, O17246, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Louis Test Vickers, O17249, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Kilbourne Johnston, O17252, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Harold Sievers, O17254, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. John Raymond Gilchrist, O17255, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Frank Rudolph Maerdian, O17256, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Maury Spotswood Crallé, O17279, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Ramon Antonio Nadal, O17280, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Edgar Elliott Enger, O17284, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Tito George Moscatelli, O17286, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Francis Henry Boos, O17291, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Thomas Lilley Sherburne, Jr., O17293, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Stanhope Brasfield Mason, O17295, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James William Lockett, O17305, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Evan McLaren Houseman, O17307, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Thomas Nelson, O17308, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. William Grant Caldwell, O17312, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. William Thomas Moore, O17313, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Paul Jones Mitchell, O17314, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Alfred Benjamin Denniston, O17315, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Franklin Trent, O17319, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Andrew Thomas McNamara, O17324, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Mason Tarpley, Jr., O17325, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. John Ogden Kilgore, O29008, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Norbert Wickens, O41535, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Pou Persons, Jr., O56776, United States Army.
×Col. Houston Val Evans, O29011, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leslie Spinks, O29012, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Franklin Webb, O51001, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Lawrence Henry Kemman, O38616, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Elmer Cleo Gault, O39589, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilber Mortimer Gaige, Jr., O41538, Army of the United States (major, U. S Army).
Lt. Col. Wallace William Lindsay, O38596, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederic Arthur Maples, O29017, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Henry Scott, O29018, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. James Fitzgerald Hanley, O39591, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Arthur Robert MacLean, O41547, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Henry Minton, O29020, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Oliver Pearson, O39592, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alexander McNair Willing, O38619, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Russell Charles Harpole, O29023, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Carl Larson, O41548, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Werner Laurin Larson, O29024, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Richard Eckman, O51005, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Julius Wuest, O29026, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Earl Davis Payne, O29027, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Willard Charles Link, O29028, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Forrest Jack Agee, O29029, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jonathan Howard Michael, O39594, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Henry Brown, O41552, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Burton French Ellis, O29033, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Hazlett, O38621, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Ray Adams, O51010, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harmon Eustace Broyles, O29038, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lylburne Madison Howell, O29042, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Clayton Frederick Fowler, O41553, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Albert Channon, O29044, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Enos Barton Thorton, O51011, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Lawrence Edwin Nobles, O29045, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Ernest Stewart, O39598, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Harry Buttolph Emigh, O39599, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Macadie Weir, O38623, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Murray Duncan Harris, O29048, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leslie Stewart Moore, O51012, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Sam Wallace Russ, O41555, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Julian Sheppard Albergotti, O39601, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hawthorne Davis, O51013, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Alvin Raymond Glafka, O41559, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herbert Steele Ramey, O41562, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thayer Chapman, O39603, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Joseph Flynn, O41563, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earnest Daniel Merrill, O39604, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Broadus McAfee, O29053, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Goodman Shinault Branch, O51014, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Charles Golden, O39605, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Boyce Dexter Kitchings, Jr., O41565, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Burton Joseph, O29054, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Ambrose Pitcher, O39607, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Joseph Sommer, O29055, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Jack Eubank Finks, O38625, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Howard Skelly, O29056, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carter Oliver Price, O51018, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Henry Wienecke, O41569, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carlton Gustav Schenken, O39609, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. William Kelly Wilemon, O29060, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Joseph Matthew Shanks, O29061, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Aaron William Beeman, O29063, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Bernard John Tullington, O29064, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alexander Norton Slocum, Jr., O39610, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Wood Poor, O41575, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Daniel Edwin Smalle, O41576, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Louis Edward Cotulla, O29069, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Glenn Eldridge, O29070, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Henry McAteer, O29072, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Leon Benjamin Humphrey, O29073, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Edward Allen, O29074, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Lindon Barnes, O29078, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Leo Keefe, O29080, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Matthias Coleman, O41582, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roy Reppard, O29084, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Norman August Donges, O29088, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Nathaniel Brewning Rieger, O51027, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. William Echols Ball, O41586, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. Joseph Charles Jackson, O29089, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edwin John Harrington, O41587, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Hugh Lawrence Quarles, O39614, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Frank Meredith Davenport, O51029, United States Army.
Lt. Col. George Gregory Gaydash, O41588, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lionel Rowan Ingram, O29096, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Glenn Johnston, O51033, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edwin Osborne Earl, O29097, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Vernon Charles Rawls, O29098, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond George Curtin, O38627, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harry Dale Nichols, O29100, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. James Harvey Cash, O38628, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Emmett Lee Nations, O41592, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Claude Ege, O29102, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Nathaniel Smith, O29105, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Allan Lee Feldman, O51036, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stuart William Davis, O41593, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Nathaniel William Koeneman, O29106, United States Army.
Col. Richard Joseph Werner, O29107, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Ellwood Webb Sargent, O39617, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ernest Wilford Bosgieter, O41596, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Robert Wesley Reed, O41597, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Milo Irving Gray, O41598, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy William Bartlett, O41600, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Henry Barnes, O41601, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Lesesne DeWitt, Jr., O29109, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edmund Otto Zarwell, O51040, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Tudor Cowen, O51042, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Norman Walker, O29112, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Werner Sturdy, O51043, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Wise Peters, O51044, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Norman Hayden Vissering, O41603, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Burnell Varnum Bryant, O38629, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Clifford Peter Holm, O38630, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Abraham Lincoln Wood, Jr., O29116, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Dreyfus, O29117, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Lyman Dutton Bothwell, O51046, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Clifford Frederick Kaiser, O29120, United States Army.
Col. Horace Fennell Sykes, Jr., O17494, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Raymond Leslie Hill, O17495, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. James Adolph Ostrand, Jr., O17501, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Charles Theodore Tench, O17502, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Frank Hartman Forney, O17503, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Alvin Galt Viney, O17511, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Walter King Wilson, Jr., O17512, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Bruce Douglas Rindlaub, O17513, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Herbert Milwit, O17514, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Benjamin Richard Wimer, O17516, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. John Lloyd Person, O17517, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Thomas Atkins Adcock, O17520, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Thomas Jahn Sands, O17521, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. John Stein Walker, O17522, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Burt Evans, O17523, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Frederic Henry Chaffee, O17524, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Robert George Henry Meyer, O17528, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. William Jonathan Thompson, O17530, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Percy Hannigan, O17531, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. DeVere Parker Armstrong, O17533, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Merle Russell Thompson, O17534, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Douglas Golding Dwyre, O17535, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Franklin Pierce Miller, O17538, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dominick Joseph Calidonna, O17539, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. David Ferdinand Brown, O17540, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Philip Henry Draper, Jr., O17543, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Paul Elias, O17546, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Paul William Shumate, O17547, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. William Lewis Bell, Jr., O17549, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Andrew Samules, Jr., O17552, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Harold George Hayes, O17554, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Joseph Horridge, O17555, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Carl Henry Jark, O17556, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Charles Blake McClelland, O17558, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Robert Emzy Chandler, O17559, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Edwin Hugh John Carns, O17560, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Joseph Milton Colby, O17562, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Eugene Hattan, O17563, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John James LaPage, O17564, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. John Elliot Theimer, O17566, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. William Price Connally, Jr., O17567, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Elmer Kraus, O17571, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Mural Perkins, O17574, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Ralph Robert Mace, O17578, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Norman Edwin Poinier, O17581, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John David Francis Phillips, O17584, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. George Richard Carey, O17587, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Airel Burr Cooper, O17595, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Miller Vestal, O17596, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Myles Wilkenson Brewster, O17597, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. George Waite Coolidge, O17599, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Johnson Woodbury, O17601, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Daniel Norman Sundt, O17604, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Tremlett Kirn, O17606, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. William Hopkins Greear, O17607, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Stevens Whiteley, O17608, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Gordon Harding, O17613, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Chandler Prather Robbins, Jr., O17614, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank M. Steadman, O17616, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jacob George Reynolds, O17618, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. William Darwin Hamlin, O17619, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Emmons Fellows, O17620, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Thomas West Hammond, Jr., O17622, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Henry Ray McKenzie, O17623, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col, Edmund Chauncey Rockefeller Lasher, O17624, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Donal Harkins, O17625, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Fowler Taylor, O17626, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Jamet McNally, O17629, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Eric Hilmer Frithiof Svensson, O17630, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Alexander Poorman, O17631, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Elial Bush O17634, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Carson Bullock, O17635, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Luther Partin, O17636, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert William Ward, O17637, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Frank Dow Merrill, O17638, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Louis Mortimer deLisle deRiemer, O17640, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Hugh Warner Stevenson, O17642, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Loomis Anderson, O17644, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Joseph Reisner Ranck, O17647, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gordon Crandall, O17652, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Kai Eduard Rasmussen, O17655, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Wesley Hammond, O17656, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Laurence Neville Buck, O17657, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Wyatt Caraway, O17659, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Elmer Elsworth Kirkpatrick, Jr., O17660, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Edgar Thomas Conley, Jr., O17665, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Paul William Steinbeck, O17670, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Clarke White Allan, O17671, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harlan Robinson Statham, O17672, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. James Bernard Quill, O17673, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. William Kerr Ghormley, O17674, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Little Cook, O17675, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Winchester Sladen, Jr., O17677, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Nisley Woods, O17679, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Russell Lowell Vittrup, O17681, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Drury Cone, O17683, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lester Skene Bork, O17685, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Bishop Strader, O17686, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Van Strauss, O17689, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Greene Calloway, O17690, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hastings Francis, O17693, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Louis Anderson Hammack, O17696, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Russell Seward, O17698, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Paul Lamar Freeman, Jr., O17704, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Marshall Stubbs, O17706, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Allen McNerney, O17707, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Clarence Renshaw, O17708, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Newton Hunter, O17710, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Logan Clarke, O17713, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Edward Lynch, O17715, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Hugh Mackintosh, O17716, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Erwin Maulsby, Jr., O17718, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Carl Bascombe Herndon, O17720, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Guthrie Rau, O17721, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Julius Winn, O17724, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Lyford Hornor, Jr., O17726, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., O17730, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Dudley Wiegand, O17731, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. John Francis Regis Seitz, O17734, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Bruce Easley, Jr., O17735, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar Wright, Jr., O17736, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Brendan McKay Greeley, O17740, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Ralph Copeland Cooper, O17741, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. David Haytor Buchanan, O17746, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Stanley Walker Jones, O17747, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Henry Chard, O17753, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Herbert John VanderHeide, O17754, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Randolph Kutz, O17763, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Normando Antonio Costello, O17764, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Philip William Merrill, O17767, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Fayette Silver, O17770, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Freeman Kearney, O17771, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, O17775, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Frederick Conner, O17777, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel Edwin Mays, O17783, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. George Van Millett, Jr., O17787, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Edwin Michael VanBibber, O17789, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Burbidge Padgett, O41611, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Morris Snow, O29122, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Myer Fried, O39623, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burl Brenton Baber, O51048, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Jacob Staub, O29123, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Newman Shaver, O29333, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paris Moore, O51052, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Henry Weske, O51054, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Edgar Liebe, O29334, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Blythe Macdougall, O29335, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Roy Patterson, O39624, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Griggs Folkes, O51057, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ludlow Calhoun Adams, O29337, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Horace Augustus Franklin, O41618, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Webb Browning, O29338, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred McManaway, O29339, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Smith Blair 2 1, O29340, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willie Henry Hughes Jones, O39626, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Carl Hendon Hatch, O29341, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Bradley Winsted, O51059, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ivan Lawrence Brenneman, O39627, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney Mason Forbes, O29342, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Keith Moffatt, O29343, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ruding Dey, O29347, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Saunders Shoemaker, O29348, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Col. Louis Gottlieb Bumen, O29350, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Cornelious Wiersema, O41624, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Conway Farley Farrar, O41625, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Edgar Meyer Nelson, O29351, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Roy Johnson, O29352, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Erasmus Hardin Strickland, O29355, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William D'Aguilar Jackson, O39628, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wood Nichols, O29357, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Porter Tarr, Jr., O29358, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Orville Aden Lesley, O39629, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlos Edmond McAfee, O41629, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Charles Higgins, O39630, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Roosevelt Moses, O29362, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Herman Wild, O51064, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James McLaren Clow, O29364, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ward Wilson Conquest, 041630, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herbert Allen Hall, O41631, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Fortress, O41632, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Owen Elliot, O39801, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Eyre Murphy, O41634, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Alvin Andrew Heidner, O41635, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edmund Theodore Bullock, O29367, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Norman Allen Moore, O29370, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alcorn Bernard Johnson, O41636, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Clifford Algy Poutré, O28371, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Louis Henry Shirley, O29372, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Mearls, O39633, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Frederick Theodore Voorhees, O29374, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Walter Edwin Sewell, O39634, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Richard Collins, Jr., O29375, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Richmond Taylor Battey, 2d, O41639, Army of the United States (major, United States Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth William Foster, O29376, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Truman Woods, O51069, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. Thomas Edmund Coony, O29378, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Frasier Taylor, O38661, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Campbell Peterson, O41642, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Wilburn Edward Langlotz, O29379, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Joseph Lawrance Jaggar, O51071, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Mason Elliott, O51072, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Edward Levings, O29380, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John William McDonald, O29381, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Walter Powell Ritchie, O41646, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Worth Lytton Kindred, O29382, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Bruce Douglas Mooring, O51073, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gordon Kennedy Smith, O29383, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles David Colman, O41649, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Alfred Connor Bowman, O56777, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Hubert Eugene Klemp, O51076, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Harold Augustus Davenport, O29385, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Merle C. Bowsky, O29386, United States Army.
Col. Lynn Carl Barnes, O39641, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Edwin Burcher, O39645, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dale Maxwell King, O39644, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter George Meyer, O41653, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Alphonso Lindquist, O41656, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Graves Keithly, O41657, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Burton Orville Morrison, O41658, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Richard Frederick, Jr., O29388, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Russell Edward McMurray, O29389, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Eugene Schliepp Graham, O41661, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Briard Poland Johnson, O29393, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Metticus Walter May, Jr., O29394, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Brantley McKay, O41662, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Alexander Bridgers, O29395, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Jerome Lyon Spurr, O29398, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lou George VanWagoner, O41668, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Eugene George Bennett, O41669, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. John Henry Heil, Jr., O29400, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frederic Gerald Bryan, O39670, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Chauncey Elman Howland, O41671, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Russel Orville Harris, O39671, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Corr, Jr., O51082, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Claude Everett Reitzel, Jr., O29404, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Stoessel Smythe Barksdale, O39672, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Samuel Greenberry Kelly, O38664, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harolde Turner Loftin, O39673, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Herman Andrew Edgerly Jones, O29405, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kelly Leo Brazier, O39674, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Howard Hillman Hasting, O39676, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Maurice Henderson, Jr., O29410, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Milton Barnes Hale, O41681, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harold Dean Shrader, O39677, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Andrew Thomas McAnsh, O38667, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Joseph Martin, O29412, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frank George Wise, O39678, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Willie Carl McMillion, O38668, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Martin Hanley, Jr., O41688, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Lawrence Lee, O51088, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Glenn Cramer, O51089, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Richard D. Boerem, O38670, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Oswald Gilly, O39681, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Madison Bauknight, O51091, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Gage Henry Spies, O29419, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lester Harold Gallogly, O29420, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carroll B. Henderson, O29421, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Francis Copass Bowen, O39682, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gerald Newton Bench, O51092, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Samuel Greenberg, O41692, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Paul Dexter Troxler, O41693, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Willard Stanford Renshaw, O29426, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Anson Day Marston, O29427, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roger McKeene Page, Jr., O29430, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. James Wilson Holsinger, O29432, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Marvin White Ludington, O29434, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Pelman Crosby, O29435, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Edward Murphy, Jr., O29437, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roy Augustus Wall, O41784, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Theodore Burgess Freeman, O29438, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Alvin Benjamin Welsch, O41786, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Brig. Gen. Paul Frailey Yount, O18022, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army.
×Col. William Arnold Carter, Jr., O18023, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. William Whipple, O18024, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Philip Frederick Kromer, Jr., O18030, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army.
Col. Emil Fred Klinke, O18034, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Edward Fenlon Kumpe, O18036, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Robert Lynn Lancefield, O18037, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Col. Oscar Benjamin Beasley O18045, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. John Henderson Dudley, O18049, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Eugene Dennis, O18052, Army of the United States, major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Herschel Allen, Jr., O18053, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carl Henry Fernstrom, O18055, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hubert duBois Lewis, O18058, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Charles Lee Heitman, Jr., O18059, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Albert Joseph Mandelbaum, O18061, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Philip Campbell Wehle, O18067, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Clifford Duehring, O18070, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, O18071, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army.
Col. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Herbert Voivenelle Mitchell, O18073, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Alexander Graham Stone, O18076, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Jacquard Hirshorn Rothschild, O18077, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Stuart Francis Crawford, O18078, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Bing Kunzig, O18081, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Keith Hartman Ewbank, 018082, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Irwin Edgar, O18083, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Frank Kowalski, Jr., O18086, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, O18088, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Robert Highman Booth, O18093, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Leonard Fuller, Jr., O18094, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Wendell Holmes Langdon, O18101, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Harry Raymond Boyd, O18102, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Samuel Lynn Morrow, Jr., O18104, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Albert Watson 2d, O18105, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Franklin Fearing Wing, Jr., O18107, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. James Owen Curtis, Jr., O18108, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Percy Howard Brown Jr., O18117, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Paul Clark, Jr., O18118, Army of the United States (major, United States Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Sedgwick Berry, O18119, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Albert Everett Harris, O18121, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Theopold Darrah, O18124, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Roy Ernest Lindquest, O18125, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Sidney Clay Wooten, O18126, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Robert Edwin Cron, Jr., O18127, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Archibald William Stuart, O18130, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Willis Almeron Perry, O18131, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Frank Greco, O18133, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Alden Pugh Taber, O18134, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Goodrell Garton, O18138, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Aubrey Dewitt Smith, O18142, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Barksdale Hamlett, O18143, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Brainard Spencer Cook, O18144, Army of the United States (major U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Carey Peterson, O18151, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Eugene Brooks, O18152, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Paul Arthur Roy, O18153, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. William Henry Harris, O18155, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Tom Robert Stoughton, O18156, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Adam Andrew Koscielniak, O18159, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. James Frederick Ammerman, O18165, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. William Naille Taylor, O18168, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Dwight Atkinson, O18169, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. William Warner Harris, O18170, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Frederick Gardner Crabb, Jr., O18172, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Charles Hayden, O18174, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Allen Ports, O18175, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roderick Leland Carmichael, Jr., O18176, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Carl Irven Hutton, O18177, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Wareham Gibbs, O18178, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Cleveland Goodwin, Jr., O18179, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Whitman Muth, O18180, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Jaromir Jan Pospisil, O18183, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Irving Sachs, O18185, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Charles Lind Olin, O18190, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Samuel Roth, O18191, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Eugene Anthony Kenny, O18193, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Livingood Pauley, Jr., O18194, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Frank Theodore Folk, O18195, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Carleton Merritt Clifford, O18199, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond Charles Brisach, O18202, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charley Paul Eastburn, O18203, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clifton Donald Blackford, O18205, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. James Sawyer Luckett, O18209, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Myron Albert Quinto, O18210, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Ned Dalton Moore, O18212, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Thomas Mifflin, O18216, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Daniel Russell Taylor, O18217, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. James Knox Wilson, Jr., O18218, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Theodore Roberts Kimpton, O18226, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. John Simpson Guthrie, O18228, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Allan Duard MacLean, O18229, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Howard Russell Moore, O18231, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Eli Stevens, O18235, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Jacob Samuel Sauer, O18236, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Eakens James, Jr., O18237, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Charles Edward Beauchamp, O18238, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Paul Aloysius Chalmers, O18239, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Theodore Francis Bogart, O18245, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Thad Adolphus Broom, O18246, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Col. Walter Edwin Ahearn, O18249, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Col. Paul Russell Weyrauch, O18252, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Morton Elmer Townes, O18255, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James McKay Emigh, O29439, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Joseph Delmore, O29440, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jesse Donald Bell, O29441, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carl Sharrai Brandner, O29442, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
Maj. Melvin Miller, O41789, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. Lyman Francis Stangel, O29449, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Stanley Howerton Hankins, O51100, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Eugene Harmon Cocanougher, O38673, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Elam Eckles, O29450, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynwood David Lott, O41796, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Chatham Woods, O29451, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Embry, O41798, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Daniel Aloysius O'Connor, O29454, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic William Cornelius Ledeboer, O29458, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Caccavajo Boyer, O29461, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Herbert Lucian Scofield, O29462, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Bernard Yeager, O29464, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Brice Sumner, O39689, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Craig Kerlin, O29463, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Maurice Patterson Shaver, O29465, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Churchwell, O41806, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jasper Lemlie Searles, O39690, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Williford Jackson, O29474, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Lewis Reed, O29475, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edwin Barksdale, O29478, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Hoke Smith Wofford, O29480, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Shaffer Floyd Jarrell, O51112, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Murphy, O41815, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kenneth Elwood Tilton, O29487, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alex Kaminskie, O51116, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Roy Malone, Jr., O29489, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lloyd Julius Hellmann, O51122, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Mayo Tench Tilghman, O51105, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Nelson Kibler, O29490, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Dudley McDaniel, O39696, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Arthur Pursall, O29491, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Israel Brent Washburn, O29493, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Merryman Hunt, O51125, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Septimus Bonham Sightler, Jr., O41824, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Dickinson Smith, O29495, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Reynolds Russell, O41827, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bernd Gustav Baetcke, O29497, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Eoff Oliver, O39700, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Melvin Burns, O29499, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Clifford Lyon, O41832, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Benjamin DeWitt Beach, O29505, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Hiram Dudley Ives, O29509, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lillard Parker Miller, O29511, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Samuel McConnell, O41838, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lloyd Robert Macadam, O29513, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Joseph Karrer, O51195, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hugh Christie, O29514, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Graden Clarence Waters, O41842, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Boyd Wilson, O51198, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald L. Jarrett, O41845, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willis Theodore Smith, O29518, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Merton Edward Munson, O29519, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Eldon Hunter Larecy, O29523, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Lewis Alfred, O29068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Steven Stanley Cerwin, O29526, Army of the United tates (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Thomas Barton, O29529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Harriman Comstock, O51206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. S. D. Slaughter, Jr., O29530, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lindley Ames Pennypacker, O41851, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Carlisle Gray, O29531, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ernest Brown Skinner, O39710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Leonard Edward Wellendorf, O29538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Cox Zalesky, O38682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Carlisle Rodgers, O29540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alton Vernon Arnold, O41858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Joseph Livingston, O39714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Peter MacArthur, O51216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Davis Maxfield, O38683, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Goodrick Hollister, O29547, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Pierce Daniels, O29550, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. LaVern G. Witmer, O29551, Army of the United States (captain (U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl Theodore Schmidt, O41862, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Carl Hoffmann, O39719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Loren William Olmstead, O39721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Leo Joseph Schultheis, O29555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Stanley George Reiff, O38688, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Johnson Elser, O29557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Edward Adams, O29561, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Franklin Hartman, O41872, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Stephen James Millet, O38690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Oren Weaver, O41876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Carroll, O41877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Allen Bedell, O39722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Corston Arthur Greene, O29565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nicholas Robert Voorhis, O38691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Troy Ammons, O38692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Emerson Simpson, O51227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Everett Capito, O29568, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George LaVere Walker, O41882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Fredericks Howard, O38695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Parker Stillwell Day, O29573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ervin Leon Keener, O29572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William John Ewing Keish, O41885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard James Dial, O51230, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Roger Hunt Holt, O29574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion William Schewe, O29748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Joseph O'Connor, O41888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Joseph Greeve, O29576, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Herrod, O29577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Hammond Forse Henderson, O39724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Lowry, O39725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Luckel Doerr, O39726, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Louis Dlugensky, O39727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Karl Sample Thornburg, O29582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lyal Clyde Metheny, O39729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harry Loveland Kinne, Jr., O29583, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Glade Hellier, O41892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kenneth Adelbert McCrimmon, O18336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Richard Lee Jewett, O18339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel 3d, O18655, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Louis Russell Wirak, O18342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William White Ragland, O18344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Gunnard William Carlson, O18347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Stephen Read Hanmer, O18348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Walter Krueger, Jr., O18351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Champlin Fletcher Buck, Jr., O18352, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Chester Lavaughn Landaker, O18353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Aloysius Brown, Jr., O18355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Walker Wilson Milner, O18356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George M. Wertz, Jr., O18357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Phillips Daley, O18358, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Brig. Gen. Marshall Sylvester Carter, O18359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Jonathan Hauck, Jr., O18360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Angelo Ralph Del Campo, Jr., O18361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Barclay Sullivan, O18363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Glenn Frederick Rogers, O18366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Cornelius Ardalion Lichirie, O18371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John William Hansborough, O18376, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Ferris Ellis, O18378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Hackett, O18380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Donald Sams, O18381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Grosvenor Francis Powell, O18382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Frederick McNair, O18383, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William White Dick, Jr., O18384, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Donald Cubbison Little, O18386, Army of the United States captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John William Cave, O18388, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Charles Hall, O18391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Donald Bowie Webber, O18392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Sidney Glenn Brown, Jr., O18393, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Peter Schmick, O18395, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Larimer Inkeep, O18396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Philip Bessom Stiness, O18398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alphonse Alfred Greene, O18400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Walker Raymond, 2d, O18403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Michael Martin Irvine, O18404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Sebastian Speidel, Jr., O18406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Norman Ernest Tipton, O18408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S Army).
×Lt. Col. Richard Holmes Harrison, O18409, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lucius Nash Cron, O18411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Theodore Berg, O18412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gordon King Cusack, O18414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Frew Train, O18415, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Tom Victor Stayton, O18417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Warren Harlan Hoover, O18418, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Archibald Barclay, O18420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Merillat Moses, O18421, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. August Schomburg, 018422, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Bertram Corbett, O18423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Clyde Robinson McBride, O18424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Miller Osborne Perry, O18427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Herbert Walter Mansfield, O18429, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fielder Price Greer, O18430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Eaton Chandler, O18431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Lucas Bays, O18433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Coburn Smith, Jr., O18434, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Robert Bard, O18435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Camden William McConnell, O18437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Breckinridge Duff, O18438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col Samuel Smellow, O18439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Wilbur Manly Skidmore, O18440, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Milan George Weber, O18444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Arthur Davis, Jr., O18446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Joseph Diestel, O18448, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Philip Higley Bethune, O18449, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earle Fremont Cook, O18450, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Maurice Brown, O18453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frederick Richard Redden, O18455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Frederick Cassevant, O18456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Richard Sylvester Spangler, O18457, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Percy Hotspur Lash, Jr., O18458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Edward Green, O18460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Hamilton Murray Peyton, O18461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Forrest Caraway, O18466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Addison Vincent Dishman, O18471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Anderson Berry, Jr., O18473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Norton Bailey Wilson, O18476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Mervyn MacKay Magee, O18478, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene William Hiddleston, O18480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Knight Waters, O18481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Ayres Hampton, O18482, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Pasquale Francis Passarella, O18485, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Orlando Collette Troxel, Jr., O18487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Francis Thomas Pachler, O18488, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Thomas Westermeier, O18493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Glenn Aloysius Farris, O18494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Clifford Christopher Wagner, O18496, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Daniel Johnston, O18498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Louis Victor Hightower, O18502, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edwin John Messinger, O18503, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Leander Cardell, O18505, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leo Wilbur Cather, O18510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Orville Zelotes Tyler, Jr., O18511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Raymond Silas Pratt, Jr., O18512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Foster Gallup, O18513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gunnar Carl Carlson, O18515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Edward Fletcher, O18517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Pate Harris, O18518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Irving William Jackson, O18519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Quinney Brown, O18520, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Colonel Charles Edward Nason Howard, Jr., O18521, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gordon Singles, O18522, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Beishline, O18523, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Hunter Lawson, O18526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Davis, O18530, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Pence Westpheling, O18533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Irvine King, O18534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Marnane, O18535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, O18537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis James Herrick, O18538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Kenly Purnell, O18539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Elmer Lee Thompson, O18544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ashton M. Haynes, O18545, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Blair Arthur Ford, O18547, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Klemm Boyd, O18548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lowman Decker, O18549, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle Lucius Fisher, O18550, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edwin Anderson Walker, O18552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Orrin Charles Krueger, O18553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Hoy, O18556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leonard Hardick, O18558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Steinbach, O18560, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Loren Albert Ayers, O18561, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Taylor, Jr., O18565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Raster Hercz, O18566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Seiss Ertel Wagner, O18569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Barlow Coolidge, O18570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.

×Lt. Col. John Hugh McAleer, O18572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Peter Otey Ward, O18574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl William Kohls, O18575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Thomas Malloy, O18576, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew Joseph Adams, O18579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Victor James MacLaughlin, O18580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Rogers Woodward, O18582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Irving Lehrfeld, O18586, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Everett Quackenbush, O18590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Kingsley Dickey, O18595, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Frank Ruggles, O18596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roy Kay Kauffman, O18598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Frank Buchwald, O18599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Hugh McGee, O18600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Van Hugo Bond, O18601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin James Coyle, O18602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Clarence David McGowen, O18605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Edward Leary, O18607, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alexander Johnston Sutherland, O18609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Merrick Hector Truly, O18614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Houston Parks Houser, Jr., O18615, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Robert Danek, O18617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul Arthur Mayo, O18621, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pugh Baldwin, O18624, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Augustus George Elegar, O18625, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walter Brady, O18627, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Alexander Ritchie, O29586, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frederick James Kendall, O51236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irwin McClure Diamond, O39730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon E. Dawson, O29587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alford Carl Boatsman, O29588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Moyers Sidney Shore, O29589, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Victor Clark Searle, O38697, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Merle DeLaney, O29590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Eber David Russell, O29591, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Buel Taylor Rose, O29592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo John Conway, O41903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Reed Harrison, O41904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Gaeckle, O41905, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Donnell Buchanan, O29594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Clare Passink, O39734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Outsen, O29595, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Mann, O39735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester William Clark, O41908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Albert Walter Widmer, O41911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Cowart Sanders, O51246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Leander Howard Harrison, O29602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Beuford Alexander Pittman, O41913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Clio Edwin Straight, O24337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Herpel Burch, O41914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William DeMerritt Putnam, O29605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Allen Watson, O41918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roman Joseph Peisinger, O41920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius Cole Holcomb, O29610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Ivy Dodenhoff, O29611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Henry Lawrence Davisson, O29612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Greenfield, O41926, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Donald Penniman, O29616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur David Van Orsdel, O41929, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Thomas Baker, O29618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Tom Hughes Barratt, O24343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Riley McClain, O24344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nathan Jay Roberts, O24345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Noah Louis Lord, O24346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Anderson Cauthen, O51257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ned Hall Woodman, O29622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Jesse Davis, O29623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Chester Coffin, Jr., O51259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frederick Lester Smith, Jr., O41932, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fred Albert Jacobs, O41935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sheldon Miller Gilman, O29624, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Francis McDonough, O29625, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Ryland Rainford, O29626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. J. Paul Lawther, O41937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Col. John Hall Stokes, O38701, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jonas Sternberger Heiss, O51262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Earl Harold Marsden, O39747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Paul Vernon Bissell, O41941, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Brooks Harriott, O29631, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Reginald Hall, O51265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Samuel E. Sax, O51267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Ennis Robert Sullivan, O29635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Austin Duncan, O29638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leonard Earl Engeman, O29641, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Marcellus Richard Kunitz, O29642, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. James Ulmer Moorhead, O41957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ernest Roudolph Gillespie, O41956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Lowe Fox, O41962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Roderick Whitaker, Jr., O51272, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Fred Charles Smith, O38703, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Donald Denby Bode, O29651, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Richard Ralph Middlebrooks, O38704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Westray Edwin Wilson, O41971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roy Alfred Stephens, O38705, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Estel Averal Thompson, O29653, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Henry Jervey Kelly, O41974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Clement Monahan, O38706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Cecil Joseph Madden, O29656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harold Harry Shaller, O29657, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Henry Collins Urquhart, O39754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Benjamin Hanford, O29660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Joseph Carl Stewart, O29662, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kelso Dale Vernor, O41988, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Hal Dayhuff, Jr., O38709, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Franklin Edward Winnie, O41992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Adolph Barnaby, O39758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Richard Samuel Miller, O38710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Tabb Snodgrass, O29670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Haven Huckins, O51290, Army of the United States, captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kenneth Arthur Latta, O29672, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard Malcom Hobson, O29673, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Lockett, O51292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Maxwell Hine Thompson, O41998, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Moses Myrick, O29675, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Loyd William Brenneman, O29676, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Herndon Hale Long, O39759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Oscar Adolphe Schroeter, O51295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. E rle Barrett Nichols, O38712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Hal Cushman Pattison, O29683, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Kenneth Dale Macomber, O42009, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Joseph Harry Buys, O29689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Irvine Russell, O42010, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Kay Daly, O42011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles James Barry, Jr., O38713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Loudon Darley, O29693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Davison Burch, O42013, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wayne William Brame, O39765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Montie Fowler Cone, O29695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Thomas Barrett, O42015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roger Moore Crosby, O51299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Cummings, O29392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Donald Striegel, O29700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carlos Frank Reynolds, O29702, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Marion Gant, O39767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Jackson Blythe, O51308, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Oliver Beets, O29707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Regis Burr, O39769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Hugh J. Socks, O39771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Pugh Kirk, O29710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Lester William Teter, O51312, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Otto Theodore Saar, O42033, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kenneth Paul Jones, O29720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harold Hulbirt Newman, O38716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Clarkson Gill, O29724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William James Allen, Jr., O29725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earl Monroe Corothers, O29726, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Albert Hadfield, O29727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Hamblin Black, O38718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward James Kotrich, O39776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Bernard Egil Hagen, O29733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. David Cletus Lewis, O29735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Thomas Hoyne, O29739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Clair Gorsuch, O29740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Lynn Davis Smith, O29741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Lawrence Mitchell Scarborough, O51323, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Loren Dwight Buttolph, O42053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Frederick Lucey, O42054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Quentin Laurier Kendall, O29745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Wright Allard, O29747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Palmer Whittemore McGrew, O29749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Leonard Beaver, O42057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Montgomery Palmer, O42058, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Laurence Edwin Lynn, O42059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Homer George Hamilton, O39781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Arvo Nikolai Niemi, O29753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harry Waring Gorman, O42062, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Aubrey Robert Morley, O29758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Hall McCaw, O38722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Gabe William Lewis, Jr., O42064, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Rush Blodget Lincoln, Jr., O18656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, O18658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Kumpe, O18660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Brig. Gen. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr., O18662, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Herrol James Skidmore, O18664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Julian David Abell, O18666, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frederick Raleigh Young, O18667, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Chandler Steele, O18668, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Allen Fraser Clark, Jr., O18669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Christian Frederick Dreyer, O18671, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Francis Powers, O18672, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Brig. Gen. James McCormack, Jr., O18673, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Russell Manly Nelson, O18674, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Arnold Sommer, O18676, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Kissam Allen, O18677, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Sam Carroll Russell, O18678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Henry Weber, O18680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Archibald William Lyon, O18682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Ellis Farnsworth, Jr., O18683, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Milton Leonard Ogden, O18687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alexander Graham, O18688, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Wilson Power, O18691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Kenneth Frederick Zitzman, O18694, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Earl Metzler, O18695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Robinson Mather, O18696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harrison Alan Gerhardt, O18697, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Stanley Sawicki, O18698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Hamilton Britton, O18703, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Byron Leslie Paige, O18704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Ray Longanecker, O18707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Irving Donald Roth, O18708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lauri Jacob Hillberg, O18710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Samuel Watson Horner 2d, O18711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Augur Hewitt, O18713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Simpson Hartshorn, Jr., O18716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Michael Baer, O18718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Alden Call, O18719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roland Capel Bower, Jr., O18721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, O18722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Edward Gill, O18723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frederick William Ellery, O18725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Horace King Whalen, O18727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Preston Steele, O18729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gilbert Nevius Adams, O18737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Gibbons Shinkle, O18741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Lockwood Williams, Jr., O18742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Earl Schukraft, O18744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carl M. Sciple, O18745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Little, O18748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Massello, Jr., O18749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Johnson Hunt, O18752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Stephen Michael Mellnik, O18754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Louis Watson Truman, O18755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Dale Eugene Means, O18756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Curtis Alan Schrader, O18760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Fletcher Spurgin, O18762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Floyd Allan Hansen, O18767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Edward Godwin, O18763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harold Walmsley, O18769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gerald George Epley, O18770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Ashton Herbert Manhart, O18773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harald Simpson Sundt, O18774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Horace Freeman Bigelow, O18775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Francis Arkadjusz Liwski, O18777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Jefferson Davis Childs, O18787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Aloysius Gavin, O18788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Todd Humbert Slade, O18789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Ramsey Pugh, O18790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Joseph Edward Stearns, O18791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Ratcliffe Murray, O18792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wallace Hawn Brucker, O18793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis Garrison Hall, O18794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Louis Williams, Jr., O18795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Barnes Moore, O18796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Bogardus Snowden Cairns, O18798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Delbert Abraham Pryor, O18799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Burns Fraser, O18692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Meyer Abraham Braude, O18802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John George Ondrick, O18804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Isaac Sewell Morris, O18806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Gordon Whitney Seaward, O18809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Henry Graham McFeely, O18810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Walter Marquis Tisdale, O18811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Nelson Landon Head, O18814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walker Raitt Goodrich, O18815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Henry Harvey, O18817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Whitfield Culp, O18821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Norman Herbert Lankenau, O18824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Bing Kunzig, O18825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Marvin Iseley, O18828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Avery Madison Cochran, O18834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Samuel Arthur Daniel, O18835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Edward Reif Howarth, O18837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Lee Massey, O18838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edmond Michael Rowan, O18841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Milton Skerrett Glatterer, O18843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Henry Mikkelsen, O18844, Army of the United States, (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hugh Thomas Cary, O18845, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roscoe Constantine Huggins, O18851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Lon Harley Smith, O18854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Burke, O18857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Reynolds Grunert, O18859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. David Peter Schorr, Jr., O18861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Clinton Welborn, O18863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Salvatore D'Orsa, O18866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frederick Milton Hinshaw, O18867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Anderson McNulty, O18871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Joe Edwin Golden, O18872, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Winfield Coutts, O18875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Gilmer, O18876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thigpen Duncan, O18878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roy Edwin Moore, O18880, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harley Niles Trice, O18881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arville Ward Gillette, O18883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gates Herman, O18885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Loris Ray Cochran, O18889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Chesnutt Britt, O18891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Randall McDonald, O18892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Keating, O18897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Garnett Coughlin, O18898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Robertson Hannah, O18899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Bowen, O18904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Madison Churchill, Jr., O18907, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Morris Schonholz, O29761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Dwight Funk, O42067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Blumenfeld, O29763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert McDonald Gray, O24644, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Hill, O19058, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Gerald Joseph Higgins, O19530, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Alfred Byroade, O20624, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

To be lieutenant colonels, Corps of Chaplains

×Chaplain (Col.) Paul Joseph Giegerrich, O29137, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Col.) Frank Alden Tobey, O41698, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Maj.) John Wallis Kilburn, O41700, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Col.) Glenn John Witherspoon, O38635, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) William Pollock Maxwell, O38636, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Maj.) John Joseph Mullaney, O29150, United States Army.

Chaplain (Maj.) Erwin Theodore May, O38637, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Maj.) Charles Max Buck, O29154, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Maj.) John Casimir Radlinski, O29156, United States Army.

Chaplain (Col.) Paul Judson Maddox, O20099, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Edward Twyman Donahue, O39650, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Harold Henry Schulz, O20074, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Aubrey John O'Reilly, O20537, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Chaplain (Maj.) Herman Edgar Knies, O29164, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Maj.) Waldo Emerson Dunn, O41710, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Col.) John Chauncey Wolcott Linsley, O41711, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Maj.) Emil Adams Zund, O29168, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Col.) Martin Carl Poch, O20097, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Wallace Irving Wolverton, O20098, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) James Corey Bean, O20101, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Col.) Charles Irving Carpenter, O20102, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) James Thomas Wilson, O20103, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John Oscar Woods, O22755, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Maj.) William Frederick Nern, O51134, United States Army.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Wilson Blough De Chant, O29173, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Chaplain (Maj.) Robert Samuel Hall, O29174, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Maj.) Matthew Hindmarsh Imrie, O29181, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Maj.) Cecil Loy Propst, O51145, United States Army.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Terence Patrick Finnegan, O23618, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Chaplain (Maj.) Henry Tavel, O39652, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Howell G. Guin, O41718, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Chaplain (Maj.) Morris Clark McEldowney, O41719, United States Army.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Alvie Littleton McKnight, O22762, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Peter Stephen Rush, O56793, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Chaplain (Maj.) Lawrence Edward Deery, O41722, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Lt. Col.) William Joseph Moran, O29195, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Maj.) Charles Montgomery Smith, O29199, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Maj.) Joseph Thomas O'Brien, O51149, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Thomas Francis Shea, O29204, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Edwin Lankford Kirtley, O24355, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Maj.) John Allen DeVeaux, O21470, United States Army.

×Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Lexington Odett Sheffield, O21702, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Earl Dwight Compton, O21703, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

×Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John James Wood, O41732, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve, on active duty, for appointment to the ranks and grades hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Alexander, Aaron G.
Allen, James R.
Allen, William Y., Jr.
Allred, Jimmie B., Jr.
Applegate, Richard C.
Arnett, "A" "B", Jr.
August, Joseph J.
Bahnsen, Alfred H., Jr.
Baker, Granville M.
Baker, William F., Jr.
Barfield, Norwood R.
Bartholomew, Barton W.
Beavers, Harrison J.
Beeland, Cecil H.
Benson, William D.
Beumer, Everett H.
Biltz, Sylvain F., Jr.
Blair, John A.
Blondin, John L.
Boland, Paul
Bowden, Bill
Bower, Charles J., Jr.
Boyle, Charles J.
Branum, Rudolph
Breen, Charles E., Jr.
Brouillette, Robert R.
Brown, Lewis C.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Robert H., Jr.
Bryan, George S., Jr.
Buren, George
Buchanan, Clyde E., Jr.
Buckles, Charles A., Jr.
Burgesser, Charles B.
Burgin, Wilbur J.
Carey, Grayson R.
Carlson, Robert L.
Carr, Loran "H"
Childs, William J.
Chute, Charles L.
Clarke, John L., Jr.
Clemmons, Robert H.
Cocke, Edgar M.
Coe, Arthur S.
Colley, Edward L.
Collins, Wayne D.
Cone, Warren M.
Cotariu, Alan R.
Criner, Eugene F.
Cullen, Harold M., Jr.
Currie, James J.
Damus, Henry H.
Davis, Hector W., Jr.
Davis, William R.
Davison, Richard R.
DeFries, Hugh O.
Delmanowski, Ernest F.
De Lorenzi, Robert M.
Dillon, John M.
Dolan, Owen F.
Dooling, David
Dorman, Alvin E.
Doss, Robert F.
Downs, Frank A.
Dozier, James H.
Drace, Thomas N.
Egert, Marlin V.
Ellis, William H.
Elwood, Albert A.
Emerson, Allan L.
English, James G., Jr.
Etcheson, Kenneth C.
Evans, Thomas G., Jr.
Fader, Kenneth B.
Farrell, John E.
Faughman, Franklin P.
Ford, Jones H.
Forson, Roy E., Jr.
Fox, Francis M., Jr.
Fullerton, Gordon W.
Funston, Harry C., Jr.
Gammill, James L.
Garver, Richard E.
Gathje, Warren H.
Geary, Mervyn O.
Gee, Robert D.
Gerhard, Harry E., Jr.
Gercy, Francis O.
Gibbons, James G.
Gifford, Walter H.
Glaser, William R.
Glauser, Clarence J.
Griest, Hadley C.
Grubbs, Harmon C.
Hagen, Harold A.
Hall, Ray E.
Hamblin, Robert N.
Harris, Donald W.
Harsh, Forrest G. D.
Hause, Joseph R.
Hauser, William F.
Hayes, Robert W.
Henriques, David N., Jr.
Higley, Warren A.
Hobbs, Brack W.
Hoey, Richard
Hoff, Alan
Hoffman, Raymond L.
Horn, Francis R.
Horn, Maurice A.
Howser, Howard M.
Huval, Willard R.
Ideker, Donald E.
Jackson, Clinton W.
Jenrette, Homer W.
Jensen, Duane L.
Johnson, Frank E., Jr.
Johnson, Philip W.
Johnson, Olaf C.
Jones, Edward A.
Jones, William M.
Jordan, James, Jr.
Keiser, George R.
Kenefick, James P.
Kerfoot, Dale L.
Kibler, Robert L.
King, John W., Jr.
King, William D.
Kingsbury, Chester E.
Kinney, Grayson C.
Kline, Edward C.
Knell, Floyd M.
Knowles, Eugene D.
Knox, Gordon L.
Koons, Tilghman B.
Kuerten, Walter C.
Kushner, William F.
Lacewell, Lesley K., Jr.
Landis, Calvin D.
Latka, Robert A.
Lear, John R.
Lee, John W.
Leib, James M.
Little, John B.
Lucas, William E., III
Lynch, Richard J.
Maier, Frederick L., III
Manring, Alvin B.
Matthews, Walter L., III
McAdams, Lee T.
McCallum, John F., Jr.
McClintock, William W., Jr.
McDonnel, James L.
McFann, Howard L.
McGee, Daniel, Jr.
McGraw, Donald L.
McKee, David A.
McKee, John N.
McKeever, Elmer V.
McNary, Johnnie W.
McNaughton, Clark "H", Jr.
McNeil, Richard S.
McNeill, Howard G.
McReynolds, Robert W.
Merrell, Chandler V.
Miles, Kenneth N.
Miller, George V.
Mills, Jack O.
Mills, William P.
Moody, Loren D.
Moore, Harry R.
Moore, Robert S.
Morgan, Robert L.
Morgan, Joseph L., Jr
Morrison, John E., Jr.
Mosser, Douglas
Murphy, Thomas J., Jr.
Murphy, Francis C.
Nagler, Gordon R.
Nash, Charles G., Jr.
Neth, Robert L.
Nevitt, Fred M., Jr.
Newton, Daniel D.
Nichol, Philip W., Jr.
Nilson, Clifford E.
Noble, Guy E.

Noble, Lee V.
Nolta, Cornelius V., Jr.
Norman, James H.
Norville, Robert W.
Nuernberger, Gale W.
Olson, Edwin G.
Ottea, Mathis M., Jr.
Paige, Robert W.
Painter, Ethan A.
Parks, William L., Jr.
Parr, Charles W.
Peksa, Charles F.
Petre, Gabriel L.
Phillips, Harvey R.
Piatek, John A.
Picton, Richard E.
Poe, Robert V.
Pole, Thomas M.
Powell, Edwin H.
Probyn, Robert W.
Purcell, Kenneth E.
Putman, Orlin N.
Ralston, John, Jr.
Randle, David D.
Rectanus, Earl F.
Reese, John W., Jr.
Reeves, Charles E.
Revis, John T., Jr.
Rice, Lincoln P.
Richelieu, Charles F.
Robinson, Winthrop P.
Ross, Jack W.
Rushin, Thomas E.
Sanderson, James R.
Sauve, Douglas L.
Scally, Francis W.
Schaffer, John E., Jr.
Schetky, Malcolm O.
Schmieder, Arthur H.
Schoultz, Robert F.
Schwartz, Israel L.
Scott, Clyde L.
Scripp, John L., III
Searl, Floyd C.
Selby, George C.
Sevier, Ben W.
Shaner, Lowell R.
Shearer, Albert T.
Shelton, Benjamin A.
Shonk, William H., Jr.
Sigler, Edward E., Jr.
Simmons, Michael
Sinfield, Charles P.
Smith, Henry L.
Smith, Robert J. O.
Smith, Rush S.
Southworth, Robert E.
Sproule, William C.
Starbuck, Donald W.
Steedle, George D., Jr.
Stelzner, Raymond R., Jr.
Stephens, Alvis H.
St. Marie, John W.
Stokes, Robert E. L., Jr.
Stoops, William A., Jr.
Sweeney, James R.
Swope, John R.
Sword, James D.
Taylor, James D.
Terry, Bernard E., Jr.
Terry, Charles F.
Tesh, Charles P.
Thompson, William
Tiderman, Otto D.
Tilghman, Walter W., Jr.
Timmer, Bernard W.
Timpson, Nephi H., Jr.
Tipping, William L.
Titus, Ben E., Jr.
Tolson, George F., Jr.
Totino, Albert R.
Travers, Edward P.
Tucker, William W.
Vaught, Thomas B.
Vereen, Jackson
Voorheese, Jack R.
Wade, Felix W.
Wade, John A.
Wahl, Clyde F.
Walker, Grant J.
Walker, Frank T.
Walsh, Francis R., Jr.
Warde, William A.
Wassom, Frank K.
Webster, Warren M.
Welty, Wayne J.
West, Earle L.
West, Jack
White, Bernard C.
Whitehead, Andrew D.
Whitlock, Eldred L.
Williams, John C.
Wilson, Phillip A.
Wineman, Glenn W.
Wolfe, George M.
Yarbrough, Clifford J., Jr.
Yerly, Harold J.
Zimmerman, George G.
Zimmerman, Wayne L.
Zowarka, James G.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Anderson, Vernon H.
Barron, Willard D.
Crowder, Norman M.
Fay, John F., Jr.
Fischer, Carl R., Jr.
Gobel, Carl F.
Graves, Franklin W.
Jones, Joe L.
Jones, Thomas W.
Mann, Murrell
McGill, Willis L.
McLean, James P.
Meng, Edwin L., Jr.
Moore, Alvin
Moore, Wyly A.
Nasticky, Emil J.
Sittig, Raymond L.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Barrett, John H., Jr.
Dexter, Philip R.
Morgan, Joseph E.
Phelps, Harold B., Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Allen, Cleo R.
Cartier, William L. G., Jr.
Damron, James C.
Deriso, Dominic J.
Goin, Harvy B.
Henry, Girton H.
Hilton, John T.
Hook, John M.
Hunter, Russell E.
McMillin, Charles R.
Rafferty, Raymond B.
Ricker, Robert E.
White, Archie E.
Wooldridge, Melvin A.
Zellmann, Earl G.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Clayton, Margaret S.
Gabudza, Martha L.
LaRoche, Mary A.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Aldous, Theodore F.
Bock, Robert D.
Conser, Charles S.
Halbert, Damon H.
Hock, Herman E.
Keefe, Joseph F.
McKenzie, Edward
Peterson, Clarence J.
Pratt, Damon J.
Riddle, Meredith C.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Dosskey, Gordon B.
Ephland, John M.
Harju, Clarence J.
Smith, Maurice G.
Thorne, Cecil R.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Bates, Robert N.
Bennett, James W.
Bereiter, Edward A.
Bonner, James F.
Bourinskie, Edward G.
Coleman, Lawrence W.
Coulbourne, Thomas E.
Darby, Joseph M.
Doyle, George C.
Edmonds, John W. C.
Edmundson, Harry E.
Faulkner, James H.
Fish, Theodore T.
Fitzgerald, Donald L.
Flack, William W.
Forrestal, Frank W.
Fransen, Arnold J.
Fuller, Eulie
Furse, George P.
Gautrau, Walter T.
Grassi, John L.
Hall, Henry L.
Hart, Horace W.
Harty, Thomas G.
Havlin, Ernest M.
Hnatek, John, Jr.
Ingalls, Lawrence E.
Itkowsky, Francis A.
Johnstone, Robert B.
Kahler, Wellington B.
Kollert, John H., Jr.
Kyrklund, David V.
Landahl, Charles E.
Lawson, Harvey W.
Ledbetter, Bud A.
Leidholdt, Edwin M.
Lewis, Charles S.
Lindsay, George H.
Lyon, Howard E.
Malone, Roy B.
Matheny, John R.
McCluskey, Paul M.
McEnaney, Francis G.
McGuyre, Thomas A.
McIntosh, Fred E.
Minson, Robert
Mullen, Marshus M.
Newell, Walter E.
Owen, Marler W.
Panyon, Peter P.
Patschke, Charles A.
Peek, Charlie
Pierce, Clyde O.
Pittman, Shirley
Pruitt, Curtus E.
Respass, Johnny T.
Scallorn, Cecil D.
Sentman, Albert G.
Smith, Robert W.
Speed, Harvey G.
Spoerri, Charles E.
Staley, Kenneth F.
Sternberg, William G.
Stevenson, Edmund H
Sullivan, Raymond P., Jr.
Sullivan, John T., Jr.
Svahn, Albert R.
Sylva, Gerald
Thomson, George M.
Vierheller, Glen L.
Wilson, David V.
Wilson, Hugh L., Jr.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Blick, Johnnie Y.
Pierson, Percy A.
Sessum, Alfred B.
Skillman, Edgar H., Jr.
Symonds, William T.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Bradberry, Julian H.
Brofft, Beltran F.
Chapman, Edward D.
Conaway, Theodore H., Jr.
Crawford, Thomas L.
Dean, Louis E.
Eisen, Oscar E.
Fiorie, Walter M.
Gilbody, Foster F.
Gwinn, Charles L.
Harter, Wilmer J.
Jackson, Raymond H.
Joslin, Leslie H.
Kalvass, Edward P.
Kelso, James C.
Littlejohn, James H.
Nix, Joe R.
O'Brien, Charles W.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Brown, Arthur C.
Coffey, Harry S., Jr.
Davis, John S.
Dean, David
Dias, Robert F.
Freedman, Alice
Hartman, Betty
Hovde, Albin L.
Ligor, Demetre P.
Maze, Carl D., Jr.
McClellan, Thomas G
McGrath, Kenneth
Metcalfe, Eugenie G.
Millerd, Harris B.
Nelson, Harold C.
Nieweg, Elroy L.
Noble, Robert E.
Odum, Robert A.
Sandstrom, Sigfrid E.
Servies, Gordon
Shibley, Robert K.
Vitense, Russell R.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Bringgold, Marie C.
Kennedy, Ruth E.
Simpson, Elizabeth M.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve, on active duty, for appointment to the ranks and grades hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Abel, Samuel J.
Adams, Lynn W.
Agee, Victor C.
Ahlstrom, Orin J.
Alleman, Lee E.
Alotis, John
Alsover, James E.
Amaya, Leland H.
Anderson, James R.
Appel, Robert B.
Argleben, Arthur R.
Bailey, John D.
Bakle, George F.
Barnum, Ralph L.
Baughman, Robert F.
Baumgartner, Wayne A.
Behre, Herbert A., Jr.
Bell, Elton H.
Benker, Leo H.
Bennett, Jack W.
Bentley, Reuel H.
Bent, Jack
Bird, George W.
Blackwelder, Buren L.
Blades, Jehu L.
Bolstad, Daryl B.
Bonewits, Donald G.
Boule, Arthur E., Jr.
Boykin, James O.
Boyle, Paul A.
Branton, Richard C.
Brewster, Stanley E.
Brite, Murrel C.
Brooks, Richard S.
Broun, Leroy R.
Brown, Keith F.
Brown, Thomas W.
Brown, Fleming L.
Brozo, John G.
Burrell, Robert E.
Cahill, John W., Jr.
Carroll, Eugene J., Jr.
Carter, Robert M.
Cash, John J., Jr.
Casseday, Jack N.
Castillo, Edmund L.
Cauchon, Herve P.
Chamberlain, Charles H.
Chaney, Robert S.
Chaudoin, Harry D.
Clark, Boyers M., Jr.
Clifton, Emory V.
Cody, Harold R.
Cohan, George M., Jr.
Conerly, Tom B., Jr.
Constantine, James R.
Corbett, Kennet G., Jr.
Cottingham, Donald E.
Coulter, Fred W.
Coursin, Jack T.
Cox, Harry W.
Cravener, Leahmon A.
Crevier, Albert W.
Cross, Richard F., III
Cullen, Patrick O.
Curry, Nathan E.
Curry, James G.
Cushman, Charles H., Jr.
Dahn, Victor E., Jr.
Davidson, Harold W.
Debold, Joseph F.
Decker, Walter C.
Demas, George K.
Dennis, Osie F., Jr.
Devine, John J.
Dimatteo, Dominic J.
Doles, Thomas K.
Donovan, Paul F.
Doyle, Luther W.
Dudley, Sherman F.
Durbin, Stephen F.
Dutra, John E.
Eagan, Bryan R.
Eger, Frank A., Jr.
Elliott, Thomas J.
Elliott, Luther H., Jr.
Emblom, William J.
Engstrom, Joseph P. D., Jr.
Enquist, Edwin R.
Fagan, Philip J.
Fay, Robert J.
Ferree, Richard J.
Ferrante, John M.
Finkel, Herman C., Jr.
Finley, Howard B., Jr.
Finnigan, Robert J.
Fleeger, Eugene G.
Fluhart, James H.
Franch, Ardwin G.
Fritze, James N.
Fromknecht, George W.
Frostad, Robert S.
Fuller, Robert C., Jr.
Gailand, Frank J.
Galt, Robert W.
Garland, Earl E.
Gavitt, Kenneth W.
Germo, Mark L.
Gibbs, Leroy C.
Gillis, Charles L.
Ginn, John O.
Glenn, Robert R.
Glowacki, Theodore, Jr.
Godin, John E.
Gortney, William M.
Graham, John C.
Graham, Martin C., Jr.
Graham, Lawrence P.
Griffin, Warren B.
Griswold, Richard A.
Guilfoyle, Robert F.
Gunther, Ernest H.
Hanson, Richard W.
Harper, George A.
Harrison, Glenn C.
Harris, Eli P., Jr.
Harshman, Glenn W.
Hasse, Raymond W., Jr.
Hayes, Kent W.
Heckman, Robert W.
Herne, Charles G.
Herrington, Kenneth F., Jr.

Heuer, Edward H.
Hewitt, William J.
Hihn, Don E.
Hill, Charles C.
Hill, Lloyd M.
Hoke, Charles H.
Homer, Roger H.
Hopp, Frederick H.
Hoskins, Thomas H.
Howard, Carl L.
Hruska, William C.
Huff, Andrew F.
Hume, David M.
Hylind, Kenneth G.
Ingraham, Mark W., Jr.
Jablonski, Felix J.
Jeffes, Edward W. B., Jr.
Johnson, Walter P.
Johnson, Mortimer C.
Johnson, Harold E.
Jones, Robert S.
Jones, Donald P.
Jordan, Edward V.
Joy, Harmon R.
Kahre, Edward L.
Kallies, Richard H.
Kaye, Alan J.
Keele, Frank M.
Kennedy, Henry G.
Kent, Robert B.
Kessing, Oliver O., Jr.
Kip, Phelps C.
Kirley, Thomas J.
Knapton, Richard P.
Koepsell, John L.
Kranz, Arthur C.
Lambert, Carl R.
Landtroop, Joe M.
Leute, George N., Jr.
Lewis, Clark D., Jr.
Little, Clyde D.
Lloyd, Thomas E.
Long, John O., Jr.
Loritsch, Richard H.
Louis, Eugene H.
Lumsden, David, Jr.
Mackay, Robert T.
Manly, Paul W.
Marshall, Robert C., Jr.
Marshall, Leo J., Jr.
Martin, Joseph R.
Martin, Charles F.
Maupin, Elwin C.
McCarthy, Daniel C.
McCandliss, Charles
McCreary, John L.
McCutchen, John C. II
McDonald, James R.
McNeill, Joseph B.
Meenen, Henry R.
Meyer, Joseph J., Jr.
Meyer, Rudolph
Michael, Max A., Jr.
Mikhalevsky, Nicholas
Miller, John X., Jr.
Miller, Donald G.
Miskill, Donald K.
Moll, Kenneth E.
Mooney, Francis E., Jr.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, William V.
Moore, Ralph L., Jr.
Morgan, Walter N.
Morgan, William H.
Morris, James W.
Moyl, Seymour A.
Mullen, Theodore W.
Mullholland, William P.
Murphy, Francis J.
Neighbors, Milton L.
Ney, Kenneth C.
Nickerson, Jerome W.
Niehaus, Herbert H.
Nixson, Walter H., Jr.
Noetzel, Ewald R.
Nott, Hugh G.
Offtermatt, Wilbur F.
Ogle, Robert J.
Ohsiek, Robert R.
Oliver, Stephen
Palkovic, Richard M.
Palmer, John G.
Parry, Loren C.
Paterson, Donald P.
Pearson, Lloyd M.
Pedneault, Henry R.
Peterson, Herrick R.
Petricka, Robert P.
Plath, Carl W.
Plaut, Arthur, Jr.
Podhradsky, Henry B.
Pohrman, David C.
Polack, Francis T.
Polgar, Paul S.
Pommer, Donald
Pond, Robert B.
Porter, Edward M., Jr.
Potter, Horace S.
Putnam, Earl B.
Rambur, William M.
Rasmussen, Merwin E.
Ray, Charles E.
Redgrave, Dewit C., III
Remond, Hillary F.
Robertson, Claytor L., Jr.
Roberts, John
Robinson, Richard L.
Rock, Clifford T.
Rockett, Charles W.
Roe, Philip A.
Rothwell, James G.
Ruddick, William C.
Ruebsamen, Darrel D.
Sabota, Leo M.
Sanders, Rodney D.
Saylor, Beverly
Schaffer, Donald R.
Scheuming, Robert E.
Schneider, Frank J.
Schoenfeld, Samuel J., Jr.
Seabaugh, Raymond R.
Seay, George W.
Sellers, Harry S.
Shane, Elbert B.
Short, Merton D.
Sidenberg, George M., III
Sigafoos, John J.
Simon, Harold W.
Smith, Wallace E.
Smith, Bruce K., Jr.
Smith, Terence J.
Snopkowski, Edward L.
Snowden, John W.
Snow, Claire E., Jr.
Stanley, Earl W.
Staveley, Ernest
Stell, Albert L., Jr.
Stose, John F.
St. Pierre, Fernand W.
Streff, Robert J.
Stufflebeem, John D.
Sullivan, William P.
Sweeney, William L., Jr.
Swientek, Edward T.
Teague, William O., Jr.
Tennes, Ernest
Thompson, LeWayne
Thompson, Bruce R.
Thompson, Harold T.
Thompson, Thomas N
Travers, Sumter L.
Traynor, John M.
Tribble, Robert J.
Tull, John L. D.
Upshur, Giles C., Jr.
Van Train, William A., Jr.
Van Tassel, Lowell W.
Vasse, John C.
Vrolyk, Raymond
Wattle, Thomas F.
Weatherford, Jack E.
Wedding, Edwin G.
Weir, Thomas E.
Wencker, Donald P.
Wessinger, William D.
Wettlaufer, Warren H.
Wheat, Elwood C.
Whitney, Loren C.
Whitaker, Maurice R.
Wigge, Conrad J., Jr.
Wilder, James H.
Wilkinson, Roland F.
Williams, Robert L.
Willis, Charles H.
Wise, Maurice H., Jr.
Witham, Burton B., Jr.
Wolff, Alan S.
Wood, Robert D.
Woolston, John
Workman, John C.
York, Arthur A.
Youngblood, Donald K.
Young, William B.
Zartman, Walter F.
Zawoiski, Andrew J.
Zoske, Frank H., Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Ainlay, Henry L., Jr.
Bain, Louis E.
Blumling, William L.
Burke, Thomas R.
Cagle, Harry
Chance, Carl
Christy, James L.
Comeau, Reginald B.
Corbett, Fenner S.
Corley, James O.
Dargan, Marion, Jr.
Dester, John M.
Elkins, Robert H.
Erickson, Allwyn B.
Hair, Maurice E.
Hansen, Henry I.
Hanten, Kenneth S.
Harbaugh, Norman R.
Leclert, Arthur C.
Leish, Calvin R.
Locke, Frank E.
Lynch, Robert R.
Maracides, Harry N.
McElligott, William P., Jr.
McGlaun, Albert L., Jr.
Moore, Vincent P., Jr.
Murphy, Paul J.
Musci, Cosimo B.
Olson, Robert S.
Rader, Albertus S.
Renfro, Edward E., III
Rinetti, Edward J.
Schar, Kenneth A.
Speed, Donald M.
Surran, Charles R.
Valentine, Gordon K.
Wollard, Kenneth A.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Gregory, George W., Jr.
Lorenz, William F.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Allen, Robert V.
Anderson, William S.
Broulik, Frank
Burr, Leonard W.
Caldwell, Charlie C.
Carter, Charles H.
Chapman, William H.
Civiello, Harold J.
Colman, Frederick R.
Combs, Harrison T.
Dyches, Kenelm O.
Edlund, Raymond A.
Ethridge, John W.
Kelly, Joseph A.
Lasco, John, Jr.
Lee, Ulyses O.
Mason, Edwin R.
McDonald, John P.
Moore, Daniel D.
Ray, Jewel P.
Rowe, Abner P.
Smith, Forbes H.
Sorger, Frank J.
Tompkins, Franklin H.
Young, John L.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Aldrich, Elizabeth E.
Benson, Marion P.
Bouchard, Edith E.
Brady, Mary R.
Bunker, Gladys E.
Carmack, Velma I.
Chaiko, Anna
Clarke, Anna M.
Cottrell, Sallie E.
Craddell, Peggy L.
Cruise, Margaret V.
Davis, Rachel M.
Divincenzo, Julia J.
Eiler, Grace
Hagan, Patty R.
Hanig, Mary M.
Hare, Doris M.
Hay, Jean M.
Heffernan, Eileen M.
Hojnacki, Genevieve
Hurst, Patricia
Hurst, Evelyn H.
Jackson, Bessie P.
Jackson, Aida L.
Jennings, Margaret
Johnson, Jamie M.
Kuconis, Stephanie
Lamkin, Ruby A.
Landers, Lois H.
Lenz, Edna C.
Lundquist, Elaine B.
McAteer, Kathleen
Meehan, Barbara A.
Meluskey, Florence
Montgomery, Elizabeth A.
Morin, Aline E.
Oakley, Allie R.
Oliver, Nellie M.
Pantalone, Gloria A.
Perry, Mildred G.
Poisson, Agnes B.
Reback, Frances
Revelant, Rena L.
Saunders, Mary L.
Shea, Cecelia J.
Stegmaier, Madeline
Walker, Rosemary
Weldon, Addie B.
Zulick, Helen

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Algeo, John K.
Anderson, Frank
Anto, John
Baker, George F.
Bass, Ralph C.
Bergeron, Ameda J.
Bergstad, Ralph H.
Boone, Daniel A.
Bothne, Adolph M.
Calhoun, Aubra
Cleaver, Thomas L., Jr.
Davidson, John R.
Downey, Ernest W.
Dunn, George L.
Eikam, Joseph
Engler, Clifford W.
English, William J.
Evans, Paul V.
Evans, Roderick A.
Gillem, Fred, Jr.
Gindling, Howard F.
Gould, Floyd H.
Gray, Kenneth E.
Green, Keith A.
Gunn, Louis C.
Hall, William S.
Hammett, Orion A.
Hart, Bernice C.
Hartsell, Harry V., Jr.
Hazelbaker, Bill
Heath, Milton A.
Hein, John A.
Hostinsky, John L.
Hummell, William E.
Hutts, James D.
Jowdy, Albert M.
June, Russell Q.
King, Charles W.
Martin, John C.
McCammond, Earl A.
Meaden, Virgil M.
Nelson, George I.
Oaks, Leslie C.
Parks, Harold P.
Parsons, James C.
Peak, Doyle
Pearson, Robert L., Jr.
Pilkington, Marinus
Poukkula, Joel E.
Pugh, Clyde M.
Raikes, Ralph D.
Raymond, Henry H., Jr.
Riggan, Samuel H.
Schoelpple, Albert C.
Selfridge, Harry K.
Sherwood, Charles G.
Short, Alvin L.
Sibitzky, Martin C.
Skjei, Sidney M.
Sloan, William L.
Smith, Robert W.
Stephenson, Joseph E.
Stimpert, Harvey A.
Sump, Ethan A.
Sutherlin, Donald E.
Talley, William O.
Taylor, Clarence M.
Terrio, Eugene B.
Townsend, William S.
Walsh, Thomas R., Jr.
Ward, Raymond E.
Weaver, Ephraim R.

CHIEF GUNNERS

Alexander, Clyde E.
Anderson, John B.
Asmus, Dwight F.
Beadle, Robert H.
Berg, Walter E.
Betts, Frederick M.
Boehlert, William R.
Briscoe, Carlton F.
Brown, Earle V.
Bureau, Arthur L.
Byers, Elmer G., Jr.
Campbell, Roy H.
Carlson, Carl A., Jr.
Cole, William J.
Connor, James H.
Dean, Albert P.
Deaton, David C.
Drain, Orville D.
Duckworth, Edward W.
Duffy, Owen L.
Dukes, Jesse M.
Eakin, Sydney L., Jr.
Edwards, Raymond E.
Eichelberger, Robert W.
Etheridge, Landon W.
Ferrell, Walter H.
Fouts, Cecil P.
Giacomelli, Frank J.
Gilpin, Harold J.
Gorman, Paul M.
Gose, Jesse E.
Gribsby, William
Hale, Elmus L.
Hanson, Reinold H.
Haskamp, Alvin J.
Homrighausen, Donald A.
Hoyt, LeRoy L.
Jurenes, Charles J.
Kelly, John H.
Kenedy, Richard L.
Lammons, Charles W.
Larson, Arnold L.
Larson, Arthur H.
Lebsch, Otto J.
Livingston, Fred J.
Manthei, Roman G.
Matecki, Thaddeus J.
Mathes, William C.
McAnnally, Lawson T.
McCoy, Herman P.
McFarland, James E.
McVey, Lesley D.
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Luther R.
Moring, Joe R.
Morse, Guy E.
Nelson, Henry T.
Olson, Harold P.
Otto, Leon J.
Pharris, Jackson C.
Phillips, Joseph J.
Phipps, Harold S.
Popko, Sigmund
Post, Robert W.
Quinn, Joseph A.
Rath, Robert L.
Ryan, Marvin F.
Sable, Donald A.
Salling, Harry P.
Sanders, Clinton F.
Scruggs, Elmer O.
Secondo, Anthony P.
Sens, Arthur F.
Smith, Julius S.
Sowell, Carl D.
Sproule, Alexander A.
Stark, Stanley D.
Sweet, Clifford E.
Thorpe, Thaddeus
Treadwell, James L.
Treneer, George E.
Walters, John H.
Weaver, Robert E.

CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

Alexander, George P.
Blanchard, Raleigh T.
Buell, Clement A.
Brown, William E.
Christner, Donald R.
Davidson Donald K.

Davis, Howard M.
Davis, William Lee
Davis, William Leonard
Delancey, John B., Jr.
Elder, Roy T.
Fowlston, John J.
Hall, Vaness F.
Harpster, David L.
Healy, Joe M.
Hodges, William W.
Howle, James M.
Ivester, Philip W.
Johnson, LeRoy T.
Kelly, Joseph F.
Kleeman, Walter W.
Lawrence, Lister R.
McCarthy, Walter L.
Melvin, Fred H.
Oliver, George A.
Provin, Lee Roy
Runyan, Lester E.
Schooley, Austin E.
Stewart, Erwin R.
Stewart, Robert L.
Tate, Thomas R.
Thompson, Oliver C.
Trapani, Peter G.
Uhl, Glen P.
Ward, Marce D.
Wilson, Cecil E.
Wilson, Edgar L.
Young, William E.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

Abernathy, George G.
Bark, Durwood A.
Bartko, John J.
Bayers, Edward H.
Beaudoin, Amedee J.
Bennett, Vane M.
Brown, Reginald O.
Browning, Anderson A.
Carter, Delmar W.
Connolly, Alexander J.
Day, Eugene C.
Edmunds, Oscar N., Jr.
Gillispie, Thomas J.
Harpster, William A.
Hockett, Harold H.
Housh, Thomas J.
Ingram, Milton T.
Keesey, Edward R.
Legare, Philip A.
Ludiker, Charles E.
Miller, Stewart C.
Myers, Arthur R.
Pandzik, George R.
Schimmelpfennig, Walter
Ward, Arvell B.
Young, Hershell B.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Achuff, John N.
Adams, Arthur G.
Alderman, Loren E.
Anderson, Robert K.
Annis, Elliott F.
Atnip, Jack
Barber, Herbert W.
Bartsch, Lauren H.
Bengel, William G.
Birchmire, Thomas H.
Blackmore, William P.
Bloom, Eugene J.
Brady, Samuel M.
Brown, Harold C.
Brunson, Forrest M.
Burdette, Fred M.
Bush, William E.
Carlson, Arvid F.
Casey, John H.
Caudill, Jordan
Chacey, Donald V.
Clark, Cullen C.
Corkins, Charles W.
Craig, Charles L.
Cummins, George S.
Dahlen, Vincent R.
Daigle, Hubert A.
Dallendorfer, Andrew J.
Darcy, John J.
Davidson, Thurman
Davis, Eugene R.
Dawson, John E.
Dignan, Paul E.
Dobler, Herbert E.
Browne, Willard M.
Dunn, Clarence W.
Evans, Marion S.
Fennig, Otto
Fournier, Paul E.
Gabriel, Harold C.
Galassi, Francis B.
Girard, Richard C.
Grant, Merle A.
Groebler, George A.
Groves, William C.
Hamilton, Ralph L.
Harris, Robert V.
Herb, Alfred B.
Horner, Wesley L.
Houston, Arthur G., Jr.
Hunter, Murray J.
John, Herman F.
Johnson, Mathis S.
Jones, Gravil H.
Kent, George L.
Labo, Howard G.
Lancaster, Jay V.
Lefavor, Franklin A.
Lubbock, Clyde G.
Lyons, Arthur T.
Lyons, Mark A.
Mackey, George W.
Marchacos, George J.
Marsden, Roy E.
May, Earl V.
Merryman, Leroy
Meter, Gerald M.
Miller, William T.
Mowder, Harry A.
Myers, Donald J.
MacDonald, Philip N.
McCants, John R.
Palmer, William G.
Parrott, Oral O.
Pasanen, William J.
Pearson, Clarence L.
Perry, Elbert J.
Pieper, Walter F.
Pinch, Jack O.
Pound, Robert C.
Price, Morris C.
Riggs, Hiram A.
Riley, Claude E.
Robinson, James W.
Satterwhite, George B.
Scheffler, Hubert W.
Schisler, Clausen L.
Schmidt, August E., Jr.
Schumaker, Frederick J.
Shearer, Wilbur E.
Shields, Paul J.
Shoemaker, Kenneth
Spencer, Robert H.
Springstun, Harlan M.
Stasney, Lawrence H.
Steinfeld, Edwin F.
Stephens, James N.
St. Lourent, Clinton W.
Stuffler, Frank N.
Suggs, Emmett C.
Swinson, Bruce Q.
Swinson, Walter H.
Tegeler, Russell C.
Therrien, Leo E.
Thompson, Theodore H.
Unzicker, Lawrence J.
Vanaman, Herbert H.
Wagner, Richard O. E.
Watkins, Nelson J.
Webber, George W.
Williams, Pickney M.
Williamson, William
Wilson, John A.
Wright, Wayne G.

CHIEF CARPENTERS

Abbott, Frank D.
Bailey, Clyde D.
Barrington, Francis W.
Bendinelli, Donald A.
Beran, Adolph H.
Brown, Robert M.
Carow, Alvin W.
Davis, Robert L.
Deblanc, Ernest C.
Doran, Edward M.
Edgeworth, Richard L.
Englehart, John R.
Fuller, William E.
Herron, Ralph R.
Hunt, Emit
Hunt, John E.
Jensen, Christian T.
Jernigan, James E.
Lindstrom, Julien E.
Lusk, Trubie C.
Mason, Clyde S., Jr.
Mayo, Homer
Mew, James T.
Minor, Warner M.
Nowack, Harry F.
Olliver, George R.
Olson, Milton S.
Rash, Looie W.
Roberts, Loren J.
Robinson, Sylvanus B.
Rodgers, Walter U.
Saunders, Gilbert T.
Shields, Charles W.
Smith, Boudinot L.
Stewart, William E.
Strawhecker, Lester O.
Tate, Albert O.
Terrebonne, Stermen A.
Thomas, Frank E.
Urbaniak, Edmund L.
Vaczi, Stephen A.
Walls, "J" Herbert
York, Charles C.

CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Alden, John
Anderson, Paul L.
Biggerstaff, Wilbur B.
Brady, Thomas D.
Brooks, Curtis E.
Brown, Raymond C.
Campbell, Fred L.
Coffey, Eldon O.
Cole, John P.
Dutcher, Adelbert W.
Fox, Henry M.
Gardiner, James A.
Geoghegan, Henry L.
Greene, Keith H.
Guinn, Lee Roy
Hardacre, Francis W.
Higgins, Simeon G.
Iilum, Francis
Kirkhuff, John L.
Knowles, Marshall J.
Lokey, Louis L.
Marsh, Zeddie
McCarter, Shannon H.
Moore, Edgar L.
Moore, Tasca A.
Morse, Melvin E.
Ogburn, Preston W.
Oliver, Marcus G.
Rapp, Harry L.
Roseneck, Clarence
Rush, James J.
Scott, Jeff
Shaffer, Boyd M.
Sharon, Horace D.
Sikes, Thomas J.
Skirka, Steve
Smith, William A.
Strader, Walter J.
Stimeling, Kenneth H.
Szeliga, Jerome C.
Vail, Russell G.
Vanderveen, Henry E.
Van de Veire, Edward B.
Williams, Hugh A.
Yost, Louis E.
Young, Malvern D.

COMMISSIONED WARRANT OFFICERS, HOSPITAL CORPS

Adams, Clifton K.
Breillatt, Julian P.
Chalfant, Clay H.
Grady, Charles L.
Harvey, Charles R.
Joyce, John J.
Keating, James H.
Lawson, Clifford R.
Lewis, Ramon C.
Norton, Kenneth C.
Rhodes, Neblett M.
Ruth, Alfred E. H.
Sheets, John A.
Shifflette, Charles H.
Sims, Clifford M.
Soltysiak, John P.
Taylor, Andrew R.
Wilson, Flavis A.
Witcofski, Louis K.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Alexander, Murray C., Jr.
Allen, Harvey S.
Anderson, Raymond V.
Bamford, Hiram D.
Banks, William F.
Barley, Richard K.
Barnes, Robert O.
Bashaw, Carl V.
Bean, Francis T.
Beard, Bill J.
Betcher, Arnold E.
Bond, William L.
Brooks, Oscar L.
Brown, Kenneth
Buhler, James L.
Burgess, Francis R.
Burnette, Ray C.
Callis, Kenneth S.
Camm, Judson B.
Casaletti, Joe, Jr.
Cavanaugh, Joseph J.
Clark, Haskell
Coder, Jay L.
Creel, Wallace R.
Crosson, Joseph B.
Cummings, Hillman D.
Damon, William Q.
Dilorenzo, Joseph
Dobay, Steven W.
Donoho, Charles G.
Downing, James W.
Elliott, Chester E.
Ellzey, Daniel W.
Fellers, Howell E.
Ficken, Roy W.
Fields, Howard D., Jr.
Franchino, John
Frink, Bill B.
Gustafson, George W., Jr.
Gustafson, Harry W.
Gutzmer, Albert W.
Harris, "S" "J"
Haverty, Edward M.
Hicks, Thomas E.
Hippe, Leroy
Holt, Joseph E., Jr.
Hutton, William L.
Johnson, Wilton F.
Kaczur, Harry
Kahler, Russell A.
Kaiser, Wayne L.
Kaltreider, Daniel R.
Killebrew, Carl W.
Koza, Harold D.
Lawson, John H.
Lawson, Bernie A.
Loader, Harold W.
Loveland, Charles E.
Lutz, Guy E.
Mannschreck, Chris, Jr.
Mayes, Lowell G.
McConnel, Joseph L.
McDonald, Walter B.
McJunkin, William F.
McMullen, Frank W.
Messer, Frank B., Jr.
Miears, Roy R.
Miechurski, Thomas A.
Moller, Ralph L.
Morgan, William R.
Morley, William E.
O'Donnell, Lawrence E.
Paul, Reginald F.
Perkins, Carl R.
Pipp, Martin A.
Pitt, Gilbert W.
Poplin, Glenn O.
Price, William J.
Proper, Worthy F.
Randle, Clinton P.
Raymer, Francis M.
Sedor, William
Sereno, August J.
Sergun, Carl
Smith, James T.
Snipes, Jim H.
St. Clair, William F.
Stone, Horace E.
Thompson, Dale J.
Tucker, Edward C.
Turlington, Oscar R.
Urban, Carl F.
Van Winkle, Oscar L.
Walters, Charles A.
Warren, Bascom H.
Watson, Gerald M.
Weixler, Herman J.
Whitwell, Luther T. F.
White, Wray A.
Williams, Samuel W.
Wine, Chester A.
Wolfe, George E.
Wood, William R., Jr.
Wright, Leonard K.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Burkholder, Arthur W., Jr.
McCormick, John A.
Pavelka, Albert K.
Scott, Kenneth A.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Bean, Joshua S., Jr.
Bickford, Howard V.
Bohannan, Ray
Brooks, Lawrence W.
Burkett, Vernon W.
Carpenter, Seth J.
Chambliss, Jesse R.
Coffield, Rolland L.
Deadwyler, Robert E.
Engstrom, Eugene E.
Eslinger, Walter A.
Gault, John W.
Griswell, Hollis A.
Harrison, Russell R.
Helms, Vester J.
Hunt, Bernard H.
Jackson, Carl E.
Keck, Truman W.
Klostermann, Wolfgang E.
Lang, Wesley M.
Lanning, John R.
Lowell, William J.
Miller, Lloyd W.
Moore, James K.
Parker, James H.
Pullum, Alvin C.
Riley, William E.
Salley, Ansel A.
Shaw, Gilbert J.
Shoemaker, William C.
Taliaferro, Richard B., Jr.
Thorsell, George E.
Vernon, John F.
Walker, James R.
Walmer, Dan
Whaley, Richard V.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Brown, Charles C., Jr.
Bush, Melvin R.
Carter, Frank B.
Daris, Arthur T.
Davy, Marvin O.
Duffney, Joseph R.
Eager, Virginia J.
Elmore, Clifford L.
Evans, Helen L.
Gabriel, Fred M.
Gilles, Donald A.
Hollabaugh, John F.
Jamgochian, John, Jr.
Klein, Melvin E.
Leis, John M.
Lubein, William J.
Poole, James G.
Snead, Charles T.
Thomas, Lillis J.
Vaughn, James B.
Wentink, Francis C.
Whitaker, Elizabeth W.
Wyand, Donald M.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Clardy, Margaret K.
Hyne, Ernest E.
McKenzie, Charles H.
Schroeder, Charles W.
Snipes, Wilson C.
McHugh, Edward A.
Roy, Vershall A.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Barry, Helen M.
Buttone, Dora E.
Cirillo, Catherine M.
Clarke, Janet M.
Dauria, Gloria V.
Day, Kathryn R.
Falconi, Carolyn L.
Fischer, Corinne A.
Gabudza, Martha L.
Galles, Elaine R.
Harden, Ella V.
Hatfield, Thelma M.
Hogan, Mary M.
Koza, Frances C.
Mendelson, Marion V.
Parker, Nellie M.
Quay, Helen K.
Sabin, Ruth J.
Semprebon, Josephine N.
Steinert, Lydia
Steinmatz, Anna M.
Troyan, Dorothy M.
Turner, Dorothy
Van Gundy, Alice C.
Walters, Irene M.
Williams, Ellen

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve, on active duty, for appointment to the ranks and grades hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Absher, George W., Jr.
Ackley, Kenneth A., Jr.
Adams, Emil J.
Adams, William H.
Adkins, Lewis W., Jr.
Adrian, David L.
Ahearn, Joseph F.
Albright, John J., Jr.
Allen, Harry, III
Allen, Philip H.
Allison, Cecil G.
Althoff, William B.
Amos, John B.
Anders, Samuel G., Jr.
Anderson, Raymond M., Jr.
Armstrong, William F., Jr.
Aroyan, George F.
Arthur, Malcolm B., II
Ashley, Courtland L.
Ashley, Donn L.
Ashley, Linsey S.
Asmundson, Franklin J.
Atkinson, Bert M., Jr.
Atkinson, Edward C.
Aubert, George A.
Auger, Maurice A.
Auger, Thomas E.
Aulick, Donald M.
Austin, William R.
Averett, Rufus M.
Ayers, Robert W.
Babbitt, Franklin G.
Bacchus, Robert E.
Bachert, John O.
Back, Adrian G., Jr.
Bacon, Vincent L.
Bailey, John B.
Baird, Richard S.
Baldwin, Lawrence C.
Ball, Edwin L.
Banks, Robert H.
Bard, Rudolph T., Jr.
Barksdale, David A.
Barlow, John F.
Barnes, Robert J.
Barnes, William A.
Baskin, Donald
Bass, Frederick F., Jr.
Bassett, Ormon E.
Bauman, Kenneth E.
Baylis, John R.
Bayly, Donald C.
Beach, Chandler L.
Becker, Arvade L.
Bellah, James C.
Bennett, Arthur K., Jr.
Bennett, William O.
Bergs, Robert A.
Bettis, Alfred M.
Beutler, Albert G.
Beyer, Stuart E.
Bischof, William W.
Blair, Donald D.
Blake, Gordon
Blake, John S.
Blawusch, Dirck E.
Bly, Theodore S.
Boggess, Luke J.
Boland, Robert I., Jr.
Bolles, Robert R.
Bolton, Jordan T.
Bonham, William R.
Boniface, John G.
Booker, Thomas F.
Boop, Joseph H.
Borbidge, John J.
Borgerding, Howard A.
Bouveron, Ernest A.
Bowen, Alva M., Jr.
Bowen, Llewellyn D.
Bowen, William D.
Bowling, Roland A.
Boyd, Carl J.
Boyd, Paul C.
Brady, James D.
Brady, Robert L., Jr.
Branch, Linwood O. B., Jr.
Braseth, Ansel C.
Bridger, Alfred F.
Brimm, Daniel J., III
Brock, Robert J.
Brown, Richard W., Jr.
Brumbaugh, Jack R.
Brumsted, Robert B.
Bryant, John E.
Bryant, William A., Jr.
Bryce, Thomas A.
Buchanan, Fillmore B.
Bucknum, Jack E.
Bucolo, Mariano J.
Bumstead, James G.
Burhans, John H.
Burki, Arde A.
Burns, Donald L., Jr.
Burrill, James T.
Burton, James B.
Burton, Lester H.
Caldwell, George A., Jr.
Callahan, Francis J.
Camp, Herbert E.
Campbell, Joseph W.
Campbell, Quincy K.
Campbell, William E.
Candler, Samuel L.
Canna, Donald J.
Cantwell, William P., Jr.
Carey, Oscar L.
Carl, John G.
Carlin, Walter P.
Carlson, Millard A.
Carneghi, Albert J.
Carroll, Thomas F.
Cartmell, James P.
Caskey, John B.
Casson, Robert M.
Cella, Roy F.
Chambers, Lloyd S., Jr.
Chokas, Nicholas P.
Christensen, Morris A.
Clancy, George M.
Clare, James M.
Clark, Anguskerr
Clark, Edmund T.
Clark, Robert O.
Clark, William D., Jr.
Claussen, Paul K.
Clayton, Edgar J.
Clegg, George B., III
Cleland, William H.
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Clifton, Autry W.
Cole, Robert B.
Collins, John T.
Cooke, Edward W.
Coope, Peter M.
Cordell, Curtis C.
Cos, Grant A.
Costello, Edward J.
Couture, Clarence, Jr.
Coyer, Charles B.
Crawford, Francis G.
Crawford, Robert E.
Crehaw, John F.
Critchley, John P.
Cronander, James H.
Crooks, Thomas L.
Crosby, William H.
Cross, Thomas J.
Crozier, Francis J.
Crumley, Jack S.
Cuccias, Robert F.
Cullman, Hugh
Culwell, Jackson P.
Cummings, Arthur H., Jr.
Curnutte, Basil, Jr.
Cutchall, Lee G.
Dakos, Demosthenes P.
Daly, Richard H.
Dana, Richard B.
Davidson, Dale R.
Davis, John A., Jr.
Davis, Lonzo R., Jr.
Davison, Morgan L.
Day, Charles E.
Deacon, William, III
Dearman, Andrew J., Jr.
DeCamp, Edgar A.
Decker, Albert I.
Decker, Edward A.
Deen, Emerson C.
Deibler, Robert R.
DeMayo, John J., Jr.
Demming, James H.
Dente, Eugene
Devlin, John G.
Dickey, George L., Jr.
Dickson, George A., Jr.
Dietrichson, Warren D.
Dillon, Melvin J.
Dise, Robert L.
Dodson, Eugene D.
Doty, William K.
Dougherty, John J.
Douthett, Richard B.
Dowling, Patrick S.
Downey, Denis-James J.
Drinkwater, Eugene E.
Duberg, Carl W.
Dudley, Harrison G.
Duesterberg, Louis C., Jr.
Dugger, John A.
Ducan, Robert C.
Dunn, Robert
Dunning, Richard A.
Dunseath, William J. R.
Dutton, Granville O.
Eckert, George J.
Eckhart, Myron, Jr.
Edwards, John A., Jr.
Eells, John P.
Eidson, Lee M.
Elliott, Michael B.
Ellis, Edmund H.
Ellis, George W.
Engel, Wilson F., Jr.
Engelmann, Henry A.
Enyart, John W.
Erickson, John W.
Esarey, William L.
Ettner, Edward R.
Evans, James G.
Exum, John D.
Fagan, John F., Jr.
Farmer, Harry C.
Faucett, William A.
Faulders, Cyril T., Jr.
Fenton, Percival N., Jr.
Ferch, George, III
Finlay, Robert W., Jr.
Finley, Robert N.
Fisher, James R., II
Fischer, Richard H.
Fisher, Elmer H.
Fiske, Samuel L.
Fitzgerald, Thomas R.
Foglesong, George M.
Folop, Elbert A.
Fontaine, Charles T.
Ford, Frank W.
Forrester, John J.
Forsyth, William D.
Foster, Albert L.
Foust, James W.
Frame, Eldon B.
Francis, Samuel
Frasch, Elmer T., Jr.
Fridge, Herbert E.
Froehlich, Prode F.
Fryer, William S.
Fuller, William T.
Furland, Fred W.
Gaehler, Alfred H.
Gardner, George H., Jr.
Garodz, Leo J.
Gates, Jack C.
Gatewood, Walter P.
Gahl, Raymond A., Jr.
Gautier, Robert H.
Gee, Harry G.
Gmer, Herman F.
Gesmer, Paul L. B.
Gibbs, Howard B.
Gibson, John C.
Giedt, John G.
Gilliam, Gail H.
Glennow, Allen W.
Glenn, Claude M., Jr.
Glindeman, Henry P., Jr.
Glover, George W.
Goloway, Edward D.
Goodwin, Everett R.
Gorak, Walter
Gordon, Jack G.
Gorman, John V.
Gorski, Joseph J.
Gorton, Robert J.
Goure, James V.
Graefe, Henry
Graling, Thomas R.
Graves, Luther J., Jr.
Gray, Julian F.
Greene, Joseph M.
Griffiths, Charles H.
Grkovic, Nicholas
Grojean, Charles D.
Guentz, Jack E.
Gulick, Richard I.
Gullatt, Victor R.
Gullette, John G.
Gunderson, Nels A.
Gwiazdowski, Peter P.
Haak, Frank S.
Hafer, Alvin A.
Hagler, Billy E.
Haes, Orrie A.
Haley, Robert S.
Hall, Richard P.
Hall, Walter D.
Haller, John J.
Hamberg, Harold A.
Hammell, Howard A.
Hankins, Wallace W., Jr.
Hanks, Robert J.
Hannah, Clyde B.
Hansen, John E.
Hansmann, Anton C.
Hanson, William V.
Haring, Peter A.
Harlan, Wick R., Jr.
Harman, Charles W.
Harmer, Frank D., Jr.
Harris, Dale S.
Harris, James L.
Hart, Carten M.
Hart, John E.
Hart, Robert R.
Hartley, Theodore R.
Haselton, Frederick R., Jr.
Haupt, John W., Jr.
Hayes, Arthur M., Jr.
Hayes, Wilford E.
Hayward, John L.
Heberling, Donald A.
Heesacker, Bernard A.
Hellwinkel, Donald F.
Henderson, Jerome E.
Henningsen, William J.
Herzog, John J.
Hess, Charles M.
Heumann, Monroe, Jr.
Highsmith, William N.
Hill, James A.
Hill, Nathaniel M., Jr.
Hilsabeck, Robert B.
Hinchcliff, Lester G., Jr.
Holden, John J.
Holk, Edward
Hooks, Bennett W.
Hoover, Ralph A., Jr.
Hopkins, Francis D.
Horner, Walter R.
Hourigan, Woodrow W.
House, Edward H.
Howard, George D.
Howard, William R.
Howe, Raymond E.
Hoy, Hugh A.
Huddleston, William E.
Huey, William M.
Hugus, James E.
Hughes, John A.
Humpton, Louis R., III
Hurst, Howard B.
Hutches, Robert S.
Iacobelli, Rocco F.
Irvine, James F., Jr.
Iverson, Robert G.
Jackson, Billy G.
Jackson, Joseph A.
Jackson, Laurence L., Jr.
Jacobsen, John A.
Jacobs, Harold W.
Jacobus, Arthur F.
Jandrall, John A.
Jankovsky, Norlin A.
Jennings, John A., Sr.
Johnson, Charles M., Jr.
Johnson, Dean R., Jr.
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Oliver T.
Johnson, Peter W.
Johnston, Frank C., Jr.
Johnston, Frank S.
Jones, Francis F., Jr.
Jones, John M.
Jones, Theodore R.
Jones, William F.
Jordan, Edward C.
Jorgensen, George D.
Junod, Louis L.
Kaloupek, William E.
Kane, Brian B., Jr.
Karch, Alfred S.
Kaufman, John
Kaufman, Robert Y.
Kearns, John S.
Keene, Warren E.
Kelly, Albert J.
Kelly, George R.
Kelly, Leslie D., Jr.
Kennedy, Alfred F.
Kennedy, Edward L.
Kennedy, James R.
Kennelly, Cletus W., II
Kent, John L.
Kenworthy, Arthur R.
Kenyon, Eugene C., Jr.
Kern, Francis X., III
Kiley, Donald W.
Killefer, William, Jr.
Kilpatrick, David D.
Kimzey, Ord, Jr.
King, Franklin T.
Kingsbury, Edward J., Jr.
Kirkiighter, James F., Jr.
Klein, George R.
Klug, George J.
Knight, Richard H.
Knoblock, Walter W.
Koch, Ferdinand B.
Komorowski, Raymond A.
Koons, Jack L.
Krause, Robert N.
Kulik, Adam P.
LaBarron, Robert M.
Lademan, Dixon
Lane, Dwight A.
Langille, Justin E., III
Languedoc, Arthur J.
Lavelle, Francis M.
Lawler, Willis D.
Layton, Donald M.
Ledbetter, Robert L., Jr.
Lee, Jerome A., Jr.
Leffingwell, William B.
Legare, Armand F. F.
Leighton, David T.
Lemeshewsky, Andrew A.
Leonard, Ernest, Jr.
Lessmann, Walter G.
Leuschner, Robert J.
Levine, Saul
Lewis, George H.
Lichtenberg, Robert S.
Lilly, Creighton D.
Lindsay, John R.
Lindsay, Donald B.
Little, John B.
Lockhart, Richard M.
Longton, William F.
Lonnquest, Theodore C., Jr.
Loper, Jack E.
Lowell, John E.
Lowen, Ernest E.
Lucas, Fielding G.
Lund, Howard R.
Lyon, Harvey E.
Lyon, James O.
Lyons, Kenneth H.
Lyons, Richard T.
Lyster, William A.
Mabbitt, Robert C.
Mabee, Richard W.
MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
Macon, Glen G.
Mcginnis Hayden R.
Mahinske, Edmund B.
Malone, Walter J.
Maples, Luther W., Jr.
Marsh, John C.
Martin, Benjamin S.
Martin, Lealyn E.
Mascenik, John
Mason, George E.
Mather, Howard A.
May, Robert C.
Mayer, William S.
Mayes, Luther E., Jr.
Mayo, George W., Jr.
McCall, Robert E.
McCalla, John H.

McClelland, Robert A., III
McDermott, Nelson J., Jr.
McDonnell, John C.
McElroy, Robert L., Jr.
McGaw, Donald A.
McGovern, Clinton G.
McGrath, Charles T.
McKeand, Irvin J.
McKenzie, Robert P.
McLeskey, John F.
McMillan, Leo D., Jr.
McMurdo, Robert B.
Mealy, John K., Jr.
Medcalfe, Maurice L.
Metschi, John J.
Metzger, Robert L.
Miller, Charles R., Jr.
Miller, Kirk C., Jr.
Milloy, Robert D.
Mills, Herbert D., Jr.
Mills, Ralph B., Jr.
Millsais, Lewis M.
Minton, Don R.
Mitchell, Paul N.
Mize, Harlie L.
Moise, McFaddin
Montgomery, Brooke
Montgomery, William R.
Monthan, George R.
Moody, Herbert W.
Moore, James A.
Moore, Lester, Jr.
Moore, Oswald M.
Moore, Raymond A.
Moore, Robert B.
Moran, Thomas L.
Morey, William C., Jr.
Morgan, Bobby G.
Morgan, Lawrence P.
Moro, Albert J.
Morrison, Joseph B.
Morris, Gene C.
Morrow, Arthur J.
Morse, Kenneth L.
Morton, William W.
Mouton, Edison E.
Muncie, Wendell B.
Munns, David L.
Murdock, John E., Jr.
Murray, John R., Jr.
Myers, Robert W.
Myhre, Charles A.
Naffah, Ned
Nasipak, Valentin
Nelson, Gerard L.
Newbern, Robert O.
Newman, Dale E.
Nicklas, William C., Jr.
Nicol, William J.
Norris, Crackett J.
Norris, Nicholas B., Jr.
Northup, William H.
Nugent, Corliss R.
Oakley, William F., Jr.
O'Brien, William R.
Odell, John D., Jr.
Olson, Edward C.
O'Neal, Alfred C.
O'Neil, Gerald P.
Ortland, Henry III
Otten, Vincent B.
Oyer, John L.
Page, Robert A.
Parker, Robert E.
Parks, Ralph Z.
Parsons, Robert C.
Patterson, William C., Jr.
Paul, John A.
Pavis, George P.
Pearson, Francis E., III
Pegram, Robert Q., Jr.
Pennington, Philip B.
Penny, Harmon C.
Peregoy, Frederick C., Jr.
Perkins, William L.
Perkins, Jack B.
Perszyk, Joseph S., Jr.
Peters, Bernard
Petersen, Richard L.
Pfefferkorn, William R.
Phelps, Henry E.
Phillips, Chester G.
Phillips, Robert G.
Pickrell, Robert M.
Pilmer, Edwin H., Jr.
Pitz, Marcellus T.
Plummer, Philip F.
Popa, Justin
Poulsen, Robert N.
Powers, Francis P.
Pritchard, Denzil L.
Quisenberry, William R.
Rabe, Richard D.
Radloff, Fred H.
Rae, Samuel G.
Ragland, Roy J.
Ratte, Paul W.
Ray, Troy G.
Reaves, George A., III
Redden, Lawrence E.
Reich, Charles A.
Reiff, Glenn A.
Renn, John E.
Reynolds, Allan J.
Reynolds, Hugh D., Jr.
Rhoads, Harry E.
Rice, Hallie P.
Richardson, Richard P., Jr.
Riggs, Wallace M.
Riley, Jack
Rives, James D., Jr.
Robertson, Horace B., Jr.
Robeson, Robert H., Jr.
Robinson, Errol W.
Robinson, Gordon E.
Robinson, Jackson R.
Robinson, William H., Jr.
Rogers, David A.
Rogers, Frank W.
Rogers, Harris G., Jr.
Rogers, Harry M.
Rose, Albert E., Jr.
Rosenbloom, Marvin I.
Roulstone, Don J.
Roux, Vernon K.
Ruckel, John P.
Rulon, Charles A.
Rusling, John A. III
Russel, Joseph W.
Russell, Thomas B., Jr.
Ryan, William J.
Samota, Frank
Sampson, Alvin N.
Sandeford, William H.
Sartain, Milton S.
Saunders, Walter E., Jr.
Savage, Richard A.
Savage, Stuart, Jr.
Schabacker, Robert B.
Schifanelli, Thomas M.
Schindler, Clyde H.
Schirra, Walter M., Jr.
Schmidt, Wesley H.
Schoonmaker, Herbert G.
Schultz, Henry
Schwemley, Paul A.
Schwitters, Merlin J.
Scoggins, Willis L., Jr.
Scott, Harry R.
Scott, Richard Y.
Scott, Wiley A.
Seargeant, John A.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Seccombe, Stanley G., Jr.
Seeber, James W.
Sells, Warren H.
Sensenbach, Wilson E.
Sheehy, Edward J.
Shepard, Everett G., Jr.
Sherman, Benjamin F., Jr.
Shofner, Howard B., Jr.
Shumaker, Merle L.
Sickel, John A.
Simmons, Robert L.
Simons, Minot II
Simpson, William E.
Sims, Clifford L., Jr.
Sindell, LeRoy J. E.
Skidmore, Edward O.
Skoog, Joseph L., Jr.
Smith, Bryant G.
Smith, Franklin, Jr.
Smith, Frederic N.
Smith, Henry P.
Smith, James J.
Smith, James M., Jr.
Smith, James T.
Smith, Joseph A., Jr.
Smith, Perry N.
Smith, Lloyd S., Jr.
Smith, Lowell H.
Snelling, Henry F.
Snider, Denis
Snowden, Macon S.
Snyder, Bernard L., Jr.
Spangle, William G., II
Sparkman, Homer A., Jr.
Sperandio, Joseph L.
Spoerl, Harvey E., Jr.
Sprague, Albert T., III
Sprickman, Phil T.
Stahl, Lawrence E.
Stevenson, Fred A.
Stickels, Jack R.
Stiegeimar, Loren R.
Still, Raymond G.
Story, Kenneth A.
Stout, Cecil C.
Stoutenburgh, Joseph S.
Strang, Walter D.
Strong, Charles R.
Strowk, Peter M.
Suddath, William O.
Sueur, Charles A.
Sullivan, Joseph J.
Sullivan, Richard J.
Sullivan, Russell H., Jr.
Swanson, Karl T.
Swanson, Robert M.
Swanson, Wayne H.
Tanner, Henry J.
Tarleton, George W.
Taylor, Conway A.
Taylor, Frank H., II
Taylor, John L.
Taylor, Perry R., Jr.
Taylor, Thomas E.
Taylor, Waymon
Taylor, William E.
Thomas, Albert H., Jr.
Thompson, John C., Jr.
Thompson, Robert D.
Thorndyke, John R.
Thrasher, William E., Jr.
Tiemann, Wilbur F.
Tierney, John M.
Tiffany, Emory G.
Tisdale, Robert S.
Tittemore, Gordon H.
Toutant, William T.
Towner, Robert V.
Trapp, Bill C.
Treacy, Edmund J.
Tribble, Gordon B.
Trott, Robert J.
Tully, Claude I.
Turk, Carl F.
Turley, Miles D. J.
Uhwat, Robert A. D.
Ullman, Charles D.
Upthegrove, Harry N.
Urquhart, Alexander W., Jr.
Valenty, Gabriel E., Jr.
Valentine, Andrew J.
VanAntwerp, James C., Jr.
VanCuren, Verlyn
Van Stone, Stanley K.
Vardy, Richard S.
Vaughan, James P., Jr.
Viele, John W.
Vosburgh, Everton P., Jr.
Waddell, Henry M., Jr.
Wade, Kenneth A.
Wagner, Paul R.
Walker, Charles W., Jr.
Walsh, John A.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.
Wanee, Donald V.
Ward, Xenophon C.
Warmate, Martin C.
Wasdin, James R.
Wash, John L.
Wasner, James A.
Watson, Harry A.
Watt, Jesse R.
Weaver, Roy B.
Weaver, Walter A., Jr.
Weaver, Walter C.
Webb, William M.
Weber, William J., Jr.
Webster, Robert J.
Weidner, Robert E.
Weigle, Howard L.
Weir, Robert A.
Weirich, James E.
Weiander, Robert O.
Werlein, Richard O.
Wertheim, Robert H.
Wesper, Willis H.
West, Richard E.
Westfall, Elmer T.
Whalen, William F., Jr.
Wheeler, William L.
White, Allan E.
White, Arthur T.
White, Ira R.
White, Lloyd R., Jr.
White, Ray B.
White, Robert J.
Whittle, Alfred J., Jr.
Wible, Lester C.
Wieland, Daniel T., Jr.
Wilcox, Burr C., Jr.
Wilhoit, Charles V., Jr.
Willett, Elbert H.
Williams, Cassius A., Jr.
Williams, Charles S., Jr.
Williams, William H.
Williamson, Robert II
Wilson, Henry R.
Wilson, Prentis M.
Wilson, Richard H.
Wingo, Rodney K.
Winter, Henry E., Jr.
Wolf, Edward F.
Wolfe, John M.
Woods, Charles E.
Woolums, Charles R.
Wynee, Donald M.
Yalen, Seymour
Yerbury, Robert H.
Zeni, Levio E.
Zenni, Martin M.
Zisette, Reginald R., Jr.
Zyvoloski, Richard A.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Adrian, Rodger J.
Albea, John P.
Baker, William R.
Balon, Joseph M.
Benson, John A.
Blaes, James H.
Bower, Edward R.
Buchanan, Richard W.
Buck, Walter J.
Conard, Melvin L.
Conover, Donald T.
Crook, Lewis J.
Dellasega, Joseph L.
Eble, Frederick D.
Effner, James E.
Evans, Houston H.
Ewing, Paul C.
Forrest, James E.
Frank, Martin L.
Gardner, George H.
Gralla, Eugene
Haberlin, William E.
Harvey, Robert D.
Haslett, Robert H.
Henker, Donald E.
Hill, Roger E.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Jones, Joseph B.
Kephart, Norman R.
Kornfeld, Leo L.
Larson, Albert G.,
Larson, Leslie O., Jr.
Lucand, Dale C.
Lynch, John E., Jr.
MacDonald, Malcolm W.
McHenry, Wendell, Jr.
Means, James M.
Melville, Robert E.
Meyer, Milton, Jr.
Mulholland, Donald E.
Pilgrim, Orvill L.
Poor, John L.
Sloan, Dale F.
Small, Joseph T.
Smith, Stanley N.
Spargo, Robert A.
Stabe, Robert W.
Steele, James H.
Stewart, John K.
Thompson, Richard C.
Thurman, Horace E., Jr.
Tinney, Richard T.
Toney, Lee E., Jr.
Tongren, Hale N.
Vogel, William J.
Watson, Sanley W., Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Acuff, James T.
Boyd, Earl I.
Brantner, William B.
Burton, George W.
Farley, Robert J.
Forquer, Charles J.
Francy, William J.
Hediger, Fritz H.
Iselin, Donald G.
Lalande, Albert M., Jr.
Livingston, George E.
Paletti, Arthur V.
Petersen, John H.
Saunders, Edward M.
Spangler, William S.
Vander Wolk, Walter W., Jr.
Van Leer, Blake W.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Clauss, Edward L.
Connell, Clyde E., Jr.
Cox, Walter R.
Garrett, John L.
Mason, Anderson T.
Meade, Charles D.
Schurhammer, Joseph W.
Smith, Orville E.
Sullivan, John J.
Tennille, Robert M., Jr.
Traxler, James A.
Von Radesky, Horace

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Andrews, Lois A.
Bales, Josephine F.
Boyles, Carrie L.
Bragg, Genevieve L.
Buckley, Leonora M.
Carville, Elizabeth C.
Daiber, Elizabeth
Daley, Mary E.
Devoe, Edith M.
Donovan, Eleanore A.
Eldrup, Gladys
Hallquist, Eleanor A. M.
Hutchison, Martha P.
Kopecky, Cecile E.
Marshall, Harriet A.
Oftedal, Helen I.
Parker, Sarah L.
Sigurdson, Thorbjorg
Smith, Margaret
Turner, Mary E.
Tutkus, Anna F.
Wheat, Loena

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grade of chief machinist:

Baxter, Ernest W., Jr.
Blackburn, Roy T.
Coates, Ernest R.
Hickey, Chester O.
Jennings, Russell L.
Mathys, Harry E.
Miller, Joseph F.
Ollerman, Carl E.
Perrin, George W.
Spangler, Kenneth E.
Trimmer, John J.
Weaver, Hubert A.
Woody, Myrrl M.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Alexander, Clifford F.
Anderson, Paul E.
Baker, Jeriod I.
Beiman, Kenneth B.
Bogdanovic, John
Bonham, John W., Jr.
Bossert, John W., Jr.
Brown, Robert J.
Camp, Jack E.
Campbell, Leonard A.
Caron, Roland J.
Cochran, William J.
Comer, Paul R.
Cross, Eugene W.
Daras, Steven
Davis, Elbert L.
Deforge, Anthony R.
Denton, Lewis A.

Dixon, Kay L.
Dowling, Jerome M.
Esch, William S.
Fridley, Daniel C.
Fruzia, Guy L.
Gour, William D.
Greathouse, Eugene V.
Green, Herbert W.
Guilday, Thomas J., Jr.
Hahne, Charles E.
Halligan, Louis C.
Halstead, Jesse W.
Handy, Henry L. T.
Happich, Edward W., Jr.
Hebert, Normand A.
Horton, Seldon
Hubert, Earl R.
Huffnagle, Norman
Jennings, Gerald W.
Johnson, Wallace J.
Jones, Thomas J.
Kiefer, Gordon L.
Klentz, Augusta C.
Kowalchyk, Peter
Leichninger, Max H.
Luckenbach, Lovic B.
Mackintosh, Robert C.
Martin, Curtis C.
McClurg, William L.
McGill, Cecil B.
McKinney, Troy M.
McLarnan, John E.
McRae, Leslie B.
McVay, Harley V.
Merritt, Thomas E.
Miller, William A., Jr.
Miskinis, William
Morton, Malvin
Muschick, Paul E., Jr.
Noble, Willard V.
O'Brinar, August A. M.
O'Neal, Roscoe
Page, Ralph L.
Peacock, Richard M.
Peterson, Howard W.
Pierce, Robert M.
Poss, Clarence L.
Premseiaar, Seymour J.
Rice, Thomas G.
Rogers, Norbert F.
Rutledge, John W.
Schaefer, Elmer H.
Schmidt, Harry W.
Schranz, William J.
Scott, William M.
Short, Lloyd G.
Smiglewski, John J.
Smith, Walter J.
Spiewak, Chester J.
Spreeman, Howard J.
Steigerwald, Elmer, Jr.
Stowell, Edward J.
Tannehill, Clarence A.
Tucker, Alfred C.
Tull, Frank H.
Vaughn, William W., Jr.
Walden, Walter A.
Watkins, Bernard R.
Watson, Donald F.
Whalen, Bruce R.
Wolber, Charles O.
Zimmermann, Elmer T.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

De Witt, John S.
Keeley, William M.
Sumrell, Guy H.
Thompson, Woodrow W.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Argaud, Samuel E.
Bobja, Arthur
Carter, William O.
Comstock, Melvin A.
Herndon, Glen A.
Hise, Theodore R.
Hutchison, Charles D. L.
Keener, Robert N.
Lesher, William A.
Long, Marion W.
McAllister, Damon O.
Stutler, David R.
Vickroy, Robert K.
Vitlip, Joseph J.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Andreoli, John J.
Basilone, Joseph J.
Bied, Gerald T.
Cole, Kenneth L.
Crawford, Thomas A.
Kistner, Leonard E.
Ludwig, Lyle L.
Mallahan, Joseph J.
McFetridge, Vernon C.
Nelson, Thomas C.
Rickman, Wilford M.
Scheurich, Thomas E.
Shuder, Robert A.
Tucker, Richard M.
Welch, Wardell B.
Winter, Mary W.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

McGovern, Austin F.
McRae, Ellen E.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Crabtree, Helen E.
England, Ethelyn E.
Hunsecker, Isabel V.
Lux, Eleanor M.
Molloy, Mary P.
Mullikin, Sudie B.
Rasmussen, Charlotte S.
Sieland, Rita A.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve, on active duty, for appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) as hereinafter stated:

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Adams, Kenneth
Albert, Thomas F.
Allen, Charles D., Jr.
Amos, James W.
Anderson, Paul E.
Andrews, Robert
Andrich, Vincent J.
Arthur, Frederick E.
Atcheson, George, III
Baar, Don R.
Bailey, Edward C.
Barksdale, Allen D.
Barnes, Jerald D.
Beck, Charles E.
Becker, Karl E.
Behm, Charles H. H.
Bell, Samuel V., Jr.
Bennett, Francis B.
Berry, John W.
Bibb, Thomas Z.
Bivins, William F.
Blanks, Alva L.
Bohmert, Gerald G.
Boland, Joseph P.
Boller, Jack W.
Boulding, Austin L.
Bowden, Daniel T.
Bowerman, Robert G.
Bowman, Donald A.
Braid, Robert A.
Braly, Henry L., Jr.
Bridwell, Samuel L.
Broadfield, Ward H., Jr.
Brooks, Claude C.
Brown, Edward A.
Brown, Francis T.
Brown, Jack, Jr.
Brown, Russell D.
Burke, Robert E.
Campbell, Thomas H., Jr.
Carper, John E.
Chapman, Kendall J.
Chiles, James O.
Chrisler, Robert P.
Cochran, Billy E.
Coleman, Eddie T., Jr.
Coleman, Yale
Comet, Robert E.
Connelee, William L.
Connelly, John J., Jr.
Cronemiller, Carl F., Jr.
Crowe, Thomas H.
Cruse, Vernon E.
Davenport, Herman P., Jr.
Davies, Henry E.
Davis, Harry O.
Davis, William R.
Decamp, Dwight E.
Deney, Leonard J., Jr.
Doak, William C.
Dolvin, Sheridan L.
Dorroh, Ray P.
Duacsek, Anthony W.
Dukin, William
Durey, Orin J.
Ebel, Stanley T.
Elicker, Clare H.
Elliott, Homan O.
Endacott, Jack A.
Ennis, Edward J.
Estler, David S.
Farley, Russell J.
Faull, Joe D.
Fisher, Robert M.
Fisher, Lee W.
Foltz, Robert L.
Fosdick, Theron D.
Fossum, Theodore T.
Gard, John G.
Gardner, Dennis D.
Garrison, Walter V.
Garrison, Robert G.
Geer, Jon R.
Gerecke, Thomas F.
Gibbs, John D., Jr.
Ginn, Benjamin F.
Girard, Jean L.
Goforth, Calvin T.
Gorden, Oliver A., Jr.
Grantham, Robert D.
Graves, Jack C.
Groves, John G., Jr.
Gudal, Sigurd M.
Haecherl, Frank S.
Hand, Marshall H.
Hansen, Herman C.
Hargis, Jack R.
Harker, Theodore R.
Harlow, Harry B.
Harrison, Alan W.
Hartley, Paul J., Jr.
Hays, Robert C.
Hazen, Alan M.
Neile, Donald H.
Heise, Frederick J.
Herbert, Edward D.
Herman, William M.
Herndon, George H.
Holbrook, James G.
Hollingsworth, "R" "J"
Holm, Weston
Holmes, Robert E.
Horton, William P.
Houston, Willard S., Jr.
Huber, Ernest, Jr.
Hughes, Leslie D.
Hughes, Arthur J.
Irish, Edelbert E.
Irwin, Charles M., Jr.
Jackson, William J.
Jenkins, Glen E.
Jennings, Robert B.
Johnsen, Clarence S.
Johnson, Allen R.
Jones, Cowan E., Jr.
Jones, Theodore
Joynton, Harry D., Jr.
Judson, Sheldon B.
Kallen, Robert G.
Kasner, Edmund B.
Kiernan, Francis J.
Kimble, Elbert D.
King, John M.
Knapp, Richard G.
Knox, Robert V.
Koepcke, William W.
Kovanic, Francis J.
Kroes, Henry W., Jr.
Kyle, Richard A.
Lambert, Joel, Jr.
Landess, Herbert S.
Larson, Melvin G.
Laskowski, Walter E.
Lassiter, "A" "C," Jr.
Lebreton, Guy J.
Leist, Frederick, Jr.
Leonard, Elmer F.
Leutz, Leon H.
Lillesand, Alan M.
Lococo, Salvadore
Long, Douglas L.
Longley, Wilbur E.
Madill, William G., Jr.
Magee, William M.
Mapes, George C., Jr.
Maple, Charles J.
Matejceck, John F.
Matthews, William R.
Mattson, Kenneth B.
Maxwell, Raymond C. Jr.
McAdams, Robert B.
McAdams, Joseph B., Jr.
McClung, Donald H.
McDonald, William M.
McFadden, Frank H.
McGrane, Clarence V. Jr.
McMahon, Joseph D.
McRostie, Richard J.
Meadows, Roy L., Jr.
Meekins, Willis E.
Melick, Roger E.
Mitchell, John E.
Mitchell, William, Jr.
Molony, James
Moore, Charles R.
Moore, James I.
Moreland, Herbert A., Jr.
Morin, Edward C.
Morris, Adrian B., Jr.
Morrison, James W.
Moseley, Raymond H.
Mottarella, Victor G.
Nemoff, Alfred J.
Noesen, Harold
Oechslin, Robert E.
Olmstead, John B.
O'Reilly, Peter J. F.
Orton, Robert D.
Owens, Haydn, Jr.
Packer, Samuel H., II
Paulsen, William H.
Pein, Edward W.
Pels, John H. III
Perdue, Uley F.
Perez, Raul B.
Peters, James C.
Phares, John V.
Pierozzi, Constantine
Pietrowski, Edward L. F.
Pitts, Joseph C.
Popoff, Alec N.
Posch, Frank M.
Powell, Arthur E.
Powell, Michael
Pringle, Robert C.
Putzier, Charles W.
Randell, William D.
Rappuhn, Alfred A., Jr.
Rayner, Donald E.
Reider, Richard K.
Reisinger, Edward A.
Ress, Joseph
Reynolds, George R.
Rezzarday, Joseph, Jr.
Richards, Floyd C., Jr.
Rieke, Norbert A.
Riggan, James M., Jr.
Roberts, Lester B.
Robertson, Gene D.
Roberts, Levi J., Jr.
Roden, Dan C.
Rodier, Richard L.
Roetman, Orvil M.
Rooke, William A.
Rostan, David A.
Roy, Robert I.
Ryan, George G.
Sandlin, Charles R.
Scheer, Lawrence E.
Scheibner, Juergen G.
Schelb, William F.
Scherrer, David E.
Schimpf, Donald R.
Schmucker, Stanley K.
Schubert, Allen H.
Schultz, Clarence W., Jr.
Scott, Kenneth G.
Scott, Norvell O., Jr.
Shakshober, Maclean C.
Shea, Stephen J.
Shipman, James L.
Shrake, Francis B.
Simmons, Loyd D.
Smith, Donald L.
Smith, Floyd L.
Smith, George T.
Smith, Raymond D.
Smith, Wayne H.
Sorenson, Richard C.
Spruit, Robert E.
Stadter, George B.
Stanley, Henry T., Jr.
Starkweather, Robert L.
Starr, Mark R.
Stevenson, Norman M.
Stevens, Mortimer
Stowitts, Emory V. P., Jr.
Strayve, Jerome R.
Sullivan, Robert M.
Sumney, Frank F.
Swanson, Hjalmer E.
Taft, Jesse W.
Tedholm, Charles E.
Tennyson, Durward J.
Thomas, Robert H.
Thomas, Robert E.
Thomson, Robert G., Jr.
Thurman, Russell, Jr.
Tilley, Herbert S.
Timm, Fred C.
Tobin, Dan P.
Treadwell, Archie B.
Untiedt, Hugh D., Jr.
Uretsky, Jack L.
Vaa, Norman A.
Vail, Malcolm E.
Vallely, James R.
Virostko, Joseph J.
Waddick, Robert J.
Ward, John F.
Ward, Raymond E.
Warren, Burtis W.
Webb, Babe W.
Welch, Paul R.
Wells, Frank M.
Whitney, William J.
Wilkinson, Donald W.
Willard, Charles F.
Williams, Elmer R.
Williams, James E.
Williams, Dwight L.
Williams, John H. D.
Wilson, George B., Jr.
Wollam, Raymond L.
Woody, William S.
Wright, John H.
Young, Robert D.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Allen, Paul
Armstrong, William S.
Avellone, Francis P.
Bailey, Edward F.
Baker, James J., Jr.
Beckner, Bruce A.
Bond, Calvin C.
Britt, Ernest R.
Brooks, Carol H.
Canalejo, Armando, Jr.
Challain, Leonard J.
Chapman, Edgar C., Jr.
Chazal, John P., Jr.
Cherney, Boris E.
Collins, James H.
Cornell, Felix C.
Craven, Ethridge
Creekman, Charles T.
Damon, Stewart W.
Dietz, Howard M.
Dorion, William E.
Duncan, Bryan L.
Edwards, Harry W., Jr.
Gallup, Mearl
Graves, Norman C.
Griffith, Stephen, S. D.
Hamilton, George K.
Hanson, Ever L.
Hassenger, William E.
Hay, Patrick M.
Irwin, Harry E.
Joslin, Harry W.
Kessler, Joseph E.
King, Edward D.
Klecotka, Carl J.
Knobel, Roland J., Jr.
Kompanek, Andrew J., Jr.
Kuzell, James E.
Lewis, Raymond O.

Locke, James E.
Lohman, Frank J.
Mandich, Donald R.
Martin, Robert W.
McDaniel, John M.
McKee, Richard N.
McKenzie, Harry F., Jr.
Miller, David E.
Miller, John C.
Mueller, Carl C.
Mullenmeister, William J.
Murphy, Francis J.
Nelson, Warren F.
Newton, Ernest C.
Nichols, Horace E.
Nimick, David A.
Peffley, John F.
Peterson, Clarence P., Jr.
Petro, John G.
Philion, Thomas F.
Pollitt, Ernest A.
Potter, William R.
Reese, Lawrence W.
Richwine, Alton J.
Rigg, Donald C.
Ristan, Albert G., Jr.
Robinson, James A.
Schanze, Fred, Jr.
Schirmer, August A., Jr.
Simonson, Eldon D.
Small, Donald B.
Smith, Howard W.
Smith, Joseph F.
Sprague, Raymond E.
Sulcer, Robert L.
Swopes, Bart R.
Sylvest, Robert S.
Taylor, Albert T., Jr.
Thayer, Ernest C.
Toomey, John F.
Victor, William V.
Walker, Charles L., Jr.
Wellington, Robert L.
West, John E.
Worden, Frank N.
Zenk, Lawrence P.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Allen, Max H.
Arn, John A. M.
Briggs, Fred M.
Burfield, James A.
Burkman, Eugene E.
Check, Kenneth G.
Chloupek, Carl C.
Colbert, Raymond D.
Cole, Marvin L.
Dalton, Donald F.
Daub, Leland A.
Healy, John J.
Hudson, Richard I.
Jones, Malcolm S., Jr.
Koonce, Stephen J.
McFarland, Cecil W.
Moore, Charles G., Jr.
Paul, Edwin C.
Powell, Joseph E.
Schmoker, Robert F.
Snyder, Donald C.
Tarran, David G.
Thompson, Keith R.
Umble, George R.
Vivoli, Pierre L.
White, David P.
Williams, Herbert C.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Ware, Robert M.

The following named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Achille, Frank A.
Albrecht, Fred J.
Anderson, Robert W.
Arvidson, Donald L.
Bailey, Ira V.
Bobek, Billie J.
Brown, Carl D.
Chapman, Robert W.
Cook, John M.
Cottingham, John J.
Crouch, Eugene
Denny, James T., Jr.
Dowlen, Jack H.
Eiswald, George E.
Ferguson, Alfred F.
Garlock, Dale F.
Hall, Charles W.
Hamilton, Robert C.
Hays, Harlan J.
Johnson, Wesley A.
Johnson, Edward L.
Jordan, Francis P.
Kane, Michael G.
Kenison, George E.
Kennedy, Harold L.
Lemmon, William R.
Little, Charles H.
Mayer, Richard T.
Metrolis, Albert P.
Montgomery, Paul A.
Morgan, Jack
Postlethwaite, Charles W.
Rice, Francis W.
Riggins, John E.
Smith, Raymond T.
Strunk, Gorman L.
Upton, William O., Jr.
Uzdevenes, John J.
Vanderveen, Don
Walters, Quinton O.
Wheat, Newton L.
Williams, David T.
Yelton, Harold M.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Bender, Merle D.
Brown, Chester F.
Denton, Durward W.
Doyle, John P.
Gluesing, Julius G.
Gunkel, Frederick H.
Jones, Robert L.
Mandeville, Don C.
McElhanon, Byron F.
Michler, Alexander J.
Reese, John N.
Ridpath, Raymond C.
Salmon, Douglas A.
Smith, Courtney A.
Steele, Warren E.
Stutheit, Raymond H.
Vanscoy, Richard L.
Weaver, Clyde A.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Allgood, Vernon L.
Bowen, James R.
Brouse, William
Cooper, Gordon F.
Duncan, James L.
Eslick, Taliaferro G.
Gibson, Stanley M.
Janiec, Roy T.
Keller, Robert F.
Killian, Roy G.
Kirichenko, Victor
Mincheff, Boris D.
Remillard, Wilfred J.
Sullivan, William H.
Tice, John J., III
Tucker, Robert S.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Jordan, Robert L.
Kirchhoff, Donald J.
Little, Steven M.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Naval Reserve.

Vaughan, James H., Jr.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

Fraine, Georgia A.

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Remenih, Edward J.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Raymond B. Corob, June 4, 1948.
Jack M. Fretwell, June 4, 1948.
James C. Greer, June 4, 1948.
Donald E. MacCullough, June 4, 1948.
Paul A. Sims, June 4, 1948.
William K. Witthaus, June 4, 1948.

Justus A. Muller (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of name.

Karol M. Morphew (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

Nicholas F. Truog (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of name.

Frank P. Hammon (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Frederick B. Carlson

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Michael A. Dello Russo
Livius L. Lankford
James W. Lynn, Jr.
Henry A. Schlang
William K. Woodard

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Albert C. Cornsweet
Verne W. Lyon

LIEUTENANTS

Frank W. Brown III
Robert L. Henry
John C. McNair
William W. Taylor, Jr.
Edward W. Welch, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Frances V. Cleeton
Ida G. Patrick
Dolores M. Petersen
Jewel A. Selph

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Helen J. deMariano
Anne E. Larkin
Margaret E. Leggett
Eunice Loyd

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 3 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Richard B. McEntire to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1953.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE AS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE AFORE-MENTIONED TITLE

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Ray Edison Porter
Maj. Gen. John Wilson O'Daniel

To be brigadier general

Col. David Lewis Ruffner

APPOINTMENTS TO THE POSITIONS INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 504 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Gen. Lucius DuBignon Clay to be commander in chief and military governor, United States zone, Germany, with the rank of general.

Lt. Gen. Clarence Ralph Huebner to be deputy commander in chief, United States zone, Germany, and commanding general, United States Army, Europe, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Lt. Gen. Willis Dale Crittenberger to be senior United States Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations with the rank of lieutenant general.

RETIRED LIST, UNITED STATES ARMY

ADVANCEMENT ON THE RETIRED LIST AND TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SUBSECTION 504 (D) OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be general

Maj. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Levin Hicks Campbell, Jr.
Maj. Gen. John Lesesne DeWitt
Col. Troy Houston Middleton
Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold
Maj. Gen. Wilhelm Delp Styer
Brig. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves
Lt. Gen. Raymond Albert Wheeler

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. George L. Russell, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. John D. Hayes, National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God and Father of mankind, Thou to whom all men come for counsel, grant us Thy insight to understand men of differing race and culture, Thy faith to recreate in Thy likeness, Thy love to fire our faith, Thy wisdom to order our doings aright. Strip us of selfish ends and unrighteous means, that men may see Thy will in our purpose, Thy sustaining power in our acts.

Grant us each one personal communion with Thee, Thy guidance in private devotions and in public service, the courage that comes from complete trust in Thee that men may honor and carry out the decisions here made.

Let Thy blessing rest on the States here represented, especially those in great distress, that truly brotherly affection may grow and our country be ever closer knit together.

We remember before Thee men of every race and every condition. As Thou didst send our fathers to these shores to find fullness of faith and abundant life in Thee, send us back to the lands from which we have come and on to others where men are struggling to build with them a new world from the rubble of the old.

May those who name Thy name among all nations witness more clearly to the unity of Thine indwelling spirit that we may lead the peoples of this world along the paths of enduring peace, that Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1675) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6355. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Army.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labor.
6. Department of the Navy.
7. Department of State.
8. Post Office Department.
9. Federal Communications Commission.
10 Federal Security Agency.
11. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
12. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

CALL OF PRIVATE AND CONSENT CALENDARS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday next to call bills on the Private Calendar, including an omnibus bill, and the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as was announced here by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and as the membership knows, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported a measure dealing with railroad retirement. We expect to call that bill up under suspension of the rules on Tuesday.

SUSPENSIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that suspensions which would be in order on Monday next may be in order on Tuesday next, and I may say to the membership that the only bill to be called up on Tuesday under suspension of the rules is the bill dealing with railroad retirement, to which I just referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today on the naval appropriation bill and to include certain tables.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, less than two short years ago the Eightieth Congress received its mandate from the electorate. This mandate was to place a strong padlock on the stable door through which our wealth had been escaping for more than a decade. We were pledged to balance the budget and lower taxes. We did our duty—the budget has been balanced for 2 years. For the first time in many a moon, taxes have been substantially reduced.

But the specter of inflation is still with us. The seeds of socialistic spending have been planted. The wanton weeds have spread like wildfire. They must be stopped. This Congress, elected on an economy pledge, has made a good start. Much more must be done. For years we have not recognized our country's boundaries as the limits of our squandering. We have sought to pour the hard-earned wealth of our citizens into every corner of the earth. We have weakened the very structure that Congress should strengthen. Unless we check the pressure for more and more spending, our great Republic, like so many other governments, is likely to be wrecked on the rocks of a loose fiscal policy. As President Franklin D. Roosevelt warned us in March 1933, "We must avoid this danger." The entire world, all mankind, is dependent on our solvency. We must maintain it.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to stop spending and that is to apply the brakes and restore to Government spending the automatic checks which were known to our forefathers who framed the Constitution and laws which protected us from the failures so prevalent in other countries.

I recommend the thoughtful reading of the Wall Street Journal editorial Unchecked. It asks that we stop running with the tide and face the situation squarely. Inflation, like flood or fire, will never be checked until the danger is fully recognized.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the editorial be placed in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 1, 1948]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

UNCHECKED

The pressure for government spending bears on specific projects many of which are quite worthy and benefit immediately a large number of people.

The pressure for government not to spend is support of an abstract principle. The benefits of not spending involve the sacrifice of immediate benefits for benefits which are long range and seemingly remote.

At times the pressure to save may be dramatized in some extraordinary or critical situation. But over the long run the pressure to spend will be the stronger.

So in the long run the spending of governments has been limited only by the amount of money the governments could get.

A government has three ways to get money. It can tax. But the amount of taxation people will bear is limited. Beyond that they will take revenge on the government in power. Furthermore too high taxation defeats itself by drying up the tax sources.

A government can borrow. But if a government continues to make large requests of lenders, they may finally refuse to lend. Before actual refusal, they will demand higher interest rates. The payment of these will boost all interest rates, thus striking at trade and commerce. Decline in trade and com-

merce dries up both sources of lending and sources of tax revenue.

A government may create money, either by printing it directly or by creating it through the machinery of the banking system. Until about 25 years ago men thought they had an automatic check to that too. The amount of currency was related to the supply of gold and currency was redeemable in gold. At the first sign of disposition of a government to water the currency, its holders could exchange it for gold; in other words they could refuse to do business with a bad currency.

So there were three automatic checks to government spending: Resistance to taxation, the market's verdict on the government credit and the ability to flee from a currency that might be suspect.

About the first two of these checks governments can do very little. For a government to decree that men should pay cheerfully taxes which men thought excessive would be absurd. When governments have decreed that men should lend beyond their judgment, men merely hid their assets. But governments can and do find pretexts to do away with limitations on the creation of money and they can get rid of their promise to redeem it.

In many countries all limits on the amount of currency issued have been removed. In this country there are still some limits but the redeemability which acted as a final check is gone, and without that the other limits may be easily overridden.

Well, there are two checks left. Why do we bother so much about a third one? Why not use the other two?

It is our purpose to suggest that unless all three checks are present, the other two are at least partly paralyzed and perhaps wholly useless; that as long as a government is free to get money, it will continue to spend money and that the futility of efforts to reduce government spending arises from its unchecked access to a supply of money.

If you will remove one leg from a three legged stool you do indeed have two left. But you have not a stool. You have just a piece of wood from which protrude two other pieces of wood to no good purpose whatever; and you would be tempted to throw the whole thing into the scrap heap.

The government's ability to create money certainly weakens the other two checks on its ability to get money.

Continuous increases in the money supply make it appear that taxes are easier to pay. Many people will have to pay more taxes but they still have more pieces of paper left after they have paid them and so think they are well off.

And a government which can create money need not pay much attention to the verdict of the market. It can manipulate interest rates—which is being done in this country—and it can issue bonds and then support the market for those bonds which bear an interest rate on which the government has more or less arbitrarily decided.

But the final, and the predominantly more important, point is that a government which can create money need not depend on either taxation or borrowing.

We come to the question whether the power of money creation does not cripple all effective checks on government spending; whether, so long as money is obtainable, an abstraction called economy can resist specific pressure for spending; whether the failure of efforts to check or reduce Federal budgets does not arise from government power to create money and, finally, whether the control of inflation is possible so long as that power exists.

The Congress of the United States certainly knows that increased spending risks Government deficits. It knows that deficits will be met by what is called borrowing but which is really creation of new money. It knows that this is the route to more inflation, and that more inflation means final disaster. The leaders of Congress say all that, and very few Members would disagree.

Yet knowing all that, Congress continues to vote very large sums of money. Its leaders advocate projects which would pledge further large sums, and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, warns—citing figures to prove his point—that within 3 years there may be a total deficit of about $20,000,000,000.

Now the leaders of Congress are not bad men, and they are not stupid men. In fact they are quite the opposite.

Then what makes them point to a danger, describe the route to that danger and then set their feet on that very route?

We suggest that these men are doing what men in Government always have done, which is to spend all the money they can get. And the checks which limited their ability to get it have been so weakened that they have nothing at their backs.

Or to return to our simile, they are in the ungraceful act of trying to take a position on a two-legged stool.

Well, what is to be done about all this?

It is not an easy question. Some gentlemen have ready answers, but when you go to the next authority he tells you what is wrong with the answer of the first. The program of the second runs into the objections of the third.

One suggests the return to redeemable currency. The answer is that redeemable currency can be again rendered irredeemable and that the tradition having been breached once, the second breach will be a relatively easy matter.

Another suggests that the role of the Government in central banking policy be made smaller and that the Government thus be forced to submit its borrowing proposals to the verdict of the market. That makes sense, for certainly the principal borrower ought not to be in control of the source of funds. But one does not have to be too politically experienced to see the difficulties in that proposal.

From Washington comes no better idea than an increase in bank reserves. This amounts merely to saying that more money can be created and then a part of it sterilized so that it will have no inflationary effect. If that worked at all, it would not continue to work if more money were continuously created. So we merely get back to the starting point.

This newspaper is very far from convinced that a return to a redeemable currency is unfeasible. Neither are we convinced that it need disappear with the first economic windstorm; if public sentiment supported reestablishment, the same sentiment would be a safeguard against easy elimination.

But the means of checking currency expansion is presently less important than the realization of the need for some action.

It is time, we think, to face squarely this situation:

There are disturbing signs that the Federal budget is out of control.

These signs appear, as they have appeared historically, when the guards against easy money creation have been weakened.

If the situation is acknowledged candidly the agreement on meeting it may prove the easier part of the job.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman today begins a political campaign tour across the country. As he starts I respectfully challenge him to tell the American people where he would get the $20,000 000,000 that would be necessary to finance the many projects that he has recommended to the Congress in addition to his all-time high Federal budget of $39,700,000,000.

On the demand of the Republican-controlled House Appropriations Committee, in an effort to determine how much the Federal Government owes in debt and contingent liabilities, the Budget Bureau, acting for the President, submitted the following figures, which show that after 15 years of the New Deal policies of reckless waste and extravagance, the public debt and contingent liabilities, have now reached the astronomical total of $420,360,005,629.53.

At the request of the House Appropriations Committee, the Budget Bureau listed the following items:

Direct public debt Dec. 31, 1947	$256,889,844,854.11
Contingent liabilities June 30, 1947	26,936,089,014.24
Unliquidated obligations June 30, 1947	13,787,000,000.00
Outstanding guaranteed loans June 30, 1947	6,473,673,957.18
Insurance in force June 30, 1947	116,273,397,804.00
Total	420,360,005,629.53

In addition to this, President Truman, in his annual budget message to the Congress, has not only asked for $39,700,000,000, with which to run the country for the next fiscal year, but in subsequent messages he has asked several billions for national defense, and on top of that he has sent to the Congress a train of messages that would add another $20,000,000,000 a year to the cost of Government.

For 14 years he and his party have had the votes to pass all this legislation but much of it was so bad they dared not do it.

Now, in the hope of gaining political advantage and to appeal to every pressure group and special interest, he is criticizing the Republican Party for not doing so. It is cheap politics and should deceive no one.

The fact is that if the spend-and-spend program recommended by President Truman were approved by the Congress, the result would be national bankruptcy, and ruin would stalk the land.

Furthermore, many of the money-spending recommendations of the President are pure socialism and socialism is simply the vestibule to a complete police state.

Veteran leaders in the President's own party have denounced his spend-and-spend and tax-and-tax policies as dangerous to the country's welfare and certain, if permitted to continue, to plunge our country into bankruptcy, weak and a prey to radical revolutionaries in our midst.

Senator GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, long-time member of the Senate Finance Committee, who knows what the spend-and-spend and tax-and-tax policies of the Truman administration would mean for the country, has stated that if we

continue to increase the cost of Government by billions of dollars a year, we will bankrupt the Nation. Senator GEORGE is recorded as saying he does not think Mr. Truman is "the answer to the country's prayer for leadership." Senator GEORGE also has said that Government expenditures must be "brought down to the point where we won't go bankrupt."

That is what the Republican Party and the Republican majority in the Congress think and that is why we are cutting the President's padded, spendthrift budgets.

Mr. President, I ask you to tell the American people where is the money coming from to finance your spending spree?

The American people know that taxes come from their toil and sweat. Despite your pleas and over your veto the Congress has cut taxes and we shall continue to drive to get the Government down to size and to cut taxes still further.

When the American people pay more for their Government than they do for their food bill, as they do today, it is high time that something be done about it.

The Republican Party is determined to cut unnecessary Government expenditures and to proceed wisely and within the ability of the country to pay.

President Truman has made plain what the course of his administration would be should the very unlikely catastrophe of his election occur. Many sound, solvent governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policies and that is the road Mr. Truman is following.

The President is making what is called a nonpolitical tour to the west coast in a 16-car special train at Government expense. More than 40 newspaper and radio correspondents are accompanying him. He is blaming the Republican Congress for not spending more and more money to get the Government into every conceivable scheme and device to manage the affairs of the people.

The American people are not being fooled by the President's so-called inspection tour. More properly it ought to be called a farewell tour, because it is destined to end in a political boomerang.

Of course, with his power to distribute Federal patronage and to grant favors, Mr. Truman undoubtedly will be nominated for the Presidency by his party, but for practical purposes it will not amount to much.

After the Republican Party nominates the man who will be the next President of the United States, the attention of the country will be upon him as the new leader, who will sweep away the socialistic, communistic, New Dealism of the New Deal-Democrat administration.

The people want a Republican President who will cooperate with a Republican Congress in doing the job that needs to be done in Washington; get the Government down to size, give the American way of free enterprise a chance, and stop the vacillation in our foreign relations.

Mr. President, please explain to the American people how you reconcile your statement that Government price control and rationing are police methods, with your constant clamoring for more and more power to control the lives of the American people.

And, Mr. President, will you tell the American people why you favored having the Communists included in the Government of China, while at the same time declaiming against Communist aggression in other parts of the world?

Also, Mr. President, will you explain to the people why you give mere lipservice to elimination of disloyal persons from our Government pay roll while you deplore Communists' aggression abroad?

Mr. President, in your Chicago speech will you tell the people how the New Deal Democrat administration sold Poland and the other liberty-loving peoples of Europe "down the Volga" to Soviet Russia?

Tell the people how your long adherence to the revengeful, stupid Morgenthau plan to hold Germany to a purely agricultural nation, held back the recovery of all of Europe for years.

And tell the people that the bungling and fumbling in foreign affairs by present and past New-Deal Democrat administrations have blocked lasting peace and made it necessary for us to strengthen and expand our national defense at a cost of billions of dollars 3 years after the end of the most devastating war in history.

Also, Mr. President, since you are now campaigning for the Presidency, it is in order for you to tell the people that because of your failures in foreign affairs America today is confronted by high prices for the necessities of life.

Tell them the sending of billions of dollars worth of goods to foreign countries from our short supplies, together with the diversion of materials and manpower to national-defense expansion, are root causes of the high cost of living.

And all of this, you might add, has been piled upon the biggest Government deficit-spending spree in the country's history, dating back to the advent of the New Deal in 1933.

VOLUNTEER RESERVES

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the House passed an appropriation bill authorizing the expenditure of $6,500,000,000 for military preparedness. Out of this tremendous sum only 1½ percent, or $100,000,000, is to be used for the work of the Organized Reserves.

The Department of Defense is demanding more manpower, and the reports are correct we shall presently debate a bill designed to provide 700,000 additional soldiers over a period of 2 years. Less than 3 years ago, immediately after VJ-day, the Army and Air Force had available to them in the Organized Reserves a total of 1,100,000 men, all of them war trained—600,000 enlisted men and 500,000 officers. Why do the services not make more constructive and effective use of these volunteer Reserves? They have failed to carry out any kind of an adequate Reserve training program, and, in consequence, morale is at a very low point among both officers and enlisted men who joined the Reserves.

The report of the Appropriations Committee tells us that—

> The committee was not impressed with the presentation of the needs for the funds requested—
>
> For the Reserves—
>
> or with the manner in which this program is apparently being conducted.

What is the reason, if there is one, for neglecting the Reserve program and giving the Appropriations Committee a completely unimpressive presentation of its needs and activities?

Many of us who regard the Organized Reserves as a vitally important element of our plan of national defense are inclined to look with a critical eye on the requests for peacetime conscription and universal military training until we find out what the Army intends to do with the manpower it already has. Specifically, it seems to me that these questions demand an immediate answer:

First. Why have the Reserves not been organized into table of organization units?

Second. Why have substantially all of the officers and enlisted men in the Reserves not been assigned to such units?

Third. Why have the Departments of the Army and Air Force refused to ask sufficient funds for both inactive and active duty training for Reserve personnel?

Fourth. Why do the Departments continue to explain deficiencies in the Reserve program without taking affirmative action to correct the deficiencies?

Fifth. Why is sufficient equipment not made available for training of Reserve personnel when only 3 years ago we had equipment enough for 11,000,000 officers and men on a war status?

Sixth. Why is it that today there is not a single Reserve unit trained and equipped for use in an emergency?

These questions go to the heart of the problem of utilizing the Organized Reserves effectively, and I think we must have complete and convincing answers to them before we can act intelligently to meet our manpower requirements for national defense purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a eulogy of Senator TAFT and in the other a criticism of the public housing program and include in each an editorial.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Paul E. Fitzpatrick.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each editorials.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Miami Herald.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Questionable Trade Practices of the Committee on Public Works may be allowed to sit during general debate today and tomorrow. I have conferred with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and it is satisfactory to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE MINISTERS WITH THE STATE OF ISRAEL NOW

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the state of Israel has again shown its desire to live at peace with the world. It promptly accepted the unfair British plan of a truce as adopted by the UN. Its ceasefire order came at a time when the defense army of the state of Israel was prepared to launch a devastating attack on the Arab aggressors which would have stopped them in their tracks.

The answer was continued warfare by the British-instigated and abetted Arab brigands under the leadership of their feudal chieftains.

Our country which did so much to bring this new democracy into being, and which was the first to accord it recognition, should now be the first country to exchange ministers with it. Such immediate action will be evidence of our intention to implement our words with deeds.

We should promptly lift the unfortunate embargo on arms to the state of Israel.

We should immediately enter into lend-lease agreements with the new state, not only to help bring hostilities to an end, but in order to relocate the thousands of Jews still being supported in displaced persons camps in Europe. The state of Israel is ready and willing to assume the burden, now being borne by the United States, to sustain and rehabilitate these harassed people. The saving in dollars alone, aside from the humanitarian motives involved, should be sufficient incentive for the United States to so proceed.

President Truman is quoted as saying that the Jews always pay their debts. No one can gainsay that. It is high time for the world to begin to pay a small part of its debt to them, a debt created by the blood, bones, and ashes of Jews the world over.

Let us prove we still have the intestinal fortitude that conceived this Nation and made it great.

The time to act is now. Let us go forward under the banner of liberty before it is too late. Stop talking—act.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY RAISE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, for many months now the Members of Congress have been considering a pay raise for all Federal employees. With the increased cost of living the need for such legislation is indisputable. However, recently the limelight of public attention, and that of Congress, has been focussed on broader and more spectacular measures designed to cope with international affairs. Therefore, the hour for the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress is approaching with the distinct possibility that this deserving and well-earned raise for the loyal employees of our Government will be forgotten in the hustle and shuffle of the closing days.

Private industry has recognized that in order for its employees to meet the cost of the necessities of life, several increases had to be granted. Federal employees cannot resort to the strike weapon or otherwise protect themselves and can only ask that we, the Members of Congress, recognize their legitimate request.

It seems to me that in fairness to them, for the protection of their welfare and to maintain the efficiency of our Government, it is essential that this Congress should raise the wages of all Federal employees. The problem is an immediate and pressing one and we cannot with good conscience postpone action any longer.

COMMUNISM AT HOME

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from various publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has gone a long way in providing funds for ERP, sometimes referred to as the Marshall plan, or the Bevin plan, by burdening the American taxpayers under the pretense of fighting communism in foreign countries.

On yesterday the vanguard of communism invaded this Capital. I have never seen such a motley multitude of alleged misplaced persons and colored supplements. They insulted both Houses of the Congress of the United States. Strange as it may seem, the other body seems to have got excited and passed a bill to bring in 200,000 more of them. I hope the House does not make that mistake.

These Communists even went down to the White House and insulted the President of the United States.

They attempted to insult every Member of Congress. In the name of common sense, how long are we going to tax the American people, appropriate money and send a few radicals abroad to spend it, while these Reds continue to stir up trouble here at home?

Instead of bringing more of them into this country, we ought to be shipping some of them out.

Are we going to spend these billions of dollars in foreign countries ostensibly fighting communism abroad, and at the same time permit these Communists to invade the Capitol, insult the Congress of the United States, wave the red flag in the face of a Senate committee, and go to the White House and insult the President?

It is about time the Congress woke up to the fact that the only thing we have done that is worth a tinker's dam as far as stopping communism is concerned was the passing of the bill providing for the 70-group air force and for an abundant supply of atomic bombs. Let us give notice to the world that we are not going to tolerate the activities of this communistic riff-raff that is attempting to undermine and destroy American institutions.

It is more imperative than ever that the anti-Communist bill, known as the Mundt-Nixon bill, be passed without delay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXCISE TAX EXEMPTION OF TOILET PREPARATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3825) to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what does this bill do?

Mr. CURTIS. This bill, H. R. 3825, is in the nature of a revision. It does not grant any special favor to any group interested in excise taxes. Its purpose is to meet a specific problem and to eliminate a frightening and unreasonable certificate that the operator of a barber or beauty shop must sign in connection with cosmetics used on the customer and the cosmetics sold at retail. There are some companion bills, one of which has been offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], which are identical with this measure.

At the present time the cosmetic supplies that a barber or beautician uses on the customer, which are the tools of their trade, are subject to the tax. They pay this tax when they buy the supplies. If they sell cosmetics at retail, they do not pay the tax when they buy the cosmetics, but they collect the tax from the customer when they sell it retail and then transmit. This double system of taxation leads to endless confusion and hardship and requires the signing of a certificate which contains this statement:

It is understood that the fraudulent use of this certificate to secure exemption will

subject the undersigned and all guilty parties to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years.

In order to eliminate this certificate, we are removing in this bill the tax on those cosmetics that the barbers and beauticians use on customers in their shops. It does not affect the tax on cosmetics generally. If a barber or beauty shop sells cosmetics at retail, the tax will be paid the same as a drug store or department store does at the present time.

Mr. RICH. When the barber purchases those cosmetics, does he pay the tax the same as I do if I go to a store and purchase them?

Mr. CURTIS. He has to do it both ways at the present time. He has to pay the tax now when he buys cosmetics to use in his shop. If he buys some to sell to his customer, he does not pay the tax on that, but must collect from the customer and remit the tax to the Government. That is where the confusion arises.

Mr. RICH. When he buys it originally, he has to pay the tax; and if he sells it, then he does not have to collect the tax. Is that what you are trying to do?

Mr. CURTIS. No; that is not correct.

Mr. RICH. Then why should not the barber buy it and resell it when the tax is being paid?

Mr. CURTIS. He does not do that. He must account for the tax on that which he retails the same as any other seller of cosmetics.

Mr. RICH. In other words, everybody is going to be treated right, but nobody is going to be eliminated.

Mr. CURTIS. On the retail sale of cosmetics—that is correct.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This bill was carefully considered and unanimously reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means. After full consideration, it was decided that it is a meritorious bill.

Mr. RICH. All I am interested in is seeing that everybody pays and that you treat everybody alike.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except when sold to any person operating a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof."

That section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is repealed.

The amendment made by this act to section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the repeal of section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Anderson, Calif.	Hartley	Nicholson
Barden	Heffernan	Nodar
Bell	Hendricks	O'Toole
Bland	Holifield	Owens
Boykin	Jenkins, Pa.	Patterson
Buckley	Jennings	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Ill.	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Riley
Chiperfield	Johnson, Tex.	Rivers
Clark	Kearney	Robertson
Clippinger	Kee	Rooney
Coffin	Kefauver	Russell
Cole, Kans.	Kelley	Sadowski
Cole, Mo.	Kennedy	Scoblick
Combs	Kilday	Scott, Hardie
Cooper	King	Shafer
Cox	Knutson	Sheppard
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Short
Dirksen	Lichtenwalter	Sikes
Dorn	Ludlow	Simpson, Ill.
Durham	Lusk	Simpson, Pa.
Elliott	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Engle, Calif.	Macy	Somers
Fernandez	Madden	Stigler
Fuller	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Gore	Miller, Calif.	Tollefson
Gwynne, Iowa	Monroney	Twyman
Hale	Muhlenberg	West
Harless, Ariz.	Mundt	Whittington

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate this afternoon to consider the subject of housing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him on Memorial Day.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE CRITICAL NEED FOR HOUSING

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to remind any Member of the House of the critical need for housing which exists throughout our Nation. From my own observation and from comments made to me by other Members, it is apparent that the situation is most acute with respect to veterans and families of low income. The housing shortage is national in scope and it presents a problem urgently calling for national legislation.

Most of all, I think we need to provide additional incentives for private builders which will enable our system of free enterprise to supply more adequately the housing units needed.

Definitely we need a permanent extension of title VI of the National Housing Act to assist in home financing on the basis of current construction costs. There are many evidences also that we need to provide a secondary mortgage market and additional devices for stimulating the financing and construction of cooperative housing, particularly for veterans.

Although there is divergence of opinion concerning the propriety of Federal assistance in connection with slum clearance and subsidized housing for low-income families, it is my feeling that the entire House membership should have an opportunity to participate in and listen to full debate on these proposals, with a view to determining their feasibility and to taking such action as appears to be wise.

For many weeks I have been hoping that the Committee on Banking and Currency would complete its deliberations on several proposals before it and report a bill to the House floor. It is gratifying to note from this morning's newspapers that housing legislation has been placed on the must list for action at this session of Congress, and that the committee chairman expects to report a bill early next week.

I sincerely hope that a proper measure will be presented promptly for consideration by the House and that there will be ample time for full and complete discussion of all the controversial proposals, to the end that legislation may be enacted to meet the pressing needs of our Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I inserted in the RECORD an edi-

torial with regard to the Mundt-Nixon bill. I would like to add a supplement to that in the form of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6772, with Mr. RIZLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy commenced its consideration of appropriations for the Navy for fiscal 1949 way back on the 18th day of November, last.

Then we suspended operations until the original estimates were received early in January. As I recall it, we went to work again on the 14th of February. We were again interrupted around the 17th of March when action on the original estimates was discontinued pending receipt of supplemental requests, the first of which reached us around the 8th of April. Then, on the 13th of May, we received the second supplemental estimate, held the necessary hearings, and finally were able to mark up the bill and present it for the consideration of the full committee which reported it without amendment yesterday.

I should say in passing, as did J. Mason Knox, that—

> It is not the guns or armament
> Or the money they can pay,
> It's the close cooperation
> That makes them win the day.
> It is not the individual
> Or the army as a whole,
> But the everlastin' teamwork
> Of every bloomin' soul.

The subcommittee has been particularly fortunate in the assignment to it of its executive secretary, Kenneth Sprankle, who knows the Navy from top to bottom and, always ready to supply us with the informaation we sought, has made a very great contribution which I am sure all members of the subcommittee appreciate very thoroughly.

While we congratulate our friend and collaborator, the gentleman from Indiana, Representative NOBLE JOHNSON, on his nomination by the President to be judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and approve the President's selection so made, we realize that what the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals has gained is our loss as well as the loss of the whole House. The gentleman from Indiana is an outstanding and very able lawyer and particularly well informed on all matters with respect to expenditures which come under consideration by the Appropriations Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take much time. Before I discuss the items of appropriations which are before you for consideration I wish to emphasize the fact that the world stands today on the threshold of its greatest opportunity. I believe we will seize that opportunity. I feel that this may be humanity's last opportunity. I pray God the day may come when there is no longer a need for any Army or any Navy.

The arrival of that day can be speeded by the reasonable maintenance of America's might until the hopes and dreams of today are translated into the living, effective world organizations of tomorrow. That happy event will be postponed and perhaps may never materialize unless America retains and develops a Navy which will be capable of snuffing out any threat against the just and enduring peace for which the entire world yearns.

Today America stands as the bulwark of liberty, the last resort, the final field on which those may land who fight or have fought for liberty upon this planet.

There are two conflicting concepts of government, the clash of which resounds around the world today. Upon the outcome of this conflict depends the future of the world. The two conflicting ideologies and doctrines of government cannot coexist in the world. That is a fact which must be faced factually.

By force of circumstances, the United States has been driven into a position of world leadership, never sought; has been compelled to become the world's banker, the world's Samaritan of mercy, the world's coordinator of unity, facing facts so realistic as to be beyond the bourne of wishful thinking. It is our God-given destiny.

Every American and all Americans have but one concept of government: That is to assure that every man may live in peace with his neighbors. That may be local, but it has become the burden of our national responsibility to see to it that the peoples of the world, beyond our own local orbit, shall have the same rights of self-determination as ours. Whether we like it or not, we are forced to assume that burden of responsibility. We either have to carry it out or quit. We will not quit.

I have the peculiar notion that the people of the United States are God's chosen agents to undertake to see to it that the peoples of every nation shall be enabled to carry out civilization's program, to choose their own form of government. That is for what we fought, right or wrong, in World War I and in World War II—or else we fought in vain.

We have fought in order that small, weak nations might be made free, that they should not be overrun, despoiled, and enslaved. We poured millions of fighting forces and millions of dollars in munitions and supplies of war into the theater of war to that end—in order that such a war as that of which we were a part might determine the fact that all men might be free.

Americans are not warmongers. We are not militaristic. We have no designs on other peoples or other territories. We are, however, determined to stand for and by the ideals and principles of our own Nation. We will never abandon or compromise these ideologies because of those, either at home or abroad, who are working to destroy our democracy.

America must be strong. It must be secure against aggression, both military and ideological. America must be ready to meet every contingency. Our armed might, reinforced and sustained always by the loyalty and determination of our people, backed by our great productive strength, must be adequately maintained until we are able to prevail upon other nations to accept judicial settlement of international disputes as a substitute for the horrors of war, and to establish perpetual peace.

The challenge of peace runs the whole gamut of the challenge of life itself. Just as individuals are judged by their ability to meet the emergencies of life, so it is also with nations. To meet such exigencies is by no means an easy task. We shall make it no easier by refusal to face the facts.

We must never forget that it is the respect for our power of enforcement that makes it possible for us to administer law, not the language of the law itself, the parchment on which it is written, nor the names of signatory powers thereto appended.

Therefore, we must be well prepared and have an overpowering military, naval, and air force establishment which will command and deserve respect and be able if necessity requires to enforce our demand that the world shall be at peace.

Our people want peace and security. The peace of the world and the security of all requires the maintenance by us of a strong national defense. Congress has provided and will continue to provide the necessary funds for the maintenance of an army, a navy, and an air force to guarantee that the United States will continue to be supreme on the land, on the sea, and in the air.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have brought you this bill to appropriate what we believe to be sufficient funds to carry out such an American program, to build and to operate and to maintain a navy adequate to meet the demands of the occasion, to measure up to our burden of responsibility for world leadership which is our destiny.

I will now discuss briefly some of the items to which I think your attention should be called with respect to the bill which is before you for consideration, making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

As you will observe if you read the report which we have submitted in explanation of this bill, the budget estimates were $3,927,738,700, as against which we recommended an appropriation of $3,686,733,250, which represents a reduction below the budget estimates of $241,005,450.

COST OF THE NAVY

As suggested in the report, the committee believes that it has an obligation

to impress upon the country the fact that we are today operating a larger naval establishment than the current appropriations will support in normal times, due to the fact that the Navy is still living, in considerable part, on its wartime inventory.

The table on page 3 of the report shows that the actual cost of the Navy in 1947 was considerably in excess of the appropriation, which was also the case in 1948. We estimate that in 1949 the excess will be $1,300,000,000. The question which will confront Congress eventually is this: Are we going to continue even larger appropriations to maintain the same size Navy, or can we safely maintain our place in the world with a smaller one?

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that when you look at these appropriations you should consider the fact that we are taking advantage of the supplies now on hand which the Navy can utilize, which supplies will undoubtedly be exhausted before another bill for appropriations for the Navy is brought before the House for consideration. I cannot see how, after the supplies now on hand are exhausted, there can help but be a bill for a larger amount for appropriation brought before the House for its consideration by reason of the fact of the necessary rehabilitation and the purchase of new supplies. I pass that out for your consideration.

FLEET

Now, as to the fleet, we gave a lot of time and consideration to the matter of the size of the fleet.

We are very sure that the appropriations which we have recommended will permit the Navy to allocate 277 major combatant ships and 486 auxiliary craft, or a total of 763 vessels to the active fleet in the fiscal year 1949. This will leave in the reserve fleet, 644 major combatant and 1,215 other vessels, or a total of 1,879 in an inactive status.

The reserve fleet continues to be one of the major war reserves of the Nation. Consisting as it does of groups of modern preserved ships with which the active fleet could be quadrupled in size as quickly as crews could be assembled, it must be protected as a real national asset.

For the information of the general public I am including a table which shows the make-up of these fleets and their costs:

Reserve fleets, vessels and maintenance costs, fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949

Type of vessel	Average vessels in reserve fleets		
	Fiscal 1947	Fiscal 1948	Fiscal 1949
Combatant	693	664	663
Minecraft	137	141	141
Patrol craft	72	72	72
Landing craft	546	554	552
Auxiliaries	411	449	451
Subtotal	1,859	1,880	1,879
District craft	125	141	141
Floating drydocks	4	50	50
Subtotal	129	191	191
Total	1,988	2,071	2,070

Appropriation title	Maintenance costs, exclusive of laying-up charges		
	1947	1948	1949
Maintenance, Bureau of Ships:			
Repairs, etc.	$27,032,000	$20,300,000	$15,622,000
Supplies and equipage	5,970,000	3,300,000	3,128,000
Subtotal	33,002,000	23,600,000	18,750,000
Ordnance and ordnance stores	3,658,300	5,299,934	1,001,250
Maintenance, yards and docks	7,340,867	7,972,402	6,973,714
Pay and subsistence	[1] 33,211,000	[1] 33,211,000	[1] 33,211,000
Aviation, Navy	100,700	100,700	100,700
Total	77,312,867	70,184,036	60,036,664

[1] Includes pay only of 1,000 officers and 13,800 enlisted men assigned to reserve fleet in 1949.

CONTINGENCIES OF THE NAVY

We allowed the full amount of the budget estimate, which is $12,000,000, an increase over the 1948 amount because of a desire to allow the Secretary ample funds to meet unforeseen contingencies.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

We allowed $45,000,000 for basic research under the appropriation "Research, Navy," which, with various other titles throughout the bill, provides a total of $268,000,000 for research.

I am inserting a table which shows the comparison as between the amounts we have recommended and those available for the same purpose in the current fiscal year:

Appropriation	1948	1949
Medical Department, Navy	$2,842,344	$2,935,663
Maintenance:		
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	1,000,000	500,000
Bureau of Ships	45,000,000	30,350,000
Aviation, Navy	75,000,000	110,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks	900,000	1,644,743
Ordnance and ordnance stores	52,500,000	65,030,000
Ordnance for new construction	17,933,650	10,827,575
Increase and replacement of naval vessels (armor, armament, and ammunition)	9,120,795	2,063,420
Research, Navy	34,000,000	45,000,000
Total	238,296,789	268,351,401

In the report which is before you, we stated:

In the reduction of $8,108,000 made in the estimate for "Research, Navy" the committee has declined to approve the request of $5,000,000 which was set up in the justifications simply as a contingent item. The committee suggests that for ensuing years the appropriation structure be so readjusted that this appropriation will not carry the cost of production of synthetic training devices, inasmuch as the bureaus using such devices should provide the funds therefor. Only in that way can the expenditures of funds under this title be restricted to actual research purposes. The committee feels that reimbursement should be made to this appropriation by the bureaus which order production work for their own purposes.

NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

We approved the budget estimate in full to carry on the work in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 and approved $14,600,000 additional for exploration in Alaska. That there is an absolute necessity to locate all possible sources of petroleum to meet the requirements of this country need not be argued.

ISLAND GOVERNMENT

We reduced the appropriation for this item in the amount of $250,000, for we felt that the program should be reduced more rapidly than present plans now contemplate for, that the best interests of the Government of the United States and the people governed will be served thereby and by a more aggressive program attempting to put these island people on their own resources.

PENALTY MAIL

In line with appropriations carried in other bills, we denied the $2,500,000 requested for this facility.

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE

We recognized the importance of the program carried on by this office. We approved the consolidation of three former appropriation titles, reduced the appropriation $442,000 by reason of such consolidation, and suggested a revision of the pricing procedure in connection with the sale of charts and maps to meet the actual cost of production.

BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL—TRAINING AND EDUCATION

As appears in the report:

The committee has approved the proposal to consolidate under this one title several items that were formerly carried separately under the following titles: "Naval training stations at Great Lakes, Ill., San Diego, Calif., and Newport, R. I."; "Naval War College"; and "Instruction, Navy"; and recommends an appropriation of $13,000,000, a reduction of $745,000 below the estimate. The consolidation was proposed by the Navy in order to secure more efficient and more economical administration and on that account the reduction made in the estimate should not result in any curtailment of the various programs involved.

WELFARE OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

This new title contains a consolidation of two appropriations formerly carried as "Libraries, Navy," and "Welfare and recreation, Navy." The committee has approved an appropriation of $2,400,000, a reduction of $110,000 below the estimate. Here again consolidation should produce more effective use of funds and secure the same service for a lesser expenditure.

OFFICER CANDIDATE TRAINING

The committee recommends $12,000,000 under this title which is the same amount as originally recommended by the committee in the 1948 bill. After strong insistence by the Navy, however, the committee finally agreed to an appropriation of $15,000,000, which has been proven to be more than the Navy could use. As of April 30, 1948, with 83 percent of the year past, only 61 percent or $9,216,000, had been obligated in the fiscal year 1948. The committee wholeheartedly approves of the program but can see no need of appropriating more money than the Navy can absorb.

In connection with all programs for educating, developing, and training officers the committee feels that the Navy should take more positive steps to see that a reasonable amount of service is given to the Government after it has paid for the training and development of an officer, than has been given in many cases in the past.

NAVAL RESERVE

The committee recommends $125,000,000 for this program, a reduction of $4,224,350 in the estimate. This program has the full ap-

proval of the committee and the reduction is not made with the purpose of curtailing it. However, through April 30, 1948, only 67 percent, or $67,000,000 of the 1948 appropriation had been obligated. With such a record of performance up to the present time, the committee does not see how the Navy can use more than $125,000,000 for 1949.

NAVAL ACADEMY

Let me call your attention to what we have to say about the operation of the Naval Academy and again quote from the report, as follows:

The committee recommends $5,020,000 for operation of the Naval Academy. The committee is astounded at the number of resignations from the service of graduates of the Academy within a very short time after completion of their scholastic work.

Thirty percent of the Naval Academy class which graduated in June 1945 resigned from the service upon completing 2 years' active duty. The committee is not in accord with the Navy Department's policy that 2 years' active service in the fleet is an acceptable minimum return to the Government for the excellent education provided to these young men. It, therefore, urges that the Department initiate changes which would require, except in extenuating circumstances, that each graduate of the Naval Academy who is physically qualified be required to accept a commission and to serve on active duty for a minimum of at least 5 years before his resignation will be considered.

Similarly, action should be initiated to secure modification of legislation to insure adequate return to the Government for its expenditure on Naval Reserve officers' training graduates. It is considered that at least 3 years' active duty, and preferably 5, followed by duty in the Reserve elements would be a more equitable return to the Government.

It is placing a most unfair burden on the taxpayers of the United States to provide such an outstanding education as given at the Naval Academy and in other officer-training programs of the Navy, only to have the officer resign from the service upon graduation or relatively soon thereafter.

In the act for 1948 the committee inserted a provision limiting to 1,025 the number of enlisted men of the Navy or Marine Corps that could be assigned at any one time to duty at the Naval Academy. The committee has denied the request to delete this limitation, as it was shown in the hearings that the number of men so assigned was considerably below the limit set in the law.

BUREAU OF SHIPS

This brings us to consideration of the Bureau of Ships and the question of its maintenance. If you will look at your report, you will find on page 9 a table which is self-explanatory. I will repeat, however, what we of the subcommittee told the full committee with respect to this matter:

The committee recommends an appropriation of $350,000,000, which is $17,443,000 below the total estimate, and $37,157,000 above the original estimate for this purpose submitted in the regular 1949 budget. For the fiscal year 1948 a total amount of $370,000,000 was available in this appropriation by reason of the direct appropriation of $320,000,000 plus a transfer of $50,000,000. At the request of the Chief of the Bureau of Ships a proviso was carried in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, allowing the use of $20,000,000 of 1948 "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships" funds for the purpose of liquidating obligations incurred under the same appropriation during the fiscal year 1946. The Bureau considered it most advantageous that such an arrangement be granted. It will thus be seen that the amount available in the fiscal year 1949 will be the same as the new authority which has been made available in the fiscal year 1948. The committee is of the opinion that the Bureau of Ships with the amount provided can continue to maintain the fleet in good condition during the fiscal year 1949.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

On the same page you will find also a table showing the appropriations for 1948 and the budget estimate for 1949 and the amount which we recommend for ordnance and ordnance stores:

The committee recommends an appropriation of $210,000,000 under this title which gives the program $26,000,000 above the 1948 appropriation while cutting $56,860,000 from the total budget estimate. The original budget estimate submitted in January requested $195,650,000.

The committee could not help but notice the lack of coordination between many of the requests of th Navy in the hearings on the original budget. Time and time again assurance was given that the budget as first presented was in complete balance and that to change any part of it would be to throw the remainder into disorder. However, when the supplemental estimates were considered it was clearly evident and admitted that many of the items being requested in the supplemental were nothing more or less than corrections of the original budget and the committee could only come to the conclusion that in many cases the opportunity to submit a supplemental estimate was used to request items which had been rejected by the Bureau of the Budget in the original presentation. This holds true not only for the Bureau of Ordnance, but in most of the other bureaus' requests as well. In some cases requirements were listed 9 or 10 times greater than they were only 3 months ago. The committee realizes that the situation has greatly changed since the original presentation, but this criticism is directed to obvious adjustments in the budget not related directly to new developments.

I am inserting these portions of our report in this RECORD because I think the people of the country are entitled to the information which the subcommittee presented in its report to the full committee, which report is before you as you consider this bill. The statements were carefully made, and I know of no better way to get the substance before you and before the country than by frequent reference to and quotation from the report.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

When it comes to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts we recommended the full amount of the budget estimate for pay of naval personnel, $1,215,912,000.

We reduced the appropriation for "Transportation and recruiting" to the tune of $1,800,000, for there is no indication which would lead us to believe that the expense incident to transportation and recruiting will be any greater than during the fiscal year 1948.

We allowed the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts $200,000,000 for its maintenance, which is the same amount as allowed in 1948. You will notice that there was available in 1948 a direct appropriation of $150,000,000 plus transfer authority of $50,000,000.

We have suggested that the Bureau give its full attention to and concentrate upon inventorying and cataloging the material on hand and that which is being returned from overseas, at the earliest possible date.

FUEL, NAVY

So far as "Fuel, Navy" is concerned, we recommended an appropriation of $65,000,000 which is $11,000,000 above the amount available in the current fiscal year. As pointed out in the report, this is an item which is subject to considerable variation as prices continue to rise.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

We have recommended an appropriation of $40,000,000 for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, which amount represents a reduction in the estimate of $343,000 but an increase of $2,500,000 over the amount available in 1948.

The Medical Department is the only one, so far as we know, which actually shows, already, some of the benefits which may be derived from unification of the services. Although even here there are further possible economies in sight, we learn that the Navy and the Army are cooperating and each has made available to the other its hospitalization benefits and services.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

Insofar as the Bureau of Yards and Docks is concerned, we appropriated $17,550,000 above the 1948 figure.

When it comes to moving Navy personnel to the Pentagon Building, we think that is a matter which should be handled by the Public Buildings Administration. We discuss that on page 12 of the report, to which I call your attention.

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

I think the people are entitled to know the details with respect to our appropriation for the Bureau of Aeronautics—excluding construction of aircraft—and what we have to say about "Aviation, Navy"; so I am going to insert, with your permission, the statement which we made in our report:

Bureau of Aeronautics (excluding construction of aircraft)

1948 appropriations	Total 1949 budget estimate	Amount recommended in bill for 1949	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with—	
			Appropriations, 1948	Budget estimates, 1949
$411,000,000	$617,268,000	$575,000,000	+$164,000,000	−$42,268,000

NOTE.—1949 estimate for "Construction of aircraft" of $315,000,000 (of which $150,000,000 is to liquidate prior contractual authority) plus new contractual authority of $588,000,000 carried in the Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948.

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT

The accompanying bill carries no appropriation for the construction of aircraft inasmuch as that program was carried in the Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1948. Under that act there was appropriated the sum of $315,000,000 in cash, plus contract authority of $588,000,000. Of the cash appropriated, $150,000,000 was to liquidate contract authority previously granted so that in all a new program in the amount of $753,000,000 has been given to the Navy during the present session of Congress for the procurement of aircraft.

AVIATION, NAVY

An appropriation of $575,000,000 is recommended for this title which is divided into three categories, namely: Replacement of navigation and radio equipment, $25,000,000; maintenance of aviation shore establishment, $440,000,000; and research and development, $110,000,000. The bill approves in full the amount requested for research and development, but reduces the estimate for maintenance of the shore establishment and operation of aircraft by approximately $41,000,000. Under the supplemental request the Bureau of Aeronautics proposed the reopening of 14 additional air stations. The committee does not believe that the reactivation of so many stations is necessary, but rather that it would be more economical to increase activities at stations already in full commission.

It has often been stated by the Navy that their stations were only allowed to operate at a fraction of their normal capacity. The committee believes that it would be a better practice to open fewer additional stations and thereby save money which would otherwise be needed for additional administrative expense involved in the operation of a greater number of activities.

The revised estimate proposed the operation of 8,035 aircraft in the Regular Navy and 2,678 in the Reserve program. Another example arises here where stocks of considerable value are drawn from existing inventory. New planes are not coming into the fleet to equal the rate of use and consequently the Navy will be required to draw some planes from the supply in storage.

Language is carried authorizing the extension for 1 year of the unexpended balance of the appropriation "Aviation, Navy, 1946." Certain important contracts—some dealing in research and development work—undertaken under this appropriation have been delayed through causes beyond the control of the Navy. Testimony indicated that the contracts could not be terminated without definite loss to the Government. The other course of permitting the obligated balance to lapse would require the contractor to collect through complicated claims procedure and would thus work an undue hardship on the contractor as well as additional cost to the Government in the long run. It is anticipated that during the fiscal year 1949 these matters can be concluded.

MARINE CORPS

We have approved the full budget estimate of pay for officers and pay of enlisted men in the Marine Corps, but we cut the appropriation for pay under the Reserve program of the Marine Corps by about $500,000, which cut is justified by the situation which obtains with respect to the Naval Reserve.

SHIPBUILDING

With respect to shipbuilding, we recommended the approval of the original budget estimate in the amount of $56,800,000 for "Construction of ships," $9,470,000 for "Ordnance for new construction," a total of $66,270,000.

We approved a transfer of $14,300,000 to "Construction of ships" from an appropriation "Increase and replacement of naval vessels, construction, and machinery," and a transfer of $1,700,000 to "Ordnance for new construction" from the appropriation "Increase and replacement of naval vessels, armor, armament, and ammunition," which makes a total of $16,000,000.

In this total appropriation is carried $5,200,000, in round numbers, to cover the beginning of work on the new 65,000-ton super aircraft carrier of the flush-deck type. There is no need for legislation authorizing the construction of this super aircraft carrier, for it is authorized under the Vinson-Trammell Act which limits the amount of tonnage for construction purposes to which the Navy is entitled.

You may be interested to know that we approved language making permanent a prohibition against using any of the balances remaining in this appropriation for the start of new construction of any type. We went further than that, for we declined to approve language which we were requested to insert to make balances of the appropriation available for the pay of people engaged in technical services and the purchase of plans and other supplies involved in the construction of vessels heretofore authorized. We did not feel any such language was necessary for the program which has been operating through 1948 did not carry any such language, and no question with respect thereto or with respect to the right to so operate has been raised by any agency having jurisdiction.

There is no legislation in this bill which requires a rule.

So, briefly, I have covered the outstanding items to which your attention should be directed. Anything which I have omitted will be discussed by other members of the committee.

This is a good bill and a fair bill. Sufficient money is appropriated thereunder for the Navy in order for it and America to maintain their place in the sun.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In connection with penalty mail, I think it might be well to point out that we were informed that by eliminating this section it would also avoid the necessity of using between 65 and 68 employees who did nothing except monitor this mail through, an absolutely futile service.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. When the NATS carried the mail, the mail was carried free and that organization handled better than $5,000,000 worth of mail each year.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman is correct. The cut was justified.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In cutting the appropriation for the Naval Reserve, I wonder if the committee took into consideration that the program of the Naval Reserve was somewhat stymied during the present fiscal year by reason of the lack of equipment, and so forth? If that equipment is available for the next fiscal year, will they not need more money to carry on their activities?

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman is absolutely right in respect to that. But we have allowed them $25,000,000 more, or 25 percent more than they have for the present year, and it should be ample.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In other words, if a deficiency is necessary, the money will be appropriated.

Mr. PLUMLEY. We are in full approval of the program. But, as I stated, the facts are that only 67 percent of the money we appropriated was used or obligated up to April 30, 1948, and on that basis we could not find ourselves justified to allow any more than we did. I assured them, and I assure the gentleman, that you will find this committee cooperating with them; in fact, the Naval Reserve is this committee's baby.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I commend the gentleman and his committee for their consideration of the Naval Reserve program.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I recall in reading the hearings that the chairman of the committee raised a question in connection with the activities of the Naval Reserve in New England, and received some assurances, though there appeared to be a lack of interest in the postwar development of the Naval Reserve, that they would receive favorable attention. Are those assurances satisfactory?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I think so.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Did the gentleman gain the impression over-all, and did the members of this committee gain the impression, at least at the conclusion of these hearings, that the Naval Reserve program would have the wholehearted cooperation of the Navy Department and that that program would go forward?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 additional minutes.

As the gentleman well knows, it has been quite a difficult situation by reason of some things perhaps that we should not talk about, in the nature of jealousies, and the right to use armories, and the right to use facilities, which has prohibited the growth of the Naval Reserve to the extent which the subcommittee, and I am very sure the whole Committee on Appropriations, would like to see it grow. Those things are being ironed out. The national necessities are such that these little petty obstructions are being removed gradually and the field for the development for the Naval Reserve is expanding, and we are glad of it.

Mr. KEATING. I have heard of those same petty jealousies on many occasions, and I commend the chairman and the committee for the fine work they have done in endeavoring to overcome those

and to get the Navy Department to push forward this Naval Reserve program in every way possible.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Well, I do not speak for the Navy, but I am very sure the Navy is in close cooperation with the Naval Reserve.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman satisfied that the Regular Navy Establishment is giving to the Naval Reserve all the cooperation necessary?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Yes. I reiterate my statement that the Regular Navy Establishment is giving the cooperation which the Naval Reserve is entitled to. There may be some folks in the Navy who would like to sink the Naval Reserve, but the Regular Navy Establishment is for the Naval Reserve program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentleman will confess that the Naval Reserve program of today represents one of the best Reserve programs of our national defense establishment.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Your cannonball questions are going to embarrass me before long. I do not want to discriminate between different branches of the Navy.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman was referring only to the Navy when he made that answer, was he not?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Does not the gentleman mean to say that the Naval Reserve is one of the outstanding Reserve components of the United States?

Mr. PLUMLEY. You boys do your fighting outside.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman agree that if those in the Navy who would like to sink the Naval Reserve were successful, they would sink the Navy?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I will agree.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely right in saying that the Navy is cooperating with the Naval Reserve, is friendly to it, and wants to see it succeed in every particular. However, as the gentleman knows, in life there are always differences of opinion. I commend the gentleman for his attitude.

CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, today is Confederate Memorial Day. Throughout the entire South the Daughters of the Confederacy are decorating the graves of our Confederate dead.

Today is the one hundred and fortieth anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis, the great white chieftain of the Confederacy, the most revered of all Mississippians, of whom it was once said that "he needs no monument save the indestructible substance of his own greatness to commend him to the consideration of all coming ages."

Caleb Cushing once said that "he was eloquent among the most eloquent in debate, wise among the wisest in counsel, and brave among the bravest on the battlefield."

Bishop Calloway once said of him:

Marvelous, many-sided, masterful man. His virtues will grow brighter and his name be writ larger with each passing century.

When another hundred years have passed away, no intelligent voice will fail to praise him. No patriotic hand will refuse to place a laurel wreath upon his radiant brow.

The Daughters of the Confederacy are responsible for Memorial Day. They started it in 1866 at Columbus, Miss. in the district I have the honor to represent. In decorating the graves of the Confederate dead, they decorated alike the graves of the Federal dead who were buried in the same cemetery.

That incident brought from the pen of the Honorable Francis Miles Finch that immortal poem called The Blue and the Gray that will live as long as the Stars and Stripes continue to float over a free people, as long as the sweet strains of Dixie shall continue to stir the southern heart with its sweet but melancholy pathos.

The inland river referred to is the Tombigbee, on whose banks these veterans were buried.

In that poem Judge Finch said:

By the flow of the inland river,
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave-grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgment Day:
Under the one, the Blue;
Under the other, the Gray.

These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat,
All with the battle-blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgment Day:
Under the laurel, the Blue;
Under the willow, the Gray.

Sadly, but not with upbraiding,
The generous deed was done.
In the storms of the years that are fading
No braver battle was won:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgment Day:
Under the blossoms, the Blue;
Under the garlands, the Gray.

No more shall the war-cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red:
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead!
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgment Day:
Love and tears for the Blue;
Tears and love for the Gray.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution because I well know that the Daughters of the Confederacy and the Jefferson Ladies each believe in keeping a great navy, just as the gentleman from Mississippi does.

Mr. Chairman, oftentimes today we hear the question asked: Just why do we need a Navy? They ask: Why, when we are living in a push-button age? Some people not only intimate but they even say out loud that we do not need a Navy. In truth and in fact, we are far from living in a push-button age, as far as war is concerned. We have always needed a Navy, and as far as I can tell now we always will need a Navy, and a good one. Today the Navy has concentrated its activities more or less on two big points among other things, but certainly the prime interest of the Navy today falls into two important categories: One, naval aeronautics with its floating bases that go really to the iron pits of the enemy nation; and two, the submarine warfare, the detection of enemy submarines and their destruction; and, certainly, the protection of our own ships, commerce, and trade against enemy submarines.

They ask, Where is the danger from naval activity against the United States? That may be a very good question but, to be perfectly frank about the matter, and to call a spade a spade—and I think it is high time that we did that in this country—we must admit that Russia does not have much of a navy. I use the word "navy" in the sense of battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and the thousand and one other types of ships they need to make a well-balanced navy. But what about submarines? It is generally agreed, and we know it to be a fact, that when World War II started, as far as we were concerned Germany had only 50 submarines. Certainly this country has not forgotten and it will never forget in many many years to come just what they almost did to us with 50 submarines. Well, how many does Russia have today? She has 250 submarines, which is five times as many as Germany had when she declared war on us and attacked us in 1941. What type of submarines have the Russians? Are they laid up in pens without adequate, well-trained personnel to man them? No. Our information is to the contrary. Furthermore, it may be said that when Germany got out of the war she was in the process of making the greatest improvement in submarine warfare and in the actual construction of submarines the world has ever known. When Russia captured the northern part of Germany she went in there and took those yards and all of the trained Germans, technicians, and material where those fine, improved German submarines were being made. As a matter of fact the United States got about 3 of those, Russia some 3 or 4 for herself, but then she took over the yards, the material, the designs, the plants, and the trained German personnel, and today Russia, instead of having 3 of those big Schnorkels, has about 50 of them and they outstrip any submarine in the world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Texas a while ago referred to Jefferson Davis' attitude toward the Navy. When he was Secretary of War under Franklin Pierce, he had a brother-in-law, who lived, I believe, in Bethlehem, Pa., by the name of Brodhead. I believe they

were brothers-in-law. Jefferson Davis visited him. He came home and reported that Bethlehem was the place to make our armor plate for the Navy. In that one movement he probably contributed more toward the development of the Navy than any other man of that day and generation.

MR. THOMAS of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for that valuable contribution.

Before I go into the dollars-and-cents program of the Navy for the fiscal year 1949, I would like to say something about the personnel of our own subcommittee which deals with appropriations for the Navy. We think we have a grand committee and I know the Members of the House as a whole will agree with that statement. I want to pay my respects to our very fine, dear chairman, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. I do not know of any man in this House who knows his subject any better than does the gentleman from Vermont. He has been a member of this committee for some 10 or 12 years and is a very hard worker. Sometimes we members of his committee think he is a little bit too hard. He likes to drive us about 5 or 6 days out of every week. But he is a fine chairman and he knows his subject; he is a great patriot; he believes in a fine, strong Navy, and as long as he is chairman of that subcommittee you need not have any fear that he will see to it that the Navy, according to his judgment, gets what is needs to carry on its necessary functions. We may differ with him on small details, but on general principles there cannot be any disagreement.

Then there is our distinguished friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], an outstanding Member, not only of this committee but of the House, who has rendered most beneficial service to the committee.

There is also the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], an old-timer in the Congress—certainly an old-timer on the Appropriations Committee. He is going to leave us pretty soon. He has all but accepted, as I understand it, an appointment to the bench dealing with customs and patents appeals. The people of the United States are indeed lucky to have a man of NOBLE JOHNSON'S character and ability on that bench. His leaving will be a distinct loss to our committee because today he brings to us a lot of good, common horse sense and balance of judgment, and, in my judgment, those three qualities are indispensable in any public man.

Then there is our distinguished friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], an able lawyer, considerate of all of his colleagues and people generally. He also serves on the War Department Subcommittee and, therefore, he brings to our Navy Subcommittee a great deal of information that perhaps we would not otherwise have. He is a strong believer in unification of the armed services, and, in my humble judgment, is making one of the outstanding records of the entire membership of the committee.

Our clerk, Mr. Sprankle, is an exceptionally well-informed young man. He is not the oldest in point of service on the committee among our experts, but I will tell you that he is certainly high up in point of ability and judgment and industry. The Federal Government, and certainly the Committee on Appropriations, is lucky to have a man of his high caliber and his industry and his good judgment.

Certainly I would be remiss in my duty, Mr. Chairman, if I did not say that we gentlemen on the minority think we are pretty good, too.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The majority thinks the gentleman is pretty good, too. It has not been long since he was on the majority and we were on the minority side. I think it can be said, certainly in the 6 years that I have been a member of this committee, that there has never been a majority or a minority division on this subcommittee. We do not think in those terms. There is never any action taken in those terms. The courtesies of the committee are common to all and the cooperation of the committee is one team. We think in the degree of the proper defense of the United States, first winning a war, and now protecting us from another. I think it should be said at this time that the gentleman from Texas, in all his modesty—and he is an extremely modest man—is probably one of the outstanding authorities on the United States Navy, and I do not know what this committee would do without his keen judgment, and I think that is the opinion enjoyed by all members of the committee. I did not mean to make this a love feast, but then I have such great admiration for the ability of the gentleman from Texas that I simply have to say it.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Missouri is indeed generous with his praise. I hope that I can live up to it.

I must say something about our distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. He has been the most recent addition to our subcommittee and, I might say, one of the most helpful. Of course, we are most delighted to welcome him on our subcommitee and we will be glad for him to stay there for years and years. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], as you know, is chairman of the Subcommittee of the Department of the Army, and I do not know of a harder working man in this House than he. He brings to our subcommittee a wealth of good judgment, and we are delighted and happy to have him here with us, and I hope that he will devote as much time and energy and constructive work to our subcommittee as he does to his own. Such action on his part is going to improve both of the services.

We Americans are proud of the traditions of our Navy. We have a great Navy now and we are all proud of it. We have had great national heroes and fine solid men in our Navy since its inception, and we have some fine men at the head of the Navy today. After all, what makes the Navy? What makes anything else? It is manpower and human beings and leadership. I do not know of any finer men any place in the country than the chiefs of the various bureaus of the Navy. It is these chiefs who have the responsibility and who furnish the driving power to make this great Navy click. I may say that the reason these men who have these tremendous jobs of responsibility as bureau chiefs are so good is the old Navy system. When they take these young naval officers, they change them periodically from job to job and promote them from one job to another that is vastly different. After they have served 10, 15, or 20 years in the Navy, you have as fine a finished product as it is possible for training and experience to make.

I might add that the chiefs of these bureaus carry responsibilities which, if they were in private industry, would allow them to earn salaries of from $50,000 to $100,000 a year. Let it be said that some of our Navy chiefs have recently retired and gone into private industry, where perhaps their responsibilities are less than they were in the Navy, yet they are getting salaries reputedly as high as $50,000, $75,000, and $100,000 a year.

Certainly there is no finer man in the Navy than the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Louis E. Denfeld. He has been well known to this committee for many years. We all love him and have respect for him. He is a great administrator, and will do a fine job for the Navy.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I want to endorse what the gentleman has said in general, particularly what he has said with reference to our distnguished friend, Admiral Denfeld. He comes from Massachusetts. I think he is one of the great military and naval leaders of our country.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I concur 100 percent in the remarks of my friend from Massachusetts. Admiral Denfeld is a great naval officer and a great citizen.

There is General Cates, Commandant of the Marine Corps. He was made commandant only a few months ago, but the committee was deeply impressed with his ability and his good, common horse sense. We expect great things of him, and we are confident that he will continue to lead the Marine Corps and make it the great organization we all want it to be and that it truly is.

Rear Admiral Hopwood, the Navy Budget Officer, has been most gracious and helpful to the committee ever since he assumed his present position. His wide knowledge of the budgetary probblems of the Navy has been most helpful. In our daily contacts with him throughout the hearings he never failed to produce whatever information happened to be required. I feel sure that all members of the committee will agree with me that his service to the committee, and also to the Navy, has been outstanding.

Rear Admiral Pride, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, is a great naval officer and a great administrator.

Rear Admiral Sprague, Chief of the Bureau of Personnel, has a great human touch about him. I think he is well adapted to handling the Bureau of Per-

sonnel. He gets along with men. He is a great administrator. I think he will make a great chief of that Bureau.

There is our friend, Rear Admiral Swanson, Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Right here I want to dispel a misunderstanding that has been kicking around a long time with reference to doctors. We hear it said that doctors are not good businessmen, but I tell you right now, as far as Admiral Swanson is concerned, he is an outstanding businessman and administrator and, frankly, one of the finest witnesses I have ever seen in my life before any committee. He is really good. He knows his subject, and he is frank and earnest, just as all of these Bureau chiefs are. He does a fine job, not only for his Bureau, but for the Navy.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I want to pay my compliments at this time to Admiral Sprague, whom the gentleman was gracious enough to mention. I had the privilege of serving quite closely with him during wartime. I know the great job that he did. I am happy that the House should know of your opinion that he is doing an equally great job in peacetime.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I understand that he was a great fighting man, as the gentleman has just pointed out.

The same can be said for Rear Admiral Foster of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. He is a fine gentleman, a fine officer, and a good administrator. We feel that he will provide his Bureau with a first-class business-like method of management.

Our distinguished friend, Rear Admiral Noble, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, is fine, frank, and honest; a great officer and a great technician. The committee is always delighted to hear him because he knows his subject and we have confidence in him.

Then there is our distinguished friend, Rear Admiral Manning, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the little Irishman, as we affectionately call him. I do not think there is any man who comes before the committee that the committee enjoys having more than him. Sometimes we do not always agree with him, but in my humble judgment, when we have disagreed, I am inclined to think that the Admiral really knew a little more about the subject than we did. I think he is a great officer and a fine engineer. He has certainly done a fine job for the Navy, and I know he will continue to do a fine job for the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Then there is our old friend, Vice Adm. Earle Mills, Chief of the Bureau of Ships. I think among all the Bureau chiefs, he is perhaps most experienced. He has been in his Bureau far longer, much longer, than any of the other gentlemen that I have named.

Admiral Mills did a great job during the war in getting the Navy into the shape that it was. He is a fine construction man. He is one of the outstanding shipbuilders and engineers in the country. I hope he stays in the Navy for many, many years to come.

Another outstanding officer to whom I would like to pay a brief tribute is Rear Admiral Colclough, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. He is soon leaving that position, I regret to say, but I am sure that all members of the committee feel that his direction of that office has been of the highest caliber. There have been many kinds of legal problems thrown upon his office and the manner in which they have been disposed of is a credit to Admiral Colclough and his associates.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked longer than I intended to talk. I am not going to take but 4 or 5 minutes more. This bill carries $3,686,733,250. The budget estimates were $3,927,738,700, which means that the committee has clipped and shaved the estimates by about $241,000,000. I think we shaved the estimates of the Budget Bureau a little too much in the case of two or three of the Bureaus. I will go into that presently. We reduced the Bureau of Ships on the maintenance item from $377,443,000 plus $350,000,000, a decrease of $27,443,000. I think that is a little severe, in view of the fact, as my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Vermont, pointed out a while ago, these Bureaus in the Navy Department are weakening themselves year by year to the extent of roughly a billion dollars by consuming supplies and materials that we bought and paid for during the war. In other words, we are eating up our backlog. Translating that one billion dollars in terms of total cost, we are eating our backlog at the rate of 25 percent per annum, just like we are doing for 1949. As long as Russian communism is on the march, we may be taking too long a jump. But I am not going to offer any amendments and I am not going to quarrel with my colleagues about it. Their judgment prevailed in the matter. If mine had prevailed I would not have cut it that much.

Bureau of Ordnance: I am a little inclined to think that we made too deep a cut there. We reduced that estimate from $266,860,000 to $210,000,000, a cut of about $56,860,000. Perhaps, if that does prove too severe, and I am one of those who thinks it does, it can be changed later. After all, the vast majority of that goes into maintenance of our Bureau of Ordnance, and buying a few odds and ends of short-supply material, mainly of the new gun type for aeronautics. It is the job of this Bureau to furnish munitions and guns for these new planes that we are now buying. I hope that when we go back in conference the committee will restore that reduction.

Maintenance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks: That item was cut $21,772,000. It reduced the total from $171,772,000 to $150,000,000. That is too much of a cut for that Bureau. Bear in mind, there are no funds in this bill for what we call a public-works program—new construction. This is purely maintenance; and again I say that the Bureau of Yards and Docks is eating up its seed corn, its backlog of supplies obtained during the war, and it has reached the point where it ought to be stopped, as long as world conditions are as they are.

Our able chairman has written a very fine report. It is very constructive. I want to read from his report on the Bureau of Aeronautics. That Bureau was cut $42,268,000. The budget recommended $617,268,000, and the committee reduced it to $575,000,000. That is a rather arbitrary cut. That fund is for maintenance and operation, fuel and gasoline and spare parts, and keeping the airfields going. We are going to open up 14 more for the Reserves and for Regular training. That cut of $42,268,000 I think is a little deep, again in view of world conditions. For that reason and that reason alone, personally I do not think we ought to take a chance by cutting it that much.

As I pointed out, there are no funds in that amount for construction of new planes. That was done under the Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948, which provided a total of $3,198,000,000 for the Air Force and for the Navy. Of that sum the Navy got approximately $903,000,000 in cash and contract authority, but $150,000,000 went to retire prior obligations for construction of new planes. That new money and that new contract authority will purchase about 1,500 planes in the next few years.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this point the committee's report on "Aviation, Navy." Since I have already obtained unanimous consent, I will insert it at this point in my remarks, because I think it is a very fine report, and it is information that I would like to have carried in the permanent record.

The report is as follows:

AVIATION, NAVY

An appropriation of $575,000,000 is recommended for this title which is divided into three categories, namely: Replacement of navigation and radio equipment, $25,000,000; maintenance of aviation shore establishment, $440,000,000; and research and development, $110,000,000. The bill approves in full the amount requested for research and development, but reduces the estimate for maintenance of the shore establishment and operation of aircraft by approximately $41,000,000. Under the supplemental request the Bureau of Aeronautics proposed the reopening of 14 additional air stations. The committee does not believe that the reactivation of so many stations is necessary, but rather that it would be more economical to increase activities at stations already in full commission.

It has often been stated by the Navy that their stations were only allowed to operate at a fraction of their normal capacity. The committee believes that it would be a better practice to open fewer additional stations and thereby save money which would otherwise be needed for additional administrative expense involved in the operation of a greater number of activities.

The revised estimate proposed the operation of 8,035 aircraft in the Regular Navy and 2,678 in the Reserve program. Another example arises here where stocks of considerable value are drawn from existing inventory. New planes are not coming into the fleet to equal the rate of use and consequently the Navy will be required to draw some planes from the supply in storage.

Language is carried authorizing the extension for 1 year of the unexpended balance of the appropriation "Aviation, Navy, 1946."

Certain important contracts—some dealing in research and development work—undertaken under this appropriation have been delayed through causes beyond the control of the Navy. Testimony indicated that the contracts could not be terminated without definite loss to the Government. The other course of permitting the obligated balance to lapse would require the contractor to collect through complicated claims procedure and would thus work an undue hardship on the contractor as well as additional cost to the Government in the long run. It is anticipated that during the fiscal year 1949 these matters can be concluded.

Bureau of Personnel: I think we did very well there. This bill carries for officer and enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment of the Navy for 1949 a total average of 444,675 personnel.

The funds for fiscal 1948, the year we are just about winding up, provided in the matter of officers and enlisted men 417,156; in other words we are increasing our average personnel strength for fiscal 1949 by 27,519 enlisted men and officers. That will give us a little larger and stronger Navy in terms of personnel than we have in the present year. As far as I am concerned, as long as world conditions are what they are, I would be willing to increase that personnel another 100,000 for the Navy.

The Naval Reserve has been allowed $125,000,000 in this bill. The committee has also had a warm spot in its heart for this program. We realize that the Naval Reserve is actually the backbone of the Navy in case this country goes to war. Without the capable services of the members of the Naval Reserve much valuable time would be lost in getting the Navy machine into high gear in case of hostilities.

We cannot afford to let anything happen that might discourage this particular function.

The Marine Corps is increased in officer and enlisted personnel strength for the fiscal year 1949 up to approximately 92,000. This year it has a total strength of about 87,000. Generally, let me say that we have not forgotten our Marine Corps. This year we have given it $340,189,000 for its total operations, excluding medical services, which it obtains from the Navy, whereas last year it had $302,174,000.

All in all, with the exceptions I have pointed out, and perhaps some language changes on which all of us did not agree but which perhaps can be straightened out later, I think the committee is now offering you a good bill and I hope you will give us your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 35 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to clarify what I know to be the clear intent of the committee, having discussed it this morning with the chairman of the committee, with the ranking minority member, and also with all the other members, I believe, who were on the floor. In the absence of the chairman, I wish to ask this question of the acting chairman. I realize, of course, that this bill contains quite a substantial amount of money for necessary fuel in order to operate the Naval Establishment, but it is also my understanding that this committee has felt, as have all other subcommittees, that great care should be taken by the Navy Department in spending of these funds so as not to undertake anything in the nature of unnecessary installations of new oil-burning equipment or converting from coal to oil-burning equipment unless a clear case can be shown that it is wise and sound.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. PLOESER. Let me say to the gentleman that the committee, I believe, concurs without exception in the gentleman's expression of opinion and what he thinks should be done.

I believe it should further be said that we have $65,000,000 in this bill for fuel, that probably there is no organization in America more conscious of the need for conservation of fuel than the United States Navy. So it is not just a committee desire, but I think the desire is inherent in the Navy itself.

Mr. HESELTON. I agree completely; and the Navy, incidentally, should be especially commended for the steps they took at shore facilities earlier in the year which was of tremendous assistance to the east coast.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I begrudge the necessity for the spending of these huge sums for national security. I am sure every member of the committee feels the same way. With very few exceptions, I believe the members of the Naval Establishment feel the same way.

We felt buoyed up a year ago when we could come to the Congress and show where it was possible to make considerable reductions in spending, not only for the Naval Establishment but for the Military Establishment as well. You will note by referring to the hearings that they began in the middle of March, prior to the President's message in which the President pointed out the critical condition of world affairs. His message was undoubtedly construed in some quarters as a challenge to Soviet Russia. Each member of the armed forces, each witness who appeared before both of these subcommittees, the Subcommittees on Army and Navy Appropriations, and I am a member of both committees, stressed the changed conditions. How critical they are, frankly I do not know.

You will recall, too, that the Navy as is the case with the Army, must begin the preparation of their budget for the fiscal year 1949, which begins on the 1st of July this year, many, many months in advance. Many of the facts and figures that were prepared had their inception as far back as a year ago this month, and perhaps longer than that. So that they are not only planning weeks in advance but a year and in some cases a year and a half in advance.

If you will turn to the hearings you will find that the original plan for expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 called for still further decreases in the military-civilian personnel and in the Naval Establishment, but, of course, with the change in events, the change in the world situation, after those hearings had been completed—and they were all presented on the normal 1949 budget—first, it then became necessary to recall the officers of the Navy before the committee to present their new estimates based upon the changed conditions and their increased needs for the coming year. While there have been some reductions under the amounts proposed by the Navy, they were not as much as I personally thought might be imposed upon them. Knowing them as I do, their keen efficiency, their alertness to duty, and their untiring energy, I thought they could operate efficiently with a much smaller sum.

This bill authorizes the expenditure of $3,680,000,000, which is a reduction of 6.1 percent under the final amount requested by the Navy. It does not include, however, any funds for the procurement of new aircraft because that has been taken care of in a previous measure which provides the Navy with plane replacements to the extent of $315,000,000 of which they were required to pay $150,000,000 on some contract authorizations allowed, leaving them of that figure a net of $165,000,000. But in that same plane procurement bill they were authorized to contract for an expenditure of $585,000,000, which will give the Navy an available sum to be spent for new planes this year and succeeding years of $750,000,000. This would make the total amount available for the Navy, both in its fleet and air fleet, $4,436,000,000.

Were it not felt necessary—and I am sure every member of the committee feels as I do—in view of the statements made to us both on and off the record, this large sum would not be presented to the Congress at the present time, because we scanned these items as though every dollar came out of our own individual pockets.

One of the activities which is quite important to the Navy and to the Nation is that of research and development. In this budget the sum of $45,000,000 has been set aside for basic research, because we feel that now is the time to go into your laboratories and your plants and your colleges and get the benefit of the scientific brains so that they can propose new changes and new modifications that will increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of our armed services. If an emergency arises, you do not have the time then to sit down in the quiet of a labratory and plan and draw and work out these various scientific developments. Then the remainder of the appropriation is for further development of those things already discovered. Great strides have been made. It is not my place nor is this the time to disclose many of the forward steps we have taken and many of the scientific advances which we have made. It is sufficient to say that the

advances are amazing. As regards the scientific advances which have been made in other countries, I will match the brains of free Americans against them at any time, and when the chips are down we will have finer, we must have finer and more effective equipment, and we will have as we have always had, more gallant men than any other nation in the world.

A question was asked a few moments ago about the Naval Reserves. That matter has been close to our hearts because we know the value and the contribution of the civilian components to the armed services, whether it is the Army or the Navy or the Marines. We have been strong for that program because we would like to see as many young Americans as possible participate in a program where they can get naval and military training without disrupting their civilian pursuits. The result is that we have increased this year the Naval Reserve appropriation 25 percent over 1948, in spite of the fact that after 82 percent of the year had elapsed they had only expended 67 percent of the funds made available last year. We are confident that this program, with these additional appropriations, will grow and make its usual addition to the military strength of the Nation.

As the chairman and others have pointed out, since the budget originally presented was prepared, there has been a sharp increase in the price of fuel and therefore it was necessary in the supplemental budget to increase the appropriation just to take care of the cost of the fuel alone. It was also necessary to increase in the supplemental budget the items of subsistence, or food, because food prices, too, have gone up as many other prices have.

Another one of the bureaus close to our hearts, and it is an important one as you can recognize, is the Bureau of Aeronautics, the aviation branch of the Navy, which is now becoming its paramount activity. Not only do you have naval aviation, but included in that you have marine aviation as well. This supplemental bill will provide sufficient funds for the Navy to operate 8,000 planes in the Regular Navy and 2,700 planes in the Naval Reserve, so that they can carry on with their training, their aviation activities, and then when and if any emergency arises, which we trust will not, these men who performed so well during World War II will again be able to give this Nation that glorious service that they have given in the past.

One question has been raised that I think should be discussed. If you care to read it for yourselves you can turn to the supplemental hearings that are available. That was the question of the 65,000-ton aircraft carrier. I have listened to and read everything that I could get hold of both for and against. I am not yet convinced that this is the answer to the problem they are seeking to solve. The committee recommended that this should be included. I opposed that action. We discussed it thoroughly in committee and we discussed it both on and off the record. We have the views of the Chief of Naval Operations and we have the views of the Secretary of the Navy and others. While much of what they said is not in the record, what is on the record is for you to read and judge for yourself.

This bill does give us, as we have had in the past, the best and biggest Navy afloat. We sometimes like to think of ourselves as sitting over here on a large, isolated block of land, with 3,000 and 5,000 miles of ocean on either side, and that we are impervious to attack. That might have been true at one time when we had to expect that attack only from the surface of the ocean. It is my studied opinion that if and when any other conflict comes, this Nation—and I am not an alarmist—will be the first target because we have proven twice in two great world wars that American youth, American farms, and American factories are able to stop those who would make a conquest of the world. So if a third conquest is sought, naturally, we shall be the first target. Therefore it is vital in the defense of this Nation and for the security of this Nation and the security of our homes and our very lives that we do have command not only of the surface of the ocean but of the skies above. With these appropriations which you are making available now, I am sure we can rest secure in the fact that we shall eventually be able to control both the sea and the air and, with that control, our Nation will be secure.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentlemen of the subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to speak briefly on a matter which is of much concern to me.

As we keep on appropriating billions of dollars for our defense and preparedness program, I keep asking myself this question, How much, if any, of this money is being spent to save operational costs? Let me illustrate.

One of the most important problems facing us today is the training of our pilots. We have heard much discussion on the floor of this House as regards the methods for procuring the necessary materials needed to build and fly our aircraft. But thus far I have heard little discussion as regards to the methods to be used in the training of the men to fly our planes. In this connection, the value of synthetic training must not be overlooked. From the dollars-and-cents basis, it costs between $100 and $300 an hour to fly operational aircraft. The proper use of synthetic training devices can save between 15 and 25 percent of training flight operation, a very real saving in dollars if we are seriously considering a 70-group air force and an expanded naval aviation program.

I do urge that our synthetic training program, so brilliantly conceived by Admiral deFlorez while he was in the Navy, be expanded not only in the interests of training better pilots, but also in the interest of national economy.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the figure that the gentleman has mentioned as a saving is very modest indeed. It might be twice that much.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I hope he is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I believe in connection with the remarks that the gentleman has just made he would be gratified upon reading the hearings to find the amount of money which has been allocated for the procurement of these very aviation training devices of which he is speaking.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

In this connection I do recommend that our present operational flight trainers be kept in proper shape and utilized to the full for the training of pilots to fly our present-day aircraft.

With the development of new electronic computers, new training devices must be made so that our pilots will not only be trained to fly the new airplane of the future but also so that we may work out in advance the new tactics which will be needed in this high-speed warfare.

I further recommend that much of our training equipment be made mobile. The last war certainly should have taught us the value of having equipment which could be moved from place to place and thus be utilized not only in providing needed services but just as importantly avoiding enemy attack. Rather than build elaborate fixed bases to be used as training centers for certain specialized fields of training, I suggest we keep our training equipment mobile so that it can be sent wherever needed.

You and I have the responsibility of making sure that the American aviator is still the best aviator in the world.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The subcommittee is in full accord with the suggestion that the gentleman makes with regard to the program which should be followed.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, in line with the remarks made by the gentleman from Connecticut, I would like to compliment him for bringing up that subject, because it is a very important one indeed.

I would like to mention for a moment this supercarrier that is being proposed for the Navy. It is one of four that have been proposed to be built. There has been a very great question in the minds of a number of persons who are intimately familiar with the armed services as to whether or not this is an advisable move. As the chairman of the Combat Aviation Subcommittee of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, I made the

recommendation unofficially that this subject be submitted to a committee or board composed of relatively disinterested persons for a decision as to whether or not it was a thing that was feasible before the construction was entered upon. Unofficially, I suggested Dr. Vannevar Bush as a proper chairman for such a group, as he has for a long time been familiar with the details of national defense. You see, there is involved in this business, not only the matter of a carrier, which may cost a very great deal of money, something on the order of $125,000,000 to $180,000,000 and perhaps $200,000,000 before they get through, but all of the task-force vessels that necessarily go along with such a carrier. It would mean smaller carriers to provide for its air defense; it would mean antisubmarine vessels to keep submarines off such a carrier. It would mean antiaircraft cruisers and auxiliary vessels of all kinds, many thousands of tons of shipping more than the supercarrier itself.

That carrier can handle a relatively small number of strategic-type aircraft, namely, bombers. Those aircraft, because of the weight of the undercarriage, and other factors necessary for use off of a carrier, would have a somewhat limited range. That is, a range limited in comparison with a commensurate size airplane which used a land airfield as its take-off point. Of course, that carrier perhaps can be moved closer to a potential target which is outside of the Western Hemisphere than could one of these other types of airplanes, and it might be sent into a place which would be unavailable to any other of our armed services. On the other side there is the question of its vulnerability to being sunk or rendered uninhabitable by radiation products, and there is a great question also as to whether or not the aircraft that take off from it can land again on its deck. In all probability such aircraft could not be landed on its deck after having once taken off.

There are a number of factors involved which I do not want to discuss, because, after all, they are of a nature that should not be discussed in a public forum. But in any event, it was our conclusion that this entire matter should be submitted to the decision of an impartial board. It has not been so submitted. The vessel is not approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, because there is objection from one member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I read in the paper the other day that the objection came from the Air Force. It comes from the Air Force because in the assignment of roles and missions, strategic bombing was assigned to the Air Force, yet this is obviously a strategic-bombing undertaking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wonder, in our consideration of this subject, whether it would not be advisable, before we go too far along, to have such a study undertaken. If the study proves that this is a feasible type of undertaking and one that is not too expensive for the results to be achieved, then I would be wholeheartedly in favor of it. However, so far, the decision on that matter has been unilateral on the part of the Navy Department, and from certain documents which I have had the privilege of reading, emanating from the Navy Department, that action probably was taken because the Navy Department believes that unless it engages in strategic bombing it may lose its preeminence among the armed services. That is a decision, of course, which is up to the Secretary of National Defense. I have recommended to him that careful consideration be given to this subject, more than has been given it. In other words, we may have a billion dollars or so worth of vessels tied up to handle a relatively few aircraft for a striking force. It may be that a billion dollars worth of vessels for this purpose is worth while. It may be that it is entirely too expensive an undertaking. I suggest again that this matter be submitted to an impartial but competent board to figure out, and that before further appropriations are made, that board should be called upon to report to the Congress as to the advisability of continuing in this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has again expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great appreciation and interest to the fine presentation made by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. I think it was a very nice piece of work, and we are grateful for it. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES] and I appeared before this Subcommittee on Appropriations to present certain requests in regard to increased funds, particularly for maintenance of ships. We are happy to note that those requests were very largely granted by the committee.

I was particularly interested in the comments of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] in regard to ordnance, and I think his statements are extremely well founded.

At the beginning of the last war, we heard complaints repeatedly that we should have had better antiaircraft defense in the fleet. The answer was one thing and one thing only—lack of money to develop such defense. You cannot develop a new type of defense without large expenditures. If anyone had been foolish enough to go before one of our congressional committees prior to the war and ask for $50,000,000 for antiaircraft gun development, it is probable that he would have been called crazy. If he had asked for $100,000,000, some would have suggested sending him to jail indefinitely as a menace to society. The simple truth is that we spent hundreds of millions in the development of antiaircraft defense during World War II and we finally came out with some marvelous equipment—equipment that can only be developed with money. So I hope if the Bureau of Ordnance runs short of funds, it will come back to this subcommittee and tell the gentleman from Vermont about its difficulties.

I dislike very much to disagree with my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HINSHAW], but I believe that the big carrier provided for in this bill is fully justified and that this Congress should approve it. I do not think we can write strategy in Congress. I believe we must leave that to the people who know something about the workings of ships and fleets.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. How many years has the gentleman now speaking served in the naval service?

Mr. BRADLEY. A little more than 43, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. He is a retired naval officer?

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman; yes.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy of the United States has made fewer mistakes in design and construction than any other navy of modern times. I will stand solidly on that statement. The Navy has made a few mistakes, such as the building of the 13,500-ton *Mississippi* and *Idaho* after completion of the 16,000-ton *Connecticut* class, but those mistakes were made, and required chiefly, by the Congress when it specified exactly what the Navy should build and just what size each unit should be. Since those restrictions were removed, the mistakes have been mighty few indeed.

There are differences of opinion in naval matters, of course. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] remarked that the Navy had come largely to consist of aviation and submarine activities. That is correct as far as it goes, but there is considerable error in it, because there are two very measurable services besides those mentioned. Amphibious warfare is one of the greatest developments of modern times, and it is absolutely necessary to keep prepared for it. This is largely in the hands of the Marines at the present time. Also, you cannot get along without surface ships. Warfare cannot be waged overseas without a surface fleet for combat. Throughout the history of the world, from the time of the Carthaginians to the present, that nation which controlled the sea has been dominant in the world. It has been dominant for better or for worse, but it had control and exercised it. I do not know whether control of the sea in the future will be through surface ships, submarines, or aircraft, or through a combination of these services. No one of us knows, but we do know that today the surface ship still plays such a part in war that no nation can possibly wage an effective war without a surface fleet. A nation must have ships for convoy protection. A nation must have thousands of ships to work against submarines. Aircraft are very valuable for such operations but they cannot take the place of the patrol ship at night and in stormy weather.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was particularly interested in the comments of the gentleman from Texas, in regard to the various chiefs of bureau and other officers. I concede they are fine gentlemen and deserving of the kind things he said about them. But we are a Nation which is very prone to forget. Already we are forgetting that during the last war we had some very eminent and some very prominent officers among whom were three of our four-star admirals, Raymond Spruance, Kent Hewit, and Tom Kincaid, all of whom will be demoted on the 1st of July unless this Congress acts before it adjourns. Never before that I know of have we demoted the men who have led our Navy in great battles and our armies in great campaigns. I am delighted to hear that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] has a bill pending which will permit these three officers in particular to retire in their present rank.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HESS. The bill to which the gentleman refers was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services on last Tuesday.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate that. I certainly hope the bill will come to the floor of the House for consideration and that we shall be able to allow these three very fine officers to retain their rank.

Mr. HESS. It is on the Consent Calendar and should be reached on Monday next.

Mr. BRADLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy has been aviation-minded for years. The Navy ordered its first planes in 1911. At that time it bought two planes, even before some members of this committee can remember. I had the pleasure then—a pleasure as I look back at it now, but I did not think it was so much of a pleasure then—of flying in both of these planes, which looked like box-kites with chain-drive propellers. The Navy has never ceased in its development of aviation and it has been about as thoroughly progressive as any service could be, but, as you gentlemen of the committee know from your own correspondence, you cannot please everybody all the time.

Mr. Chairman, as long as the Navy has this subcommittee of which the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is the able chairman, and has the services of these distinguished gentlemen who have spoken on the floor as members of that subcommittee, the Navy need fear nothing in its legitimate development in the future, but will be very, very well treated by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call to the attention of my colleagues some of the facts which are contributing to the rapidly deteriorating situation in Palestine and the Middle East.

First let me say that I have just learned of the heroic death in Israel of a young man from New York to whom freedom and justice were more than words.

Lt. Morris Rosenbaum, a veteran of the Army Air Forces in which he served as a navigator in rank of first lieutenant, who was shot down over Hungary and a prisoner of war for 13 months in Germany, decided some weeks ago that the war against fascism had not been finished.

He enlisted in the Haganah. He went to Palestine a month ago. Now he is dead.

How he died, his parents in Brooklyn do not yet know. They know only that he laid down his life that Israel might live.

Had he continued his studies at Cornell University, he would have obtained his degree in engineering in a short time. Lieutenant Rosenbaum was an accomplished athlete and a talented painter. He could have, had he chosen, lived in comfort.

There was something bigger than he was which impelled him to offer that last great sacrifice for the sake of an idea. Mr. Chairman, an idea which commands such devotion must command our respect. I hope that the example of Lieutenant Rosenbaum will lead us here to do everything in our power to insure the survival of Israel in the family of nations and to protect it against the combined Arab and British war of annihilation.

In New York the Fur Workers Union, composed of hardworking people whose incomes are far below the luxury level, has chosen to donate 50,000 hard-earned dollars from its treasury to the new nation of Israel.

We read of these selfless act of heroism and of sacrifice by humble individuals with admiration; yet here at home and in Great Britain the responsible leaders of the governments in power are doing nothing to halt the carnage in Palestine.

Ernest Bevin, the anti-Semite at the head of England's foreign affairs, continues to defy decency and the United Nations with his bold bribery of the cruel King Abdullah.

Foreign Minister Bevin has exposed his bald anti-Semitic bias often enough in his public pronouncements. America will not soon forget his sneering references to New York City.

BRITISH ACTIONS CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED

The aid that Great Britain is giving to the Arabs cries aloud to the conscience of the world. It is impossible to justify the action of Great Britain. The British are encouraging the aggressors, the Arab States, by money, by arms, and in every way possible, and doing so openly. Yesterday Mr. Bevin asserted that they would continue to supply arms and they would continue to supply money to the Arab States, knowing that the Arabs are the aggressors. They have been so found by the United Nations; they have been so found by world opinion, and yet nothing is done to stop them. Great Britain can stop them if Beven wants to stop them.

WILL OPPOSE ECA AID TO ENGLAND

I want to take this opportunity, Members of the House, to call to the attention of the committee that tomorrow when we debate the appropriation bill under the European recovery program I intend to introduce an amendment striking out all aid to Great Britain, and I also want to serve notice on the committee now that if that amendment is voted down I, and many of us in this House who voted for the Marshall plan, who voted for the European recovery plan, will vote against the appropriation.

There is no reason in the world why our money should go over to Great Britain to be used to build up and create another world war, which is what is happening over there. Here we are appropriating all this money for the Army and the Navy. I voted for it and, I think, properly.

But, what are we doing here? We are helping Great Britain. We are helping countries who are trying to kill and knife the United Nations, which is an organization formed to prevent future wars; we are helping Great Britain, which is deliberately sabotaging the United Nations.

BRITISH MILLIONS GO FOR BRIBES TO ARABS

I do not say that the money that we are going to give them under the foreign-recovery program will go to the Arabs, but we have their own admission that they are giving millions and millions of dollars of their own money to the Arab states. They give $8,000,000 a year to Transjordan. There is $38,000,000 that they admitted giving under treaty obligations, as they call it, to the different Arab states. They say that they have treaties; that they have contracts with these states that they have to live up to which means that they are going to give them arms which they know are being used to create a war and kill innocent and defenseless people everywhere, especially in Israel.

How can you justify the fact that the taxes of the American people are being raised to send money over to Great Britain, when they obviously do not need our money? If they need money, then they should not give it away as they are doing. Yet they are using our money, possibly, for some relief purposes, but taking their own money they could use for self-rehabilitation and giving it to the Arab states against all justice and decency. That is exactly what it amounts to. I hope the Members will give this thought, and will support my amendment when I introduce it tomorrow.

Otherwise, all our protestations against the totalitarianism of the Soviet Union

and its satellites becomes empty phrases, "full of sound and fury and signifying nothing." We must make American democracy mean something besides the subsidizing of reactionary regimes throughout the world if we are to lead the world toward our kind of democracy, which I believe and assert is the best kind of democracy.

In yesterday's New York Post I found an editorial so succinct in expressing my own feelings today that, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting the full text of the editorial at this point. It says, in words clearer than I can find myself, what millions of Americans feel today.

[From the New York Post of June 2, 1948]

HAS THE PRESIDENT SURRENDERED AGAIN?

(By T. O. Thackrey)

It is now perfectly clear that the Arab Legion will accept a cease-fire order from the Security Council and a truce any time it becomes useful in stopping an Israel counter-attack.

But not before.

Israel has accepted every dead line—and issued its cease-fire orders—and has resumed battle in every instance only when required to defend against renewed Arab attack.

The most outrageous and tragic farce in history continues to be enacted at Lake Success—while men, women, and children are being slaughtered in Palestine by invading armies, fully supported, guided, armed, and directed by Great Britain.

Great Britain, meanwhile, has become the spokesman not alone for the Arab invaders but for the United States of America as well, despite the formal protests of our Ambassador at Lake Success that the Arabs are clearly invading and attacking far beyond the borders of each country, and that sanctions, military and otherwise, should be applied—should have been applied, in fact, months ago.

If the Security Council knuckles under again—it will be at least the fifth time—to the combined pressure of the Arab League and Great Britain, to extend the dead line so that the massacre of Jews can be continued but be ready to enforce it if the tide swings against the invaders, the United Nations had better be written off as an expensive and crimally constituted ally of exactly the kind of mass murder and genocide it was organized to prevent.

Meanwhile, Washington is becoming the bitter joke of the world. In Lake Success we call the Arabs aggressors—but in Washington they are merely the good friends of our good ally, Great Britain.

The President waits upon the United Nations, where Bevin calls the turn and effectively blocks any honest action to stop the war except on his terms, which are the destruction of Palestine's Jews and dismemberment of the state of Israel.

The President warns Lebanon to release abducted American citizens, but agrees to accept Lebanese conditions that they be returned to the United States.

The President solemnly warns Egypt not to interfere with American citizens or their property, but, when both are interfered with, avoids action by the excuse that Great Britain's United Nations has not yet decided whether there is war or peace, and, if so, how much of either.

Israel is being cut to pieces, while the arms embargo on supplies to Israel, requested by Great Britain and supported by oil profiteers and British fifth columnists in the Government, is left clamped down tight by the President, who speaks of friendship for Israel and sympathy for the cause of freedom.

When reactionary Greece called for help against her own citizens we responded promptly and in a manner that said the need was so urgent the United Nations must be bypassed.

Was that just because Great Britain decided it would suit the British book to have our money and our arms and our food poured into Greece to keep British commitments? It was.

When Turkey called on the grounds of pressure from Russia, we responded as promptly, with the same aid, and with the same excuse.

When fascist-minded China—now allied with Great Britain and the Arabs—called for help against her native revolting populations, we responded in the name of freedom.

But while Israel is being slaughtered, we sit on our hands, mouthing empty phrases of courtesy, denying arms, help, or effective support—because Britain wouldn't like it.

It has been clear for some time that Hitler conquered Bevin even after death.

Has Bevin, and the Hitlerian code of death to Jews, now captured the Presidency of the United States? Or is it merely cowardice and cupidity that have won the day?

Answer, Mr. President.

Freedom is being slaughtered in Palestine.

Is Britain's reconquest of America to be so complete—and so easy? Paid for, that is, by Israel's life?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is made to appear that there are no further requests for time. I therefore ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to points of order and amendments at any place thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the bill? Are there any amendments to the bill?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RIZLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. JUDD, and Mr. COURTNEY.

NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4721) to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 2. No funds appropriated for the repair or alteration of any naval vessel shall be utilized to make any repairs or alterations to a vessel which result in a change of the category or type of such vessel, unless such funds have been specifically made available for such purpose."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous material.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to include in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole an editorial from the New York Post.

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by Representative MCCONNELL.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently delivered by Representative GILLIE.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WATER FILTRATION PLANT, HIGHLAND FALLS, N. Y.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2359) to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2359) to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, New York, as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended title proposed by the Senate, amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $85,000, to the village of Highland Falls, New York, as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes."; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE J. BATES,
L. C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
LANSDALE G. SASSCER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2359) to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $100,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill provides for the payment of the sum of $100,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of the construction of a water-filtration plant. The Senate amendment reduced the amount of the payment to $50,000. The conference agreement provides for the payment of $85,000.

The Senate amended the title of the bill to conform to the amendment of the text reducing the amount of the payment. The conference agreement provides for an amended title conforming to the conference agreement with respect to the amount of the payment.

GEORGE J. BATES,
L. C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
LANSDALE G. SASSCER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1676) to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1676) to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 15 of the House engrossed amendments, lines 4 and 5, strike out "family quarters so constructed" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in any case in which the construction at any station of family quarters having a net floor area in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet is prohibited by the provisions of the foregoing proviso, an equal number of family quarters having a net floor area not in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet may be constructed at such station and any funds saved as a result of the construction of such smaller family quarters or as a result of the succeeding proviso may be utilized to construct family quarters having a net floor area not in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet at any Army or Air Force station scheduled for retention in the permanent Military Establishment: *Provided further*, That family quarters constructed with the funds authorized for appropriation herein"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

GEORGE J. BATES,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
OVERTON BROOKS,
LANSDALE G. SASSCER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1676) to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment, and that the House agree to the same. The committee further recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the title.

The original authorizations for military construction by the Army and Air Force for the fiscal year 1948 were contained in H. R. 4122 and S. 1676, companion bills, which were introduced in the House and Senate last year. Both of these bills were favorably reported by the Committees on Armed Services. As reported, they would have authorized a total expenditure for military construction of $247,530,659.

S. 1676 subsequently passed the Senate without amendment and hence would have authorized the expenditure of the sum just stated, namely, $247,530,659.

Although H. R. 4122 provided for the expenditure of an equal sum, no further action was taken on this bill by the House. In lieu thereof, a new bill, H. R. 6342, was introduced, which reduced the total authorization to $207,930,350. By this action a saving of $39,600,309 was effected by the House.

This saving was brought about by the omission from the new bill of a number of specific projects which were included in H. R. 4122 and which also remained in S. 1676 as it passed the Senate. The projects eliminated were selected by the Army and Air Force as being of lesser priority than those retained in the new bill. The reduction of $39,600,309 in the total authorization represented the sum total of the estimated cost of these individual projects which were omitted.

During the consideration of H. R. 6342 by the House an amendment was adopted consisting of two provisos, the legal effect of which is as follows:

1. To prohibit the use of funds authorized in this bill for the construction of family quarters having a net floor area in excess of 1,080 square feet per family unit; and

2. To require that all family quarters constructed with these funds be of the multiple type or apartment type except under certain specified conditions which would warrant a departure from this policy.

The practical effect of this amendment would be to permit an additional saving because of the limitations as to the size and type of dwellings which may be constructed. H. R. 6342 originally contemplated the construction of 3,559 detached and semidetached family units of varying sizes. By resorting to the multiple or row type of construction and by limiting the net floor area of all

units to a maximum of 1,080 square feet, the same total number of family quarters can be provided at an estimated saving of $13,298,910.

Following the passage of H. R. 6342, the Senate bill, S. 1676, was taken from the Speaker's table and was amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting in lieu thereof the language of the House bill. The House also amended the title to conform with the separation of the Army and Air Force under the Unification Act.

The Senate receded from its insistence upon the restoration in the bill of authorizations totaling $39,600,309 which had been deleted by the House.

The Senate receded from its disagreement with the provisos adopted by the House which would prohibit the construction of housing with a net floor area in excess of 1,080 square feet and which would require that dwellings be of the multiple type.

The Senate insisted, however, that the resulting savings of $13,298,910 which will be effected by these provisos be made available for the construction of additional family units of the smaller size and multiple type at Army and Air Force stations scheduled for retention in the permanent Military Establishment. It is estimated that $13,298,910 will provide for the construction of 876 additional units of this type. The Senate took the position that the critical shortage of family housing makes it mandatory that the funds resulting from these economies be utilized to provide additional housing. The Senate view prevailed, and, accordingly, the conferees agreed to accept the House amendment to the Senate bill, with an amendment.

The conference amendment provides for the addition of a new proviso which will give effect to the intent of the conferees that savings resulting from the operation of the two House provisos be made available for additional construction at permanent stations.

Under the House amendment to the Senate bill it was contemplated that the services would be permitted to substitute an equal number of units of the smaller size for such units of larger sizes as were originally planned. In the interest of clarity, the new proviso restates the legislative intent in this regard in addition to providing that savings may be utilized at any permanent station.

GEORGE J. BATES,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
OVERTON BROOKS,
LANSDALE G. SASSCER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1948

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 589 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration for H. R. 6419, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Those of you who were Members of this House during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and previous Congresses, will remember that two omnibus bills were reported each year. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors reported one omnibus bill, and the Committee on Flood Control reported another. You will remember that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 vested the functions of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Flood-Control Committee in the Public Works Committee.

I have reviewed the history of the procedure by which these bills were formerly reported only to emphasize the remarkable job the Public Works Committee has done on the bill this year. The omnibus rivers, harbors and flood-control bill they have reported this year calls for an expenditure of less than the omnibus bills reported in past years. The members of the Public Works Committee have recognized the stringency of our present Federal finances, and they have reported a bill which will cost less than legislation for like purposes in the past 25 years.

Every project in the bill has been screened and rescreened by the committee, and every project has had a favorable report from the Army engineers. The bill now includes 32 rivers and harbors projects in 14 States, and 13 flood-control projects in 10 States. All of this construction is of an urgent nature, or it would not have been included in the bill.

There is one other important improvement over the procedure followed in past Congresses in reporting similar bills which I would like to point out to you. In the past, authorization for preliminary examination and survey items have been approved as a matter of course. This year, however, the survey items have been carefully screened by the committee, with the results that only nine surveys have been approved. This new procedure will save a considerable amount of money, and will prevent the waste of time and efforts to surveying projects which obviously are not feasible.

Again allow me to compliment the work of the members of the Committee on Public Works for their diligence in reporting this bill. I am sure that it will meet the approval of every fair-minded Member of this House.

This resolution provides 1 hour of debate on the bill, and waives points of order against it. I am sure that a majority of you recognize the value and the necessity for this legislation, and there is no need for me to urge you to vote for this resolution providing for its consideration.

This bill, as I understand, is unanimously reported by the committee. There was no objection in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, there is no desire to consume any time on this side.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECOND DECONTROL ACT, 1947

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6659) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6659) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That subsection (b) of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (Public Law 188, Eightieth Congress), and as further amended by the Act of February 28, 1948 (Public Law 427, Eightieth Congress), is hereby amended by striking out 'May 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1949'. Subsection (b) (1) (C) of such section 1501 is hereby repealed. Subsection (b) (1) (E) of such section 1501 is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'and nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia), in any form, necessary for the manufacture and delivery of the nitrogenous fertilizer materials required for such export: *Provided, however,* That 50 per centum of the export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials to nonoccupied areas shall be supplied out of nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) produced in plants operated by or for the Department of the Army, and notwithstanding any other provision of

law the Department of the Army is authorized to produce and sell such nitrogenous fertilizer materials and nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) to fill such 50 per centum of such export requirements'. Subsection (c) of such section 1501 is hereby amended by striking out 'May 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1949'.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this Act shall take effect as of the close of May 31, 1948, and all regulations, orders, directives, directions, requirements, and delegations issued under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, which were in effect on May 31, 1948, shall be in effect in the same manner and to the same extent as if this Act had been enacted on May 31, 1948, and any proceeding, petition, application, or appeal which was pending on May 31, 1948, under such title III, as amended, or under any regulation, order, directive, or direction issued thereunder, shall be proceeded with and shall be effective in the same manner and to the same extent as if this Act had been enacted on May 31, 1948: *Provided*, That in any case in which such title III, as amended, or any regulation, order, directive, direction, or requirement issued thereunder, prescribes any period of time within which any act is required or permitted to be done, and such period had commenced but had not expired on May 31, 1948, such period is hereby extended for a number of days equal to the number of days from June 1, 1948, to the date of the enactment of this Act, both inclusive: *Provided further*, That no act or transaction, or omission or failure to act, occurring subsequent to May 31, 1948, and prior to the date of enactment of this Act, shall, by reason of the enactment of this Act, be deemed to be a violation of such title III, as amended, or of any regulation, order, directive, or direction issued thereunder."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RALPH E. FLANDERS,
C. D. BUCK,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
By R. E. F.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6659) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text. The committee of conference recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same.

The substitute agreed to in conference, aside from minor clarifying amendments, is the same as the bill as passed by the House except as explained below:

The date until which the controls are continued is the date provided in the Senate amendment, namely, June 30, 1949. The House bill had prescribed the date of February 28, 1949.

It should be noted that, in addition to its other effects, this legislation extends the power of the President to control the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers beyond February 28, 1949, the date on which that power would expire under existing legislation.

It is intended that in the exercise of distribution and use controls under this legislation fair and equitable allocations shall be made.

The conference substitute does not contain section 2 of the House bill, which proposed to repeal section 3 (b) of the act of December 30, 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.), relating to the use of price criteria in the licensing of exports.

In view of the fact that powers under title III of the Second War Powers Act, to which this act relates, expired at the close of May 31, 1948, a section 2 is included in the conference substitute to provide that this legislation shall become effective as of the close of May 31, 1948. This will make it clear that the employees administering these powers, many of whom are war service appointees, may be retained and will avoid other incidental and unfortunate effects upon their employment status. It will also have the effect of keeping all the former regulations and orders in force without confusion or doubt and without reissuance. Appropriate provisions are included, however, to insure that persons will not be subject to criminal penalties by reason of acts or omissions occurring after May 31, 1948, and prior to the enactment of this legislation.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the most controversial provision in this bill and one that seems to be of much interest to a majority of the Members was with respect to the fertilizer control.

As stated in the conference statement, the provisions of the House bill prevailed, and the language agreed to by the conference was, in substance, the language agreed to by the House in the House bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I think the conference report is a very happy solution of the problem submitted to the conferees. The requirement that 50 percent of the nitrogenous fertilizer materials for export to nonoccupied areas shall be furnished by plants operated by the Army will release, I am informed, 30,500 tons of pure nitrogen which will eventually mean 95,000 tons of ammonium nitrate or about 150,000 tons of ammonium sulphate or about 190,000 tons of sodium nitrate or about 750,000 tons of a 4 percent nitrogen mixed fertilizer to the farmers of the United States, which will go a long way to help them in the present predicament in which they find themselves.

This amendment was in the House bill, and no provision on the subject was in the Senate bill. The Senate concurred in this provision and I think we brought back a conference report that we can unqualifiedly commend to your favorable consideration.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if the provisions of the conference report as interpreted in his statement in reference to the fertilizer situation mean that there is going to be no disturbance of the domestic allocation of the production of fertilizer over what now exists? And if it means further that the requirements for foreign export are going to be made up by the production that is required of the Army operated and owned plants mentioned in the amendment?

Mr. SPENCE. The provisions of the amendment do not categorically answer affirmatively the question of the gentleman from Texas, but I do think it is going to be administered in a liberal spirit in order to meet the needs of the farmers. We had before the committee Mr. W. T. Hart, from the Commerce Department, who will administer this act, and he expressed great interest in seeing that adequate fertilizer materials were furnished to our farmers. I believe we have come to the conclusion that the bill as represented by the conference report will result in giving the farmers as near their requirements as possible could be done.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very much interested in the fertilizer problem. How soon will this relief be effective as far as the domestic supply of fertilizer is concerned?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it should have an immediate effect upon the availability of fertilizer to the American farmer. The effect perhaps will not be felt in its fullness for a matter of 2 or 3 months, but surely it should ease the situation immediately.

Mr. CURTIS. It does mean the reopening of these Government plants?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have urged the expansion of production in the Government plants, or plants which would be operated by or for the Department of the Army, and I think it will have an immediate effect upon the availability of fertilizer for the American farmers.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I wish to refer to the sixth paragraph of the statement of the managers, where the following statement is made:

> It is intended that in the exercise of the distribution and use controls under this legislation, fair and equitable allocations shall be made.

The gentleman will recall that I appeared before the committee in connection with the difficulties of steel-wire users of tin, and the chairman and the members of the committee were most courteous in their consideration of the problem facing that segment of industry.

Is my interpretation correct that the managers intended to indicate that fair and equitable allocations should apply to the users of tin in the steel-wire industry?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Most decidedly; and the gentleman's problem was before the

conference in respect to steel wire. I might say that this language in the report was agreed upon in consequence of the discussion which we had in relation the gentleman's problem.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, as many Members know, I have been working for months to find ways and means to channel more nitrogen to the American farmers. As a member of the subcommittee which investigated the nitrogen supply, I can assure you that there was never a greater need nor a greater demand for nitrogenous fertilizer than there is today.

In my studies of this problem I found that almost 28 percent of American manufactured and imported nitrogen was being shipped abroad to the occupied and unoccupied countries. In round figures we export 314,500 tons of pure nitrogen annually or 28 percent of the American supply. True it is that 253,000 tons of the exports are manufactured by the Ordnance Department of the Army but the fact remains that the Army's output is produced in American-made plants and paid for with American tax dollars. All of Army's production is earmarked for shipment to the occupied countries of Germany, Japan, and Korea; and 61,000 tons of industrial production is annually requisitioned by the Federal Government and exported to countries around the globe. Even if every pound produced by American industry and the Army was made available to the American farmers they would still be short by more than 33,000 tons—and I am still speaking in terms of pure nitrogen.

Not one of the six nitrogen plants in the bizonia area of Germany was destroyed during the war. Shortly after cessation of hostilities all were put into operation and production has continued almost without interruption. With the shooting war having been concluded 3 years ago and Germany's plants going strong, it just does not make sense that we should continue to supply the bizonia area with such large supplies of nitrogen, more particularly when our own supply is so very short.

As stated above, about 61,000 tons of nitrogen is exported annually to the unoccupied countries of France, Greece, Turkey, Philippines, and so forth. Army does not supply this. The Government forces private American manufacturers to make these exports. Early this year the thought occurred to me that the Army should reduce the amount of its supply to the occupied countries of Germany, Japan, and Korea and in turn absorb all exports to the unoccupied countries. This would make available to the American farmers every single ton manufactured by American industry. Even though that of itself would not entirely offset the short supply, it would go a long way.

Earlier in the year, when the Banking and Currency Committee opened hearings on the question of nitrogen exports, I appeared before the committee and urged that Army be required to absorb the exports to the nonoccupied countries. In all, I made three appearances before the committee and made available to its membership the information which had been gathered as a result of our investigation. Of course, Army officials appeared and protested my proposal. They claimed that they could not absorb any of the exports. I cited undisputable figures to show that the German farmer was receiving at least 10 percent more of his fertilizer need than was the American farmer, that production was up in the German plants and that to say the very least the Army could reduce the supply to Germany and other occupied countries sufficiently to absorb a minimum of 50 percent of our international exports.

The Banking and Currency Committee accepted our views on this matter. I am most grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee as well as other members of the committee for incorporating this amendment in the bill. You have rendered a great service to American agriculture. This marks the first real step toward relieving the serious shortage of nitrogen among our farmers. Oh, I know that some of the international moon-gazers may insist that this amendment will seriously affect the occupied program or that the production of food around the world will be reduced. But I can assure you that no such thing will happen. After all, we are bleeding the nitrogen from our soil at an alarming rate. The Department of Agriculture continues to set high-production goals. Without nitrogen the goals cannot be met and the fertility of our lands will be further impaired in the effort unless nitrogen is made available.

The farmers of my own State use large quantities of nitrogen. They have sent many appeals to the members of our State delegation urging that everything possible be done to stop the Government drain on the short supply. In my effort to accomplish this, I have had the most valuable assistance of the members of my delegation, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. COLMER, Mr. RANKIN, Mr. WINSTEAD, and Mr. WILLIAMS. All of them have worked hard in support of this amendment and have rendered a real service to their farming constituents. There are hundred and hundreds of farmers, particularly small farmers, throughout Mississippi who have not received one single pound of high content nitrogen fertilizer this year. For them and their families nitrogen means, as we often say, "a crop or a flop." By no stretch of the imagination can our Government justify the exportation of 28 percent of its supply of nitrogenous fertilizer while many of our own people are without nitrates of any kind.

I am for this conference report. It will mean that for the next fertilizer year an additional 100,000 tons of amonium nitrate will be made available to our farmers, or, if the nitrogen is manufactured in the form of domestic nitrate fertilizers it will add between 200,000 and 275,000 tons of such to the supply. The supply will still be short, I know, but what a great relief this will be. I sincerely urge that the conference report be adopted without a single objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the amendment which will result in allocating additional nitrogen to our farmers is to be adopted. Heretofore 61,000 tons of nitrogen have been shipped overseas from commercially produced stocks of this fertilizer. This nitrogen represents 200,000 tons of ammonium nitrate or 300,000 tons of ammonium sulfate, so I am told. The fact that one-half of this amount will now be available for domestic needs is most gratifying information for our farmers. Thirty thousand five hundred tons of nitrogen should represent 100,000 tons of ammonium nitrate or 150,000 tons of ammonium sulfate. When given the proper base, it will represent about 250,000 tons of commercial fertilizer, so I am informed. Congressman TOM ABERNETHY, of Mississippi, has rendered fine work on the matter of freeing for domestic usages commercially produced nitrogen which heretofore has been shipped overseas. He has made a strong fight in this direction and I have joined with him on numerous occasions likewise in pushing this matter vigorously.

Many farmers in north Louisiana are extremely short of nitrogen fertilizer during the current crop year. They have been writing me letters pleading for additional stocks and supplies and I have recently worked with the Agriculture Department and the Commerce Department in obtaining the cancellation of certain allocations of nitrogen which had previously been designated to Finland. Already some of our farmers have received the benefit of this cancellation but the shortage of nitrogen fertilizer has become even more acute as the summer progresses. The action today of this House will result in making available an additional amount of this material badly needed by the farmers of the agricultural section of the South.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire more time?

Mr. SPENCE. No.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] may be given indefinite leave of absence due to urgent personal and family reasons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6419, with Mr. FULTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express to the members of the Public Works Committee on both sides of the aisle my very deep and sincere appreciation as chairman of that committee for their splendid cooperation, and their courteous consideration in the preparation of the projects which are contained in this bill, as we bring it to the floor of the House for consideration today.

The chairman of this committee, like a number of the members of the committee, served his apprenticeship under the able and distinguished former chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the late lamented Joseph J. Mansfield, of Texas. It was my privilege to serve under him for 14 years, for many of those years as the ranking minority member. I greatly admired and respected him for his integrity, his ability, and his statesmanship in the consideration of rivers and harbors projects for a decade and a half.

The bill which the committee brings to the floor today is an unusual bill in several respects. First, it is the smallest bill to come to the House for consideration for more than a quarter of a century, small in number of projects and small in the total amount involved.

The bill contains 45 projects, 32 of which are rivers and harbors projects and 13 flood-control projects. They are distributed among 21 States of the Union and the total amount of money involved is less than $44,000,000.

When the committee considered the projects to go into this bill, it had in mind two things: First, those projects which fell into the category of emergency or where the conditions were of a very acute nature, and, second, such projects as would yield back to the people of the country great benefit for the amount of money expended. Certain of the projects in this bill will return a benefit of $5 for every dollar to be expended in their construction.

May I say at this juncture that there are many projects in numerous districts of the country that could very well have been included in this bill. But there was no necessity for a large bill. I call to the attention of the Members of the House who have projects in their districts which may not be included in this legislation, that another Congress will be here within the next 7 months to consider such other projects as may be deemed wise for construction. Having in mind the financial condition of the land it was thought best that no large omnibus rivers and harbors, and flood-control bill should be presented; secondly, I might cite as an additional reason that the backlog of projects already authorized and awaiting appropriations for their construction is of such magnitude that the absolute necessity for this bill could not be justified. But the committee believed that a small bill, of small projects, was proper to present to the Congress, as I have just indicated, either where conditions were acute or where an emergency existed.

I might add one more thing. The bill comes to the House without any controversy, by a unanimous vote of the committee. Every project in this bill has had the careful consideration of the Board of Army Engineers, the Chief of Engineers, then the prope subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, under the able leadership of the ranking majority members, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], for rivers and harbors projects, and under the able gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control. In addition to that, it might be of interest to call attention to the fact that in the last 25 years the commerce of the United States—and I mean by that that water-borne commerce—has almost doubled. I ask you to listen to this record of increase in water-borne commerce of our country

In 1920 it was 399,000,000 tons, in 1925 it was 483,000,000 tons, in 1930 it was 520,000,000 tons, in 1935 it was 453,000,000 tons, in 1940 it was 607,000,000 tons, and in 1945 it was 618,000,000 tons.

That simply indicates the vast increase in the commerce of our country and requires that these rivers and harbors, and flood-control projects be given not only attention but that they be improved in many instances to accommodate the deep-draft vessels built during the war. It is vital and necessary that some harbors and channels be deepened, widened, and extended in order to accommodate those ships of a new era in the Nation's history.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I just wanted to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee upon the statement that he just made, because while we realize that it may not be the appropriate time for great public-works programs in the development of rivers and harbors and flood control, and so on, at the same time those existing projects, where they do not have sufficient water in depth and width in the channel for these vessels to navigate, that it is absolutely essential and necessary that these improvements be made.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, it is most unusual for a flood-control bill to be considered with our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] not being present to make a presentation on the part of the Democratic side; however, due to unusual circumstances, our colleague is absent with good reason. He is in Mississippi where he is addressing the graduating class of his college, where he likewise graduated 50 years ago, and while he is not present here today, his hand and guidance will be disclosed in the record of the hearings on the bill which we are now considering.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has delegated the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] to place in the RECORD a statement in connection with H. R. 6419, and this will be done.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the members of the Public Works Committee, I desire to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], on the result of their labors on this bill and in the committee. Leadership entails responsibilities, and they have discharged their obligations.

Mr. Chairman, as one who represents a district and State susceptible to perennial floods, I have been greatly interested in flood control and rivers and harbors legislation since I have been a Member of the Congress. Before the Reorganization Act of 1946, I had been successful in obtaining membership on both the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Committees of the House, and when these committees were absorbed by the Public Works Committee, I was again successful in keeping my place on that committee to give such service as was possible by virtue of my membership on that committee to my district, State, and Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to call to the attention of the House the fact that the waters from 32 States must pass through Louisiana and find their way to the Gulf and while other States have similar problems from time to time, I do not believe that many of the other States have the same constant threat and are visited with disaster as often as has our State, but I repeat that flood control is a national problem and wherever and whenever any protection or relief is needed by any part of the Nation, it is our duty to give protection and relief to that section of the country, and the only manner in which to accomplish this, in my opinion, is to make annual substantial appropriations for all parts of the country which need protection and relief.

Having been one of those who has consistently voted against giving the resources of this country to foreign nations, I can well argue that it is our obligation to use these resources for the protection of our own people and our own country.

Our distinguished chairman has called our attention to the very small amount of appropriations which will be involved in the authorizations under the bill under consideration, and while it is commendable to be economical, I feel that we could well afford to make authorizations and appropriations for flood-control and rivers-and-harbors projects to protect the property and lives of our own country and people rather than be more solicitous about the welfare of other foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, there are two points in the report of the committee which strike me as being of special importance in connection with this bill. The first is in respect to the attention given to the deepening of the channels of our rivers and ports to accommodate the new modern,

large tankers and ships of our merchant marine. The committee recognizes these are facts which confront us due to the increased size and draft of ships now in use, and is a problem which must be met from an economic and practical standpoint.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, before discussing briefly the pending bill, as the ranking member of the Committee on Public Works, I would like to make public acknowledgment in behalf of the committee to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] for his uniform courtesy, patience, and fairness in all hearings, and in the consideration of all bills that have come before the committee. The chairman has familiarized himself with all matters that have been considered by the committee. I pay not only a deserved tribute to his ability, but to his fairness in the conduct of the work of the committee.

I would also like to say that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] conducted full hearings with opportunities to those who advocated and opposed the projects that were submitted to the Subcommittees on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control. They, too, were courteous, fair, and considerate.

The pending bill is the first river and harbor and flood-control bill submitted to the House during the Eightieth Congress. It will be remembered that prior to the Reorganization Act authorizations for rivers and harbors were reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and authorizations for flood control by the Committee on Flood Control. The measure under consideration is for very modest authorizations. Hearings were conducted. Published hearings are available to the Members of Congress, and there is a full report with a description of the projects and analysis of the two titles to the bill.

TITLE I

Title I is known as the River and Harbor Act of 1948. It authorizes the projects enumerated at an estimated cost of $20,887,900. It provides for the preliminary examinations and surveys described in the bill. All of the projects have been reported by the Chief of Engineers and recommended for adoption by the Congress.

TITLE II

Title II is known as the Flood Control Act of 1948. It authorizes projects few in number. The estimated cost aggregates $22,875,000. All of the projects are covered by reports that have been published and are available to the Members of Congress. The projects are described in the report of the committee. In all of the projects, the benefits exceed the cost. The smallest authorization is for $100,000. The largest authorization is for $7,770,000.

The report contains an analysis of the bill.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS AND SURVEYS

In addition to authorizations for the construction of projects, the bill provides for the preliminary examinations and surveys named in the bill by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of Agriculture.

CONSTRUCTIVE PROVISIONS

A constructive authorization is contained in the bill. It authorizes the Chief of Engineers to construct small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by Congress when, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, such work is advisable, to the amount of $2,000,000, provided that not more than $100,000 be allotted to any single locality. It often happens that the public interest would be promoted and protection would be accorded by the immediate construction of small projects without the usual preliminary examinations and surveys, the usual reports to the Congress, and the usual authorizations by Congress. Economy as well as protection will result.

Again section 12 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 was amended with respect to repair, restoration, and maintenance so as to include the extending or other modification of the flood-control works.

There is a third outstanding authorization and the amount of this authorization is not included in the aggregate of the estimated costs of the projects authorized. I refer to a permanent authorization of $25,000,000 for emergency flood-control repairs.

Heretofore, in 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1947, Congress has authorized the appropriation for each of the said years of from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 for emergency repairs. All of the amounts authorized for those years have been appropriated. The pending bill is the first to carry a permanent authorization limited to no one year, but it will be available for floods without regard to the year until the whole amount has been authorized and expended. The authorization will relieve and eliminate the necessity for an annual authorization such as has obtained from 1943 to 1947, inclusive, for emergency repairs. I regard this as a most constructive provision.

AUTHORIZATIONS

For general flood control there remain balances of authorizations previously made of $1,441,308,600; for rivers and harbors, $1,615,691,000; for the lower Mississippi River, $479,764,634; or there remains authorized a total of $3,556,764,234 for rivers and harbors and flood control in the United States. There should always be an adequate backlog of flood-control improvements. I believe that there should be an annual authorization. Rivers are being examined. Flood control is important on many streams on which report has not been previously submitted. Authorization should be made so that all river basins may have comparable treatment.

The pending bill, as I stated, is for very modest authorizations. The committee plans, during the next Congress, to report a general authorization bill. Heretofore projects have been approved and authorizations made for the partial accomplishment of the works. Heretofore the authorizations for the river basins have been increased in each succeeding Flood Control Act. This policy should continue. There should be additional authorizations for the construction of works along all the principal rivers between the Lakes and the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, including the Connecticut River Basin, the upper Mississippi River Basin, the Ohio River Basin, the Missouri River Basin, the lower Mississippi River Basin, the Arkansas River Basin, the White River Basin, the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, the Sacramento River Basin, the San Joaquin River Basin, the Kaweah and Tule River Basins, and the Willamette River Basin. While the remaining authorizations are apparently large, it will be kept in mind that the annual damages from floods are much larger.

The program of adequate authorizations heretofore adopted by Congress should be continued. In periods of unemployment public works, including flood control and river and harbor improvements, should be stepped up. There should be an adequate backlog of such improvements. It is for the Congress to determine the amount of the annual appropriations. It is for Congress to determine whether construction should be increased or whether it should be decreased. Many problems are involved. The stabilization of wages, the ability to obtain materials as well as the stabilization of prices are to be considered. I favor the passage of the pending bill, but I advocate the passage of a comprehensive bill during the next Congress to provide for additional authorizations as projects may be submitted to the Congress, and for additional authorizations for projects in all of the great river basins heretofore approved by the Congress.

The other provision carried in the bill and which is also covered in the committee report is in respect to making authorization for funds for emergency situations which will not necessitate a special authorization each time that there occurs a flash flood or other flood which requires funds in the hands of the Corps of Engineers for immediate relief. These situations must be met, and if funds are not available for immediate relief, delays entailed in setting the legislative machinery in motion to act, cause undue hardship and in the end are more costly than by having funds available for such purposes.

In this connection, I wish to express my appreciation to the officers of the Corps of Engineers for their interest, cooperation, and work in their appearances before our committee, as well as for the manner in which they perform their tasks when called upon, and I have just learned with regret that one of the outstanding men who has been serving as Chief of the Corps of Engineers, General Wheeler, has reached the statutory

age where it is necessary for him to retire.

Mr. Chairman, this distinguished Chief of Engineers, General Wheeler, has served his country in peace with the same distinction and honor which he served his country in war, and I know that all of our members of the committee and all of our colleagues who have come in contact with General Wheeler join me in expressing their regrets in his retirement, and wish for him continued success and happiness in the days to come.

While it is true that in the particular bill under consideration there are no authorizations for Louisiana, I desire to say that the Congress has been considerate of the problems which confront us and has given approval to legislation and appropriations to help protect Louisiana from the ravages of floods which have cost us so much in destruction of property and loss of lives, and while there is yet much more to be done to protect us before we can feel safe from the recurring floods, we are sympathetic to the problems of all of the other States and desire to assist in any way possible to give them the same consideration and protection which we ask.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary for me to add anything to the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I do want to say on the part of all of us on this side of the committee, however, that we have been delighted with the fairness exhibited by our chairman. Not only is he fair but he is able. He is very conscientious. All of us have worked with him in a very fine spirit of agreement. We have approached all of these matters with thoroughness. As he stated to you, all of these projects have been considered by the Army engineers and have been considered adequately by the subcommittee. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], the chairmen of the two respective subcommittees, have held all the meetings necessary. They have accorded every witness who wished to be present and to be heard every opportunity to appear. So this bill comes to you with a unanimous report.

We recognize that a great many projects should be authorized, and we expect that the next Congress, under the direction of this committee, will consider all of the necessary projects and will return to this House for consideration those found most necessary. This bill contains the very minimum of authorized projects. All of these projects have been carefully examined and, as I have said, the bill comes to you with a unanimous report.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I commend the gentleman on his fine statement. I have heard the utility of flood-control and rivers-and-harbors projects debated and to some extent questioned in recent days. I am very happy to know that this bill comes out of the committee with a unanimous report. I think it is most timely. I think any time, whether it be in prosperous times or bad times, is a proper time to use our energies and our abilities for the development of our country and especially for the development of the water resources of our country.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

May I add that in the light of recent sad experiences in the far West we feel that the time is rapidly approaching when we must with vision and certainly with good business sense approach these serious questions in the control of the waters of this country. We must not have destruction in the years to come. We must see that the dollars spent shall be used constructively.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking Member on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] who for so many years performed such distinguished service as chairman of this full committee, is in the State of Mississippi today delivering an address to the graduating class of Mississippi College. Fifty years ago the gentleman from Mississippi got his degree from this college. He has not missed a single session or any of the subcommittees or the full committee, and we feel that this is one time we can properly excuse him from attendance on the presentation of a bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I certainly want to express my appreciation, and I think I speak for the members of the majority on the Committee on Public Works, of the splendid cooperation the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and the distinguished gentleman who is handling this bill from the minority viewpoint today, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] have given us in the preparation of this legislation. I am sure it is appreciated by all.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. I concur in everything the gentleman from Tennessee has said regarding the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and the gentleman from Tennessee. No man could be more cooperative or helpful in the work of the Committee on Public Works, especially that having to do with rivers and harbors and flood control, than the gentleman from Mississippi, a very diligent and able man. We consider him of the greatest value on this committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank my chairman. We do feel extremely confident by virtue of having the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in the respective places they now fill on this important committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my very deep appreciation to the members of the subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and the members of the full Committee on Public Works for their very kind consideration and the courtesies extended to me when I appeared before the subcommittee on April 14, 1948 in support of the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau with respect to West Tennessee tributaries. I am also grateful to the committee for the action in including this project in the pending bill. As I stated to the committee, this project is of vital importance to the people of west Tennessee and especially those of the district which I have the honor to represent.

It was at my request that the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, by resolution adopted April 26, 1944, almost exactly 4 years ago, very kindly requested the Chief of Engineers to review House Document No. 188, Seventy-second Congress, 1st session, and other reports, with a view to determining whether improvements for flood control and drainage are advisable at this time on several streams and their tributaries in western Tennessee. This resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is hereby requested to review those portions of House Document No. 188, Seventy-second Congress, 1st session, covering lands in Dyer County, Tenn., and in Lauderdale County, Tenn., subject to overflow from the Mississippi River, and reports on the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and tributaries, Tennessee, covering Dyer, Lauderdale, Lake, Obion, Gibson, and Crockett counties, with a view to determining whether improvements for flood control and drainage are advisable in said counties:

I might also add that Weakley and other counties of this area were also included for this investigation.

In order to comply with these resolutions the Chief of Engineers requested the Mississippi River Commission to make a report to him, which report has been made, and after full consideration of said report, the Chief of Engineers concurred with the Mississippi River Commission and has recommended that the existing project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended, be modified to provide for the improvement recommended by the Mississippi River Commission at an estimated additional cost of $7,700,000 for construction, subject to the usual conditions with respect to cooperation by the local interests.

As above stated, it was my privilege to appear before the committee in support of the project covered in the report of

the Chief of Engineers which had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and I desire to briefly invite attention of the House to some of the points that I think should be considered in support of this project.

There is an overflow area, above the Mississippi River backwater area, along the Obion River and its principal tributaries, which comprises about 310,000 acres. Frequent overflows have caused abandonment of large areas of cropland and retarded development of woodland. Inadequate drainage, due to insufficient outlets, hampers cultivation and reduces yields within the limit of maximum overflow. Local interests, through organized drainage districts, have constructed ditches at a cost of many millions of dollars in an effort to provide drainage for this area, but the rivers covered in this project have become so filled up and their channels so congested that sufficient outlet is not provided to afford the proper drainage of the area. These local interests appeared at public hearings held by the district engineer at my home town of Dyersburg, Tenn., as well as several other places, and expressed their desire for improved drainage outlets and relief from overflow by channel improvement of the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and their tributaries. They gave assurances of their willingness to cooperate by furnishing rights-of-way and the usual cooperation provided by local interests.

The district engineer made a very thorough investigation and has presented his report and recommends a plan contemplating channel improvements as required to insure adequate outlets on the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and their principal tributaries. The Mississippi River commission recommends that the existing project for the lower Mississippi River be modified to provide for improvements on the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and their principal tributaries, substantially in accordance with the plan outlined in paragraph 27 of the district engineer's report.

It should be noted that the district engineer advises that the greatest problem in the Obion and Forked Deer River systems principally concerns the ineffective drainage of farm lands. He expresses his opinion that channel improvements consisting of clean-out, enlargement and realinement, as required of the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and their principal tributaries, will, by reducing the extent of overflows during the crop season and by materially reducing the duration of overflow periods, provide effective drainage for 118,000 acres of cropland and present the opportunity for development of 60,000 acres of woodland for agricultural use. The engineers find that the project is economically feasible and recommend its approval.

It should be borne in mind that the channel improvements covered in this project are designed with capacities sufficiently large to eliminate overflow during the crop season on a considerable part of the area and provide drainage outlets which are now lacking. Flood run-off will be so accelerated that the duration of the overflow periods will be materially reduced. The overflow area along the main stems of the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers, above the general effect of Mississippi River backwaters, and along their principal tributaries, comprise about 310,000 acres. In addition, there are approximately 145,000 acres in the flood plains of the minor tributaries.

As the situation now exists the channels of these rivers and many of the drainage ditches are intermittently filled to a considerable depth and, in many instances, are blocked for a distance of several miles with sand, silt, stumps, and drifts, and these conditions have resulted from inadequate outlets, insufficient capacity, and improper maintenance of these streams.

The improvements embraced in this project are vitally needed in the interest of agriculture, as well as the improvement of health conditions in the area, and I very strongly urge that the project be retained and authorized in the pending bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PASS THE RUSSELL BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, with the adjournment of Congress set for June 19, I want to call to the attention of Congress to the plight of the small mine owners throughout the State of Montana and the Rocky Mountain region as well. All year I have been doing what I could to get some action on the Russell bill. While we fidget around and talk about doing something for these small mining people they are losing their investments and many of their mines have been ruined to such an extent that they will find it impossible to open them up again.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman will recall that in the last Congress we passed a bill to take care of these small mine operators and the President vetoed it. The President is a member of the gentleman's party. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that if we passed another bill and sent it to the President, it would not be vetoed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the majority leader has brought up that question. I would appreciate it if he would pay a little attention to what I am going to say in the course of my remarks.

I am pleading with the Republican leadership of this House to bring the Russell bill to the floor so we may have an opportunity to debate and pass it. If we are going to get any new production in this country, we are going to have to depend on the small miners of the United States to bring it about.

It is extremely unfortunate that the President vetoed the Allen bill which passed in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. I am very hopeful, if we pass the Russell bill, the President will have recognized his error and will sign this new measure in behalf of the small miners of Montana and the Nation. I urge that the Russell bill be reported out immediately so that necessary assistance to the marginal and the little miners of our country can be forthcoming and so that these small operators can wherever possible once again put their mines in operation and contribute to the great needs of our strategic minerals so necessary in our country.

I should like to call to the attention of the Congress the pressing necessity of this particular legislation in view of the statement made by Secretary of Interior Krug before the Subcommittee on Appropriations considering the Interior Appropriation bill on April 29, 1948, when Secretary Krug was asked about the stock-pile situation. He answered as follows:

> Frankly, I will let the committee know that military strategic stock piles don't exist. We have a few items that are not important, but on the extremely important critical materials we have virtually nothing in the stock pile.
>
> In commercial use we have pinched in practically every way, and we will be even more pinched with the increase in productivity activity that must come to meet this heavy production program for foreign aid and the defense program.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this statement by Secretary of Interior is more than ample to show the need for the passage of the Russell bill at the earliest opportunity, and certainly it is shocking to find from so authoritative an official that our mineral supply is in such a sadly neglected condition.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works has spent many months in the consideration of projects which are included in this bill. As our chairman has explained, it is an omnibus bill covering projects both in rivers and harbors and in flood-control work. It has long been the practice in the House that in connection with rivers and harbors, all of the bills be included in one so-called omnibus bill so that we may with expedition bring to the attention of the House the projects which are before the committee, without consuming too much of your time. That practice has been followed this time. Also, we have included in the same bill projects under flood control, which likewise are usually considered, under the old procedure, as one bill from that committee.

As the chairman has explained to you, under my section of the bill—rivers and harbors—there are 32 projects. They are not large in size, as has been usually considered. The total amount for rivers and harbors is $20,887,900, which in fact is a very, very small bill, when we consider that this covers the entire United States.

I have seen some comments in the newspapers, and perhaps some of our

Members have seen them, that this is a pork-barrel bill, where we all get together, everybody with a pet project and include all the projects in one bill, and thereby the bill passes. Now, that is not the case in this bill. Neither has it been the practice of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I have served on that committee during my entire tenure in the Congress, some 10 years, and I am quite sure there is no committee that gives more careful consideration to the projects that come before it than does this committee. In fact, every single project here must first be initiated by the committee. We ask the Corps of Engineers to take up the matter. They do not initiate them. They do not go out and determine, willy-nilly, what projects are to be taken up. They are requested to make a preliminary survey, and then later they are authorized to make an actual examination and a complete detailed survey by authority of the Congress. That is presented back to the committee. Then, the committee very carefully goes over that particular project and gives notice of a public hearing. Of course, the committee has the experience of the Corps of Army Engineers, which is a most efficient body. Then we call witnesses, pro and con, anyone who is interested in the project, and those on the ground in the vicinity of the project who are interested or who may be adverse to the project. In the first instance, when the Army engineers take up a project, they hold hearings out in the community where the project is, and they give anyone who is interested an opportunity to appear. So these projects that appear in this particular bill, to which I have called attention, have had this careful consideration throughout.

As my chairman has said, they have been fully approved by the committee. They were first approved by the Army engineers. Now we bring them to you for your consideration.

I think it might be said that if this great country of ours is going to continue to prosper and be in the first rank of the great nations of the world in production, as we were during the last war, we must give careful consideration to the development of our own natural resources and our own internal economy. It seems to me it is penny-wise and pound-foolish to expend billions of dollars of money here, there, and everywhere around the world, and at the same time allow the economy of our own country to break down, and not take care of our own natural resources. We must utilize to the full our own natural resources, and preserve them.

Included among them are, of course, our rivers and harbors and our great water transportation systems in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to call to your attention, before I sit down, a great tragedy that has overtaken us in the West, in the great Columbia River Basin, which is vitally interested in river and harbor projects and especially at this time in flood control.

As I called to your attention earlier in the week, the Columbia River is the second largest in the United States. It is a great harbinger of peace. It is a great work horse. In ordinary times that great river is working day and night. The greatest potential hydroelectric power any place in the world is locked up in that river. We have utilized only about 1,500,000 kilowatts, when there are available 20,000,000, the balance being wasted. As years pass, 50 or 100 years, we are confronted with a great emergency, a great tragedy such as we are passing through today when the old river has gone mad and on the rampage. Over 100,000 people are now in distress by reason of this devastating flood. In my own district over 5,000 homes have been destroyed and completely blotted out, and the victims are without any place to lay their heads. Furthermore, families have been separated and there are literally dozens of children whose parents are unaccounted for at this time by reason of the great flood in my area. It is too early to know the death toll. It is heavy.

We now have news that the waters are again increasing in the upper stretches of the river and we may have even more serious trouble ahead.

These great internal improvements of our rivers, flood control, the development of rivers for transportation, the multiple-purpose dams are the works which help us to control these great streams, these great waterways when these unusual conditions arise and provide some security against flood damage. For that reason I think this country certainly should give more attention to providing a long-range development program not only for the full utilization of these great waterways and our great harbors and ports but also to restrain these great streams when they do get on the rampage and cause so much trouble and damage. Probably more than a hundred million dollars' worth of property has been wiped out and many lives lost in the 2 or 3 days in my area by this catastrophe.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the House Public Works Committee, I presided at the many hearings held by the subcommittee in the consideration of rivers and harbors projects during the Eightieth Congress. As you will recall, no rivers and harbors bill was presented by the committee in the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

In the bill now under consideration, as I have said, there is combined both rivers and harbors projects and flood-control projects. Our colleague [Mr. WILSON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, and other members of the full committee, will present those projects. I will limit my discussion to the rivers and harbors projects coming under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee.

The committee purposely has not taken up any major projects involving large expenditures of moneys, due to the fact that we are endeavoring to cooperate with the leadership in keeping expenditures within reasonable bounds. These projects are located in various sections of the Nation from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the committee has endeavored to deal justly with all sections of the country. No political considerations have entered into the committee's determinations in giving approval to these projects. I may say in passing, there is no project in my own congressional district.

I hold the view that while we must be diligent in reducing the cost of Government and prevent the unnecessary expenditure of public funds, we will be penny-wise and pound-foolish, and derelict in our duty if we fail to take a broad, long-range view in the development and full utilization of the natural resources of the Nation. From the beginning of our national existence, we have followed a consistent policy of development of our resources and continued a sound program of internal improvement development. We have spent, and are continuing to spend, billions of dollars for overseas operations, much of these funds being gifts to European nations, and now we are embarking on a world-wide program of relief and aid for European recovery, which will aggregate over $20,000,000,000, if it is carried through to completion, as is now contemplated. We will be unable to meet our commitments in this respect, as well as our commitments at home, if we fail to take advantage of our natural resources and keep them working at full capacity. This involves projects having to do with flood control, public buildings necessary for economic operation of our Government, development of our national highway system, and development and use of our rivers and harbors, all of which are necessary to an integrated program of internal development.

At the present time there are some 1,200 river and harbor projects actively in force. The construction activity in connection with these projects includes the maintenance of channels and harbor areas, channel-control works, breakwater work, snagging, and the operation and care of facilities which have been provided in the interest of navigation.

Since April 6, 1802, when an appropriation of $30,000 was made for piers in the Delaware River by the Corps of Engineers, the total funds appropriated through the fiscal year 1948 for river and harbor projects in the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Island amounted to $3,370,000,000.

As you know, the Federal Government has jurisdiction over the improvement and control of navigable waterways by reason of the commerce clause in the Constitution. Under this authority the Government has constructed many multiple-purpose projects, not only for navigation but for flood control, reclamation, and hydroelectric power. Hydroelectric power is a most important factor in the program by reason of the fact that it brings into the Federal Government revenues from such projects which not only reimburse the Government for the cost of the power facilities, but help to retire the indebtedness for other portions of the improvements, such as reclamation. It has been the policy of the Government for many years to retain control over generation of hydroelectric

power in such projects, which is a wise one and should be continued. I am a firm believer in private enterprise and hold the view that the Federal Government should not inject itself into commercial operations where private enterprise may carry them forward adequately and successfully. However, it is my view that in these large river developments which have power development as one of the major factors, the ownership and control over the entire project, including power, should be retained by the Federal Government.

The industrial machine of America runs full speed by reason of our oil, coal, and hydroelectric energy. Our coal and oil supply is expendable. According to the American Petroleum Institute, the estimated proven petroleum reserves existing as of last year were 21,900,000,000 barrels. This Nation is now being placed between the two jaws of the mechanical vise which are being tightened by the screw of increasing domestic demands. No wonder Arabian oil is now receiving international attention. The stated proven reserves in the Middle East are 25 percent higher than the total like United States reserves, and geophysical soundings indicate that the most probable Middle East reserves will be double the present reserves of the United States. Such soundings further indicate that the greatest existing oil pool lies in the area of the Caspian Sea—Russian territory—and extends into and across the Indian Ocean into the East Indies.

Our usable refining capacity is now being operated at the highest obtainable rate, and the industry is making every effort to expand refining facilities. Everything possible is being done to increase refining volume, but this is the easiest part of the over-all problem. The petroleum industry is doing all possible to help in the solution of this problem.

As against our diminishing oil and coal supply, our wealth of hydroelectric energy has been only partially tapped and it will continue as long as the sun shines and water runs. Therefore, it is of first importance that the Federal Government retain its control over this enormous resource which is fundamental to the success of our industrial system. One kilowatt-year of hydroelectric power is equivalent to about 15 barrels of oil.

The Bonneville plant, in my congressional district, during the war turned out 570,000 continuous kilowatts, which is equivalent to 8,800,000 barrels. The 15-unit completed Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to 28,000,000 barrels of oil annually. When McNary Dam on the Columbia River is completed, the oil saving will be about 15,500,000 barrels annually. The existing usable steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions, 5,000,000 barrels will be consumed. From present indications, it will be difficult to secure commitments on even 5,000,000 barrels, due to the tight situation on the Pacific coast. The potential power on the Columbia and its tributaries is around 20,000,000 kilowatts, and 18,500,000 kilowatts is now flowing to the sea, unused. If this displacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be, in round numbers, 290,000,000 barrels annually, or about 95 percent of the total European consumption, or a quarter of our own prewar consumption. I cite these facts to show the importance of undeveloped hydro power in our future economy.

We have all shared the hope that now that the war is behind us almost 3 years, we could look forward to an era of peace, good will, and economic stability throughout the world. Unfortunately, as evidenced by chaotic world conditions at this very hour, we are confronted with an international crisis of uncertainty and grave portent which challenges the abilities and loyal devotion of all Americans. The peace and stability of the world is hanging in the balance. Out of the death and destruction of World War II, we want to build a structure for enduring peace which will embrace all the peace-loving nations of the world and make unnecessary another catastrophe such as the one we have just passed through. To accomplish this we cannot forget that our first consideration should be the security and protection of our Nation, and we must not be lulled into a sense of false security by appeasement and double talk. This is a time when, as Washington said in the dark days of Valley Forge, only Americans should be put on guard. Let us maintain our national defenses, particularly our Air Force and Navy at full strength, so that we may be in a position to meet any eventuality that may arise.

The urgent need for additional hydroelectric power is shown by the announcement of the Secretary of Defense of a $2,000,000,000 program for airplane construction. We all know that this involves enormous quantities of aluminum which can be produced only with large pools of hydroelectric power. There is a dearth of this power at the present time for ordinary industrial and commercial activities, and this heavy additional demand means early construction of all available generating capacity. A number of river and harbor and flood-control projects also have hydroelectric power provisions which should be rushed to completion. This is particularly true in the Columbia River area and the Hungry Horse project in Montana. McNary Dam, now under construction, Hungry Horse project under contract, and Foster Creek on the Columbia River in the planning stage, afford an opportunity to make available a heavy accretion to our hydroelectric power production facilities. I mention these projects and the need for hydroelectric power because many projects coming under my Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, as well as those under the Flood Control Subcommittee, are multiple-purpose projects carrying, among other features, the development of hydroelectric power.

It should be remembered in considering these projects, that each one has had most careful consideration, not alone by the subcommittee and the full committee, but also by the Army engineers, and each one has been approved by the engineers, the subcommittee, and the full committee. The approval was unanimous in each case.

This bill is an authorization bill and further consideration will have to be given to each of the projects before construction is commenced. The Army engineers do not even make a preliminary examination of any of these projects until they are requested to do so by resolution duly enacted into law. After the projects are approved by legislation such as the bill we are now considering, the Army engineers have the further duty of selecting, among the projects approved, those that are most urgent, and determination is made when, in their judgment, construction should be commenced. Thereafter appropriations must be considered by the Appropriation Committees of the Congress, and funds made available for commencing the project.

All of the projects for both rivers and harbors and flood control are included in the one bill known as an omnibus bill, in order to conserve the time of the House and to expedite consideration of the combined projects. I call attention to the report of the committee where, on page 2, each of the rivers and harbors projects is set forth, and where, on accompanying pages, the factual descriptions of each project are given.

These are worthy projects, fully approved, and will materialy aid in promoting the economy of our country. The bill should be approved by the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, in making a few remarks with reference to the bill, I approach the subject with a deep sense of humility and some sense of responsibility, not only to the people of Texas but also to the people of the United States.

It was my privilege to be elected to membership on the Public Works Committee in July of 1947 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of our colleague, Hon. J. J. Mansfield, who passed away on July 12, 1947. Judge Mansfield died at the age of 86 after 60 years of public service to the people of his own immediate town and county, to the people of Texas, and to the people of the United States. Thirty years of that public service were devoted to his duties as a Member of this Congress. He took his seat in March 1917. During the course of those 30 years in Congress Judge Mansfield served for a longer time as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors than any other Member in the history of the House, having been elected to membership on that committee in 1921. He succeeded to the chairmanship in December 1931, and served as chairman for a longer period of time than any man in the history of Congress. The quality of his service is beyond question, the merit of his work is superior, the pattern he set for those whose duty it is to follow in the wake of his great endeavors is all-embracing. Therefore, as a new member of this committee as I take up, not where he left off, because his was the broad vision of years of experience and knowledge that can come only with experience, there comes to me a sense of humility and responsibility to add in some measure to the impetus he gave to

the development of rivers and harbors, in the construction of new work and the improvement of the old, that we may progress as the exigencies of time require and utilize the facilities constructed for the best interest of the commerce and industry not only of the United States but of the world. Judge Mansfield's service as a member and chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee has contributed more greatly to the development of a Nation-wide program than that of any other man who ever served in the Congress. It certainly contributed more to the progress we have made in the State of Texas, not only in rivers and harbors development but also from the standpoint of flood control. At the time he became a Member of this Congress, the total commerce from the harbors of Texas was only a little more than 9,500,000 tons per year. When he was elected to the Congress in the year 1942 it exceeded 100,000,000 tons a year. For that development and for that increase, much of the credit is due to the broad vision, the keen insight, and indefatigable industry of Judge Mansfield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, in passing, let me briefly note that the chairman of the committee at present is, in my opinion, one of the most able, most competent men in the entire Congress, a man of keen insight and cooperative spirit. The same may be said of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors.

This bill is a new departure in one sense of the word. In this bill we, for the first time in the recent history of the Congress, bring a rivers and harbors and a flood-control authorization into one proposed act. Rivers and harbors improvement is provided for in title I, flood control in title II.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It is true that it is the first time in over 31 years that a bill of this kind has come before the House where the two titles have been merged into one, because on February 24, 1916, the Flood Control Committee was established by the House.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman.

In the process of the development of the contents of title I, the rivers and harbors title, the subcommittee under the able direction of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] screened as carefully as I could possibly conceive any committee could screen, each of the proposals submitted to it. It is of a great deal of significance that not one single member of the committee questioned any project after it had been completely explained. It was carefully reviewed by the members of the committee through interrogation, not only of the Corps of Engineers representative who appeared before our committee, but of those who represented the local interests and testified in favor of the projects. It is worthy and significant of notice that there is not a single project in this rivers and harbors title where the cost-benefit ratio is not favorably reflected, in that the benefits to be realized from the completed project will far more than outweigh the total cost of the project.

These projects were all screened from the time of their inception by a proposal to the Congress in the form of a resolution for initial investigation by the Corps of Engineers, through the investigation by the district engineer, his report back to the division and to the Chief's office, then submission to the Congress, where the committee reviewed the reports.

In each successive step careful attention was paid to the cost-benefit ratio and need for the project. Local hearings under the direction of the district engineer were held, and both proponents and opponents had the opportunity to appear. In the final analysis, the criteria prescribed by laws enacted by Congress were carefully followed.

There are 34 projects in title I of the bill, two of which require no money for new construction. The total cost of the 32 money-requiring projects in the rivers-and-harbors title is slightly in excess of $20,000,000. All of the projects have merit. I look forward to the day when these projects we shall authorize today will have been completed, and by their completion have contributed to a great extent to the betterment of the trade, commerce, and industry of this Nation. The benefits to be derived accrue not only to the localities where these projects will be constructed but in the surrounding areas. We must keep pace with the progress of the times and maintain a high standard of usefulness of the facilities that nature has endowed us with initially by making these improvements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the Congress, and as a new member of the Committee on Public Works, I commend the care and thoroughness with which this committee has studied, scrutinized, and screened every project which has gone into this bill.

I want to call attention of the House in particular to one project in this bill which is of an extremely emergent character—the project at Westport, Grays Harbor, Wash.

The coast line of the State of Washington is broken by four harbors. At our southern boundary is the Columbia River and on our northern boundary is Puget Sound. Along the coast line, almost midway between these two great bodies of water, are the ports of Willapa Harbor and Grays Harbor.

Grays Harbor is a great port. In the twenties as many as 900 big cargo ships cleared that port annually, and now the number is 300 to 400 annually, but the ships are larger, being mostly of the Liberty and Victory classes.

The Federal Government has thought well enough of the importance of this port to invest more than $11,000,000 in building great jetties at the entrance to Grays Harbor.

Lately storms have smashed through one of these jetties and set into action powerful ocean currents which now threaten a long spit of land known as Point Chehalis that projects into the harbor and behind which is a large fishing boat haven.

This haven shelters several hundred boats. A publicly owned wharf projects into it. On this wharf are canneries where tuna, salmon, and crab are packed. There are fish buying stations on and near this wharf. There are oil and water service installations for the fish boats and canneries. There are icing facilities.

Also on the shore of this cove there is a large and costly Coast Guard station.

All of these canneries, this Coast Guard station, and all of the installations to service the canneries and fishing boats are in danger of being washed away and destroyed unless Point Chehalis is protected. The United States engineers say the protection of Point Chehalis is urgently needed, is an emergency.

It is essential that something be done just as soon as possible for no one can tell when the sea, unless protection is provided, may wipe out and destroy Federal, county, and private property that it will require many hundreds of dollars to restore.

I am hopeful, once this authorization bill is passed by House and Senate and signed by the President, that the Appropriations Committee will move promptly to make available sufficient money to make such installations as will protect Point Chehalis and the installations it protects, safe from destruction.

If $1,000,000 were to be provided by this Congress so that work could start soon, leaving appropriation of the remainder of the fund authorized until next year many hundreds of thousands of dollars of installations may be saved.

The longer we delay in starting this work the more damage the sea will do to Point Chehalis and the more costly the repairs that will have to be made will be.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH], a member of the committee.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works I want to say that if all of the future flood control projects that come before the Congress are as worthy as those contained in this bill as to public benefits, comparative cost, as to immediate necessity to relieve the situation in the various sections of the country where these projects will be built, and as to the thoroughness in which the committee has looked at them from the point of economy, there will be very little difficulty in future projects passing the Congress. I am and always have been vitally interested in flood control for the reason that it is of vital necessity in the area that I come from in southern California, Los Angeles County.

I want to take this opportunity to say that without the benefits that we have received, insofar as flood control is concerned in southern California, millions and millions of dollars worth of assessed

valuation would be off the rolls today and thousands and thousands of beneficial acres that have been used for agriculture and the development of homes would not be now available for the thousands and thousands of people from all sections of the United States who are coming to southern California to live. The Federal Government has recognized that flood control in southern California is not only a local problem for the protection of life, limb, and property, but it is a national problem because of the thousands of people that have crowded into that area over the years.

There is a section in this bill that has not been mentioned that I would like to call to the attention of the members of the committee, and that is section 208, which is an amendment to previous Flood Control Acts, in the immediate emergency section of previous legislation. There is in this bill an authorization for the sum of $25,000,000 that may be directed to be spent under the direction of the Secretary of National Defense through the Chief of Army Engineers for any flood disaster emergency that may arise without further authorization of the Congress.

We have an emergency today that will run into a tremendous loss of life and property along the Columbia River. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] has referred to this emergency. This legislation will immediately meet the requirements in that connection. It will not only meet the requirements for the replacement of the works that have been washed out by the flood but it will fortify and further improve the works that were washed out, so that under normal circumstances there would not be a recurrence of this disaster. I think that is a very important and wise section of this bill, because we have had similar instances in the Middle West and the Southern States where emergency legislation was necessary to provide for these disaster conditions.

May I refer to another project that is not in this bill but that is of vital interest to southern California. It is in the Army civil functions appropriation bill that is now in conference. It has to do with flood control. It is the Whittier Narrows project, in Los Angeles County, and that was put into the Army civil functions appropriation bill by the Senate, and will come back to the House for approval. It is a vitally important project which will affect the lives of some 500,000 people in the immediate area of Long Beach and north of Long Beach. It has to do with the future construction of vital flood-control works in San Gabriel Valley. I trust that when that item comes back to the House it will receive favorable consideration because of its importance to southern California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. I concur in the gentleman's statement as to the great need for the Whittier Narrows Dam. Like the gentleman, I hope the committee will permit that item to become law.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Further, the amount of $1,000,000 for Whittier Narrows should not be startling, because the returns in dollars and cents expressed in assessed valuation and in the national assets of the country will be in the ratio of almost 15 to 1 in that area, if this project receives approval of the Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H. R. 6419. Every item in this bill is an important item. It is the omnibus bill which our Committee presents to the Congress from time to time authorizing various projects throughout the country. This bill takes into account the United States as a whole and outlines the flood control, river and harbor development on a national scope. It does not set any particular section of the country apart for special consideration. This is wholesome and democratic.

We are in difficult days, not only in an international sense but in a domestic sense as well. In order to meet our responsibilities in each of these fields, we have appropriated billions of dollars for defense centering largely upon aiding the democratic nations of the earth to become strong enough to help themselves; and upon expanding our own Army, Navy, and Air Force. If I should criticize the bill at all today, it would be because only minor projects are included, when a program commensurate with our needs in this strained period of our national history would better suffice. A majority of the people, I believe, agree with the Congress in its attitude on international affairs and on its determination to strengthen our Armed Services. While these programs are of paramount importance, they will fail without a strong economy at home to support them.

Every flood control and hydroelectric project possible should be constructed. Wisdom on our part, as a matter of national economy and of national defense, makes such action mandatory, if we are to meet the challenges which are ahead of us.

Through a misjudgment of the demand, industry in the past thought that enough electric power was available to meet every need in the country for years to come. We know now that there is a great shortage of electric energy in every section of the country. The public utility companies, who up until a short time ago fought the building of hydroelectric dams with all the strength they possessed, realize their error. They not only favor the dams at this time but are demanding that they be built at once to relieve the present power shortage. With our oil reserves dwindling and our coal reserves being heavily drawn upon, it verges upon a criminal act, in my opinion, for the Congress to permit a single drop of water to flow unharnessed down any of our streams. The water should be controlled and used to generate the power which will turn the wheels of industry in order to save our oil and coal reserves and to meet future demands of a growing economy. Next year, I hope the Congress will authorize the construction of every available project which can develop electric energy no matter in what part of the country the project may be located.

I represent a section which is interested in the development of the White River Basin and the Arkansas River Basin. We had hoped that H. R. 6419 would carry a provision to remove the ceiling from the Arkansas River and its tributaries thus enabling the Corps of Engineers in conjunction with the Appropriations Committee to go ahead with the development of this project. This is a river-and-harbor project and I understand is one of the two river-and-harbor projects in the country where a ceiling upon possible appropriations has been placed. It is my sincere hope that in our bill next year we will be able to lift that ceiling to provide for the completion of the project. It is so vital to the development of the Southwest.

Our immediate opportunities for progress in the country as a whole depend upon our efforts to tie these great flood control and hydroelectric projects in with the national soil-conservation program as well as with the rural-electrification program. Soil conservation is our basic problem in America and any flood-control program which does not look to soil conservation also lacks balance.

Legislation is now pending in Congress looking toward a general farm program including soil conservation. The people are divided upon this legislation but I am sure that a workable plan can be evolved which will command the united support of the farmers in this vital field of agriculture. This is no time for division among us. In order for agriculture to keep its rightful place in a well-balanced economy along with industry and labor it behooves us to keep our house in order.

Since the first immigrants landed on the shores of this country, we have exploited our soil and our other natural resources. Heretofore, when soil became so depleted that it would not sustain the family, there was always a new frontier, and the pioneers lifted their families and moved westward across the mountains. These are the people who settled our own section. They came from Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, and Alabama. They were the salt of the earth. And so it continued until their posterity had moved westward to the Pacific. Now we must pioneer in a new direction, and we have learned that it is necessary to conserve what fertility is yet left in the soil and to reestablish that which we have taken away. I have constantly supported all the measures in the Congress, including the appropriation for soil conservation, which I thought would help the farmer keep and improve his heritage.

In this connection, I might add that only in recent years has anything approaching security on the farm been developed. Workers in civil-service status have for years been contributing to a retirement fund against that day when they will be retired on account of age, physical disability, or completion of service tenure. The same situation obtains in most of our other industries where

the laborer contributes to benefits of unemployment compensation under social security to take care of himself and his family in case of physical disability, lay-off, or retirement. Various enterprises are protected by law in their income. For instance, the utility companies, where rates are so fixed that they have a guaranteed 6-percent income above all expenses, including taxes, salaries, rebates, advertising funds, and public-relations funds. The same situation practically obtains in the insurance field, where the rates are fixed to insure proper protection to the policyholders and at the same time guarantee a profit to the company. But the farmer has no such security. He must fight and scratch for his. All too often he sells in a free competitive market and must buy his machinery, his fertilizer, and his electricity in a protected market.

Rural electrification is really a godsend to the farm home. For years, our rural people hoped and clamored for electricity. It never came—until the Rural Electrification Administration was established and money was lent to the farmers to establish their own organization and bring this much-needed commodity to their farms. When electricity came to the farm home, washing machines, refrigerators, stoves, and lights came with it. The farm home became more attractive to our young people, and as a result more of them are staying on the farm to make it their calling. I have supported this program with all my strength. I shall continue to support it, and I shall resist any movement to hamstring it.

Flood-control and hydroelectric projects in our district are a definite reality. Already Norfork Dam is completed. Work is moving ahead at Bull Shoals. In the not-too-distant future, Gilbert Dam, the Lone Rock Dam, the Table Rock Dam, the Beaver Dam, and the Archey Fork Dam will all be built. They will do three things to our district. First, they will control floods; second, they will develop much needed hydroelectric power, without which small industry will not come to our section; and, third, they will make our district one of the garden spots of the United States from a recreational standpoint. I shall continue to support these projects.

I have voted in the past to tie all these dams together. I shall continue to vote the same way. The dams which are being built across our streams belong to all the people; the water which turns the turbines to generate the electricity from these dams belongs to all the people; the electrical energy generated by these turbines belongs to all the people. Therefore, it is my firm conviction that the people should retain control of the power generated at all these dams. To do so not only protects a vast system of rural electrification cooperatives throughout the country from possible discrimination by the utility companies who might wish to do so; but, in addition, by tieing the dams together, according to competent engineers, the output of electric energy is increased at least 15 percent with resultant savings to the taxpayers of that amount.

There is a bill pending in the Congress to require the people to sell the power generated at these dams, at each dam separately, which if passed, will certainly put the owners of the dams at great disadvantage in bargaining power. In other words, the people will have to take whatever is offered at the dams because naturally there will be only one utility company at each dam to bid for its output.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, while H. R. 6419 would not be called a major flood control and rivers and harbors bill, it is important that we continue progressively this program. Sometimes I hear complaints regarding expenditures on this type of work and recently I believe it was the United States Chamber of Commerce that called one of our appropriations bills on flood control and rivers and harbors "pork barrel" legislation. Invariably following these criticisms, the Nation reads of some disaster throughout the country, indicating the urgent need for a continuation of the program of flood control.

Every paper we pick up now is filled with news of the terrible devastation caused by the floodwaters of the Columbia River. A major flood is now in process on the Pacific coast. People are being inundated by the thousands and property ranging up to hundreds of millions of dollars is being destroyed by unmanageable torrents of water. Such a situation calls loudly for congressional aid and I think Congress is going to respond generously in helping to prevent a recurrence of this frightful situation on the Pacific coast.

Like floods may happen in other sections of the country. The work of taming the floodwaters of the great streams of our country must go on. Water which becomes so destructive at extraordinary times must be harnessed to the good of mankind and to the use of civilization. The Army engineers can do this job with proper aid from Congress.

I compliment the Committee on Public Works for bringing in this measure at the present time. I am glad that both majority and minority parties are unanimous in their approval on this measure and that it will in all probability be disposed of as finished legislation by adjournment time of this session of Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], our chairman, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], our ranking minority member, and all the members of the Public Works Committee, for their hard and diligent work in reporting this important bill unanimously.

I am deeply grateful to the committee for recommending for passage the participation of the Army engineers in cleaning of debris from our Baltimore Harbor. The increasing need for protection against damage from drift by the initiation and development of a regular program for its collection and removal has too long been urgently needed. In my opinion, this is warranted in view of the substantial benefits which will accrue to navigation.

Baltimore Harbor for six consecutive months of 1947 was the Nation's leading port in volume of exports, and during August, the port outranked New York in total exports and imports tonnage handled. Increases in the volume of domestic coastwise and inter-coastal traffic and other branches of waterborne trade are anticipated and it is expected that the volume of the port's total water-borne commerce in 1948 will exceed 40,000,000 tons.

Therefore, I believe that with the Federal Government taking over the supervision and removing of debris will help, not only our water commerce, but will also be a great benefit and will guarantee more safety to our pleasure craft.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER IN AND AROUND BRADFORD, PA.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is of the opinion that the flood problem in Bradford, Pa., and vicinity, is a serious one and flood protection urgently needed, I hoped the project for flood control and improvement of the upper Allegheny River in and around Bradford would be ready for inclusion in the omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill, H. R. 6419, which we are considering today.

The views and recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors have been approved by the Chief of Engineers, who in his letter to the Secretary of the Army, copy of which I have before me, stated that after due consideration of the Board's report, he concurred in its views and recommendations. Likewise the report was approved, in accordance with the request of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It now awaits the approval of the Bureau of the Budget where it is now on file.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the distinguished and able chairman of this committee for reporting the smallest river and harbor bill in 25 years. Being recently cast as the

Devil's advocate, however, I wish the amount were smaller than it is. I am addressing myself solely to river and harbor items. I am about to start a movement for truth and accuracy in committee reports. On page 3 of this report appears the following:

The committee has carefully analyzed the reports and the testimony presented to it. It finds that a number of deep-draft channels and harbors are presently inadequate to accommodate the new deeper draft tankers and dry-cargo vessels. These channels were constructed to serve the now obsolete and rapidly vanishing ocean carriers with drafts up to 30 feet and speeds not exceeding 11 knots. Vessels with loaded drafts from 30 to 34 feet and speeds up to 16 knots now predominate in the trade using the channels and harbors which are recommended for improvement.

Now I want to read you the names of some of the channels and harbors recommended for improvement:

Beals Harbor, Maine; Cape Porpoise Harbor, Maine; Falmouth Harbor, Mass.; Taunton River, Mass.; Provincetown Harbor, Mass.; Point Judith Harbor of Refuge, R. I.; Westcott Cove, Conn.; Greenwich Harbor, Conn.

Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with most of those harbors. I doubt if a vessel of 34-foot draft has put into Beals Harbor, Maine, or Point Judith Harbor of Refuge in the last 50 years, if ever. Then the report goes on to say that these improvements will permit these heavy vessels of 34-foot draft to proceed at full speed in the channels with safety and convenience. I ask anyone familiar with harbor navigation if any heavy vessel can proceed at 16-knot speed and not create a swell which would wreck every berthed barge in the harbor.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that on page 3 from which he read, there is a succeeding paragraph following the one from which he read where the distinction is made in the report, I believe, very clearly for all who want to read it. In the paragraph from which the gentleman was reading, we were talking about deep-draft vessels in harbors and channels that handle such vessels, such as the Texas City-Houston-Galveston ship channel and the Baltimore or New York channels and so forth, with which the gentleman is bound to be familiar. In the succeeding and last paragraph on page 3, we were talking about these shallow-draft harbors which the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. BUCK. Nevertheless, the report does state that vessels with loaded drafts of 30 to 34 feet "predominate" in the harbors which are recommended for improvement. The gentleman, I am sure, will agree as to the inaccuracy of that language.

I now refer to the justifications for some of these improvements. In the justification for Falmouth Harbor, Mass., for example, the report sets forth that a conservative estimate of the increase in retail business to accrue from the improvement is 1 percent. I suggest that the author of that estimate was hard put to find any justification. Another question is of course involved. If Falmouth benefits 1 percent in its retail business by virtue of this improvement, what of the nearby city or town which suffers loss of that 1 percent. Nation-wide or even State-wide gain would not seem to result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGARVEY].

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to express my high regard for this committee. This is the first committee of which I have been a member since I have been here. I must say to our able chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] that it has been a great education for me.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time for the purpose of asking a question.

Lines 16 to 21, on page 8, provide that no project will be considered unless a report has been submitted by the Chief of Engineers to the Congress. That is the law now, is it not?

Mr. DONDERO. That is the law now.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask this question because of my concern about the Beatrice, Nebr., flood-control plant. The President has not transmitted the Kansas River report to Congress. As I understand it, this could not be included in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. In other words, the project must follow the usual procedure; consideration by the Army engineers, the Chief of Engineers, and be transmitted to Congress and then considered by the subcommittee, and then the full committee, before it comes to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, being chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, I would like to make this brief statement with reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]. Anyone who takes the time to read our report in full will find everyone of these projects explained in detail. It shows everything which has to do with the merits of each project. Naturally, in the preliminary statement we could not give that detailed information, but it is in the report, and it will show among these projects, such as the Baltimore Harbor, one of the largest harbors in the country and in the world, and many other projects which are quite small; some in Massachusetts, some in the far West and elsewhere, which are improved largely for local interests, such as fishing; men who make their living on the water. But these small projects certainly should receive the same type of consideration as the large ones, such as New York City.

Mr. BUCK. Is there anything in this bill for the port of New York?

Mr. ANGELL. No. There is provision for Baltimore Harbor. The same law applies to New York as applies to Baltimore Harbor. The Federal Government has been spending funds on New York Harbor for years in keeping the harbor clear from refuse dangerous to navigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provision of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public, No. 14, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), shall govern with respect to projects herein authorized; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

Beals Harbor, Maine; House Document No. 553, Eightieth Congress;

Cape Porpoise Harbor, Maine; House Document No. 555, Eightieth Congress;

Channel from Buzzards Bay to Buttermilk Bay, Mass.; House Document No. 552, Eightieth Congress;

Falmouth Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 566, Eightieth Congress;

Provincetown Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 600, Eightieth Congress;

Taunton River, Mass.; House Document No. 196, Eightieth Congress;

Harbor of refuge at Point Judith, R. I.; Senate Document No. 15, Eightieth Congress;

Westcott Cove, Conn.; House Document No. 379, Eightieth Congress;

Greenwich Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 272, Eightieth Congress;

Rock Hall Harbor, Md.; House Document No. 273, Eightieth Congress;

Chester River, Md. (channel from Kent Island Narrows to Wells Cove); House Document No. 380, Eightieth Congress;

Cambridge Harbor, Md.; House Document No. 381, Eightieth Congress;

Honga River and Tar Bay, Md.; House Document No. 680, Eightieth Congress;

Bransons Cove, Lower Machodoc River, Va.; House Document No. 420, Eightieth Congress;

Deep Creek, Warwick County, Va.; House Document No. 601, Eightieth Congress;

Norfolk Harbor, Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Va.; House Document No. 545, Eightieth Congress;

Stumpy Point Bay, N. C.; House Document No. 422, Eightieth Congress;

Inland Waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, N. C., including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C.; House Document No. 421, Eightieth Congress;

St. Andrew Bay, Fla.; House Document No. 559, Eightieth Congress;

Galveston Harbor, Tex.; House Document No. 561, Eightieth Congress;

Galveston Channel, Tex.; House Document No. 561, Eightieth Congress;

Texas City Channel, Tex.; House Document No. 561, Eightieth Congress;

Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; House Document No. 561, Eightieth Congress;

Port Aransas-Corpus Christi waterway, Tex.; House Document No. 560, Eightieth Congress;

Grand Traverse Bay, Mich. (in the vicinity of Traverse City); House Document No. 546, Eightieth Congress;

Dunkirk Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 632, Eightieth Congress;

Halfmoon Bay, Calif.; House Document No. —, Eighteth Congress;

Noyo River and Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 586; Eighteth Congress;

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg. (channel to, and boat basin at, Garibaldi); House Document No. —, Eighteth Congress;

Umpqua River, Oreg. (channel to, and basin in, Winchester Bay); Senate Document No. —, Eighteth Congress;

Coos Bay, Oreg. (Charleston Channel); House Document No. —, Eighteth Congress;

Coos and Millicoma Rivers, Oreg.; Senate Document No. 124; Eighteth Congress;

Skipanon Channel, Oreg (at Warrenton); Senate Document No. 93, Eighteth Congress;

Smith River, Oreg.; Senate Document No. 94, Eighteth Congress;

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.; House Document No. —, Eighteth Congress.

SEC. 102. That hereafter direct allotments from appropriations for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works, or from other available appropriations, may be made by the Secretary of the Army for the collection and removal of drift in Baltimore Harbor and its tributary waters, and this work shall be carried out as a separate and distinct project.

SEC. 103. That the existing project for the Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex., adopted in the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, is hereby modified so as to provide that the local agency which gives assurances that upon completion of the entire project it will contribute toward the first cost of the work the sum of $5,000,000, shall be permitted to withdraw from the pool of dam B not to exceed 2,000 cubic feet of water per second for its own use.

SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made at the following-named localities, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That no preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this or some prior act or joint resolution shall be made: *Provided further*, That after the regular or formal reports made as required by law on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law: *Provided further*, That reports of surveys on beach erosion and shore protection shall include an estimate of the public interests involved, and such plan of improvement as is found justified, together with the equitable distribution of costs in each case: *And provided further*, That this section shall not be construed to interfere with the performance of any duties vested in the Federal Power Commission under existing law:

Desoris Creek, N. Y.;

Tolchester Beach area, Maryland;

Little Magothy River, Md.;

Holdens Creek, Va.;

Hacks Creek, Northumberland County, Va.;

Back River, York County, Va., and channel connecting Back River with Front Cove.;

Bennetts Creek, York County, Va.;

Powells Bay, Accomack County, Va., at Wisharts Point, and channel connecting said bay with the "Ballast";

Fishermans Bay, Lopez Island, Wash.

SEC. 105. Title I may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1948."

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this act except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 2, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), shall govern with respect to projects herein authorized; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the following provisions shall be observed:

No project or any modification not authorized, of a project for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report for such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

SEC. 203. That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive flood-waters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this act with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That pen stocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission:

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The projects for flood protection at Carthage and Monett, Mo., in the Arkansas River Basin are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 445, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $740,000.

The projects for local flood protection on the Arkansas River authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, in accordance with House Document No. 447, Seventy-eighth Congress, are hereby modified to provide that the United States will participate in the cost of raising the approaches to the highway bridges across the Arkansas River at Morrilton and at Van Buren-Fort Smith in an amount not to exceed $200,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at South Beloit, Ill., on the Rock River is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 112, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $100,000.

The project for flood protection on the Henderson River, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 245, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,520,000.

The project for flood protection at and in the vicinity of Aitkin, Minn., on the Mississippi River is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 599, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,680,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The local flood-protection works at and in the vicinity of Uniontown, Pa., on Redstone Creek, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 301, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,015,000.

The project for flood protection at Rosiclare, Ill., on the Ohio River is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 125, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $500,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood protection at Batavia and vicinity, New York, on Tonawanda Creek is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 46, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $565,000.

The project for flood protection at Dansville and vicinity, New York, on Canaseraga Creek, a tributary of the Genesee River, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 206, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $165,000.

The project for flood protection and other purposes on Red Run, a tributary of the Clinton River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 628, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,010,000.

The project for protection of the Reno Beach-Howards Farm area and adjacent areas, Lucas County, Ohio, from floods caused by frequent windstorms and from increases in the lake level of Lake Erie, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 554, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $330,000.

SANTA CLARA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection along the Santa Clara River and its tributaries, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 443, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,960,000.

GILA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at Tucson and vicinity, Arizona, in the Gila River Basin, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 274, Eighteth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,390,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the act approved May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts, is hereby modified and expanded to include the following item and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly:

The project for improvement of the Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau with respect to the west Tennessee tributaries at an estimated cost of $7,700,000, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with

the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 627, Eightieth Congress.

SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following-named localities, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage areas, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to the Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law;

Rahway River and its tributaries, New Jersey;

Chowan River and its tributaries, Virginia and North Carolina;

Pantego Creek and Cucklers Creek, N. C.;

Rice Creek, a tributary of St. John River, Fla.;

Streams flowing through the Brazoria-Galveston Soil Conservation District, the Trinity Bay Soil Conservation District, the Coastal Plains Soil Conservation District, and the Matagorda County Soil Conservation District, Texas, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements;

Area at and in the vicinity of Texas City, Tex., with a view to providing for its protection against storms and erosions, including the protection of the instrumentalities and aids to commerce located there;

Au Gres River and tributaries, Michigan;

Area at and in the vicinity of Bellevue, Ohio, and the surrounding area of Seneca, Erie, Huron, and Sandusky Counties, with a view to the control of floods caused by excess underground and surface waters;

Harbors and rivers in Alaska, with a view to determining the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and related water uses.

SEC. 205. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $2,000,000 for any one fiscal year, for the construction of small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by Congress, and not within areas intended to be protected by projects so authorized, which come within the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable: *Provided*, That not more than $100,000 shall be allotted for this purpose at any single locality from the appropriations for any one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply: *And provided further*, That the work shall be complete in itself and not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation, except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey reports.

SEC. 206. That section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended by section 12 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $2,000,000 for any one fiscal year to be expended in rescue work or in the repair, restoration, or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood, including the strengthening, raising, extending, or other modification thereof as may be necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the work for flood control."

SEC. 207. That the sum of $25,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out improvements by the Department of the Army, and the sum of $10,000,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended in equal amounts by the Departments of the Army and Agriculture for carrying out any examination or survey provided for in this act and any other acts of Congress to be prosecuted by said Departments.

SEC. 208. That the sum of $25,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by recent floods, or which may be threatened or destroyed by later floods, including the raising, extending, or other modification of such works as may be necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the works for flood control: *Provided*, That the provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply: *Provided further*, That pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of the Army may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work authorized by this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from said emergency fund when appropriated: *And provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general," made available in War Department Civil Functions Appropriation Acts for specific purposes.

SEC. 209. Title II may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1948."

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and subject to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk, on behalf of the committee, a list of clarifying amendments passed by the Committee on Public Works, and I ask that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DONDERO:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "projects", strike out "herein."

Page 2, line 5, after the partial word "ized", insert the words "in this title."

Page 3, line 11, after the word "Numbered", strike out "680" and insert "580."

Page 4, line 17, strike out the long dash and insert "644."

Page 4, line 21, after the word "Numbered", strike out the long dash and insert "650."

Page 4, line 24, after the word "Numbered", strike out the long dash and insert "154."

Page 5, line 2, after the word "Numbered", strike out the long dash and insert "646."

Page 5, line 10, after the word "Numbered", strike out the long dash and insert "635."

Page 6, line 9, after the word "this", insert the word "title."

Page 6, line 17, after the word "this", strike out the word "Act" and insert the word "title,"

Page 7, line 1, strike out "Desoris" and insert "Dosoris."

Page 7, line 19, after the word "this", strike out the word "Act" and insert the word "title."

Page 8, line 9, after the partial word "ects", strike out the word "herein" and insert after the word "authorized" the words "in this title."

Page 9, line 6, after the word "this", strike out the word "Act" and insert the word "title."

Page 9, line 14, after the word "this", strike out the word "Act" and insert the word "title."

Page 14, line 12, after the word "this", strike out the word "Act" and insert the word "title."

Page 16, line 23, after the word "improvements", insert "under this title."

Page 17, line 3, after the word "this", strike out the word "Act" and insert the word "title."

Page 17, lines 15, 16, 17, and 18, after the word *"Provided"*, strike out "That the provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply", and insert "That local interests shall provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the work and shall maintain and operate all the works after completion in a manner satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FULTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 589, he reported the bill back to the House with amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2173), which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LUCAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER (at the request of Mr. BLAND) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

STAR-ROUTE MAIL CONTRACTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the Rules Committee I may call up House Resolution 623, providing for the consideration of the bill, S. 263, to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 263) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and, among other things, pertains to the carrying of mail on star routes. Members of the committee are here to discuss the provisions of the bill itself. I have no further comment concerning it. I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is here. I yield him 30 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was not here when the bill was called up for consideration because the Rules Committee was holding hearings on very important legislation.

However, I know something about this bill. I appreciate that some Members feel it is necessary for us to change our star-route system and eliminate the awarding of contracts to low bidders. This bill proposes to give the Postmaster General the right to award contracts not to the lowest bidder but to any bidder he may prefer. I know it has been stated that these star-route carriers have not made very much money. However, I think they are being much better compensated than the post-office clerks and the letter carriers in the large cities where the cost of living has and is going up so tremendously. Still we are holding up the bill to increase the wages of the postal workers, a bill that the country demands and urges that we pass in order to do something to relieve the unfortunate situation of a group of men who beyond any doubt are the most patriotic and the hardest-working men we have in the Government service. That bill is not being brought in here for consideration, but this bill, eliminating the protection that the Government has in letting contracts to the lowest bidders, and playing favorites, is called up for consideration. The measure plays favoritism with those who stand best with the powers that be regardless of what the increased cost may be. Personally, I tried to obtain some information on how much it will cost over present costs, but I was unable to obtain the information from those who testified before the Committee on Rules. I am under the impression that this will add an additional three to five million dollars to the cost of star-route service. I do not think there is any justification for it, except that some gentlemen are interested in some of these people who would like to get these contracts at their own price. In view of the ever-increasing cost of government I think that we should cease being reckless in our appropriations and in the passing of legislation that means an additional burden upon the taxpayers of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we also have had a bill pending for a long while that would to some extent reduce the deficit which exists in the Post Office Department. I refer to the bill to increase second-class-mail rates. I wonder why it is not being brought in here for consideration, because it has been carefully drafted and the committee has given it a great deal of consideration. If the bill were passed I think we would be able to reduce our postal deficit by from $150,000,000 to $160,000,000. There is still another bill that should be considered instead of the one under consideration, but you gentlemen have the power, you have the majority, and the demands of the favorites are great and you will follow their wishes regardless of the cost of the Government and regardless of the fact that you have failed to bring in the bill giving promised wage increases to the deserving postal and other Government employees. Yet you have failed to bring in this bill increasing second-class rates which will reduce the deficit of the Post Office Department as I have stated by at least $150,000,000.

I know why you do not bring the bill in. It would perhaps affect some of the magazines that are friendly to you and that you have so much interest in, also it may affect some of the newspapers that are favorable to you, so you do not want to increase the cost of second-class mail.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to the deficit in the Post Office operations and its effect on the taxpayers, and he referred to a measure to increase the postal rates to overcome some of that deficit. Would the gentleman support such an increase as that—that is, an increase in the postal rates—if such a bill were brought in here?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; and especially on second-class-mail matter. You do not lose any money on first-class mail. I leave it to the chairman of the committee if I am not right that we are losing money on second-class-mail matter due to the fact that we are carrying millions of catalogs of mail-order houses, which cost a tremendous amount of money, and which you are interested in aiding. These catalogs, weighing 2 or 3 pounds, are sent at great cost to the Government. I do not think the mail-order houses need this relief or should continue to receive this advantage from the Government. They are making enough money the way it is, there is no question about that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SABATH. Neither have I, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 263) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 263, with Mr. STEFAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to correct certain evils that have grown up during the years with respect to star-route service. The evils might be described as insecurity and financial losses to the carriers, both of which have had a rather bad effect on the mail service as well as the morale of the carriers. In recent years every Congress has been plagued with the problem of the star-route carriers and all are agreed that something ought to be done, but the proper solution has been difficult to obtain.

I want to say right here that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], has spent a great deal of time and effort and energy in an attempt to deal with this problem. A bill, was reported to the House in a previous Congress authored by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], but for some reason did not secure the approval of the House. So, we are here today with this bill recommended unanimously by our committee and reported by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]; it has been agreed upon and approved by the Post Office Department. It has also been approved by the legislative representative of the star-route carriers. I do not know of any objection to this legislation.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. What will be the application of the provision in this bill to a situation where bids have already been submitted to the Post Office Department on a particular route in the United States, and presently under consideration?

Mr. REES. With respect to that, the bill says in substance that if the Postmaster General approves the man who has the present contract he may continue his contract. What we are trying to get rid of here is the cut-throat bidding, where one person has a contract in effect and wants to renew it, and somebody comes along and underbids him by a few dollars. Ordinarily the lowest bidder is the one who receives it, but suppose a man bids $10 or $25 per year less, we will say, under the present law the new bidder is expected to get the contract. Then frequently he is disappointed and asks to be relieved of his contract. We are trying to get away from that. Of course, if he has offered a substantial bid that is lower and the Postmaster General thinks a substantial amount can be saved, such a contract should be approved, but substantially the bill provides that the Postmaster General may continue a contract now in effect if the contract is fair and the service satisfactory. Of course, if the contract is open for bidding, the present law obtains. The lowest bidder is given consideration, provided he can give the bond and comply with the law and the rules and regulations thereunder.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, who has taken a great deal of interest in this legislation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Under the bill now being presented by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, can the Postmaster General disregard the bids, if he cares to, and continue the contract now in effect under which the contractor is carrying the mail?

Mr. REES. That is correct. If a contract is in effect and the Postmaster General thinks the contract is fair, he can continue it even though someone else bids a lower price. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He has the discretion to carry on the present contract?

Mr. REES. That is right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He would have no way of compelling the contractor to continue the contract unless he wanted it?

Mr. REES. Certainly not. There must be mutual agreement for contract extensions and revisions.

Mr. DOUGHTON. How about the bond? The present contractor is bonded only up to the 1st of July. The contractor would have to get a new bond; he could not extend the old bond?

Mr. REES. No; it is a new contract.

Mr. DOUGHTON. He would have to furnish a new bond?

Mr. REES. Yes; certainly.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If it is a new contract, for how long would it run?

Mr. REES. He just enters into a new contract for 4 years, just the same as what he has now.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If it is satisfactory to the Postmaster General and to the postmaster where the route originates, then he furnishes a new bond?

Mr. REES. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The contract would be renewed for 4 years?

Mr. REES. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will yield further, the situation I was talking about was this. Suppose 3 or 4 months ago the Postmaster General called for bids on a star route and bond was put up by the bidders. Those bids are already with the Post Office Department, but the contract has not been let. Would this bill apply to the star routes where bids have already been submitted to the Post Office Department?

Mr. REES. I would say so, because the contract has not been let. If the present contractor has bid again, he will be given consideration for continuing his contract.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. What happens in the event the contractor and the Postmaster General cannot come to an agreement as to the terms of the contract?

Mr. REES. The only terms they would have to agree on would be whether or not the present contract is to be continued.

Mr. COLE of New York. Suppose they cannot agree.

Mr. REES. Then it is open for bids.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the Postmaster General must accept the lowest bid?

Mr. REES. Yes; the lowest reasonable bid.

Mr. COLE of New York. That puts him right back in the situation the bill seeks to avoid.

Mr. REES. We must keep in mind we have given the present holder an alternative. He is throwing it open to bidding only because he wants a much more favorable deal.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. My understanding is that the Postmaster General has authority to accept the responsible bidder and not necessarily the lowest bidder.

Mr. REES. Certainly, that is correct. He has authority to accept the responsible bidder. He does not have to accept an irresponsible bidder, and I do not believe that he would.

Mr. BONNER. In other words, in the situation of the contract of a star carrier having expired and bids having been placed and opened, the Postmaster General under this bill, should it become law, can then negotiate with the existing carrier, he having given satisfactory service, notwithstanding the fact that there is a lower bidder.

Mr. REES. That is correct. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. BONNER. I congratulate the gentleman and his committee on this legislation. I think it is long past due.

I would like to ask the gentleman one further question. Does this place the star carrier in a civil-service status similar to that of the rural carrier?

Mr. REES. It does not.

Mr. BONNER. I regret very much that the legislation does not go that far, because I do think they are entitled to that, particularly those men who through the past years during the shortage of automobile transportation struggled and labored to carry on this service at a cost that did not return to them a fair amount for the operation of their vehicles.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's views on that problem. I wish we had more time to discuss it here. I will say our committee did give the problem careful consideration.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In renewing the present contract, could they renew it at a higher rate than at present? Suppose the contract was at a certain rate, would the Postmaster General have a right to renew that contract and increase the rate? If there were a new bidder who bid less, what would be the status then? I understand that the Postmaster General could renew it at the present price.

Mr. REES. That is right. The Postmaster General may renew the contract at an increased rate but must justify it on increased costs.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Could the Postmaster General renew the contract and increase the price in his discretion?

Mr. REES. I would say that it is possible that he could.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That about eliminates new bids, does it not? If the Postmaster General has authority to increase the price on the present contract and carry it on, it would eliminate new bids?

Mr. REES. If the Postmaster General wants to show favoritism to particular people, he could go to that extreme, of course. It is possible, but I would say it certainly is not probable that that sort of thing is going to happen.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There would be no limit to which he could increase the price?

Mr. REES. Yes, certainly there is a reasonable limit.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What is the limit? If it is within his discretion, there is no limit then to what he might do.

According to the bill increases are limited by increased costs occasioned by changed conditions occurring during the contract term which could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time the contract was made.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I commend the committee for reporting this bill. There is one question which arises in my mind. The bill provides that the Postmaster General may in his discretion readjust the compensation of a star-route contractor for increased or decreased costs occasioned by changed conditions during the term of the contract. I would like to know if that gives the Postmaster General authority to terminate a contract in the middle of a 4-year term and decrease the compensation under the contract.

Mr. REES. For the RECORD, and so that we may express the intent of the committee with respect to that matter, the bill does provide that they may increase or decrease. It is with the understanding that if increases are made it is done because of changed conditions occurring during the contract term that could not reasonably have been anticipated at the time of making the original proposal, or when the contract was made.

Mr. BARRETT. I agree with that provision. The point I had in mind was this: We want to give these men some security in their contracts. I hope the intent of the committee is not to give the Postmaster General authority to cancel a contract in the middle of a 4-year period, and decrease the compensation, because a man might have his equipment and then find out he has lost his contract.

Mr. REES. That is not the intent of the committee. Any change must be by mutual agreement.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Suppose the Department extends the contract and decides while the extension is in force to discontinue the star route and convert it into a regular rural route.

Mr. REES. Well, they can do that under the present law.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. This does not change that situation at all?

Mr. REES. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN. I want to answer the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. Page 6 of the bill, line 20, reads:

> Any cancellation or change in contract must be with the consent of the contract holder.

So he is thoroughly protected. The contract holder must agree to any change.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The reason I am making this inquiry is that I have so many inquiries from my constituents about how this new law will work if this bill is enacted into law. You say the Postmaster General can, in his discretion, increase the amount of compensation to the present contractor. Suppose it is $1,500 a year for carrying a certain star route, and some new bidder comes in with a good bid, a good bond, certified by his postmaster that he is a man of good character and qualified under the old law and bids $1,450. Then, could the Department award the contract to the present contractor at a higher rate than the proposed new contract?

Mr. REES. I would say that the Postmaster General possibly has authority to do that. In other words, the present carrier bid $1,500, and another bidder came along and offered $1,450. I think the Postmaster General, if he finds that under the circumstances, all things considered, for example, the present carrier has the equipment to carry the mail and has spent considerable money to provide the necessary equipment to carry this route and is doing a good job, and if the Postmaster General thinks that $1,500 is a fair price for carrying the mail, I would say the Postmaster General has a right to allow that contract to the present contractor. Under the bill, in the case you cite, the contract would have been extended without advertising for bids.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

The gentleman from Kansas has consumed 14½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, ever since I became a member of the old Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in January 1943, there has been consideration of star-route legislation each year by the committee, but this is the first time since I became a member of the committee that your committee has been able to present a unanimous report on any star-route legislation.

Many of the star-route contractors wanted to be blanketed into civil service through a noncompetitive examination. There are about 11,000 star-route contractors. Your committee did not feel that it was advisable or fair to blanket these star-route contractors into the civil service and make them full-fledged Government employees with all retirement rights to the exclusion of World War veterans and others who might want to take the competitive examination also. For that reason your committee reached the conclusion that these star-route carriers should continue as star-route contractors and not be employees of the Government. In my opinion, the Federal Government already has entirely too many employees, and your committee did not feel like adding 11,000 more by reporting any such legislation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I would prefer not to yield until I complete my statement.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The question I wanted to ask was whether, if this bill be enacted into law, it would eliminate competitive bidding for star routes and leave it entirely within the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I will cover that in my statement, and I believe I can clear it up.

Mr. Chairman, the present cost of the star-route system is approximately $21,000,000. The cost has been increasing each year. For the purpose of handling star-route contracts, the country is divided into four sections—North, East, West, and South. The contracts run for a 4-year period and expire in different years in the various sections of the country. For instance, in the East it will be one year, in the North the following year, in the West the third year, and so forth. It so happens that this year the southern contracts expire on June 30, and if this legislation is not passed, new contracts will be awarded through competitive bidding on all southern contracts.

This legislation provides, in substance, that if the Postmaster General finds that a star-route contractor has rendered faithful, capable and efficient services in the carrying of the mail under his contract, then the Postmaster General is authorized to extend the contract of this satisfactory star-route contractor for an additional term of 4 years.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I understand that, but can the Postmaster General increase the present compensation of the contractor and if so by how much?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The legislation provides that in the discretion of the Postmaster General and in the best interests of the postal service, the Postmaster General may decrease or increase the compensation of any star-route contractor at any time during the extended contract for another period of 4 years. The increase or decrease must be based upon changed conditions due to increased cost of living, due to change in the operation of motor vehicles used

by the contractor, due to the lengthening or shortening of the route, the increase in mail carried, and other changed conditions.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not so understand this bill. This bill indicates that the compensation might be changed if there were a change in conditions which could not have been reasonably anticipated.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. That means that at the end of the 4-year term and if the contract is extended for another period of 4 years by the Postmaster General conditions are changed due to additional cost of operation, due to the extension of the route, due to increase in the amount of mail being carried, then the Postmaster General may increase the compensation of the star-route contractor at any time during the new term of 4 years.

Mr. COOLEY. It could only be done for the new term of 4 years.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. At the present time if a man is carrying a star route and is not being reasonably compensated and is carrying the mail at a very low rate, he cannot immediately increase that for the period of the oncoming 4 years?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No, that cannot be done under the present law. Under the present law, if a star-route contractor feels he is losing money under his contract price and he cannot afford to carry the mail any longer the Postmaster General cannot increase his pay but the contractor may, under an act passed by Congress in 1940, ask the Postmaster General to cancel his contract. He will forfeit 30 days' pay by the Postmaster General canceling his contract. Then that route will be again put up to open, competitive bidding, and the old contractor, whose contract was canceled at his request, may offer a new bid.

Mr. COOLEY. What effect does this have on the rights of returned GI's to take examinations? It appears to me if we permit the Post Office Department to renegotiate these contracts, all the GI's might be excluded, because they cannot compete in an examination.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. May I say that many of the old contractors are gradually giving up their contracts at the end of the 4-year term. When the southern section was advertised for bids, on 49 of these routes there were no bids at all. In such cases the Postmaster General must get out and make some kind of a temporary contract for the carrying of the mail where there are no bids because the mail must be carried regardless. Also whenever the Postmaster General does not desire to extend a contract because he does not think the service of the carrier has been satisfactory for the past 4 years, that route will again be put up to open, competitive bidding. When the star-route contractor has decided to retire or has decided he may not want another 4-year contract, then the route is put up for competitive bidding. For instance, in the southern territory this time 559 of the present holders of star-route contracts in the South out of 2,264 star routes there did not submit new bids. Under this law those 559 routes would then be let under open, competitive bidding to the lowest responsible bidder from bids already received by the Post Office Department.

Mr. COOLEY. In those cases which the gentleman has just mentioned, any GI who has been away from home in the Army or in the service of his country can submit a bid, but in numerous other cases you are going to give the Postmaster General the power to relet those contracts to the exclusion of all those GI's who will not have a chance to compete by submitting a competitive bid?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That could be done as long as the services of the present star-route contractor have been satisfactory and efficient.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman think that is in keeping with the policy of Congress to give these GI's every opportunity to secure Government jobs?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Certainly I do, when these routes are let by open, competitive bidding. I think when a star-route contractor has carried the mail for 20 to 25 years, has rendered a faithful, efficient service, it is unjust and unfair for him to be deprived of his contract for another 4-year term by cutthroat bidding. We have many cases today where a conscientious, honest, capable contractor, who has served as a carrier for 20 years, has lost his contract by an underbid of a dollar or two.

Mr. COOLEY. If you are going to do that as a policy, you should give the postmasters some power to offer an inducement to that competent, efficient carrier that the gentleman is talking about. Under this law he cannot increase his pay $1 a year. He cannot offer him an additional $100 to stay on.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Certainly he can.

Mr. COOLEY. Under this law could he increase the compensation of a present carrier?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Under this proposed bill, yes; when his contract is extended by the Postmaster General for another term of 4 years.

Mr. COOLEY. Only in the event of change of circumstances in the year.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. He cannot do it as of the beginning of the contract.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. He can do it at any time during the extension of a new 4-year term.

Mr. COOLEY. Right at the beginning?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. For instance, let us say that there has been a star-route contractor who has rendered faithful service for a number of years, and it develops that during his past 4-year term he has been carrying the mail at a loss, then it is nothing but right and fair that the Postmaster General should increase his compensation so that he will at least get a fair return on his investment and his time for carrying the mail at any time after his contract is extended for another 4-year term.

Mr. COOLEY. And the fixing of the compensation is left entirely to the discretion of the Postmaster General?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct, when the contract is extended for a 4-year period.

Mr. COOLEY. And he can then offer some inducement to the old carrier to remain in the service?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. COOLEY. But it is a fact that the GI will not have a chance to compete.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Except where the contract expires, where the star-route contractor whose services have been satisfactory does not desire his contract again, then the route will be put up to open competitive bidding.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to call the attention of my colleague from North Carolina to the fact that many of these contracts now are held by servicemen, men of the First World War, and if the record will be looked into I am sure it will be found that the same thing is true in other communities as it is in mine; that is that a majority of the routes are served by former World War I veterans, so this business about GI's not having a chance to compete is not true.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I think the statistics show that of the present star-route contractors about 40 percent of them are World War I veterans.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. What worries me about this bill is this: In the southern division bids have been called for; is that true?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. RICHARDS. And many bids have been submitted on the understanding that the contract would be let under the old basis. Now, many veterans have submitted these bids. I think we have got a fair bill here, but what I am worried about is whether or not these people who have gone ahead and submitted their bids under a misapprehension will be dealt with fairly.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I think so.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman will recall that we passed a resolution just a few weeks ago authorizing the Post Office Department not to accept these bids which were called for recently in the southern division, so they have that authority now to defer the awarding of the contracts in anticipation of the passage of this legislation. So, the bidders have known for some time that they will not be considered and, as a matter of fact, there are many carriers in the southern section who are veterans and who are anticipating this legislation in the hope that they can renew their contracts.

Mr. RICHARDS. But many of these bids were submitted months ago.

Mr. HAGEN. That is true.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the chairman of our committee the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. To clarify some of the discussion with respect to these bids, the gentleman from North Carolina called attention to the question of having a chance to compete. I will say this to him, that of the 2,264 star routes in the southern section, section No. 2, there are now 559 present holders that did not submit new bids. That is more than one-fourth of them. So, I just wanted to explain that the bidding is not a closed matter. Five hundred and fifty-nine routes are still open for bids that the veterans can bid on or anybody else. I just wanted to clarify that particular point.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman agree that in most of these cases, a majority of them, competitive bidding will be a thing of the past if you enact this law?

Mr. REES. I would not say that that would be true, not necessarily; no. I think the gentleman from Tennessee has made a very fair explanation on that score, so we hope there will be no cut-throat bidding.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I do not agree with the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina that this will destroy open competitive bidding. It only provides that in the event of faithful service performed by a star-route contractor that his contract will be extended for an additional term of 4 years. Many of the star-route contractors are old in the service, and it is not contemplated that they will be in the service many more years, and when they give up their service, their routes will go back to open competitive bidding.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know that I object to the bill, but I did want to point out the fact that it is a possibility that for a few years in the future competitive bidding will become a thing of the past, because it will be a negotiation between the contractor and the Department.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is true on certain routes. I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the gentleman will yield further, leaving out of consideration for the moment the present contractors who have not submitted new bids and do not desire to carry the mail any longer, the present contracts in the southern territory expire on the 30th of this month. Other bids have been submitted for all the routes. Will they be let under the present law or will the Postmaster General have the discretion to differentiate among those bidders, or will he have to take the lowest responsible bid among the new bidders?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The star-route contract in the South may be extended by the Postmaster General where the contractor has rendered faithful service and where the contractor wants to continue service, but if the contractor does not want the route any longer or does not bid, then the bids that have already been made and are now down in the Post Office Department will be considered, and the contract for that route will be let to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. DOUGHTON. As under the present law?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This bill does not interfere with the present law providing for open competitive bidding. Under the present law, every star-route contract extends for only 4 years. At the end of 4 years the route must be put up for open competitive bidding. This bill amends the present law only in this instance: It gives the Postmaster General the right to extend the contract for additional terms of 4 years where the contractor wants the contract extended and where his services have been satisfactory to the Postmaster General.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It deals only with present contractors.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, a member of our committee.

Mr. LYLE. I think it might be made clear here that for 3½ years the gentleman and I have worked on this matter. As a member of the committee, I think that what I wanted to get away from as far as possible, even more than the gentleman, perhaps, was cutthroat competitive bidding. I think it is no more sound to have cutthroat competitive bidding for star routes than it would be to have such bidding for mail routes in the city of Washington or in Corpus Christi or in any other place. The important thing is to have a sound, useful star route service. We cannot have that if men are carrying mail on these routes on a cutthroat basis, where they are losing money by the day, complaining constantly to the Department, and trying either to get out of their contracts or forfeit their bonds or negotiate through their Congressmen for higher pay. As for myself, I think that the further we get away from this unsound business of cutthroat bidding the better off the service in the United States will be.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I agree thoroughly with the statement of the gentleman from Texas. In many cases there has developed a vicious cutthroat system of bidding on the star routes. Take the case of a star-route contractor who has performed satisfactory service for five contract terms, covering 20 years, and his contract is again put up for bid for another 4 years, at the expiration of his fifth term. Everybody in the community where this star-route contractor operates knows what his contract pay was. Let us say his contract was $2,000 per year for the previous 4-year term. Some fellow who is out of a job in that community might say, "Bill Jones, the present star-route contractor, is getting $2,000 a year—I am out of a job and I want this work. I will take the contract for $1,995." By bidding $5 under the responsible contractor he would get the contract from the Post Office Department. We want to eliminate that.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. There is one point that is not quite clear in my mind. Where bids have already been received, if this bill is passed can the Postmaster General renegotiate with the old carrier, or will he have to accept the lowest bid, since they have already been called for and received?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No, the Postmaster General can go ahead under the terms of this bill and extend for another term of 4 years the contract of any responsible, satisfactory star-route contractor, regardless of the bids that have been submitted.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. In case no bids have been submitted or the present contractor has not submitted a bid, as is the case in about one-fourth of the southern contracts, then those contracts will be let to the lowest responsible bidders who have sent their bids down to the Post Office Department.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I believe you have a good bill here. The purpose of my question was to clarify the situation that has arisen in the southern districts to which this bill refers.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. May I say to the gentleman that the members of our committee have labored long on this proposition. We have given it much study. We have tried to be fair to both the star-route contractors and to the Government. This bill does not satisfy the star-route contractors altogether. They want to be blanketed into the Civil Service and become Government employees. We just did not feel that we could go that far, but we did feel that where a contractor has rendered faithful service, the Postmaster General should have the authority to extend his contract for another 4-year term and free that contractor from the evils of cutthroat bidding.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. Also there is another point. We came to the conclusion that it would be perhaps a great harm to the veterans themselves to make it possible for them to be getting $1,500 or $2,000 to carry a route that would cost them $2,200 or $2,600 under the present unbusinesslike method of bidding. We felt that this would do more justice to those veterans than to throw it completely open.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. You cannot have one yardstick for the payment of all star-route contractors, because there are eight different types of service performed by the different start-route contractors.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to ask the gentleman if any veterans' organization appeared before the gentleman's committee in opposition to this measure?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No, sir. Certain veterans' organizations indicated that it would not meet with their approval for these star-route contractors to be blanketed into the Civil Service and not give the veterans a chance to bid when the star route contracts came up for competitive bidding.

Mr. COOLEY. That provision is not in the bill before us at the present time; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. As I have stated previously, this legislation has the unanimous support of the committee. It is satisfactory to the Post Office Department. It is unobjectionable to the star-route contractors. Mr. Frank E. Russell, representative of the star-route contractors, appeared before the subcommittee considering this bill, and said that it was unobjectionable. It was not all that he wanted, but he certainly would like to see it passed on account of the time element involved. Your committee feels that this is a meritorious and deserving piece of legislation. We trust there will be no opposition to it.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this star-route problem has been before the members of the Post Office Committee and the Civil Service Committee for the past 7 or 8 years. Eleven thousand men would like to come under civil service. The Senate voted to put them under civil service and sent us a bill which would cost some $15,000,000.

The facts are that the type of service, starting probably with a Ford automobile and finishing up with a man on horseback, and then, when he cannot go any farther with the horse, he goes through the mountains down in Kentucky and Tennessee on foot seems to make it impracticable to put these men under civil service. The Postmaster General says the administration of the bill under civil service would be next to impossible.

We must put a little faith in the Postmaster General. We have a Postmaster General who has come up from the ranks. He insists he can and will fairly deal with the employees and the Government. We ought to try to get rid of this problem and pass this legislation that will be fair to everyone, and in order to continue this service and give the best possible service to the patrons, we must put a little trust in the Postmaster General. We questioned him about this bill to be certain that there would be no politics in these appointments, and, we have confidence that it will be good for the Government and give the greatest equity to these employees of the Government as well.

The star-route carriers preferred to be brought under civil service, yet they have agreed to this bill because they feel sure it will improve their present position. This bill should be enacted into law before this session of Congress closes.

Now, we ask you to put a little confidence in the Postmaster General, that he will administer this bill properly, taking into consideration not only the interest of the carrier but of the general public. If he seeks to abuse the power granted in this bill, he can be checked by the Appropriations Committee, and he is certainly under the gun of the Civil Service Committee and can be checked by that committee. So you have nothing to fear. We ask you to put a little confidence in the committee, which studied this bill, which consists of only three or four paragraphs, and which found there was no objection from any quarter.

I would like to see this bill passed by a unanimous vote, because the bill ought to be enacted into law by this House and the Senate and signed by the President before this session closes. This is a good bill. There is no use asking a lot of questions about it. No question can be asked about this bill but what can be satisfactorily explained to an impartial mind. I hope the House will pass this bill by unanimous vote. I assure the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that the interests of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and various organizations, does not obtain as to this bill, but they would have an interest if you put them under civil service and attempted to blanket those 11,000 people into civil service without giving the veterans a chance. But there is no objection, as far as any veterans' organization is concerned.

For your further information, I think it is fair to say that probably 50 or 60 percent of the star route carriers are poor old World War I veterans, who, because of age, probably could hardly make a living in other walks of life. Many of them are making a good living on star routes and they are entitled to be protected from present cut-throat contracts. This is a veteran's bill, because it helps to protect the decent rights of these World War I veterans, who are now rendering faithful service to this Government. This legislation will help most all star route carriers, and in part will do justice to these faithful public servants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I introduced a bill somewhat similar to others that have been introduced on this problem as long ago as 6 years. I have been a member of this committee, with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] for 6 years. As he has told you, we have often considered star-route legislation, but until this year we were not able to get together on a satisfactory solution. I believe that this is a satisfactory solution to the problem, but if it is not just what we expect it to be, we can change it in a year or two.

However, this proposal should be given a fair trial. The committee was unanimous in reporting the measure to help solve this very bad star-route problem. You will be interested in knowing that out of 11,000 star routes, 5,000 have failed in the last 4 years. In other words, there is a casualty list of almost 50 percent in the contract holders during the last 4-year period. Every time there was a contract failure the Department had to call for new bids, and that takes time and money. Meantime the mail service suffers to the patrons on the route. So by this method we hope to eliminate the failures and defaults on star routes. Furthermore, it is pointed out in the report and as you will notice in the bill, that the change in the contract, the increase or decrease in the compensation must be agreeable to the present contractor; in other words, any proposals or suggestions made by the Postmaster General or the Department must be agreeable to the contract holder. If he is not satisfied he does not have to continue the contract or accept it. If the Postmaster General offers to give him an increase that he thinks is not sufficient he does not have to continue the contract. At the present time he has the privilege of giving up the contract and he will have that right under this bill. Where conditions change, the cost of cars goes up, the cost of living goes up, or the route is extended, or more mail is carried, he has the opportunity and the right to ask for readjustment of his contract so he can make a profit or at least a living and break even or better as they have not been able to do in so many cases in recent years. Pass this bill and the Post Office Department will be able to operate its star route service more economically and more efficiently and without injustice to veterans of the First and Second World Wars who now hold contracts but who all too frequently in the past have found themselves losing the contract because of a bid $5 or $10 lower each 4 years. Then they find themselves left with a lot of expensive equipment on their hands for which they have no use. I can tell you about hundreds of cases where contract holders have lost their contracts because of a slightly lower bid by someone else after having held the contract for 20 or 25 years. They lost their contracts because of the vicious system of competitive bidding practiced over the past years. That is the system we want to eliminate and that is what we do to a great extent in this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. I wish to call the committee's attention to a case down my way where a local boy, one of my constituents, lost a contract because he was underbid 50 cents. The Department gave the contract to a new bidder, because the new bidder underbid the contractor by 50 cents. This man was left with more than $8,000 of equipment on his hands, equipment for which he had no use and which he could not sell to the new bidder. It was a great loss to him. I think the problem raised by this bill should be given every consideration.

Mr. HAGEN. It is just cases of that kind that we are trying to eliminate and

correct and that is one good reason why the committee reported out this legislation unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, you might say this to your constituents, that in no other instance that I have seen since I have been in Congress has a committee been able to work out a bill more nearly to the satisfaction of the Government and the people involved than the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service in this star-route legislation.

There is a great deal of confusion as to what star routes are. I think I spent 2 years on the committee before I ever was able fully to inform myself on what a star route is. I highly commend to the Members of this House the various hearings that have been held so that they too may understand fully the difficulties that arose in working out a measure of this nature.

There are two things involved in a bill of this character: First, satisfactory service to the Government of the United States; second, satisfactory treatment to the people who serve the Government of the United States. We sincerely believe that this measure will serve both the country and those who carry the star routes.

Considerable thought was given to the proposition of blanketing all of these people into the civil service. It has some merit. Perhaps it has a great deal of merit. However, it is startling to contemplate the confusion that would arise in the department if you attempted to do that. Secondly, it would cost a great deal more money than I believe this House would want to spend at this time; and, third, it would upset the balance between the pay and the work of the regular rural-route carriers and the star-route contractors. Star routes have been carried by busses or other contractors of that nature, common carriers. Quite often they take on the nature of a rural route, but they are so varied that it is quite impossible to bring out a measure that intelligently can put the proper coordination over the whole field; consequently, I believe you will find that your people who are interested in star routes will be quite happy with this measure because it offers them some security that they do not have now. It offers them I think possibilities for better compensation. I can think of nothing that would do me more harm as a veteran than to require me to render a service to my country at a loss, and that is exactly what has happened in connection with many of these star-route carriers. It would be a great injustice to continue the present system.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is long overdue. I know it cannot possibly meet the full approval of all concerned; however, may I call attention to the fact that very few bills that have passed this House since I have been a Member were in a form that I would not have rewritten in some portion or left out in some portion. Perhaps it is a fortunate thing I do not write all of the legislation here.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will give full approval to this measure.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a number of years ago I introduced a bill in the interest of the star-route carriers of the Nation. These carriers represent a small group, but they are entitled to justice. There is no doubt but that they are the forgotten men of the postal service. However, throughout the years the Members of Congress who were advised on the subject have sought legislation to remedy a bad situation, but somehow or other it has not been possible to secure action up to now.

I want to commend this committee and its members, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], and the other members who are responsible for presenting this bill for a small group of people who have long waited for some measure of justice to be meted out to them. It may well be that this bill is not perfect, but it will enable the House and Senate to work out the most favorable solution that can be agreed upon at this time and will be the basis perhaps for legislation in the future. I know that these people who have waited so long for legislation on this subject, the star route carriers and their families, will be highly appreciative of the action of their Congress in taking up and passing the pending legislation at the present busy moment of this important session of the Congress. Again, I want to congratulate the committee on the good work it has done.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the committee substitute for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 3951 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 434), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Postmaster General may, in his discretion and in the interest of the postal service, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3949 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 429), by mutual agreement with the holder of any star-route contract, renew such contract at the rate prevailing at the end of the contract term, for additional terms of 4 years with such bond as may be required by the Postmaster General. Any such contract may be terminated at the end of any 4-year term at the option of the Postmaster General or the contractor or terminated at any time by operation of any existing law.

"The Postmaster General may, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, with the consent of the contractor, and without regard to the provisions of sections 3958 and 3961 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, secs. 438 and 441), readjust the compensation of a star-route contractor for increased or decreased costs occasioned by changed conditions occurring during the contract term which could not reasonably have been anticipated at the time of making his original proposal or executing his bond for a renewed contract as provided herein."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STEFAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 263) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 623, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD at the close of the discussion on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEARNEY, for 3 days, on account of official business.

APPOINTMENT OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED TO POSITIONS IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service, having met, after full

and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

EDWARD H. REES,
FRANCIS J. LOVE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amended the bill by adding a section providing for conferring classified civil-service status upon physically handicapped persons who have served at le t 1 year in the postal service, who are involuntarily separated, and who pass suitable noncompetitive civil-service examinations.

The committee of conference recommended that the Senate recede from its amendment. Thus the bill as agreed upon is identical with the bill passed by the House.

EDWARD H. REES,
FRANCIS J. LOVE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SHORE PROTECTIVE WORKS AT NOME, ALASKA

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent to call up House Resolution 621, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6228) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 621, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6228) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6228) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 6223, which has to do with the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska. The members of the committee who reported the bill are present and can explain it on its merits. I understand there are no requests for time on the minority side. I have no requests for time on the rule.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6228) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6228, with Mr. HESELTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the construction of short installations at the town of Nome, Alaska. From the standpoint of economy, this bill cannot be justified before the House today. It came before our committee, but should have been given to the Committee on Armed Services, because the one thing that justifies the House in considering this bill is national defense. It so happens that we have a large airport at Nome, Alaska. It is on the eastern shore of the Bering Sea and the Bering Straits opposite Russia. Nome, Alaska, is a port, so to speak, since a great airport was maintained there during the last war and is still in existence. The armed forces built some jetties out into Bering Straits which have caused action by the sea waters as to result in the damage and partial destruction of the sea wall at Nome. The extent of that damage is the wall is being washed away, and also a part of the town. This bill provides for the construction and repair of that wall or the building of a new wall in order to save the town of Nome, Alaska. The lives of several hundred people are in jeopardy. Incidentally, but more important, it is necessary to preserve a port for the great airfield we have at Nome, Alaska, in which our Government has $10,000,000 invested. It is certainly one of our strategic outposts in the great northwest. It is necessary for the national defense and security of the United States. It is on that basis wholly and entirely that the bill is before us today for our consideration. I hope it will meet with the approval of the Members of the House, because it is so important for our national defense. The amount of money that is included in this bill ought to be charged to the funds appropriated to the armed services of the Nation, rather than the Public Works Administration.

But in any event, the purpose in bringing the bill here today is to get action and get action quickly in order to save the town of Nome, Alaska, our outpost in the great Northwest.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. How much money actually is involved?

Mr. DONDERO. About $1,875,000; less than $2,000,000 in all.

That is all I care to say about it, Mr. Chairman. Those are the facts in a few words. I hope the Committee will support the Committee on Public Works in the passage of this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. From what I have heard of the gentleman's statement, the real necessity for this project arises out of the necessity for protecting the airport, which is of value in the national defense establishment of the country?

Mr. DONDERO. That is exactly right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It has been my privilege to visit this city and hold hearings and very carefully look into this project. I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and his committee for having reported this bill. I am sure the facts of the case will show that the defense of the Government will save more money annually on the freight differential by having this installation than the total cost of the installation and perhaps several times over. Alaska is the buffer state between Russia and the United States. The United States is the buffer state between Russia and the balance of the world. You cannot run a defense program in Alaska unless you have your air base, military base, and naval base. This project protects the air base at Nome, Alaska, and it should have the full approval of the Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. The House should be gratified for the valuable information which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has presented to it, after having been there personally and observing it.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, everything that the chairman of the Public Works Committee has said about this proposal is absolutely correct. He has stated it fairly and I think clearly. There is but little that can be added to his statement.

Perhaps it might be worth while to note that the Army air field installation near Nome, Alaska, cost approximately $10,000,000. During the course of the last war there was continually maintained at that airport a large Military Establishment, both of air personnel and ground troops, as well as those engaged in the service of supply. The only means of supplying the personnel and the necessary equipment at that airfield was the use of air transportation itself, or by sea. Impractical it is, of course, to supply a base of that size with the number of personnel required to be there, if it should ever be necessary to have a large personnel there again, by air. On the other hand, it is becoming increasingly costly and increasingly more difficult to supply by sea those persons who must man that airfield, if we must again maintain a large establishment at that point.

In addition to that, there are several hundred persons who live at Nome, Alaska, and the action of the waters that beat upon the coast having been changed by the erection of the jetties which Chairman DONDERO referred to, has time and again necessitated the actual moving of buildings constructed by the inhabitants of Nome, from the water's edge a little farther inland to prevent their being engulfed by the action of the water. There is absolutely no question about the need of this project from a national defense standpoint. There is little doubt of its great desirability and virtue from the standpoint of aiding the people who must live at Nome, for whatever reason they must live there. So, Mr. Chairman, from our side of the aisle, we endorse this proposition wholeheartedly and submit it to the Congress for its favorable consideration.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. As a majority member of the committee I certainly want to recognize the splendid cooperation the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] have given on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I know we are operating under forced time and it is necessary to proceed with much dispatch, but this is indeed a very important matter. I visited the airport at Nome, in fact I traveled by air over practically all of Alaska, and I feel perhaps it might be well if I speak briefly on this subject.

Those of you who have not been to Alaska I feel cannot appreciate the necessity of the air facilities. We have an immense territory there. It is our outpost which is most important to the defense of the Pacific Coast as well as all of the United States, and without adequate air facilities we would be handicapped in our defense. From a little north of Nome it is only 40 miles across to Russian territory. This airport is the only one on the northern frontier there for almost a thousand miles. Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the United States Air Force, who is particularly interested in maintaining the air base there, testified before our committee. I read briefly from a letter he wrote:

> Nome, Alaska, is considered an important station in the chain of installations contemplated for the defense of Alaska. This station, which has limited facilities, is the only Air Force base in over 1,000 miles of coast line on the Bering Sea from which operations may be conducted. In addition to air operations, it is proposed to use Nome in our radar and long-range warning system in Alaska.

In my judgment it is most essential that we maintain this air base. Without the facilities which are provided in Nome, Alaska, it will be impossible to maintain the air base unless the Government at its own expense installs facilities itself. This will cost infinitely more than the work provided for under this bill which is $1,835,000. I certainly commend this bill to your careful consideration.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I cannot add much to what has been said regarding the necessity for this bill for almost all has been said that should have been said, but I do want to bring out a couple of points that I believe have not yet been presented.

Not only is this operation necessary from the standpoint of national defense, as has been testified, but it also provides for the only practical way of getting raw materials into Nome from which the Army installations can be built. Unless the harbor can be protected there is no safe way in for bulky supplies, which obviously cannot come in by air. Further than that, it also protects a very large investment of the Government itself. It has not been brought out yet, but we have a Federal building there that I believe cost some $200,000 which actually, unless we do this beach protection work, is going to be washed away and be a total loss to the United States Government.

The job is necessary, as has been testified, from the standpoint of national defense. It is necessary not only to the people of Nome who, without this work, will have their holdings washed away by erosion, but also to the many Army installations nearby who must depend on Nome for all services and facilities not provided for directly at the posts. Nome cannot move, for land further back from the beach is absolutely unsuitable for building projects.

The reason for asking for immediate consideration of this bill is because the construction season is so short. Unless we get a prompt appropriation we are going to have to postpone the job another 12 months. It may then be too late to meet the actual necessities of the situation.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman mentioned the Federal building. As I recall its cost was in the neighborhood of $600,000.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I thank the gentleman for the correction.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure we all recognize the great ability of the gentleman who is speaking and know of his architectural and engineering work. I am wondering if he would state in his opinion whether or not this is definitely a part of our defense picture.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Yes; I am ready to state that flatly and in no uncertain terms. In my opinion, after investigation of both Army and Air Force plans, this job is absolutely necessary, not only for the immediate Army training situation at Nome, but for proper training of personnel in winter operations: also as has been testified, it fits in with long-range plans for national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following work of improvement is hereby adopted and authorized, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations hereafter made for improvement of rivers and harbors:
>
> Nome Harbor, Alaska, in accordance with the plan presented in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated March 8, 1948, and subject to the conditions set forth in said report.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HESELTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6228) to provide for the construction of shore protection work at the town of Nome, Alaska, pursuant to House Resolution 621, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska, which is similar to the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following work of improvement is hereby adopted and authorized, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations hereafter made for improvement of rivers and harbors:

Nome Harbor, Alaska, in accordance with the plan presented in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated March 8, 1948, and subject to the conditions set forth in said report.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following: "That the following work of improvement is hereby adopted and authorized, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations hereafter made for improvement of rivers and harbors:

"Nome Harbor, Alaska, in accordance with the plan presented in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated March 8, 1948, and subject to the conditions set forth in said report."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6228) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on behalf of the Rules Committee I may call up House Resolution 622.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 5710) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the RECORD may disclose the true situation, the Rules Committee is presently meeting on matters of urgent and immediate consequence, which accounts for the fact that the members of that committee are not present. However, I have ascertained the fact that these rules have been reported. And, of course, have been approved by the committee. I understand there is no question about them.

May I also say for the RECORD that I spoke to the very able minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], about disposing of these bills this afternoon, and that procedure met with his complete approval.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 5710, a bill to amend an act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes.

The members of the committee who have reported the bill are present and can explain the merits of the provisions. I know of no objection to the rule.

Does any Member on the minority side desire time on the rule?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. We have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5710) to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5710, with Mr. ELSTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5710 as amended has been passed by a unanimous vote, both by the subcommittee and by the Committee on Public Works. At this time I want to extend my word of appreciation to the leadership of this House that we are allowed to bring this type of legislation on the floor, because this bill is definitely a step in reducing governmental and bureaucratic control, and certainly will reduce governmental expenditures. H. R. 5710 as originally introduced would remove from the statutes the jurisdiction of the Federal Government on temporary houses constructed in political subdivisions and temporary houses on college and university campuses. After a great deal of consideration and after opposition by representatives of the various armed forces, it was decided that we would strike from the original bill that section which had to do with the political subdivisions and municipalities and only leave incorporated in the bill which is now before us for consideration those dwelling units which we consider temporary houses which are constructed on college and university campuses.

May I call to the attention of the Committee that in my opinion in excess of 95 percent of those units constructed on college and university campuses are dwelling units which were originally in the category of the military service or the naval service or the air service. They have been moved to these particular locations on college and university campuses and put there to serve the GI's who are going to college or to the university. Under this act, H. R. 5710, we give to those colleges and universities without monetary consideration the right of ownership to those temporary dwellings.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In my judgment this is very meritorious legislation. I want to express my appreciation to the committee for bringing it out.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I want to acknowledge his interest as he has contacted me many times on this subject.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, a recognized and valuable member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does this bill carry any language which would permit a municipality by resolution to extend the time that temporary housing projects can be retained?

Mr. McGREGOR. As the bill is before us it does not, but we have a committee amendment which we hope the Committee of the Whole will accept which will extend the time. Under exist-

ing law, these temporary dwellings will have to be removed as of June 30, 1949. This bill H. R. 5710 has to do only with the dwellings on university and college campuses, but we have an amendment which will be submitted as a committee amendment which will extend the time so that none of these dwellings need be removed until January 1950, I believe. If I am wrong, I yield to my chairman for correction.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct as to the date. I may say this amendment was requested by the Housing Administration in order to give them ample time to submit to the committee in the next Congress such facts as may be necessary to provide a basis for legislation to dispose of these temporary houses owned by municipalities.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is aware, I think, that I introduced a bill to make it possible for this housing to be continued by resolution of the municipalities where it is located, and which would have removed the time limit entirely. I, of course, recognize that the proposed amendment, which would permit the housing to be continued until January 1, 1950, is an improvement over the present law, because if this housing had to be removed today it would simply put a lot of people out on the street. In some of the communities in my district where this temporary housing exists, what we call temporary housing is much better than a great deal of the housing in which people are compelled to live under present conditions.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the consideration and the interest shown by the gentleman, because he has contacted me a number of times relative to the extension of the law so that the temporary houses would not be removed. As I know he is vitally interested in a definite housing program.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman would explain section 505, with reference to the buildings that are now on college sites, and that have been in the past used by ex-servicemen while they were attending college. This section is found on page 3, line 21, and reads, "Upon the filing of a request therefor as herein provided, the Administrator shall relinquish and transfer, without monetary consideration, to any educational institution all contractual rights and all property right, title, and interest of the United States" in that property.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is simply upon a definite written request by the Board of Governors, the Board of Trustees, or the governing body of the university to the Federal Works Agency, stating that they have the authority and they are requesting the outright ownership in 120 days, that the Federal Government without monetary consideration give to that university or that college the outright ownership of that unit.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much. Do I correctly understand that the Senate has passed a similar bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. The Senate has not passed a bill. I may say that the other body I think is waiting to see what disposition is made of this bill. This has been somewhat an agreed bill between the Federal agency in power and the other body, as well as the House. I think the other body is waiting until we pass this bill, and we are hopeful it will concur in our recommendation and pass this bill as amended at once.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I compliment the gentleman, as chairman of the subcommittee, and also the committee, for this legislation. It is going to help a great number of educational institutions.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. And I certainly acknowledge his interest as he has contacted me many times on this legislation. This whole program is simply a matter of taking into consideration the fact that 95 to 97 percent of the units constructed on the college and university campuses are temporary structures. We might consider that they were expendable during the war emergency. We might say they have served their purpose. They were moved on to these college and university campuses. Now, under the existing law they are under Federal control, and they have really served their purpose. Their maintenance cost is far in excess, if I may say so, of the revenue that we are going to get from them, at least in the very near future. If under existing law we are compelled to remove them as of June 30, 1948, their value then will be practically nothing. So there was a consensus of opinions, of the author of the bill and the members of the subcommittee, as well as of the members of the full committee, that by giving them to these universities and colleges they might get some value from them. They then will be able to use them and in turn give to the veterans who are occupying them as temporary dwellings a lower rental because a Federal overhead cost is not involved.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I congratulate my colleague for his foresight in introducing this legislation. Being a contractor and builder himself, I know that the legislation is sound. The folks in his district should be proud to have such a far-seeing businessman in Congress representing them.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank my distinguished colleague, who has himself made a successful mark in private life, as well as established himself as a sound and capable legislator, which has been recognized by his constituency.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon, a member of the subcommittee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. ANGELL. As a member of the subcommittee, I think there is a great deal of merit in this bill, particularly because it protects the colleges where they have these temporary structures and protects the veterans who are largely occupants of these structures. Unless some such procedure is followed as is embodied in this bill, these institutions will not have authority to make repairs to preserve these buildings.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am glad that my colleague from Oregon brought that point out, because these buildings have arrived at the point where they definitely need repairs. The exorbitant costs which would be incurred under Federal control are beyond the amount that we might derive from them.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the members of the committee for bringing out this legislation. It is certainly very much in order, and there is a great need for it.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I do appreciate his interest. May I add that very shortly our distinguished chairman of the full committee will offer an amendment whereby we are extending what might be termed in laymen's language the removal time of the temporary dwellings so that the time limit will be January 1, 1950. Under existing law, all temporary buildings have to be removed by June 30, 1949. But under the proposed amendment, we are extending the time to 1950. I hope the committee will agree to the amendment. I feel that this legislation is a definite step in getting the Federal Government out of the housing business, and will give private capital and private ownership a chance to operate without Government interference and Government competition.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, reduced to its simplest terms, this bill simply provides that whereas under the Lanham Act, during the course of the last war, a large number of temporary housing units were constructed in various parts of the United States. Under the authority of that act, as well as amendments, certain of these temporary housing units were dismantled and transferred to colleges and universities in various sections of the country, and there re-erected on the college campuses for the use of veterans for living quarters while in attendance at these educational institutions. There is provisions in the Lanham Act that these temporary structures must be torn down not later than July 1, 1949. Yet these temporary structures on the college campuses have further utility for several years if properly cared for and maintained for the purpose they are now being used, which is for the housing of veterans. Under the law as it now exists, these structures must be torn down by July 1, 1949, and they will have no practical utility for any purpose and particularly will they have no value when it comes to the disposition of them. It

is estimated that many of those units would have such a small salvage value the cost of tearing them down would exceed the value as salvage. Therefore, to follow the terms of existing law which would require the dismantling of these temporary units on college campuses by the date of expiration under existing law, would be but to destroy very usable houses. This bill simply proposes to give to the colleges and universities on whose campuses these structures now exist the title that the Government has in those units.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. At this point, as chairman of the subcommittee, I want to recognize the splendid efforts and endeavors and support which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT], as well as all the other members on the minority side, have given to us on this legislation.

Mr. PICKETT. May I thank the gentleman from Ohio, both for myself and for my colleagues.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As chairman of the committee, I wish to endorse everything the gentleman from Ohio has just said, and much more if I could.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman.

The other provision of this bill which will be offered as a committee amendment, simply extends the time for the tearing down of the temporary housing, wherever it may exist in towns and municipalities and otherwise, for one additional year, in order to give this Congress ample opportunity to dispose of the various conflicting questions and contingencies that will arise when we consider legislation on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate that these dwellings are needed. There is a great shortage of dwellings throughout the United States. This bill will give to the colleges and universities about 139,000 units which brought to the Government a revenue of about $5,000,000 a year. So it is really a gift to those universities and colleges in that amount.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman says it is a gift of $5,000,000 to these colleges and universities. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Illinois will tell the committee what the expenditure of the Federal Government will be on the maintenance of these particular units?

Mr. SABATH. Well, I do not know what it would cost the Government, but it applies to properties and land where the housing is on college or university grounds. I hope that those universities and colleges do not hold up the Government to any great amount for furnishing them much-needed housing facilities. Personally, I have only one objection. I am in favor of this bill, notwithstanding it is a gift to these colleges and universities, which really goes into the millions. That was the original cost of these houses.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair. Will he yield at that point?

Mr. SABATH. Just let me finish, please.

But what I wanted to know is this: Why should not the small, poor municipalities and counties that have been accorded the same privilege by the Government and who put up some of these temporary structures there—why are they not entitled to the same privilege and the same right and the same opportunities as the universities and colleges, most of which are endowed?

Mr. McGREGOR. If the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to answer his question.

Mr. SABATH. They are in much better position than many of these small municipalities, which could utilize them to advantage to house ex-servicemen and many of the people who really are in need of them.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I may say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, that I do recognize the fact that he voted for this rule. As to the matter of why municipalities about which he asks were not included I may say that all the heads of the Armed Services appeared before the Committee on Public Works of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is chairman, and requested of us to strike from the bill that paragraph which had to do with political subdivisions or municipalities because of the seeming emergency that may confront us, and that they might need these temporary units. For that reason we struck from the bill the municipal and political subdivisions sections and only left in the college and university clause.

Mr. SABATH. And I exceedingly regret that they were stricken from the bill because I still believe that many of these poor municipalities and some communities are in just as great need as these universities and colleges.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Just a minute.

I fully appreciate that some of these units need to be reconstructed and repaired; consequently, I am indeed in favor of this legislation with the exception that I have made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SABATH. This to some extent will help the veterans to remain in the houses who are now in attendance at colleges and universities, even though the houses are poorly constructed. At least they will have some place to live. But there are thousands of veterans not as fortunate as those in the colleges and universities who have been unable to obtain any place to live. They are seeking and pleading that something be done to enable them to obtain suitable homes.

Notwithstanding the fact that the other body has already acted on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, I am still waiting, hoping, and urging that this House will take action to relieve the millions who are in real distress and have no place to hang their hats. I want to know how much longer you are going to delay action on that bill which will do much greater good to a much greater number than the bill that is now before us.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I may call the gentleman's attention to the fact that for 16 years his party has had control of housing. I am glad to have the distinguished gentleman recognize the fact that the housing situation is deplorable. We on our side in cooperation with the gentleman on his side are endeavoring to iron out the difficulties.

Mr. SABATH. If you Republicans had not forced the repeal of the housing material priorities and your Banking and Currency Committee had not filibustered on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, hundreds of thousands of homes could have been built at a cost within the financial reach of the ex-servicemen and peoples in the low-income class. The removal of priorities on materials and the 2½ years' delay in action of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, for which you Republicans are responsible, has enabled the real-estate lobby operators and contractors to construct homes costing $12,000, $15,000, $18,000, and $20,000, which are only available to the high-salaried official and persons in the higher-income group. The blame for the failure to provide decent low-cost homes to our deserving ex-servicemen and citizens in the lower-wage class is yours, not ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 5710 which will afford our educational institutions an opportunity to acquire housing projects which have been constructed with the assistance of the Government. Many of these dwelling units have been erected for the use of veterans and other students attending colleges and these projects have made it possible to adequately house these students and their families.

These educational institutions have had a substantial financial interest in these projects by furnishing the land, utilities, and other necessary items. I believe it is only proper that the Government should now make it possible to transfer without cost to the educational institution all the buildings erected by the Government for student housing.

Many colleges in Texas have benefited by the housing program of the Public Housing Administration and these educational institutions will continue to put the housing units to good use for many years in the future. I have observed the

good results of the student housing program at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station, Tex., where so many veterans have returned to complete their education. These extra family dwelling units have made it possible for many men to finish their schooling who otherwise would not have had the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, hundreds of colleges and thousands of students will continue to reap the benefits of having adequate housing accommodations if the transfer of these units is made possible by the enactment of H. R. 5710. The Navarro County Junior College at Corsicana, Hillsboro Junior College, and Westminster College at Tehuacana, Tex., have several family and trailer units being utilized by their students. I urge that the Members favorably consider H. R. 5710.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Clerk will read the committee substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section 505:

"SEC. 505. (a) Upon the filing of a request therefor as herein provided, the Administrator shall relinquish and transfer, without monetary consideration, to any educational institution all contractual rights (including the right to revenues and other proceeds) and all property right, title, and interest of the United States in and with respect to any temporary housing located on land owned by such institution, or controlled by it and not held by the United States: *Provided,* That any net revenues or other proceeds from such housing to which the United States is entitled shall not cease, by virtue of this section 505, to accrue to the United States until the end of the month in which the rights, title, and interest with respect to such housing are relinquished and transferred hereunder, and the obligation of the transferee to pay such accrued amounts shall not be affected by this section: *And provided further,* That this shall not be deemed to require a transfer to an educational institution which has no contractual or other interest in the housing or the land on which it is located except that of a lessor. As used in this section, the term 'temporary housing' shall include any housing (including trailers and other mobile or portable housing) constructed, acquired, or made available under this title V, and includes any structures, appurtenances, and other property, real or personal, acquired for or held in connection therewith.

"(b) The filing of a request under this section must be made within 120 days of the date of enactment of the section and shall be authorized by the board of trustees or other governing body of the institution making the request. Such request shall be accompanied by an opinion of the chief law officer or legal counsel of the institution making the request to the effect that it has legal authority to make the request, to accept the transfer of and operate any property involved, and to perform its obligations under this section. The provisions of section 313 of this act (and the contractual obligations of the educational institution to the Federal Government with respect thereto) shall cease to apply to any temporary housing to which rights are relinquished or transferred under this section 505 if (and only if) the request therefor is supported by a resolution of the governing body of the municipality or county having jurisdiction in the area specifically approving the waiver of the requirements of said section 313. The Administrator shall act as promptly as practicable on any request which complies with the provisions of this section 505 and is fully supported as herein required.

"(c) In filling vacancies in any housing for which rights are relinquished or transferred under subsection (a) of this section, preference shall be given to veterans of World War II or servicemen, who are students at the educational institution, and their families: *Provided,* That the educational institution shall be deemed to comply with this subsection (c) if it makes available to veterans of World War II or servicemen and their families accommodations in any housing of the institution equal in number to the accommodations in the housing for which such rights are relinquished or transferred."

SEC. 2. (a) Any Federal agency (including any wholly owned Government corporation) administering utility installations connected to a utility system for housing under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized—

(1) to continue to provide utilities and utility services to such housing as long as it is under the jurisdiction of the Administrator;

(2) to contract with the purchasers or transferees of such housing to continue the utility connection with such installations and furnish such utilities and services as may be available and needed in connection with such housing, for such period of time (not exceeding the period of Federal administration of such installations) and subject to such terms (including the payment of the pro rata cost of the Government or the market value of the utilities and services furnished, whichever is greater) as may be determined by the head of the agency;

(3) to dispose of such installations, when excess to the needs of the agency, and where not excess to grant an option to purchase, to the purchasers or transferees of such housing, for an amount not less than the appraised value of the installations and upon such terms and conditions as the head of the agency shall establish.

(b) Any Federal agency (including any wholly owned Government corporation) having under its jurisdiction lands across which run any part of a utility system for housing under the jurisdiction of the Administrator is authorized to grant to the Administrator, or to the purchasers or transferees of such housing, easements (which may be perpetual) on such land for utility purposes.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following: ": *Provided further,* That, for the purposes of this section, housing constructed or acquired under the provisions of Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved September 9, 1940, or Public Laws 9, 73, or 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved respectively, March 1, 1941, May 21, 1941, and December 17, 1941, shall be deemed to be housing constructed or acquired under this act."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. DONDERO:

Page 6, line 16, substitute the word "to" for the word "of."

Page 7, line 16, substitute "24" for "21" after the word "May."

Add the following new section:

"SEC. 4. Section 313 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the following words in the second sentence: '2 years after the President declares that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1950'."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ELSTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5710) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 622, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made yesterday at the statue of former Justice of the Supreme Court John Marshall.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include the text of Pope Pius XII's address to cardinals and in the other to include a telegram.

H. R. 6794

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6794.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEEFE, H. CARL ANDERSEN, SCHWABE of Oklahoma, CHURCH, ROONEY, HENDRICKS, and FOGARTY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Warren S. Reese.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 624, Rept. No. 2183), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table; that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, disagreed to by the House; that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the said bill be, and hereby is, agreed to by the House; and that the Speaker shall immediately appoint conferees without intervening motion.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 633, Rept. No. 2184), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 634, Rept. No. 2185), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. POTTS, for Friday, June 4, 1948, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5816. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On May 20, 1948:

H. R. 1878. An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of aliens who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States;

H. R. 3219. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3510. An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 5193. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

On June 2, 1948:

H. R. 669. An act to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers;

H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Fred E. Gross;

H. R. 3638. An act to amend section 10 of the act establishing a National Archives of the United States Government;

H. R. 3805. An act for the relief of Thomas A. W. Elder;

H. R. 4954. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington;

H. R. 5151. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake and Ohio canal between Great Falls and Cumberland, upon advisability of a parkway thereon;

H. R. 5283. An act to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.;

H. R. 5553. An act to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5587. An act to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5607. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5965. An act to amend paragraph 813 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 6056. An act to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.;

H. R. 6071. An act to provide for the treatment of sexual psycopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6078. An act to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended;

H. R. 6091. An act to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6242. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap;

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Turners Society in the United States;

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth an-

niversary of the founding of Fort Kearney, in the State of Nebraska;

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition, Incorporated, Atlantic City, N. J., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of powers of appointment, and for other purposes.

On June 3, 1948:

H. R. 3680. An act to amend section 207, 213, 215, 216, 220, 222, and 225, of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 5816. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1613. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $6,000,000 for the Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 693); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1614. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 694); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1615. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (H. Doc. No. 695); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1616. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal the Canal Zone Retirement Act, and to extend the Civil Service Retirement Act, with amendments, to employees affected by such repeal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1617. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, for the month of April 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CLASON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6247. A bill to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances; without amendment (Rept. No. 2170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6801. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers; with amendments (Rept. No. 2182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 624. Resolution agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2183). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 633. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6801, a bill making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2184). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 634. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5904, a bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2185). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2188). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2189). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4635. A bill to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6106. A bill to amend the act of December 20, 1944, to provide for the issuance, without examination, of licenses to certain persons to engage in business; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6524. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 2192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6598. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 2193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6759. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6794. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6216. A bill to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair; without amendment (Rept. No. 2171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 424. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 2175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West; without amendment (Rept. No. 2176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels; without amendment (Rept. No. 2178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1170. A bill for the relief of Bernice Green; without amendment (Rept. No. 2179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3848. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; with amendments (Rept. No. 2180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4133. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Harber; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6794. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 6795. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide a priority for veterans in the purchase of certain residential property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 6796. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 6797. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age for veterans of World War I in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 6798. A bill to encourage enterprise capital investment in private business and aid industrial preparedness for national emergencies by abolishing mandatory depreciation deductions in loss years and permitting reduced depreciation deductions in low-income years for Federal tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6799. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, to increase the salaries of the members of the Railroad Retirement Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6800. A bill to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 6801. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 6802. A bill to strengthen the United Nations and promote international cooperation for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 6803. A bill to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 6804. A bill to mend the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the necessity of holding an election as a condition to the making of an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 6805. A bill to provide emergency aid for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public facilities damaged or destroyed by certain catastrophes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6806. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept buildings and improvements constructed and affected by the Buffalo Rapids Farms Associations on project lands in the Buffalo Rapids water conservation and utilization project and canceling certain indebtedness of the association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 6807. A bill to amend the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 6808. A bill to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6809. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. J. Res. 419. Joint resolution to correct the service records of Navy veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 625. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6730; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 626. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6507; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 627. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5134; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 628. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1791; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 629. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6635; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 630. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6716; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 631. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6234; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 632. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5734; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 6810. A bill for the relief of Teiko Higo and Yoshiko Higo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6811. A bill for the relief of Antonio M. Opisso and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 6812. A bill for the relief of Lew Hirshman and Mrs. Essie Hirshman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 6813. A bill for the relief of Morris E. Paddick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2054. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. M. F. Pierce, of Draper, S. Dak., and 48 others, expressing their opposition to enactment of legislation providing for a program of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2055. Also, petition of Mrs. H. G. Lippman, president, and Mrs. J. C. Quinn, secretary, Hill City (S. Dak.) Parent-Teachers Association, and 21 other signers, urging enactment of the Federal aid to education bill, S. 472 and H. R. 2953; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2056. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Winfield Grange, No. 1105, Butler County, Pa., opposing H. R. 4278 or recommending prohibiting the sale of beer to trainees, especially those under the age of 21 years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2057. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Kenosha Taxpayers Inc., Kenosha, Wis., in opposition to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2058. Also, resolution of the Commercial Club, Union Grove, Wis., urging revision of the United Nations Charter directed toward a world government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2059. Also, resolution of General Sherman Council, Knights of Columbus, Corona, N. Y., protesting continued imprisonment of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, of Zagreb, Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2060. Also, petition of ladies of Gateway Post, No. 2751, Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kenosha, Wis., in favor of Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2061. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Earl E. Gongaware and others, of Irwin, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, we are ashamed that money and position speak to us more loudly than does the simple compassion of the human heart. Help us to care, as Thou dost care, for the little people who have no lobbyists, for the minority groups who sorely need justice. May it be the glory of our Government that not only the strong are heard, but also the weak; not only the powerful, but the helpless; not only those with influence, but also those who have nothing but a case and an appeal.

May we put our hearts into our work, that our work may get into our hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 3, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 263) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3825. An act to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—LETTER FROM THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I addressed an inquiry to the Brookings Institution asking them to express their opinion on Senate Joint Resolution 200, which is the joint resolution I introduced providing for a constitutional amendment under which the electoral vote would be counted in proportion to the popular vote in electing the President and Vice President. The joint resolution was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary, and an identical measure has been reported favorably by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, this is a very important reform, which would eliminate the possibility that the man who received the most popular votes for President could lose the election, and it is very pertinent to have this question considered at this time, when we are approaching a Presidential election.

The Brookings Institution, which is a very serious organization which specializes in the high-level study of important public questions, has analyzed this proposal, and in a letter to me gives it unqualified endorsement. This is such an impressive event that I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Brookings Institution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1948.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Several members of our staff have examined carefully Senate Joint Resolution 200, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the election of the President and Vice President, together with the hearings, the committee report, and the other material you submitted.

We are in agreement that the Congress should give the States the opportunity to vote on this amendment and that its adoption by them would result in a material improvement in our political system.

We note with approval that the proposed amendment does not abolish the electoral vote for President and Vice President, but leaves each State with a number of electoral votes equaling the number of its Senators and Representatives in the Congress. It thus preserves the compromise between the large States and the small States that permitted of the adoption of the Constitution and the formation of a more perfect Union and leaves the States free to determine the qualifications for voters, which shall be the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

It provides, however, that the electoral votes of each State shall be apportioned among the several parties on the ballot of that State in accordance with the votes polled by those parties in the Presidential election. Thus, if one party polls 51 percent of the votes in a State and the other party polls 49, the electoral vote will go 51 percent to the leading party and 49 percent to the other party, instead of 100 percent to the leading party as at present.

The proposed system has great advantages over the existing system in that—

1. It will practically eliminate the chance that a President will receive a majority of electoral votes despite the fact that his opponent polled a majority of the popular vote.

2. It will eliminate the chance of the election of a President being thrown into the House of Representatives.

3. It will practically remove the chance that small minority groups can attain and exercise great power over Presidents, Presidential candidates, and political parties because they hold the balance of power in pivotal States. These minority groups will have no power beyond that justified by their number of voters in a Presidential election.

4. In the selection of candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency the parties will be concerned with the capacity of the persons chosen to command the support of voters throughout the Nation and not upon their capacity to carry certain pivotal States or even big cities. Able men from small States will not be handicapped as they are at present.

5. Sure States will no longer be neglected as they are at present both in nominations and in campaigns because a substantial minority vote in those States will result in electoral votes for the candidate of their party. Voters opposed to the dominant party in their respective States will be encouraged to work and vote for their candidates, because their work and votes may actually affect the results. Their votes will be cast and counted for the candidates of their choice and not thrown away as under the present system.

Another reason for favoring the amendment is that it would eliminate an archaic provision from the Constitution. Article II, section 1, provides that: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress * * *"

It has, of course, been years since any legislature has itself chosen the Presidential electors and has not submitted the choice to the voters, but the power to do so is still in the Constitution. This amendment would remove all possibility of a revival of appointment of electors by the legislature. It would also do away with the cumbersome device of the electoral college and the nomination of electors.

For these reasons we believe the proposed amendment should be submitted to the people.

Very sincerely yours,

LEWIS MERIAM,
Vice President.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to state that all debate is out of order, under the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into when the Senate recessed yesterday. The time from 11 until 1:30 o'clock is to be divided between the proponents and opponents of the pending joint resolution, to be controlled by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. Senators cannot be recognized except by release of time from one or the other of the Senators.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Committee on the Judiciary to sit during the session of the Senate today.

He also asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works to sit during the session of the Senate today.

He also asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to hold a hearing at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to sit this afternoon, beginning at 3 o'clock.

MAINTENANCE OF STATUS QUO OF EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] for himself and other Senators to House Joint Resolution 296, and, as previously indicated, the Senate is proceeding under the unanimous-consent agreement which limits debate.

Mr. WHERRY. I am about to ask for a quorum, the time to be charged equally to the proponents and opponents of the pending measure, if that is satisfactory

to the distinguished Senator from Arizona and the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is satisfactory to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado agree to a quorum call, half the time to be charged to each side?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado agrees.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll, the time to be divided equally.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	McCarthy	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McGrath	Thye
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Feazel	Maybank	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Flanders	Moore	Williams
Fulbright	Morse	Wilson
George	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am glad that we have the opportunity again in the Senate to give some consideration to increasing the amount of pensions to the senior citizens of this Nation. This is a subject near and dear to my heart and one to which I have given much time, thought, and labor over a period of many years. I am a cosponsor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and am strongly in favor of the amendment; yet at the same time I should like to see us go much further than this amendment provides. Inasmuch as the debate is limited today on this amendment and the joint resolution which it proposes to amend, we shall not have time to go into a thorough revision of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona and other Senators, or to offer a substitute for that amendment which would be more liberal toward our aged citizens. Consequently I shall content myself by lending my support to the amendment as it has been offered.

If there is one group of citizens in our country who have been overlooked and not properly taken care of, it is the pioneer aged citizens who are drawing very meager pensions from the States and from the Federal Government. I receive thousands of letters from old folks in Texas. These letters prove conclusively that their writers are in a very desperate condition. These aged people do not have sufficient food to satisfy their needs. They are unable to obtain the services of a doctor or even to get medicine from the drug store for the ailments which beset many elderly citizens. They are ill-housed.

Most of this condition has been brought about by the increased cost of living. According to statistics given by the Senator from Arizona, the increase in the cost of living is 100 percent or more.

The senior citizens of this Nation have been led to believe that they will be properly cared for by their Federal and State governments. As a consequence, the children of these citizens have taken on other responsibilities and have got out of the habit of taking care of their parents, as once was the case. The senior citizens have been led to believe that they have friends in their State and Federal Governments; but they are now finding out that those two friends, the State government and the Federal Government, are not taking care of them in accord with their actual needs because of the increased cost of living.

Our aged citizens are helpless, and we are responsible for their helplessness insofar as we have undertaken the responsibility of caring for them. Had we not done so, they would have been cared for by other methods, methods by which they were cared for prior to the adoption of the social-security program.

This responsibility is a grave one. We do not give it sufficient consideration in the Senate. It seems that every time a Senator who is deeply interested in the subject wants to give consideration to increasing old-age pensions the time is limited or other Senators claim that the subject is not germane to the bill under consideration. If bills are introduced they fail to get through the committees.

In the meantime, we are very generous not only with the aged persons but with all other classes of people in foreign countries. That is the policy which has been adopted by the Congress. We give billions of dollars to foreign countries. When the Marshall plan was under consideration in the Senate, on March 13, I offered an amendment which would allow an increase to the senior citizens of our own country in exactly the same amount that our Government was giving to Great Britain for the purpose of providing a food subsidy to all the citizens of Great Britain. I produced an article which appeared in the public prints showing that the British Government was issuing a food subsidy which amounted to 70 cents a day to every man, woman, and child in the British Empire. It totaled $21 a month. That was undisputed. Twenty-one dollars a month of our tax dollars went to each individual citizen of Great Britain—not only to the aged citizens, the blind, and the dependent children, but to wealthy citizens. It went to everyone, regardless of his financial status or age, from the day-old babe to the oldest person living.

Inasmuch as we were about to pass that multibillion-dollar bill, designed to deal generously with the citizens of a foreign country with reference to food subsidies, I thought we might at the same time consider augmenting the food bills of our own aged citizens. Therefore I offered the amendment to which I have referred.

The estimate given to me at that time by the Government agency was that there were in the United States 2,297,995 aged pioneer citizens drawing pensions. The estimated cost of my amendment, to give an additional $21 to each of those persons, would have been $600,000,000, which was a very small amount compared to the billions of dollars we were then proposing to give away to foreign countries. It was stated that my amendment was not germane to the then pending measure. It was further stated that my amendment was one which should be given more complete consideration by some committee of the Senate. Although those criticisms of my amendment were made on the floor of the Senate, there was no objection to having a record vote taken, and a yea-and-nay vote was taken on that amendment at that time. Only 13 Senators voted for the amendment. Seventy-three Senators voted against it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me ask what would be the cost of the Senator's substitute.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am not offering a substitute, Mr. President. I am talking about an amendment previously offered to the Marshall plan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator offering an amendment to the amendment now pending?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator from Texas is not offering this as an amendment, because of the limited time for debate. I should like very much to offer the amendment; but some of the authors of the amendment now pending have suggested that its adoption might be interfered with if I attempted to offer a substitute. Certainly I do not wish to do anything on the floor of the Senate which will interfere with the adoption of

the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and other Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Arizona if I may have a few minutes more.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas whatever additional time he desires.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am simply discussing the amendment I previously offered, so that all may know that I am in favor of going much further with respect to taking care of these destitute and aged citizens of our country than is proposed to be done under the amendment now pending. But time does not permit me to go further with the matter at this time.

Consequently, I am lending my wholehearted support to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona which, as he very ably stated yesterday on the floor of the Senate, is at least half a loaf, and of course it is better to take half a loaf if it is not possible to get a whole loaf.

So I am supporting the amendment, and I trust that all Members of the Senate will realize the need of the aged citizens of our country and will lend their aid to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Perhaps the Senator from Colorado wishes to yield to some Senator at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has no Senator to yield to at the present time. He will be very glad if the proponents of the McFarland amendment will move forward with it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona is in the same position as the Senator from Colorado. One of the difficulties, of course, in view of the stipulation that a vote shall be had at a definite time, is that it is not always possible to have on the floor of the Senate, Senators who desire to speak.

If any Senator now present would like to speak on the amendment, I shall be glad to yield time to him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the agreement, as I understand it, beginning at 1:30 all amendments which have been submitted to the joint resolution will be voted upon. Does that mean that if a proposed amendment is sent to the desk—of course, we cannot call it up until the present amendment is disposed of—but if an additional amendment is sent to the desk and is there at 1:30, can it be considered then?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may propose any amendment he desires to propose, and it will be laid down at 1:30, subject only to the limitation that it must be germane.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if neither of the Senators in charge of the time wishes to use any of the time allotted to them, let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that if he intends to propose an amendment, he might do so now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia could not do so without a release of time to him from one or the other of the two principals.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not care to do so at this time.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PRESIDENTIAL POWERS UNDER SECOND DECONTROL ACT OF 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is ready a conference report which can be handled now, if both parties agree to release some of the time for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. How much time will the conference report take?

Mr. WHERRY. I must ask the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I had suggested that I would not submit the conference report on the Second Decontrol Act until the vote had been taken on the social-security joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Could the conference report be presented now?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let me ask how much time the conference report will take?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recalls that under a similar circumstance, the Senator from California once arose and said that if there was nothing else to be discussed, he would be glad to speak about California, where the sun sets reluctantly. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, if there is nothing else to be discussed, I should like to talk about nitrates and nitrogenous substitutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield for this interesting interlude? [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me ask how much time the conference report will require.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should say not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Very well; I yield that much time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6659) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That subsection (b) of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (Public Law 188, Eightieth Congress), and as further amended by the Act of February 28, 1948 (Public Law 427, Eightieth Congress), is hereby amended by striking out 'May 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1949'. Subsection (b) (1) (C) of such section 1501 is hereby repealed. Subsection (b) (1) (E) of such section 1501 is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'and nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia), in any form, necessary for the manufacture and delivery of the nitrogenous fertilizer materials required for such export: *Provided, however,* That 50 per centum of the export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials to nonoccupied areas shall be supplied out of nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anydrous ammonia) produced in plants operated by or for the Department of the Army, and notwithstanding any other provision of law the Department of the Army is authorized to produce and sell such nitrogenous fertilizer materials and nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) to fill such 50 per centum of such export requirements'. Subsection (c) of such section 1501 is hereby amended by striking out 'May 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1949'.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this Act shall take effect as of the close of May 31, 1948, and all regulations, orders, directives, directions, requirements, and delegations issued under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, which were in effect on May 21, 1948, shall be in effect in the same manner and to the same extent as if this Act had been enacted on May 31, 1948, and any proceeding, petition, application, or appeal which was pending on May 31, 1948, under such title III, as amended, or under any regulation, order, directive, or direction issued thereunder, shall be proceeded with and shall be effective in the same manner and to the same extent as if this Act had been enacted on May 31, 1948: *Provided,* That in any case in which such title III, as amended, or any regulation, order, directive, direction, or requirement issued thereunder, prescribes any period of time within which any act is required or permitted to be done, and such period had commenced but had not expired on May 31, 1948, such period is hereby extended for a number of days equal to the number of days from June 1, 1948, to the date of the enactment of this Act, both inclusive: *Provided further,* That no act or transaction, or omission or failure to act, occurring subsequent to May 31, 1948, and prior to the date of enactment of this Act, shall by reason of the enactment of this Act, be deemed to be a violation of such title III, as amended, or of any regulation, order, directive, or direction issued thereunder."

And the Senate agree to the same.

RALPH E. FLANDERS,
C. D. BUCK,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
By R. E. F.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the managers on the part of the House recommended that the House recede from its disagreement to two of the four items in respect to which the bill as passed by the Senate differed from the bill as passed by the House.

First, they agreed to extend the control period to June 30, 1949, instead of to February 28, 1949.

Second, they agreed not to repeal the provisions of existing legislation which authorizes the President to use price criteria in the licensing of exports.

After full discussion, the conferees on the part of the Senate found it necessary to accept the House version of the bill with regard to the remaining two points in dispute.

The general effect of the House provisions on those two points is as follows:

First, they remove as of the close of May 31, 1948, controls over cinchona bark and quinidine which had been authorized by the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 and by Public Law 427, Eightieth Congress, approved February 28, 1948.

Second, under existing law the President is authorized to exercise import controls over nitrogenous fertilizer materials and to establish priority in production and delivery of such materials for export. The effect of the bill agreed upon in conference would be to add to such authority the power to exercise controls over nitrogenous compounds, including anhydrous ammonia, necessary for the manufacture and delivery of the nitrogenous fertilizer materials required for export. The bill as agreed upon in conference would also require the Department of the Army to supply 50 percent of the export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials to nonoccupied areas out of such materials or nitrogenous compounds, including anhydrous ammonia, produced in plants operated by or for the Department of the Army. Under the bill agreed upon in conference the Department of the Army is expressly authorized to produce and sell the nitrogenous fertilizer materials and nitrogenous compounds, including anhydrous ammonia, required to fill 50 percent of the export requirements to nonoccupied areas.

In view of the fact that the control powers to which the bill relates, with the exception of those dealing with the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers, expired at the close of May 31, 1948, a new section was added to the bill to provide that this bill, when and if enacted into law, shall take effect as of the close of May 31, 1948, except that this provision making the legislation retroactive shall not have the effect of subjecting to criminal penalties any person who has acted during the period between the close of May 31, 1948, and the date of enactment of this legislation in such a manner as would constitute a violation of the provisions of the act in effect on May 31, 1948.

The Senate conferees are of the opinion that they have obtained the best compromise possible under the circumstances, and recommend immediate adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say to the Senator that we had a meeting in his office this morning, attended by representatives of the Army and the Commerce Department and various persons interested in promoting and increasing the supply of fertilizer material. From that discussion I received the impression that the Army would really do something about increasing production. Am I correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from South Carolina is correct. The Army now say they are able to produce the 50 percent, but that they will require an authorization, not for an increase in the appropriation, but for a transfer of appropriation, which will come before the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. Was not the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], present at the meeting?

Mr. FLANDERS. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was present, and was a party to the negotiations.

Mr. MAYBANK. He was a party to the negotiations, and is one of those who believe that the supply of nitrates can be increased.

I should like to ask the Senator another question. I understand that for every ton of nitrogen the Army may produce to be sent to ERP or to the occupied and unoccupied areas of Europe, and for every ton we manufacture in this country, we expect a ton of nitrates to be imported into this country from Chile. Is that not true?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct. In other words, this measure protects the supply of nitrates to American agriculture.

Mr. MAYBANK. To the American farmer?

Mr. FLANDERS. To the American farmer; yes.

Mr. President, I should like to make one further observation, which is that in the report on the House bill it is suggested that the distribution of tin should be made equitably, and that has reference, though not exclusively, to the complaints of the makers of tin for steel wire that they are not being given adequate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MORAL REARMAMENT CONFERENCE—ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK N. D. BUCHMAN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MILLIKIN. How much time would the Senator require?

Mr. CAIN. About 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am glad to yield that much time.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, through the kindness of the Senator from Colorado, I am permitted to submit a unanimous-consent request.

I should first like very briefly to call the attention of the Senate to a unique international conference now in session in California. I refer to the world assembly for ideological preparedness being held in connection with the tenth anniversary of moral rearmament. It opened last night in the Hollywood Bowl and will continue next week in the Mission Inn in Riverside. The United States Congress is being represented by Representative ANTON J. JOHNSON, of Illinois.

We on the west coast are particularly proud and pleased that our section of the country has been selected as the site of this significant assembly.

I am also happy to say that the statesmen from other countries who have come to the United States to participate in this assembly were invited by a group of 82 Senators and Representatives, including myself. Several of our offices have been flooded with cabled replies from national leaders in a score of countries, giving graphic evidence of their conviction as to the effectiveness of this world force in inspiring the democratic countries with a unifying ideology.

Last fall, Mr. President, I had the privilege, along with other members of the Appropriations and Displaced Persons Committee of the Senate, to observe in Europe the work of moral rearmament at first hand. My colleagues and I were particularly impressed with the story told us by a group of British miners of the marked increase in the production of coal in the areas where MRA had been at work in providing a new incentive and heightening the spirit of cooperation on the part of both labor and management. Their work in the field of cementing the relations between democratic nations also has been remarkable.

The initiator of this world-wide program is Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman. Tomorrow marks the seventieth birthday of this great America who perhaps as much as any other citizen of our country, has fought through the years to give the best of our American heritage and an awakened sense of Christian democracy to the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address which Dr. Buchman delivered at the opening session of this world assembly before an audience of 30,000 people in the Hollywood Bowl last night and which has been broadcast and is being rebroadcast to every corner of the earth. The address is entitled "The Answer to Any Ism—Even Materialism."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANSWER TO ANY ISM—EVEN MATERIALISM

(World broadcast by Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman from the Hollywood Bowl on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of moral rearmament)

Everywhere men long for peace and prepare for war. They long to rebuild and prepare to destroy. They plan for new prosperity and expect fresh disaster.

What is the missing factor in the planning and statesmanship of the world today?

It is our lack of an ideology for democracy. We say, we are democrats, we need no ideology.

So we try to meet the united plan and passion of alien ideologies with talk and with lip service to high ideals and with a last resort to force. And we hope to live as we have always lived—selfishly, comfortably, and undisturbed.

We have all lived too long in an atmosphere of imagining that security, prosperity, comfort, and culture are natural to man.

We forgot the eternal struggle between evil and good, victory in which brings the blessings of security and prosperity. But defeat in this struggle, and even ignorance of it, brings poverty, hunger, slavery, and death.

It takes more than diplomacy to exorcise evil. It takes more than lip service to fight for God. Statesmen talk about the answer. They talk of union. But disunity increases. They talk of moral values. But immoral policies prevail. They use these words which the hard logic of events has proved true. But it remains words. These men do not face the cost in their own lives and the life of their nations of giving an answer.

An extreme of evil must be met with an extreme of good. A fanatical following of evil by a passionate pursuit of good.

Only a passion can cure a passion. And only a superior world-arching ideology can cure a world divided by warring ideologies.

We Americans have been lulled into a false security by believing that all the isms are across the sea.

Isms grow from unsolved problems in the life of men and nations. One man's hate kindles a million hates. One man's suspicion explodes a million suspicions. It spreads like a prairie fire, or it creeps like a flame underground to burst out unexpectedly in a hundred places.

Is America free from hates, fears, suspicions, greed?

Why is our record of broken homes so high? How about industrial strife?

Are we victims of the greatest ism of all? Materialism.

Is materialism the mother of all the isms? Is materialism becoming our national ideology?

We stretch out generous hands to help Europe and Asia economically. But materialism frustrates our best intentions. Prices rise, money is worth less. Troubles in industry cut down the supply of goods. At the moment when our strength is most needed abroad we may find ourselves in our greatest crisis.

The other isms are banking on that. They wait for their time. They know that money, food, and clothes alone will not save Europe; that material things may make nations just strong enough to become tools in their ideological conquest of the world.

Ten years ago moral rearmament was born.

What have we learned in these 10 years?

We have learned that democracy without an ideology can win a war but cannot build a peace; that ideological preparedness is the talk of the whole Nation, and that the one sure basis of national strength—moral, military, and economic.

Today MRA offers the democracies and the whole world the superior armament of an ideology, without which armies are outfought and statesmen are outthought.

Moral rearmament has grown in 10 years to the stature of a world answer to any ism—even materialism. In the words of a British coal miner, "Moral rearmament is the answer to every ism ever invented." It is for everyone, everywhere. It has restored for millions the simple sanctities of home and honor, and given hope for a new world. It has built the world organism that can make a reality of this hope.

Let me cite a few proven facts of the past 12 months. One hundred and fifty leading Germans came to the world assembly for moral rearmament in Caux, Switzerland. General Clay in Berlin and Lord Pakenham in London made their visit possible. These Germans found the answer to nihilism and to an ideologically broken nation. An Allied official, military governor of Cologne said, "Moral rearmament is the ideal solution for Germany." A leading German Socialist, a former minister-president said, "If Europe is to be saved, it must be saved in the spirt of moral rearmament."

The first democratic handbook by Germans giving the answering ideology was produced by these men. It is going out far and wide even behind the iron curtain. Sweden gave 100 tons of paper because she saw her security lay in a new spirit in Germany.

French industry—battlefield of the ideologies—has found a uniting force. An employer, heading an organization of employers of 600,000 workers, fought labor. The head of all the Socialist women of France mistrusted management. These two saw the new battle line—for or against democracy's inspired ideology. They met. They changed. They apologized, and are working together. Thousands rally to them. They speak not of revolution, not of reaction, but of renaissance—the rebirth of a nation, the rebirth of a continent.

Italy—focus of an anxious world. Two hundred Italians including 26 members of the Italian Parliament from 5 different parties came to the moral rearmament conference last summer. The Christian Democrat and the Socialist learned to work together. A Socialist said, "It is a miracle. Our parties can get together in the same way as we have." Is that one of the secrets of the Italian elections?

Britain—production is returning. But what is her greatest problem today? After seeing the moral-rearmament program in the coal fields of Britain a mine manager said, "Moral rearmament fills the emptiness and gives the dynamic we need." Lord Nuffield, the genius of Britain's automobile industry, sent this message to the moral-rearmament program at the time of the British Industries Fair, "We must be prepared to face man-made problems which beset us by bringing into our personal, family, and industrial lives in full measure the principles of truth, integrity, unselfishness, and compassionate understanding of the other man's problems."

What is the common factor in all this good news? It is union—the almost forgotten solution to all our problems today.

Division is the mark of our age. Division in the heart. Division in the home. Division in industry. Division in the nation. Division between nations.

Union is our instant need.

Division is the work of human pride, hate, lust, fear, greed.

Division is the trade-mark of materialism.

Union is the grace of rebirth. We have lost the art of uniting because we have forgotten the secret of change and rebirth.

Moral rearmament is the good road of an ideology inspired by God upon which all can unite.

Catholic, Jew, and Protestant, Hindu, Moslem, Buddhist, and Confucianist—all find they can travel along this good road together. It lifts them above their differences to the level of a superior ideology.

I called on a great leader in his time of deep sorrow. He gave me these words of Fulton Sheen, "What the world needs today is not to plead for religious unity so much as to plead for the unity of religious people." Those are the words of a great Catholic leader.

The Jew has his pristine contribution in the words of the great prophet leader Isaiah, "Nations shall run unto thee because of the Lord thy God," and "Great shall be the peace of thy children." And in the words of the psalmist, "Great peace have they which love Thy law; and nothing shall offend them."

And what does Islam say? The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Sir Zafrullah Khan, sent me this word, "Among my friends of MRA I have been delighted to observe the constant striving after discovering God's plan and purpose and putting their lives in accord with it. I am convinced that it is only through sincere and sustained effort in that direction that mankind can win through to its true redemption."

Is that the medium of approach for the Palestine problem?

It is so easy to have these great truths lost in prejudice. "Behold how these brethren fight one another" says the world. But it should be, "Behold how these brothers love one another."

The Bishop of Tammerfors in Finland came to see that great ideological play "The Forgotten Factor" in his own land and language. He was afraid a play might not be the right medium. He came. He wept. He said, "This must go to everyone." After the first act he telephoned a well-known industrialist who came straight to the theater. As a result the cast was asked to show the play for a whole month.

What a joy must have possessed this bishop who leerly and almost against his will decided to come, and found the thing he most longed for for his nation—an overarching ideology.

And what does India say? The Minister of Labor in Bombay Provincial Government, took this word back to the leaders of his country and to the millions of India's workers, "Here is the force that can change selfishness and greed and all that is wrecking the spirit and soul of people. Until I met moral rearmament I had not felt confident that there was an idea which could be applied universally as an adequate answer."

Labor here in California says the same. They see this great principle of changing and uniting on the level of an answering ideology. It led a group of labor leaders to go to management and offer their services free for the filming of our play The Good Road. I didn't ask them to do it. They saw a tremendous part they could play and they took the initiative. Isn't this the freer atmosphere in which we all need to move? Isn't this the dignity of labor?

Think of strikes today; 75,000 men—100,000 men. No one thinks much about strikes. True, the President says they may have national repercussions. Economists give us grave warnings. But do we see that strikes can be the entrance for one of the "isms"? Is it materialism in the thinking and living of both management and labor—and of you and me?

Think of America destroying herself with the very thing she condemns in others.

And how about France? Italy? The Po Valley? Do they understand the language of an answer to strikes?

And what does the employer say? The representative of one of the greatest aircraft manufacturers in California told us, "Until I saw your work, I thought the answer to materialism was dead with St. Francis."

Now make no mistake. I do not say that this message will be wholly popular. It stirs the conscience. That is uncomfortable. It will always be open to misinterpretation by those who wish to escape it. But it comes as illumination to those who are ready.

Let me tell how it came to me. Just 40 years ago I was divided. Just as nations today are divided. Materialism was winning its battle in my heart. I went to Europe to try to escape. But my battle came with me. One day, in England, God showed me the cost of my pride and my materialism. I admitted it. That is the first step. Get honest.

I said, "Sorry"—first to God, then to those I had wronged. That is the second step.

I learned to listen to God. I accepted His commission to bring an answer to men and nations. That is the third step.

God is calling men everywhere to be the instruments of union. It comes not by conferences, not by laws, not by resolutions and pious hopes, but by change.

Change is the heart of the superior ideology.

As individuals change, a new climate comes to the Nation's life. As leaders change, policies become inspired and the Nation's lifeblood flows again. As statesmen change, the fear of war and chaos will lift. The most difficult will respond to the firm, united but humble voice of reborn democracy.

Why should there be catastrophe again when, with God, renaissance is inevitable?

This is the new pattern of freedom for all nations. Shall it be a new Dark Age for Europe and the world? Or shall it be worldwide renaissance of the moral and spiritual forces everywhere, bursting into life and bringing at the last moment a miracle to mankind?

Which shall it be? The decision lies in your hands.

MAINTENANCE OF STATUS QUO OF EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect to certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask for how long, please?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like about 15 minutes, if that is possible.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Fifteen minutes?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Or less, if that is transgressing upon the time of the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator attempt to confine himself to 10 minutes?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should be very happy to do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Colorado, please, to my opening remarks.

On March 4 of this year I introduced in the Senate the bill (S. 2269) to amend title II of the Social Security Act in order to reduce the qualifying age for old-age and survivors' insurance benefits to 60 and broaden the old-age and survivors' insurance system to include benefits on account of disability, which was referred to the Committee on Finance. The bill has a twofold purpose. Its first purpose is to reduce the pension age limit from 65 to 60. The second purpose is to write into the social-security law an entirely new feature which would permit the payment of disability benefits to persons who become disabled at any age.

I can well understand that, as to the second part of the bill, it would require a great deal of study and probably much information, together with recasting of the law. As to the first part, it is quite simple, substituting the figure "60" for "65." So, Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of the Senate this morning certain very pertinent facts with respect to this phase of social security and to the bill which I have introduced, which is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

The reserve fund under social security has at this time in excess of $9,500,000,000, I am informed. Seven hundred and two thousand persons are currently receiving old-age benefits. Approximately 880,000 additional persons are eligible, but they have not chosen to accept retirement benefits. A lowering of the age limit to 60 would make an addition of approximately 1,000,000 men and women eligible for old-age benefits.

I should like to address some remarks to the able Senator from Colorado, the chairman of the Finance Committee—we have discussed this subject before upon the floor—with respect to the bill which I introduced, which would lower the age limit from 65 to 60 years. The joint resolution now under consideration proposes to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage. It seems to me that one of the very first subjects which should be considered under this resolution is a change of age limitation. We are finding throughout the country that in many employments men and women are often worn out and become frail before they reach the age of 65. They cannot carry on. The amendment would not require anyone to retire at the age of 65. Those who were blessed with health and strength could continue their employment; but there are many, particularly in industries which are very exacting with respect to physical strength, such as the mining of coal, work in steel mills, and other heavy industries, who find themselves broken in strength before they reach the age of 65. It seems to me that as we carry on this plan to care for the aged—and age is never the fault of any man or woman, and the frailties that accompany it can never be attributed to any wrong on their part—we must, as time progresses, expand the benefits. One of the most definite and fair expansions that I consider to be subject to consideration is that of lowering the age from 65 to 60. Under my proposal, a man or woman would not have to take a pension at the age of 60 years, but it would take care of those who need it.

I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado, Would it not be an entirely proper procedure to amend the resolution which is before the Senate by reducing the age from 65 to 60? What objection could there be?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia and I have had frequent discussions on this subject, because of his great interest in it. I know he is aware that, pursuant to a resolution of the Senate adopted last year, we established a very able advisory council which is reviewing the entire social security system and is making recommendations for improvements. The council has already made a recommendation to lower the retirement age of women to 60 years, but not to lower the retirement age of men. The difficulty—and I say this in a respectful way—the difficulty of a piecemeal approach to the whole problem is that the recommendations which we are receiving from the able council are integrated recommendations, each one having relation to the other. I suggest that that is the way it should be.

The Senate Finance Committee has not taken action on the recommendations of the council, because they have not been completed and because we have not received legislation from the House. If we start to nibble at the subject and make piecemeal approaches to it, we shall lose half the advantage of our comprehensive approach. I do not believe such an approach could be considered as fair to the able council, whose members, without compensation, are leaving their ordinary tasks and giving the Senate and the country the benefit of their great abilities in making a comprehensive survey and integrated recommendations. If I may say so, I am very much interested in the retirement limits which the social-security system should have. It certainly is one of the fundamental questions which must be decided in relation to the whole integrated series of recommendations which we shall receive.

I can say with certainty that this will be a subject of prime importance for the consideration of the Senate Finance Committee in connection with social-security legislation. As a matter of general principle I do not believe we should proceed piecemeal. The council is moving expeditiously toward comprehensive recommendations. Therefore I hope the Senator will exercise a reasonable degree of patience, so that the committee may consider his views along with those of the council and others interested when we come to grapple with a revision of the system on an integrated and comprehensive basis.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have already agreed to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for the purpose of asking one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Will the Senator from South Carolina suspend for a moment while the Chair suggests that he has been advised that the time allotted to the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado will yield another 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, if I have the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to say to the distinguished and most able Senator from Colorado, who is chairman of the Finance Committee, that I understood him to make the suggestion—and if I misunderstood him I want him to correct me—that the pension laws and the social security laws should be amended at some time in the future, and that a committee had been appointed to make a study and to report. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he thought the laws should be amended and adjusted? I understand he is against this amendment, but he does believe that justice should be done to many persons to whom injustice is being done today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, first, that so far I have not taken any position with reference to the amendment. Secondly, it is my personal belief that the act is in need of revision, indeed, of comprehensive revision. Thirdly, the advisory council has not completed its recommendations. It is in process of sending to the Senate a series of recommendations on a coordinated basis. We consider ourselves very fortunate to have the benefit of the council's advice.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the remarks the Senator from Colorado has made, because they indicate that he feels, as I do, that the law should be adjusted in some manner. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding the floor to me to ask that one question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think our experience under the system has been such that now we are in good position to take a look at the whole situation, and recommend some adjustments which should be made.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am very much impressed with the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, who advises me of the advisory council which is at work, but I find that the advisory council has acted upon the question of lowering the age limit, and desires to lower the age limit to 60 years, only with respect to women. I cannot see any reasonable basis for such a conclusion. If the age limit is to be lowered, it should be lowered for both men and women, and that is covered by the bill which I have introduced and to which I have referred.

I feel that it is proper to offer an amendment on this subject at this time. Let me say to the able Senator from Colorado that I can understand, with respect to the payments of benefits because of injury at any age, there would be a requirement regarding the subject, because it is entirely in addition to the act, but when it comes to a matter of merely reducing the age limit from 65 to 60, there is no tearing apart of the act, the figures are already available to show who may be affected by it and how many more there will be.

I would accede to the view of the Senator from Colorado insofar as concerns the adoption of any amendment or the passage of any bill at this time dealing with the payment of benefits because of injury or illness at any age, but I am certainly of the view, and particularly so since the advisory council has said that it desires to recommend a lowering of the age limit only as to women from 65 to 60, that now is the time when we should have an opportunity to consider the lowering of the age limit so far as both men and women are concerned.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In my time?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be glad to make the additional allowance.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senate Committee on Finance is taking its assignment in this matter very seriously. I feel that it is a very able committee. It would have its own procedures for weighing this particular question. It would, for example, have the social security authorities before it, and probably have representatives of the advisory council before it. It would seek enlightenment on the question from all available competent sources.

I most respectfully suggest that it may not be sound here on the floor of the Senate, where we do not have the benefit of witnesses, and are operating on limited time, to legislate on these questions which are committed to a responsible committee of the Senate.

Perhaps a very good argument can be made for reducing the age limit so far as men are concerned to 60, but perhaps there is good reason for not doing it. In any event, the advisory council in its preliminary recommendation has suggested that the age limit be lowered to 60 years in the case of women.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say that that was not an impulsive decision. The council meets from time to time as a full body, with remarkable attendance, and has the constant assistance of a highly trained and specialized staff. There is a presumption, I respectfully suggest, that it knows what it is doing. That is far from saying that the Congress or the Senate Committee on Finance will accept its recommendations, but we certainly would like to have the opportunity to consider them after they have been made, and when we are in position to integrate all the problems which are involved.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from Colorado that it is very apparent that great weight is being given to the advisers and their reports. While this does not preclude the committee from taking a different viewpoint, yet at the same time we have here a report which in my opinion is thoroughly bad in that it does not reduce the age limit as to men from 65 to 60. While I do not want the Senate to act with undue haste, or to take any action upon any legislative subject without fair consideration, I may say that my bill has been before the committee since March 4, and no action has been taken on it. The report of the advisers has been there, I do not know for how long, with this bill asking a reduction of the age limit from 65 to 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield the Senator 2 minutes more.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Presdent, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Just a moment. I have 2 minutes only, and I should like to proceed for the 2 minutes, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I feel very strongly that the time has come for action upon this subject. I do not want action taken that would bar the committee from considering the subject, but, as I have said, it has been before the committee since March in connection with the bill to which I have referred, and the advisor's report is now in, and the advisor's report does not follow the bill. It deprives men of the right of reduction in their age limit. They are the workers in the heavy industries of the country; they are the ones who should have consideration along with the women. My bill covers both, and provides what I think should be done.

I think the Senate should have an opportunity at this time to consider this subject, and I am sending to the desk an amendment, to lie upon the table and to be called up and considered in due time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show the names of the members of the advisory council. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed the names of the members of the advisory council who are going to help the poor people for whom we are pleading.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., rector, University of Virginia; Chairman.

Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor, Harvard University: Associate chairman.

Frank Bane, executive director, Council of State Governments.

J. Douglas Brown, dean of the faculty, Princeton University.

Malcolm Bryan, vice chairman of board, Trust Co. of Georgia.

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of social-insurance activities, American Federation of Labor.

Mary H. Donlon, chairman, New York State Workmen's Compensation Board.

Adrien J. Falk, president, S & W Fine Foods, Inc.

Marion B. Folsom, treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.

M. Albert Linton, president, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co.

John Miller, assistant director, National Planning Association.

William I. Myers, dean, New York State College of Agriculture.

Emil Rieve, president, Textile Workers' Union and vice president, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Florence R. Sabin, scientist.

S. Abbot Smith, president, Thomas Strahan Co.

Delos Walker, vice president, R. H. Macy & Co.

Ernest C. Young, dean of the graduate school, Purdue University.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the senior Senator from Kentucky such time as he may desire.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall not take much time, but I do wish to register one or two ideas with regard to the pending legislation.

For many years I have advocated an increase in the pensions paid to the old people of this country, and I have gone so far as to say that in my judgment it should be an exclusive Federal field of operation and of action, that the obligation is a national one, and should be assumed as a national obligation, that the amounts of money drawn by old persons should not depend upon the whim of any State legislature or any State administration, because the amounts they receive, regardless of the fact that the Federal Government is willing to put up more as its share, are determined by the local authorities.

It costs just as much to live in Kentucky as in Massachusetts or in Ohio; it costs just as much to live in Texas as in Indiana or Illinois; yet there is such a diversity in the amounts drawn by equally meritorious people who are charged with the responsibility of living under standards which are approximately the same, that I have reached the conclusion that the only way ever to level the payments off and have a uniform system, depending upon the circumstances of each particular beneficiary, is to make the obligation a Federal one, and the amounts payable out of the Treasury of the United States.

I am satisfied that the States which are now contributing to this fund could use advantageously the money they are now paying for old-age pensions in education and other activities which are purely State functions. Therefore, I do not modify my opinion held for years that the old-age pension system of the country ought to be a national system and that all persons under the same circumstances ought to draw the same amount, instead of depending upon where they live and the action or failure to act on the part of any legislature to appropriate sufficient money to give them a decent amount on which to live.

So believing, Mr. President, and as long as the present system is the law of the land, I have urged an increase. I voted for the $5 additional Federal contribution when that was added to the law a couple of years ago—I have forgotten the date—and I favor the pending amendment and the increase it provides.

But it is extremely unfortunate that in order to provide an increase which is overdue we have got to vote on it as an amendment to a measure which, in my mind, is without justification. In other words, in order to increase the pensions of the old people of the United States now we have got to vote for a bill which will take away from 750,000 persons any opportunity to get on the rolls or draw anything at all. It presents a very embarrassing and very difficult and inconsistent situation.

The whole subject of increased pensions ought to have been reviewed. It ought to have had the benefit of a committee report upon it. It is not for me to say where the fault lies. It has not been given consideration. There are some who contend that we cannot increase the pensions even though there is not a penny of additional tax involved, unless the measure originates in the House of Representatives. I do not adhere to that view myself. The Constitution gives the House of Representatives the right to originate revenue legislation, that is legislation raising revenues, but it does not in my judgment give the House exclusive original jurisdiction to increase pensions for old-age pensioners in this country when no increase in taxes is involved. The amendment does not involve any increase in taxes. The amount is payable out of the Treasury of the United States like all other charges on the Treasury.

Be that as it may, somebody has been grossly negligent in allowing this situation to drift until now the only opportunity to vote for an increase in old-age pensions is on a joint resolution which some of us oppose, and if the amendment should be adopted we are then confronted with the proposition whether we shall vote for a measure which is, from my standpoint, undesirable, in order to get an increase of pensions, something which I have advocated for years.

I am going to vote for the amendment. What I do after that is in the lap of my feeble mind. [Laughter.] I will cross that bridge when I get to it, and I think I am going to get to it. It looks as though I am. When I arrive I shall probably have to decide whether to go across the bridge or balk at the approach.

I cannot vote against the increase since I have for years advocated not only an increase, but have advocated the complete assumption of this obligation by the Government of the United States in order that all our citizens might be treated alike, no matter where they live.

When Congress originally voted a $30 pension to be contributed one-half by the Government of the United States, all of us had an idea that the pension would be $30 a month; that some of the State legislatures would not whittle and whittle down on the pittance they were supposed to contribute up to $15, which would be matched by the Government of the United States. They were not limited to $15. They could go as much beyond that as they wanted to, and some States have gone a considerable distance beyond the $15 that is matched by the Federal Government. So in some States pension laws are fairly liberal, because the legislatures have increased their contribution beyond that which is matched by the Federal Government. But, taking it by and large, there is to me an inexcusable difference, distinction, diversity, and inconsistency in the law as it now exists, and we cannot change it except by action of Congress, unless all the legislatures themselves raise their contributions to an amount sufficient to give to these old people a decent pension.

So much for the pension theory. So much for the amendment. The bill itself, which I opposed in committee, I presume is going to pass, at the very time when the President of the United States and everyone who has made a study of the social security set-up and the provisions of the law are advocating an extension, a broadening of the coverage, rather than a contraction of the coverage.

There have been investigations, there have been reports on the problem of including self-employed persons, and it is conceivable that one who all his life has been self-employed may find himself, when old age approaches, as indigent as those who have been hired by others upon a salary during their entire lives. So, from the standpoint of society, from the standpoint of preventing these aged people from becoming charges upon their relatives or their friends or local institutions, they are just as deserving as those who are employed upon salaries.

It has been suggested that farm labor be included, that domestic employees be included, and that others be included, involving several million persons. I believe that Congress must in the very near future give serious consideration to the extension of coverage under the Social Security System. But at the very time—and this is one of the objections I have to the original House Joint Resolution 296—at the very time when we all recognize that there must be an expansion of the base of coverage under the Social Security Act, we are asked to take away from 750,000 persons who are not now on the rolls but who might come on the rolls, or at least a number of them, the opportunity of being placed on the rolls, and deprive them of the hope of getting on the rolls under the law as it exists now—and why? Because the Supreme Court rendered a decision in which it modified the old common-law rule of employment, and said other factors should be taken into account in determining whether these people are entitled to consideration under the social-security law.

I am opposed to House Joint Resolution 296 and voted in the committee against reporting it. If it is voted on, and it stands alone, I shall vote against the joint resolution again. If the amendment for which I am going to vote, and which I have advocated in principle for years, is added to the joint resolution, I shall be in a situation which the Irishman described during the Russo-Japanese War, when Port Arthur had been besieged for 6 months, and all the reports that came over the wires said that Port Arthur is "in statu quo." Every day the report came that Port Arthur was in statu quo. Finally some newspapermen asked an Irishman what that meant, and he said that from the best he could understand it meant that Port Arthur was in a hell of a fix. [Laughter.] That may be my situation if this amendment is added to the joint resolution. I shall determine that question when I reach it.

But I am opposed to the principle involved in House Joint Resolution 296. I

do not believe that this is any time to narrow the base of our social-security program when everyone is advocating that it be extended and broadened. My votes here today may be a package of inconsistencies, dependent upon what I have to vote on, but I think it is unfortunate that at this particular time we are asked to narrow the base of our social-security program. It is especially unfortunate that we must use a measure denying to American citizens rights to which the Supreme Court has held that they are entitled, or might be entitled, as a vehicle to obtain an increase in pensions to those who are already beneficiaries of this law. The whole situation presents an inconsistency. It presents a serious indictment of the legislative inefficiency with which the entire subject has been treated by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, there is nothing further that I could say if I stood here all day. Therefore I yield back the time which I have not used.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am grateful for an opportunity to associate myself with the thought which the pending amendment brings to the floor of the Senate concerning the subject of social security. I am not one of those who believe that the social-security program is a panacea for all the problems which confront us, including old age; but I am convinced that in considering the future economy and the general welfare of our Nation the Congress could not address itself to a more far-reaching or more important subject than that involving some kind of security for old age.

I am very much interested in what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] had to say about the general study which is now in progress. I believe that in these times of plenty and prosperity we shall be derelict and negligent if we do not give careful and complete study to the solution of this far-reaching problem. I believe that our plans for the aged should be placed on a sound basis for the future, and that that is one of the high contributions which we can make and should make.

I believe that this subject is closely related to the employment problem of the future. I have been greatly impressed over the years with the scientific achievements which have brought prolonged life to a great number of our citizens. That is a blessed work; but it brings with it economic problems which can be solved only through a sound plan—not something to bubble like a pot in political campaigns from year to year, but a plan designed on a sound basis.

Generally, I favor the idea of some local contribution. I think that continued State contributions is one of the fundamentals which will have to be included in any sound plan which is to serve in the future. However, I do not believe that this is exclusively a local problem to be solved by the States alone. It has a national aspect. From the national standpoint and in the national interest, the problem will not be met until the contribution of the Federal Government is increased, particularly in view of present prices and present conditions.

I am supporting the pending amendment, not merely because of the small increase for which it provides, but because I believe that it points in the direction of solving the problem on a broad basis, and because I believe that the problem is a part of the national picture. I do not believe that we can solve the problem until the contribution of the Federal Government is increased.

I do not believe that the public dollar has ever reached, or can ever reach, a higher plane of service than when it is devoted to lessening the hardships and the physical daily burdens of life of men and women who have carried their part of the freight in their time, but who now, because of the infirmities of age, cannot quite make the grade alone. It is not a question of sentiment or emotion. It is not a question of a pension. In most cases it is merely a question of simple justice that the aged be given an added lift. They carried their freight in their day, and most of them are willing to carry it now.

I respectfully submit to the sound judgment of the Senate not only the favorable consideration and the adoption of this amendment, but the continuation of the fine studies which are now in progress, and which give promise of leading to a sound, broad base which will serve us well in years to come.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the brow of the noble marble edifice which houses the Supreme Court of the United States, so near to this Capitol, is inscribed the motto of the judiciary, "Equal justice under law."

What we are seeking here today, Mr. President, is equal justice under law for the deserving citizenry of our country now discriminated against in respect to the matters involved in the pending joint resolution.

We are presented with two immediate issues to which I shall address myself. The first is the McFarland amendment, which attempts to raise, by a mere pittance, the amount of old-age assistance funds to be available to the honorable aged of this country. The second is the joint resolution itself.

I regret very much to feel the necessity of facing the choice described in the remarks of the able minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY]. I shall support the McFarland amendment to raise the Federal contribution for old-age assistance. I shall support the Revercomb amendment, to lower the age of eligibility from 65 to 60 years; and, whatever may be done with respect to the joint resolution by way of amendment, unless all after the enacting clause is stricken out, I shall oppose the joint resolution.

I base that announcement upon what I believe to be sound principle. The joint resolution to which our amendments are offered proposes to reverse, for all practical purposes, three recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. It proposes to arrest the action of the executive branch of the Government in implementing the decisions of the Supreme Court interpreting the law of Congress, which decisions hold that between 500,000 and 750,000 of our citizens are eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the Senator regret the seeming tendency on the part of Congress, every time the Supreme Court renders a decision which some Member of Congress does not think it ought to have rendered, to propose to reverse that decision by an act of Congress?

Mr. PEPPER. I heartily share that sentiment. In case after case Congress has considered itself the final court of appeal to review decisions of the highest court in the land interpreting acts of Congress. I recall the Southeastern Underwriters case. The Supreme Court held that the Southeastern Underwriters were subject to prosecution under the antitrust laws. We were confronted with legislation designed to give them immunity, as distinguished from other business elements which were subject to the operation of the salutary principle of the antitrust laws. Another instance is the antitrust laws as they might affect the fixing of rail rates, and recently we had to deal with the congressional efforts to override the liability of the railroads, as held by the judiciary of this country, to the antitrust laws if they violated them in fact.

Another case—and there are many—was the portal-to-portal case, the Mount Clemens Pottery case, in which the Supreme Court of the United States had laid down in certain decisions regarding the workday, the right of the worker to be paid for what he did. Congress was appealed to; and in the portal-to-portal bill we were expected, of course, to lay down a different standard from that prescribed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, if there is a pitiful appeal that could be made to the Congress of the United States by a section of our population for aid which they never have had, it is the appeal from the elder citizenry of our country. I do not need to dwell upon the service they have rendered the United States or the patriotism with which they have built the greatest democracy upon the face of the earth, this country of ours, which they have fathered and mothered, this country they have built up, which stands as the dividing bulwark for the protection of democracy not only in this hemisphere but in the wide world.

Yet I turn to the table which shows the assistance they have received from the Public Treasury, both State and Federal. I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public assistance: Average assistance payment per recipient, by program and State, March 1939 and March 1948

State	Old-age assistance		Aid to dependent children (per family)		Aid to the blind	
	March 1939	March 1948	March 1939	March 1948	March 1939	March 1948
Total	$19.37	$37.71	$32.21	$65.85	$23.29	$40.63
Alabama	9.39	19.54	12.37	33.17	8.79	22.14
Alaska	27.43	43.27	(1)	31.30	(1)	(1)
Arizona	26.19	47.73	32.48	48.61	24.87	56.56
Arkansas	6.08	18.19	8.14	35.46	6.61	20.99
California	32.47	57.13	42.02	106.35	48.00	72.65
Colorado	27.12	60.57	30.27	79.51	28.18	51.04
Connecticut	26.89	48.79	(1)	99.79	26.57	42.37
Delaware	10.84	25.32	30.60	73.75	(1)	29.97
District of Columbia	25.56	40.09	46.48	76.13	26.65	44.64
Florida	13.83	38.03	25.52	41.97	14.56	39.25
Georgia	8.59	18.50	20.85	36.27	10.79	22.06
Hawaii	12.59	33.33	34.99	84.94	14.78	36.87
Idaho	21.29	41.66	26.52	80.40	21.64	46.20
Illinois	18.83	40.92	(1)	86.94	(1)	42.65
Indiana	16.89	32.18	27.50	49.94	19.51	34.24
Iowa	19.84	42.40	(1)	71.16	23.24	45.93
Kansas	19.47	39.48	29.65	72.39	20.44	42.18
Kentucky	8.68	17.38	(1)	34.36	(1)	18.52
Louisiana	10.42	22.22	21.17	39.95	13.43	27.24
Maine	20.53	36.50	37.60	79.03	23.10	33.60
Maryland	17.47	32.53	31.56	72.39	21.28	35.40
Massachusetts	28.08	55.11	59.66	104.13	22.04	53.19
Michigan	16.83	38.46	40.31	77.83	25.66	41.16
Minnesota	20.60	43.11	35.84	68.74	25.16	50.32
Mississippi	7.13	15.78	(1)	26.33	7.10	24.08
Missouri	18.65	36.38	24.18	46.31	(1)	(1)
Montana	20.55	39.57	28.37	70.96	20.91	41.09
Nebraska	16.64	39.68	24.94	74.01	20.39	45.25
Nevada	26.47	48.57	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
New Hampshire	23.44	39.53	39.58	81.25	22.27	41.78
New Jersey	19.60	42.36	29.85	81.76	22.70	44.66
New Mexico	11.50	35.84	20.04	55.19	14.38	39.44
New York	24.47	49.92	48.69	103.40	24.46	55.20
North Carolina	9.54	18.07	15.49	35.61	14.66	29.02
North Dakota	17.60	39.42	32.53	86.62	20.10	41.35
Ohio	22.54	41.73	39.69	71.94	19.87	39.23
Oklahoma	19.86	42.40	14.19	44.15	16.12	42.81
Oregon	21.27	43.58	39.47	99.03	25.34	50.31
Pennsylvania	19.04	35.14	34.99	77.60	(1)	(1)
Rhode Island	18.79	41.59	46.68	78.32	(1)	45.34
South Carolina	7.78	19.81	14.39	25.99	10.14	22.51
South Dakota	19.24	32.07	(1)	45.30	19.17	29.48
Tennessee	13.23	20.35	18.40	44.21	14.65	30.38
Texas	13.96	31.15	(1)	37.34	(1)	34.56
Utah	20.61	46.70	33.62	102.33	25.33	55.45
Vermont	15.00	33.51	28.24	48.05	18.15	37.98
Virginia	9.67	18.44	22.28	41.55	12.88	24.04
Washington	22.14	56.61	29.19	99.07	30.62	68.54
West Virginia	13.90	20.34	21.27	40.86	17.33	23.42
Wisconsin	21.03	37.45	37.82	87.65	22.61	39.37
Wyoming	21.82	49.21	31.16	91.58	28.74	46.30

[1] No Federal-State program.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall refer to only two or three States. My dear native State of Alabama, of which I am so proud, pays only $19.54 a month on an average. Another of the great States of the Union, South Carolina, in the soil of which I am proud that my ancestors were sired, pays only $19.81 a month.

I turn now to the great State of Michigan, one of the great States of the Union and one of the rich States in many respects. The average paid there is only $38.46 a month.

In the great State of Georgia the average is $18.50.

The figures for aid to the blind and for aid to dependent children are comparable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What does the table show about Colorado, please?

Mr. PEPPER. I am proud that the Senator has given me an opportunity to compliment his State upon what it has done. It leads the Union in this respect; it pays $60.57 on an average. California comes next, with $57.13.

Since we are speaking of pointing with pride, I am glad that the figure for Florida is up to $38.03. I hope it will reach the figure for California and the figure for Colorado.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I look forward to the day when South Carolina reaches the figures the Senator has mentioned for California and Colorado. I have always worked for that. I worked for it as Governor. The legislature passed whatever legislation was necessary. I only hope we can reach the peak that the State of the distinguished Senator from Colorado has attained for its people. I appreciate what the Senator from Florida has said.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator feels that sentiment very deeply. He has always been in the forefront of those struggling to improve the remittances that are made to this segment of our citizenry.

I should also like to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, two additional pages giving data as to the average monthly payments for old age and survivors' insurance, civil-service retirement, old-age assistance, veterans, and railroad retirement.

I pause only to say that in the case of old age and survivors' insurance, the average paid to the insured upon retirement is only $24.20 a month.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Number of recipients	Average monthly payment (December 1947)
Old-age and survivors insurance:		
Primary benefit to—		
Insured only	874,724	$24.20
Benefit to insured and wife	269,174	39.60
Insured and 1 child	21,100	38.40
Insured and 2 or more children	16,500	47.70
Insured, wife, and 1 or more children	600	53.70
Survivor benefit to—		
Widow or widower	164,200	20.40
Widow or widower and 1 child	138,300	35.40
Widow or widower and 2 children	117,800	48.80
Widow or widower and 3 or more children	52,100	52.20
Total	1,978,200	(1)

[1] Not available.

	Number of recipients	Average monthly payment (March 1948)
Civil-service retirement	123,300	$75.77
Old-age assistance	2,345,136	37.71
Veterans:		
Disabled	2,324,500	62.44
Survivors	949,000	34.77
Railroad retirement:		
Retired workers	215,300	70.27
Survivors:		
Widows	51,115	29.18
Widowed mothers	8,913	27.02
Children	27,289	16.77
Parents	517	16.40

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it has already been pointed out by the Senator from Arizona that since 1939 the cost of living has increased at least 70 percent. I think the housewife who has to struggle with scarcity as well as with high prices will attest that as a matter of fact the actual increase has been at least 100 percent. Yet all we have done to date, as was pointed out here yesterday, has been to add $5 a month to the Federal contribution to old-age assistance. That does not have to be matched by the States. This amendment proposes to add an additional $5 to the fund, and that would not have to be matched by the several States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. In connection with what he has just been saying, I wish to ask a question regarding the financial stability of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. I should like to ask the question of the Senator from Colorado, if the Senator from Florida does not object to having me do so.

Mr. PEPPER. I have only 20 minutes' time, but I am always eager to yield to my learned and able friend, the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

I should like to ask this question: I have the trust accounts as of June 2, 1948, in the statement of the Treasury Department. It shows receipts in the Federal old-age and survivors trust fund during this year, up to that time, of $1,606,000,000. It shows benefit payments of $465,000,000.

I am informed that that in 1947 there was $1,557,000,000 collected and $466,000,000 paid out, and that at the present time the fund has over $9,600,000,000 in its account.

My question is this: If this $5 additional amount is paid out, it will come out of that trust fund and will increase the payments by approximately $184,000,000 a year, I believe. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I regret to say that it is not a correct statement. The cost of the McFarland amendment will come out of the General Treasury, not out of the trust fund.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then the statements which have been made to the effect that this additional payment will come out of the trust fund are incorrect; are they?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They are.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And this additional payment, as proposed, will have to be appropriated out of the General Treasury, will it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the $10 presently contributed by the Federal Government out of the first $15 come out of the trust fund?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The public assistance payments are made out of the General Treasury funds which have to be appropriated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the figures which I have show that the average

old-age assistance payments throughout the whole Nation are $37.71 a month. With the present high cost of living, we ask a man or woman 65 years of age or older to subsist on $37.71 a month, as both State and Federal payments to them. Yet we have appropriated $5,300,000,000 for 1 year to save democracy in Europe—and I voted for it. We are appropriating from $12,000,000,000 to $14,000,000,000 a year for national defense, and I am in favor of it. We have appropriated other hundreds of millions and billions of dollars for other worthy purposes throughout this Nation and throughout the world, and I have supported every one of them. But, Mr. President, we have over 9,000,000 of our citizens above 65 years of age today, most of whom are living in squalor and penury and poverty of which the United States Congress should be ashamed.

What I regret is that they are the neglected segment of our citizenry. Instead of following the Biblical injunction, "Honor thy father and thy mother," we have dishonored them with the disregard we have afforded them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Florida to the fact that in North Dakota, for example, although the table shows that the average old age recipient is paid $41.35 a month, that is not so at all. Those figures are misleading. Aside from 11 States, when an elderly person applies for a pension, the authorities get a list of everything that person owns. I know of a case, a few years ago, in which a woman had a ring on her finger, but the authorities made her take off the ring and sign it over. If such a person has a life insurance policy of a few hundred dollars, he or she has to sign it over. If such a person has a little piece of land, he or she has to sign it over, no matter how large a mortgage there may be on it. It is manifestly unjust that in the State of North Dakota, for example, an old-age beneficiary must sign over his property while in Minnesota he does not have to do that. Of the money or property signed over, the Federal Government receives one-half and the State keeps one-half.

I should like to suggest, if it would be of interest to the Senator from Florida, that at an appropriate place on page 2 of the amendment, a few words be added providing that an old-age pension beneficiary need not turn over the little property he has when it is found to be needed by him.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President, I am thankful to the able Senator from North Dakota for pointing out the fact to which he has referred and for mentioning the average; $37.71 is the average. The limit is $45 a month, under the present Federal contribution; that is, the Federal Government only puts up $25 as its maximum. Of course the States may supplement it, and a few of them do.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The law in South Carolina is the same as that stated by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. A note must be signed in order to receive a pension.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the infamous and iniquitous means test is applied. If a family through thrift and sacrifice has saved enough money to own a little home, a humble cottage, and a room is rented in it, that diminishes the amount the family can receive, if they can receive anything at all.

Mr. President, I have not the time to labor this matter further, but I may say that the Social Security Board in giving an estimate as to the minimum cost of living for an aged couple has fixed it at $770.85, or $463.88 for a single aged person in June 1938 and would be about $1,250 and about $800, respectively, in 1948 based on the increase in the cost of living. Yet, Mr. President, 12 times $40 would be but $480. Are they to go to the poorhouse? Are they to subsist upon the charity of neighbors or through dependency on relatives, to make up the remainder of the money required? Or are they to be ignored and neglected in a way we would not treat a faithful old horse, Mr. President, after a lifetime of honorable service?

Mr. President, I am in favor of the suggestion made by the able Senator from North Dakota. As I said I am favorable to lowering the age limit to 60. But we cannot effectively deal with the matter of old-age subsistence and social security here on the floor of the Senate, especially when our amendments can be attached only to a resolution which itself would deprive 500,000 to 700,000 of the other honorable citizenry of this country from eligibility to share in the old-age and survivors insurance plan. But, Mr. President, I do call upon the able chairman of the Finance Committee, I call upon the majority of the Congress, I call upon all our colleagues, and I tender my own service for whatever it may be worth, to meet this problem squarely and fairly.

I am not ashamed to say—in fact, I am proud to say—that I am the author of the Townsend plan bill which would provide $100 a month, it is estimated, to every person in this country 60 years of age and over, and to every totally and permanently disabled person from the receipts of a 3-percent tax on the gross income of every person and every business in the country. There is no means test in my bill. It is available to every eligible person without any stigma of the poor laws. Let us at long last by this or other adequate legislation deal justly with the aged people of America, so we can show the world by example that we believe in democracy and that we practice it here, rather than to be dependent upon the persuasion of our preachments alone.

Mr. President, in the brief moments I have left I address myself to the resolution proper. What does the resolution do? Why, Mr. President, it simply says the social security authorities are forbidden to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States holding eligible some 500,000 to 750,000 employees of this country who, the Supreme Court said, are eligible to share in the old-age and survivors insurance system. Mr. President, let it be remembered that they contribute to that system. It is not like the old-age assistance program, under which the funds are derived solely from the Federal and State treasuries. They and their employer provide all, or substantially all, the funds under that program.

Mr. President, what the employer contributes is, of course, generally passed on to the public, so that the public at large shares the employer's burden. The employee pays directly. What does he get? If he makes the maximum payments for the maximum length of time that he may be covered under the program, Mr. President, he cannot receive upon retirement, as I recall it, in excess of $80 a month. All this is a means by which he can take cheap insurance, in which his employer, and through his employer, the public, will share, giving him a maximum of $80 a month, if he makes the maximum contribution for the maximum time that he may share in the system.

Mr. President, I have a letter here from one of the dearest friends I have in Florida, Mr. Payne H. Midyette, of Tallahassee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Chair. Hon. Payne H. Midyette, of Tallahassee, Fla., one of the finest and most able citizens of my State, expresses concern that a general insurance agency would be subject to coverage under the Supreme Court decisions and the regulations of the Federal departments, which this resolution would restrain. I am advised by the highest legal counsel in the Treasury that that would not be so. A general insurance agent would not be covered. He is an independent contractor. He deals principal to principal with his principal, Mr. President. But it would cover those who, in terms of fact instead of in accordance with some old technical common-law definition, are employees—his employees, and employees of a company engaged in the insurance business. They also tell me that hardly any, if any at all, of the general fire-insurance agents who do a fire-insurance agency business, representing several different companies, would be covered. I am stating that here upon the floor for the RECORD as coming to me from the tax legislative counsel for the Treasury in response to my special inquiry.

But, Mr. President, what it does is to make the matter of agency a question of fact. We know that in truth and in fact one man may be a principal and the other may be an agent. He may make his subsistence by commissions. He may derive his compensation upon some other basis mutually agreeable and satisfactory. But the question is, Does the relationship of principal and agent in fact exist? If it does, he is an employee

and is eligible to participate in this program.

Mr. President, why should we want to deny these employees the privilege of participating? Why should the employers resist the inclusion of particular employees? A great many of them, I am proud to say, have private insurance and annuity programs. They can supplement the public program. But the employees contribute one-half of the fund. Is it not in the public interest, and is it not to the satisfaction of the employer, as well, that he know that his employee is contributing to his own security in a period of disability or at the time of retirement?

So, Mr. President, the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States was a wise decision; it was a practical decision; at the same time, it was a humane decision. Do not let this Congress arrest the wheels of progress when they are moving forward. Let us not put the dead hand of congressional stricture upon the progress which the Supreme Court has made possible. This is the first time that I have seen a law which has been called on its face a law to maintain the status quo. I think the resolution should be called in statu quo. Humanity is moving forward. I had hoped that this Congress was moving forward. I believe the people are moving forward. I hope, therefore, that this Congress will not allow the restraining shackles of this unjustified prohibition to be put upon the advancing social-security program of the Nation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for some questions on the subject?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Colorado the quandary in which I find myself with respect to the joint resolution and the pending amendment. I understood from the very able speech made by the Senator yesterday that he in no way is negativing the idea that social-security coverage should be extended so as to cover groups not now covered. He is simply taking the position that under the existing legislation a certain trust fund has been established by those who have contributed to the fund, and that there is no authority, legal or otherwise, by which the fund can be used to cover persons other than those contemplated in the original legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. SMITH. If that be true, I want to go to the further point that, in voting for the joint resolution, I do not want to be put in the position, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has just suggested, of placing a status quo on any progress in connection with the social-security program. I want to say to the Senator, and I am sure he agrees with me, that we want, in a proper, legislative way, to expand the program so that it will be effective and have legislative authority for whatever may be done in the future. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a report to the Senate Committee on Finance from the Advisory Council on Soci Security. It is dated April 20, 1948, and was submitted to the Senate Committee on Finance by Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Chairman of the Council which apparently was appointed to advise the Senate Committee on Finance with regard to a legislatively-sound social-security program of expanding benefits. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to read into the RECORD the names of the members of that advisory council, in order to make clear what I have in mind, namely, that this matter is not being neglected, but is being approached in the most intelligent way in which it can be approached, through a committee composed of persons who are thoroughly familiar with the program.

The members of the advisory council, whose names I want to read into the RECORD, are as follows:

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., rector, University of Virginia; chairman.

Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor; Harvard University; associate chairman.

Frank Bane, executive director, council of State governments.

J. Douglas Brown, dean of the faculty, Princeton University.

Let me say that I have discussed this matter with Dean Brown, and I appreciate the approach to the subject which he and his group are making. He has made a study of social and labor legislation all his life, and he feels, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado feels, that we must take a sound legislative approach to the problem.

I continue reading the names of the members of the advisory council:

Malcolm Bryan, vice chairman of board, Trust Co. of Georgia.

Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of social-insurance activities, American Federation of Labor.

Mary H. Donlon, chairman, New York State Workmen's Compensation Board.

Adrien J. Falk, president, S & W Fine Foods, Inc.

Marion B. Folsom, treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.

M. Albert Linton, president, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co.

John Mill, assistant director, National Planning Association.

William I. Myers, dean, New York State College of Agriculture.

Emil Rieve, president, Textile Workers' Union, and vice president, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. Rieve, from the standpoint of the labor group, is one of the outstanding authorities on the entire problem, and he is a member of the council which is advising the Senate Finance Committee.

I continue reading the names of the council:

Florence R. Sabin, scientist.

S. Abbot Smith, president, Thomas Strahan Co.

Delos Walker, vice president, R. H. Macy & Co.

Ernest C. Young, dean of the graduate school, Purdue University.

Mr. President, I am bringing this to the attention of the Senate because it seems to me that we should commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado and his committee for making an overall approach to deal with the problem, rather than to do it by piecemeal amendments on the floor of the Senate.

I am supporting the joint resolution, because I believe the Senator from Colorado has properly pointed out the limitations by law with reference to dealing with the present trust fund. We cannot extend the use of that fund beyond our legal authorization under existing statutes.

The Council which has been established to study the subject has a membership which everyone must admit, from reading the names, is widely representative of opinion and ability throughout this great country. The Council will undoubtedly present, in the near future, a program for the expansion of the social-security laws which we can wholeheartedly endorse.

Am I correct in my assumption that that is the purpose of the establishment of the Council, and that is what it is doing, and that we can expect in the reasonably immediate future an orderly program?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that that is the precise purpose for which the Council was established. It was created pursuant to the instructions of a bipartisan resolution adopted by the Senate last year. Its personnel was selected without reference to partisanship, but with complete cooperation during the summer between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the ranking Democratic member of the Senate Finance Committee and its former distinguished chairman, and myself.

Mr. SMITH. Then the Senator will agree with me, will he not, when I say that support of the joint resolution on my part in no way negatives my strong position that I want to see social-security legislation extended to cover those groups not now covered and who should be covered, and that I want to see it done in a sound, legal, legislative way, and not by piecemeal. Is that a correct assumption?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my own feeling. The minute we commence to tamper with the trust fund, the minute we commence to breach its integrity by including in it free riders, persons who have no right to its benefits, we take a step which ultimately will destroy it.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for that additional statement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may make this additional point, the persons we are hurting if we cover into the system individuals who have no right to be there, giving them free rides, as has been proposed, are the 30,000,000 workers who have paid money into the trust fund, who have created the trust fund so that there might be a fund available to make good the benefits which they have purchased.

Mr. SMITH. The implication from that statement is that the order of the Treasury which has been made to extend the use of the fund to persons who have not contributed to it would do the

very thing which the Senator is suggesting. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The proposed regulation of the Treasury would admit from 500,000 to 750,000 persons who, I again suggest, have no legitimate coverage in the present system. It would give them retroactive coverage for 4 years without their having paid a penny for it, and at a cost to the trust fund of $100,000,000. That statement has not been challenged on the floor of the Senate since the debate started, and it was not challenged at the hearings.

Mr. SMITH. I congratulate the Senator from Colorado on the able way in which he has presented that matter. Yesterday I was very much impressed with his presentation, and the purpose of my question was to emphasize what appeared to me to be the perfectly sound and unassailable position the Senator has taken. To cover into the system persons who have no right to be there would be attempting by congressional action to legalize the taking of funds which have been contributed by other people to a general pot to take care of their old-age requirements. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me we would be stultifying the Congress if we made ourselves a party to a procedure of that kind.

Mr. SMITH. Is it an unfair implication, in supporting the pending joint resolution, to say that to provide such coverage now would be holding back the wheels of progress, when we are trying to act in a legal way, through the Advisory Council which has been established to study this matter, formulate a complete program, and provide adequate coverage in the social-security system?

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the short time I have been in the Senate I have never seen such misrepresentation of any subject. There has been an organized campaign of propaganda to give the appearance that we are taking benefits away from people who are entitled to benefits. We are not taking a single benefit away from anyone who is receiving benefits.

Mr. SMITH. That is what I understand.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the contrary, we are continuing to give benefits, where they have matured, to persons who have paid nothing for them and have no right to be in the system, and we are doing it, as I said yesterday, as an act of governmental grace, to ameliorate the hardship which would result to men who have changed their position in life through an erroneous construction of the act by the Federal Security Agency if they were now to be deprived of the right to benefits they are presently receiving.

Mr. SMITH. A few minutes ago the Senator from Massachusetts called attention to the fact that about a billion dollars plus came into the fund during the last year and four hundred million plus went out, which seemed to indicate that there was a surplus in the fund which might be used for some purpose. As I understand the facts, the accumulations will be needed because the load will be heavier as the years go on, and those who have contributed insurance premiums to the fund will be coming in for their benefits.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is entirely correct. In other words, that surplus is not a grab bag which is available for irresponsible disposition. The surplus has been built up by 30,000,000 wage earners, who have created it in order to assure the protection of the benefits which they ultimately will receive.

Mr. SMITH. And to take that away now, or impair it, would be a breach of trust, assuming that trust fund has been created under the legislation as originally passed, in order to provide a social-security fund.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know of any type of breach of trust that would be more flagrant.

Mr. SMITH. One more question, and I shall be through. Does the Senator feel that the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and other Senators would violate the principles laid down in the joint resolution, or could we at this time, as funds were made available, increase the old-age pensions provided for?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am continuing to observe the debate on that question, and I am not quite ready to declare a personal position on it.

Mr. SMITH. I am in the same position. I am not clear as to whether we could not still adopt the amendment, or possibly some modification of it, to take care of the increased cost of living, without violating the principles of the law. I think the Senator is perfectly correct in his position.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for the very careful clarification he has given this subject this morning.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I now yield to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado will remember that I have upon several occasions discussed with him the matter of the revision of the Social Security Act. I have noted in his argument the statement that the act should not be revised piecemeal.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Last year, acting upon the belief that the act has heretofore been amended piecemeal and that it should not again be considered in such fashion, I introduced, as the Senator will recall, Senate bill 1355, as a proposed comprehensive revision of the Social Security Act, one provision of which would equalize Federal aid among the States in proportion to the fiscal ability of the States.

Specifically it proposed a new title to the Social Security Act, title XIV, which would revise the present provision with respect to assistance and welfare. I do not wish to detail all the changes which were proposed, and I ask consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of the objectives of the bill, and a copy of the bill itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First. Federal financial aid would be available not only for the aged, blind, and dependent children as at present, but for all needy persons.

Second. Welfare services for adults, families, and children could be included in the public-welfare program, and child-welfare services could include foster care, temporary institutional care, and services needed to supplement home care.

Third. Federal financial aid would be extended to the States on a basis ranging from 50 to 75 percent of total costs, depending on the relative per capita income of the States.

Fourth. Standards of assistance would be determined by the State on a basis of individual need and resources but in such a way as to assure equitable treatment to persons in similar circumstances throughout the State. Standards of assistance would be left to the States without maximum limitations specified in the Federal act.

Fifth. Persons requiring medical care would be able voluntarily to enter public medical institutions, other than those for tuberculosis or mental illness, without loss of assistance if the institutions met standards established by the State.

Sixth. Welfare agencies would be authorized to make payment for medical care rendered assistance recipients and other needy persons, directly to the individual or institution furnishing such care.

Seventh. Residence requirements and required transfer of property to the State during the lifetime of an assistance recipient would be prohibited.

Eighth. Administration through a single agency at each level of government would be required.

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to establish more adequate public-welfare programs, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc.—

SEC. 1. This act may be cited as the "Public Welfare Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1947, the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XIV—COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAM

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 1401. (a) The Congress finds and declares that a public-welfare program is an essential part of the social-security system in promoting the security and welfare of the people of the United States.

"(b) The purpose of this title is to enable each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to develop a comprehensive public-welfare program of assistance and welfare services for families, adults, and children; to make assistance available to all needy individuals in the State whose resources are not sufficient to enable them to maintain a minimum standard of economic security, with due recognition given to the special needs of the aged, the blind, the children, and handicapped individuals; and to make welfare services available in order to promote personal well-being and a maximum degree of self-help.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 1402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums sufficient (a) for making payments to each State which has submitted a State public-welfare plan and had it approved by the Federal Security Agency, hereinafter referred to as the Agency; and (b) for expenditure directly by the Agency for the training of personnel for public-welfare work

and for demonstration projects in cooperation with State agencies administering approved public-welfare plans.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1403. As used in this title—

"(a) the term 'public welfare' means assistance and, where the State plan so provides, welfare services.

"(b) The term 'assistance' means—

"(1) money payments to needy individuals who have attained the age of 18 years and are not living in a public institution except as patients in a medical institution, and, with respect to needy individuals under the age of 18 years, money payments to parents, or to relatives or other individuals assuming responsibility for parental care and support of such children, who maintain a family home for them; provided, that such needy individuals are not patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or in any medical institution following diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis; and

"(2) where the State plan so provides, and where not otherwise available, medical services for needy individuals, provided through payments to persons, agencies, or institutions furnishing or procuring such services, but does not include medical services for individuals living in a public institution except as patients in a medical institution, or for patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or in a medical institution following a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis.

"(c) the term 'welfare services' means family and adult welfare services and child welfare services, including (1), with respect to family and adult welfare services, social services designed to help families and individuals to become self-supporting, to meet individual or family social problems, and to make use of community resources and to contribute to community life; and (2) with respect to child welfare services, social services designed to assure the welfare of children and to help them overcome problems resulting from parental neglect or other circumstances likely to result in dependency, neglect, or juvenile delinquency, and care necessary to provide for children without parental care and supervision and children requiring temporary care outside their own homes, such care to be given in foster-family homes, temporary homes, or other facilities needed to supplement home care.

"STATE PUBLIC WELFARE FUNDS

"SEC. 1404. (a) A State public welfare plan must—

"(1) provide for the establishment or designation of (A) a single State agency to administer or to supervise the administration of the plan, and (B) not more than one agency of a local subdivision of the State to administer the plan within such subdivision;

"(2) provide, (A), with respect to assistance, that the plan shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and if administered by them, be mandatory on them, and (B) with respect to welfare services, for the progressive development of a State-wide program as rapidly as trained personnel can be secured to administer it;

"(3) provide for financial participation by the State in all parts of the State plan, and for such distribution of funds for assistance and its administration as to assure equitable treatment of needy individuals in similar circumstances, wherever they may live in the State;

"(4) provide for the establishment and application through the State of standards necessary to the operation of the plan, including standards directed toward enabling each recipient to secure the essentials of living through assistance and his other income and resources, which standards shall include provision that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any income and resources of an individual claiming assistance;

"(5) if assistance is administered by categories, provide for a reasonable basis for establishing such categories, such as age or blindness;

"(6) provide that all individuals wishing to make application for assistance shall have opportunity to do so, and that assistance shall be furnished promptly to all eligible individuals;

"(7) provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual, whose claim for assistance or welfare services included in the State plan is denied or is not acted upon.

"(8) provide that the assistance and welfare services included in the State plan shall be available without discrimination because of race, creed, or color;

"(9) provide such methods of administration as are found by the Agency to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan, including (A) methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Agency shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods; and (B) a training program for the personnel necessary to the administration of the plan;

"(10) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the plan;

"(11) provide, after July 1, 1951, if the plan includes assistance to individuals in private or public institutions, for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for such types of institutions; and

"(12) provide that the State agency shall make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Agency may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Agency may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Federal Security Administrator or head of the appropriate constituent unit or units of the Agency, duly authorized by him to do so, shall approve any public welfare plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes as a condition of eligibility for assistance or welfare services (1) any citizenship or residence requirement, (2) any requirement that individuals must accept any other assistance or welfare services under the plan, or (3) any requirement that an applicant or recipient must, during his lifetime, transfer to the State title or control to any property which such individual may own.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 1405. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved public-welfare plan, for each period after June 30, 1947, an amount which shall be used exclusively for carrying out the State plan equal to the Federal percentage for such State, as determined in accordance with section 1405 of the total of the sums expended during such period under the State plan, not counting so much of such total expenditures by the State as are included in any other State plan aided by Federal funds.

"(b) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) The agency shall, prior to the beginning of each period for which a payment is to be made to the State under subsection (a), estimate the amount to be paid to such State for such period under the provisions of subsection (a), such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such period in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such period, and if the sum of such amount and the estimated Federal grant to be paid the State under subsection (a) is less than the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other data as to such estimated expenditures and such other investigation as the agency may find necessary.

"(2) The Agency shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by the Agency, (A) reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under subsection (a) for such period; and (B) reduced by a sum equivalent to the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Agency, of the net amount recovered during any prior period by the State or any political subdivision thereof under the State plan; except that such increases or reductions shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior period greater or less than the amount estimated by the Agency for such prior period; *Provided:* That any part of the amount recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof for the funeral expenses of the deceased shall not be considered as a basis for reduction under clause (B) of this paragraph.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Agency, the amount so certified.

"(4) The period for which estimates and certifications are made under this section shall be a calendar quarter, except that, upon application by a State, the Agency may extend the period for such State to not more than four calendar quarters.

"FEDERAL GRANT PERCENTAGES

"SEC. 1406. (a) The Federal percentage for any State shall not be less than 50 percent and not more than 75 percent. The Federal percentage for the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii, and for each State whose per capita income is greater than or equal to the per capita income of the continental United States, shall be 50 percent. The Federal percentage for each State, whose per capita income is less than the per capita income of the continental United States, shall be 50 percent plus one-half of the percentage by which the per capita income of the State is below the per capita income of the continental United States, except that such percentage for each such State shall not exceed 75 percent and shall be rounded to the nearest whole percent: *Provided,* That the Federal percentage for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 75 percent.

"(b) The Federal percentage for each State shall be promulgated by the Agency between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average per capita income of each State and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall for purposes of this section be conclusive for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided,* That the Agency shall promulgate such percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, which promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this sec-

tion for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1949.

"OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 1407. In the case of any State public welfare plan which has been approved by the Agency, if the Agency, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds—

"(a) that the plan has been so changed as to impose any requirement prohibited by section 1404 (b), or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

"(b) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 1404 (a) to be included in the plan; the Agency shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under such plan or, in its discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for activities in which there is such failure, until the Agency is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer imposed or that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until it is so satisfied, it shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State, or shall limit payment to activities in which there is no such failure."

SEC. 3. Section 1101 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia, and when used in titles V and XIV of such act, includes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 4. No payment shall be made to a State under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act for any period for which funds are made available to such State under title XIV of such Act and for any period thereafter, or under part 3 of title V of such act, for any period for which funds for child welfare services are made available to such State under title XIV of such act; and in any event, for any period after June 30, 1949.

SEC. 5. In the case of a State which has a plan approved under title XIV of the Social Security Act, adjustments, which have not previously been made with respect to overpayments or underpayments under titles I, IV, or X, or under part 3 of title V of such act, shall be made in connection with payments to such State under title XIV of such act.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado will remember that the bill which I introduced had three chief objectives. The first was that there should be a comprehensive program of Federal assistance to the aged and blind, and to dependent children, and for all purposes, upon the basis of need. The second objective was that there should be greater emphasis on local planning, administration, and responsibility. The third objective, which I thought was important, was that Federal payments should be made to the States on the basis of their fiscal ability to contribute to the program. The last provision would make possible greater aid to the aged, blind, and dependent children of the less prosperous States. Section 1406 of the bill, which was called the variable-grant section, would carry into effect the last objective.

I have reviewed the records of the congressional debates in 1946, when a proposed revision of the Social Security Act was before the Senate. I found that at that time the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], then chairman of the Finance Committee; and other Members of this body stated that they recognized that the principle of variable grants was sound.

After the introduction of S. 1355 in April of last year, I conferred with the distinguished Senator from Colorado, and he told me that the bill would receive the consideration of his committee. It has been approved by the officials of several States and by a great number of public-welfare agencies. As far as I know, it is the only bill before this body today which does propose a comprehensive revision of the Social Security Act.

I should like to ask the Senator at this time whether his committee has taken into consideration the provisions of Senate bill 1355, and whether it has made any report upon the revisions suggested in the bill with respect to increased aid for the aged, blind, and dependent children?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, first, I should like to say that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has made aware to me many times since he has been a Member of the Senate his sympathetic understanding of the problems of social security, and he has discussed with me the bill to which he has referred.

The specific question is asked whether the committee has considered that particular bill, and has made a report on it. The answer must be in the negative. It has been the intention of the committee to receive all the reports of its advisory council and have them available for its information when a social-security bill should come from the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has been working diligently on a social-security bill. I understand that there may come over during this session a bill which will afford a limited increase in coverage intended to permit municipal employees, State employees, and employees of philanthropic institutions to have coverage on a compact or voluntary basis. That bill has not yet arrived, and I do not know whether it will arrive in time for processing during this session. The question which is raised is, obviously, whether we wish to content ourselves with that from the Senate viewpoint, or whether we wish to approach it on a more comprehensive basis. As I said yesterday, I have my personal views on that, but I doubt whether there is any point in airing them at this time.

I believe I have answered the Senator's specific question.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for another question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I intend to vote for the amendment increasing assistance to the aged, blind, and dependent children. If it should be adopted, would the money needed for its purposes be a charge against the trust fund of which the Senator has spoken?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It would not be a charge against the trust fund, because it does not come out of the trust fund. It would be sustained out of the general revenues and by appropriation.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator if the amendment relating to old-age assistance is in his opinion an application of the principle of variable grants, of which I spoke a few moments ago.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is not my understanding that the proposed amendment follows the variable-grant theory that was in the Senator's bill.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall that last week at a hearing in a subcommittee, of which my distinguished friend the junior Senator from Connecticut is the chairman, a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, it was stated to us there by Mr. MacDonald, the head of the Bureau of Public Roads, that in reexamining his budget situation he found that the Congress had voted an average increase of salaries to his personnel of about 37 percent because of the increase of living costs, and because of that increase the Public Roads Administrator requested, and, insofar as the recommendation of the subcommittee and now of the full Committee on Public Works in its report to the Senate are concerned, they have agreed to his contention that the allowance to his department for the necessary cost of carrying on the work of the department should be considerably increased, the largest factor being to take care of this 37 percent of increase of salaries under action of the Congress.

I was hoping that the Senator from Colorado would be willing to see that the grant of this minor pittance of an added $5 to the monthly benefits payable to the aged and the blind, and the lesser pittance of $3 to the dependent children, might be considered as a partial recognition of the fact that for them too the cost of living has gone up, and a smaller recognition of that fact than has been granted to our employees here in the making of increases of their salaries, which I suspect have been increased on the average about in line with those increases reported to us by Mr. MacDonald.

From that point of view, and basing my request simply on the compelling justice of the situation, as it appears to me, I want to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if he will consent to the approval of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona and other Senators, solely from the viewpoint of trying to make up in part for the increased cost of living to these wards of our Nation and of our several States? I hope the distinguished Senator will feel that it is in line with his conception of simple justice in the situation that the amendment may be accepted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his very wise observations, and I appreciate the circumstances which press on many of our needy people, and which the Senator understands so thoroughly, and which activate his warm interest in this matter.

There can be no question at all that many of the people of this country are finding it hard to get along under the

present cost of living and on the money which is available to them. Of course, in the case of the aged and needy there is not the elasticity of earning power and the access to other sources of income which enable other people to make adjustments. These needy people are facing very grim facts of life. I wish that by legislative magic we could relieve all their problems in one fell swoop. But because we cannot relieve them all in one fell swoop, let us not argue against doing that which can be done.

We have several things to balance. We have to consider the cost which, compared to many other expenditures which we make, might, as has been said, be regarded as a pittance. But it is $200,000,000, and it will have to come out of the general revenues.

The amendment as drawn is technically adequate for its purpose. If one agrees with its theory the mechanics of the amendment will perform the objective. It follows the scheme which the Congress adopted in 1946 when it made the last raise in the pension benefits.

On the other hand, we are in process and are moving expeditiously to make a comprehensive revision, and public assistance, of course, is a very important part of that field.

The question is, therefore: Shall we in the interests of preserving the orderliness and the symmetry of that general revision say "No" to this amendment, or shall we recognize the needs to which the Senator has referred and say that they rise above these other considerations—that they require us to do something now rather than 6 or 8 or 9 months from now? Six, eight, or nine months are a long time for people who are hungry. And, in the interest of perspective, 6, 8, or 9 months are a long time also for our taxpayers who drudge to accumulate the money with which we sustain our Government.

If we did not have these humanistic angles, if we did not have the obligation, as I feel we have, to keep ourselves sensitively adjusted to the needs of our citizens, especially those who are in want and in distress, I should not hesitate one moment to say that we would be doing an irresponsible and a disorderly thing if we accept the amendment. But under the circumstances I cannot say that we would be doing it.

We have asked a distinguished council of citizens of this country to join the Senate Finance Committee in making a comprehensive survey, and I regret that we cannot wait until they have done so to reach a more orderly, symmetrical plan of adjustment. I am hopeful that if the Senate decides to adopt this amendment, members of the Council who have labored so diligently on this problem will understand the humanities which will have overridden other considerations of importance and will not feel that we are inappreciative of their splendid labors.

Under all these circumstances, I am willing that the amendment be taken to conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Perhaps my question should be directed to the author of the amendment. As I read it, its effect would be as follows: If a State is now paying the maximum of $45, and goes up to $50 under the provisions of the joint resolution, the effect will be to increase the Federal contribution $7.50, and actually reduce the State contribution $2.50. Am I correct? If so, I wonder why, if we are trying to increase old-age assistance—and it seems to me, in view of the increased cost of living, that is desirable—we should increase the Federal share and actually decrease the State share. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona can answer that question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that the Senator from Arizona should answer the question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not understand the question.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] is now charged with the remainder of the time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. If a State is now paying the maximum—and I agree that they do not all pay the maximum—of $45, the State puts up $20 and the Federal Government, $25. If the State paid $50, the joint resolution would increase the Federal share by $7.50 to $32.50, but would actually decrease the State contribution to $17.50.

Mr. McFARLAND. The joint resolution would increase the Federal share by only $5. I take it that every State will enact legislation which will give the benefit of the additional $5. Not only that, but I hope the States will match the contribution with another $5.

Mr. BALL. How does the Senator figure? One-half of $20 is $10. Adding three-fourths of $30, we get $32.50.

Mr. McFARLAND. The amendment will require the Federal Government to put up the first $15, matched by $5 of State money. That makes $20. Thereafter it is on a 50–50 basis, with a maximum of $50, which makes the maximum amount which the Federal Government may contribute $30.

Mr. BALL. Has the Senator modified his amendment? That is not the way it reads.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is the way it reads.

Mr. BALL. It says three-fourths of the expenditure over $20, and one-half of the first $20.

Mr. McFARLAND. The language is:

> Three-fourths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $20 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who receive old-age assistance for such month, plus——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to reserve the remaining few minutes of my time. I am willing to allow very short interruptions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must say that all the time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is a very excellent disposition of the matter.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona.

I am lending my support to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona for himself and other Senators, which would increase the payments to the aged, the blind, and dependent children. I think the amendment is in keeping with the times. From time to time we have increased the pay of many Federal employees. The cost of living continues to increase, and I regret that the increase is not even more than that provided for in the amendment. I myself have introduced legislation along this line. A bill which I recently introduced sought to increase the amount by more than this amendment provides for.

Our Government cannot escape its responsibility of caring for those who are unable to take care of themselves. Ours is a prime responsibility. We must look to the interests of the aged, the blind, and dependent children. For that reason I shall support the amendment. I am glad that the Senator from Colorado has accepted it, and I hope it will be adopted.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to use the few minutes remaining to point out that this amendment is only a temporary measure. The increase will expire on December 31, 1949.

All the amendment does is to require the Federal Government to put up an additional $5 for the aged, an additional $5 for the blind, and an additional $3 for dependent children.

It has been stated that the need clause should be eliminated from this law. I agree with that contention. I have introduced legislation to eliminate the need clause, but that is a question which we must consider as a part of the over-all study. All this amendment does is to permit the aged to live a trifle more easily until the study can be completed. It would not do some of them any good if they were to starve to death before the study was completed. We are trying to offer them a little assistance so that they may enjoy a more decent livelihood until that time comes.

Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment. On page 3 there is a typographical error, in line 14. The figure "$30" should be "$27."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment has been accepted; has it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senate has not yet voted on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment will be perfected, as he requests.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his willingness to accept this amendment. I have been requested to ask for the yeas and nays, because a number of Senators who did not have the opportunity of placing their names on the amendment desire the opportunity of recording their votes in favor of it. I, therefore, ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the amendments which have been sent to the desk, and which, of course, could not be considered with another amendment pending, be taken up in order after 1:30?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will.

All time has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bricker	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Ives	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	McCarthy	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McGrath	Thye
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Feazel	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Flanders	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murray	Young
George	Myers	
Green	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the pending amendment and all other amendments that may be pending and called up, and on the bill itself, without further debate.

The pending amendment is the one submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] for himself and other Senators.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is a coauthor of this amendment, has been called away on official business. He would not have left the Senate if it had not been apparent that this vote would be practically unanimous, and he so informed the Senator from Arizona. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—77

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bricker	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Ives	Russell
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stennis
Connally	McCarthy	Stewart
Cooper	McClellan	Taylor
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Thye
Dworshak	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Umstead
Ecton	Martin	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Watkins
Feazel	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Flanders	Morse	Williams
Fulbright	Murray	Wilson
George	Myers	Young
Green	O'Conor	

NAYS—2

Byrd Knowland

NOT VOTING—17

Brewster	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Tobey
Bushfield	Lucas	Wagner
Hatch	McCarran	White
Hawkes	Malone	

So the amendment submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. STEWART, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. McCLELLAN) was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other amendments which Senators wish to call up?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire at this time to call up my amendment that is on the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

AGE OF BENEFICIARY LOWERED

SEC. 2. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "65" and inserting in lieu thereof "60."

(b) Effective only with respect to applications filed prior to July 1, 1949, and after the end of the third calendar month which begins after enactment of this act, clause (A) of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section 202 is amended to read as follows: "(A) has attained the age of 60."

(c) Clause (B) of paragaph (1) of subsection (d) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "65" and inserting in lieu thereof "60."

(d) Clause (A) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "65" and inserting in lieu thereof "60."

(e) Paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of section 209 of such act is amended by striking out "65" and inserting in lieu thereof "60."

(f) The amendments made by subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall be applicable only in cases of applications for benefits filed under title II of the Social Security Act after the end of the third calendar month which begins after the enactment of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to be called up? If not, the question is on engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator

from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is absent on official business, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—74

Aiken	Green	O'Conor
Baldwin	Gurney	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brooks	Hill	Revercomb
Butler	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Holland	Russell
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Feazel	Maybank	Wiley
Ferguson	Millikin	Williams
Flanders	Moore	Wilson
Fulbright	Murray	Young
George	Myers	

NAYS—6

Barkley	McMahon	Pepper
Ives	Morse	Taylor

NOT VOTING—16

Brewster	Jenner	Taft
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Buck	Lodge	Wagner
Bushfield	Lucas	White
Hatch	McCarran	
Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) was passed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CONNALLY conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Kaare Paul Zakariassen and Young Ten Po or Young Tin Po from reports relating to aliens whose deportations he suspended more than 6 months ago, heretofore transmitted by him to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPENSATION FOR ANNUAL LEAVE OF CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF BITUMINOUS COAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 686, 79th Cong.) relating to lump-sum payments of compensation for accumulated annual leave and current accrued annual leave to certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from the active service of the United States as a result of the expiration of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 72), by providing therein for the payment of such lump-sum settlement to the personal representative of any such deceased officer or employee, extending the time within which notice of election to receive such payments may be filed, and authorizing the appropriation of funds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUDIT REPORT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

USEFUL PUBLIC WORKS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALASKA

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Mrs. Beatrice Murphy, of the Bronx, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the so-called Mundt un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Josephine Murray, of Washington, D. C., relating to the housing problem; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting on Palestine held under the auspices of the Adult Council of the Henry Street Settlement, Lower East Side, New York City, N. Y., favoring withholding all ERP funds to the British Government until it ceases its alleged instigation and open support of the attack upon the state of Israel by the Arabs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of Mrs. Annie Coulter, of Helena, Okla., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; ordered to lie on the table.

The memorial of Flora Benson, of Newark, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Sgt. Howard L. Klingelhofer Post, 3148, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Towson, Md., favoring the enactment of the so-called Mundt un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 108. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1471);

S. 165. A bill for the relief of Doris E. Snyder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1472);

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton; with amendments (Rept. No. 1476);

S. 1717. A bill for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1477);

H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478);

H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of W. A. Knox, W. L. M. Knox, and Frank C. Morris, operating as Knox Lumber Sales Co., of Thomson, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1485);

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp., of Detroit, Mich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1479);

H. R. 1726. A bill for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow; without amendment (Rept. No. 1473);

H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1474);

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Elbert Spivey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1480);

H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481);

H. R. 2684. A bill for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese beetle quarantine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1475);

H. R. 3159. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482);

H. R. 3260. A bill for the relief of Clarence S. Osika; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1483);

H. R. 3352. A bill for the relief of Emeline Lartigue; without amendment (Rept. No. 1484);

H. R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1486); and

H. R. 5891. A bill to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487).

By Mr. LANGER, from Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2517. A bill to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1468); and

H. R. 2588. A bill requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of the

city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1469).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2779. A bill to create a Government corporation to operate cafeterias and conduct certain other activities in Government buildings and on Government property; without amendment (Rept. No. 1507).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 543. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1488);

S. 1683. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State; with amendments (Rept. No. 1489);

S. 1820. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1490);

S. 1844. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public-school buildings and facilities at Winnebago, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1501);

S. 2171. A bill to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1502);

S. 2286. A bill to provide for nonreimbursable allocations on the Carlsbad Federal reclamation project; with an amendment (Rept. 1491);

S. 2371. A bill validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances; without amendment (Rept. No. 1500).

S. 2638. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1492);

H. R. 3218. A bill to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1493);

H. R. 4688. A bill to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery; without amendment (Rept. No. 1494);

H. R. 4874. A bill to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county; without amendment (Rept. No. 1495);

H. R. 5071. A bill to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 1496);

H. R. 6073. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1497);

H. R. 6229. A bill to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 1498); and

H. R. 6252. A bill to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, for school purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1499).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5147. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1503).

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 2273. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1470).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2076. A bill to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1504); and

S. 2736. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1505).

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 5808. A bill to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1506).

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES, SECURITIES EXCHANGE, AND NATIONAL BANK ACTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report an amendment to the bill (S. 2636) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act, heretofore reported from that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. FLANDERS. I now ask unanimous consent that the amendment, together with a letter from Wallace H. Fulton, executive director, National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., Washington, D. C., and a statement of that association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment, letter, and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO S. 2636, REPORTED BY MR. FLANDERS FROM COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

On page 3, after line 17, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 4. In order that the Congress may from time to time review the operation and effect of the provisions of this act, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems shall transmit to the President and to the Congress special reports on the operation and effect of the provisions of this act as hereinafter in this paragraph provided. The first report shall be made not later than 2 years after the approval of this act and a report shall be made every 2 years after the making of the first report. Each report shall cover and include: the extent to which the exemptions herein provided for have accomplished their purposes; the operations and the policies of the bank in the marketing of obligations issued or guaranteed by it; the extent to which such exemptions have aided the bank in the marketing of such obligations; the extent, if any, to which modifications of this act may be advisable in the opinion of said Council in order adequately to protect the interests of investors and securities dealers; and the recommendations of said Council with regard to the advisability of continuing, modifying, or terminating such exemptions, with particular reference to the extent to which the discontinuance or modification of such exemptions may affect the bank in respect of the aid which it may be able to afford under its articles of agreement in the financing of European recovery and the reconstruction and development of the economic resources and facilities of its members. Before making any such report said Council shall afford to any association of brokers or dealers which shall be registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a national securities association under section 15 (A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 an opportunity to present to said Council its views with regard to the matters to be covered and included in such report as hereinbefore provided."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECURITIES DEALERS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1948.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 26, 1948, a telegram was addressed to you by L. Raymond Billett, chairman of the board of governors of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., wherein was expressed our views with respect to H. R. 6443 and S. 2636, presently pending before the Congress.

It is our understanding now that an amendment to said legislation is to be presented to the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for consideration. I have been instructed to state that if this amendment is approved and becomes a part of H. R. 6443 and S. 2636 the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., will withdraw its objections to such pending legislation. A copy of our understanding of said amendment is attached hereto.

In view of the withdrawal of our objections based upon the foregoing, we have today informed the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives that we do not believe it necessary to appear before the committee at their hearing on Friday, June 4.

Yours sincerely,

WALLACE H. FULTON,
Executive Director.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO H. R. 6443 AND S. 2636

SEC. 4. In order that the Congress may from time to time review the operation and effect of the provisions of this act, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems shall transmit to the President and to the Congress special reports on the operation and effect of the provisions of this act as hereinafter in this paragraph provided. The first report shall be made not later than 2 years after the approval of this act and a report shall be made every 2 years after the making of the first report. Each report shall cover and include the extent to which the exemptions herein provided for have accomplished their purposes; the operations and the policies of the bank in the marketing of obligations issued or guaranteed by it; the extent to which such exemptions have aided the bank in the marketing of such obligations; the extent, if any, to which modifications of this act may be advisable in the opinion of said Council in order adequately to protect the interests of investors and securities dealers; and the recommendations of said Council with regard to the advisability of continuing, modifying, or terminating such exemptions, with particular reference to the extent to which the discontinuance or modification of such exemptions may affect the bank in respect of the aid which it may be able to afford under its Articles of Agreement in the financing of European recovery and the reconstruction and

development of the economic resources and facilities of its members. Before making any such report said Council shall afford to any association of brokers or dealers which shall be registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a national securities association under section 15 A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 an opportunity to present to said Council its views with regards to the matters to be covered and included in such report as hereinbefore provided.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Hon. Oscar E. Bland, resigned; and

J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Hon. Herbert W. Christenberry, resigned.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 2805. A bill to extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (by request):

S. 2806. A bill to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational rehabilitation purposes; and

S. 2807. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for certain investigation reports in connection with insurance claims; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COOPER (by request):

S. 2808. A bill for the relief of Frano de Bona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2809. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property incurred incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2810. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; and

S. 2811. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Luz, Maria, and Raquel Porrata Doria 1.56 acres of land, more or less, in the municipality of Ceiba, P. R.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2812. A bill to authorize the sale of land withdrawn under the Reclamation Act to the Church of the Nazarene for church purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2813. A bill for the relief of Osmore H. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2814. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works and in the vicinity of Bradford, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate Joint Resolution 228, authorizing and providing appropriations for disaster relief, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

FLOOD DISASTER IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Pacific Northwest has been visited by a great catastrophe. The flow of the great Columbia River has been out of all proportion and has caused great loss of life in my State, in the State of Oregon, and in the State of Idaho. The number of lives lost has not yet been determined. In some cases it will be necessary to wait until the river recedes in order to find the bodies and to learn who has been lost. Families are separated. It is estimated that at least 70,000 people have been displaced. Homes have been washed away along the whole length of the river, not only in the Portland and Vancouver area, but along its entire 1,000-mile stretch. Cities have been flooded. In many cases water systems and sewerage systems are gone. There is a question of public health involved, in some cases, because of the pollution of the water caused by the destruction of the sewerage systems, and there is a likelihood of epidemics. The loss is conservatively estimated. In the area below the confluence of the Snake and Columbia Rivers, along the Washington-Oregon border, there is well over $500,000,000 in property damage alone. The industrial area of Portland is at a standstill, waiting for the water to recede. There is serious loss of employment. In other words, it will probably turn out to be the greatest flood catastrophe in the history of the United States.

I know that Congress and the Federal Government will do everything possible to alleviate suffering and help in rehabilitation and reconstruction. There are on the statute books laws to provide grants-in-aid, and probably allowing additional appropriations to the Army Engineers and the Public Health Service. The Red Cross is doing an admirable job. It has already spent half a million dollars of its limited funds for temporary nursing and feeding and in attempting to get together families which have been separated. The permanent reconstruction and rehabilitation of the area will of course receive the attention of Congress and the Federal Government, I am sure, but in the meantime, because of the extent of the catastrophe other funds are required.

I have discussed the subject with the several Senators from the Pacific Northwest. There is some difference of opinion as to the actual approach, as to whether we should attach relief funds to an appropriation bill, such as the civil-functions bill. It involves a multiplicity of items which might have to be utilized to take care of the area, because the flood itself will continue for almost a month before the waters recede. We shall probably need some money to help out not only private agencies, but State agencies. Roads are washed out and bridges are out. Some towns are entirely without transportation. The power shortage is becoming acute. Because of the fact that the flood waters went over the great dams built on the Columbia River, the power facilities have either been closed down or are operating at half capacity. In these troubles, trials, and tribulations, the Army engineers are doing an admirable job, as are also private agencies. The governors and all the agencies of the States are setting their hands and hearts to the task and doing what they can. In the meantime, they must have funds.

Many of the small cities and communities up and down the river have no money in their treasuries with which to rebuild. Fire hydrants have gone out. Water systems, electric systems, and all the utilities that make American cities good places in which to live are out of commission. That loss is causing much suffering.

So, in view of those circumstances, Mr. President, I am suggesting that the Congress authorize a sum of money to be appropriated immediately to the President of the United States for emergency work in consequence of the flood. I make that suggestion because the President has no emergency fund. Prior Presidents had emergency funds to use in such cases, but for some reason the present Congress has seen fit to give the present President no funds in his emergency account.

So I am asking that Congress give the subject immediate attention. I have discussed it with several Senators. Section 2 of the joint resolution which I am introducing provides that the President can accept and utilize volunteer and uncompensated services, and the services of Federal agencies, officers, and employees of State agencies, or any organization, and he may give the money as needed to any organization. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has declared the area a disaster area. I hope Congress will take very prompt action in the matter.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing and providing appropriations for disaster relief.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 228) authorizing and providing appropriations for disaster relief, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE PROTECTIVE WORKS AT NOME, ALASKA—CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF S. 1025

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome,

Alaska, to make the following correction, namely: In line 5 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert "Secretary of the Army."

CONTINUATION OF STUDY OF NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEMS

Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. PEPPER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 249), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized and directed through the Subcommittee on Health of the said committee to—

(a) continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto which have been referred to the said subcommittee, which study shall be primarily concerned with ascertaining the full extent and nature of existing national health problems and the action, if any, which the Federal Government should take in relation to said problems;

(b) consult, in the course of such study, with Federal agencies administering health and related programs, with such other legislative committees of the Senate as are concerned with related matters, and with such other agencies, organizations, or persons as the subcommittee may desire to consult;

(c) report to the Senate not later than March 15, 1949, the results of the study, together with such proposed legislation, if any, and such other recommendations as the subcommittee may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. (a) The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through the said Subcommittee on Health, is authorized to sit and act at such times and in such places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such consultants, clerical, and other assistance, to procure such printing and binding, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, within the limits below set forth, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The expenses incurred under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 149, ENTITLED "OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE"

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 250), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 149, current session, entitled "Old-Age and Survivors Insurance" for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SALE OF PORTION OF WAR HOUSING PROJECT NO. FLA-8252-1 — AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2322) to provide for the sale of a part of war housing project No. Fla-8252-1 to the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the Calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3825. An act to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 227) providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. PHILLIPS of California, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. WHITTEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. TIBBOTT, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITHS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KIRWAN, and Mr. JACKSON of Washington were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $85,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 4721. An act to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy; and

H. R. 6407. An act to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes.

THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a luncheon given by the Committee of One Thousand on the Mundt-Nixon bill at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, June 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MURDER OF GEORGE POLK—SCRIPT OF CBS RADIO BROADCAST

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a script regarding the murder of George Polk in Greece, prepared for broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System, which appears in the Appendix.]

OIL AND STEEL SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of oil and steel supply and distribution made by Senator WHERRY in opening a meeting of the Special Committee To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, on May 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIFE AND ACTIVITIES OF J. N. THELAN—ARTICLE BY FRED OTHMAN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Fred Othman with reference to the life and activities of J. N. Thelan, of Great Falls, Mont., published in the Washington News, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—STATEMENT BY WILLIAM P. JACOBS

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement on the reciprocal trade-agreements bill made by William P. Jacobs, president of the American Cotton Manufacturer's Association, before the Committee on Finance, June 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE IMPRISONED HOUSING BILL—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Imprisoned Housing Bill," published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MERGERS THROUGH A LOOPHOLE—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. STROUT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mergers Through a Loophole," written by Richard L. Strout and published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWTH OF INDUSTRIAL MONOPOLY—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Growth of Industrial Monopoly," written by Marquis Childs and published in the Journal of Commerce of May 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DESTROYING FREE ENTERPRISE—EDITORIAL FROM THE RALEIGH (N. C.) NEWS AND OBSERVER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Destroying Free Enterprise," published in the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., of April 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIR SHIPMENT OF UNITED STATES PERIODICALS ABROAD—LETTER FROM LANGDON P. MARVIN, JR.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relating to shipment by plane of American newspapers and magazines abroad, written by Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., and published in the New York Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS MUST NOT LET THE HOUSING BILL DIE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Must Not Let the Housing Bill Die," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ALASKA INDIANS—LETTER TO THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter with reference to the rights of the Alaska Indians, addressed to the editor of the New York Times, by Jonathan M. Steere and Isaac C. Sutton, of Philadelphia, published in the New York Times of March 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—EDITORIAL IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Taft-Hartley Law," published in the New York Times of Friday, June 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL SCIENCE—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Science," published in the New York Times of June 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COST OF SEGREGATION IN LIVES—ARTICLE FROM THE SOUTHERN PATRIOT

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an article entitled "The Cost of Segregation in Lives," published in the Southern Patriot, of New Orleans, La., which appear in the Appendix.]

WHAT IS KENTUCKY?—POEM BY MAURICE H. THATCHER

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "What Is Kentucky?" written by Maurice H. Thatcher, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL—ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an introductory paragraph to an address delivered by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at New York, May 16, 1948, printed in the RECORD on May 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF BALER TWINE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, when the calendar was called on Tuesday, June 1, I made several attempts to secure consideration of my proposed amendment to permit duty-free entry of baler twine. Unfortunately, these attempts were not successful. Since many members of the Senate may not be familiar with this problem, I believe a short statement of explanation of my amendment might be helpful.

My proposed amendment is the same in substance as Senate bill 1862, which would provide for the free-duty entry of baler twine on the same basis as the present free entry of binder twine. Certain changes have been made from the amendment as printed under date of April 20, and I ask that there may be included at the end of my remarks the revised language I am now proposing.

The arguments for this bill are the same as those which have guided our national policy on imports of agricultural equipment and supplies for many years. Traditionally imports of items of equipment and supplies generally used by farmers have been free of duty. The farmer has never paid a duty on such commodities as agricultural machinery, fertilizer, barbed wire, and binder twine. Free entry for binder twine, in fact, goes back to the Tariff Act of 1896.

In fact, the real purpose of my amendment is to correctly classify baler twine on the free list the same as binder twine. The Tariff Act of 1930 continued binder twine on the free list because of its exclusively agricultural use. Baler twine should have the same status as binder twine. Like binder twine it is used by the farmers directly in the course of their farming operations. The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals has specifically held that the baling of hay is an agricultural pursuit.

Baler twine, however, is a comparatively new product. It did not exist in 1930 when the last general tariff act was enacted. If it had been in commercial use at that time, there is no doubt that it would have been specifically exempted from duty by name. In fact, the language of the Tariff Act of 1930 leaves considerable doubt whether it should not be permitted free entry under the present law. A real argument could be made that the congressional intent of that period meant to cover any such commodity as baler twine along with binder twine on the free list. However, Customs officials and the Customs Court have ruled that baler twine must be entered under paragraph 1005—the cordage paragraph—of the Tariff Act.

At present, the duty on baler twine, in line with this decision, is 15 percent. This means a duty of around 3 cents per pound. It is significant that the price of baler twine has stayed around 3 cents per pound above the price of binder twine in spite of the fact that the costs of manufacture of the two products are almost the same.

Mr. President, the statement, I think, can be truthfully made that binder twine, which has free entry, and baler twine, which has a 15-percent duty, originate at the same places. They come from foreign sources. They are identical in quality, but, when manufactured into binder twine, the product is free of duty, whether coming already manufactured or in its raw state. However, when baler twine is manufactured out of the same free-entry material it is subjected to a 15-percent duty. There is none shipped in, to my knowledge, but the farmers would be charged 3 cents a pound or $3 a hundred pounds, because almost any farmer who needs any of it would buy several hundred pounds every season. I think it is entirely unfair and is a gross prejudice against the farmer which was not intended by the act, in the first place.

Mr. President, approximately 100,000,000 pounds of baler twine will be used during the coming year. If the duty maintains the price of baler twine 3 cents a pound above what it should be, it will cost the farmers of this country $3,000,000 during the coming year alone. At a time when many Members of this Congress are trying to knock down the price of butter, I suggest we had better give some thought to helping the farmer reduce his costs.

Furthermore, this market is growing by leaps and bounds as more and more farmers buy the type of pick-up baler that requires the use of baler twine. Thus the cost of the duty will continue to grow and grow.

Furthermore, it has proved impossible to date for domestic manufacturers to keep up fully with this growing demand in a satisfactory manner. There have been local shortages during the past 2 years, and there is no proof that there will be enough baler twine during the coming year because of the rapid increase in requirements. It appears that importers cannot afford to bring in supplies of foreign twine at present rates of duty.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize that these two products, binder twine and baler twine, are very similar in every respect. All the fibers customarily used for both baler twine and binder twine are entirely free of duty. Both products are manufactured on the same carding and spinning machine. Both are used exclusively by the farmer and are manufactured by the same producers and sold through the same channels. There is no reason why baler twine should not receive the same tariff treatment as binder twine.

Domestic manufacturers of this product would have us believe that they absolutely depend on this duty to stay in business. I do not believe that is the case. That has not been our experience with binder twine. Although there has been no duty on binder twine for many years, domestic producers still supplied nearly three-fourths of the total market here. I see no reason why imported baler twine would take more than a small part of the market. The real importance of this proposal is to subject

domestic manufacturers to some healthy competition so as to knock down the excessive price. On that basis, I hope the Senate can find time to seriously consider this question.

As originally introduced, Senate bill 1862 would have removed the duty permanently. It was suggested to me, however, that it might be more appropriate to provide for merely a temporary suspension of the duty for 1 year. This 1-year trial period would give us an opportunity to discover whether imports were inflicting any real injury on domestic producers. I have redrafted my proposal along these lines, and I am asking that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end thereof insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph 1622 of section 201 of title II of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words 'binding twine' a comma and the words 'and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials.'

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall be effective as to merchandise entered for consumption for a period of 1 year beginning on the thirtieth day after the enactment of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer, and to provide for the free importation for 1 year of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials."

OUR QUEST FOR THE DIFFICULT AGREEMENT—TESTAMENT OF FAITH OF AMBASSADOR AUSTIN

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the remarks of Ambassador Warren R. Austin, representative of the United States to the United Nations, made at the commencement exercises of the American University, after he had received the honorary degree of doctor of laws annually conferred upon that American who by the choice of a national panel of 100 electors has rendered a most distinguished public service.

There being no objection, Ambassador Austin's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In accepting this honorary degree from the American University, I wish to give you a simple testament of my faith in the cause of the United Nations.

To serve during the early years of its development as the representative of the United States, is a privilege I esteem above all others that have come to me in my public life. I believe in it now even more than I did 2 years ago when I left the Senate to become Chief of the United States Mission to the United Nations.

The framers of the Charter at San Francisco displayed a unique wisdom in their choice of the word "determined" in the first sentence of the preamble. The opening line reads: "We, the people of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war * * *." All the other parts of the book rest back upon this vital word "determined."

The substitution of pacific settlement of disputes for war was recognized as the most difficult step the human race has ever attempted to take. The people of the world could expect to take this step only if they were determined to use to the utmost the full facilities of the United Nations. They could hope to take it only if they were determined to cling to its principles regardless of disappointments and discouragement. Given that determination on the part of the people, we have a solid foundation for our faith in the day-to-day work of collaboration.

Our first great achievement was unanimous agreement upon a Charter based on the principle of universality of membership and the sovereign equality of states. For the first time in history, all the great powers and most of the smaller nations of the world are participating members of one body. The nations with the greatest power to wage war have the daily opportunity and responsibility of seeking agreements to build and to maintain peace.

The great object of peace cannot be attained without accord among the most powerful members. An association of states that may be able to agree easily is no substitute for an association of all nations. The easy agreement among members within two or three blocs would lead inevitably to the hardships of war while the difficult agreement among greatly differing states in one United Nations will lead, however tortuously, to the blessings of peace.

With so great a goal as the survival of civilization in view, we must persist in our quest for the difficult agreement, no matter how many times we may fail to achieve it. That is why the framers of the Charter used the word "determined."

My faith in the Charter grows as time and circumstance demonstrate its responsiveness to the strivings of the members. I have become convinced that, notwithstanding imperfections, the Charter provides the means by which the members may act in concert to whatever extent they are really prepared to do so.

Our present problem is not so much to improve the Charter, as to improve the quality of participation of the members. We have not yet lived up to the limits of the Charter.

Through this Charter peoples and governments can recommend the steps needed to create conditions favorable to peace and be responsible for taking them.

Through this Charter they can throw the weight of world opinion behind pacific settlement of disputes as the alternative to war.

Through this Charter they can build collective defenses and present a solid front against aggression.

Whether they do what no other generation in history has done, depends upon their sense of responsibility, their understanding, and their determination.

We have the means to make the last war really the last. There is no greater challenge to youth than this.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, because my State of Vermont has a long tradition of faith in world organization, I wish further to include the citation made to Ambassador Austin by President Paul F. Douglass, who, like the great leader he honored, comes from our Green Mountains.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARREN ROBINSON AUSTIN

Representative of the United States of America at the Seat of the United Nations.

American rising above party politics in the interest of the common good, who has served his neighbors from the offices of local government to the most responsible posts of the international community.

Lawyer, distinguished in the profession, believer in liberty under law, devoted to the conviction that democracy is a government of law, and not a dictatorship of men.

Senator serving indefatigable on legislative detail, whose vigor quickened every part of the war effort and whose work at Chapultepec was a strong influence in bringing the nations of the Western Hemisphere solidly into the United Nations.

Statesman humble in greatness, courteous in controversy, forthright in discussion, and unswerving in loyalty to the ideal of a United Nations.

Yankee persevering with stamina in pursuit of an ideal despite momentary difficulties, disappointments in human beings, and confusion in counsel.

Diplomat, faithful and patient, always negotiating forward to the limits of the achievable, believing that no nation can isolate itself, but must find its own security in the security of all; relying on spiritual sanctions to encourage the good behavior of nations as well as of men.

Lover of home, where the end of man's quest is the enjoyment, in security, of family and friends—his own home from which public duty so long has separated him—where the red-brick house in the hills of Vermont awaits, and where the orchard now blossoms with the native strains of apples which he has sought to conserve—the rare Blue Pearmain, Fameuse, the Golden Russet, Spitzenburg, Jewett Red, Northern Spy, Quebec Sweet, Talman Sweet, Baldwin—where recently there have taken root, with lusty vigor, several young apple trees flown from England—a gift symbolizing enduring international friendships.

By the authority of the Congress of the United States vested in the trustees of the American University and by them delegated to me, and upon the nomination of a national panel of electors, I confer upon you for distinguished public service the degree of doctor of laws, invest you with the hood appropriate to the honor, and welcome you to the rights and privileges which throughout the world pertain to such degree.

PAUL F. DOUGLASS,
President.

MAY 31, 1948.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate reverts to the consideration of Senate bill 2655, to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the benefit of the Senators who have inquired as to voting on the pending bill and amendments. Several Senators have asked me if there would be record votes this afternoon. There certainly will be record votes if a vote is taken on some of the amendments. It is the intention to remain in session until 6:30 this evening. There will be no night session tonight and no session tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator's announcement brings to the attention of the Senate the question of procedure after today, during the following 2 weeks. It seems to me that if we are to conclude the program by the 19th of this month we shall have to forego our customary Saturday recesses and hold sessions on Saturdays from now until that date. I think we shall also have to hold night sessions and continue meeting at 11 o'clock a. m. Is that contemplated?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to state to the distinguished minority leader that it is not only contemplated but it has been announced rather informally that that would be the procedure. In other words, I can say now, if it meets with the approval of the Senator, that the sessions will begin at 11 o'clock a. m. each day; there will be Saturday sessions until the session closes; and there will also be as many night sessions as we feel are necessary. I think Senators should be prepared to attend a session each night, because it is my opinion that night sessions will be required all through the next 2 weeks in order to accomplish the program.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree thoroughly with the Senator's position, and I will say that we are willing to cooperate according to that schedule or a similar schedule in order that we may conclude the business of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his observation. He knows what it takes in order to conclude the session. I want to thank all the Senators on both sides of the aisle for the cooperation which they have already given during this session.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this afternoon I should like very much to have some technical amendments acted on, printer's errors and what not, so as to have the bill as reported by the committee in proper shape. The amendments are merely technical in character.

I turn first to the amendment on page 5, line 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 3, under the heading "Training and service," it is proposed to strike out "and in such age groups."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. I next turn to the amendment on page 29, lines 6 and 10, which is necessary to provide a basic scale of disability payments contemplated in that section of the bill. It was placed in the bill as a technical amendment at the request of the Department. If omitted, the preceding paragraphs of the bill as originally written would not be clear. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 6, after the word "work", it is proposed to insert: *"Provided further,* That for the purpose of determining the benefits payable with respect to the disability or death of any such person, the total compensation payable to him in cash and in kind shall be deemed to be $87.50 per month."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. The next amendment to which I wish to call attention is on page 36, line 10, where, after the designation "(c)", there should be inserted "(1)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Next, on page 45, line 14, before the name "State", there should be inserted the words "headquarters in each." Those words were erroneously omitted in the original text, and I move their insertion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 45, line 14, before the name "State" it is proposed to insert "headquarters in each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. On page 65, line 4, the subsection was erroneously denominated "(b)," and should be "(d)." I move that the bill be amended in that particular.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there are three technical amendments which do not appear in the print of the bill before the Senate. I send them to the desk and ask that the clerk state them. They are small amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to have them considered en bloc or separately?

Mr. GURNEY. I think it would be better to have them considered separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 12, in the amendment of the committee, after the word "under", it is proposed to strike out "conditions other than dishonorable" and insert in lieu thereof "honorable conditions."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 23, to strike out "10 (a) (10)" and insert in lieu thereof "10 (b) (10)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 9, to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there are in the bill several amendments, insertions, and parts stricken out, which have to do with changing the bill as originally reported on May 12 to an entirely voluntary provision for the 18-year-olds, in other words, taking out the compulsory feature with regard to the induction of the 18-year-olds. I think the amendments should be considered en bloc. They are in the nature of technical amendments to accomplish the purpose I have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator identify the amendments?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an explanation of each amendment and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, lines 13 through 15, the portion in italics is necessary so as to limit induction to the 19 to 26 age group. As originally written the bill contemplated induction of a limited number of 18-year-olds. Since registration covers the 18 to 26 group, the insertion of these italics has the purpose of limiting inductions so as to begin at age 19.

On page 5, line 5, the portion in italics is necessary to insure that induction procedures will not be utilized to fill the quota of 161,000 1-year trainees.

On page 6, beginning on line 12, the original provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) are to be stricken, and the italics inserted, beginning on line 22. This removes the induction provision for the 1-year trainee, and leaves only the provisions providing for induction of individuals for 24 months.

On page 8, beginning on line 25, and carrying over to page 9, lines 1 and 2, the wording has been changed so as to strike out reference to persons inducted before attaining age 19, and to insert the corrected reference to persons enlisted under the terms of the 1-year trainee enlistment.

On page 10, beginning on line 3 and extending to line 12, the wording has been changed so as to delete reference to persons inducted before attaining age 19, and substituting reference to persons enlisted under the 1-year-trainee program—subsection 4 (g).

On page 12, line 21, and running over to page 14, line 5, subsections (g) and (h) have been rewritten so as to reflect the fact that the 1-year-trainee program has been changed from an induction basis to an enlistment basis.

On page 18, beginning on line 21 and extending over to the first three lines on page 19, a new paragraph (4) has been inserted to protect the 1-year enlistee from induction after his year of active-duty training is completed.

The original paragraph (4) has been renumbered (5).

On page 59, lines 8 and 9, the wording has been changed so as to refer to the 1-year-enlistment program which we are now discussing—this is a new provision, and to that extent it modifies present recruiting laws, which is the subject of paragraph 15 (d).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator, with his permission, a question which I think would clarify, at least in my own mind, what is the fact with respect to what each boy who comes in on a voluntary enlistment, who is between 18 and 19 years of age, is expected to do under the proposed act. I should like to ask the Senator if I understand it correctly as follows: First, that the boy will then serve in the armed forces for 12 months.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Second, that he will then be transferred for 6 years to a Reserve component of the force in which he served.

Mr. GURNEY. He must serve 6 years in a Reserve unit. That means in an unorganized reserve. If he joins a Class A unit that drills once a week and goes to summer camp, he has to serve only 4 years.

Mr. DONNELL. At the end of the 12 months which he serves in the armed forces he is transferred, subject to what the Senator has said, for 6 years to a Reserve component of the force in which he served. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And during that period of 6 years he is liable to two things. First, he is liable to be ordered to active duty for not to exceed 1 month in any calendar year. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct; that is summer camp.

Mr. DONNELL. Second, he is required to accept a 4-year enlistment in an organized unit of the force in which he

served, provided such enlistment shall be offered to him.

Mr. GURNEY. Providing one is available in which he wants to serve.

Mr. DONNELL. Or in the ROTC, whenever it is administratively determined that a vacancy exists therein. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. All the statements the Senator has made are entirely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Then am I correct in understanding that at the end of this course that is outlined, beginning with the service in the armed forces for 12 months and continuing through the period which I have mentioned, the obligation of the boy between 18 and 19 years of age terminates, except for conditions of war or national emergency, as determined by Congress?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct, and he could not then be subject to active duty under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough to let me state my understanding, part by part, as to a boy who is 19 but not yet 26? I understand that under that category there may be either an induction or a voluntary enlistment. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. Not quite. There may be an induction for 2 years. If he volunteers, he must volunteer, not under the proposed act, but under previous law, and would thereafter be allowed to join up in the service for no shorter term than 3 years, if he volunteers.

Mr. DONNELL. If, on the other hand, he is inducted—and I am speaking of the boy who is 19 years of age and not yet 26—in the first instance, he serves in the armed forces for 24 months. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. He is inducted for that period.

Mr. DONNELL. He is then transferred to a reserve component of the force in which he served. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. During the period for which he is so transferred to the reserve component, I understand he retains his membership in such reserve component for 5 years, subject, however, to two alternatives specified in the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Are those two alternatives, first, that he may remain on active duty for 1 year after the termination of the 24 months which I have mentioned, or may enlist in an organized unit of the Reserve component of any of the armed forces for 2 years?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And is it correct that thereupon, after the various services and courses to which I have referred which are open to the boy who is now 19 but not yet 26, he is relieved from further liability for service except in time of war or emergency declared by Congress?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct, under the terms of the bill, under the different provisions as I have stated them before; but I am glad to get them down in this apple-pie order, and I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for the courtesy he has shown me.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and also for the RECORD, I desire to read the latest communication received from the Defense Establishment respecting the bill as it is now before the Senate, it having been completed by the adoption of the committee amendments. The letter is dated May 26, 1948, and is from James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense. It is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 26, 1948.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Armed Services
Committee of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have read the report of your committee on the selective-service bill and have also read the proposed amendment which would put the training of 18-year-olds on a voluntary basis. Your committee is to be commended for the thoroughness with which the hearings and discussions upon the bill have been held, and for the sound thought, effort, and common sense that has gone into it. The result, in my opinion, is an excellent bill, which should have the support of all Members of Congress.

I would like to mention two matters specifically.

The first is the proposal to enlist approximately 161,000 volunteer 18-year-olds for 1 year of training with the Regular forces. This provision is, in my opinion, one of the most important features of the bill. As I stated in my testimony before your committee, the problem with which we are faced has two aspects—there is the short-term problem of providing immediate additional manpower for the regular components in order to enable them to carry out their missions in support of national commitments and to furnish a minimum defensive force in the event of an emergency. Selective service provides the only effective solution to this problem. In addition, there is the long-range problem of developing adequately trained Reserves and in sufficient numbers to permit an eventual reduction in the size of our Regular Military Establishment. I believe that we cannot hope to obtain an effective M-day force of Reserves unless provision is made for extended training with the Regular forces in the techniques of modern warfare. The bill which your committee has reported recognizes this need and provides an excellent foundation for the establishment of such a training program.

The second matter that I wish to mention is the allocation of these special 1-year enlistments on a fair geographical basis. I do not foresee any administrative difficulties in the establishment of quotas which will permit these enlistments to be fairly spread among the rural and urban areas throughout the country, so that anyone wishing to avail himself of this opportunity for training will have a substantially equal opportunity with all others.

In closing, I wish to express my personal appreciation and that of the National Military Establishment for the consideration that your committee has given to this subject, and for the excellent bill which you have reported to the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Mr. President, I thought if I did not read the letter no other Senator would. It is a sort of a pat on the committee's back, and I am glad to have it in the RECORD as a matter of record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish to have the remainder of the committee amendments adopted?

Mr. GURNEY. I believe all the committee amendments have now been adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the amendments which were adopted en bloc are not available. The only thing we have is the printed sheets explanatory of the amendments. Therefore it is impossible——

Mr. GURNEY. Then I should like to take the amendments up in order, because I should like to have them acted upon now. It was my understanding that all the committee amendments had been adopted; that the printed sheets to which the President of the Senate refers took care of their adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They do take care of their adoption, but the clerk is unable to mark up the bill until text of the amendments is available. There is no text of the amendments available.

Mr. GURNEY. The amendments are all contained in the reprint of the bill. They are shown in italics, and the sheets handed up to the desk specify the pages on which they appear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. Then action on the committee amendments is completed.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say to the President that the amendments were previously submitted in the regular form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

Mr. GURNEY. And a reprint of the bill, setting out the committee amendments in italics, was requested, and the reprint was made accordingly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Is the bill now open to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I call up my amendment lettered "B," and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

PROHIBITION AGAINST SEGREGATION OF AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PERSONS INDUCTED OR ENLISTED UNDER THIS ACT

SEC. . (a) No person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under this act shall be discriminated against, or be subject to segregation, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, or religion, in assignment to duty or quarters in the armed forces, in assignment to organizations or units of the armed forces, in assignment to camps or stations, or in any other matter relating to his service in the armed forces.

(b) In the selection of persons for induction or enlistment under this act, no person shall be discriminated against because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion. Quotas for selection prescribed by section 5 of this act shall be established and filled without regard to the race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion of the persons subject to selection.

(c) Any person who violates any provisions of this section by discriminating against, or segregating, persons inducted or enlisted under this act or in the selection of persons subject to selection shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in section 12 of this act.

(d) Any person discriminated against, or segregated, contrary to the provisions of this section may apply to the United States district court for the district within which such discrimination or segregation occurs for an injunction against such discrimination or segregation. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the United States courts to enjoin any discrimination or segregation in violation of this section.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, first of all I want to refer specifically to the speech made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] yesterday, which appears on page 6998 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

All who have made a study of this problem—

He said—

are determined to do something about it. They believe that, in consideration of our responsibilities in Europe and the Far East, it is tragic—yes, criminal—for us to require these forces to serve in distant lands without proper mobile Reserves at home, and without a guaranty that continuing effort will be made to provide replacements.

I now pass over to page 6999 of the RECORD and read the following from the speech delivered by the Senator from South Dakota:

May I say again, the Armed Services Committee presents this legislation as a measure for peace; its enactment will have a stabilizing influence throughout the world, and it will give all of us some relief from the feelings of uncertainty, anxiety, and insecurity which now pervade the globe.

The Senator from South Dakota continued:

The responsibilities which our position in the world of today has pressed on our country—and whether or not we accept them willingly, we cannot avoid them—call for commitments of our armed forces on every continent except Australia.

As I understand that language, Mr. President, we are to have troops on every continent in the world except Australia. That is one of the purposes of the bill.

In attempting to meet these responsibilities we have stationed overseas some 260,000 of the Army alone, or approximately 50 percent of the entire Army strength. This number is woefully inadequate to meet these widespread requirements, yet is so great a proportion of our total strength in service that it leaves our security forces at home incapable of affording this Nation the protection to which we are entitled. We must increase this strength to a minimum of 1,795,000 in our armed forces—Army, Air, and Navy.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that his number of 1,795,000 is a larger number than those employed today by the United States, not only in the civil service, but also in the postal service. In spite of all we have heard from such men as the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the effect that the pay roll is far too large and should be cut down—in fact, that it must be cut down because of the amount of money available to pay Government employees—we find there a proposal to have in the Army, Navy, and Air Forces a greater number than we have in the employment of the United States Government in civilian life. In other words, if we were to add the number he is asking for, it would be 1,795,000 less 260,000, which number he says are now in the Army alone. It would mean, roughly, 1,535,000 more, which, added to the number we already have on the Federal pay roll, would make a larger force than we had at the beginning of this session, at a time when we were trying to cut it down.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I merely wish to state the figures correctly. The figure of 1,795,000 is the total strength authorized in the bill for all three services.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. The present strength is approximately 1,300,000. So the bill authorizes an increase of 435,000.

Mr. LANGER. Roughly half a million.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; but not 1,300,000 or 1,400,000 more.

Mr. LANGER. What, then, becomes of the Byrd-Langer resolution, which was passed about 2 years ago, and under which the armed forces have been consistently reduced every 3 months? The purpose was to get rid not only of civilian employees in the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, but employees in the Post Office Department and all the other departments of our Government. Up to the present time the result has been a decrease of roughly 1,200,000 since the Byrd-Langer resolution was passed. In other words, the Byrd-Langer resolution will go out the window.

Mr. GURNEY. The Byrd-Langer resolution, about which the Senator is speaking, refers only, I am sure, to civilian employees. It had no effect whatever on men and women in the armed services.

Mr. LANGER. But even when applied to civilian forces, the addition of 435,000 will bring the number of those employed by the Government very close to what it was at the time the Byrd-Langer resolution was passed.

Mr. President, I wish to come to another part of the speech of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, also found on page 6999 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

We must at all costs be able to prevent an enemy from establishing himself in positions from which he could attack us at will, and at the same time we must be able to secure for ourselves those bases from which we can retaliate against his aggression if we are to have any hope of stopping it. To do this we need efficient forces in being, ready to move; time will not be available to mobilize and build them.

That bears out the paragraph which I previously read, and which appears in another part of the distinguished Senator's speech. We are to have forces available in every continent except Australia. We are to have them in bases from which we can meet any attack upon the United States.

Mr. President, if we are to have all those forces it can be for only one purpose, and that purpose must be to have democracy not only in the United States, but all over the world.

Let us go back to the Charter of the United Nations, which I think is the very Bible of democracy. If ever there was an instrument drawn up in the history of the world which laid out clearly and concisely an agreement among all the countries under which we were to have peace, it is the Charter of the United Nations. On the very first page of the United Nations Charter the purposes are enumerated. I wish to speak of purpose No. 3.

The purpose of organizing the United Nations was to abolish in every country in the world all discrimination because of race, color, creed, sex, or language. Every Senator except two voted for the United Nations. They voted for this paragraph. They voted for this purpose. Senators will remember that it was also stated that the United Nations stood for social equality between the various countries, races, colors, and creeds.

In the United Nations Charter we have clearly expressed our belief, for the first time, in a very few words. I read from page 3, section 3, of the purposes of the United Nations. I submit that the language could not be clearer. The English used could not be better. The thought could not be more coherently expressed than we find it here:

3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

4. To be a center of harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common needs.

Mr. President, I wish to make my position on this matter very clear. During the 7½ years I have been a Member of the Senate I, first of all, joined two very distinguished Members of the House, Clare Boothe Luce and EMANUEL CELLER, in seeing to it that some 3,000 persons who had entered the United States illegally prior to 1924—persons who came from the East Indies and who had jumped off ships in the harbors of this country prior to 1924—had an opportunity, according to the law which then was passed, to become citizens of the United States of America. Among those 3,000 it was discovered there were 250 who had served our country in the last war, and thus, upon their petition, they could automatically become citizens of the United States. That proposed legislation was enacted, and I am happy to say that during the last year and a half I

have been advised by the Immigration Service that practically every one of those 3,000 persons has applied for United States citizenship.

Mr. President, what was their position before that bill was passed? In some States they could not drive an automobile, because the law required that a person had to be a citizen in order to secure a driver's license. In other States they could not testify in court. In five States they could not own land. So, Mr. President, as the hearings developed before the House committee on the bill which was introduced by Mrs. Luce and by Mr. CELLER, and as the hearings developed before the Senate Committee on Immigration on the companion bill which I introduced in the Senate, we found there was rank discrimination against those people. Some of them could not attend public schools in some of the States; they were barred there. That was at the very time when we adopted the United Nations Charter. We found a situation in which those folks, who had come to the United States, had gone to Willows, Calif., and to Colusa, Calif., and some of them had gone to a place near Phoenix, Ariz. In California those East Indians had gone into alkali swamps, onto land that was absolutely worthless, land which would not sell at that time for 1 cent an acre; it was full of alkali and weeds; it was simply swampland. But those persons were experts in the seeding of rice. In India they had learned to make worthless swampland, alkali land, produce rice. So, away back in 1906, some of those East Indians went into the swamplands near Willows and Colusa, Calif., and seeded those swamps to rice—going there in rubber boots, and in the Imperial Valley going into such land when it was 120 degrees in the shade, and seeding the land to rice, although knowing that they would have no crop the first year. They seeded the land again the second year, although they knew they would have practically no crop that year. Again, they seeded the land the third year, although they knew, when they seeded that worthless land, that they would not have a paying crop that year. They knew it would be the fourth year before they would produce sufficient rice on that worthless land to pay them for the time and work they had put into raising the crop. They kept on seeding rice there. The land rose in value until by 1920 it was worth from $300 to $500 an acre.

Then what happened? Some folks—I shall call them white folks, but to properly denominate them I shall have to call them greedy white folks—suddenly said, "We want this land." So they brought a lawsuit which finally ended in the Supreme Court of the United States. The testimony before the Immigration Committee was not clear on the point. Those poor people claimed that it was a fake lawsuit. They claimed that the lawsuit was instigated by an Indian, with a corporation hiring the lawyers for him, and that those lawyers were engaged for the purpose of getting the land away from them. But the net result of it all was that in July 1924, the Supreme Court of the United States, with Mr. Justice Sutherland writing the opinion, held that those East Indians were neither whites nor blacks, were neither Negroid nor Caucasian, and that therefore under the Constitution of the United States they could not become citizens of the United States at all.

The result was that they lost every single acre of that land which they had made so valuable; they lost it because they could not own it. Five States had already passed laws providing that they could not own that land. Those States also said, for example, that Japanese or Chinese people could not own land there.

Mr. President, again to show my good faith in introducing these amendments on the floor of the Senate, I point out that Congress enacted a law providing that 107 Chinese could enter the United States each year under their quota. A quota was created for the Japanese. The entire theory of the United Nations Charter was that sitting around one table would be the representatives of 51 nations. The hope, which was shared by many, was that black men and yellow men and white men and men of all denominations and colors and creeds could sit down together, and that all the people of the world would be brothers and sisters, that we would have a real democracy not only in the United States, but everywhere in the world.

So, Mr. President, although I am the only remaining Member of the Senate who voted against the United Nations Charter—and I shall go into detail in regard to that matter in a few moments—I expected to see some of my brother Senators walking arm in arm and shoulder to shoulder with every other kind of human being on this earth, regardless of race, color, or creed.

In Arizona, Mr. President, what did some of the Indians I have described do? They went out into the desert, 9 miles from Phoenix, where there was no irrigation. During the hottest period of the year, they constructed their own irrigation projects. They developed thousands of acres of land some of which is today worth from $500 to $600 an acre. Besides engaging in truck farming, they produce barley and certain other kinds of grain. They have literally made the desert to blossom as the rose.

Sons of those Indians were in the late war. They bought Liberty Bonds. I once saw in the home of one of them a wedding picture, showing the bridegroom wearing the uniform of the United States Army. Three of his friends were wearing Navy uniforms. Yet at that very time, Mr. President, the fathers of those boys were being discriminated against. They could not become citizens. Had it not been for Representatives Clare Boothe Luce and EMANUEL CELLER, who obtained passage of a bill in the House, those Indians would today be discriminated against.

So, Mr. President, I maintain first that any Senator who voted for ratification of the United Nations Charter, containing as it did paragraph 3, which I have read, is on record in the Senate as having voted to wipe out any and all discrimination because of race, sex, creed, or language.

What does my amendment propose, Mr. President? I ask if my amendment lettered "B" is not in full accord with paragraph 3 of the United Nations Charter? A vote against my amendment would be a vote to repudiate the United Nations Charter, about which so much was said only a few months ago upon the Senate floor. All I ask is this:

No person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under this act shall be discriminated against, or be subject to segregation, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, or religion, in assignment to duty or quarters in the armed forces, in assignment to organizations or units of the armed forces, in assignment to camps or stations, or in any other matter relating to his service in the armed forces.

(b) In the selection of persons for induction or enlistment under this act, no person shall be discriminated against—

A reference to the United Nations Charter, will show that my amendment is very carefully drawn. I read subsections (b) and (c) of my amendment:

(b) In the selection of persons for induction or enlistment under this act, no person shall be discriminated against because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion. Quotas for selection prescribed by section 5 of this act shall be established and filled without regard to the race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion of the persons subject to selection.

(c) Any person who violates any provisions of this section by discriminating against, or segregating, persons inducted or enlisted under this act or in the selection of persons subject to selection shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in section 12 of this act.

I ask unanimous consent that section 12 of the pending measure, Senate bill 2655, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the section 12 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENALTIES

SEC. 12. (a) Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this act, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said act, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this act, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades or refuses registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this act,

or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant to this act, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way, by force or violence or otherwise, with the administration of this act or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this act unless such person has been actually inducted for the training and service prescribed under this act or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this act. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this act, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

(b) Any person (1) who knowingly transfers or delivers to another, for the purpose of aiding or abetting the making of any false identification or representation, any registration certificate, alien's certificate of nonresidence, or any other certificate issued pursuant to or prescribed by the provisions of this act, or rules or regulations promulgated hereunder; or (2) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, has in his possession any such certificate not duly issued to him; or (3) who forges, alters, or in any manner changes any such certificate or any notation duly and validly inscribed thereon; or (4) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, photographs, prints, or in any manner makes or executes any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of any such certificate, or any colorable imitation thereof; or (5) who has in his possession any certificate purporting to be a certificate issued pursuant to this act, or rules and regulations promulgated hereunder, which he knows to be falsely made, reproduced, forged, counterfeited, or altered; or (6) who knowingly violates or evades any of the provisions of this act or rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto relating to the issuance, transfer, or possession of such certificate, shall, upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $10,000 or be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of any certificate not duly issued to him, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to establish an intent to use such certificate for purposes of false identification or representation, unless the defendant explains such possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

Mr. LANGER. We now come to subparagraph (d) of my amendment, reading as follows:

(d) Any person discriminated against, or segregated, contrary to the provisions of this section may apply to the United States district court for the district within which such discrimination or segregation occurs for an injunction against such discrimination or segregation. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the United States courts to enjoin any discrimination or segregation in violation of this section.

Within a few weeks after the adoption of the United Nations Charter, a young man, who had lost an arm in the war, walked into my office. He was in uniform. He was perhaps 50 percent colored. Here in the Nation's capital he had gone into a restaurant and tried to buy a cup of coffee. He laid 10 cents on the counter. Although he was in uniform, he was informed by the young lady behind the counter that they did not serve colored men in that restaurant.

But that is not all. When the United Nations Charter was under consideration in the Senate, when there were upon the floor manifestations of great piety, at that very moment, in our own Senate Restaurant, a colored man was denied the right to purchase a cup of coffee. When I tried to take some colored people into the restaurant, I was informed I could not get them in without a fight. Had it not been for the fact that Mr. Justice Burton of the Supreme Court, who was passing by, took the colored people over to the cafeteria in the Supreme Court Building, those men, so far as those in charge of the Senate dining room were concerned, could have died of hunger or thirst, or both.

Oh, yes, Mr. President, at the time we were considering the United Nations Charter, one of the daily newspapers of this city said on its front page that if any Senator dared vote against the Charter, it would make it its business to see that he was retired to private life, that he was voting for war, not peace. A little handful of Senators, including the late Senator Hiram Johnson, former Senator Shipstead, and myself, were denounced over the radio as being for war.

Mr. President, in the minds of some people Negroes are the only persons thought of when we speak of discrimination. In the State from which I come there are not more than 30 or 40 Negro votes. The total colored population of North Dakota, according to the latest census, is 210. That includes every Negro man, woman, and child in the entire State. But, Mr. President, in my State we hate and detest discrimination, although there are persons who used to be discriminated against. We have a considerable number of Indians. I very well remember the day before I became Governor of the State. The Indians were cooped up on a small reservation, of which there were four in the State. When beef was advertised for the reservation Indians, prime beef from prime cattle would be stipulated, but a miserable lot of old bulls would be delivered in place of fine cattle which the Indians were supposed to get and for which the Government paid.

I need not go into all the ways the white men thought of to cheat the Indians. Suffice it to say that when General Grant became President there was a man by the name of Gen. George Custer in North Dakota. When Custer discovered that a member of the Cabinet had received an $11,000 bribe in order to make those Indians buy from a certain little country store at Fort Yates, N. D., Custer came to Washington, and when he told about the discrimination against those Indians, and demanded the impeachment of the Secretary of War, General Custer was demoted. They sent him back to North Dakota, and in a few weeks he got his orders to leave for Montana, there to fight some Indians on the Little Big Horn. All of us are familiar with the massacre there, when General Custer and his little band were killed, and when it was all over nothing was left of the entire command but one horse, Comichee, which was subsequently taken all over the United States and exhibited at various fairs.

Mr. President, the discrimination against those Indians continued year after year after year. They were barred from public schools, they could not buy a piece of land off the reservation. I went to one of the reservations when I was attorney general of my State, and in a small room, with the hot sun beating down on the tin roof, I saw an Indian woman seated all afternoon, with a little baby in her arms, begging for enough money so that she could buy a few beans and potatoes. The Indian agent was sitting in another room, going to see her at his leisure. When I went back the second time and saw what was happening to that Indian woman, I took her aside, and it did not take long to get that woman some of her own money, money that belonged to her and was to her credit, a part of the money to which she was entitled to as a member of that tribe.

In North Dakota today, Mr. President, Indians vote, and they can own land. We have there democracy. Let me give a typical instance of what happened when the last war broke out. An Indian family lived there, the head of which was Joseph Wicks. They got a notice calling upon their boys to come in and register. Mr. Wicks walked in and threw on the table the notice he had received from the selective-service board, and said, "Since when has it become necessary to summon a Sioux Indian to fight?" His boys, one 15 and one 16, enlisted, and both of them made outstanding records in the war as flyers. I do not know of any better citizens in the United States today than the Indian family I have just described.

Yet, Mr. President, under the present regulations, the Government can take some of the Indians who reside in the State represented by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who is trying to secure the passage of the pending bill and discriminate against them. I am informed by some of the Indians that in the last war they were discriminated against.

Mr. President, the purpose of section 3 of the United Nations Charter apparently did not mean anything to some of those who voted for it. I read it again:

To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social—

Oh, how much we hear about the word "social."

Under our Constitution, Mr. President, all men, regardless of race, color, or creed, are entitled to just exactly the same treatment.

I repeat, one of the purposes of the United Nations Charter was "To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

As I said before, all through this debate this is going to be my fight, and not only in this debate, but so long as I am a Member of the Senate. I hope that the day will never come when I cannot stand here and ask that the purpose of the United Nations as stated in its Charter be carried out.

Mr. President, as I have before stated, discrimination is leveled not only at the Negro, but at the Indians. Last summer I went with Mrs. Langer to visit the Navaho Indians in New Mexico and Arizona. We spent a week there, a week out of my vacation. Before making that trip I spent 30 days at Ellis Island. I went there first for 30 days to see the German aliens, some of whom had conspired against the United States of America during the last war; some of whom had come over to our shores in submarines to wreck the United States of America. Those men and those women at Ellis Island got three fine meals a day, they had a nice place in which to sleep, they had a commissary where they could buy a little more food to eat in case they were still hungry. They were our enemies. They had tried to kill our American boys and wreck our factories. A week after leaving there I went to Arizona and New Mexico visiting the Navajos, men and women whose ancestors had been here before a single white man came to the United States of America, and what did I find? On every side, on every hand, there was hunger amongst those Indians, and there was discrimination against them. They cannot vote. Under President Coolidge, Congress passed a law which provided that they should have the right to vote, but two States promptly passed laws which provided they could not vote, and the overwhelming majority of them do not.

I had with me some immigration officers and also Oscar Chapman, Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, was with me. I had no legal standing there; I was merely a Senator of the United States. What did we find? On every side were hunger, want, suffering, and privation. The tubercular rate among the Navajos is five times as high as among the white people. I found 20,000 children of school age, Mr. President, but there were school houses sufficient to accommodate only 6,000. And for the first time in my life, Mr. President, I had such an experience as this: I found hundreds of young men and women among those Navajo Indians, who had been born on the reservation, some of them 21 years old, who could not speak the English language.

So when I speak about discrimination, Mr. President, I want to make it clear that I am speaking not only about the Negroes, but am also speaking about the Indians.

Let me then take you, Mr. President, to the great State of California. From New Mexico and Arizona I went to California and visited the Martinez Tribe of Indians in California. There was a little tribe of 300 Indians living only a few miles from Los Angeles, one of the richest cities in the world; yet on every side among those Indians there were hunger and want and suffering and privation.

Then, Mr. President, there are 400,000 Mexicans in California, but the citizens of that State do not want the Mexicans in the public schools. They want to segregate them. Oh, during the war we heard how Mexico was standing shoulder to shoulder with the United States. When it came time for the great Charter of the United Nations to be signed, what did we find? We found that Mexico had signed the Charter. These Mexican names were affixed as signatories to it: E. Padilla, F. Castillo Nájera, Manuel Tello. Three men signed it for the Republic of Mexico.

Mind you, Mr. President, we were now all going to be sisters and brothers—sisters and brothers! I thought we would never again see a race riot in the city of Washington because the Representatives and the Senators would be walking all over Washington with their sisters and with their brothers, regardless of race or color or creed. But apparently this beautiful feeling we have in the city of Washington did not permeate all the way to California because, when I met with representatives of those 400,000 Mexicans, I found on every side discrimination. Why, Mr. President? Incredible as it may seem, when I was there, there actually was pending a lawsuit—it had been adjudicated in the local court but was headed for the Supreme Court of the United States—involving a very fine woman who I met, who was married to an Indian. It seemed that she had some Mexican blood in her and that in the particular part of Los Angeles where she and her husband lived there was a covenant with restrictive clauses. So a lawsuit was brought to get her out of the locality in which she lived. I think one of the finest decisions ever given was that handed down by our Supreme Court wiping out such restrictions.

We must remember that Haiti signed the United Nations Charter. Two individuals—Gerard Lescat and A. Liantaud—signed for Haiti. Oh, we were going to be sisters and brothers with all the people of Haiti; not only sisters and brothers, Mr. President, because sisters and brothers might even fight on occasion, but in order to develop cultural and social relations we were going to be good sisters and good brothers with the people of Haiti. We were going to sit down around the counsel table with representatives from all parts of the world—and remember, Mr. President, that in this world there are many times more brown and black people than there are white. We were going to sit around the counsel table with them and were going to make this a beautiful, beautiful world. There were to be no more wars. We were going to have peace. It was said that if any Senator did not vote for the United Nations Charter he was for war and that those who voted for it were for peace. That, according to the columnists, is the way the propaganda machine that was so well supplied with money operated to put over the United Nations Charter.

But now what is going on in this country? Certainly everyone is familiar with the names of Albert Einstein, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Reuben Gustavson, that good priest William J. Millor, and Arthur Morgan. Everyone has heard of Arthur Morgan. Certainly everyone has heard of that great Cabinet officer who served under Herbert Hoover, Ray Lyman Wilbur. What do they say about the pending bill? They detest it so much that they have issued a report on it. They call it the Militarization of America. That is the way the bill is designated by a man who was formerly a member of the Cabinet. Later on I propose to read what they say. I shall read one paragraph now, and I want to give the names of those who signed that paragraph:

> Because of our deep conviction that America cannot remain democratic if the present trend toward military control of our institutions continues, we join in issuing this report and recommending it for most serious study by our fellow citizens. In listing these numerous illustrations of the expanding influence of the military in America we do not necessarily imply that each of us would be opposed to every activity herein described, but what might be approved or overlooked as an isolated activity cannot be ignored when seen as a part of a basically dangerous pattern.

Who signed it? It was signed by Gould Beach, editor of the Southern Farmer, Montgomery, Ala.; Anton J. Carlson, former president of the American Association for Advancement of Science; Donald J. Cowling, former president of Carleton College, located in the State of Minnesota and one of the great colleges of the Middle West; Henry Hitt Crane, pastor of the Central Methodist Church, Detroit; Edwin T. Dahlberg, president of the Northern Baptist Convention; George C. Danfield, executive secretary of the National Conference of Union Labor Legionnaires; Albert Einstein, scientist; Kermit Eby, director of education and research of the CIO; Dorothy Canfield Fisher, author; Reuben Gustavson, professor of the University of Nebraska; J. Thomas Heistand, Episcopal bishop, Harrisburg, Pa.; W. H. Jernagan, executive secretary of the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches; Julius Mark, chairman of the justice and peace commission, Central Conference of American Rabbis; Cord Meyer, Jr., author; William J. Millor, S. J., president of the University of Detroit; Arthur Morgan, first chairman of TVA and former president of Antioch College; Chat Paterson, executive secretary, American Veterans Committee; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union; Paul E. Scherer, Lutheran clergyman, professor at Union Theological Seminary; Ray Lyman Wilbur, ex-Secretary of the Interior, chancelor of Stanford University; and Robert Wilson, physicist, former president of the Federation of American Scientists.

Surely all these men and women are not prejudiced. Surely, if there ever was an unprejudiced group, a group of men and women who have had a world of experience, it is this group. It consists of doctors, scientists, authors, presidents of universities, and a former member of the President's Cabinet. Surely those people are fair. They are not like the group which I described yesterday or

the day before, who were collecting $152,000 to promote passage of the displaced-persons bill. I gave the names of certain persons who were receiving $15,000 a year, $12,000 a year, or $10,000 a year to aid in the passage of that bill. What I said about those persons certainly does not apply to a single one of the distinguished men and women whose names I have just read.

What do they say about the bill? What do they say about the theory of appointing generals to diplomatic posts—generals who, I say, either consciously or unconsciously get us into war? Men who from their youth have been trained in war are suddenly placed in diplomatic assignments. They are getting into the Department of State.

Mr. President, I wish to digress for a moment to tell why I think so many military men are in favor of this measure, and why they tell us of all these dangers. A young man went to war from my home town. He rendered good service and rose to be a lieutenant colonel. He was getting $350 a month. He was over in Germany. The war ended, and he went along for a year or two at $350 a month. Then his father received a letter. The father sent it to me, and I have it. A little later the boy came home and verified what was in the letter. The distinguished Senator presiding over the Senate at this moment [Mr. BALDWIN] is a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and he knows that I read the letter and brought it to the attention of the committee. That boy was taken out of the Army and placed in the civil service. He did exactly the same work which he did before. His salary was raised $200 a month. He was a bachelor at that time, but he was given one of the most beautiful houses in the town where he was residing. The house had 8 bedrooms. He had 2 dogs, 2 automobiles, and 6 servants. In my opinion, he is a representative of the military men who were taken out of the Army by the high military authorities and placed in the civil service of the United States, where we cannot get rid of them without changing our entire civil-service structure, which, of course, we cannot do. There they are drawing large salaries, and have automobiles, and servants to wait on them. It is all a part of a nefarious system. The military authorities want billions of dollars more. They want hundreds of thousands of young men whom they can order around.

Here we find a group of distinguished men and women who are opposed to the militarization of the United States. I should like to read a small part of this pamphlet. Every word of it should be read. I believe it would astound the taxpayers of the United States, just as I was astounded by reading the front page of a newspaper 2 days ago. I voted against the Marshall plan, but even when I voted against it, I did not know that $15,000,000 was to be used to finance Life magazine, Time magazine, News Week, and Fortune magazine in England and other places, and that part of the $15,000,000 would go to motion picture organizations which were boosting the Marshall plan. I intend to make a separate speech on the $15,000,000 which was given to those proponents of the Marshall plan. I shall show that the Herald Tribune of New York got $800,000, and the New York Times nearly $1,000,000. No wonder they are for it. I say to my colleagues that that is the best way I know of to make more Communists in the United States—to tax the rank and file of the people and give $15,000,000 to a group of newspapers and two or three motion picture organizations which helped to put the Marshall plan over. Whether we like it or not, the common impression exists that they were bribed. The idea of selecting out of thousands a few magazines and newspapers that were the most active for the Marshall plan, and distributing $15,000,000 among them. Mr. President, I did not see any of that $15,000,000 going to Robert La Follette's Progressive in Wisconsin. I did not see a single dollar of that money going to any progressive farm newspaper.

I should like to read a little of what these distinguished men and women have to say about the militarization of our Government. The caption is "The militarization of America."

> One of the important safeguards of the American democracy, civilian control, is rapidly disappearing. Not only are military men moving into key positions in the Government, but the Army and Navy are extending their influence into science, education, and industry. Huge military appropriations for public relations activities enable the Army to mold public opinion.

This is not what some Communist says, Mr. President. The names on the list which I have read are the names of some of the most reputable citizens of this country.

> Huge military appropriations for public relations activities enable the Army to mold public opinion. More subtle influences are also at work to make the people react favorably to military proposals.
>
> One index of the influence of the military in government is the amount of money appropriated for military purposes. In 1947, Army, Navy, and Coast Guard appropriations totaled about twelve and one-half billion dollars, or about 32 percent of the Federal budget of $39,265,947,065. In addition to this, $8,399,371,492 was appropriated for agencies related to the military. These included the Veterans' Administration, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, strategic highways, surveys in connection with the Inter-American Highway, and the American Battle Monuments Commission * * *.
>
> The 1948 budget includes the following military appropriations:
>
> According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1947—

Army	$6,438,653,545
Navy	3,516,766,100
Coast Guard	212,900,000

> This is 35.2 percent of the regular Federal budget (including contract authorizations) of $27,152,648,014. Agencies related to the military received appropriations as follows:

Veterans' Administration	$6,964,457,080
Atomic Energy Commission	425,100,000
Battle Monuments Commission	312,000
Aid to Greece and Turkey	400,000,000
Total	7,835,461,080

> The total for the military agencies related to the military was $18,002,780,725. This is 66.3 percent of the total budget.

In other words, Mr. President, two-thirds of everything that was appropriated by our Government that year.

I read further:

> In contrast to the enormous sums spent for the military is the $27,740,000 which was the total for the general budget of the United Nations in 1947.
>
> The United States military forces today have an authorized strength of 1,070,000 in the Army and Air Forces and 550,000 in the Navy. This is the largest peacetime Military Establishment in our history.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota says we need 435,000 more men in the armed services. It is proposed that we take from the farms, from the small towns, and from industries thousands of young men, some of whom are only 18 years of age. Instead of beginning with those who are 19 years of age, we are to begin with those who are 18, and include those of 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 years of age—in the most formative period of their lives.

I had some experience around the camps during wartime. I do not blame the great churches that have come out against this bill, because ministers and clergymen have had experience with what happens to some of the young men 18, 19, and 20 years of age who are taken away from their fathers and mothers, under whose guidance some of them have been almost continuously from the time when they were born.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota says we need them. Mr. President, we are not at war. We already have the largest peacetime military force in all our history; but some persons want 435,000 more—for what? The distinguished Senator from South Dakota said yesterday that they are wanted to keep the country at peace, that they are a peace force, not a war force, and that they are needed to keep the peace. But I repeat that we already have the largest Military Establishment the United States ever has had in peacetime in its history. Not only does the Senator from South Dakota want them in this country, but he wants them to be in every other country on the face of the earth except Australia. That is what he said yesterday. I read his own words:

> The responsibilities which our position in the world of today has pressed on our country—and whether or not we accept them willingly, we cannot avoid them—call for commitments of our armed forces on every continent except Australia.

So we are going to send our troops all over the world. We are going to take the boys off the farms in Mississippi and Georgia and North Dakota—boys of 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 years of age—and send them away, just as we did during wartime, and let the old men do the work.

I remember during the war reading on this floor some letters which I received from my State, at a time when the Government was begging for more and more wheat and more and more food. At that time we saw the spectacle of men of 70, 71, and 72 years of age trying to raise wheat on the farms. Their boys had gone into the service. I shall never forget reading on this floor a letter which I received from Joseph Bohn, of Veren-

drye, N. Dak. He had one boy, but he was taken into the armed forces, even though there were 640 acres of land to cultivate. However, he still had a 16-year-old girl. The draft board said to put her on a tractor. So she started to run the tractor. The second day that she was working on the tractor, it got on the side of a hill and tipped over and killed her. After she was dead, the draft board thought it might be better to let the boy come back.

Those are the sort of conditions we are asked to return to in this country, Mr. President.

I want everyone to understand thoroughly, in connection with the figures presented yesterday by the senior Senator from South Dakota, that we are not at war. The Senator from South Dakota proceeded to tell how many of our young men were turned down by the armed forces, some of them because of illiteracy and some of them because of physical defects. I would vote, rather, to spend every single dollar of this money for educational purposes and for purposes of public health, so that we might rehabilitate the hundreds of thousands of young men who were referred to yesterday by the Senator from South Dakota who were unable to participate in the last war either because of illiteracy or because of their physical condition.

Mr. President, what do these distinguished men and women to whom I have referred say in their report? I repeat that not one Member of this body can challenge the public record of a single one of these persons. They say:

> The United States military forces today have an authorized strength of 1,070,000 in the Army and Air Forces and 550,000 in the Navy. This is the largest peacetime Military Establishment in our history. In addition to this the Army contemplates a National Guard of about 700,000 men and an Organized Reserve of approximately 1,000,000 men. The New York Times of February 20, 1947, reported that the Army and Navy was employing then more than 1,100,000 civilian employees, or practically half of the total figure of 2,300,000 Government workers.

Mr. President, no one knows better than the distinguished Senator who is now presiding over this body, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], how hard the Civil Service Committee, of which he is a distinguished member, has tried—and tried desperately—to reduce the number of civilians employed by the Federal Government.

What do authors of this report say? They say:

> Under the proposed program of universal military training there would be an additional 1,000 men entering Army camps each year, most of whom would still be under military command 3 years later.
>
> In other words, there would be a total of more than 5,000,000 men under military command at all times.
>
> Charles Hurd, the New York Times writer on veterans' affairs, said in the September 16, 1945, Times, "Maintenance of that force necessitates absolute confidence in the judgment and efficiency of the peacetime heads of the armed services, a confidence that in the end was to be reflected in congressional authorizations and appropriations to man the services."

Certainly it is up to Congress. In the last analysis, Congress is blamed. Not a man can be taken unless the bill is passed. An appropriation cannot be obtained unless this body authorizes it. I say, Mr. President, Charles Hurd is right—the responsibility is upon Members of the Senate.

I read further:

> MILITARY MEN INFLUENCE OUR FOREIGN AFFAIRS
>
> Not only does the size of the Military Establishment and its proportion of the budget reflect its growing influence in American affairs, but there is an increasing number of military men moving into key positions in Government. The two most influential men in the Government are—

Mr. President, whom do you suppose they are? Who are the most influential men in the Government today? If one were to walk down the streets of Washington he could not find 1 man in 10 who could name them.

> The two most influential men in the Government are Admiral William D. Leahy, President Truman's personal aide, and Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State. General Marshall's assistant is Brig. Gen. Marshall S. Carter. The Assistant Secretary of State, John E. Puerifoy, is a West Point graduate. Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay is military governor of the American zone in Germany, and General MacArthur is in control in Japan. The Ambassador to Russia is Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith. Among the other military men serving as Ambassadors are Admiral Kirk in Belgium, General Hines in Panama, General Holcomb in South Africa.
>
> The United States News of March 21, 1947, described the military men in Government positions as follows: "Never before have the Army and Navy been so powerfully placed in Government control. And never before has the United States adopted so stern a foreign policy." The United States News added, in speaking about these military men, "The group as a whole have been operating as a team."
>
> The State Department itself is coming more and more under military control. When Gen. John H. Hilldring was made an Assistant Secretary of State, according to the New York Times of May 8, 1947, "He brought with him to the State Department 26 of his assistants in the War Department."

Mr. President, who do you think are running the State Department?

> When General Hilldring resigned, Gen. Charles Saltzman, vice president and secretary of the New York Stock Exchange, took his place.
>
> A number of other key positions in the State Department are occupied by military men who "served during World War II as General Staff secretaries or assistants at the War Department here or at Army headquarters overseas," wrote the Washington Star of February 2, 1947.
>
> Col. Carlisle H. Hummelsine, Director of the Office of Departmental Administration, described by the New York Times of August 17, 1947, as head of the Executive Secretariat in the State Department, was formerly in the office of the Army's General Staff. Lt. Col. W. J. McWilliams, who was secretary of the General Staff of the Sixth Army group, is Colonel Hummelsine's executive officer in the State Department. W. W. Chapman, Jr., executive assistant to Assistant Secretary of State John E. Puerifoy, was deputy assistant secretary of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Walter K. Scott, Chief of the Division of Communications and Records, is a lieutenant colonel who was secretary of the general staff of Supreme Allied Headquarters in Europe.
>
> Capt. Richard Weigle, executive officer of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, was secretary of the general staff of the Chinese Combat Command. Col. Ira W. Porter, a West Point graduate and secretary of the general staff of the Fifth Army, is administrative officer on the Division of Foreign Service Administration.
>
> Capt. L. W. Parke, an Annapolis graduate, is Chief of the Cryptography Division in the State Department. Selden Chapin, Director General of the Foreign Service, is a Naval Academy graduate. Haywood P. Martin, the Deputy Director of the Office of Foreign Service Planning, was a Navy lieutenant who formerly served in the Navy Department. Charles E. Mills, Associate Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Planning, was a Navy lieutenant in the Navy Department.
>
> John W. Bays, a retired rear admiral, is Senior Assistant Chief of Foreign Service Administration.

Mr. President, I want to go back to what I think is the very kernel of the amendment to paragraph 3 of the United Nations Charter. I shall read it again. I read it so that every Senator upon the floor will be able to remember it, morning, noon, and night. The United Nations Charter as adopted contained paragraph 3 of chapter I. It was declared to be one of the purposes and principles of the Charter. It was adopted by the Senate chiefly for these reasons:

> To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedom for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate very carefully to note the language. Representatives of the nations which signed the Charter—black men, yellow men—could have stopped at the point where it said it was to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedom for all. But they did not stop there, Mr. President. Mind you, this draft was drawn and redrawn in every one of the different languages. It was redrawn time and time again. It was drawn very deliberately, as was described by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] when he told us about it. They did not stop by saying it was to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedom for all, but they added at the end:

> Without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

What could be more plain? I repeat that anyone who votes against the amendment I have proposed is repudiating the United Nations Charter about which we heard so much only a few short months ago.

So, Mr. President, I come right back to what I was saying with reference to our Government's being militarized. In addition to the 15 or 16 men whom I have named, let me give a quotation which I hope every Senator upon the floor will listen to most carefully:

> The Army itself is of course aware of its new power.

The Army and Navy Bulletin of January 18, 1947, says so. They are so bold about it that they proclaimed it to high heaven, they proclaim it to the animals all over this earth, and to all human beings. This is what the Army and Navy Bulletin of January 18, 1947, itself says:

Today the Army—

Not the United States Government, not the Department of State, not the United States Senate, not the United States Congress, but the Army—

has virtual control of foreign affairs, commencing on the home front with General Marshall as Secretary of State, and his Assistant Secretary of State (for occupied areas) Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, who directs the military commanders controlling our foreign policy in occupied Europe and Asia. The chain of control and diplomatic high spots both in the execution of basic policy and in the formulation of ad hoc arrangements, lies almost totally in the hands of the military authorities.

I should like to ask any Senator to challenge that statement. Who is running this country? The Army and Navy Bulletin says the Army is running it, and when I see brought forward this kind of a bill, proposing to draft 135,000 more young boys, when we already have the largest peacetime Army in our history, when I see appropriations for military purposes amounting to billions upon billions of dollars, more billions than we formerly needed to run the whole country, then indeed I know the Army and Navy Bulletin is telling the truth. That is the situation with which we are face to face in the Senate today. That is why I say, Mr. President, that this bill should not pass. Certainly under no consideration should it pass unless the amendment I have offered is agreed to.

Mr. President, the amendment provides merely that segregation and discrimination against persons inducted or enlisted under the act shall be prohibited. Our Constitution so provides. What is wrong with the American Constitution? It says that all men are equal. But apparently when they get into the Army, the Army is so powerful that the Army takes another view.

Who was the first man killed in the Revolutionary War? It was a Negro, Crispus Attucks, who was killed on the Boston Common. If one goes to Boston today there, in the very heart of the city, he will find an inscription to the memory of Crispus Attucks, and in the room of the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate, and there is a beautiful flag, and a picture of Crispus Attucks, the first man killed in the Revolutionary War.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no one on the floor to take any advantage of the Senator if he yields.

I had always understood that some seven or eight people were killed by that volley on Boston Common, which has gone down in history as the Boston Massacre. Does the Senator recall the names of any others who likewise lost their lives at the same time when Crispus Attucks fell before the volley fired by the Redcoats?

Mr. LANGER. When I was in Boston I went to the site of this occurrence, and there were some other names there, but the inscription said the first one killed was Attucks.

Mr. RUSSELL. The others were killed, were they not, in the same volley?

Mr. LANGER. They were not on the same inscription. The inscription there reads: "This is to commemorate Crispus Attucks, the first man killed in the Revolutionary War."

Mr. RUSSELL. I have heard that statement made time and again, but from my recollection of history as I studied it back in high-school days, it seems to me several were killed.

Mr. LANGER. There were several killed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have wondered why it was the names of the others have passed into oblivion, and we never hear their names called, whereas the name of Crispus Attucks is mentioned frequently.

Mr. LANGER. They have not gone into oblivion, because their names are there, but there is one inscription that mentions Crispus Attucks as being the first killed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have heard the name of Crispus Attucks mentioned on this floor times without number, and I was interested to know why it was he was the only one now remembered of the men killed in the Boston Massacre, in the American Revolution.

Mr. LANGER. The other names are there, too.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the Senator does not recall them?

Mr. LANGER. I do not recall them, naturally. I recall one inscription by itself, having only one name on it, saying he was the first man killed.

Mr. RUSSELL. It always seemed to me to be a bit unfair that all the others have been forgotten and are never mentioned, although Attucks, who, of course, was one of the heroes of the Revolution, is mentioned time and again in all discussions of matters of this nature.

Mr. LANGER. That occurred in Revolutionary days, before I was born. All I know is that the little plaque is there, and says that he was the first one killed in the Revolutionary War. But the others' names are there on another plaque.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I shall endeavor to get the other names and put them into the RECORD at some point, because ever since I have been a Member of the Senate the RECORD has been interspersed from time to time with references to Crispus Attucks, and the others who were killed at the same time have never been mentioned, and I feel that it is a bit unjust. I say to the Senator, since he is speaking of discrimination, that I think it is discriminatory against the others.

Mr. LANGER. The other men may have been colored, too. They may have been discriminated against.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator they were not. I do not have any intimate knowledge of the facts, of course, I was not there, but I know perfectly well that if any of the others had been colored, all their names would have been mentioned with that of Crispus Attucks, and with that of Dorrie Miller, killed at Pearl Harbor, who is also usually mentioned in such arguments as the Senator is now making.

Mr. LANGER. There is one and only one, justification for peacetime conscription, namely, that it is necessary to enlarge our military force to the extent made necessary for national security. There cannot be any other. This bill can be defended only on that one premise, and no other. That is the justification advanced for the bill by those who favor it. Those who oppose the bill deny that peacetime conscription is necessary to national security, and I so state now.

Some charge that its real purpose is not to protect our Nation, but to militarize our youth. It is claimed that our security does not require that our armed services be increased in size to the extent contemplated by the bill, that the services can be adequately staffed through enlistments, if only the brass hats would make a genuine effort to do it.

I am in the very happy position, Mr. President, of being about to offer various amendments to the conscription bill which should be pleasing to both sides of this controversy. They will be displeasing only to those who place bigotry and prejudice above the security and welfare of this country.

Mr. President, these amendments will in their totality prohibit discriminatory treatment of any kind against members of our armed forces on account of their race, color creed, or national origin.

Again, Mr. President, I come back to the United Nations Charter, and I do not see how Senators can vote for this bill while having the United Nations Charter, chapter I, paragraph 3, lying right in front of them, because I want to be certain that I am following the United Nations Charter. I want to find out whether the Senate has changed its mind respecting the United Nations Charter. It was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 28, 1945; so on July 28, 6 weeks from now the United Nations Charter will be 3 years old. I say to you, Mr. President, that during these 3 years the morale of the personnel of the Army has become lower than it was 3 years ago when the Charter was ratified on the 28th of July 1945.

Mr. President, my amendments, backing up the United Nations Charter, will prohibit the exercise of discrimination within the armed services themselves, will protect the members of those services from incurring such discrimination in places of public accommodation, on common conveyances, and at the polls, and will protect them against violent treatment on account of their color or race. I am referring not only to Negroes, but to Japanese, to Chinese, Mexicans, Indians, Koreans, to members of the yellow race all over the world.

Those who favor conscription must support these amendments—I say they must support them—or reveal themselves as favoring conscription on some basis other than the national security, on a basis which they dare not openly describe. For if more men are wanted to fight—and it is said by the armed services they want 435,000 more men in

addition to the 1,070,000 they already have—if they want more men to fight, when fighting becomes necessary, clearly they must want more men who will be ready and willing to fight when that time arrives.

Mr. President, my amendments will make our larger Army a better Army and a more willing Army, an Army free of the taint of racist ideas and therefore better able to contribute to maintenance of our democratic principles. Those who support conscription for reasons of national defense should, therefore, support them. My amendments will make military service more attractive to millions of young men and will thus stimulate enlistment, and contribute greatly toward improving the morale of the men in the armed services.

These amendments, Mr. President, hold no bitter in the sweet. They exact no price for the benefits of a better service, a more willing service, and a more attractive service. They require no appropriations of public funds, for they cost nothing. Indeed, by eliminating duplication of facilities and preventing the waste of needed skills arising from present segregation practices, they will save the public money.

What is it, Mr. President, that makes a good army or a good navy or a good air force? I believe that my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota simply has not thought this thing through. I know the people of South Dakota. I know how fair-minded they are.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho for a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from North Dakota asks what it is that makes a good army and a good navy. Did not Napoleon once say that morale was as to matériel as 3 to 1?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words we cannot have an Army with high morale when a considerable number of those in the Army are discriminated against; and, for no extra money, without expenditure for matériel, the morale question can be raised here on the floor of the Senate by adopting the very worthy amendment of the Senator from North Dakota which is now pending.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for bringing the quotation from Napoleon again to the attention of Members of this body, and I say, Mr. President, that I agree with him.

In answering the question as to what makes a good army or a good navy or a good air force, I say it is not only good equipment, it is not only good training or good leadership, all of which are important and all of which are needed, but beyond all that, are needed men who have courage, men who have spirit and morale. We need the kind of men we had at Valley Forge, Mr. President. They were possessed of those qualities. At Valley Forge there was a body of ragged men, ill-equipped, but they had spirit. After they had received training from Von Steuben, and they became well trained, when they were no longer ragged, when the Colonial Government finally obtained sufficient money so it could properly feed the soldiers, then the spirit, the courage, and the morale which they possessed drove them on to one of the greatest victories in the history of the world.

Mr. President, the qualities of courage, spirit, and morale do not occur in men by accident. They are a product of the social forces to which men are exposed. Men will be brave if they know they are fighting for something that preserves their rights. I repeat that so every Member upon the floor of the Senate may forever remember it. Men will be brave if they know they are fighting for something which will preserve their rights. Why should an Indian, a member of the Navajo Tribe, who, with his family is hungry, in want, and suffering, whose children cannot go to school because there are not sufficient school houses—why, I ask, should such an Indian fight? There are 20,000 small Navajo children of school age, but the available school houses accommodate only 6,000. Such an Indian could not fight in order to have a place to graze his cattle, because as soon as he has a few acres of ground on which there is grass the white man will have a lease on it.

When I went to the Department of the Interior and wanted to know why the Indians could not have as their own some of the land which belonged to the tribe, land with fine grass on it, I found that it had been leased for 5 years to a white man who was grazing thousands of head of cattle. Today, Mr. President, an Indian, no matter how rich he is, can never have more than 200 cattle. On some of the reservations, if he wants to get $5, he must beg an Indian agent to give him $5 of his own money. If he wants to leave the reservation, in this great free country, even though he may be a graduate of the University of Kansas, he cannot even leave the reservation unless he obtains the consent of a man who may not even have gone through the eighth grade. That is the kind of treatment which our Indians are receiving all over America.

There are 2,000 Indians in the city of Minneapolis. There are Indians on the rolls in New York City and Brooklyn. Mr. John Collier tried to get as many of them as possible on the rolls.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am interested in the Senator's statement that there are Indians on the roll in New York City.

Mr. LANGER. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is not referring to members of Tammany, is he?

Mr. LANGER. No. I am referring to members of some of the good old Indian tribes. Some of them have been put on the rolls by John Collier. There were 233,000 of them, and when he got through adding to the number there were nearly 400,000. Now we have a bill to compel the Bureau of Indian Affairs to take some of them off the rolls. In Oklahoma some of the leading lawyers are on the rolls. When the question was before our committee the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] spoke up and said, "Perhaps I am entitled to be on the list of Indians, because I believe I am one one-hundred-and-thirty-second Indian. I am not so sure that I would not be qualified to be on the list, according to the definition of John Collier." At that time John Collier was doing all he could to get as many Indians as possible back on the rolls.

To repeat, men will be brave if they know that they are fighting for something that preserves their rights. In Alaska Governor Gruening complained that although there were 30,000 Indians in Alaska, they would be just as loyal to Japan, if the Japanese came over here, as they would to the United States. That was when the Japanese were in the Aleutian Islands.

Governor Gruening made an investigation and found that in election after election the polls were not even open among the native Indians. They did not even know that an election was taking place, although America had been in possession of Alaska for 75 years. That is the kind of treatment we have accorded the Indians in Alaska, the native Eskimos. Governor Gruening did a good job. He sent men out to talk with those Indians in their own language. Polling places were opened. He got them to vote. He armed them. Do Senators know what happened? At one of the very first meetings of one of the Indian cooperatives there was $15,000 in the treasury, and they bought $15,000 worth of war bonds of the United States. When Governor Gruening got through with those Indians they were for America. He brought about that result because he treated them on the basis of equality with everyone else. When they went to Juneau, they could go anywhere in the city they wanted to go. When they went to Fairbanks, under the ruling of the Governor they could go to any place in Fairbanks and buy a sandwich. They could go to a dance hall and dance with anyone who cared to dance with them. Governor Gruening brought democracy to Alaska. It paid well. At the next election Indians all over the Territory voted. They liked democracy so well that they kept the guns which were furnished them by the United States, and they still have them. They use them for hunting. Today they are among the most loyal people in the entire Territory. They will fight.

Let me repeat, men will be brave if they know that they are fighting for something that preserves their rights. They will show spirit. They will have morale if they know that they are being treated fairly and honestly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not wish to be guilty of any discourtesy to the able Senator from North Dakota——

Mr. LANGER. I have already announced that I would yield only for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to make it plain that with this very important legislation before the Senate, I believe the time has come strictly to enforce the rule. Under the rule, of course, the Senator is privileged to yield for a question, as he himself has earlier recognized. I merely wish to say that I shall be forced to object to yielding for other than a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think that is a very good rule. I have always abided by it. I believe that from now on I shall even bar questions. I would rather continue. When I have finished, my distinguished friend from Georgia, for whom I have such deep affection and admiration, if he wishes to ask me any questions, can do so at that time. Thus we can avoid disconcerting our friend from California. I shall be glad to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not my purpose to disconcert either Senator, but, if the Senator declines to yield, I shall take my seat.

Mr. LANGER. I am truly sorry. I should like to yield.

An army of slaves and mercenaries cannot equal a democratic people's army. England hired the Hessians to come over here. How could they fight real Americans in Revolutionary days? Those men were paid to come over here and fight. Of course they did not get anywhere at all, because they did not have spirit, and they did not have morale. They did not have courage.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. No; I think not, in view of the objection of my distinguished friend from California. But I ask the Senator from Georgia to save his questions, and I shall answer all of them at one time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like very much to address a question to the Senator in connection with his statement, but it is quite all right.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to answer the Senator's questions later.

An army which fights for Fascist ideals cannot equal the spirit of an army which fights truly for democratic ideals. Who can expect our millions of Negro citizens to be willing to fight to the death, if need be, for a system which oppresses them, in an army which itself subjects them to discrimination and segregation based solely upon the color of their skin? Who can expect our Army to be well led and our men to be contented with their leaders, if the leadership is selected not on absolute merit but in part at least because of the color of their skin?

The importance of equality in military service transcends even so important a matter as the efficiency of the service. If we expose our youth to bigotry while they receive military training, they will be bigots after they leave their training. Their own Government is setting an example—I say it is a shameful example, Mr. President—which makes a mockery of our democratic professions.

Mr. President, I shall read again from the pamphlet which was issued by these distinguished men—Gould Beach, Anton J. Carlson, Donald J. Cowling, and the others I named a while ago; and for the benefit of Senators who were not on the floor of the Senate when I mentioned it before, let me say now that I asked who is running this country and who has control of this country. I repeat now what the Army and Navy Bulletin said on January 18, 1947:

> Today the Army has virtual control of foreign affairs—

Not the Congress, I repeat, but the Army. It says so in the Army and Navy Bulletin. They are proud of it; they are boasting of it.

> Today the Army has virtual control of foreign affairs, commencing on the home front with General Marshall as Secretary of State, and his Assistant Secretary of State (for occupied areas) Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, who directs the military commanders controlling our foreign policy in occupied Europe and Asia. The chain of control in diplomatic hot spots, both in the execution of basic policy and in the formulation of ad hoc arrangements, lies almost totally in the hands of the military authorities.

I notice there was a revolution in Paraguay yesterday. The evening papers said the army took over; that is all. So if we were in Paraguay, which everyone knows has never been very much of a democracy, there we would find the army taking over.

Mr. President, under the United Nations Charter, nothing is said about having the Army run the United States. The United Nations Charter does not say anything about having the combined armies run the 51 nations. Mr. President, we are going to have world-wide democracy, with the representatives of all the nations of the world sitting around one big table. Just think who are going to sit around that table. There will be representatives of China, the land of the yellow race. The first person who signed the United Nations Charter was V.-K. Wellington Koo, who was a roommate of mine for 2 years at Columbia University. There is not a finer person anywhere in the world than V.-K. Wellington Koo, the present Ambassador from China to the United States, a man who formerly was vice president of the League of Nations and was Chinese Ambassador to Britain. He is not white. Why should anyone object to my amendment which provides that people of the yellow race shall be treated in the same way as anyone else? Then, of course, Russia signed the United Nations Charter; and not all the people of Russia, by any means—especially the Asiatic Russians—are white. Then we find attached to the Charter of the United Nations the signatures of the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States, France, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia—and I may say in passing that there have been three revolutions in Colombia lately. Each time the revolution was a bloodless one, practically speaking. The army simply took over. Yet we find the Army and Navy Bulletin saying:

> Today the Army has virtual control of the foreign affairs of the United States.

We also find attached to the Charter of the United Nations the signatures of the representatives of Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia. They are some of the men who are going to sit around the table; and, as I have already pointed out, not all those men are white by any means. Some of them come from China; some come from Ethiopia, Haiti, and so on. Some of them are colored men. Among the 2,000,000,000 people of the world, the white race is overwhelmingly outnumbered.

Mr. President, one of the most democratic things we ever did was when we opened our immigration laws and established a quota of 107 for China and a quota of approximately 107 for India So, Mr. President, if we have any political enemies over there they cannot say that the United States is making protestations about treating everyone alike but is barring the yellow man from its shores.

Also attached to the Charter of the United Nations we find the signatures of the representatives of Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia.

Mr. President, I well remember when the President of Liberia spoke in this very Chamber—a black man who was invited by the Senate of the United States to speak here. Before he spoke in this Chamber various Senators left the room. Of course, they had a perfect right to do so; but that was before we adopted the Charter of the United Nations. That would never have happened if the President of Liberia had come here after we adopted the Charter of the United Nations because after we adopted that Charter we were all brothers and sisters together—the black man, the red man, the yellow man, and the white man; and under the United Nations Charter we would go shopping together in downtown Washington, and we would go into the restaurants together, because under the United Nations Charter we all agreed, all over the world, that never again would there be any discrimination because of race, color, creed, or language. The newspapers said it was a new event in the annals of democracy, and that at last we were going to have peace—that for years and years and years we would have peace.

Mr. President, I did not vote for the United Nations Charter, but I am for it today. I announced the day it was adopted that it would never work with the veto power in it; that if it were to work, the veto power would have to be taken from it. But within a half hour, yes, within 15 minutes after it had been ratified, I said I would vote to implement it, I would do all I could to support it. When I opposed it I said that, so long as the veto power remained in it, it meant not peace but perpetual war. I was overruled. I had made speeches before on the subject of discrimination because of race or creed, and because persons were Indians, Mexicans, or Negroes, but the paragraph prohibiting discrimination was one paragraph I liked.

If the Charter had not contained the veto power, if it had not meant perpetual war, and if one or two other objections I made at that time had been properly

met, I might have supported it. But I felt sure of one thing, as the yeas and nays were recorded, that for all time, all over the world, discrimination because of race or language or creed or sex would be wiped out forever and ever. I repeat, I cannot see how a man who voted for the United Nations Charter can vote against my amendment.

Senators need not rely upon my poor words to bring home to them these truths. The President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training, President Truman's own commission, filed a report on the program for national security, under date of May 29, 1947.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses tonight it be until next Monday, June 7, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. LANGER. In the report of the President's Advisory Commission it is said that a program of universal military training "must provide equality of privilege and opportunity for all those upon whom this obligation rests. Neither in the training itself, nor in the organization of any phase of this program, should there be discrimination for or against any person or group because of his race, class, national origin, or religion."

Delegates to the Democratic National Convention held 4 years ago, coming from every State in the Union, nominated candidates for President and Vice President. They did not like Mr. Wallace. Mr. Truman was nominated. As I remember, Mr. Truman received every single vote except the votes of two States. His nomination was practically by unanimous vote of the convention.

When the Democrats nominated Mr. Truman they knew there was only one heartbeat between the Vice President and the President of this country, under our Constitution. Mr. Truman was selected by the Democratic Convention. I had nothing to do with it, the Republican Party had nothing to do with it. The Democrats, with more than 1,000 delegates in their convention, said that of 143,000,000 people Harry S. Truman was the man they wanted for Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Truman, the man selected by the Democrats, appointed the Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training. It was his own committee. In its report, dated May 29, 1947, it says:

> Neither in the training itself, nor in the organization of any phase of this program (for national security), should there be discrimination for or against any person or group because of his race, class, national origin, or religion. Segregation or special privilege in any form should have no place in the program. To permit them would nullify the important living lesson in citizenship which such training can give.

The report is the one made by the commission appointed by President Truman, who was himself selected by all the leading Democrats of America. Among those delegates were scores of Senators, some of whom are still upon this floor. The report continues:

> Nothing could be more tragic for the future attitude of our people, and for the unity of our Nation, than a program in which our Federal Government forced our young manhood to live for a period of time in an atmosphere which emphasized or bred class or racial differences.

Mr. President, in view of the position of the President, and in view of the report of his Commission on Universal Military Training, let no one suppose that the amendments I offer are unnecessary. The military men I have described this afternoon, the men who the Army and Navy Bulletin says are running America today, may have something to say about how the Army and the Navy are run, but this is exactly how it is done: It is done by the generals and the admirals and the secretaries, who are quick to mouth the pious expressions about keeping the services free of discrimination; but unfortunately the facts are otherwise. It is likewise a fact that uniformed men are subjected to mistreatment in places of public accommodation and in public conveyances because of their color. I shall read certain excerpts from the report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights:

> Yet the record shows that the members of several minorities, fighting and dying for the survival of the Nation in which they met bitter prejudice, found that there was discrimination against them even as they fell in battle. Prejudice in any area is an ugly, undemocratic phenomenon; in the armed services, where all men run the risk of death, it is particularly repugnant.
>
> All of the armed forces have recently adopted policies which set as explicit objectives the achievement of equality of opportunity.
>
> However, despite the lessons of the war and the recent announcement of these policies, the records of the military forces disclose many areas in which there is a great need for further remedial action. Although generally speaking, the basis of recruitment has been somewhat broadened, Negroes, for example, are faced by an absolute bar against enlistment in any branch of the Marine Corps other than the steward's branch, and the Army cleaves to a ceiling for Negro personnel of about 10 percent of the total strength of the service.

Mr. President, that might have been all right up to the 28th day of July 1945, but on that day the Senate voted to ratify the United Nations Charter. Everything was to be changed. Of course we know today that a Negro cannot advance, even in the postal service, or in any other place in which there is money to be handled. But that was all to be changed. On the 28th day of July, when the Senate voted for the United Nations Charter, we announced to the world that, regardless of race, color, creed, sex, or language, we were all going to be loving sisters and brothers, and the United States would set an example for all the world. What has taken place? The President's own commission says that Negroes, for example, are faced by an absolute bar against enlistment in any branch of the service except the stewards' branch. The report further says that while the number of Negro officers is infinitesimally small, while there is one white officer for approximately every seven white men. In the Navy there are only two Negro officers, or a ratio of less than 1 to 10,000 Negro enlisted men. There are 58,571 white officers, or 1 for every 7 enlisted whites.

Under the United Nations Charter, Mr. President, we were going to wipe out discrimination in the theaters in Washington and in the Mayflower Hotel, or any other hotel, because we were wiping out all distinction because of race, color, language, or sex. But we find that 3 years later the President's commission says that in the Navy there are only 2 Negro officers, or a ratio of less than 1 to 10,000 Negro enlisted men, and there are 58,571 white officers, or 1 for every 7 enlisted whites.

With respect to the Marine Corps, Mr. President, the commission reports that there are 7,798 officers. How many of them are Negroes?

I ask any Senator upon the floor how many of the 7,798 officers in the Marine Corps are Negroes. The answer is, Not one. If any Senator upon the floor thinks that the Senator from North Dakota will stand idly by and see such discrimination perpetuated, he is making the mistake of his life. We do not raise that kind of people in North Dakota, Mr. President. It happens that I am a native son of North Dakota. The adoption of the United Nations Charter either meant something, or it meant nothing. The sooner we find that it meant nothing, the better it will be for the United States of America. Only a short time ago we appropriated $67,100,000 for buildings for the United Nations. Are the very men who voted for the United Nations Charter going to sit idly by and vote against my amendment, which provides that Negroes, Indians, Mexicans, Chinese, and Japanese citizens shall be entitled to have their share of officers in the Marine Corps, who number 7,798?

O Mr. President, I have seen sneers upon the faces of some of the men to whom I have talked about this matter. They know everything about it! But I say that the United Nations Charter was a great document. While I did not agree, and said I would never agree unless the veto power were eliminated, nevertheless, I repeat, 50 minutes after I voted against it I said I would vote to implement it, that I would do all I could to support it. I say in all sincerity and honesty that when the United Nations Charter said there was to be a great world brotherhood, I was firmly convinced, as I am firmly convinced today, that so far as that paragraph, drawn up by the representatives of the nations in San Francisco, was concerned, they drew it up in answer to a prayer, a prayer of American men and women, a prayer, I believe, of all the common people all over this earth.

Does anyone think I am going to sit in the Senate without protest when there are 7,798 officers in the Marine Corps and not a single race represented except the white race?

I repeat, anyone who thinks I am going to do so is entirely misjudging the Senator from North Dakota.

I read again, Mr. President, from the report of President Truman's commission. It says:

Out of 2,981 Coast Guard officers there is 1 Negro.

Mind you, out of 2,981 Coast Guard officers there is 1 Negro, but there are 910 Negro enlisted men.

The ratio of white Coast Guard commissioned to enlisted personnel is approximately 1 to 6.

I wish to repeat, the Democrats chose Mr. Truman. I had nothing to do with it. They said that out of 143,000,000 population, or whatever the population was when they met, roughly, 4 years ago, President Truman was the one man for Vice President of the United States of America. Among those selecting him there were many Senators who are on the floor at this time. They chose him; I did not select him. President Truman named this commission. No Negro selected the commission, no Japanese or Chinese selected it. The Democrats' own Vice President—and I repeat, when they elected him, they knew there was only one heartbeat between him and the Presidency—President Truman, named the men who made this report. Therefore I say it must be accurate, and it says that out of 58,571 white officers in the Army, the ratio is 1 out of every 7, and there are only 2 Negro officers, or a ratio of less than 1 to 10,000.

The commission appointed by President Truman says that in the Marine Corps out of 7,798 officers not a single one is a Negro. The same commission says that out of 2,981 Coast Guard officers there is just 1 Negro.

Mr. President, that is the cold-blooded record. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record," and here it is. It could not be any better, so far as accuracy is concerned, because President Truman's own commission made the investigation and submitted the report.

I read further:

Similarly, in the enlisted grades, there is an exceedingly high concentration of Negroes in the lowest ratings, particularly in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

Listen to this:

Almost 80 percent of the Negro sailors are serving as cooks, stewards, and steward's mates. Less than 2 percent of the whites are assigned to duty in the same capacity.

Mr. President, the following is from page 42 of President's Truman's commission's report.

Almost 15 percent of all white enlisted marines are in the three highest grades; less than 2½ percent of the Negro marines fall in the same category. The disparities in the Coast Guard are similarly great. The difference in the Army is somewhat smaller, but still significant: Less than 9 percent of the Negro personnel are in the first three grades, while almost 16 percent of the whites hold these ranks.

The report continues:

Some of our servicemen are all too often treated with rudeness and discourtesy by civil authorities and the public. There are numerous instances in which they have been forced to move to segregated cars on public carriers.

Mr. President, that is what I am trying to stop by my amendment.

They have been denied access to places of public accommodation and recreation.

That is what I am trying to stop by my amendment.

When they attempt to assert their rights, they are sometimes met with threats and even outright attack. Federal officials find they have no present authority to intervene directly to protect men in uniform against such abuses.

Who says that, Mr. President? Not WILLIAM LANGER, Senator from North Dakota. This is quoted from the report of the Commission appointed by President Truman, the man named for Vice President at the last Democratic National Convention by almost unanimous vote. I did not pick him, but some of the Senators upon this floor helped to pick him. I am for the report of his Commission. I believe in it, and want to support it. Whether or not others do so will be shown by their votes on the amendment.

The report continues:

The armed forces, in actual practice, still maintain many barriers to equal treatment for all their members. In many cases State and local agencies and private persons disregard the dignity of the uniform * * *. Morally, the failure to act is indefensible. Practically, it cost lives and money in the inefficient use of human resources. Perhaps most important of all—

The report continues—

we are not making use of one of the most effective techniques for educating the public to the practicability of American ideals as a way of life.

Have these recommendations of the distinguished Commissioners appointed by the President been heeded by the leaders of our armed forces? I believe the evidence is clear and convincing—I would say indisputably convincing—that they have not. Only in February of this year the Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, made it clear that his Department still stood for racial segregation. In his letter to the Governor of New Jersey dated February 7, 1948, Kenneth Royall, Secretary of the Army, said that after "full consideration" he and the military staff have decided that the regulations of the War Department requiring segregation "would be continued in force for the Regular Army, and subject to the exception noted below, would also be effective for federally recognized components of the Army."

The exception made was for the National Guard of New Jersey, which was required, by a recent revision of the New Jersey Constitution, to be free from segregation.

Mr. President, the choice is clear. If the Senate adopts my amendments it will serve notice to the world that it seeks to build an army for peace and security in a society of freedom and brotherhood. Let it vote down my amendments, and it demonstrates to the world that our conscription is a fraud and a sham, designed not to protect freedom and democracy, but to blight our liberties and to infect our youth with the virus of militarism.

Mr. President, I return to the report made by the 24 distinguished citizens whose names I read to the Senate a little while ago, men like Ray Lyman Wilbur, ex-Secretary of the Interior and former chancellor of Stanford University. I repeat that these 24 outstanding citizens of the United States say that the Congress is not running this country and running foreign affairs. They quote the Army and Navy Bulletin of January 18, 1947. This is what the Army and Navy Bulletin says about it:

Today the Army has virtual control of foreign affairs, commencing on the home front with General Marshall as Secretary of State, and his Assistant Secretary of State (for occupied areas), Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, who directs the military commanders controlling our foreign policy in occupied Europe and Asia. The chain of control in diplomatic hot spots, both in the execution of basic policy and in the formulation of ad hoc arrangements, lies almost totally in the hands of the military authorities.

But they say more than that. These 24 outstanding citizens continue on page 7 of the pamphlet as follows:

In addition to this penetration of the State Department, the National War College is attempting, wrote Hanson Baldwin, in the December 18, 1946, New York Times, "to unify under one roof not only an academy for the higher study of war, but an institution to integrate, examine, analyze, and study various aspects of the problems of national power and foreign policy. The integration of military with foreign policy is one of its primary interests."

Bernard Brodie, who has been a resident civilian member of the War College Faculty, and who generally espouses the Army's point of view, is the author of studies on the atom bomb, universal military training, and so forth, for the Legislative Bureau of the Library of Congress.

These 24 distinguished citizens proceed to the next chapter, Military Influence in the United Nations, and I ask unanimous consent that that chapter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY INFLUENCE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Military influence has been extended to the United Nations. For example, Warren Austin, the UN delegate who was the military's enthusiastic supporter while in Congress, has as his deputy representative on the United States Atomic Energy Commission Frederick Osborn, a former major general in the Army. Ralph A. Bard, former Under Secretary of the Navy, is the deputy representative on the UN Commission for Conventional Armaments. The State Department's Director of United Nations Affairs is Col. Dean Rusk. The New York Times of May 7, 1947, stated that two of the three advisers to the "American atomic delegation to the United Nations" are military men, Maj. Gen. Leslie Groves, and Maj. Gen. Thomas Farrell. Col. Kenneth Nichols, West Point engineering professor, was also added to the American staff.

Although the State Department is largely controlled by the military men, War Department officials have not always consulted their colleagues on foreign problems. The New York Times of August 7, 1947, described a speech by Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of War, which in discussing foreign policy was at variance with a State Department proposal and caused the United States some embarrassment. The Times said, "The State Department's dilemma goes further than a mere difference of opinion between itself and the War Department which happened frequently since the military got the upper hand in the conduct of foreign relations after the outbreak of war."

Since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947 which was supposed to unify

the armed services, the military departments directly through the National Security Council are directed to "advise the President with respect to the integration of foreign and military policies and to enable the military services and other agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively."

The conduct of foreign policy by military men leaves much to be desired. For one thing, General Marshall conducts his foreign policy as a soldier would do in dealing with an enemy. The New York Times of April 30, 1947, described Marshall's conduct at the Moscow conference as follows:

"In the entire 6 weeks of the Moscow conference, however, General Marshall apparently did not unbend. He was as rigid as the Washington Monument * * * though there were many outstanding questions between the United States and Russia and the United States and Britain, he apparently made no effort to talk out these problems."

The New York Times called "probably without precedent" General Marshall's instructions of military precautions at a diplomatic conference, the Moscow conference of foreign ministers. The Times said that the instructions were printed and stated, "It must be assumed that there is no security outside the office and rooms of Spasso House and the Chancery." The Times added, "A detachment of United States Army military police, working in shifts, is standing 24-hour duty outside Ambassador Walter Bedell Smith's home." The Times of March 30 pointed out that General Marshall slept with a pistol by his bed while in the American Embassy at Moscow. Since all of this information was available to the press it could not have failed to have an impact on Russia and other countries.

Military men also use military missions as a technique of foreign policy, believing that the subtle threat of military force will win friends and influence people. The New York Times of June 4, 1947 reported that "Secretary of State Marshall urged Congress today to grant discretionary authority to the President to send military missions, consonant with American interests, to any country that asked for them. As the spokesman for the War and Navy Departments as well as the State Department he told the House Armed Services Committee that either this country would send missions or else 'some other countries would'."

William D. Pawley, United States Ambassador to Brazil, drew attention to our reliance on military means to achieve the political aims of our foreign policy, when on August 6, 1947, at Rio de Janeiro, he stated that the most important step the United States could take to improve relations with other American states would be "to establish large and efficient Army and Navy missions" in Latin-American nations.

The influence which the military idea has in the President's thinking was apparent with his announcement on March 28, 1946, of a proposal for a council of elder statesmen on problems of national security. The elder statesmen under the President's proposal would be the 10 top-ranking World War II leaders of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

Without interference from the President, military leaders have been making and influencing foreign policy. They urged publicly that the United States keep the former Japanese islands in the Pacific.

They have without rebuke suggested that we abandon our historic policy to become an aggressor Nation. The New York Times of November 21, 1946, carried the following item: "General Eaker predicted that the next war would be a short war of unparalleled destruction, that the first blows would be struck through the air, and that to prevent destruction of this country in event of such an attack, we must strike the enemy first."

Military spokesmen have even discussed the possibilities of war with Russia in particular. Sometimes it is with a note of regret such as Eisenhower's statement in the November 16, 1945, New York Herald Tribune that "There is no point in blinking the fact that we have war with Russia on our minds, or to put it more correctly we have fear of war with Russia in our hearts * * *." At other times, as in Gen. H. H. Arnold's address on December 6, 1945, to the National Press Club, it is a prediction as to the geographical area in which a war will take place, "in the area of the North Pole." Gen. Mark Clark at Fort Lewis, Wash., addressed his troops saying, "We are not able to see eye to eye with Soviet forces" and according to Robert Allen in the September 6, 1947, Collier's, "demanded a tough policy in dealing with them."

In this connection Reinhold Neibuhr's comment in the June 25, 1945, Christian Century is pertinent: "It is well known that American strategists, both military and naval, have considered a possible war with Russia as one of the eventualities for which they must prepare. It is the business of military strategists to prepare for all eventualities and it is the fatal error of such strategists to create the eventualities for which they must prepare."

The Army's approach to foreign policy is graphically presented in a recent recruiting booklet This Is Your New Regular Army. It is full of statements like the following: "Peace treaties are only as strong as the men who back them up." "Army garrisons are to be found on almost every continent, in Equatorial and Arctic zones, on islands, and in foreign cities." "America has understood the necessity of a compact and highly trained group of men. That is the way we are going to insure the peace." "America must keep strategically located overseas garrisons if the peace is to be guarded properly."

The climax of the Army recruiting booklet is seen in the following: "You and your country are determined that no other nation or group of people will ever again prepare for war."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now come to page 10, on which these 24 distinguished citizens have a chapter entitled "Military Action Influences Foreign Policy." I say as much as I do concerning foreign policy because the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in making his report yesterday, said at page 6999:

The responsibilities which our position in the world today has pressed on our country—and whether or not we accept them willingly, we cannot avoid them—call for commitments of our armed forces on every continent except Australia.

So we are going to have these soldiers everywhere in the world except Australia. Therefore, what these 24 citizens say about military action influencing the foreign policy becomes important. We are going to take farmers' sons and put them in every country except Australia; and I might say that the distinguished Senator goes further. He not only is going to have them on every continent except Australia, but he is going to have them at every place from which the United States might be attacked. He said yesterday:

We must at all costs be able to prevent an enemy from establishing himself in positions from which he could attack us at will.

We only have to remember some of the speeches of the late President Roosevelt to know that they could attack us from the North Pole, from Africa, from almost any part of the world. So the foreign policy becomes important. We want to know where these 425,000 farm and city boys from 18 or 19 to 25 years of age are going to be sent. In the last war a number of my friends' sons were placed for months and months in Iceland. Strangely enough, the boys on returning said the Army did not take farm boys from North and South Dakota but took some of the boys from down South and placed them for service in Iceland. Some time ago, in company with other Senators I went to Alaska to investigate the Alaskan Highway. When I got to Juneau, Alaska, I found that there was a very sensible school board. They had found from experience in Alaska that when they hired a teacher who was not from the middle Northwest, that teacher had to be absent a great deal because of illness. If one goes to Juneau, Alaska, today, he will find that practically all the school teachers are hired from the Northwest. They are hiring boys and girls from Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Montana. But lo and behold, when I went up there with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the late Senator Scrugham to investigate the highway, what did we find? Hundreds of Negroes from the South had been brought in, men who were totally unused to cold weather. They were sent out into temperatures of 40 or 50 below zero, to clear out trees and work on the road. The result was that there was a great deal of illness. After they had been there for several months, they were released and sent back.

To return to the chapter headed "Military action influences foreign policy," these 24 distinguished citizens say:

Military men not only make political policy by their attitude and their statements, as in the foregoing, but also by actual military activity. For example, although the United States had in 1944, through the Secretary of State, stated that colonial powers should prepare for the liberation of colonies—

Mind you, the Secretary of State had announced this—

the Combined Chiefs of Staff, composed of British and American officers, asked Britain to send forces to the Dutch East Indies to help remove Japanese troops after Japan's surrender. However, this was at the same time the natives were revolting against Dutch rule. The sending of British troops not only resulted in the rounding up of Japanese soldiers, but also helped preserve the colonial status of the Indies.

When the United States freed the Philippines we reserved the right to use military, naval, and air bases there. The War Department is maintaining and improving bases on British territory in Jamaica, Trinidad, Antigua, Bermuda, St. Lucia, British Guiana, and Newfoundland. We are maintaining or seeking bases in other nations, such as in Iceland, Canadian, and Danish territory, in Labrador, Greenland, and Baffin Island, in Brazil, and until recently in Panama outside the Canal Zone.

We have soldiers in so many places that the average taxpayer does not know where the countries are located.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from South Dakota, told us yesterday that he was for this bill. He said:

The responsibilities which our position in the world of today has thrust on our country—and whether or not we accept them willingly, we cannot avoid them—call for

commitments of our armed forces on every continent except Australia.

We are going to send them all over the world—to Ethiopia, China, Asia, and Labrador. We are going to send them to Haiti and to the Dominican Republic. Indeed, it is said that we are going to send them every place from whence the United States of America might be attacked. Let me read what the Senator from South Dakota said, so that there can be no possible doubt about it. I read from page 6999 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday:

We must at all costs be able to prevent an enemy from establishing himself in positions from which he could attack us at will, and at the same time we must be able to secure for ourselves those bases from which we can retaliate against his aggression if we are to have any hope of stopping it.

As I have already read, the Senator from South Dakota said:

The responsibilities which our position in the world of today has pressed on our country—and whether or not we accept them willingly, we cannot avoid them—call for commitments of our armed forces on every continent except Australia.

So a young farm boy going into the new army of 435,000 goes in with the assurance that he is going to be sent somewhere in the world. He may be sent anywhere in the world except Australia. He knows that he is not going to Australia. He does not know where else he may be going. He may go to the North Pole or the South Pole. He may go to Asiatic or European Russia. He may go to Pakistan. He may go anywhere, but he knows that he cannot go to Australia. That is the one place from which he is barred.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from North Dakota realizes that many committee meetings are in progress, and conferences must be held this evening, especially the conference on the civil-functions bill, starting at 7 o'clock. Senators wish to get their dinners. Will the Senator yield soon for a motion to recess?

Mr. LANGER. I will yield now. I am delighted to accommodate my friend.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1641. An act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Air Force, Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 4, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Air Force, Regular Navy, and Marine Corps, and in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next, in accordance with the unanimous-consent order previously entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 7, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Tracy S. Voorhees, of New York, to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Army.

IN THE ARMY

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be lieutenant colonel

Howard W. K. Zellhoefer, MC, O233474.

To be majors

Charles T. Brown, MC, O301813.
Paul V. Davis, MC, O1685365.
Horace W. Doty, Jr., MC, O212407.
William W. Franklin, DC, O272330.
Vance H. Marchbanks, Jr., MC, O379380.
Harry Spitz, MC, O209984.
James C. Vanneter, MC, O247042.

To be captains

Jesse F. Brown, MC, O1747307.
Roy E. Clausen, Jr., MC, O1786358.
Oscar K. Diamond, MC, O402602.
George J. Hayes, MC, O1725182.
John J. Kavanagh, MC, O542867.
Julien C. Kennedy, MC, O392610.
James W. Lassiter, MC, O469672.
Charles S. Lueth, MC, O1725172.
Richard L. Martin, MC, O1747313.
Melvin T. Pennell, MC, O414939.
Earl S. Smith, DC, O1775014.
William C. Strong, DC, O1746019.
Henry Thompson, Jr., MC, O539345.
Norman A. Twigger, MC, O1725493.

To be first lieutenants

Charles F. Althaus, MC, O936899.
Francis E. Barry, MC, O1705683.
John R. Black, MC, O1786936.
Ralph W. Clemments, MC, O1718624.
Millard E. DeYoung, DC, O1756583.
Charles C. Dugan, MC, O490998.
Cloyce L. Duncan, MC, O935981.
William F. Enos, Jr., MC, O1705088.
James D. Green, MC, O1756385.
Harry M. Henderson, Jr., MC, O1776460.
Frank F. Marsh, MC, O1714764.
Marion E. McDowell, MC, O1765012.
William A. Moore, MC, O1786509.
Thomas M. O'Grady, MC, O1717760.
Edmond Scavone, MC, O1725570.
Martin J. Schumacher, MC, O1755987.
David G. Simons, MC, O1726132.
Harry F. Sproat, MC, O935706.
Richard J. Sullivan, DC, O1746777.
Clarence G. Sutherland, MC, O1735210.
George C. Walter, MC, O1786575.
Gordon T. Wannamaker, MC, O1736519.
William H. Westbrook, MC, O1776236.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit of God, be with us and inspire us to set our affections on the dateless and spaceless things of Thy everlasting kingdom. Guide our lives that they may be honest in the dark as in the light, as good in obscurity as in publicity, and as faithful when alone as when the world is looking on.

To Thee, who art the captain of our salvation, we pray that our country may be freed from the blinding power of selfish and ignorant men and from any works of disloyalty to our Government. Shame upon those who enjoy the fruits of the American tree of life and yet are disloyal to our Republic. Lord God of hosts, lead us on in the splendor of a mighty Union, and thus we shall fulfill our high destiny. In the name of Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University; and

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CAIN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. GREEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints

Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. CHAVEZ to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6407. An act to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social security coverage.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials eulogizing the record of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], chairman of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

JAMES I. MATHEWS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday when the Private Calendar was called the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] and I objected to the bill (H. R. 2508) for the relief of James I. Mathews. I am authorized by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] to withdraw his objection. I withdraw my objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and an editorial.

THE NATIONAL DEBT AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand daily statement of the United States Treasury for June 1, and I find that we are in the red $252,010,542,297.51. That is a greater national debt than all the Marshall-plan countries, and yet we are asked today to appropriate to these Marshall-plan countries over $6,000,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to put them on their feet, as it were.

Now, do not overlook the fact that in 1945 we gave Britain $4,400,000,000 to do the job in 5 years, and, by the way, they spent all this amount in 19½ months. Now, today we are giving Great Britain over a billion dollars more. Personally, I cannot see the sense in granting these gifts. It would be bad enough to give them a loan and to think that would relieve our taxpayers of the amount of money we would have to borrow to make the loan. But, no; it is not a loan; it is a gift. I am sure the people of Britain must think we are the greatest suckers that ever were in the stream, and easy to catch.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me call to your attention and to the attention of the Members of the House an article in the United States News and World Report for June 4. This is what it says relative to London:

Potato rationing was lifted recently, and milk is more abundant. Fresh fruits and vegetables are a little easier to get, and crops look good. Clothing, especially the cheaper kind, is suddenly more plentiful. Just now there are surpluses in several kinds of clothing, including children's shoes.

The article goes on to state jobs in Britain are more plentiful than ever before. There are 20,000,000 persons working, and only 300,000 unemployed. This compares with the prewar number of 1939, when 18,500,000 had jobs and 1,500,000 were unemployed. Production is rising steadily and is 25 percent above the 1946 rate. There is one fly in the ointment, and that is each British worker now, on the average, is producing from 10 to 13 percent less per hour than he did in prewar 1937. That is because they are socialized, and we keep that Government in power.

Now, let us go on and see what they are doing down in Italy. Here is the report from Rome:

More food is becoming available, now that the spring garden crops are coming to market. Food carts often have surpluses on hand at the end of the day; something that never used to happen to Italians.

Then let us go over to Brussels:

There are all sorts of shiny new cars. Businessmen from all over the world fill hotels. Signs of prosperity are everywhere. Belgian shops are well stocked with goods.

Now let us ride into Warsaw, Poland:

The Polish food situation is greatly improved, and now probably is one of the best in Europe.

Then to Stockholm. The article says food is plentiful there. Then down to Berlin, and the situation there is not so inviting, because Russia has one slice of Germany, the United States, England, and France another, and the German people are not allowed to put their program into effect. The old Morgenthau plan did more to retard progress than anything I know of.

I suggest that you take the United States News and read it. Then get the information as to the amount of business being done in these countries and you will find the situation is not nearly as bad as some radio commentators and newspapers would have us believe, especially those people who are more interested in having us help the people in foreign countries than our own people. Have you looked out on the Capitol steps this morning? Thousands of Townsendites there, asking the American people to give them a little help. It is high time we helped the elderly and aged in our own country instead of sending it all to Europe. It seems to me it is time to stop wasting American dollars. If the Members of Congress do not wake up and give some consideration to our own people rather than first consideration to Europe, my guess is there will be some faces among us missing in November. When the time comes that I am called upon to neglect the people in my district in order to look after our former enemies in World War II, then I do not wish to remain in Washington. Who won this war? You would think we lost it, the way we are paying every country in the world instead of looking after our own people who need assistance. Furthermore, all our people have more taxes than they can stand. It is time to take an inventory at home, and stop, look, and listen before we pass this ERP appropriation bill today. Cut it down and it will not hurt anybody to do so, and it will help the American people a great deal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 624 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table; that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, disagreed to by the House; that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the said bill be, and hereby is, agreed to by the House; and that the Speaker shall immediately appoint conferees without intervening motion.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield some time to this side?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 91]

Abbitt	Harness, Ind.	Mundt
Anderson, Calif.	Hart	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Hartley	O'Brien
Barden	Hébert	O'Hara
Bates, Ky.	Hedrick	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Heffernan	Owens
Battle	Herter	Patterson
Bell	Holifield	Pfeifer
Boggs, La.	Hope	Ploeser
Buckley	Isacson	Plumley
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Potts
Camp	Jenkins, Pa.	Powell
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ill.	Price, Fla.
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Reed, Ill.
Clason	Johnson, Tex.	Rivers
Clippinger	Kearney	Robertson
Coffin	Kee	Sadowski
Combs	Kefauver	Scoblick
Corbett	Kennedy	Sheppard
Coudert	Keogh	Short
Cox	King	Sikes
Crow	Knutson	Simpson, Ill.
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Smith, Maine
Dingell	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Domengeaux	Lesinski	Smith, Wis.
Dorn	Ludlow	Somers
Durham	Lusk	Stigler
Elliott	McDonough	Stratton
Fernandez	McDowell	Thomas, N. J.
Fuller	Macy	Twyman
Gallagher	Madden	Vail
Gathings	Manasco	Wadsworth
Gore	Marcantonio	West
Grant, Ala.	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Calif.	Whittington
Hale	Mitchell	Wood
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Monroney	Youngblood
Harless, Ariz.	Morrison	
	Morton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 314 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FERTILIZER MATERIALS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the changes in the bill, H. R. 6659, which has just passed, relative to the provision on nitrogenous fertilizer materials for export to nonoccupied areas will be of great benefit to the American farmer in the following ways during the 1948–49 fertilizer year:

First. By requiring that 50 percent of the 1948–49 export program be supplied from Army ordnance production, the amount to be supplied from commercial production in this country will be cut in half or about 30,500 tons of nitrogen. This means that this much more will remain available for domestic use—including American farming—than if the act had not been changed to require a 50-percent contribution from Army production. Thirty thousand five hundred tons of pure nitrogen is equivalent to about 95,000 tons of ammonium nitrate or about 150,000 tons of ammonium sulfate, or about 190,000 tons of sodium nitrate, or about 750,000 tons of a 4-percent nitrogen mixed fertilizer.

Second. By clarifying the authority to issue priorities for anhydrous ammonia needed to make fertilizer for export, the Government will be able to do two things of interest to American farmers. First, the Government will be able to tap sources of anhydrous ammonia which now are making no contribution to fertilizer production or an inadequate contribution. Second, the Government will be able to increase the production of solid materials, the bulk of which goes to fertilizer usages. As a result, this should tend to increase the total supply of fertilizer and to increase the proportion of solid materials. The latter increase would, among other things, correct localized shortages. The former increase, which would benefit American farmers generally, depends upon how anhydrous-ammonia producers handle priority orders for that material.

The House fertilizer amendment prevailed in the conference.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] I said I would yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I see the gentleman from Illinois is now in the Chamber, so I yield 30 minutes to him.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on its face this resolution appears to be very innocent. However, it is a far-reaching resolution. It will deprive the House of voting on some of the very, very important matters in which they are interested.

I must admit it is not unusual when objection has been made to a unanimous-consent request for the consideration of a conference report to obtain a rule to expedite consideration but, in this instance, an effort has been made to instruct the conferees on the provisions relating to soil conservation, school lunches, and the REA.

I know we are trying to get through by June 19. I, for one, have cooperated in every way, with the exception that I have taken a few minutes here and there when it was absolutely necessary. I am not going to take any time today, except to say to you that I do not see how any of you who are interested in soil conservation, which is of great importance to this Nation and to the farmers of this country, can vote for this rule, since the Senate has cut $75,000 from the appropriation, to which the conferees undoubtedly will agree. I feel we owe it to the farmers of our country to conserve our lands. The conservation program was started under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and has been a great blessing, and I feel we should continue in our efforts to preserve our lands. We should bear in mind what occurred in Nebraska, Kansas, and other States as a result of the dust storms.

However, I am particulary interested in the school-lunch provision involved. I know there are many of you who have aided in the past to provide that the poor children in our schools would be able to obtain a warm and nutritious lunch at a decent price.

But unfortunately, though we are going to vote later this afternoon to contribute over $5,000,000,000 to feed the people of Europe, in this instance the Senate has seen fit to reduce the meager appropriation for the school-lunch program.

In view of the high cost of living, the school boards throughout the United States cannot, with the small appropriation, really serve the nutritious lunches the children deserve. And as I said once before, you are interested in land and crops, but with the most valuable crop we have—our youngsters—you are niggardly.

I know that my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is very capable in drafting a short-cut resolution to expedite legislative consideration, and in his manner he usually seems to be able to convince the House that he is right, although he may at times be wrong. But that applies to all of us. I do not maintain that I am right at all times, but I know this resolution provides a short cut, and I know it also deprives the membership of rights and privileges which are theirs under the rules of the House.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, is present and well informed. He appeared before the Rules Committee, but he did not have much of a chance to say very much. In fact, no Democrat nowadays has much opportunity to be heard before that committee, unlike the time when the Democrats were in power, when members of both parties who desired to be heard on any resolution that was of interest to the country, were given an opportunity to be heard. Nowadays, it is only those who favor some of the bills that are brought in here from the various committees that have been approved by the National Republican Committee or the NAM that are heard; but of course such bills have precedence and must go through, regardless of what form or shape they are in, how much harm they do to the country, how detrimental they are to the consumers and to the people in general.

The gentleman from Missouri is thoroughly familiar with the rule, more so than I, because with the speed with which we are going and I cannot really familiarize myself on some legislation as well as I would like or to the extent where

I could give you a factual report that I usually do when I have an opportunity at least to read some of the rules or some of the reports. During the last few days that has been impossible because three, four, and five rules are reported in a day.

I may say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], that he is one of the few who likes to hear the truth. Unfortunately, many of his colleagues do not because they are busy with other matters.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I regret I cannot now. I have paid my compliments to the gentleman, and I think that should suffice. I now want to yield to a gentleman who is thoroughly familiar with all aspects of rural electrification, a Member in whom we have confidence, who will explain the situation as to REA and other matters, and do it in a very intelligent and convincing manner.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Illinois that the chairman of the Rules Committee said he had but one speaker and asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to yield his time.

Mr. SABATH. That being the case I will do so. Is that all the gentleman has?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have just one speaker. I wish the gentleman would yield his time.

Mr. SABATH. Very well, but I wanted to put the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] after that speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time is running.

Mr. SABATH. How does my time stand, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has consumed 10 minutes and has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, while we are paying so much attention here to foreign affairs, why not give a little consideration to domestic affairs? And while we are doing so much for the farmers of nations across the sea why not do a little for the farmers at home?

When the agricultural appropriation bill passed the House and was messaged over, the Senate added enough to the appropriation for soil conservation to bring it up to the budget estimate. It added enough to the school-lunch appropriation to bring it up to the amount spent last year. And it added a comparatively small amount to the Rural Electrification Administration appropriation to administer the added amount we put in for loans. These three items are for the most deserving beneficiaries of all those provided for in the agricultural appropriation bill—the farmers, the school children, and the farm family working early and late with oil lamps and lanterns. Surely while we are spending vast sums for the farmers and children of Europe we can spare this pitiful amount for those of our own household.

It is particularly important that this rule be voted down in order to give us the opportunity to instruct conferees to agree to these three sadly needed increases in the Senate amendments.

It is our last chance to get them because these amendments were put in by the Senate over the protest of the members of the Senate committee. And if the bill is forcibly taken from the Speaker's table and sent to conference without allowing us to vote on the amendments, the Senate conferees will immediately disregard the action of the Senate and take these amendments out and the farmers and school children and kerosene lamps will be abandoned. There will be nothing in the conference report for them and as we are near the end of the session we will have to vote the conference up or down without opportunity to get a vote on these three items. Our soil will continue to erode, children will continue to go without a warm noonday lunch, and lamps and lanterns will continue to light the work table of the farm wife at night and she will still have to milk and wash and iron without electricity to lighten her burden.

It is a very simple proposition. All we ask here this morning is to be allowed to vote on these three items. This resolution takes away from us the right to vote on them and sends this bill to conference, where we know in advance that both the House and Senate conferees are opposed to them. They do not have to tell us how they stand on these three amendments. All majority members of both the House and Senate committees have already voted against three increases. A majority of the Members of the House are for these three items and a majority of the Members of the Senate are for them. But the House and Senate committees are against them and have opposed them from the first. To vote for this resolution is to vote to send soil conservation, school lunch, and REA to certain execution.

Surely the House is entitled to a vote on these three vital amendments. For more than a week we have been trying to get the committee to call up the bill and send it to conference. That would have given us an opportunity to move to instruct conferees on the three items and would afford the Members of the House an opportunity to vote on them. That is all we ask. And that is what the committee is trying to avoid.

Several days ago the bill was called up and conference was agreed to, but when we offered the motion to instruct the bill was withdrawn.

Now they come in with this drastic rule, which nullifies the conference rules of the House which have been in effect for 150 years.

The inconsistency of the committee is shown by a comparison of this rule with the other rule reported out simultaneously this morning. The rule reported this morning to make in order all provisions of the foreign aid bill makes it possible for the House to vote on many items on which it would otherwise be prevented from voting.

If the rule was not adopted, the House could not vote on them. But this rule makes it impossible to vote on items in the agricultural appropriation bill.

One of these rules is wrong. Either we should be allowed to vote on all items in both bills or we should not be permitted to vote on such items in either bill. In keeping with the principles of democracy in Government, and in the interest of the American farmer and the children of the Nation, we should be allowed to vote on all of them.

That course would also expedite the proceedings of the House. But for this refusal to permit a vote on these items, we could have sent this bill to conference a week ago.

If the rule to send the bill to conference without permitting a vote on the amendments is voted down, we will offer the following motion:

Mr. CANNON moves to instruct the managers on the part of the House to agree in conference to Senate amendment No. 33, increasing the authorization for the 1949 program for soil conservation from $225,000,000 to $300,000,000.

Also to agree in conference to Senate amendment No. 36, increasing the amount for the National School Lunch Act from $65,000,000 to $75,000,000.

Also to agree in conference to Senate amendment No. 40, increasing the amount for administration expenses under the Rural Electrification Act from $5,000,000 to $5,450,000.

The proposition in the first item is to increase the appropriation for soil conservation from $225,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949 to $300,000,000 the original budget estimate. Our arable land is being depleted and washed away at an alarming rate. Millions of acres of our most productive soil have already been eroded beyond all hope of redemption. Our farmers have not been able to cope with this situation unaided. Through governmental cooperation they are slowly preserving and reclaiming this important natural resource but they need the full amount of the estimate. This $75,000,000 which the Senate has added to bring the amount up to standard is a comparatively small amount to invest in preserving our soil—not only for our farmers but in order to have food for our rapidly increasing population. It is as important to the consumer as it is to the producer.

This is our last chance to get a vote on soil conservation. If we do not vote on it now it will not be incorporated in the conference report and no separate vote will be allowed.

There is not a farmer in America who does not want ample provision for soil conservation. There is not a farm journal or a farm organization in America that does not favor the full appropriation. And yet it is to be eliminated without permitting us a chance to vote on it.

The school-lunch program is the second item. For the last 2 years we have appropriated $65,000,000 and in both years the amount was inadequate and it was necessary to supplement the $65,000,000 with deficiency appropriations. This year we are allowed only the first $65,000,000 with no deficiency supplements.

All evidence before the committee in the last 3 years is that the school lunch program not only results in improved health and increased weight—even in children from the better homes—but

that it has invariably resulted in higher scholarship and improved discipline.

To deny sufficient money for this program means that some children must go hungry and others suffer in health. Surely while we are supplying much larger appropriations to feed European children we can spare the comparatively small amount carried in the Senate amendment for American children. At least we should have an opportunity to vote on it.

The last proposition is to provide sufficient money to administer the increased amount provided in the pending bill and the deficiency appropriation bill for REA loans. As you will recall, the House increased the amount recommended by the committee for REA loans by $175,000,000 without increasing the amount recommended for administration of the loans. The Bureau of the Budget immediately sent up an estimate of $900,000 to be used in administering the additional funds. The Senate adds an amendment providing only half of the $900,000. Either the additional $175,000,000 cannot be loaned or it must be inadequately serviced unless this money is provided for administration. The Senate amendment provides $450,000 which is half the amount the department considers necessary. Give us an opportunity to vote a little business common sense here by allowing half the minimum needed to get the most out of the money we loan.

These are three of the propositions involved in the motion to send this bill to conference without a vote on the Senate amendments.

Our farmers worked miracles of production during the war. We could not have won without them. But they cannot produce food without soil. They cannot make bricks without straw.

The school children of today are the citizens of tomorrow. We must not stunt their development, either physical, mental, or moral.

And we must banish the oil lamp and the wash tub and the milk stool and emancipate the farm women from dawn-to-dusk drudgery by delivering electricity at the door of every farmhouse at a price the farmer can pay.

The only way to insure this important step in each of these programs is to vote down the rule and instruct conferees to agree to the Senate amendment on the three items.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that if we do not adopt this rule that the House would have an opportunity under the rules of the House to decide for itself what it wants to do in regard to these three matters that the gentleman has named, and by the adoption of this rule we do not hasten the procedure of this House one bit?

Mr. CANNON. We delay it.

Mr. POAGE. We simply take from the Members of the House the right to make the decision for the expenditure of funds for these purposes. Is that not what we will do if we vote for this rule?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Texas is correct. This is the first, last, and only chance we will have to vote soil conservation for the farmers, school-lunch programs for the children, and REA for the farm family.

We should vote down the gag rule and then vote on these three amendments on their merits.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN.]

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House of Representatives will not be deceived into voting for this resolution without realizing its full import; without considering that its adoption will constitute a denial to the Members of the House of their final opportunity during this Congress to cast a vote in favor of three important agricultural measures—the school-lunch program, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the soil-conservation program.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The Seventy-ninth Congress, by a large majority, enacted a law authorizing an annual appropriation for the school-lunch program. In this Congress the House of Representatives voted an appropriation of $65,000,000 for this meritorious program. The other body increased it to $75,000,000, and this resolution would deny the House an opportunity to vote on that increase of appropriations for this program that provides for the use of surplus farm products to assure a wholesome, nutritious, balanced diet to the boys and girls in the schools of America, to help build strong, sturdy bodies that will enable them to meet the problems and fight the battles of life.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The House of Representatives voted an increase of $175,000,000 for the Rural Electrification Administration but voted no funds with which that additional appropriation could be administered. The other body has provided such a fund in the amount of $450,000 for the administration of the additional fund appropriated by the House for the extension of REA lines into rural districts badly in need of electric service. The REA has been of inestimable benefit to rural America There had never been any effort to extend the benefits of electricity to remote sections of the country until the first administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the first hearing on this subject was held. We considered and reported the bill and it was promptly enacted into law. We have continued year after year to make appropriations for the extension of electric lines into new territory. The service has penetrated the darkest corners of America. It has lightened the back-breaking burdens of the housewives in hundreds of thousands of farm homes. It has given electric light to millions of children who otherwise would have had to study their lessons by coal oil lamps. It is obvious that the adoption of this resolution would mean the defeat of the increase which this body has already voted to the REA appropriation, in which the other body did not concur. Those of us who have supported REA in every step of its progress for the benefit of rural America should vote against this resolution. We are determined to carry on the fight for the extension of REA until the comforts and blessings of electricity are carried to every remote rural hamlet and every farm home in America in obedience to the divine command that has come ringing through the ages from creation's dawn when God said: "Let there be light."

SOIL-CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Our greatest natural resource, and the most important material heritage that we can hope to transmit to those who come after us, is our soil. A cardinal characteristic of the American is love of land and love of liberty. When our intrepid forebears, brave men and dauntless women, blazed trails through trackless wilderness, over towering mountains and across pathless plains, armed with the sturdy axe, the trusty rifle and the Holy Bible, to build a cabin home in the wildwood, clear the forest and cultivate the land, they found throughout America the God-given blessing of a rich, fertile, productive soil. A few farmers in early days, far in advance of their time, such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, practiced proper methods of soil conservation, but for the most part, for 150 years, Americans wasted their priceless heritage of soil with wanton prodigality. They let it wash away, down the creek to the river and down the river to the sea.

This Government never recognized the slightest obligation to help conserve this greatest and most invaluable resource of the American people until such action was taken by a Democratic Congress upon the recommendation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. At that time we found that we had permitted our soil to wash away and blow away until 50,000,000 acres of the best land in America had been utterly destroyed and 50,000,000 additional acres were on the verge of absolute destruction. We then began this great constructive program for the conservation and rebuilding of our soil Today there are 1999 soil conservation districts and 1,077,000,000 acres of American soil embraced in this great soil-conservation project. My own State of Kentucky has 91 soil-conservation districts which include 170,800 farms and a total acreage of 18,290,000.

The other body has increased the soil conservation appropriation from $225,000,000 to $300,000,000. Many of us are anxious to vote for that increase for this important and vital program. Soil conservation is the most fundamental aspect of our great agricultural program which has been built up by successive legislative enactments during the past 15 years into what is generally recognized as the most beneficial and successful farm program in the history of the world. If this rule is adopted it will probably mean that this Congress will adjourn without an opportunity for us to cast a vote for that much-needed increase. Scarcely anyone be-

lieves that a conference report will come back here containing that increase for this beneficent purpose.

We ought to vote down this resolution which, if adopted, will deny the membership of the House the opportunity to vote for these increases for school lunches, REA, and soil conservation. This is the last chance we will have before sine die adjournment to vote for these great forward-looking programs for the benefit of the American people. Let us not be deceived by this resolution proposed by the majority party. A vote for it is a vote against school lunches, against rural electrification, and against soil conservation. I hope this resolution will be voted down.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of the American people this day will go down as one of the most important days in the history of the American Congress. The record of today will be read and reread by those boys who fought this last war, which we now seem to have lost, and which communism now seems to have won.

It will be read and reread by the fathers and mothers of those boys who gave their lives in that conflict.

It looks now as if the result of that war was to put communism in charge of two-thirds of the world.

It will be read by those millions of farmers who are interested in rural electrification, in soil conservation, and in the building up of our natural resources. Why do I say that? Because here you are straining at the American gnat and getting ready to swallow the foreign camel.

You are refusing to permit us to vote on these Senate amendments, which amount to a mere drop in the bucket. Yet you tell us that before nightfall you are going to have the House vote to give away, I believe it is five and nine-tenths billion dollars, an average of more than $1,250,000 out of the pockets of the people in every individual county in America, to be sent abroad ostensibly to stop communism in foreign countries, when as a matter of fact, we cannot get a bill passed to drive Communists from our own Federal pay roll.

Communism invaded this Capital 2 days ago when the vanguard of the Internationale insulted the Congress of the United States. They marched down to the White House and insulted the President. They went to the other body and insulted it. They waved the Red flag in the face of a Senate committee; and yet that body has failed to pass the bill to check communism in the United States. Already some of the names I see that are being selected to spend these billions of dollars abroad are on the list of men who have been playing with communism here in the United States.

I wondered where all this propaganda was coming from. I wondered where all this demand for ERP, the so-called Marshall plan, or the Bevin plan, came from.

I wondered when General Marshall became an overnight statesman, after having gone as sound asleep as King Tut and letting the Japs come 5,000 miles and destroy our Navy at Pearl Harbor and kill 3,000 of the finest American boys who ever wore the uniform.

I wondered if he had become a statesman since he went to China and put in 13 months trying to inveigle Chiang Kai-shek into accepting communism.

I wondered if he became a statesman after he kept Gen. George Patton from going into Prague and protecting the people of Czechoslovakia against communism.

I wondered if he had become a statesman immediately after he had ordered General Patton, and other American generals, to move southward from in front of Berlin and turn that city, as well as all eastern Germany, over to the Communist Army of Russia.

I agree with Robert E. Lee when he said that he was opposed to military Presidents or political generals.

You are not selling America down the river with these billions that you are pouring into Europe; you are giving America down the river toward national bankruptcy. Mr. Pettengill says this morning, in a letter that came to your desks, that the debt of the United States of America exceeds the combined national debts of all the other nations of the earth. Does that make any impression on you? Are you going to wait until patriotic Americans arise and demand the election of a Congress that will look out for the American people first?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. TIBBOTT, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITHS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KIRWAN, and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the harangue of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the flowery and entertaining campaign speech of our oratorical friend from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and the usual entertaining Communist speech on the part of our distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I demand that those words be taken down.

Mr. MICHENER. I just made a mistake. I intended to say "anti-Communist speech."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will yield for the gentleman to correct his mistake; but that was an anti-Communist speech, sir.

Mr. MICHENER. I certainly want to correct any mistake I made, because I entertain the same views about communism as are entertained by my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we have specific business before the House. Now that we have heard those three speeches on three different subjects, will it not be proper for us to return to the business of the hour.

What is that business? It is the consideration of House Resolution 624. What does that resolution provide?

First, the House passed the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, H. R. 5883, in the ordinary and usual way. That bill went to the Senate. The Senate attached certain amendments. Under the rules of the House, the Senate reported the bill back to the House, with Senate amendments, and with the request that the House join in a conference between the House and Senate to compose the differences between the two bodies.

Under the House rules, that bill and the request of the Senate lies on the Speaker's table. They can only be taken from the Speaker's table by the unanimous consent of the House, or by a rule. Objection has been made; therefore a rule is necessary if this legislation is to proceed to conclusion and the bill sent to conference. The rules of the House are being meticulously followed, and all this fuss is in opposition to following the rules of the House, taking the bill from the Speaker's table and sending it to the conference, in order that the two bodies may work out, or compose their differences.

This rule provides no refusal of the right of the House to vote. After the conferees report, their report must come back to the House, and it will be on the Speaker's table, just the same as this bill and Senate request is on the Speaker's table. Then, it will be up to the House to determine what action it wants to take on the report of the conferees, and ample opportunity will be given to the House to work its will so far as the bill, the Senate amendments, and the conference is concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]—and I risk his displeasure in consuming these few moments—I think correctly described the talks which have previously been made, and now we have had the oracle of the House, my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], clearly and concisely explain the issue which will shortly be before you for consideration.

The gentleman from Missouri had a great deal to say about the poor farmer. Having many farmers in my district, I am with him on that, especially as this is an election year when we should make our position known.

I notice the gentleman did not say anything about—it must have been an oversight on his part which I will pick up for him—about the hundreds of thousands of Townsendites in the country who want and deserve a little consideration and many of whom are in the gallery. I hope that none of the Members will think that that reference was made for any political purpose, because none of the people here are from my district. However, I will not criticize if they pass the word along.

Now, the gentleman from Mississippi sought to divert our attention from the real issue which was so correctly described by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. There are no acknowledged supporters of Communists in the House that I know of. There may be one or two somewhere who have concealed their views, but there are no open advocates of the Communists, so this talk is all beside the point at this time.

No one has a higher respect for the gentleman from Mississippi than have I. I live in the same building on the same floor with him, and I know that no man in Congress made a more desperate effort to prevent the last World War than did the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. No one has more vigorously or more conscientiously fought the Communists. I know, not from what he says, but from what I see and from a sort of mind-reading process that nothing has grieved him more than the success with which the New Dealers took over his party. It has been heartbreaking to him all along and I can understand his zeal in pleading for our country.

And I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] that I am with him on his proposition. He talks about the fertile soil of America being swept into the seas over the years; and he is right about that. But the thing that bothers me is why it is that he, wanting to stop the soil of America from being swept into the seas, is so anxious to send the products of American soil and labor across the seas. He objects to the soil being swept into the sea, but if all our products of the soil and our production get over the sea that is all right with him. For myself, permit me to say, I have never supported the Townsend plan because I did not believe it was economically sound, but if our country is to be impoverished, its resources dissipated all over the world, and perhaps rendered unable to defend itself, certainly, if the test be between the Marshall plan or any other scheme which obligates us to do for others what they should do for themselves, and some modification of the Townsend plan, I shall vote for the latter in preference to the former.

It is not only unfair and unjust, but it is heartless to impoverish ourselves by giving billions upon billions to foreign governments and at the same time deny to the elderly people and to the unfortunate of our own land sufficient funds to enable them to compete in the open market with the money which we give to foreigners in the effort which our own people are making to purchase the things necessary to sustain life.

I cannot understand the political or economic philosophy which gives so much to others while at the same time denying so little to our own.

In conclusion, I want to say to my brethren on the other side of the aisle that I have gone along with you and against my party on occasion on some of these bills, the poll-tax bill, the anti-lynching bill, the FEPC bill. I did it not because I loved you but because I thought it was the right thing to do. But you are making it terribly difficult for me to follow my conscience, live up to my obligations, be faithful to my trust, discharge the responsibility imposed upon me, while I see you on almost every occasion follow your party line, let political policy determine your vote.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. We understood on this side of the aisle that the gentleman had but one more speaker; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] used all of his time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. We understood definitely that there was but one speech on that side. That was half an hour ago. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has recognized three or four Members. What kind of an agreement did we have?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say that the gentleman from Texas is absolutely right. At the time we had but one speaker and I thought that was all we would have. Since then, however, other Members have asked for time and the time being available I yielded it to them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, we used all of our 30 minutes, relying on the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that he had only one speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I did make that statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time is running.

Mr. RAYBURN. I just want that part of the RECORD straight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I never cease to wonder, frankly, at the mental dexterity that is sometimes evidenced on the floor at times and I am sure my feeble talent is not equal to it. In the space of 10 minutes I cannot begin with Genesis and cover General MacArthur and the National Manufacturers' Association, the concept of legislative ethics, parliamentary procedure, and legislative morale, I cannot do it. I wish there were time to regale you today in that same fashion. But, perhaps, in the interest of expedition we ought to stick to the facts and consider the business at hand.

On the 18th of March this House passed an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. On the 24th of May it was passed by the Senate with sundry amendments. It was messaged to the House by the Senate with the request for a conference.

On a certain day last week about 5:30 in the evening I addressed myself to the distinguished Speaker of the House and asked unanimous consent that the bill be sent to conference. Shortly after that request was made, and I had supplied the names of the conferees, there was a motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to instruct the conferees. That was at 5:30 in the evening when there were not more than a score of Members on the floor of the House. I withdrew the request.

The gentleman from Missouri had called me at noon that day and I indicated I would call up the bill and ask to have it sent to conference. I told him that he ought to be on the floor. He said nothing to me at that time about a preferential motion. Now, I admit a preferential motion to instruct the conferees is in order. The gentleman is a skilled parliamentarian, and certainly he was in order under the rules of the House when he offered his motion. I shall not yield because this is the fact, and make no mistake about it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I decline to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it was a surprise. He said it was in regular order and it was not a surprise motion. However, I could not agree.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield. Later I called him myself and said I was going to ask to send the bill to conference and if he came over I would talk to him about it on the floor. He said, "I am going to rely on my position." I said, "Under those circumstances I have no choice except to go to the Rules Committee and get a rule."

Now then, what is involved here? Read the language; it is as customary as it can be:

Resolved, That, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table; that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, disagreed to by the House; that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the said bill be, and hereby is, agreed to by the House; and that the Speaker shall immediately appoint conferees without intervening motion.

Mr. Speaker, how much substance is there to the statement that this is the last chance to vote on items in this bill? We ask only to have this bill sent to conference to confer with the Senate on the amendments that were written into the bill by the Senate committee and on the Senate floor. That is all that is involved. Is that so unusual?

Let us see about that. On May 23, 1939, at page 6000 of the RECORD, House

Resolution 201 was offered, reading as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, be and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that all Senate amendments be, and the same are, disagreed to.

Who belabored that resolution on this floor? The gentleman from Missouri, who was a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations at that time. What did he say? He said:

Mr. Speaker, this is the most remarkable rule reported by the Committee on Rules during this Congress—remarkable because it does not change in one iota the custom of the House—because it does not deviate by the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" the procedure the House customarily follows under such circumstances.

I am sure it is all done in good faith. But, this is customary and all we ask is to go over and sit down with the conferees of the Senate in regular order and compare notes and discuss the various amendments that the Senate made to the bill. That is the regular order, and I trust, therefore, that the rule, which is the customary rule under those circumstances, will be adopted.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 140, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—204

Allen, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Hall,
Allen, Ill.	Cotton	Leonard W.
Andersen,	Crawford	Halleck
H. Carl	Crow	Hand
Andresen,	Cunningham	Harness, Ind.
August H.	Curtis	Harvey
Angell	Dague	Herter
Arends	Davis, Wis.	Heselton
Arnold	Dawson, Utah	Hess
Auchincloss	Devitt	Hill
Bakewell	D'Ewart	Hinshaw
Banta	Dirksen	Hoeven
Barrett	Dolliver	Hoffman
Beall	Dondero	Holmes
Bender	Eaton	Horan
Bennett, Mich.	Ellis	Jackson, Calif.
Bishop	Ellsworth	Javits
Blackney	Elsaesser	Jenison
Boggs, Del.	Elston	Jenkins, Ohio
Bolton	Engel, Mich.	Jennings
Bradley	Fellows	Jensen
Bramblett	Fenton	Johnson, Calif.
Brehm	Fletcher	Johnson, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Foote	Jones, Wash.
Buck	Fuller	Jonkman
Buffett	Fulton	Judd
Burke	Gamble	Kean
Busbey	Gavin	Kearns
Butler	Gearhart	Keating
Byrnes, Wis.	Gillette	Keefe
Canfield	Gillie	Kersten, Wis.
Carson	Goff	Kilburn
Case, N. J.	Goodwin	Kunkel
Case, S. Dak.	Graham	Landis
Chadwick	Grant, Ind.	Latham
Chenoweth	Griffiths	LeCompte
Church	Gross	LeFevre
Clason	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lemke
Clevenger	Hagen	Lewis, Ky.
Cole, Kans.	Hall,	Lewis, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Edwin Arthur	Lichtenwalter
Lodge	Nodar	Scrivner
Love	Norblad	Seely-Brown
McConnell	O'Konski	Shafer
McCowen	Phillips, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
McCulloch	Phillips, Tenn.	Smith, Kans.
McDonough	Potter	Smith, Ohio
McDowell	Poulson	Snyder
McGarvey	Ramey	Stefan
McGregor	Reed, Ill.	Stevenson
McMillen, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.	Stockman
Mack	Rees	Sundstrom
MacKinnon	Reeves	Taber
Maloney	Rich	Talle
Martin, Iowa	Riehlman	Tibbott
Mason	Rizley	Tollefson
Mathews	Rockwell	Towe
Meade, Ky.	Rogers, Mass.	Vail
Merrow	Rohrbough	Van Zandt
Meyer	Ross	Vorys
Michener	Russell	Vursell
Miller, Conn.	Sadlak	Wadsworth
Miller, Md.	St. George	Weichel
Miller, Nebr.	Sanborn	Welch
Mitchell	Sarbacher	Wigglesworth
Morton	Schwabe, Mo.	Wilson, Ind.
Muhlenberg	Schwabe, Okla.	Wolcott
Murray, Wis.	Scott, Hardie	Wolverton
Nicholson	Scott,	Woodruff
Nixon	Hugh D., Jr.	

NAYS—140

Abernethy	Fogarty	Multer
Albert	Folger	Murdock
Allen, La.	Forand	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.	Garmatz	Norrell
Barden	Gary	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Gordon	O'Brien
Battle	Gorski	Pace
Beckworth	Gossett	Passman
Bennett, Mo.	Granger	Patman
Blatnik	Grant, Ala.	Peden
Bloom	Gregory	Peterson
Boggs, La.	Hardy	Philbin
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	Pickett
Boykin	Harris	Poage
Brooks	Harrison	Preston
Brown, Ga.	Havenner	Price, Ill.
Bryson	Hays	Priest
Buchanan	Hébert	Rains
Bulwinkle	Hendricks	Rankin
Burleson	Hobbs	Rayburn
Camp	Huber	Redden
Cannon	Hull	Regan
Carroll	Isacson	Richards
Celler	Jackson, Wash.	Riley
Chapman	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Colmer	Jones, N. C.	Sabath
Cooley	Karsten, Mo.	Sasscer
Cooper	Kelley	Smathers
Courtney	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Cox	Kilday	Somers
Cravens	Kirwan	Spence
Crosser	Klein	Stanley
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Teague
Deane	Larcade	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney	Lesinski	Thompson
Dingell	Lucas	Trimble
Donohue	Lyle	Vinson
Doughton	Lynch	Walter
Douglas	McMillan, S. C.	Wheeler
Eberharter	Mahon	Whitten
Engle, Calif.	Manasco	Williams
Evins	Mansfield	Wilson, Tex.
Fallon	Marcantonio	Winstead
Feighan	Mills	Wood
Fisher	Morgan	Worley
Flannagan	Morris	

NOT VOTING—87

Abbitt	Gathings	Lusk
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	McCormack
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa	McMahon
Bates, Mass.	Hale	Macy
Bell	Hart	Madden
Bland	Hartley	Meade, Md.
Brophy	Hedrick	Miller, Calif.
Buckley	Heffernan	Monroney
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Morrison
Chiperfield	Hope	Mundt
Clark	Jenkins, Pa.	O'Hara
Clippinger	Johnson, Ill.	O'Toole
Coffin	Johnson, Okla.	Owens
Combs	Johnson, Tex.	Patterson
Corbett	Kearney	Pfeifer
Coudert	Kee	Ploeser
Davis, Ga.	Kefauver	Plumley
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Potts
Domengeaux	Keogh	Powell
Dorn	King	Price, Fla.
Durham	Knutson	Rivers
Elliott	Lane	Robertson
Fernandez	Lea	Sadowski
Gallagher	Ludlow	Scoblick
Sheppard	Smith, Wis.	Twyman
Short	Stigler	West
Sikes	Stratton	Whitaker
Simpson, Ill.	Taylor	Whittington
Smith, Maine	Thomas, N. J.	Youngblood

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. McMahon for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Owens for, with Mrs. Lusk against.

Mr. Patterson for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Youngblood for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Andrews of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Twyman for, with Mr. Gathings against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Rivers against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Short with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was in the office of the Architect of the Capitol and did not hear the bells. Can I qualify?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the resolution just passed, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DIRKSEN, PLUMLEY, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, PHILLIPS of California, CANNON, SHEPPARD, and WHITTEN.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 227, providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall of course not object, may I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to explain the significance and meaning of this resolution?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution would extend the greetings of the Congress and the Government of the United States to Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., which will celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of its founding during 1949.

The resolution provides for the appointment of a committee of 12 to represent the United States, 4 to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, 4 by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and 4 by the President of the United States. It provides that the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate also be members of the committee who would join in the celebration and the different activities in connection with it, and act as a committee on behalf of the United States to welcome foreign and other dignitaries who will participate in the celebrations.

There is no appropriation attached to this resolution whatsoever. It is the same type of resolution which has been adopted for Muhlenberg College, for Princeton University, Harvard, and other universities and colleges.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I hope that this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

Next year Washington and Lee University will celebrate her two hundredth anniversary. Two hundred years ago a small but determined bunch of Scotch-Irish Presbyterians founded a classical school in the beautiful valley of Virginia near the present town of Lexington. The founders were deeply religious; they were intensely patriotic; and because they put God and country first, they laid a lasting foundation. God and country have ever stood first at Washington and Lee and today, after 200 years of God-fearing, patriotic service, still stand first and because these two things have ever been placed first, today upon that simple, lasting foundation laid by God-fearing, patriotic men 200 years ago stands the great university of Washington and Lee whose influence for good has been felt not only in every State of the Union but throughout the world.

No wonder General Washington esteemed it a privilege to render financial aid to, and General Lee was proud to become a part of, such an institution.

May religion and patriotism ever remain the guiding influences of Washington and Lee.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, I hope that this resolution will be approved.

Washington and Lee University, which is a great institution in a great section of the country, was founded in 1749 as Augusta Academy. It was organized and maintained by the Scotch-Irish settlers of the Shenandoah Valley.

Augusta Academy was the first concrete expression of that devotion to learning and religion which characterized the settlers of the Valley of Virginia. It was the fifth in order of founding of our historic American colleges.

In the spring of 1776, 2 months before the Declaration of Independence, its name was changed to Liberty Hall. It was incorporated in 1782. In 1798 George Washington endowed the school with a gift valued at $50,000 and formally authorized it to bear his name. It was at this time that it became known as Washington College.

After the surrender at Appomattox, the immortal Robert E. Lee was the recipient of many offers at home and abroad. Among these were offers that would have brought him wealth and further fame. Instead of any of these Lee accepted the presidency of Washington College, then a war-wrecked and poverty-stricken institution. Thus he chose to help prepare the youth of the South to meet the problems and bear the burdens of the tragic years of reconstruction. Without money or endowment, in 5 years he developed the little college into a university of practical training.

In 1871, after the death of General Lee, the name of Washington College was changed to its present title "The Washington and Lee University."

Washington and Lee is independent of both church and state. It has given to the Nation many of its greatest leaders. Its history is now ancient and honorable. Yet it stands today as one of the most progressive and modern institutions of learning in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation and urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that this resolution passed the Senate on yesterday by a unanimous vote. There are many Members and former Members of the House and the Senate who are graduates of Washington and Lee University, a school that has given to the Nation many great men, and I think it only proper that this resolution be adopted.

Mr. CRAVENS. I fully concur in all that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has said. I withdraw my reservation and urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas during the year 1949 there will be celebrated the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Washington and Lee University as Augusta Academy; and

Whereas George Washington made this institution the beneficiary of the gift which the Commonwealth of Virginia tendered him for his services in the Revolution; and

Whereas Robert E. Lee, declining easier and more lucrative positions, gave the last years of his life to the service of education in that college; and

Whereas the contributions of these two eminent citizens, joined with those of a long roll of others devoted to the public good, have forged an institution which has served the Nation for two centuries in maintaining and promoting the ideals of constitutional American liberty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Government and people of the United States unite with Washington and Lee University and with the Commission on the Washington and Lee University Bicentennial authorized by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia in the appropriate observance of this anniversary.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Washington and Lee University Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) to be composed of 15 commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States and 4 persons to be appointed by him, the President of the Senate and 4 Members of the Senate to be appointed by said President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 4 Members of the House to be appointed by said Speaker.

SEC. 3. The Commission, on behalf of the United States, shall cooperate with representatives of Washington and Lee University and the Commonwealth of Virginia in appropriate observance of this anniversary and extend appropriate courtesies to the delegates of foreign universities and other foreign learned bodies or individuals attending the celebration as guests of Washington and Lee University.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number, but the President of the United States shall be designated as the honorary chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 5. Any vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments to such Commission are made.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, we are advised that in about 2 weeks the Republican leaders intend to adjourn the Congress. In view of this decision, I am becoming very much alarmed about the lack of action regarding the promised pay increase for governmental employees.

I am sure that the Chamber fully agrees with me when I say that no group of workers in this country have been more faithful or hard working than these. We all know that they have been led to believe that an honest attempt would be made to bring their wages somewhat in line with the rise in the cost of living. Actually they are not asking for a pay raise but only want to regain the standard they held before the drastic rise in prices. In my sincere opinion the only way we can return them to that same position is for the majority leadership to bring out that legislation which will provide for an average $800 increase and which will make that increase a permanent one. I am sure that such a measure would be overwhelmingly approved by this House.

I earnestly hope that we also give consideration to those employees under wage-board systems as well as the classified and postal groups. There is certainly no justification for excluding wage-board employees who are just as desperately in need of a cost-of-living raise as are the other governmental

groups. In my own State of Rhode Island, wage-board employees in the Narragansett Bay area have received wage increases of 1 to 4 cents per hour in the past 2 years. I think that you will agree with me when I say that such increases are wholly inadequate in the light of the continued rise in the cost of living. After the First World War they were included in the general cost-of-living pay adjustments. Again, during the economy period of 1932 these wage-board employees were included in the 15 percent general wage cut effected by Congress.

There is no adequate reason, at the present time, for excluding this group from consideration and I for one will strenuously object to any such discrimination. I am heartily in favor of the Jones bill, now in the House Armed Services Committee and the Bridges bill in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Among other things both these bills would make it mandatory for 50-percent representation on the wage boards by labor members. It was primarily due to lack of adequate labor representation on these boards that the sorry plight of employees under their jurisdiction has reached its present stage.

Yesterday, this House recognized its responsibility under the present economy by providing for adjustments to star-route carriers. I see no reason why such recognition will not be applied to all Government employees; if only the Republican majority leadership will permit the Members of this body to exercise their discretion by reporting out suitable bills.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mrs. BOLTON submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 633 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule, with the exception that points of order are waived. The Committee on Appropriations felt that it was necessary that points of order be waived in order to preserve certain restrictions which they feel are necessary in order to administer this relief program in the highest degree.

This resolution permits amendments to be offered, and one motion to recommit. It provides for 4 hours of general debate.

Although some of us are opposed to the bill, I know of no one who is opposing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall not actually oppose the rule because it would unnecessarily take the time of the House. I shall not even ask for the yeas and nays on the rule. However, I do wish to make a few observations.

The rule has been granted on a bill that had not even been introduced and bore no number when the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, appeared before the Committee on Rules. The report on the bill was only partially prepared, and the unnumbered bill, itself, carried insertions of pasted-in, typewritten amendments, as you will note from the copy which I hold in my hand. You will see that the bill was not even printed, and included amendments that had been agreed on, and that are now, I presume, in the printed bill that has been reported. This merely shows the indifference that has been shown toward the right of Members to familiarize themselves with the provisions of this important measure.

This bill calls for the appropriation of $5,900,000,000 and a few extra millions, which amount means nothing to us now, in addition to a loan of $1,000,000,000, which very likely will never be repaid. Yet only a few minutes ago we refused to listen to the appeal that would make it possible to provide $10,000,000 additional for school lunches for our children. In view of the extremely high cost of living, many of the poor children are unable to have decent lunches, and the school boards are unable to provide decent, wholesome lunches for them. Just think of it. Many of them really in need are relying on this little school lunch that they can get at a reasonable price, yet here we appropriate billions for feeding not only the children of Europe but even men and women, and people who have not been very friendly to our country, at that.

AID TO GERMANY

We provide in this bill over $1,100,000,000 for the aid of Germany, whom to defeat cost our country over 300,000 lives and nearly one million in casualties and an expenditure of over $250,000,000,000 in the prosecution of the war, the country that was responsible for the war and that is now preparing for a third world war. We appropriated these tremendous sums in addition to the $2,000,000,000 we have already given them since the cessation of hostilities and this nothwithstanding that the evidence discloses many of its people are not trying to help themselves. I wonder how long this will continue and how long we will be obliged to appropriate billions of dollars to help the people of Europe who refuse to help themselves. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of helping all the needy children of Europe and the hungry and starving people. That has always been my position. But I cannot understand why we should continue to spend these billions and billions of dollars and send them to countries which have not only been unfriendly, but which I fear will not be friendly toward us in the future. At least, judging the future by the past, I fear very much that most of this money will be wasted and will not be appreciated by those who are getting this great help and assistance from us. We know that after the last war, the Germans through their propaganda, obtained a great deal of help from our country and within a few years started to prepare for the Second World War. I am afraid that they are doing the same thing today with the great propaganda that is going on to help the poor Germans and the German manufacturers. In view of what happened after the First World War, even worse may happen today. Many of you gentlemen who have studied and are acquainted with the practices of the I. G. Farben cartel of Europe, with this octopus that has mulcted the American people out of millions of dollars for so many years, know that that same group by changing some of the names of the officers is being again helped to obtain control of this great institution, as well as the Krupp works and other industrial plants controlled by German trusts and combines that produce war material.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. And is it not a fact that a great deal of this money is going to Communist countries?

Mr. SABATH. In that connection I want to say, and I want to be understood rightly, that I am in favor of spending all the money necessary to fight communism here. If I thought that the appropriation would eliminate communism in Europe, I would not object. Naturally, I would be only too pleased to support any and all provisions in the bill. But such is not the case. For instance, in

this bill we are providing for $1,200,000,000 to Great Britain. That is in addition to the $3,750,000,000 that we have given Great Britain about a year and a half ago. No one will contend that this appropriation is for the purpose of fighting communism. We know that Great Britain cannot be so hard up that we should continue to pour our taxpayers' money into Great Britain, when a great deal of that money is being spent by her for war purposes, financing the Arabs, paying large sums of money to their greedy king down in Arabia, supplying money to pay their colonels, generals, and military advisers who are leading, training, and fighting side by side with the Arabs, and who have willfully and deliberately delayed innumerable times to bring about an adjustment of differences between the Arabs and the Jews, as recommended by several commissions and by the United Nations Organization.

Great Britain, to my mind, has been responsible for many millions that we have appropirated and will continue to appropriate if we permit ourselves to be used in the future as we have in the past.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that after the last war every country in Europe, with the exception of Finland, repudiated its debts to the United States and refused to pay back more than $10,000,000,000 of loans that we made them?

Mr. SABATH. Not only have they repudiated the debt, but when we even asked for one-half of 1 percent interest on the money we advanced, they called us Shylocks and all kinds of names. That was the appreciation shown by the people in many of those countries. To be accurate in answering the gentleman from Mississippi, I am inserting the total indebtedness of the foreign countries:

World War I debts owed the United States as of July 1, 1947

COUNTRY AND TOTAL INDEBTEDNESS	
Funded debts:	
Belgium	$520,211,077.60
Czechoslovakia	184,247,307.74
Estonia	25,636,760.81
Finland	8,259,270.28
France	4,760,727,124.40
Germany (Austrian indebtedness)	26,024,539.59
Great Britain	6,719,464,782.58
Greece	37,745,215.10
Hungary	2,873,678.38
Italy	2,062,176,909.34
Latvia	10,593,416.04
Lithuania	9,495,275.51
Poland	320,829,064.20
Rumania	78,527,457.53
Yugoslavia	64,012,968.78
Total	14,830,824,847.88
Unfunded debts:	
Armenia	28,587,071.07
Russia	467,339,367.69
Total	495,926,438.76
Grand total	15,326,751,286.64

Mr. Speaker, I am fearful that again we will within a very short time have the same experience with these loans and advances, and that of all the money we are pouring out not a penny will come back to us.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. This is a gift of $5,900,000,000. They do not even pretend that this is a loan.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no, no.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not to feed the hungry people, but it is a gift to the heads of a few governments over there.

Mr. SABATH. Why, of course; and to pay many of the governments that have been proven, beyond any doubt, to be corrupt. They have utilized many of the articles and the food that we have sent them for aid and put it into the black market. Officials were benefited to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars. That was true in Greece; the same thing in China; and in Germany and in Great Britain. Great Britain is building up its industries now at our expense, and we are aiding the Farben cartel to build up its industries again, to compete with America, and at the same time give them the right and the privilege to fleece the American people and people all over the world on all their products, whether they are chemicals, dyes, or any other product on which they may have a monopoly through cartel and license arangements.

The question has been raised as to potash fertilizer. I know that in past years it cost our country millions upon millions which we were obliged to pay, in addition to the regular cost, for the German potash fertilizer that we were obliged to use, and on which they have a monopoly. The same situation exists with Great Britain. She has a monopoly really on tin, lead, rubber, and a lot of other products, yet we are going to help poor Great Britain out with additional millions.

I realize the interest we have in trying to eliminate communism in the old country, in Europe especially; yes, and in China; but I am fearful that what we are doing will not bring that about. I think we should take into consideration how far and how long we can continue to pour the millions and billions of our taxpayers' money into these countries.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Who started pouring this money out that the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. SABATH. Who?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I did not want to say anything about politics, I dislike it, but I will tell the gentleman that I think our former President Hoover, with his Republican adviser, John Foster Dulles, the Wall Street lawyer and manipulator, General Dawes, and a former member of the firm of Dillon, Read & Co., and other big bankers of Wall Street, including Mr. Morgan and a few of the big banks, were responsible. They have certain interests over there, especially in the cartels, and in the rebuilding of German and British industry.

It is the same group, or representatives of the same Wall Street interests, who are misleading our President. He means well, he actually has the interest of the country at heart, but he permitted these Republican gentlemen to mislead him. That, indeed, is unfortunate. He did it because of the promises of the Republicans, because the Republicans had control of the House and the Senate, and he believed that the Republicans would support him on domestic issues, that they would support him on legislation that he recommended in the interests of our country. But they are not interested in the United States, they are interested in the financial and industrial corporations and institutions abroad that they want to rebuild and make strong again so that they can compete with American industry. They are rebuilding the plants over there, even taking plants over there from this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON], in answer to his question, that they started this in 1926, I believe it was during the Coolidge administration when they brought in legislation here to virtually cancel the $10,000,000,000 the European countries owed us, in order that they might get their protected goods over the tariff walls. That is what is behind this measure. Steel and tobacco and aluminum and even peanuts and a large number of other things they are trying to shove over the tariff wall at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. SABATH. I disagree frequently with the gentleman from Mississippi, but I am indeed gratified that he is right on this proposition, and I know he is well informed on it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I know the gentleman from Mississippi has the interest of the country at heart. He is a little fearful of the so-called communistic danger here but he fails to realize that there is greater danger to us here from fascism as represented by these very men to whom I have called attention that have these greater interests in Europe, who are rebuilding Europe at the expense of the interests of the American people. Why, I realize, and you all realize, that the cost of living has gone sky high. In fact, in the last 18 months the cost of living has gone up in this country by nearly 50 percent, so much so that many people who have accumulated a few dollars in war bonds to be secure in the future, since you Republicans came into power during the last 18 months, have been obliged to sell their bonds and to now buy on credit terms. The record shows that the amount of credit that has been extended is tremendous.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. A large part of the funds appropriated by this bill will go to Great Britain. Does not the gentleman agree that as long as Great Britain can find money of her own to aid aggressor nations, she should get none of ours.

Mr. SABATH. That is what I am seeking to bring out. That is my position. If any of this money goes to the actual needy and starving, I shall be only too pleased to vote for it, but I resent that we should be imposed upon by a few leaders who actually have not the interest of our country at heart. Their interest lies over there because they have for years represented the lords, the dukes, and those very large interests that have not only competed against our markets but have tried to steal our markets from under our very noses. This being the case, I feel it will be a great mistake if we permit ourselves to be used by that element, by these shrewd lawyers representing the Wall Street interests and the big interests, to finance industries over there at the expense of our own country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In reference to the subject to which I referred a few moments ago, those measures brought to the floor of the House in the twenties during the Coolidge administration did not cancel the debts outright but extended them over a period of 62 years. Everybody admits that no international debt extending beyond the life of a generation has ever been paid. It was understood all around that meant cancellation.

Mr. SABATH. Not only that, but after President Hoover was elected, he recommended the cancellation of the debt, amounting to close to $10,000,000,000, which Germany owed us at that time. Now, we are appropriating most of this money for those who opposed us in the First as well as in the Second World War.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. As I remember it, Hoover wanted to put a moratorium on the debt. Then when President Roosevelt came in we never got a single nickel from Germany or England or anybody else and have not got anything since.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Hoover really canceled the debt. I have not the exact word for it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. He asked for a moratorium. You people would not give it to him, and you were in control at that time.

Mr. SABATH. I know a little bit more about it than the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Oh, I have been reading your record ever since I was born, because you have been here over 42 years.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the gentleman has read my record, because it gives him information in the right direction. If he had paid real attention, if he had given serious consideration to what I said, he would not be sitting on that side; he would be sitting over here; at least he would not permit himself to be used as a rubber stamp as most of you on that side are. During the last war you charged we were rubber stamps. That did not apply then. But it does surely apply today to those on that side of the aisle.

Now, in view of conditions, I want to say this, that I intend to, or someone else will, make a motion later on to strike out the privisions for Great Britain, unless we succeed in embodying in the bill an amendment that no part of this money that is to be given to Great Britain shall be used for the purpose of feeding their King in Arabia and financing the war against the Jewish people, and also paying for tremendous large forces of British generals and colonels that are living on our money, fighting with our money and using our money for the purpose of trying to destroy the efforts and the aspirations and the hopes of the Jewish people to obtain their freedom and liberty. And their government will not be a communistic government either. It will be a real, progressive, democratic country. They are people who believe in democracy and in a democratic form of government.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. Does the gentleman not agree that if such an amendment should carry, and if funds to Great Britain should be cut off from this bill, that they would soon stop their aggression and their encouragement of the aggressive Arab States in their war on the New Jewish state of Israel?

Mr. SABATH. Well, I think it would. Personally I know, and history tells me, and I have been more or less familiar with the activities of Great Britain, that Great Britain has always been for Great Britain first, last, and all the time, regardless of the conditions in which her friends were. She was at all times ready and willing to sacrifice anyone at anytime if it would be in her own interest.

BRITISH INFLUENCE

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to respectfully add that I cannot withhold my sympathy from President Truman in his unfortunately being surrounded and misinformed, as I have stated before, by many foreign-interest-minded men, especially those in the State and the Defense Departments, who are influenced in their thinking in the first place by shrewd, designing men representative of vicious financial and economic groups that seek to have the United States assume British responsibilities, thwart any plan looking to a satisfactory composition of Russian-United States, differences, and promote the interests of such evil institutions as I. G. Farbenindustrie cartels. It is, indeed, a crying shame that such marplots are in position to determine our foreign policy.

Then we have the difficulty of an inadequate fuel-oil supply. These men to whom I have referred are making it most difficult for our industries to function, in that steel and oil are deliberately withheld with a view to providing an excuse for our aiding the American and British oil interests in Arabia. Not only are these men playing fast and loose with our own economy, but they are working against the interests of our friendly neighbor, Mexico. Hundreds and hundreds of tons of steel badly needed by United States industries were and are being sent to the Arabian oil fields by the Department of Commerce under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, and former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman.

FACE ABOUT ON THE PALESTINE SITUATION

These same men misinformed and persuaded the President to face-about on the Palestine problem, thereby deceiving the President and at the same time stabbing the country in the back, all for purely selfish reasons. They stop at no place. They caused our Government to abrogate the loan agreement with Czechoslovakia, which worked in the interest of the Communists, who use such conduct as an excuse for saying that we first serve and cooperate with those of Hitler ideologies and deny help to those who remained neutral or were on our side in the late war. It is being said we are now not on the side of those who fought, bled, and died in our war aims.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA SHOULD HAVE HAD OUR SUPPORT

If we had treated Czechoslovakia half decently, she could have warded off the communistic infiltration that brought her to her knees, but our wisdom and farsightedness were not equal to the occasion and opportunity. Czechoslovakia, with our real support, could have resolved the differences between the east and the west in Europe and effected a satisfactory understanding and adjustment, but our short-sighted foreign policy spelled failure.

That our State Department is controlled by those who veer toward militarism is beyond question. Unconsciously, and I fear at times consciously, they think in terms of inspiring war and connive with stupid English statesmen bent upon imperialistic designs and a further bleeding of the United States to promote socialization, nationalization, royal weddings, increased civil pension lists, and the remainder of the things that rest so near the heart of Attlee's Socialist group. If a Britisher with a dulcet voice should tell our State Department that the moon is made of cheese, that affirmation would at once assume the status of a truism with the State Department.

I feared when President Roosevelt appointed a Republican Secretary of War and a Republican Secretary of the Navy. Of course, that was done with the best possible motive of effecting maximum cooperation in prosecution of the war. The late Secretary of the Navy brought to his office one of the high priests from Wall Street, the then head of Dillon, Read & Co.; and I regretted to see President Truman appoint that same high priest as first Secretary of Defense, where he ever parrots the aspirations of Wall Street.

DETERMINATION OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Not only do we find such men as the Secretary of Defense in position to determine Government policy; we go

further and revive Mr. Hoover, the man who placed a chicken in every pot and two automobiles in every garage, and assign him to the important task of reorganizing the executive branch of Government. God save the executive branch of Government.

But we do not stop there. We give John Foster Dulles high place as adviser to our Secretary of State.

And now Dean Acheson, late Under Secretary of State, is not inactive in looking after the interests of malefactors of great wealth.

All these gentlemen work to have the United States pull British chestnuts from the fire, cause the United States to underwrite everything British and un-American. Instead of trying to effect an understanding between the United States and Russia, employ the good offices of the UNO to the fullest possible extent, they work in the opposite direction, at least that is the net result. In that way they follow the Hitler technique. The great cartels and Farbenindustrie interests leagued together ostensibly to fight communism, but really to destroy freedom throughout the world.

A COMMISSION SHOULD BE APPOINTED TO EXAMINE AND REPORT ON GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES

I believe that if the President were not surrounded by his current advisers, who tell not the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, we would do better in searching for the peace we all so very much desire. Most of his advisers think in terms of great wealth and an enthronement of militarism in the United States.

I believe a commission to examine and report on our governmental policies should be created by the Executive at once. Such a commission, made up of intelligent, patriotic Americans, could do much to enlighten the President and enable him in this feverish hour to regain the confidence of the American people. There should be a greater resort to the good offices of the UNO which was created solely to properly resolve world differences and bring peace, prosperity, and plenty to a heart-sick world.

I urge the creation by the Executive of such a commission to make a thorough, unbiased, intelligent study of world conditions.

We all know that all well-disposed people, and practically all Americans as such, are resolutely opposed to war and are praying for peace.

I feel that this matter is of such great importance that no time should be lost before trying to deal with it as I have outlined.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me, I insert a statement signed by 20 outstanding Americans, bearing on the German situation, that I feel is entitled to real consideration by the Congress and the American people. It is entitled "Last Chance in Germany," and is as follows:

LAST CHANCE IN GERMANY

It cost the world millions of lives to crush the Nazi war machine. For more than 2½ years there has been talk of peace terms. Yet a German menace still remains.

At Potsdam, in August 1945, the leaders of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union agreed on a program which would rid the world of Nazi threats. The Potsdam agreement called for a democratic Germany, unified, and cleansed of Nazis, cartels, and militarists. It reflected completely the policies outlined by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

TODAY, THE PROMISE OF POTSDAM IS STILL UNFULFILLED

We feel that the American people must face the ugly truth: The problem of Germany has once more brought us to the edge of disaster. What is worse, there remains little time to argue the question of Germany's future.

A German peace treaty was the main topic at the London meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers. The time for planning and debate is reaching an end. Since negotiations have failed, we must be truly on the alert against any kind of separate peace being made with part of Germany, for then it must be said that we shall have taken a huge leap toward war.

We urge the American people to take one more look at what has happened in Germany. In our own zone of Germany, where ours is the main responsibility, we have failed in our pledge to wipe out nazism. Franklin Roosevelt's plans have been scrapped. The Truman administration long ago allowed itself to move away from the policies laid down at Potsdam; in their place have been put the policies of Dulles and Hoover. Here is the record of what has been done:

1. We told the world we would remove the war guilty. We have failed to do so. The whole job of cleaning out Nazis—denazification—has long since been turned back to the Germans. Repeated amnesties toward Nazis have been declared. At best, no more than a third of the possible war criminals were ever screened. We have not even removed war makers from the most important jobs in Germany, and Nazis and their financial supporters have been allowed to return to their positions of power. Names like Poengsen, Dinkelbach, Abs, and Von Schroeder are not as well known as Goering and Goebbels. Yet the bearers of those names were leading industrialists who planned the war and they are still active and influential in western Germany.

What of the German general staff? We said they should never be able to plan another war, as they did after World War I. What kind of watch is being kept over these engineers of the blitzkrieg? There is no answer either from Germany or from the State Department.

The Nazis and Junkers have been shielded by our own officials in military government—often men from influential corporations. The reason? It must be stated bluntly: Hope of future gain and control of a base of operations in the dangerous game of power politics.

2. We said we would knock out Nazi armament industries. We failed to do so by bombing. We have not done so by military occupation. Originally, more than 1,500 industrial plants in western Germany were marked for dismantling, their equipment to be shipped to Allied countries as reparations. Then the number was cut to 600. But even the smaller figure is meaningless. In 30 long months of the occupation, no more than two dozen plants have actually been dismantled or their special war-making equipment destroyed in any degree. Every change in our plans for the German economy has given the Germans more industrial capacity—at the expense of our wartime allies. And to rebuild German industry without taking it out of the hands of its former masters means to rebuild the Nazi war machine. The Ruhr arsenal is still in the hands of war makers.

3. We said we would destroy the German cartel system. Before the war the big German combines controlled most of Europe by means of cartel agreements. The cartels paved the way for the blitzkrieg. Yet the essential features of the cartel system remain. There is every indication that major United States corporations are renewing and tightening their links with German industry.

The simplest proof of the renewed danger of the German cartel system is seen in the fears of Germany's neighbors. Countries like France and Poland know from tragic experience what can happen to Germany's business satellites. Even the recent Harriman committee report admits that "The fears of neighboring nations are thoroughly understandable." Equally understandable is the procartel drift of our policy. John Foster Dulles, a key figure in the group around Secretary of State Marshall, was for years the intimate business associate of such German cartelists as Baron Kurt von Schroeder, who was one of the top liaison officials between Hitler and the German industrialists.

4. We have stated over and over that Germany cannot be split without disastrous political consequences in Europe. Yet the bipartisan drafters of foreign policy are now talking about a separate peace with western Germany. The result of this policy would be a historical monstrosity. The effort of the two parts of Germany to reunite could throw Europe into turmoil for decades.

Much worse, a separate peace with western Germany would force a wider breach among the Allied Powers which defeated Germany. It must be said, with full realization of the gravity of the charge, that a separate peace would be a long step toward war.

Germany must grow again as a democracy. The props of the Nazi war machine must be wrecked and the German cartel system replaced by a democratic form of economic organization. It has been basic to every policy agreed to by Allied Powers that there must be some kind of unity of the Germans.

To settle the German problem quickly and safely, we urge the following program:

1. There must be no separate peace with part of Germany.

2. The reparations question can and must be settled satisfactorily for all nations which fought in the alliance against Hitler.

3. We must carry out Franklin D. Roosevelt's pledges—(a) to aid anti-Nazi Germany in rebuilding a united and democratic Germany; (b) to eliminate the cartel stranglehold from the new German economy; (c) to remove war criminals; (d) to dismantle all arms plants.

Louis Adamic, Balocovic, Elmer Benson, Jo Davidson, Olin Downes, W. E. Dubois, Allen Freelon, Ira Hirschman, James S. Martin, Russ Nixon, Abraham L. Pomerantz, O. John Rogge, Elliott Roosevelt, Representative Sadowski, Richard Sasuly, Frederick Schuman, Rexford Tugwell, Ray Walsh, A. F. Whitney.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert a resolution adopted by district 8 executive board of the Congress of Industrial Unions advocating a 25 percent direct annual tax on all foreign assets in the United States; the income from such levy to be made available to the agencies of the United Nations for direct aid to those foreign countries. It is estimated that there are $27,000,000,000 of hoarded foreign assets in this country which, if returned to the various foreign nations, would aid in their economic rehabilitation and provide for the relief of their citizenry. The resolution reads as follows:

According to the master report of the President's Committee on Foreign Aid, an estimated $27,000,000,000 are owned in this country by foreign bankers, industrialists, kings, dukes, duchesses, and the idle rich

of the 16 foreign countries seeking dollar loans under the Marshall plan.

The report states that such assets are divided into hoarded cash dollars and gold amounting to sixteen or seventeen billions and in investments in American real estate, mortgages, and trust funds totaling eight billions. Of these eight billions, approximately three and one-half billions are in stocks and bonds; the rest mainly in direct investments, real estate, mortgages, and trust funds.

The idle rich, the former industrialist and Nazi collaborators and moth-eaten royalty of Europe wax fat on American industrial profits and rent gouging and stock dividends, while hunger and deprivation haunt the people of Europe.

Europe's plutocrats, through their billions of hoarded gold and investments in America, share with their American blood brothers of Wall Street in the benefits of rent increases, industrial speed-up, profiteering in food and clothing, and the lush profits of the steel, railroad, auto, utility, and other giant American trusts. Every time rents are increased, every time prices go up, every time new speed-up methods are introduced, the pickpockets of Europe's idle rich get their cut from the wholesale robbery of the American purse.

And now the men of Wall Street who run Washington are proposing that the American people continue to pay high taxes to support the Marshall plan, the plan which gives aid to the efforts of the plutocrats of Europe to regain their positions of pomp and power, and to safeguard their twenty-seven billions of gold and investments in America.

This twenty-seven billions of gold and other wealth rightfully belongs to the people of the 16 countries which now seek our aid. It should be returned to them to be used to feed, rehabilitate, and reconstruct their countries.

Those powerful Wall Street forces in Government who seek to safeguard the gold hoards of Europe's idle rich must be exposed.

Why should American people pay high income taxes to be used for loans and grants to the European nations whose idle rich possess twenty-seven billions of hoarded assets in America? Why shouldn't the people demand of our Government that these riches be used to give the European farmer equipment to till and fertilize the soil and harvest the crops? Why shouldn't these billions be used to rehabilitate foreign industry and provide mass housing for the people? Why shouldn't these vast hoards be used for the people's good? Government agency after Government agency, congressional committee after committee, and Mr. Marshall himself, have all talked about self-aid for Europe. What better place could that start be made than in the use of these twenty-seven billions of hoarded foreign assets in America?

Therefore be it resolved:

1. That we demand an immediate levy by our Government of a 25 percent direct annual tax on all private foreign assets in America; the income from this levy to be made available to the agencies of the UN for direct aid to those foreign countries from which it came. And that this plan of taxing the twenty-seven billions of hoarded foreign assets and distributing the income therefrom be started immediately.

2. That the Government make public a complete list of all holdings and assets in this country by citizens of other countries.

3. That no taxes shall be used to finance any foreign aid to a country whose nationals retain gold or other financial holdings in America which is not being used for the purchase of food or other materials needed for the citizens of their country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of course, I disagree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] on his attitude toward Great Britain; but I am for voting down this rule and, if it is adopted, I expect to vote against the bill.

If we are going to feed the hungry people of Europe, let us do it through the Red Cross. That is not what this is for. You are getting ready to spend billions of dollars out of the pockets of the American people when our Government is virtually bankrupt. This money is to be given to the heads of the various governments involved.

If we were to go back to the prewar price levels our National debt would amount to as much as the value of all the property in the entire Nation.

I am unwilling to embark upon what I consider a thoroughly dishonest policy of taxing the people I represent and giving the proceeds to foreign countries without even a promise of repayment.

Now, do not get the idea that Wall Street is going to pay all this in income taxes or that the big interests are going to pay it. It is going to come from the toiling masses you and I represent. That little fellow out on the farm or down in the shop or behind the counter may not pay any income tax, but he pays the man who pays the taxes, or pays the man who pays the man who pays the taxes. It comes out of him after all.

The question was raised here a little while ago about our old people. Why not use this money to help them? If we are going to spend this money, why not first, as the gentleman from Michigan said, look after our own old people.

There is petition No. 14 on the Clerk's desk to bring out the bill for an adjusted compensation for those millions of servicemen who fought the war, came back, and went to work and have not received a dollar. How many of you have signed that petition? Why not take care of our own servicemen who fight the Nation's battles in times of war and sustain its institutions in times of peace?

I am going to vote against the motion for the previous question; I shall vote against the rule; and I shall vote against the bill. I am not willing to embark my country upon a policy that may mean national bankruptcy.

That is what a great many of our enemies at home and abroad want. They want to see this country bankrupt and dragged down to the economic level of the poorest countries in the world.

They will never do it with my vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the previous question will be ordered and that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 94, noes 3.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that point of order and take the vote on the rule.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 142, noes 4.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 329, nays 22, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—329

Abernethy	Cravens	Heselton
Albert	Crosser	Hess
Allen, Calif.	Crow	Hill
Allen, Ill.	Cunningham	Hobbs
Allen, La.	Curtis	Hoeven
Andersen, H. Carl	Dague	Hoffman
	Davis, Ga.	Holmes
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Tenn.	Hope
	Davis, Wis.	Horan
Andrews, Ala.	Dawson, Utah	Huber
Angell	Deane	Jackson, Calif.
Arends	Delaney	Jackson, Wash.
Arnold	Devitt	Jarman
Auchincloss	D'Ewart	Javits
Bakewell	Dingell	Jenison
Banta	Dirksen	Jenkins, Ohio
Barrett	Dolliver	Jennings
Bates, Ky.	Domengeaux	Jensen
Bates, Mass.	Dondero	Johnson, Calif.
Battle	Donohue	Jones, Ala.
Beall	Douglas	Jones, N. C.
Beckworth	Eaton	Jones, Wash.
Bell	Eberharter	Jonkman
Bender	Ellsworth	Judd
Bennett, Mich.	Elsaesser	Karsten, Mo.
Bennett, Mo.	Elston	Kean
Bishop	Engle, Calif.	Kearns
Blackney	Evins	Keating
Blatnik	Fallon	Keefe
Bloom	Feighan	Kelley
Boggs, Del.	Fellows	Kerr
Boggs, La.	Fenton	Kersten, Wis.
Bolton	Flannagan	Kilburn
Bonner	Fletcher	Kilday
Boykin	Fogarty	Kirwan
Bradley	Folger	Klein
Bramblett	Foote	Kunkel
Brehm	Forand	Lanham
Brooks	Fuller	Latham
Brophy	Fulton	Lea
Brown, Ga.	Gamble	LeCompte
Brown, Ohio	Garmatz	LeFevre
Bryson	Gary	Lewis, Ky.
Buchanan	Gavin	Lewis, Ohio
Buck	Gearhart	Lichtenwalter
Buffett	Gillette	Lodge
Bulwinkle	Goff	Love
Burke	Goodwin	Lucas
Burleson	Gordon	Lyle
Busbey	Gorski	Lynch
Butler	Gossett	McConnell
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	McCowen
Camp	Granger	McCulloch
Canfield	Grant, Ala.	McDonough
Cannon	Grant, Ind.	McDowell
Carroll	Gregory	McGarvey
Carson	Griffiths	McGregor
Case, N. J.	Gross	McMahon
Case, S. Dak.	Gwinn, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.
Celler	Hagen	McMillen, Ill.
Chadwick	Hall, Leonard W.	Mack
Chapman		MacKinnon
Chelf	Halleck	Macy
Chenoweth	Hand	Mahon
Church	Hardy	Maloney
Clason	Harless, Ariz.	Manasco
Cole, Kans.	Harris	Mansfield
Cole, Mo.	Harrison	Martin, Iowa
Cole, N. Y.	Hart	Mathews
Colmer	Harvey	Meade, Ky.
Cooley	Havenner	Merrow
Cooper	Hays	Meyer
Cotton	Hébert	Michener
Courtney	Hendricks	Miller, Conn.
Cox	Herter	Miller, Md.

Miller, Nebr.	Ramey	Spence
Mills	Rayburn	Stanley
Mitchell	Redden	Stefan
Morgan	Reed, Ill.	Stevenson
Morton	Rees	Stockman
Muhlenberg	Reeves	Stratton
Multer	Regan	Sundstrom
Murdock	Richards	Taber
Murray, Tenn.	Riehlman	Talle
Murray, Wis.	Riley	Teague
Nicholson	Rizley	Thomas, Tex.
Nixon	Rockwell	Tibbott
Nodar	Rogers, Fla.	Tollefson
Norblad	Rogers, Mass.	Towe
Norrell	Rohrbough	Trimble
Norton	Rooney	Vail
O'Brien	Ross	Van Zandt
O'Hara	Russell	Vinson
O'Toole	Sabath	Vorys
Pace	Sadlak	Vursell
Passman	St. George	Wadsworth
Patman	Sanborn	Walter
Peden	Sarbacher	Weichel
Peterson	Sasscer	Welch
Pfeifer	Schwabe, Okla.	Wheeler
Philbin	Scott, Hardie	Whitten
Phillips, Tenn.	Scott,	Wigglesworth
Pickett	Hugh D., Jr.	Williams
Poage	Scrivner	Wilson, Ind.
Potter	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Tex.
Poulson	Shafer	Winstead
Preston	Simpson, Pa.	Wolcott
Price, Fla.	Smathers	Wolverton
Price, Ill	Smith, Va.	Wood
Priest	Snyder	Woodruff
Rains	Somers	Worley

NAYS—22

Barden	Isacson	O'Konski
Clevenger	Landis	Rankin
Crawford	Larcade	Reed, N. Y.
Doughton	Lemke	Sadowski
Ellis	Lesinski	Schwabe, Mo.
Gillie	Marcantonio	Smith, Ohio
Harness, Ind.	Mason	
Hull	Morris	

NOT VOTING—80

Abbitt	Hartley	Owens
Anderson, Calif.	Hedrick	Patterson
Andrews, N. Y.	Heffernan	Phillips, Calif.
Bland	Hinshaw	Ploeser
Buckley	Holifield	Plumley
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins, Pa.	Potts
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ill.	Powell
Clark	Johnson, Ind.	Rich
Clippinger	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Coffin	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Combs	Kearney	Scoblick
Corbett	Kee	Sheppard
Coudert	Kefauver	Short
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Sikes
Dorn	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
Durham	King	Smith, Kans.
Elliott	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Engel, Mich.	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Fernandez	Ludlow	Stigler
Fisher	Lusk	Taylor
Gallagher	McCormack	Thomas, N. J.
Gathings	Madden	Thompson
Gore	Meade, Md.	Twyman
Gwynne, Iowa	Miller, Calif.	West
Hale	Monroney	Whitaker
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morrison	Whittington
	Mundt	Youngblood

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. King.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Youngblood with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Corbett with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Plumley with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Monroney.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Mundt with Mr. Gathings.
Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Short with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Twyman with Mr. Rovers.
Mr. Owens with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Simpson of Illinois with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Gore.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

EMERGENCY DISPLACED PERSONS ADMISSION BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 637, Rept. No. 2199), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6396) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H. R. 6396, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2242, and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 6396 as passed.

STABILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRICES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 638, Rept. No. 2200), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6801, with Mr. COLE of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 22 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has held long and arduous hearings on the foreign aid bill. We have had the Federal agencies and departments concerned with the program appear before us. We have listened with unrewarded patience to the advocates of this program and to our dismay they failed to produce anything of substance. In other words, the architects of this world-wide relief program have no definite plan and no definite program. There is no Marshall plan. It is merely a conversational term and we find those who are most vociferous in its support are those who know least about it.

The budget estimates presented to the committee were not the result of facts and reliable information compiled by intelligent men. They appeared to be the result of a series of after-dinner conversations in which administration economists and planners let their imaginations run riot.

The question presented to us today is this, Do the people of the United States want to support a Government based on honesty, sincerity, and factual presentations or do they want to support a Government based on hearsay with figures and projects pulled out of a hat? The architects of the foreign aid bill are the same boys who dreamed up a score or more of disatrous governmental experiments in the past 15 years. They apparently have a complete disregard for the welfare of this country.

We believe it is necessary to aid in the recovery and rehabilitation of war-torn nations. We are willing to supply them with necessities, but we are not willing to finance a lot of nebulous projects just for the sake of spending money. Based on our extensive hearings, we believe this appropriation, if properly administered, will be ample to take care of all essential items.

We cannot remind ourselves too often of the astronomical sums this Nation has spent directly and indirectly for foreign relief. Since the cessation of hostilities

the United States has rendered foreign aid through grants and credits in excess of $18,000,000,000.

We now have before us the foreign-aid bill of 1949, which carries appropriations totaling $5,980,000,000. This is the largest single peacetime relief measure in our history. It is world-wide in scope. It proposes relief and assistance in one form or another to 21 nations—some of which were practically untouched by the war. In the final analysis, the American taxpayer will foot the bill.

The supporters of this vast foreign aid and rehabilitation project can be divided, roughly, into three categories: First, those level-headed, solid citizens who sincerely believe that we have a moral obligation to help reestablish war-stricken nations so that they, in turn, can do their part in stemming the tide of world communism; second, those who are inveterate "do-gooders" and support any missionary project that comes down the pike. They will reconvert and reconstruct, whether the reliefee likes it or not. With them, it is an obsession; third, the parasites and opportunists who live off the distress of others. In this last category we have not only individual ghouls but some business enterprises and so-called charitable organizations who are out to get their "cut," come what may.

Let me say that the great majority of individual Americans fall into the first category. On the other hand, the organized minorities—those who have access to powerful promotion and publicity media—are heavily concentrated in the second and third groups. More than once in the past decade have these traders in special privileges deceived a Congress into believing they voice the sentiments of a majority of the American public. Let me warn you against their smooth representations.

The administration's budget estimates on the foreign-aid bill totaled $6,533,000,000; the appropriation recommended by the House Appropriations Committee is $5,980,000,000. The direct reductions are as follows:

Economic Cooperation Administration, $245,000,000.

Trieste, $20,000,000.

China, $63,000,000.

Greece and Turkey, $75,000,000.

GARIOA, $150,000,000.

The appropriations for ECA and for China are recommended on a 15-month basis. The assistance for Trieste is covered into ECA and authority was carried for Japan, Korea, and the Ruykyus to be taken care of by ECA if sufficient funds are available.

There was some consternation among the advocates of blank check appropriations for this international aid because the House hearings were long and detailed. We took testimony from April 20 through May 21. I realize that it was embarrassing to the administration to have us reveal the complete lack of substantiating evidence on the proposed needs and requirements of the participating countries. To be sure, the hearings are full of figures and statistics, but take my advice and spare yourselves the torture of wading through them because they change every few pages. No two witnesses could agree on any one item, and the discrepancies in data supplied by the various Federal agencies resolved themselves into a tug-of-war as to which agency or department could "out-give" the other.

Let me high-light a few of the pertinent facts which inspired the reduction in funds:

First. It was proposed that ECA carry funds to take care of the balance of exchange between the participating countries and the United States. In making up their deficit balance, it included $288,000,000 which the ECA nations could spend out of other funds to pay their debts to the United States. Thus, it proposed that we, indirectly, pay their debts for them. This is neither a normal nor a healthy economic procedure.

Second. The grain crop for the participating countries is estimated by ECA consultants at practically the prewar figures. On the whole, the crops are so substantial that large relief supplies should not be required. For instance, France is expected to have 299,900,000 bushels—almost 300,000,000 bushels of grain with which to feed 42,000,000 persons.

This year our consumption for a population of 145,000,000 persons is estimated by the Department of Agriculture to be 560,000,000 bushels, or 3.9 bushels per head. Thus, the French have 7 bushels per person against our 4, yet ECA scheduled France to receive 60,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Western Germany is expected to produce 164,000,000 bushels of grain as against a 115,000,000-bushel crop last year. This would provide them with nearly as much consumption of wheat per capita as we have.

Italy is expected to produce 269,000,000 bushels, considerably more than last year, and enough to provide 4.9 bushels per capita.

Third. ECA proposes to furnish participating nations agricultural implements costing eighty-one and a half million dollars. This includes 26,100 hard-to-get tractors which American farmers have been begging for. Making that many tractors available overseas at this time poses some pertinent questions which were unsatisfactorily answered during the hearings. Foreign utilization of farm machinery, the availability of gasoline and parts, mechanical knowledge, are a few of the factors involved.

Fourth. Cotton cloth is scheduled for ECA totaling $72,600,000 and raw cotton to the tune of $511,000,000. Cotton manufacturing in recipient nations should be encouraged as an indirect aid to the American consumer who is still trying to purchase a house dress, shirts, and curtains at a reasonable price.

Fifth. Petroleum products are included in the program at a rate of $379,000,000. There is no secret about domestic shortages of this item, yet ECA planners seemed only vaguely aware of it.

Sixth. Coal is listed at a cost of $245,000,000 with about one-third of the supply coming from the United States.

Seventh. Tobacco is in the picture at a rate of $120,000,000.

Eighth. Timber is to be furnished at a rate of $142,000,000. We have been hearing a great deal about the housing shortage, lack of building materials, and scarce timber products. The next time a veteran tells you that he cannot get the ingredients that go into the building of a moderate-priced home, think of ECA and try to explain it to him.

Ninth. Hide, skins, and leather are to be shipped overseas at a rate of $89,000,000. Here is another item in short supply at home, with prices at peak levels.

Tenth. ECA proposes $114,000,000 for relief in Ireland, $295,000,000 for Belgium, $130,000,000 for Denmark, and $10,000,000 for Iceland, at a time when any one or all of these nations could go to a bank and secure a loan, if necessary.

If any more illustrations of the grandiose conception of this program are needed, I refer you to the charts available in the hearings. It is the same story all along the line.

The committee has reduced the amount for China to $400,000,000 and has provided that this shall be thoroughly supervised by persons who will see to it that China secures necessary assistance, and that it shall be utilized in such a manner as to help restore some semblance of order in that chaotic country.

I understand that Mr. Paul Hoffman, upon learning of the Appropriation Committee recommendation, remarked, "The less money we have, the less recovery we can get." In view of the foregoing evidence that seems to me to be an ill-advised statement. The $64 question is, Just where does the administration draw the line on foreign aid? Is the American taxpayer expected to finance a new world-wide design for living? Congress voted for a measure that would protect our national interests and foreign policy and help restore conditions abroad which would produce stable international economic relationship. The ECA planners have gone far beyond the intent of Congress, in my estimation. I am satisfied that with proper housekeeping ECA can get along for 15 months on the $4,000,000,000 which have been recommended and with that sum provide necessary relief and proper rehabilitation. Mr. Hoffman may have to cut out the furnishing of soft drinks, magazines, and picture books to Europe, but I have a hunch they will manage to get along without these items.

I want to take a few minutes to call your attention to a matter which I fear will resolve itself to a major stumbling block in this entire program. Perhaps if we air it out now, we may save ourselves much grief later on.

When the United States went into Germany as an occupying power the Army established a program known as government and relief in occupied areas. We call it GARIOA. This set-up was staffed with the apostles of the vicious Morgenthau plan, designed primarily to prevent the reestablishment of German economy and aimed to reduce Germany to the status of a goat pasture. GARIOA is riddled with vindictive hatreds quite foreign to American nature. When I was in

Germany last fall there were upward of 700,000 persons scheduled for trial on the charge of being Nazis. Some of the cases were absurd and far fetched. A merchant, for instance, who ran a grocery store and paid taxes to the Nazis and who very likely was forced to pay a money tribute to the party, yet may not have engaged in party activities, was hauled off to await trial for being a Nazi. Protests from Congressmen who made investigation into this situation resulted in the reduction of this so-called criminal horde to about 200,000. Even this was a fantastic number, and after some more screening and inquiry the group was reduced to between 25,000 to 50,000. It is is my hope that this procedure will soon end.

The Morgenthau boys engage in their own peculiar type of sadism. They have blocked every attempt to bring about German rehabilitation and recovery. Their revenge has cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars and it has made a mockery of our efforts to sell democracy. A direct result of this policy is the present German industrial production which stands at only 37 percent of prewar level. France is over 100 percent. United Kingdom stands at 116 percent. Ireland at 118 percent. Italy runs about 85 percent prewar. The Netherlands stand at nearly 100 percent and Belgium at 112 percent. Our misguided policy in Germany costs $700,000,000 for relief through GARIOA and $549,000,000 through ECA which totals $12,000,000,000 for relief in Germany alone.

GARIOA and ECA personnel will be working closely together in the occupied areas. There is bound to be some interchange of personnel and I maintain that the ability, sincerity and forthright Americanism of the persons assigned to these jobs should be of primary concern to every Member of the House and every citizen of the United States.

I have repeatedly questioned Mr. Hoffman and his assistants with regard to their choice of staff. I have been repeatedly assured that the very best talent in the Nation will be solicited. We shall see. In the next day or so, I will have ready a statement on the type of persons it appears that we will have to cope with in the European relief program. They will bear watching.

As a result of ECA we will be building up our agricultural production way beyond our domestic consumption. This program will also be responsible for expanding our industrial production considerably beyond our domestic needs. What comes after this mammoth relief program?

If we keep the present incompetent planners in the saddle, they will dream up a subsequent program whereby we will have to tax our people to pay a subsidy to business and agriculture to reduce production.

Let us pause on this monetary merry-go-round for a moment and consider the folks back home. Give them a break and move cautiously on ECA. Let us be generous when needed but let us not be foolhardy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to relief and the report refers as follows:

> The purpose of this was twofold: To direct grants, to help feed, clothe, and house hungry and impoverished people.

Now, can the gentleman tell us whether or not any of this food or material that we are giving as aid will be given directly to feed and care for hungry people in these countries or do these hungry people have to pay for the stuff they get?

Mr. TABER. I understand it is turned over in such a way that most of these people pay for it in the currency of their own land.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The same as they did in the interim-aid program?

Mr. TABER. I understand so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Which means 99 percent of the people in the low-income groups will never get a bit of this assistance we are giving to them.

Mr. TABER. I do not know about that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman indicates that he thinks the de-Nazification program in our zone in Germany has retarded progress in that zone.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the gentleman thinks that we have carried the de-Nazification program too far?

Mr. TABER. I think so, and down too deep.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is to be much regretted that the House is called upon to consider this bill. It is especially to be regretted that the American people are called upon to provide this enormous sum of money for expenditure abroad.

Let us labor under no misapprehension. While every effort will be made to salvage as much of this money as possible by putting it in the form of loans, with such security as is available, we must face the fact that the great proportion of it is to be disbursed in grants and gratuities. We may as well understand now that there is little prospect that any considerable amount of it will ever be paid back.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are in the same position that we were in in 1941, when war came from the clouds, without premonition; we had no choice; we had no alternative; and we poured into the devouring crucible of war, without stint, billions of dollars that could have been so advantageously spent in the processes of peace, in eliminating disease, in banishing poverty, in establishing foundations for education and retirement and building great national facilities which would contribute for all time to come to the happiness and welfare of our people in this and future generations.

Then, as now, we had no choice.

As in 1942 we appropriated, through no choice of our own, billions of dollars in a desperate struggle for survival, we are now called on to appropriate billions of dollars to avoid a war of extermination.

Some have the impression that this is a relief measure. Quite the contrary. Relief is only incidental. We are not spending this money from any altruistic sentiment of charity or philanthropy. It is a cold, hard-headed business proposition of self-preservation.

The real issue here is not the number of bushels of wheat or tons of coal or the amount of wool or tobacco involved. The proposition before us today, when expressed in the bluntest terms, is to avoid another war.

There is no assurance that it will have the effect desired. There is no certainty that it will ward off a third world war. But it is the only alternative; the only recourse which promises success. We either provide money to rehabilitate western Europe and reestablish their industries and put them on their feet and make them once more self-sustaining and strong enough to reject communism and repulse Russia—or we start an all-out race of armaments in which we will eventually sink a thousand times the amounts involved in this program—and a race which can only culminate in a holocaust of war the like of which the world has never seen nor dreamed.

We must take one of two roads. We can pass this bill—with an amount sufficient to carry out this program—or we can turn our country into an armed camp, drill our young men, regiment our economy and eventually fight the war for which both Russia and the United States are preparing feverishly and at a rapidly increasing tempo.

Either we rehabilitate our allies, reestablish their industries, and support the anticommunistic governments in the capitals of western Europe or we prepare for eventual war.

I do not need to tell anyone here what another war means. With our high national debt, and with the enormous burden of our present armament program, another war will have two effects: It will completely destroy our present system of individual enterprise on the one hand, and on the other hand it will decimate our people and reduce our major cities to rubble.

When you drive through the streets of Berlin, Frankfurt, and Essen and view the utter destruction of what were once the most beautiful and the most opulent cities in the world; when you traverse the site of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and see what one blast has accomplished in those terrible areas, you have but the faintest idea of what is in store for cities and peoples in future wars.

We are now told that the bomb used on Hiroshima is today as out of date as a model T Ford, and that the new engines of destruction, the improved methods of mass eradication, not only atomic warfare but bacterial warfare, are such that only an inconsiderable part of the urban populations of nations engaged in future wars will escape. The Secretary of the World Organization for Health of the United Nations estimates that in the

event of another war 90 percent—it seems to me that is an exorbitant number, but I am just giving you his views of it, and he is in a position to know as much as anybody knows about it—90 percent of the people of all the nations involved would be destroyed, and only 10 percent would be left.

Let us turn it around and put it the other way. Suppose that 90 percent were left and only 10 percent destroyed. To save even that menace to 10 percent of our people, not to mention our cities, we can afford to spend the amount cut from this bill and consider it a bargain. Some may be inclined to question the possibility, but Himmler assured Germany that no hostile bomb would ever fall within the borders of the Fatherland. In view of the fact that Russia has more effective planes than we have and is building planes faster than we are, some of our statesmen may be as sadly mistaken as Himler.

This program is costly. It comes high. But if we are to adopt measures to avoid another war, if we are to have any assurance of avoiding another Pearl Harbor, if we are to insure our cities against a destruction worse than Hiroshima and Berlin, this is our only present practical plan. It is this or preparation for war. What else have we to offer?

In the past week in both the House and the Senate, bills providing unprecedented peacetime appropriations for the Army and Navy have been passed. Never before in the history of this country, or any other country, have such enormous peactime provisions been made for war.

Last week the Munitions Board alerted throughout the Nation every industrial plant capable of producing war material. They were admonished to stand by and be ready for overnight conversion. Programs were distributed to every manufacturing establishment susceptible of being converted on short notice to the production of war material. What does that mean?

But here, embodied in this bill, is a chance to avoid war. And there is every prospect that it may prove effective. Already the Marshall plan is having a determining effect. Only last summer, there were times when it was thought impossible to save Italy from communism. There was apprehension that the anticommunistic government could not be sustained.

There was a time when the anticommunistic ministry in France wavered in the balance. Even in staid old England there was growing apprehension.

But with the enactment of the Marshall plan by the United States Congress the situation changed. Communism was defeated in the Italian election by an overwhelming majority. A stable government has been established in Greece. The anticommunistic administration has been strengthened in France. Throughout western Europe hope is restored and recovery is progressing at an encouraging rate.

But this bill proposes to cut the estimates more than a billion dollars. The cut is without justification. Not a single witness who appeared before the committee recommended a reduction. No evidence was adduced which warranted any such reduction. Every agency of Government examined testified that the estimate called for the minimum; that any reduction would be disastrous.

If there is any doubt as to the appropriation that doubt may be resolved in favor of the full estimate, with the assurance that Mr. Hoffman will be in charge of its expenditure and administration and may be relied upon to conserve all funds under his direction and to spend only what is necessary to make the recovery plan effective. Mr. Hoffman impressed every member of the committee as a competent, experienced businessman of the greatest sincerity and integrity. No better qualified man could possibly be secured for the exacting requirements of his office, and if by any inconceivable chance he should fail to do his duty or prove neglectful of the trust imposed upon him the joint committee, the watchdog committee, of which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is himself a member, will have constant opportunity for observation and recommendation and is in a position to forestall any mistake or right any error.

Public sentiment approves the Marshall plan and the appropriation of the full amount recommended by the estimate. Editorial comment from the Nation's newspapers reaching Washington this morning is unanimous in criticism of the Committee on Appropriations for the proposed cut.

Here is what the New York Times says this morning:

> Today it is the chief hope of democratic forces everywhere to hold their own against the onslaught of the new totalitarian power to the east, yet today this whole program is endangered because of the action of the House Appropriations Committee in slashing the funds already authorized by the Congress to a point which must dim the hopes and slacken the energies it has aroused.

Here is the considered opinion of a newspaper ranking as one of the greatest newspapers of the world.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman think the Soviet press is saying throughout the world with regard to the action of this committee?

Mr. CANNON. The action of this committee in cutting this estimate meets with the wholehearted approval of the Soviet press. You will think, when you review the Soviet press, that the committee of this House was an agency of the U. S. S. R.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON. Not at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has made a very serious charge in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> By Mr. CANNON: You will think, when you review the Soviet press, that the committee of this House was an agency of the U. S. S. R.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> By Mr. CANNON: You will think, when you review the Soviet press, that the committee of this House was an agency of the U. S. S. R.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the words used indicate criticism of the House but do not reflect upon the integrity of any Member of the House; therefore the Chair does not believe the words used are unparliamentary.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6801, with Mr. COLE of New York in the chair.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the warm approval, by the Soviet press, of the action of the Committee on Appropriations in cutting the estimates for the implementation of the Marshall plan is reflected in a flash just received over the ticker. It says: "Recommended cut ERP appropriations featured jubilantly on front pages Communist and Soviet newspapers."

And again: "This Washington news item comes like a sledge-hammer blow for the 16 governments who staked all their hopes on Marshall plan."

Here is a further quotation from the editorial page of this morning's New York Times, which is particularly apropos:

> This slash amounts to nothing less than a betrayal of American commitments already made and a repudiation of the will of Congress itself, as expressed in previous authorizations.

Here is an excerpt from an editorial in this morning's New York Herald Tribune:

> And the House, in particular, must rebuke the ill-advised efforts of its Appropriations Committee to whittle down the appropriations for the European recovery program and other foreign-aid plans.

There has been no editorial comment to the contrary by any paper that has yet reached Washington.

> It is not merely that the authorizations approved by Congress for those purposes were minimum sums for the tasks involved and that reduction may well mean failure.

That is true, because we were told that this was the smallest amount for which the job could be done. Now they are cutting the minimum one-third to one-fourth.

Nor is the Appropriations Committee action bad only because it attempts to alter by indirection policy decisions that were made after full and free debate, and, therefore, constitutes a blow to the reputation of the American Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

According to this paper the reputation of the American Congress, for fair play, for good faith, is at stake.

The foreign-aid programs are the positive portion of American policy and, as events in Italy and other portions of western Europe during the last few months have demonstrated, a most effective means of enabling national communities to regain their economic health and check or throw off Communist infections.

Already it is working. It is pushing war further into the background. It is contributing to both American and world prosperity.

They are just as essential to this country's security as armaments.

And at this time they are more important because they may make it possible to avoid the necessity of providing for armaments.

And the House cannot vitiate the effect of its prompt action on defense by cheese-paring in this parallel field.

Another indisputable evidence of the attitude of the American people on this very vital measure: Only a little while ago the likelihood of the nomination of Mr. VANDENBERG for the Presidency of the United States at Philadelphia was considered exceedingly remote. There were a dozen candidates ahead of him. But, as a result of his leadership in the Senate in sponsoring this legislation and securing its enactment, he is today the top man in all editorial lists of those who aspire to the nomination. What has given him that preeminence? His statesmanship, his constructive management of this vital legislation has given him the first place of all Republican contenders in the hearts of the American people. And if through any unforeseen misfortune we should happen to have a Republican President, it is my considered opinion that he would make the greatest President his party could provide.

On the other hand, let us consider who is against this bill. Mr. Wallace is against it. He has opposed it on all occasions. Are you going along with Mr. VANDENBERG or Mr. Wallace?

There is another gentleman who does not like it. That is Mr. Stalin. When the Marshall plan was proposed he came out from under cover for the first time and issued open orders in every capital in Europe that the Communists were to oppose the Marshall plan and everything pertaining to it. There you have the issue well defined. You can go with Senator VANDENBERG or you can trail along with Mr. Wallace and Mr. Stalin.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most far-reaching appropriation bills ever considered by the Congress or any other parliamentary body.

It carries with it a total of some $6,000,000,000. It provides for financial aid to some 24 different nations.

It makes available for ECA $4,000,000,000, in addition to $55,000,000 already provided in a previous deficiency bill, and in addition to $1,000,000,000 already provided on a public-debt basis through the Export-Import Bank; in other words, a total of $5,055,000,000.

It contemplates $20,000,000 for the Free Territory of Trieste.

It provides $200,000,000 in addition to unexpended balances for Greece and Turkey.

It provides $400,000,000 for China.

It provides $1,250,000,000 for government and relief in the occupied areas.

It provides $60,000,000 for the International Children's Emergency Fund, and $70,000,000 for the International Refugee Organization.

Much of the world is involved in this appropriation bill.

Most of the program which the bill is designed to implement is in my judgment of the greatest importance to America if only from the standpoint of national self-interest. It is designed, as we all know, to aid nations in western Europe to get upon their feet again. It is designed to check the spread of communism throughout the world.

In my judgment, it has already contributed very hopeful results in both respects.

Most of the items provided for in this bill are, in my opinion, adequately covered in the report. I am going to limit what I have to say at this time to a few brief comments on the appropriation for ECA.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat as far as my own personal point of view is concerned, that I am one of those who has favored a recovery program for Europe from the outset. My views were strengthened in this respect by a visit which I made last autumn to nine European countries, many of which I had known well in days gone by when I worked for some 4 years in Germany and in France.

During the trip I saw in country after country on the one hand the economic and financial problems growing out of the war, and on the other hand the threat of communism, either within the borders of the country, or just outside those borders.

I saw what to me was a vicious circle, threatening to encircle some 260,000,000 people with an enormous productive capacity, people who largely think and feel as we do, people, many of whom stood shoulder to shoulder with us in World War I or in World War II.

I returned with the conviction that the recovery-program gamble must be taken and that it must be taken in our own national self-interest. I have not changed my mind in that respect.

But, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the question of how much is necessary to implement a proper recovery program and how much we can afford to spend in fairness to ourselves and in fairness to the rest of the world, there is presented an entirely separate question.

That is the question which members of your Committee on Appropriations for months past and in particular during the last 6 weeks have been striving to answer. That is the question which is before the House as a whole on this occasion. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that if any of you had sat through the last 6 weeks of hearings before the Committee on Appropriations I believe you would be amazed in the light of all the thought that has been put on this tremendously important question, how little specific information is available.

I am frank to state that my own conclusion as a result of the hearings is that there is no one in the Government who can predict with any accuracy the amount that will be necessary in the period under consideration to do the job that the Congress has determined shall be done within a matter of a billion dollars. It is a matter of guesswork with very few definite facts to work with.

Mr. Chairman, I have here an over-all break-down presented to us by the Department of State reflecting the computation of needs as presented for consideration to your committee.

In column 1 there is a long list of items purporting to show the needs of the 17 participating nations in Europe.

Your committee has considered those figures with great care. I submit, reflecting as they do the deficit in the balance of payments with the Western Hemisphere, that they are subject to very wide variation. Already we are beginning to hear of the extent to which crops and other conditions in the nations to be aided have improved since these estimates were determined.

In column 2 is another set of figures entitled "Dollar Earnings." These figures total $4,468,000,000. They are supposed to represent earnings which the recipient nations can be expected to obtain through their own foreign trade, and the total is deducted from the total in column 1, reflecting estimated needs of those nations.

Your committee has also considered these figures with great care. Again, I submit that no one can predict with any accuracy what these figures will actually prove to be in the light of the recovery now being realized in Europe.

In column 3 you will find a third set of figures aggregating $1,315,000,000, entitled, "Loans and Credits." These loans and credits are also an estimate of what can be obtained aside from ECA from Western Hemisphere countries, from the World Bank, from the Export-Import Bank, and from private financing. The total is also deducted from the estimated needs of the 17 countries.

These figures have also been carefully considered by your committee. They are also a guess. They are very much on the conservative side, in my judgment. I may note in passing that the Herter committee, or its chairman, in appearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, indicated that in their judgment there was an underestimate here to the extent of some $900,000,000.

Over and above this is the all-important question of availability. Here again we have been presented with detailed figures showing production, imports, and contemplated exports for commodity after commodity. The representatives of the Administration made

a real effort to present the committee with information along this line which they had been unable to present heretofore.

Here again, however, it is impossible, in my judgment, to predict with any accuracy. It is largely a day-to-day job for the ECA Administrator and for the Department of Commerce.

A change in the price level could alter the entire picture.

We have been given a break-down by country, showing the tentative allocations that might be made to each of the 17 countries.

We have been given a break-down by commodity, showing the tentative allocations that might be made in terms of each of some 50 commodities.

Again, Mr. Chairman, all of these figures are tentative and subject to change at almost any time.

All that anyone can do is to make the best possible estimate he can in the light of all the evidence.

Your committee has spent 6 weeks in hearings. It has given the details presented painstaking consideration. The testimony is embodied in two volumes of hearings, some 1,500 pages in length.

Your committee's best estimate after 6 weeks of hearings, after careful consideration of all the facts presented by the Administration, is to the effect that, barring unexpected developments, if the funds are wisely spent, if they are properly screened, if they are properly supervised, it will be very difficult to spend in a period of 15 months the $4,000,000,000 carried in this bill, the $55,000,000 already provided in another appropriation bill, and the $1,000,000,000 already provided in terms of national-debt-transactions, a total of $5,055,000,000.

Your committee's best estimate after 6 weeks of hearings, after careful consideration of all the facts presented by the Administration, is to the effect, in view of the fact that ECA has only allocated some $208,000,000 in the first 2 months of its existence, in view of the improved conditions abroad, in view of the possibility of greater loans and credits from the Western Hemisphere, and in view of the excess commodities programed in a number of instances, that barring unexpected developments, there will be ample funds to ECA requirements on the basis which has been provided.

The committee has made available substantially all the funds requested but on the basis of 15 months instead of 12 months. It has taken this action, knowing that the new Congress will be in session within about 6 months from the date of adjournment. It has done so knowing that if the estimate of the committee at this time should prove to be wrong, the matter can be dealt with by a supplemental appropriation at that time, without the slightest injury to the recovery program.

Mr. Chairman, this is a common practice in handling appropriations. It makes available all funds essential between now and the reconvening of the new Congress. It permits a supplemental appropriation at that time if necessary in the light of actual experience.

There is nothing unusual in the procedure. There is no attempt to "wreck the plan." The remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the press comments referred to simply make "much ado about nothing," and tend to create a most unfortunate impression abroad which is completely unwarranted by the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The committee's proposal is a perfectly normal operation in terms of appropriations. There is no attempt to sabotage or wreck the recovery program. The hope of America is that the plan will succeed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make two more brief observations in concluding these remarks.

First, the success of the program in my opinion is largely dependent on the restoration, subject to proper controls, of the productive capacity of western Germany. A recent report from the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations shows for the third quarter of 1947 that Germany's productive capacity was only 37 percent of that in 1936, while the productive capacity of England, Belgium, France, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia approached or surpassed prewar figures.

Germany has a potential productive capacity which is essential to western European recovery. It should be stimulated, it should be utilized. Its importance, in my judgment, cannot be overemphasized.

It is to be hoped that with the cooperation of all concerned, ECA will result in producing within Germany sufficient food to assure manpower, a sound currency to assure incentive, and a real restoration of productive capacity, subject to proper controls, sufficient to permit Germany to contribute not only to its own needs but to those of western Europe and at the same time to relieve the United States of America of the tremendous burden which we are now assuming.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I repeat that in my opinion the success of the program is primarily dependent on its administration.

Proper administration is of paramount importance. Improper administration could have tragic consequences for America. Impairment of our own economy would be a disaster not only for America but for the world as a whole.

Mr. Hoffman and his associates, with the power to negotiate and the power to terminate; the Department of Commerce with the last word in the field of export licenses, have a tremendous responsibility to America and to the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there are many uneventful days in the House; frequently the visitor in the gallery of the House observes nothing of special importance to the Nation and to the world. But today the situation is different. We have before us a piece of legislation which will have repercussions around the world.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who has addressed us, a very able Member of this House, was formerly an athlete. He knows just how important it is in any sort of race or contest to get off to a good start. There is much at stake in this program and it is most important that we get off to a good start. If the horse stumbles and falters just as he begins to run, the chances are he will not be in the money.

The United States of America today is playing for big stakes. Great things are in the balance. We cannot afford to lose. We must win. But here in the very beginning of this program we have cut off the top one-fifth of the appropriations, approximately $1,000,000,000 out of the five billion three hundred million which was authorized. That has been done in a very few simple words by making the program a 15-month program instead of a 12-month program as was finally agreed upon in the authorizing legislation after much controversy in the House and Senate.

So, we have cut off one-fifth. If you reduce by one-fifth this appropriation you cannot get off to a good start. You are crippled to begin with. You can keep the program alive, but you will not secure maximum results from the program and maximum results is our aim.

There are some of us who in our youth and in more recent days have been familiar with agriculture. Coming from the great plains of the mighty West I know something about agriculture in that area where the rains do not fall as frequently as we would like. There are times when we have just enough rain to keep the crop alive. It stands there, but it does not produce fruit. We do not have an adequate harvest. We merely keep the crop alive. What we want this program to do is to produce fruit.

Now, to be completely practical about the matter, about half of this program is just for relief as such, shall we say. It is for food and for fuel. It is for grain coming from our great wheat farms of the Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, and elsewhere, and from the corn fields of Iowa and elsewhere. But, there is no need for the Congress to pour money down the drain, so to speak. I came to the support of this program with considerable reluctance, on the ground that it was not a relief program but a recovery program, and if you cut out the upper one-fifth you make it rather a relief program and you detract from it as a recovery program. What I voted for when I voted for the authorization legislation was for a recovery program, and this pending bill, I am afraid, does not get the job done.

I can understand that men have differences of opinion about this foreign-aid program. It is easy for honest men to differ. But, the fact is that the Congress has now approved the program and had I voted against the program in its original authorization I would now feel that there was nothing else to do after my country had started and committed itself to the program other than to go along with it and try to make it a success. It is going to be difficult to make it succeed as we would have it succeed, but if we get off to a good start the chances of success are much greater, and therefore I shall support wholeheartely

the amendment which will be offered to restore the reductions which have been made. I do not want anybody to point his finger at me in the future and say, "if this program fails, yes, the program failed; you authorized it; you told the world what you were going to do; you put your hand to the plow but you turned back before you got started." Nobody is going to point an accusing finger at me and say that I did not give the program a chance. There is doubt as to whether or not the program will succeed, but I am going to give the program a chance, realizing the difficulties involved and that mistakes will no doubt be made. It is easy to criticize, but it is hard to go forward and do the job. Yet the job must be done. We have committed ourselves to this program and we must give it a chance. If the program then fails to succeed, we cannot feel that we have let down the people of America who have supported it and the people of the world who are depending upon it.

I should like to say that while this act is called the Foreign Aid Act, I have supported it upon the theory that it is not necessarily or exclusively a foreign-aid act, but that it is a program in the interest of the merican people. After all, I am not a great humanitarian, I am just a down-to-earth man from the great Southwest. I want to get results out of this program, and I want the program to be of aid to the people of my own country, and I am convinced that it will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Any student of present-day affairs knows that had it not been for the program of the United States of America in foreign aid, which is also American aid, the great Red tide would have already swept over western Europe. There is no doubt in my mind about that. Is there any doubt in the mind of anyone as to whether or not western Europe would have already been engulfed had it not been for the strong stand of the United States of America since VJ-day? I think not. I doubt that reasonable men could differ about that situation.

How many billions of dollars would we give to prevent the Red tide from sweeping all over western Europe and engulfing 260,000,000 people? It sounds heroic to talk about standing alone with your back to the wall, but I am convinced that the United States of America, as great as it is, cannot afford the luxury of undertaking in this disturbed world to stand alone. My people and yours came from across the seas, and there is some of that blood still left abroad. There are 260,000,000 people in western Europe. If the contest ever comes between the east and the west, I think it will save many billions of dollars and many millions of American lives if the 260,000,000 people, of the same blood as our forebears across the sea, have not lost their freedom and if they believe in democracy, and if they stand firm with the United States of America.

I want to see England, France, Spain, Italy, and the other countries of western Europe grow as strong as they can in order that they may stand on their feet and stand for something in this world, and help us in this great effort to preserve the stability of the world and the freedom of mankind.

In its simplest terms, all that this program is for is to help those people help themselves in order that they may help us to chart this world on the right course. It is a tremendous challenge and it is a mighty task that we have undertaken. In that task we must have friends. This program is designed to help our friends to help themselves, in order that they may help us and the world.

Some disparaging remarks have been made about those in the executive branch who have been working on this program. I did not know of Mr. Hoffman prior to his testimony before our committee. I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican, but he appears to be a fine American citizen. He tells me that in the background of all his thinking is the welfare of the United States of America, and that in the administration of this program his every thought is for the well-being and welfare of our own country. He says: "If you do not give us this money, we will not be able to do the job that has been assigned." He pleads for the program. When he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, he said, "We have set our goal and we would like for the committee to stand by us." Well, it was only a few days ago on April 3 that we almost unanimously passed the foreign-relief program. So why not follow through on what we said we would do? You know that a voice has come out of the Kremlin directed to the people of the western world saying, "Do not trust America. Do not be so stupid as to think America will follow a consistent foreign policy." They have told the people of western Europe that America would forsake them when Europe needed them most. No doubt in their propaganda broadcasts they are saying, "I told you so. Come link arms with Moscow." I do not think the Congress is going to reject this program, even before it has been well started. I believe the Congress is going to restore the funds originally proposed for the 12 months' program and that we are going to give it a try. Then next year when Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and I hear them testify before our committee with reference to any future program we can say, "We gave you the money that you requested. Now give us an accounting. What has been the measure of your success?" I am not going to have them say, "Well, you know we got off to a bad start. We made commitments which we could not fulfill. The blame is on the doorstep of Congress."

I do not want to be maneuvered into any such position as that. Moreover, having voted to authorize this 12-month program for $5,300,000,000, I do not propose to back up in the intervening days between April 3 and today, June 4. It does not make sense.

Another thing that the Congress can be sure of is that we are going to try to keep our hand on the pulse, so to speak, of this thing. We are going to watch the program as it operates. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and many of us as members of the so-called Herter Committee on Foreign Aid, went to Europe last year to look at the situation first-hand and learn what we could about a very confusing picture—and it is a very confusing picture. The legislation which authorizes the present appropriation wisely provides that the Congress shall appoint a watchdog committee to see to it that this program is well administered. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] are representatives from the Committee on Appropriations on the watchdog committee. They are two fine Americans who can be depended upon, along with other members of the committee, to do a good job. So realizing all the difficulties, or at least many of them, I stand pat on the proposition that we cannot do other than to carry through on what we said we proposed to do and give the program a chance.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does the gentleman mean to intimate to the Committee that the Appropriations Committee has no responsibility whatsoever once an authorization figure has been voted?

Mr. MAHON. No. The Appropriations Committee does have a responsibility. I am sure that the Appropriations Committee should assume that responsibility, and the overwhelming majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee voted for the entire authorization. So it does not become us now to reduce that sum by one-fifth in the light of the testimony and in the face of the appeal of Mr. Hoffman, the administrator of the program. The benefits of this program will come in the upper brackets of the appropriation—in the last dollars rather than the first dollars. The first dollars are for food. The last dollars are for recovery. I am most anxious that we give the program a real chance for success, and I believe we will.

I would like to say this with emphasis: This is not a partisan program. This is not a Democratic program. This is not a Republican program. This is an American program. In this great foreign-policy matter our controversies end at the water's edge, and we are working together on this proposition; and working together, I believe we can restore this bill to a place where Mr. Hoffman says he will be able to do a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additiona' minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman has made much of the fact that there was an authorization bill for a given sum passed on April 3. Does the gentleman completely overlook and ignore the fact that that bill was passed in response to certain specific, clear, unconditional representations made by the administration,

to wit: that if you do not give us this measure we shall be compelled to ask for heavy additional appropriations for the Army and the Navy. Need I remind the gentleman that the bill had no sooner passed than all of these heavy additional requests were made and have been approved by this Congress and so presented to our Appropriations Committee, of which you are a distinguished member, the very difficult and important question of balancing all of the great commitments, foreign and domestic, of the United States, with a view to maintaining the solvency of the United States and its people.

Mr. MAHON. I am glad the gentleman made that observation. He makes it crystal clear that the world condition has worsened since this authorization was made. The gentleman makes very clear the point that if we needed a program to help bolster up the nations of western Europe, who are traditionally our friends, we need it worse today. Moreover, need I point out that the Congress has been aware of that situation because the Congress has appropriated for national defense much larger sums than were requested even by the Executive; funds for a 70-group air program and other expansion of our national defense program.

I want to say this, during the war we spent hundreds of billions of dollars; this present program is a program designed to prevent the recurrence of that very thing. We are appropriating this session about twelve or fourteen billion dollars for national defense, but that would be a mere pittance if war should come again. It seems to me that we must gamble the $5,300,000,000 in this program, which was authorized by the Congress, as the best insurance that anyone has recommended to date, as a supplement to our national defense program in an effort to prevent world war III.

Next week we are going to be called upon to provide an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, which will probably run to about $6,000,000,000. It is thus quite apparent that war is expensive in more ways than one. Now is the time to build the foundations for future peace.

This is a desperate effort, shall I say, to protect our Nation and our world and we must make the program succeed. This foreign relief—American aid program, shall I say, must go hand and hand with our military program if there is to be any hope for success, and I am not one of those who thinks there is no hope of success. The American people have always met the challenge of the hour in the days gone by and the American people will meet it again. They have put their shoulder to the wheel and they are not going to falter in the heat of sun; they are going forward. While mistakes will be made and hearts will be heavy because of those mistakes I am confident that Mr. Hoffman and those who work with him have done the best job they could in a short time in outlining their undertaking. It is not a perfect program but they have done their best in the short length of time to present the problem to us. I hope and confidently expect that as the weeks go along and they gain experience in administration they are going to do a reasonably good job; at any rate, they must be given a chance to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, many of the details in this bill, which is really an omnibus bill, have been well covered by previous speakers. There may, however, be some additional information that I may have to add to what has been said in order to enlighten those of you who did not have the opportunity to sit in the sessions of the deficiency committee which had this bill under consideration for many weeks. In fact, as the chairman told you a little while ago, we have been in session from the early part of April to the last part of May considering every phase of this far-reaching bill.

Many of you listening to this debate perhaps concentrate your minds upon only one phase of it, that phase which was originally known as the Marshall plan, then later the European relief program, and now the ECA or Economic Cooperation Administration. That is only part of this very important bill. You must take into consideration the fact that this bill provides an appropriation of approximately $6,000,000,000 to which must be added a billion which will be available through the Export-Import Bank, making a total of a little over $7,000,000,000 for various foreign-relief items. Some of them were authorized a long time ago and have been implemented several times with appropriations. Among them is IRO, which has to do with the relief of people in displaced-persons camps in Europe; the Children's Feeding Fund, an international organization which receives about 72 percent of its funds from us; Greek-Turkish assistance; the Japanese-Korean-Ryukyus items; and a number of other items not originally in the Marshall plan. At the same time, I must remind the House that since the beginning of fiscal year 1946, or the end of the war, this country has rendered foreign assistance through grants and credits in the net amount of $18,182,000,000. In addition, the United States has invested in the International Monetary Fund the amount of $2,750,000,000 and has subscribed to capital stock of the International Bank in the amount of $635,000,000. Over and above this subscription to the capital stock of the International Bank, the United States has assumed a contingent liability to purchase additional stock in the bank to the extent of $2,540,000,000 whenever losses are incurred by the bank.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy for those who may have a personal interest in appropriation bills to criticize members of the committee who are endeavoring to develop all facts. It is also easy for those who may be subsidized by money in these appropriation bills to criticize members of the committee when they endeavor to bring these matters into the light of day. However, I am sure that the membership of the House, when it passed the bill authorizing the Marshall plan, served notice on the Appropriations Committee that it did not want this committee to close its eyes to facts and hand an uninformed and very new administrator a blank check. I am sure that the membership of the House expected this Appropriations Committee to do its duty to the American taxpayers and bring a bill back to this House with figures based on some real justification. This is the kind of an appropriation bill we have brought to you and it should be approved because it represents more reliable information and more actual facts than this House had when the authorization bill was presented to it.

Many of the items that came to us from the Administration have changed radically since they were originally secured by those officials. Many of the countries which will participate in this relief have recovered to a great extent since the time the original figures were submitted to the original drafters of this program. I assure you that every reduction in this appropriation bill has been made only after careful consideration; after many, many days and weeks of interrogation of witnesses; and after ascertaining facts as to availability in the United States and present productivity and future productivity in the foreign countries that will participate in this program, I say to the Members of the House that the reductions that we have made were made on the basis of the best possible justifications and information secured by the members of the committee. Much of this information we had to develop ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, some criticism has been leveled against the chairman of the Appropriations Committee because he has made some reductions in this appropriation bill and because he refuses to give blank checks to administrative officials who come before the Congress for appropriations that have been authorized by law. I wish all of you could know the real service record of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. This great American was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress and reelected to every succeeding Congress, including this Eightieth Congress, by the people of the Thirty-eighth Congressional District of New York.

The people of the Thirty-eighth Congressional District of New York and the people of the United States should be congratulated on having a statesman of the caliber of JOHN TABER as their servant in the House of Representatives. Without injuring any department of government one iota, he has saved for the American taxpayers in his long length of service untold millions of dollars and at the same time brought more efficiency into many agencies of Government. I know this to be the fact, Mr. Chairman, because it has been my privilege to personally observe the work of this public servant. It has been a privilege for me to be a member of the committee of which he is the chairman.

I wonder if Members of the House and if the people of our country realize that in the 22 or 23 years the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has been a Member of the House of Representatives he

has had much to do in steering and helping to appropriate the money which won the First World War; which made possible the atomic bomb and the winning of the Second World War. If the history of JOHN TABER's service in the House of Representatives was written on a blackboard and the appropriation figures put on one side and his contribution on legislation on another, I am sure that his critics, who are so vehement today in denouncing what they call "Taberism" would really admit that the total on the John Taber "blackboard of service" spells that "Taberism" is in reality honest-to-goodness American common sense and honest-to-goodness Americanism.

Members of the Committee, this bill is so far reaching that it is going to reach into the pocketbooks of every man, woman, and child in the United States. While you are sitting here debating this bill the speculators of the world have their fingers on the pulse of what is going to happen to prices because of this bill. They have anticipated what this bill is going to contain and they know today almost to the dollar how many hundreds of millions of dollars they may get a chance to make. In every hotel in Washington today you will find crowds of people who are already dealing in the 30 or 40 commodities represented in this huge appropriation bill. So is there any reason, members of the Committee, that your chairman and member of the deficiency committee should not go into every item requested in order to protect the interest of the American taxpayer and in order to provide the necessary relief to feed the hungry and the needy the world over? There is no intention on the part of the members of this committee to deny our friends in the 20 or 24 countries that are going to participate in this relief program some help and some cooperation.

Very few of you have had the opportunity to know the figures that were first presented to us and on which justifications were made for these appropriations. It was because you feared, when you passed the authorization bill making ECA law the policy of our country; because you feared all these things which I am warning you about that you in your hearts believed that the Committee on Appropriations would protect you and the country and bring to you a bill which you could approve and which you could conscientiously support. When they brought before us the first figures we naturally asked them what they were going to buy. Further, what was the availability in the United States of America in the way of relief for foreign friends before we could afford to send it away? I marvel at the patience of my chairman and other members of the committee who worked every morning, noon, and night, Sundays and holidays, gathering information from the far corners of America and the world in order to be fair so we could justify the modest reductions we made in this bill. Do not forget this plan to help the world is to go on for over 4 years. Perhaps longer. Americans will have to tighten their belts and do without a lot of things if everything is provided which the committee is being asked to appropriate for. With the billions we have just voted for rearmament and the additional money requests for materials of all kinds there is going to be less and less for Americans and more and more for foreigners. Just where are we to desert the American and give priority to foreigners? Your committee has endeavored to put Americanism at the head of the priority list. The reductions are not so great compared with the total figures. Already the administrator has a billion dollars and up to date has not been able to spend over $208,000,000. So let us go slow with American taxpayers' money in this gigantic world relief program. Let us feed the hungry, clothe the cold, and help heal the sick, but let us also help them to help themselves.

They told us when they came before us that the total shipments to Europe from all sources in the first 10 months from the Western Hemisphere would be $2,345,000,000 worth of bread grains; $393,000,000 worth of fats and oils; $190,000,000 worth of oil cake; $369,000,000 worth of sugar; $360,000,000 worth of meats; $270,000,000 worth of dairy products; $70,000,000 worth of eggs; $34,000,000 worth of dried fruits; $47,000,000 worth of rice; $118,000,000 worth of coffee; $299,000,000 worth of tobacco; $790,000,000 worth of cotton; $42,000,000 worth of fertilizer; $158,000,000 worth of agricultural products; $327,000,000 worth of coal; $599,000,000 worth of petroleum products; $333,000,000 worth of timber; $162,000,000 worth of finished steel; $78,000,000 worth of crude and finished steel; $84,000,000 worth of trucks; $60,000,000 worth of freight cars; $48,000,000 worth of steel equipment; $16,000,000 worth of timber equipment; $158,000,000 worth of copper, and $37,000,000 worth of tin. And then it goes on, zinc, aluminum, wool, wool yarn, woolens, cotton yarn, cotton cloth, wood pulp, newsprint, rubber, hides, skins, fish, chemicals, vehicles, and many, many other things, as the old auctioneer used to say, too numerous to mention. It amounts to what? A total of $13,565,000,000 worth of commodities from the Western Hemisphere in 15 months, of which the ECA or the American taxpayer is to pay in 15 months $6,702,000,000, or on a 12-month basis $5,222,000,000. This will be a great drain on our resources. The little people will have less.

When you walk up and down the streets of America and your laboring man tells you he is paying too much for his shirts, or somebody says he is paying too much for cotton or wool hose, and when you go into the butcher shop and meat prices are too high, you may then wonder whether an appropriation committee should give a request for an appropriation the "once over" in order that the speculators of America and the speculators of the world do not take advantage of the American taxpayers' dollars which represent these huge appropriations.

There are so many things I could talk about, but I recommend to you the careful reading of the report, which in my opinion is a directive to the administrator to use these taxpayers' dollars wisely in order that needy humanity the world over can get some relief, and that the American people are not impoverished as a result of the action we take here.

Mr. Chairman, by leave granted me, I include with these remarks tables which contain figures the ECA originally proposed to us and which were part of the work sheets of your committee. They give you some idea of the original plan for the first 12- and first 15-month requirements from the Western Hemisphere:

Recapitulation by commodity imports and by other dollar payments

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF ECA OBLIGATIONS FOR COMMODITY IMPORT REQUIREMENTS AND FOR OTHER DOLLAR PAYMENTS, BY PERIODS

[In millions of dollars with 1 decimal]

Commodity	Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949				ECA obligations	
	Total shipments from Western Hemisphere (18 months) [1]	Shipments financed from sources other than ECA funds		Total (col. 1 minus cols. 2 and 3)	Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949 (15 months)	Apr. 1, 1948, to Mar. 31, 1949 (12 months)
		Dollar earnings [2]	Loans and credits [3]			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
01 Bread grains	2,345.8	351.8	799.7	1,194.3	1,232.1	957.2
02 Coarse grains	393.1	90.7	128.0	174.4	167.6	131.9
03 Fats and oils	190.7	51.1	57.0	82.6	79.2	60.2
04 Oilcake and meal	369.8	119.2	99.7	150.9	149.9	117.9
05 Sugar	360.2	149.2	47.6	163.4	106.4	83.6
06 Meat	270.6	28.7	16.2	225.7	169.5	133.5
07 Dairy products	70.1	24.8	3.3	42.0	15.0	12.0
08 Eggs	34.5	3.9	5.5	25.1	7.6	6.7
09 Dried fruits						

Recapitulation by commodity imports and by other dollar payments—Continued

[In millions of dollars with 1 decimal]

	Commodity	Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949				ECA obligations	
		Total shipments from Western Hemisphere (18 months) [1]	Shipments financed from sources other than ECA funds		Total (col. 1 minus cols. 2 and 3)	Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949 (15 months)	Apr. 1, 1948, to Mar. 31, 1949 (12 months)
			Dollar earnings [2]	Loans and credits [3]			
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(6)	(5)
10	Rice	47.8	11.9		35.9	36.0	34.6
11	Coffee	118.7	44.8	16.2	57.3	35.0	26.1
12	Other foods	188.3	102.9	35.6	49.8	24.1	20.0
13	Tobacco	299.0	82.1	9.3	207.6	138.4	110.2
14	Cotton	790.0	103.3	60.7	626.0	661.1	511.3
15	Nitrogen fertilizer	42.8	6.8	12.0	24.0	24.0	20.6
16	Phosphates	3.1	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0
17	Potash						
18	Agricultural machinery	158.0	44.7	14.2	99.1	106.0	81.5
20	Coal	327.1	44.0		283.1	305.9	245.3
20	Coal-mining machinery	81.9	22.6	4.7	54.6	59.5	49.1
21	Petroleum products	509.6	133.4	23.3	442.9	484.5	379.7
22	Timber	333.4	118.6	14.3	200.5	185.4	142.2
23A	Finished steel	162.5	69.5		93.0	97.0	75.5
23B	Crude and semifinished steel	78.3	53.1		25.2	25.1	20.2
23C	Pig iron	.3			.3	.3	.3
23D	Scrap iron						
23E	Rich iron ore	8.4	8.4				
24	Trucks	84.8	19.0	4.5	61.3	61.1	48.1
25	Freight cars	60.0			60.0	73.0	53.0
26	Steel equipment	48.1	11.0		37.1	35.3	28.3
27	Timber equipment	16.0			16.0	16.3	13.1
28	Electrical equipment	95.0	15.2	20.5	59.3	57.9	43.3
29	Copper	158.4	39.2		119.2	107.8	85.6
30	Tin	37.7	37.7				
31	Lead	88.5	19.3		69.2	75.5	53.5
32	Zinc	53.7	5.6		48.1	48.3	37.4
33	Aluminum	62.7	43.3		19.4	18.7	14.5
34	Wool	96.7	47.3	19.1	30.3	32.1	24.6
35	Wool yarn						
36	Woolens and worsteds						
37	Cotton yarn	4.3	.5		3.8	3.2	2.7
38	Cotton cloth	101.9	2.3		99.6	89.0	72.6
39	Wood pulp	36.0	36.0				
40	Newsprint	52.4	27.4		25.0	29.8	23.3
41	Rubber	4.2	1.4		2.8	2.8	2.1
42	Hides, skins, and leather	164.5	45.3	14.3	104.9	112.4	89.1
43	Fish	76.3	18.9		57.4	53.3	47.1
44	Chemicals	301.7	91.7	9.3	200.7	211.8	166.5
45	Machinery, n. e. s	587.5	29.5	136.4	421.6	458.0	329.4
46	Vehicles, n. e. s	251.2	52.5	70.8	127.9	107.2	88.6
47	Petroleum equipment	226.7	142.7	.4	83.6	80.8	67.4
48	Miscellaneous commodities	1,899.5	1,211.8	245.2	442.5	319.0	239.6
48A	Shipments from non-Western Hemisphere sources	200.0			200.0	200.0	160.0
49	Net dollar payments	817.3	645.6	145.1	26.6	26.6	22.0
50	Price adjustment [4]	766.6	258.8	122.8	385.0	372.0	289.6
	Grand total	13,565.3	4,468.5	2,136.8	6,960.0	6,702.5	5,222.0
1.	Administrative and other expenses					+97.5	+78.0
2.	ECA program April 1948 through March 1949						5,300.0
3.	Comparable ECA program April 1948 through June 1949					6,800.0	
	Reconciliation of 12-month ECA program with comparable 15-month ECA program:						
	12-month ECA program					5,300.0	
	Add: Estimated 3-month obligations (to bring to 15-month basis April 1949 through June 1949)					+1,500.0	
	Total					6,800.0	
	Reconciliation of comparable 15-month ECA program on obligations basis with that on shipments basis:						
	15-month obligations basis					6,800.0	
	Less: 15-month administrative and other expenses					−97.5	
	Total					6,702.5	
	Less: Obligations for future delivery					−800.0	
	Plus: Goods estimated to be in the pipe line April 1948 and financed prior to that date from sources outside of ECA program					+600.0	
	Deficit arising from Western Hemisphere shipments [1] which might be financed under comparable 15-month ECA program					6,502.5	
	Reconciliation of estimated net deficit arising from Western Hemisphere shipments [1] with comparable 15-month ECA program on shipments basis:						
	Grand total of column 4, above				6,960.0		
	Deficit arising from Western Hemisphere shipments [1] which might be financed under comparable 15-month ECA program				6,502.5		
	Estimated uncovered deficit				457.5		

[1] Includes shipments to bizone Germany from sources outside Western Hemisphere financed by ECA and amounting to $200,000,000.
[2] Includes proceeds arising from exports to Western Hemisphere countries, net dollar earnings on invisible account, and drawings on cash reserves.
[3] In the case of bizone Germany, includes the appropriation of $822,000,000 being requested by the Department of the Army for the prevention of disease and unrest.
[4] Commodity imports and exports are valued at July 1, 1947, prices. The entry on line 50 (price adjustment) represents 7½ percent of estimated commodity imports from the United States, 5 percent of estimated commodity imports from other Western Hemisphere, and 5 percent of estimated commodity exports to the Western Hemisphere to compensate approximately for price increases since July 1, 1947.

Recapitulation by participating countries

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF ECA OBLIGATIONS FOR COMMODITY IMPORT REQUIREMENTS AND FOR OTHER DOLLAR PAYMENTS, BY PERIODS

[In millions of dollars with 1 decimal]

Country	Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949				ECA obligations	
	Total shipments from Western Hemisphere (15 months) [1]	Shipments financed from sources other than ECA funds		Total (column 1 minus columns 2 and 3)	Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949 (15 months)	Apr. 1, 1948, to Mar. 31, 1949 (12 months)
		Dollar earnings [2]	Loans and credits [3]			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Austria	271.6	11.6	20.0	240.0	242.7	185.6
Belgium-Luxemburg and Belgian dependencies	987.4	348.8	211.0	427.6	378.2	295.5
Denmark	265.3	24.1	62.0	179.2	169.4	130.8
France and French dependencies	1,944.4	321.9	185.0	1,437.5	1,469.3	1,130.8
Greece	235.4	60.7	----------	174.7	137.5	106.4
Iceland	20.9	6.1	----------	14.8	14.1	10.9
Ireland	195.3	33.1	----------	162.2	150.0	113.9
Italy	1,122.8	171.0	112.0	839.8	901.1	703.6
Netherlands and Netherlands dependencies	1,178.2	181.8	175.0	821.4	777.7	599.6
Norway	263.3	120.7	79.8	62.8	42.1	32.8
Portugal and Portuguese dependencies	166.8	166.8	----------	----------	----------	----------
Sweden	497.4	355.0	63.0	79.4	36.0	28.4
Switzerland	445.4	445.4	----------	----------	----------	----------
Turkey	86.7	73.7	----------	13.0	12.8	10.0
United Kingdom and United Kingdom dependencies	4,273.4	2,067.8	407.0	1,798.6	1,670.6	1,324.3
Western Germany:						
Bizone	1,442.5	64.2	822.0	556.3	554.6	437.4
French Zone	144.2	12.8	----------	131.4	126.0	96.4
Saar	24.3	3.0	----------	21.3	20.4	15.6
Total	13,565.3	4,468.5	2,136.8	6,960.0	6,702.5	5,222.0
1. Administrative and other expenses	----------	----------	----------	----------	+97.5	+78.0
2. ECA program April 1948 through March 1949	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	5,300.0
3. Comparable ECA program April 1948 through June 1949	----------	----------	----------	----------	6,800.0	----------
Reconciliation of 12-month ECA program with comparable 15-month ECA program:						
12-month ECA program	----------	----------	----------	----------	5,300.0	----------
Add: Estimated 3-month obligations (to bring to 15-month basis April 1949 through June 1949)	----------	----------	----------	----------	+1,500.0	----------
Total	----------	----------	----------	----------	6,800.0	----------
Reconciliation of comparable 15-month ECA program on obligations basis with that on shipments basis:						
15-month obligations basis	----------	----------	----------	----------	6,800.0	----------
Less:						
15-month administrative and other expenses	----------	----------	----------	----------	−97.5	----------
Total	----------	----------	----------	----------	6,702.5	----------
Obligations for future delivery	----------	----------	----------	----------	−800.0	----------
Plus: Goods estimated to be in the pipe line April 1948 and financed prior to that date from sources outside of ECA program	----------	----------	----------	----------	+600.0	----------
Deficit arising from Western Hemisphere shipments [1] which might be financed under comparable 15-month ECA program	----------	----------	----------	----------	6,502.5	----------
Reconciliation of estimated net deficit arising from Western Hemisphere shipments [1] with comparable 15-month ECA program on shipments basis:						
Grand total of column 4, above	----------	----------	----------	6,960.0	----------	----------
Deficit arising from Western Hemisphere shipments [1] which might be financed under comparable 15-month ECA program	----------	----------	----------	6,502.5	----------	----------
Estimated uncovered deficit	----------	----------	----------	457.5	----------	----------

[1] Includes shipments to bizone Germany from sources outside Western Hemisphere financed by ECA and amounting to $200,000,000.
[2] Includes proceeds arising from exports to Western Hemisphere countries, net dollar earnings on invisible account, and drawings on cash reserves.
[3] In the case of bizone Germany, includes the appropriation of $822,000,000 being requested by the Department of the Army for the prevention of disease and unrest.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the motion of the gentleman from New York in order pending the determination as regards the presence of a quorum?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's motion is in order. A quorum is not necessary upon a motion that the Committee rise.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—aye 1, noes 64.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 94]

Abbitt	Chiperfield	Dorn
Anderson, Calif.	Clark	Durham
Andrews, N. Y.	Clippinger	Elliott
Bell	Coffin	Ellsworth
Blatnik	Combs	Fernandez
Bloom	Corbett	Gallagher
Buckley	Courtney	Gathings
Byrne, N. Y.	Davis, Tenn.	Gore
Carson	Dawson, Ill.	Gossett
Gwynne, Iowa	Lesinski	Powell
Hale	Ludlow	Priest
Hartley	Lusk	Reeves
Hays	Lyle	Rich
Hébert	McCormack	Rivers
Heffernan	McDonough	Robertson
Hendricks	McMillen, Ill.	Scoblick
Horan	Macy	Sheppard
Isacson	Madden	Short
Jenkins, Pa.	Mansfield	Sikes
Johnson, Ill.	Meade, Md.	Simpson, Ill.
Johnson, Okla.	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Tex.	Mitchell	Stigler
Judd	Monroney	Stratton
Kearney	Morrison	Taylor
Kee	Mundt	Thomas, N. J.
Kefauver	Norton	Twyman
Kennedy	Owens	West
Keogh	Patterson	Whitaker
King	Ploeser	Whittington
Knutson	Plumley	Wilson, Ind.
Lane	Potts	Youngblood

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that

Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6801, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 337 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this appropriation bill, but I shall offer a perfecting amendment striking out therefrom all aid to Great Britain. I do this in the light of and in retaliation for Britain's miserable conduct in the Middle East. During the last stages of the mandate, Britain piously stated she would maintain law and order. She fomented disorder. She pontifically stated that she would remain neutral during the mandate, but she encouraged Arab attacks against the Jews. She supplied the Arabs with implements of war. Her idea of neutrality was aiding the attackers and disarming the attacked and depriving the Jews of the means of defense. Then Bevin sabotaged the partition decision. He refused to abide by the United Nations' decision that a seaport and the hinterland be vacated for Jewish immigration by February 1. He closed the port of Haifa and sealed off all immigration. He refused to permit the Palestine Commission of the United Nations to enter. The Palestine Commission castigated Britain as follows:

> The refusal of the mandated power to cooperate in its reduction of any progressive transfer of authority, and the inability of the Commission to be in Palestine constitute a serious jeopardy.

But the Jews refused to be intimidated. They held fast at Lake Success, and they held firm in Palestine, and they showed their true mettle. They bravely set up their state and are now defending it to the death. But embittered and beaten by the collapse of his cunning plan to prevent partition and the setting up of the state, Bevin then started a large-scale war against the Jews through his stooges like Abdullah, Feisel, and Faruk. He waged a squalid war by proxy against the Jews. He removed the mask of neutrality, and then he deliberately admitted aid to the Arabs because of treaty obligations. His equation ran thus: Treaty obligations equal blood money, and slaughter of the Jews. The war in Palestine was, and still is, an invasion—British controlled, British financed, British supplied, British engineered and officered. Let us not forget, and I urge you not to forget it for one moment that it was British artillery which made a rubble of the Holy City with British officers commanding Arabs manning British mortars which desecrated some of mankind's most cherished shrines. British Spitfires maimed and struck innocent women and children in the city of Tel Aviv. Do not forget that. Shall we shrug our shoulders and fail to notice, much less punish, for such shameful British conduct? Must we not bring the stubborn bully, Ernest Bevin, to book? My amendment does just that. Remember the invasion by Britain and the Arab states—with the Arabs plentifully supplied by Britain with money and equipment—has not destroyed Israel and never will. Bevin and his stooges have not even made a dent in the boundaries of Jewish Palestine. Bevin thus failed again. Now he is launching a third attack, a political campaign. First his "neutrality" failed—miserably failed, that is, his so-called neutrality; then this military offensive failed, and now, in the next few weeks of cease-fire, Bevin will seek to extort territory assigned to Israel by the United Nations, presumably turning such areas over to his stooge, Abdullah, that is, to himself. Despite the protestations to the contrary, Bevin does not wish to get out of Palestine at all. Despite protestations to the contrary, he wants to remain, and he will do everything in his power to remain there. But we are not going to let him remain. He wants large tracts of eastern Palestine including Jerusalem and the Negiv in the south. Bevin would install Abdullah as caliph in the Holy City, although under UN, Jerusalem is to be an international conclave.

But Bevin's political conniving will fail again.

Bevin is enraged at the Jews for worsting him. He covets personal revenge. He would still further truncate Israel. He will use his Arabphile friends in our State Department headed by Roy Henderson to carry out his diabolical scheme.

But we cannot remain complacent. We must crack his knuckles. Withhold funds from Britain and Bevin. Irritate the pocket nerve. Then, and only then, will he see the light.

You do not lend or give money to one who will use it to plunder and destroy your friend's house.

We cannot decry British perfidy in the Middle East and then encourage her in her fantastic and cruel war against the Jews.

Bevin and his government demand austerity for their people yet use our precious money to follow a dishonorable and treacherous course in Palestine.

To give money to Britain makes us particepts criminis—partners in crime.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, it is a source of satisfaction to those of us who opposed this legislation to find that the Appropriations Committee has made a real effort to go at this job in a workmanlike and intelligent fashion.

There are many of us who are greatly concerned about restoring the financial solvency of this country, on which the future of the world depends. No foreign foe can harm the United States like runaway inflation. That prospect is a basic home problem that this Congress persistently refuses to face.

You can talk about other problems, but the paramount responsibility of this Congress is that of maintaining the solvency of the United States Treasury and regaining the integrity of the United States dollar.

If we continue to lose that fight by default you can have all the military equipment on earth but you will lose to communism. That truth has been overlooked entirely too long in the deliberations of this House.

Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was speaking, and here are his words of warning. Every Member of this House should heed this alarm. I quote:

> Without our support [the Federal Reserve System] under present conditions almost any sale of Government bonds undertaken for whatever purpose, laudable or otherwise, would be likely to find an almost bottomless market on the first day support was withdrawn.

Do the Members of this House appreciate what that means?

I remember back in 1929, when we had artificially supported market on securities. I remember how they rigged the price of Cities Service stock month after month, and how Cities Service stock that sold at the equivalent of over $600 went down later to less than $3 a share when the support attempt collapsed.

Also I remember another experiment in holding prices, a Government experiment in rigged markets, in 1930, 1931, and 1932. Then the Government of the United States tried to hold up the price of wheat. All of you know what happened when that price-support scheme collapsed.

Now the Government of the United States is engaged in a price-support operation in which it is attempting to hold at artificial levels the price of Government bonds. In the last 6 months the Federal Reserve System has bought some billions of long-term Government bonds in that effort. That is a condition of ominous danger, that thus far this Congress has blithely ignored.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. We are printing money; are we not?

Mr. BUFFETT. Well, our currency is mostly irredeemable paper, so that you can say that indirectly we are printing money. But we have not reached the outright printing-money stage yet, but we are moving steadily in that direction.

It has always been my view, Mr. Chairman, that the real weapon that the Kremlin is counting on to defeat us is unlimited inflation in this country—an economic Pearl Harbor.

Certainly this bill moves us in that direction. What the present global spending spree amounts to is this: The Kremlin has thrown us a long rope. Our rulers have grabbed it enthusiastically and are wrapping it around our neck. That is the final effect of our foreign spending. That is what started under UNRRA. That is what followed under postwar lend-lease That is what will happen with this hand-out, if the record of the past is any guide to the future.

Now, what do you have in Europe today? You do not have Europeans investing their own money in their own lands. No, sir. They are using every device and trick in the book to get their wealth out of Europe, because they see Russia and the United States challenging

each other. As long as we keep maneuvering in the direction of war, the people of Europe are not going to have confidence in the reconstruction of their lands.

And so we are proceeding at this business backward. We are trying to get recovery before peace, and you have to have peace in order to have recovery.

The Marshall-plan dollars will fail, and as they fail the deterioration of the American dollar will gain momentum. The Truman-Vandenberg-Marshall policy still continues to strengthen Russia and weaken America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not acquainted with Mr. Paul Hoffman nor do I know anything at all about his politics. I assume from the speeches which have been made here that he is an outstanding American citizen and is trusted by both major political parties; a man who has a patriotic desire to be of service to his Republic in the trying days ahead.

It seems to me it would be the part of wisdom to fortify such a man with something in excess of the amount of money which will actually be required to do this job. I, for one, would prefer to give Mr. Hoffman too much rather than too little.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman might have pointed out in making reference to Mr. Hoffman that the attitude of the Congress toward him was well expressed by the action of the Senate in overwhelmingly confirming his appointment for the position which he holds.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. In view of the fact that my very good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is not here, I may ask for him, Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman might ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that same question. I do not know where we are going to get the money. I know we do not have the money.

We are embarking upon a tremendous program and I for one, as a humble Member of the House, feel that this bill has been changed from a recovery measure to a relief measure. It is a tremendous undertaking when we start out to revitalize and restore the war-torn areas of this world. More than a hundred Members of Congress had an opportunity during the last recess to vist Europe and to see the destruction wrought in the various countries of Europe. I am very much afraid that we are about to make the same mistake in the Marshall area countries that we have already made in the American-occupied zones. I know that in Germany we are only dragging our feet. We will never be able to restore the economy of Germany to the point that we will feel free to move out until we step up and accelerate a real recovery program. We told General Clay to maintain a subsistence diet for the German citizens, to protect the health of the people and to prevent unrest, and with that kind of program we have given him only a limited amount of money to do the great job which has been assigned to him.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will agree, of course, that Mr. Hoffman is not on trial here. Everybody agrees that he is a high-minded very patriotic American citizen; but the gentleman would not give any administrator more money than he could spend, would he?

Mr. COOLEY. I would certainly be willing to trust Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. STEFAN. So would I.

Mr. COOLEY. Trust him with an additional sum to do the job we are giving him to do.

Mr. STEFAN. We gave Mr. Hoffman $1,000,000,000 to begin with. He has been unable to spend more than $208,000,000 up to this time. The fact of the matter is the gentleman from North Carolina would not give any administrator more money than he could spend, would he? Now, as to General Clay we have General Clay's appropriation under consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. General Clay's appropriation, of course, is not involved in the matter now under consideration.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield further, it is. We are supplementing General Clay's appropriation with approximately 300 calories additional food for the German ration. General Clay's program under GARIOA is to feed the German people, raising their diet from 1,450 calories to 2,200 calories. We are supplementing General Clay's means by 300 calories from the committee's appropriations.

Mr. COOLEY. So the gentleman does admit that we have been dragging our feet in Germany and that we have failed to provide the German people with an adequate subsistence diet.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about that. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right, so we are supplementing General Clay's program with approximately 300 calories from ECA, which we have in the bill, and it will reach that amount with the money we have provided according to the testimony given the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and our committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Then you are improving the situation in Germany?

Mr. STEFAN. Definitely.

Mr. COOLEY. But you are crippling and destroying the hopes of the other countries of Europe when you fail to provide an adequate, and I should say even an abundance of relief, if it is going to be used for the purpose of restoring the depleted and devastated economies of those countries.

Mr. STEFAN. Not at all. We are giving ECA and GARIOA all the money they can spend to meet the program and the business they have with the amount provided in this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. You are doing that but the fact is you are taking a 12 months' program and stretching it into a period of 15 months. The result is that you are cutting the over-all appropriation which the people who know most about it claim is needed.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman really does not know what he is talking about for the reason that the cut was made on the basis of new evidence that was given to us. The evidence we originally had was made up many, many months ago, and the improvement was such that we were able to make that reduction.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman contend that the committee is providing the funds which all of the people in authority in the Government say are needed?

Mr. STEFAN. Oh, no. They would like to take $5,000,000,000 more if we would let them have it.

Mr. COOLEY. Why would the gentleman make that statement if he has faith in the integrity of Mr. Hoffman? Does the gentleman think Mr. Hoffman wants this Congress to give him money to waste and throw away? If so, you should not give him a dime. If you have confidence in him, why not fortify him with sufficient funds to do the job?

Mr. STEFAN. For the reason that Mr. Hoffman does not know half as much about this program and these justifications as the chairman of the Deficiency Committee and other members of the committee who had been holding hearings 6 weeks before Mr. Hoffman ever got into the picture.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman have any confidence in Mr. Hoffman?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, I have.

Mr. COOLEY. All right. May I close with this remark: I do not impugn the gentleman's motives or the motives of the other gentleman from Nebraska or anybody else who wants to oppose this bill. They have a perfect right to do so, and I do not call you Communists, but I want to say in closing that we have the mugwump of mugwumps in opposition to this measure in its entirety. I want to read from his own language back in 1946 when he admitted he was a mugwump. I want to quote excerpts from his speech delivered on March 23, 1946, and I refer to the late Cabinet officer, Mr. Wallace:

> I say this without rancor because I spent some years on the mugwump fence myself, one of those seeking progress and who found a door to opportunity—and the door was labeled "the Democratic Party."
>
> So to keep our own party on the side of progress, we must call upon those Democrats who have been harmful to our cause to return to the way of Jefferson and Jackson and to honor our side of the fence with their "mugs" as well as their "wumps."

Now is the time for Mr. Wallace to put his "mug" where his "wump" is. First, he was a Republican; then a Democrat;

and then a mug wump. He is opposed to the European recovery plan; so is Joe Stalin. He is opposed to this appropriation, and so is Joe Stalin. I do not think that Henry Wallace is a Communist, but I am certainly willing to believe that he is a misguided mugwump. By his own confession, he was once a Republican, and then a Democrat, and now I doubt if he knows what he really is. But Mr. Wallace is not alone in his opposition to the recovery program. Both the gentlemen from Nebraska voted in opposition to the European recovery plan when the roll was called on March 21. So the Members of this House who are actually interested in European recovery, in world peace and progress should not be misled by following the arguments of the gentlemen from Nebraska [Messrs. BUFFETT and STEFAN].

As a member of the Herter committee, along with 17 other members of this House, I had an opportunity last fall to visit the distressed and devastated countries of Europe and to obtain first-hand information concerning the needs of each of the countries I visited. I know that the need is great, and yet I appreciate the fact that the actual need in each country is a matter of great uncertainty. Of course, there is an element of speculation in all of the estimates which have been submitted, for no man can know what the future will bring forth. If poverty and want and the physical distress of hunger make for communism, then certainly some of the nations of Europe are ripe for the reapers of communism. Only a blind man could fail to see the sufferings and hardships which the people of Europe are now experiencing. This is a race for heavy stakes. If we would save the institutions of freedom in the world, we must be willing to make a contribution to the cause of freedom throughout the world. I hope, therefore, that when this bill is finally enacted, it will provide adequate funds to do the great job of recovery needed to be done in the suffering areas of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina says that he is tremendously worried for fear that making the request for 12 months do for 15 months will convert this from a recovery program into a relief program. Let me bring to the attention of the Members of the House the real fears of the gentleman from North Carolina.

I have in my hands here a copy of a letter written by Mr. Charles E. Gage, Director of the Tobacco Branch of the Department of Agriculture, to Mr. L. L. Gravely, secretary-treasurer of the China-American Tobacco Co., of Rocky Mount, N. C. The letter is dated February 3, 1948. In it, he says:

> Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia made the statement in Danville last week that if the appropriation requested by the Secretary for the first 15 months' operation of ERP were reduced, tobacco would be one of the first commodities affected thereby.

Bear in mind that Mr. Gage has been Director of the Tobacco Branch in the Department of Agriculture, which was involved in working up the estimates on this program as far as tobacco is concerned. Then Mr. Gage, with respect to Senator ROBERTSON'S statement, says:

> I believe this is a sound conclusion.

Let me give you that again. Gage says to Gravely:

> Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia made the statement in Danville last week that if the appropriation requested by the Secretary for the first 15 months' operation of ERP were reduced, tobacco would be one of the first commodities affected thereby. I believe this is a sound conclusion.

Now, the real fear of the gentleman from North Carolina is that if you make this 12 months' request do for 15 months, it may cut down a little on the 110 or 120 million dollars' worth of tobacco requested in this bill for the first year of ECA.

Just let me give you a little more along this same line. I also have a copy of a letter written by the head of the British Food Commission, Maurice I. Hutton, dated April 7, 1948, written to Mr. Gage, director of the Tobacco Branch, in which Mr. Hutton, head of the British Food Commission, says:

> A reduction in the total programs would necessarily involve a reduction in our request for certain individual commodities. Much as we should wish to obtain our needed requirements of tobacco, I have little doubt that in such circumstances tobacco would be one of the items which we would have to reduce.

Now, that is the reason for the fears of the gentleman from North Carolina.

And it also shows that in April, after the ECA Act had become law, that the head of the British Food Commission recognized that the total program might be reduced, presumably by action of the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

Let me give you a little more about this situation. Back in January, when the thing did not look quite so fine, Mr. Gage wrote a letter to Mr. Harry Jefferson, president of Waitt & Bond, Ltd., 310 Sherman Avenue, Newark, N. J., saying:

> It has been exceedingly thoughtful and nice of you to keep on sending me cigars week after week, but I could not possibly feel comfortable in accepting them longer with the way the business outlook has changed and the way it is affecting the fortunes of W. & B.

I am told, but do not know, that Waitt & Bond are tobacco exporters or dealers, apparently a British corporation.

Let me give you a little more on this. Mr. Gage, who has been a respected employee of the Department of Agriculture for some forty-odd years and recently head of the Tobacco Branch resigned or retired a few weeks ago, or is about to do so. I am informed that last week the tobacco industry contributed to providing a farewell banquet at the Mayflower, I believe it was, or one of the hotels in town, and he received many gifts in appreciation of what he had done for the tobacco industry. Among them was a Cadillac automobile, I am told, which makes me wonder a great deal about the estimates that were submitted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not going to yield until I put this tobacco picture before the Members. The gentleman opened this thing up, so let us go into a little bit further and see how the tobacco estimates grew.

You will find the facts in the testimony of Mr. F. B. Northrup, Director of the Price Support and Foreign Supply Branch of the Department of Agriculture, who accompanied Mr. N. E. Dodd, Under Secretary, in the presentation of agricultural requirements, and whose testimony begins at page 271 of the printed hearings. Specific testimony of Mr. Northrup on tobacco will be found on pages 365 and 366.

In the requests that were made by the European nations, the CEEC estimates, for tobacco, they asked for what? For about 247,000 metric tons. That was the request of the nations of western Europe as developed at Paris. But what did the tobacco people in the Department of Agriculture think? Well, that is not enough. So they proposed to increase the allocations on tobacco, and proposed that instead of 240,000 metric tons we should provide 328,000 metric tons of tobacco. That was their estimate along the first part of the year. They revised it in March and made it 323,000 tons. What happened to boost the requirement by 80,000 tons, an increase of 33⅓ percent? Did another war devastate Europe?

I suggest that it may be entirely in order for men who have been in Government service to accept gifts after they leave the service, if they have been faithful to the responsibility of their tasks. But it makes me wonder when I see these facts and know that the tobacco proposed to be provided by the taxpayers of this country for other governments is increased by 80,000 metric tons on the suggestion of our own officials.

In January a mission of two men by the names of J. Barnard Gibbs and C. B. Cheatham, Jr., went to England, apparently to drum up some tobacco requests from Ireland. I have a copy of a letter which they wrote from the American Embassy in London, on January 7, 1948, addressed to Mr. Joseph A. Becker, chief of the international commodity branch, office of foreign agricultural relations, Department of Agriculture. It reviews in detail, five pages typewritten single spaced, their contacts in Ireland in behalf of tobacco exports. A short quotation will be sufficient to show the character of their work. I quote:

> We found the minister, who happens to be a cousin of E. J. O'Brien, very much interested in the tobacco situation. He was particularly interested to learn of pressures being brought to bear in the United States to encourage tobacco exports. We gained the impression that he would not favor excessive generosity in giving tobacco to Ireland under the Marshall plan, but he was definitely convinced of the importance of tobacco to Ireland and thought some concession by the United States might be in order, especially if Ireland would cooperate in the Marshall plan in increasing its exports.

Is it any wonder then that on the 22d of January 1948 the Cork Examiner carried an interesting editorial. Bear in mind that this is an Irish newspaper. It said:

> Many citizens of Eire must have opened their eyes in wonder when they learned that Eire stands to be allocated almost £88,000,000 out of the United States contribution toward the recovery of Europe.

Let me insert here that personally I did not hear that Ireland was in the war, nor did I hear that it was devastated by the war, nor did I hear that Ireland had been threatened by the wave of communism; yet the planners of this program decided that Ireland should share in this recovery program, apparently, and when the figures came out that the equivalent of 38,000,000 pounds sterling out of the recovery program should be allocated to Eire, the Cork Examiner carried this editorial. Continuing:

> It is, of course, inadvisable to look a gift horse in the mouth, and the general feeling will be to thank America for her thoughtful generosity, which is all the more noteworthy when we remember that when she asked us to expel Nazi representatives in Dublin we refused.

That is, Ireland refused our request for a little ccoperation in ending use of the country as an enemy spy base. I read on:

> We also turned down a suggestion that we might allow her facilities in certain ports. We were neutral during the war, and we emphasized our neutrality on many occasions.

But in spite of that, when the planners worked this thing up and decided that they knew better than the European nations what they might need, and put this program out, Mr. Thomas B. Commins, commercial secretary of the Irish Legation, contacted the Tobacco Branch down here at the Department of Agriculture to see how Ireland might share in some of these allocations of tobacco. Under date of April 24, 1948, Mr. Commins wrote to Mr. Gage and referred to the understanding of his Government that they were going to be made some allocations of ECA dollars for tobacco, and said if that were true, then it would be possible at this time for them to use some of their own dollar exchange, and they could get an import license from their government on that basis

"Provided dollars are eventually made available under the ECA program for this purpose at a later date," his letter runs. I have it here, dated April 24, 1948. "My government would be extremely grateful if your Department could see its way to earmark 3,500,000 pounds of this tobacco for us on this understanding," he wrote.

Let us go back in this thing a minute. This program was sold to the American people on the basis that it was going to do something for the recovery of Europe.

At the outset, at one of the first hearings of the committee on this matter, I asked those who were before us to what level they wanted to build Europe, for we had just had placed in our hands a survey of the economic situation and prospects of Europe, prepared by the Research and Planning Division of the Economic Commission for Europe of the United States Economic and Social Council. My copy came to me with a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], in which he said that this represented the latest and best estimates of the situation in Europe that were available.

This report was dated March 30, 1948. It is sometimes referred to as the Myrdal Report, because Mr. Myrdal was secretary of the Commission.

On the first page of this survey appears a table on the level of industrial production in European countries. Excluding Germany, the countries of Europe in 1947, in the second quarter, reached 100 percent of their 1938 or prewar production. In the third quarter it was 99 percent.

Now as to specific countries, the United Kingdom was above 100 percent of its 1938 level from the first quarter of 1946 on through the third quarter of 1947, without exception, and wound up at 109 percent for the third quarter of 1947. The Netherlands ranged from 106 percent to 119 percent all through 1947; Denmark, from 98 percent to 108 percent; Belgium, from 99 percent to 102 percent. Germany, however, was back only to 37 percent, and yet Under Secretary Lovett, in our hearings in his testimony, said that he agreed with the statement that I had made that Germany was the key to the recovery of Europe.

What the planners are trying to do by this program is to build up the countries of western Europe outside of western Germany to about their 1938 prewar level, and to let Germany come up to something below her 1936 level. Remember Germany was only up to 37 percent and we feed her until she gets on her feet.

This afternoon I was called to the door here and told about the way part of this foreign aid program is being administered. The Procurement Division asked for a bid on 800 microscopes for Greece and Turkey. Bids were taken on them. A certain bidder offered to supply them out of the production of a factory sponsored by military government in Germany where presumably we are trying to get them back to recovery, and offered to supply them at a price that was $14,000 below the nearest bidder. In addition to that, this firm pointed out that they could supply them to Greece and Turkey without the cost of transportation to this country and the payment of import duties here and the transportation back to Greece and Turkey and would reduce the bid still more by the amount of that saving.

The Procurement Division did not open the bids publicly. When a representative of this firm went to Mr. Gouveraux and asked him about it he said, "We are not required to do that for these foreign-aid programs." So they did not open the bids publicly. In fact, they finally rejected all the bids, and then negotiated a cost-plus contract with a United States firm at $14,000 above the bid price.

Now is it any wonder when situations like that come to the attention of the members of this committee that we think we would be derelict in our duty to the American people if we did not give these estimates the once over? Some Members talk as if we ought to have taken the figure that was suggested in the authorization bill and just say, "Here it is; go to it." That is not done with respect to the authorizations for programs in the domestic field, and it ought not to be done here. The Committee on Appropriations could not escape its responsibility to look some of these things over.

Mr. Chairman, if we had ample time, I would go into the picture of cotton, but I will just hastily tell you what happened with respect to cotton.

There were no specific requests for cotton in the figures submitted. They had a chart or table which they gave us, and on this table it said, "N. A." We asked what "N. A." meant. They said, "Not available," as to cotton. Then you will find in the hearings at pages 368–369 where I ran that down to find out how we were called upon to provide $511,000,000 for cotton. The experts before us said cotton was covered in the miscellaneous requirements. Yet the quantities proposed make it almost one-eighth of the entire program and second only to wheat in commodities. If you look over the petroleum figures, you will find that Mr. Levy testified that these tables that had been submitted to us were not correct. But what happened when we hit on the fact that some of the tables offered were not correct? They would say, "This is a flexible program."

Mr. Nitze, who represented the State Department, said, "You will understand that when we gathered these figures from the different executive branches, we did not know what the Administrator would decide, and of course when the bill was set up, the Administrator had not had an opportunity to go into the figures so we should not be bound by them."

So that was the basis on which we had to act. And no one can deny that they proposed to spend these huge sums on tobacco in excess of the original CEEC request and on cotton and on petroleum according to figures that are not firm.

Time does not permit going farther but I hope the Members of the House have heard enough to convince them that the Appropriations Committee was not only within its rights but trying to meet its responsibility when it looked at these figures, and when it said that we ought to put this program on a basis that will give the Administrator a fair chance to do a decent job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because of the statement just made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] with regard to Mr. Charlie Gage. I happen to have been one of those honored by attending the farewell banquet which was given to Mr. Gage. He has been in the Government for over 40 years, and nobody, until the gentleman from South Dakota, has ever question his integrity or impugned his motives or accused him of accepting bribes or gratuities.

I went to the banquet. I know who was there. Farmers came from my district and from just about every tobacco district in this country; farmers and warehousemen, independent dealers, and others, including Members of Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I demand that the words be taken down, because I did not accuse Mr. Gage of accepting a bribe. I merely pointed out how he had been in charge of the section which apparently boosted the proposed allocations of tobacco beyond the requests of the CEEC countries, how he recently retired and was given a banquet by friends, including members of the tobacco industry and had been given, I was informed, a Cadillac car. A bribe, as I understand it, would be something that was promised to someone in advance of doing something improper and in consideration for doing it. That I did not suggest, or imply, or intend to imply. Unless——

Mr. COOLEY. Unless I do what?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Unless the gentleman will yield. If the gentleman will yield I will withdraw my demand that the words be taken down.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman did not yield to me and was not even courteous to me.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. All right; then let us have the words taken down.

No, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of expediting the business of the Committee, I withdraw my request. I merely wished to point out that I did not accuse Mr. Gage of accepting a bribe.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman did not intend to question Mr. Gage's motives. The fact is that the implication was there. The fact is that these farmers appreciating the long and loyal services of a man who had reached a mature age and was retiring from the service honored him and his wife with a farewell banquet and praised him with words. Farmers came from the tobacco sections of the country to do honor to Mr. Gage, and I have never heard such praise accorded to a man as was accorded to him at that banquet.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is entirely false that he received a Packard car.

Mr. COOLEY. A Cadillac.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Or any kind of car.

Mr. COOLEY. I never heard it mentioned until today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I did not support the ERP bill when it was before the House some weeks ago. There is abundance of evidence today to support that position, and, consequently, I shall oppose the appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. Briefly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think, after having heard the amazing revelations made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], that it becomes more and more vivid that there is just a tiny little bit of tobacco patriotism in all of this so-called anticommunism.

BRITISH RECORD FILLED WITH BROKEN PROMISES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am placed in a somewhat unusual position here, and it is an unwelcome position for me. I have never opposed an appropriation for foreign aid or foreign relief. I have always stood for cooperation between all the countries of the world and I believe my record bears that out. I voted in favor of the British loan when it came up 2 years ago, although a majority of my constituents were opposed to it. I received over 3,000 letters in opposition and only one letter for it, yet I voted for it because I felt that we were doing something to stabilize the economic condition of the world in helping Great Britain on that occasion, even though I had a great deal of doubt as to whether Great Britain would ever repay the money. Her record is replete with failures and broken promises.

I voted as well for the ERP bill when it came up, although I stated at the time that I did not like the aid to Greece and Turkey, or China to sustain those reactionary governments in power; but I voted for it because I felt that the relief phases of it were steps towards combatting communism throughout the world and I feel that the best way to defeat communism is to demonstrate to all peoples the benefits of democracy, and to give them whatever money or other means they need for relief of their people. We know that communism feeds on despair and on hunger and on misery. If we give these countries the wherewithal to help feed their people, clothe them, and house them properly, they then might realize the benefits of democracy and remain democratic, and cease their trend toward communism.

OPPOSED TO BILL IN PRESENT FORM

I oppose this bill in its present form. I hope that the Members will support the amendment that is to be offered either by myself or by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to strike out from the bill all aid to Great Britain. If we give them this money let us be honest with ourselves and realize that we are giving it to them, not lending it to them. We should know that we will never get it back. We should remember also that if we give them this money we are just helping them to turn over large amounts of money to the Arabs who have embarked on the present war of annihilation in Palestine, a war which in my opinion will lead eventually to a world conflagration.

We are permitting and helping them to carry on the inhuman things that they have been doing there in encouraging the Arabs and forcing the Arabs on, because the Arabs did not want this war. They were pushed into it by Great Britain simply to protect her own selfish interests. Great Britain's history throughout the years has always been one of imperialism, has always been one of getting the other fellow to do the fighting for her, protecting her interests, and then taking the spoils. I think the time has come when we should say to England that she has got to stop helping the Arabs. If we took a firm stand in that direction she would cease her aggressive actions. At least we should not make it possible for her to continue giving the Arabs aid to the extent of about $46,000,000 a year which they claim they must do under treaty obligations.

STOPPING FLOW OF ARMS IS EMPTY GESTURE

She claims she has now stopped sending arms to the Arabs. That may be so, but it will make no difference, for the Arabs now have all the arms they can possibly need. Here you have a typical British subterfuge. They say they have stopped the flow of arms into Arabia. Certainly they have stopped the flow of arms, but the Arabs have so much war matériel in Arabia now that they do not need any more, and they are all British arms.

If Britain continues aid to the Arabs certainly we should lift our embargo on the shipment of arms to the Jews. The Jews in Palestine are a pretty rugged lot and are able to give a good account of themselves, but it is impossible to expect that the Jews of today can duplicate the feat of Biblical times and slay the Arabs with a slingshot.

Evidently that is what we are expecting them to do.

THE JEWS FIGHTING IN ISRAEL ARE MEN OF COURAGE

A columnist has attributed to Winston Churchill this remark:

> The Jews fighting in Israel are men of courage. I admire courage. I hope they win.

That is a sentiment which most Americans will echo and applaud. Too bad his successors in office do not feel the same way.

There is no great difference between the birth of Israel and the birth of the United States of America.

Both countries were born in violence—in the violence which free men use to overthrow tryranny and oppression and exploitation. The American Colonists rebelled against the autocratic and despotic misrule of their British viceroys; and the modern Jews rebelled against the unending series of broken promises and false words.

Wherever your eye may turn history tells of such oppression by the British sway of Empire—in India, in Ireland, in the Americas, in Africa; and always free men who would not be chained rebelled with violence, and usually died to lose their chains and to unchain their compatriots.

We cannot see, Mr. Chairman, why we should now continue to subsidize British tyranny with American dollars.

America stands for freedom of all peoples, for peace, for prosperity.

Great Britain stands for oppression, for exploitation, for commercial feudalism.

We call upon the Members of this House to stand with us to strike from the instant bill all aid for Great Britain

until she has demonstrated her willingness to work in and with the United Nations, to strengthen and support the United Nations, to abide by the decisions of the councils, and to recognize the superior claims of human needs to her own selfish commercial empire.

We do not believe that the honorable Members of this House wish to stand before the world, their hands stained, like Ernest Bevin's hands, with the blood of innocent men and women and children, needlessly killed to keep the anachronistic British Empire from falling apart with age and desuetude.

I have no objection to helping countries which will carry out their agreements and we want to aid friendly countries in getting on their feet. My opposition to these items in this bill does not mean that I am opposed to the whole idea of aid to other needy nations, but it does mean that I feel that this country should stand for fair dealing among nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ.]

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, it is late—very late. I do not have to remind you gentlemen how few days remain before we go back to our constituents to answer for what we have done, or failed to do, during the 2 years in which the Eightieth Congress has been in existence. It is hardly necessary to say that high on the list of these failures is likely to be the absence of any housing legislation. If this legislation is not passed, in my city, at least, the question will be asked: "Why have you failed to reflect our wishes in this matter?" And I do not think I am the only one of whom this question will be asked. All of you know that the overwhelming majority of the people of this country have been counting on the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill to relieve a situation that is actually threatening the right of families to exist as family groups.

Our memories and those of our constituents—are not so short that they cannot go back a year. You will recall that when Congress adjourned in July 1947, it could not quite make up its mind to go back home and announce that it had done absolutely nothing about the housing shortage. You will recall—as they do—that to cover this lack a Joint Committee to Investigate Housing was formed with the understanding that it was to investigate housing at the grassroots level and return with findings on which we would base our legislation during the coming session. The committee visited 32 localities. From other cities which they did not visit, they had very thorough accounts of the housing needs of the community. You know the nature of these findings. You know that everywhere this committee went, people flocked in numbers to urge, demand, entreat that something be done to relieve the shortage of homes for the low- and middle-income groups. Professional people, businessmen, clergymen, public-health specialists, elected officials, parents, veterans, women's organizations—they all come to these hearings and with an eloquence made possible only by a recognition of acute need, they asked the enactment of housing legislation. The joint committee accordingly issued a report which recommended legislation of substantially the same nature as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

As you gentlemen are aware, this bill passed the Senate in April, and the House Committee on Banking and Currency has been holding hearings on it since May 3. Should we adjourn without passing such legislation, my constituents, and I am sure yours too, will ask one question. "Why were you unable to get a law passed that would put homes within the reach of people like us—people who do not have $9,000 to spend on a house, or $75 to $90 to pay in rentals?"

The facts in my city show that this is a sound logical question. Yes, there is a lot of building going on. Some people even call it a boom. But look at the prices. The great majority of both new and old housing is selling for over $9,000. Ninety percent—think of it—90 percent of the new rentals range from $70 to $95 a month. And if you think that old rentals are any better, let me say that monthly surveys of the newspaper ads show that the average is $75 for four rooms and $85 for five rooms.

And even if the prices were right, it would require more than the present-day construction rate to take care of our housing needs. In Baltimore, approximately 40,000 families are living under doubled conditions, and more than 50,000 homes are below the standard accepted as necessary for decent, safe and healthy living. And here is something else. In my city, new families are being created at a much greater rate than new dwelling units.

Then, too, there is this special problem of the so-called over-income families, who are obliged to leave public housing projects because their incomes exceed the limit allowed to residents of subsidized housing. The local authorities have recognized that their first responsibility is to the low-income group for which public housing was originally intended, and have accordingly given these over-income families notices to move. The real-estate interests have been very vigilant on this point, but have they made it possible for these people—over-income only by public housing standards—to find decent homes within their means? They have not. And now, by their lobbying, they are trying to rob them of even the hope that these homes will be available in the foreseeable future.

I have not mentioned still another condition in Baltimore which cries for the relief which would be made possible by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I refer to the acres and acres of slums, where children have less than their birthright. It is against the poor people who live in these slums that the activities of the powerful real-estate lobby are particularly directed. If the provision which would give these people some relief from their misery—the public housing provision—were deleted, the real-estate interests would consider allowing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to be passed. Of course, if the bill were passed without this provision, this Congress would have enacted legislation that gives housing aid to every group in the country, except the group in the country most in need of it.

Surely, gentlemen, the conditions that I have described are not peculiar to Baltimore. Perhaps I am more aware of them than many of you are, because I am only 45 miles away and therefore in practically daily contact with the terrible suffering that the housing shortage is causing. But, again, I remind you, that the time is short, and your days of geographical isolation from your constituents are numbered. Soon you, too, will have to face the problems of a suffering community at first hand.

As I mentioned before, the House committee has been holding hearings on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill since May 3. This is the fifth time since 1941 that testimony on the need for housing legislation of the nature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has been heard. There cannot possibly be anything left to say. Therefore, I strongly urge the committee to conclude the hearings and report the bill out promptly, in order that this extremely necessary legislation may be acted upon by the House before adjournment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to call attention to a paradoxical situation in the matter now before the Committee. The Bevin report, which was the first report on the so-called European recovery program and the one on which all the other reports are based, states on page 43 that—

> A substantial and steady resumption of eastern European food, feeding stuffs, and timber supplies is assumed in this report; the prewar flow of cereals from eastern Europe is assumed to be restored by 1951, and the supplies of timber are assumed to reach 75 percent of prewar by 1951.

On page 112, we are told that—

> The tentative estimate is based on a number of assumptions; these include * * * that an increasing part of the needs of the participating countries and western Germany can be obtained from eastern Europe.

And on page 118, we are again told that—

> It has been assumed that an increasing proportion of the imports of participating countries will be obtained from eastern Europe and Asia and other nonparticipating areas in cases where they are traditional and economically efficient sources of supply. * * * The extent to which western Germany will be able to obtain foodstuffs from eastern Europe is of decisive importance in this connection.

Nowhere have I seen any denial that the whole so-called European recovery program is based on a resumption of the traditional trade between western Eu-

rope and the eastern Europe that is now behind the iron curtain. In fact, Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, said in his first press interview that trade between free Europe and the Russian satellites could be built up. Mr. W. Averell Harriman, his roving assistant at large, has been quoted as strongly favoring east-west trade in Europe, and told the New York Times correspondent that the necessity for it was recognized. Now, I do not want at this time to comment on the fact that this program was sold the American people on the premise that it was an anti-Communist program. Rather, I want to call attention to the small chance there is of the Soviet Union and its satellites cooperating in the goal of restoring east-west trade to prewar levels.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in a recent report on Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, reveals that the Soviet in its desire to build up its economic potential for war seeks at all costs to avoid dependency upon the external world. On page 40, this report states:

> This policy of self-sufficiency, or autarchy, means a general inhibition of trading relationships, marked by the fact that Soviet foreign trade has never equaled the volume carried on by Czarist Russia.

It also states that—

> International trade, from their point of view, is one of the necessary evils of the transition period between the victory of communism in Russia and the final victory of the revolution.

And that—

> The Soviet role remains in essentials that of a cartel, with a profit-and-loss account calculated not in money but in power. * * * Shipments of Russian wheat in 1945 and since then have been clearly directed by political considerations.

If this is not sufficient authority to assure you that the Soviet will do all in its power to prevent the restoration of peaceful east-west trade relations, permit me to call your attention to the book Cartels or Competition? recently published by the Twentieth Century Fund. This book—page 387—finds that—

> The conclusion appears inescapable that the chances are almost nil of overcoming Soviet intransigence toward a policy of integrating its collectivist economy with the semisocialistic economies of western Europe, and the mainly capitalistic economies of America. Soviet Russia probably will not cooperate to make a private enterprise, free-market system work more effectively. Significantly it has taken no part, even consultatively, in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment and has brusquely rejected the Marshall plan.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that any recovery plan based on the resumption of normal east-west trade is bound to fall by its own weight. Before we squander any more of our resources we should reexamine the whole problem and resolve a plan based on a premise that holds water and is not dependent on Soviet cooperation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. PEDEN].

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, farmers of this Nation were called upon during the war years to produce more. They patriotically responded. Since the end of the war, the call has again gone out to the farmers of this Nation to produce more in order that we may feed the hungry people of the world. Every effort is being made to fulfill this challenge. Grassland has been plowed and put into wheat. Every available acre is now in production.

The production of food and fiber in such great quantities by the farmers has not been easy and is the result of long hours at hard work.

During all of these years, however, there has been a continuing problem of how to get equipment with which to farm. The shortage of tractors, combines, and so forth, has been critical for some time and there seems to be no relief in the immediate future.

The war saw much of the material and industry for making farm equipment diverted into the war effort. The farmer satisfied himself with repairing his old implements and tractors by saying to himself that it was necessary to give the boys adequate equipment for winning the war. But with the close of hostilities, there still remain these critical shortages of farm equipment. Much of the equipment now used on the farms of this Nation has been repaired for so long that it is completely worn out. There is the continuing demand of our farm people for necessary equipment in order to adequately maintain the necessary production of food and fiber for this Nation and the world.

Today, we have under consideration the foreign-aid appropriation bill, which provides the funds for the so-called Marshall plan and for other foreign aid. Testimony shows that the ECA proposes to spend over $100,000,000 for the purchase and export of farm machinery from this country. The bill itself places no limitation on the amount of farm equipment that can be purchased and exported to the various European countries involved in this recovery program. Apparently, the sole judge for the amount to be exported under the ECA is the Administrator. The hearings before the Appropriations Committee tells too aptly the confusion and lack of knowledge by the ECA authorities to permit their unlimited authority in the purchase and export of these critically needed implements.

This expenditure by our Government in purchasing and exporting this farm machinery will, in effect, continue, if not increase, the shortages of farm equipment so badly needed here at home. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is wrong. We must place a specific limitation in this bill in order to assure sufficient quantities of farm implements for domestic use. We cannot give to the Administrator of the ECA unlimited authority in the purchase and export of farm machinery from this country. Without amendment to this measure, he will have such unlimited authority; and we can well know, by reading the hearings that those in charge of the ECA are not at all familiar with the needs in Europe or as to the needs here at home, as far as farm implements are concerned.

It is true that this appropriation and the European recovery program have as their purpose the rehabilitation of certain countries in Europe. It is further true that their recovery means much to world recovery and world peace; but it is not true that this expenditure for farm implements is essential to the recovery of European agriculture. It will not contribute to the increase of European farm production.

During the war, I had occasion to observe these European countries involved in the ECA and their methods of farming. In brief, the farming methods of the European farmer are a far cry from those used in this country. For purposes of this appropriation bill, we cannot assume European agriculture the same as that in this country nor can we assume their methods to be the same.

In the first place, the farms are small in size averaging 20 acres. Historically, the small tracts have been farmed with hand-operated and animal-drawn implements. Modern power-driven farm machinery is unknown to the average European farmer. It will take a complete educational program for a number of years to educate the European farmers to modern methods of farming with tractors, combines, and so forth. In fact, it will perhaps be a new generation in Europe before their methods of farming are discarded for those of this country.

Another argument against the export of this farm machinery is its inadaptability to European economy. At present, in all of these participating countries, oil and gasoline are scarce commodities sold at a high premium. In fact, it is necessary under the ECA to supply oil and gasoline for these countries. To reorganize farm methods in Europe by adapting them to oil and gasoline consuming power-driven machinery adds a further drain upon the world short supply of oil. In other words, we are attempting to convert European agriculture from that of horse drawn to that of modern mechanized farming. In this regard, I should like to point out the testimony on this bill to show how far we are going with this measure:

> Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Has this Department satisfied itself that this change-over, from animals to mechanization, is both practicable and economical in terms of oil supply and gasoline supply?
>
> Mr. BECK. I understand, for example, on the question of distribution——
>
> Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Can you not answer that question "Yes" or "No," Mr. Beck?
>
> Mr. BECK. It has been thoroughly considered; yes.

Further, there is a complete lack of know-how in the repair of this equipment. Most observers from Europe will tell you that there are no mechanics schooled in the know-how of maintaining this equipment and, in fact, a complete lack of interest in modern methods of farming with power-driven machinery. This is further complicated by the necessity of supplying all types of repairs and parts, which are also in scarce supply in this country.

It must be remembered, in the light of this discussion, that labor is in abundance in Europe. The equipment that

is to be exported under the money provided by this appropriation bill is labor-saving and will further complicate European recovery by creating unemployment on the farms in Europe.

In this country, we well know that farm labor is scarce, thereby causing a greater demand for all labor-saving methods of farming.

We cannot accomplish the desired results of rebuilding Europe by trying to impose upon them a new type of economy which, historically, is unknown. We cannot rebuild their farm economy to one geared on the consumption of oil and gasoline, which is in such short supply. We cannot rebuild their economy by creating additional unemployment rather than furnishing employment.

The American farmer is in serious need of this farm machinery, which we propose to export to Europe. In fact, the "gray" markets and shortages in this country became so serious that some few months ago the House Committee on Agriculture held extensive hearings to find some solution. These hearings, although not yet printed, did show that American agriculture is laboring under a handicap of insufficient equipment, particularly tractors and combines.

This appropriation bill must be limited so that we will supply only those hand-operated and animal-drawn implements as are necessary. This will furnish all the needed equipment for European agriculture as they know it and desire it. To reduce this appropriation bill to provide only this type of equipment for Europe will not affect Europe's farm production. It will, however, help in providing the American farmer with adequate implements and machinery in the production of food and fiber.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, in the two newspapers I happened to read this morning, one from Washington and one published in my native city of New York, I found not only in the news columns but in the editorial pages the most violent, intemperate, unjustifiable, and misrepresentative comments upon the distinguished and devoted chairman of this committee and his colleagues, of whom I have the honor to be one, in connection with reporting out this bill.

What those scholars sitting in their cloistered editorial rooms did not tell their readers—deliberately did not tell their readers—is what has happened since the authorization bill passed this House on the 31st day of March.

If you will recall, when this bill was on the floor at the other end of the Capitol its sponsor, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], made this representation, a representation that was at the very foundation of the ERP bill and the program of publicity to convince the country of the necessity for it. Said he, in substance, "The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and others, appeared before our committee and stated 'If you do not give us some such program as the ERP program we shall feel obliged to make requests for additional heavy appropriations for national defense'."

Let us see what has happened since then. Four billion dollars additional appropriations have been requested and granted by the Congress for the Army and Navy and Air Force bringing the total to some $14,000,000,000. Additional other items in the name of national defense bring the total sum appropriated or authorized since this authorization bill was passed up to $5,200,000,000. Of course, against that the reduction in this bill in the total requested for foreign aid is small indeed. It is only 20 percent of the total increase imposed upon the Treasury of the United States and the people of the United States in the name of national defense and despite representations that no such increases would be requested. What else could the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which was responsible in the first instance for this bill, do? Bear in mind the enormous increased demands from military and national defense sources. It had to reconcile all the demands upon a limited Treasury and a limited national economy. That is what they tried to do in this bill. They have brought you a bill having in mind all of the other enormous conflicting demands upon the American economy. In doing it, I think they are to be congratulated. They have reconciled difficult, burdensome, and necessary demands. They have nonetheless appropriated in this bill an enormous figure—$6,000,000,000 of American goods and American services for foreign relief. I think this bill should be sustained and sincerely trust that it will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. ROGERS.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the committee is to be congratulated for investigating what is being done with this relief money. I would like to remind the Committee that $900,000,000 was appropriated for tobacco. I mention just this one item which has been scheduled in this program. Six hundred millions would more than cover the legislation for our disabled that our Committee on Veterans' Affairs has passed and is on the calendar awaiting action by the House. Legislation for our disabled veterans has been held up, as well as for our widows and orphans, because of the large relief appropriations that we are making. The people of the United States and particularly our veterans do not wish, and will not countenance, our throwing money away where it is not needed abroad.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Where will this money that we are appropriating come from? I would like to know if we have a foundation for spending $6,000,000,000. What do we have in back of us? Perhaps that is too much of a question for the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I would like to have his reply.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for propounding that inquiry. My answer is very simple. The money to finance this program will come from the same sources that money to finance every appropriation comes from, and that means it is going to come out of taxes that are levied upon the people of the United States of America. Make no mistake about that. That is an elementary, simple fact.

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues of the Congress, I happen to be one of those Members who has been from time to time denounced in certain quarters as an isolationist prior to Pearl Harbor. That has been hurled at many Members of Congress—extreme nationalists, unable to have the international point of view, and so forth, and so forth, and so forth.

Well, I have lived through 10 years of that sort of thing. It is the most amazing thing to me now to pick up newspapers and books and publications and read the confessions that are being made out of the memoirs of Harry Hopkins, the recent statements of Robert Sherwood, and all the rest of those people that are now, for the first time telling the American people the truth about what happened prior to Pearl Harbor. And they are getting paid for it, and they are getting big money for writing their so-called memoirs. I sometimes wonder why those people who were then in authority did not then come before the Congress to tell the Congress and the American people the truths that they are now uttering.

In the period prior to 1941, as a Member of Congress, I voted the honest convictions which I then had, based upon facts that were available to the Members of Congress and to the American people. I have no excuses for any vote that I cast. As many of you did, I tried to keep this country out of war, but the American people went to war. They went to war when they were praying for peace. I do not need to allude with any great particularity to the results that now face us.

But if I claim anything, I claim to be a realist, and when I am confronted with facts and the truth and unassailable information that convinces me that the welfare of my own country is involved and is at stake, I am willing to forget some of the water that has passed over the dam, and only turn my eyes backward in order that I may obtain some guidance for future action that is now demanded.

So, when they came before Congress and asked for the Greek-Turkish aid program, I stood in the well of this House and supported that program and told the Congress and the people the truth. You were not told the truth by those in authority. You were told of the bleeding hearts and suffering people in Greece, of the tuberculosis and syphilis and disease and hungry and starving people. That program was sold to the great heart and soul and charity of the people of America, when you knew and they knew that that was only a mere bagatelle of the real program. I told you I was sup-

porting that program, and I told my people I was supporting that program, and I told audiences all over this country that the reason I supported that program then was because I believed, on the basis of the facts that were available to me as a Member of Congress, that the interests of my own country demanded that we take the steps which we took. Congress authorized that program, and we have had pretty nearly a year of it now and have had some chance to appraise it. We gave $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, $300,000,000 of it to Greece and $100,000,000 of it to Turkey. There was not a dollar's worth of relief for Turkey. The whole $100,000,000 went for arms and ammunition, guns, and implements of war. What about the $300,000,000 to Greece? Why, the relief program in Greece paled into insignificance and we have heard nothing more about the sickness and the disease and the distress. The thing has been stripped of all that verbiage and we can now view the situation as it is. We are in Greece maintaining and supporting and building an army and furnishing untold millions of dollars of military supplies, and building military roads and means of communications. Why? To meet the threat that those in authority saw emanating from the threatened march of communism down through Greece that would ultimately affect your country and mine. And I am proud to tell my people, as I have told them, the overwhelming majority of whom were opposed to this whole thing, that at long last I was proud to see that my country had finally, at long last, taken a position and said to Mr. Stalin: "Here is where you stop. You go no farther." But I never was naive enough to believe that it was Uncle Sam dressed in the flowing robes of white charity spreading charity over there. My concept was of a fearless Uncle Sam at long last standing up for the rights of America against this rush of communism. And so I was proud to support that, and I did.

They had $300,000,000, and the evidence before our committee is that they have not been able yet to spend that $300,000,000 over in Greece. As I recall the figures there was about $140,000,000 unobligated as of the 31st of May of this year. When we deal in hundreds of millions and billions of dollars, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing in sums that not one Member of the Congress can even comprehend; and these people who so glibly get up here and talk about restoring these funds and putting it on a 12 months' basis instead of 15 simply do not know what they are talking about. And that goes for everybody who is hearing the sound of my voice, and I think that includes almost everybody. They just do not know how much a billion is, and they have no idea as to what $4,000,000,000 is. That is a lot of money in my book. It is true that the Congress passed this authorizing legislation and the gentleman from Missouri would take the position that the Congress having passed that authorizing legislation we are in duty bound to just write a blank check to ECA and say, "Here, take it and spend it." I have his words in the RECORD where he says so and I will read them at the proper time and show you the circumlocution of thought that sometimes is indulged in. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, during the debate on that bill, there was a very wide diversity of opinion. I remember in presenting the matter in the well of this House I said that I was going to vote for this authorization but was doing so with the assurance that the Appropriations Committee was going to examine into every item of this estimate when it came up. Did you hear that? Why, I could name 50 Members of Congress who voted for that authorization legislation on the assurance of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that we were going to make a minute examination of these estimates. So we went to work.

What did we have before us? We had before us in the initial stages the same sort of material that was gotten together by the State Department and submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. What did it amount to in essence and substance? Simply this: Mr. Hoffman is an honest man; Mr. Hoffman is a good man; Mr. Hoffman is a good administrator; Mr. Hoffman is a businessman; and he is going to give you a good administration of this money. Now, you give us the money and we will see that a good job is done.

That is all there is to it. You can run through all these hearings, taking weeks of time, and when you sum it all up, that is the attitude. Why do I say that? Because you will find that the estimates which were submitted, while they appeared to be meticulous in character, when you went into them and tried to break them down, inevitably there would be the answer of the witness who sat across the table: "Oh, but, gentlemen, these are merely tentative. We cannot give you positive figures. They are subject to change without notice. This may or may not be the program. We cannot tell you how much we are going to give by way of loans; we cannot tell you how much we are going to give by way of grants. We do not know what the crop conditions are going to be in Europe; we do not know what the production is going to be there. We do not know what the coal production will be over there; we cannot tell you what the production is going to be in America with certainty. There are so many hundreds of imponderables which enter into the situation that all I can do is give you a rounded survey of the situation as we see it. Then you trust us to do the job."

I can point to place after place in the record where that situation developed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I wish I could talk about this thing for two hours in order to thoroughly explore the intricacies involved.

Let me tell you one thing. If you will read these hearings you will find the gentleman who is now speaking asked this question time and time again: "What is the purpose of this program?" And the answer inevitably would be, "The purpose is to insure the recovery of the participating nations to a level that will enable them to maintain exports sufficient to achieve dollars by which they can maintain themselves."

Then I asked the question time and time and time again: "What is the level, the target at which you are shooting? Are you expecting to bring these countries back to the level of production of 1939? 1940? 1941? What is the level of production? What is the target? So that you can say to the American people, 'We have achieved that level of production. Now we are able to pull out and get these countries off our backs.'"

Could I get an answer to that question? I could not. You can read these hearings from one end to the other and you will not find an answer.

Now let me indicate with some illustrations just what I mean. When these figures were produced they were based on estimates of production of food in those participating countries as the estimates then existed. And they were mighty low. They had a pretty bad winter bill over there a year ago; you know that. Well, by the time we had gotten along with our hearings they had a lot of new estimates and they showed prospective increases of food production in Europe from 25 to 30 and 35 percent. Then I asked the question: The figures indicate that most all of these nations have achieved a 100-percent level of production except Germany. Now, if they have an increased farm production, could not we reduce the amount of this appropriation for the purchase of food at least by the amount of the increased production in those countries above the figures as you estimated them in these hearings? Oh, no, no; that increased production, plus all we intend to give them, must be used to further increase the standard of living in these nations abroad.

So, when you get down to it at the present time, so far as I am able to interpret this record, we are in this program as far as anybody can see for the unpredictable future. Believe me, the American people are going to know it when they keep continuing to pay the taxes that are levied upon them and when the cost of living continues to be maintained at the level it is now.

Does that mean I am going to oppose this program? It does not. But, it does mean that as a member of this subcommittee I am not going to place a single dollar in the hands of Mr. Hoffman or anyone else for expenditure under this program beyond what the majority of the committee, who have diligently applied themselves to this program, believe is absolutely the essential amount of money necessary to rehabilitate those countries, and if I were to do anything else, if I were to just simply do away with my responsibility as a Member of the Congress, simply abdicate as a Member of the Congress as some of the great minds would seem to indicate we should do, make no further inquiry at all, just give them what they ask for, turn it over to them, and then have great eulogies of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and everybody else as the only basis for the appropriation, I would want

to resign and get out of Congress, and I would not want to stand for reelection.

I want you men and women of the Congress to know that I take this job seriously; I, perhaps, take it too seriously. But I am thinking of my country. We cannot live in a world where the biggest part of it is in misery; we have got to help. It is in our own interest to help and it is on that basis that I am supporting this program, and it is on that basis, thinking of my country, that I am supporting the action of the committee, and so voted in not providing a dollar of funds more than is necessary to carry on this program. They cannot spend the money legitimately that we propose to give them under this bill. They cannot do it without riotous waste. They cannot do it without throwing away the taxpayers' dollar. The money that we have given them, my colleagues, will enable this program to go forward, and you need not expect the dire results that were predicted by the gentleman from Missouri who, in one breath talks of economy, and in the next breath says we ought to just stop hearings and give them everything they ask, not only for this year, but for the entire 4¼ years, and not even ask a question about it.

I do not conceive that to be my responsibility as a Member of Congress, and whether I am here next year or for the next 10 years I am going to assume my responsibility as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and scan every one of these items, and that is what your people expect you to do, and that is what you expect the Committee on Appropriations to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of conserving time I shall not speak at much length, but I do want to supplement the remarks I made earlier in the afternoon in a few particulars.

In the first place, it has been stated that the European countries did not request any cotton. The committee hearings clearly show that the European countries did request cotton. I cite pages 369, 370, and 371 of the hearings.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman perhaps misunderstood. I said the cotton was not requested as cotton. It was under the miscellaneous category.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; that is right. It was requested along with a number of other items in the miscellaneous category. Mr. Nitze pointed out that in dollars the total amount included in our estimate is $790,000,000. That is for a 15-month period. I thought that point ought to be made clear.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. However, it should be pointed out that while the cotton was supposed to be covered under miscellaneous, when I asked Mr. Northrup I said, "In what amount?" And Mr. Northrup said, "That we do not know." So obviously to ask for cotton under the head of miscellaneous and not to specify in what amount left it up in the air.

Mr. MAHON. That was the testimony of Mr. Northrup, but it is later supplemented showing definitely the amount of money requested for cotton. Of course, it is unthinkable that the European countries have not been interested in some amount of cotton.

Other statements have been made with respect to the fact that cotton has gone up in price at this season of the year. I do not have time to speak at length on that subject but I wish to submit the following statement for printing in the RECORD that has been prepared by a representative of the cotton industry at my request.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON COTTON

During the course of consideration by the committee, and by the Congress, of appropriations for the Economic Cooperation Administration, certain individuals have seen fit to attack the cotton industry of this country, as well as the part that cotton is scheduled to play in the recovery program.

There have been implications that the price of cotton is too high, that the market has risen unduly within recent weeks, that speculators are cornering the market and that the taxpayers' money that will be spent on this program is in jeopardy, so far as cotton is concerned.

It occurs to me that such an attitude reflects a complete misunderstanding of the actual facts involved. Let us take a look at these facts and then see for ourselves whether or not the implications are justified.

The price of cotton today is actually no higher than it was last year. Ten designated spot markets yesterday averaged 37.63 cents per pound whereas the July average for 1947 was 37.52 cents, which is approximately the same. Spot prices in June were up to 37.79 cents and in July up to 39.35 cents last year. The price which should be considered is not the price today on the old crop, most of which has been sold, but the price now in effect on the new crop which is soon to be harvested. Last night, June 3, 1948, October futures closed at 33.49 cents and March futures at 32.67 cents. These prices indicate the coming crop will be worth 3½ to 4½ cents per pound less than today's market.

October futures at 33.49 cents per pound are actually one-half cent per pound below the current parity of 34 cents per pound, on the basis of 15/16 middling cotton. May futures at 32.67 cents are 1.33 cents per pound under parity. All these prices are less than the average price for the 1946–47 crop which was 34.82 cents per pound and less than the average of the prices so far during this season of 34.19 cents per pound. Corn futures for September are 35 percent above parity whereas wheat for the same period is 5 percent above parity.

Furthermore, the May futures prices are less than 2 cents above the estimated loan rate for cotton of 30.82 cents for the 1947–48 crop. What we are afraid of is that any reduction in export prospects may break prices on the new crop down to the loan level and result in accumulation.

Now about supply. Some people have said that the ECA is going to reduce supplies in this country to a dangerous level. This is certainly not true for cotton. It now looks like we are going to carry over about 3,000,000 bales as of the 1st of August and, according to present crop prospects, it appears we may easily produce about 13,000,000 bales, which would give us a supply of 16,000,000 bales. Domestic consumption in this country next year will probably be about 8,750,000 bales which means that our supply will be almost double domestic consumption. Even allowing 2,750,000 bales for working stocks, there would still be about 4,500,000 bales available for export. Under full ECA, plus other sales, we would not export more than 3,250,000 bales.

There is certainly no question about stocks in this country being ample. We are all afraid that these cotton stock will be so large that they will break prices to the loan level. Even with the full appropriations under ECA we would probably add about three-fourths of a million bales to our carryover. If the ECA funds are cut 25 percent as they are now proposing, this would reduce our exports by 700,000 bales which means that instead of adding three-fourths of a million bales to our surplus we would add about one and a half million bales to our surplus. There is no doubt in my mind but that this added surplus would reduce prices to the loan level and result in the accumulation of one to two million bales of cotton in the Government loan. If we start accumulating cotton in the Government loans again we will inevitably return to production control programs which I am sure we would all like to avoid. By maintaining a full ECA program we may be able to avoid it.

Now as to the question of whether this amount of cotton is necessary to meet the requirements under the Marshall plan and the China aid plan. The United States is proposing to supply only about 40 percent of the total cotton requirements of the Marshall-plan countries, assuming that these countries will be able to get 60 percent of their requirements from other countries of the world. But since the current crops in the other principal producing countries like Brazil and India have been very disappointing it now appears improbable that the Marshall-plan countries will be able to get 60 percent of their requirements from these other countries.

In other words, we think that the 2,500,000 bales which the United States is scheduled to supply to these countries will actually be much less than these countries will need from us for recovery.

In the case of China, we know that our supply will be far short of meeting their requirements. Estimates are that China will need about 1,200,000 bales of cotton during the next 14 months more than she can pay for with her own resources in order to continue the present rate of consumption. The full China-aid program would give her only about 360,000 bales toward this requirement, leaving a deficit of 840,000 bales for which no financing is available. The reduced China program would probably cut this to 300,000 bales. The textile industry of China is only running at only two-thirds of prewar and it is one of her major industries. These goods are absolutely necessary to prevent disease and unrest and to help rebuild the economy.

May I say that those who maintain that this bill will bring on some inflation speak truthfully. If you want to bring about a total collapse in the price of wheat in South Dakota and Texas and Nebraska and the price of corn and the price of many other agricultural commodities, if you want to bring about one of the greatest recessions in the market we have had for many, many years, if not in a generation, of course you would want to vote against this bill, because it is a fact that agricultural America will profit tremendously from the increased prices which are made possible by the fact that we are disposing of our surpluses. I am not saying that I advocate this program as an American farm-relief program, I am just simply pointing out the fact that the use of our surplus

products by the nations of the world is no small item in the prosperity of agricultural America, and there can be no real prosperity in America without prosperity in agriculture.

May I say further that those who are opposing the full budget estimates for the program because they do not know precisely what every dollar will be spent for should vote against the bill which came out of the committee, because it is not possible for those who administer this modified program to say precisely how this money will be expended. The money is to be expended in the light of the developments and as the program progresses. That is in accordance with the law which Congress passed. It is a wise situation, because we do not want to commit ourselves to spend money for certain programs and later find that it is unwise to make those expenditures, and then have to continue to expend the money. Everyone must admit that this is a broad program closely associated with our foreign policy. The total amounts required are not possible of exact determination. We have said we would make it a $5,300,000,000 program. Let us follow through on the job which we have undertaken.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. DIRKSEN. To offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. The minority is entitled to recognition to move to amend the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House, any member of the committee may offer an amendment, and it is in the discretion of the Chair as to which member shall be recognized. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Illinois to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "June 30" and insert "April 3."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, frankly, I do not think the gentleman wants to offer this amendment at this point, because that is language which applies to numerous items in the bill. On some of them the budget estimate was submitted on a fiscal-year basis and on some of them the basis from April 3, 1948, to April 3, 1949. I would think if the gentleman wanted to accomplish what he seems to think he wants to accomplish he would offer the amendment to each of these sections as they were reached separately. If you do it this way it would destroy the effect of the items that are on a fiscal-year basis, anyway.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is point in what the gentleman from New York says, except this: The language in that first section is "for foreign aid." Now, the general language applies to every title in the bill, and to make sure——

Mr. TABER. If you want to accomplish what I think you want to accomplish, you would offer the amendment on page 2 at line 1, June 30, to April 3. Then, do the same thing on China; and the other items are all on a fiscal-year basis, so that that original amendment was put in there so that it would cover everything before we come to discussing the other items.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. I have another amendment to change the date in line 1 on page 2, but if the date on page 2 is changed, and it is not changed in the preliminary section of the bill, it would be easy indeed for some confusion to develop, because you would have a contradiction between the first paragraph and the first title of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; because as soon as funds are not available for a larger period than the total of those that are on a fiscal-year basis would all be upset; the gentleman would upset the whole picture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But this could be modified, and it is my intention to modify the others.

Mr. TABER. That is what the gentleman does by this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We could go back and modify it later. That could be modified later, but I wanted to be sure that there would be no contradiction.

Mr. TABER. This would just create confusion and disorder. I think under the circumstances I will simply object to the request that the gentleman have additional time because this is no place to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will accede to the request I could take the time now and then take a briefer time, say 5 minutes, on page 2, because I think the issue could be drawn with respect——

Mr. TABER. There will be no issue except the issue of confusion that the gentleman is raising here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the other amendment is on the desk and that, of course, will clarify it because that will be offered to page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I believe the gentleman from Illinois will recall many bills in which a date might be applicable to a particular item with the bill so far as that item was concerned relating directly to it. The date does come in the next paragraph, but it would be a lesser period and certainly the language at the opening of the bill should be broad enough to cover all of the periods embraced within the bill, and there are some sections certainly, for instance, GARIOA, that are on a fiscal-year basis.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The proposition is generic because the date appears in the first section of the bill and one could argue with some degree of persuasion that while you changed ECA in a later section of the bill you did not change it in the first section of the bill which runs basically. So there is confusion as to the coverage.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I certainly do not agree with the gentleman. I think that his amendment here would create confusion by making it appear that the general clause which covers all of the items in the bill would limit their availability to the date of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I could make clear what I have in mind, if the gentleman will accede to my request for additional time——

Mr. TABER. I think 5 minutes should be sufficient. I will be obliged to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, as soon as we read title I, I shall then offer the amendment in line 1 on page 2 to modify the date there. But it was for the purpose of being certain that there would be no confusion at all if it were offered here, but it would make for confusion if it were offered there. I do not ask for additional time on the other amendment, but it might be well to apprise the House now that I have in mind to restore this to a 12 months' program which will enlarge it and restore more than a billion dollars which in my judgment should be restored. The committee eliminated much more than a billion of ECA funds.

I have only two things with which to charge my conscience. One is peace and the other is freedom. We may get it by voting billions for national defense, and thus far over $13,500,000,000 has gone across the floor of this House for national defense; but with all of that there will be no assurance of peace and there will be no assurance of relief from the armament burden which will by some estimates reach at least $18,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952 unless we do achieve peace in the world and unless we do achieve freedom. On yesterday the Navy appropriation bill was before this body. There were 3 hours of general debate and only 1 hour and 30 minutes of that time was used. A unanimous-consent request was made from the floor and granted to consider the bill as read. There were no amendments and the bill was adopted by a viva voce vote, and we approved very nearly in the twinkling of an eye $3,800,000,000 for the Navy. We have done almost as well on the aircraft program and we have done almost as well for the Army Air Corps and for the Army. They will exceed something over $13,000,000,000. Surely there must be 5⅓ billion dollars in this country on a 12 months' basis to pursue the only thing that will relieve us from that burden.

We approved ECA 2 months ago for purposes of economic aid, the stabilization of budgets abroad, the stimulation of the agricultural and industrial production, in the hope that the goal of recovery and peace may be achieved. That is the reason I am offering this amendment. I will offer the amendment later because I am confident that the one real hope of ECA will lie in the first 365 days.

It is 61 days ago today that the President signed the bill. Considerable progress has been made in that time. We set out the purposes and created an ECA administration. We found an administrator who is a distinguished businessman in the country and we told him we wanted him to operate this program.

I believe he ought to have a chance and I believe it is not asking too much to carry out the original authorization of $5,300,000,000 on a 12 months' basis instead of a 15 months' basis so that the program of relief and recovery can be afforded. As the thing now stands, nearly $2,500,000,000 is budgeted for food, seed, fertilizer and so forth, and when you take out this other expense and this amount that is in the bill at the present time should prevail, it would leave about $1,000,000,000 for recovery.

If we do not do the recovery job in the first year, do not be fooled as to whether or not we are going to have this like a corpse on our backs for a good many years to come. So we ought to give the Administrator an opportunity, we ought to give him the money to make the try.

This estimate was predicated upon two rather well screened estimates, one by the Harriman committee and one by the International Bank committee; then comes this estimate that was submitted to the Appropriations Committee. I take off my hat to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the members of his committee, for the hard, painstaking work they have done and I am reluctant to match judgment with him and to disagree with him, but it is a matter of conscience with me. I try to see the forest as well as the trees. I want ECA to have an opportunity to carry out the purposes and objectives that have been recited in the basic act. If we fail in the first year we shall fail for good. Perhaps we need not worry about the expenditure that will come in the days ahead. So, presently I shall offer this amendment on page 2 in the hope maybe I can explain it a little more fully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if he withdraws the amendment at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, if there is going to be no confusion about it I shall withdraw the amendment at this point, not to disarrange the schedules that are on a fiscal year basis, then offer it on page 2. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 1, line 6, after the word "purposes", strike out the comma and the word "namely" and insert "on condition, however, that no moneys authorized for appropriation hereunder shall be paid or credited to any country which participates in or aids in acts of aggression, such acts of aggression to be determined by proclamation by the President of the United States, namely."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it is not in order at this point in the bill and not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CELLER. I agree to the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 1, line 6, after the word "purposes", strike out the comma and the word "namely" and insert "but no funds made available under the authority of this Act shall be paid or credited to Great Britain, namely."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order at this point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CELLER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

This is a very broad, composite, omnibus appropriation bill. It supplements, as I understand, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1944, particularly title I of that act, which is commonly called the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. It embraces many diverse acts of Congress, covers many diverse subjects, and therefore no narrow interpretation of its words should prevail.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The paragraph to which the gentleman from New York offers an amendment relates to the general provisions regarding the sums carried in the various titles and paragraphs in the bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York relates to the appropriation of specific funds. The Chair feels that the amendment is not germane to this particular paragraph, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472, approved April 3, 1948) until June 30, 1949, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation (not to exceed $30,000); purchase (not to exceed 40 including 1 at not to exceed $3,000) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claim Act (28 U. S. C. 921); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rents in the District of Columbia; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment (not to exceed $50,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and loss by exchange; $4,000,000,000, of which not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for expenditures of a confidential character (other than entertainment) under the direction of the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified: *Provided*, That not to exceed $68,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses including not to exceed $10,000,000 for direct administration and not to exceed $10,000,000 for guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948: *Provided further*, That not less than 10 percent of each special local currency account established pursuant to section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for strategic materials or other local currency requirements of the United States of America: *Provided further*, That allocations of funds provided pursuant to provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for Austria and any country under occupation by forces of the United States shall be made to the United States Military Government of such countries for administrative and other expenses: *And provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 2, line 1, strike out "June 30" and insert "April 3."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me apologize to my good friend from Missouri for any untoward and any unseemly conduct on my part on this floor today. Certainly I bear him no animus, and I will strike from the RECORD any personal allusion I made.

To the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I want to pay testimony for a tremendous job done on this bill, and it is with some reluctance that I offer this amendment. While I find myself in disagreement with him, it does not diminish my affection for him or for other members of that committee. I served on the subcommittee on deficiencies for a number of years, and I can testify out of an abiding experience what a difficult undertaking this really is. So it is with something of apology in my heart to you, feeling that I must do this, that I offer this amendment to reduce this from a 15 months to a 12 months basis and bring it more nearly within the lines of the authorization Act which passed some months ago.

As you know, the committee has put this on a 12 months' basis; namely, $4,000,000,000. The net result is that in excess of $1,000,000,000 of available money has been taken out of this bill. That might be 20 percent or 25 percent, but whatever it is, it is a very substantial amount.

Various reasons have been assigned for that action. Number one, that the matter ought to have some study, and that they could return some time after the turn of the year for additional funds. But do not forget that ECA, if it gets an appropriation for 15 months, must make its plan upon a 5-quarter basis, and it must distribute its available money accordingly. So in the event that something should happen after the first of the year, and who knows whether it will happen or not, it would be difficult, perhaps, to integrate that money into the plan that had to be laid down; and if this is the will of Congress, that plan has to be foreshortened very materially. So while they can come back, there is no assurance that they are going to get the money, and no assurance that it is going to do the proper job.

I am interested in making this successful the first year. That is the key. The people in the impoverished countries are looking at us today. I have seen some of the dispatches that have come from abroad this morning, the headlines that appeared in the German papers, in the Norwegian papers, in the papers of Athens, and elsewhere, and discounting, of course, their ambition and their anxiety to get more dollars out of the American Treasury, the fact of the matter is that already the action of the committee has been something of a blow to morale. They are seeking to make out the sentiment that was expressed by Mr. Zhdanov before the Poles in September of last year and by Mr. Molotov, that the American people and the American Congress did not mean business on this aid program, and that it was nothing more than a rash promise that would not be fulfilled. So the first year is the important year for us. It would be far better to strike it off next year or the year after. If this plan is still in effect, it will stretch it out. The theory is, of course, to provide relief and at the same time a concurrent program of recovery, to diminish the relief program and then place the emphasis upon the recovery program.

The money that is left in this bill because of the commitments for relief and for food and fertilizer and seed, which cannot be well diminished and which will require more money if prices go up, will not be enough to institute the kind of a recovery program that we envisioned when we passed this bill 2 months ago. It will leave Germany pretty flat. I have heard discussions about food here today, that production is up, and I am glad it is, but do not be unaware of the fact——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman mentioned Germany. Of course, Germany is primarily provided for in the GARIOA funds, which are already on a fiscal year basis.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, that I know. But the $437,000,000 that was earmarked for Germany will be diminished, for one thing, and there will not be the $250,000,000 additional funds that General Draper asked for in order to do the job for Germany, which is the key of recovery and peace over in the Old World at the present time.

It has been said there have been better crops. I am glad of it. The food production in Germany is about 1,050 calories a day for the people. In one breath we say, "They ought to go to work," but in the other breath we are not so sure that we are going to provide the wherewithal to go to work, and that means food. The average workingman in America who does hard work has to have 4,500 calories a day. People abroad will be fortunate to obtain one-half of that amount. In addition to all that, there has been mass edema in Germany and elsewhere, and they say it will be many years before those bodies can be built up so that they can do a whole day's work. So I am not persuaded that because there has been an improvement in crop conditions over there that it is going to meet the problem for some time to come. Unless we restore some of these funds and put this on a 12-month basis, you will find that you will have left the key recovery country on the continent pretty nearly flat on its back. That to me is highly persuasive in reducing this from 15 months to 12 months and give those people an opportunity.

Further, consider the psychological and moral effect of this. Things are rather touch and go in France. Intelligence reports indicate a delicate situation. The reduction in funds by the committee could be just the gentle little shove that might precipitate a governmental crisis there. We moved James Dunn from Rome to Paris after the Italian situation was in reasonable order. Why? For a very good reason. That is the touchy spot today. There is a smile on the face of Thorez, the Communist leader in France at the present time. They have been working as against a very early date, and so if we are going to cut this now, and cut these appropriations back so that allocations to France will have to be seriously diminished, then she may say to herself, "Perhaps the American Congress does not mean business after all, and perhaps they are not going to fulfill these promises under the Marshall plan." I cannot think of a better weapon in the hands of those who would seek to destroy the freedom of the French Republic, and seek to give the Red Army and the forces of Thorez and the Communists the upper hand in that country. That is what is involved here. I do not say it will happen, but it could happen because the delicate fabric of peace is trembling in the balance at the present time. That is why my heart is in this business of restoring this fund and giving the Economic Cooperation Administration a very considerable chance.

Now then, we go back to these expenditures for security for the Army, Air Corps, and the Navy by the billions. That burden will be upon us and our children and our grandchildren and these appropriations for armaments will increase until in 1952, at the present rate, they will constitute nearly 50 percent of the annual budget that the Congress will pass on from year to year. How shall the American taxpayers be relieved of that burden? Solicitude has been expressed here for the taxpayers. I am equally interested in the taxpayers, and as I look down the road, I see that the real assurance for relief from this burden upon our people will be to spend the money that is necessary and make a sustained and durable effort to achieve the objective of peace that seems yet so far in the distance. It is more than 3 years after VE-day. Soon it will be 3 years after VJ-day. There is still no peace in the world, and more freedom has been liquidated since VE-day than was accomplished and achieved upon the battlefields of Europe. Are we so impoverished that we cannot go all out on this program and authorize within $245,000,000 or more, the full amount that was authorized by a vote of 329 to 74 on the first day of April 1947? ECA has a good Administrator. The estimates they have submitted are as good as can be submitted. And should world conditions change, we have written latitude and flexibility into the authorizing act, so that they can change their program. Obviously they cannot come with something so firm that they can trace out every nickel, dime, and quarter of estimated expenditure. It simply cannot be done, and moreover, there will be qualifications and changes as the forces of recovery move on. I hope that we will undo this all too drastic reduction in funds and put this on a 12-month basis and give this great instrumentality of peace the one chance in the first year which will mean whether or not we shall succeed in our job of leadership in a bleeding and torn world.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if we could get an agreement as to how quickly we might be able to vote on this. I am wondering how many would like to speak.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust the gentleman will include in his request the matter which we discussed a moment ago, which will give the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Yes. I had intended to do that. There are 12 Members standing. I do not think we will have any long amendments after that. I suggest that we close debate in 1 hour and 10 minutes, and that of that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] may have 15 minutes, and that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 1 hour and 10 minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That does not close all debate on the bill?

Mr. TABER. No, it does not; just this amendment and all amendments thereto. As I understand it, there were 12 standing. That would give 5 minutes each to the others, 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the committee would have the closing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

When this matter was before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I testified at that time with regard to the question of estimates of the amount that might be required in order to accomplish the objectives of the bill that was then pending before that committee. At that time I testified that I believed the total job could be done—and this was the total job—for roughly a half billion dollars less than the amount that was then being considered. This bill, however, cuts the amount away beyond any such figure.

In the report you will find there is a cut for the over-all picture in actual dollars of $533,000,000. In addition to that, new responsibilities have been put into the program.

Mr. TABER. The cut is only $245,000,000 on this item.

Mr. HERTER. That is on this item, but when I was testifying I was testifying with regard to the over-all foreign-aid program, including GARIOA, not alone this item, when I suggested the possibility of that cut. At the same time, however, I testified in almost the exact words which appear in the committee report. I am going to read two sentences of that report. This is the report of the Appropriations Committee itself:

> It is admittedly impossible for anyone to state with any degree of assurance the actual needs of the participating countries within a billion dollars. World political and economic condition are still too unstable to permit of long-term estimates.

With that statement I fully agree and it is because of that impossibility for any human being to make an estimate at this time within a billion dollars that I prefer to stay on the safe side of this picture rather than on what to my mind might be called the unsafe side. We have undertaken a program of very great magnitude, a program of the utmost importance to the safety, to the future, not alone physical, of this country but of our institutions. We have undertaken this program not alone from a humanitarian point of view but because in this very unstable world we are convinced that the restoration, the economic restoration of the nations of Europe and to some extent the nations of the Far East is the most helpful factor to which we can lend ourselves for our own good in the long run.

This particular amendment puts back the period of time in which the appropriation is made available from a 15-month period to a 12-month period. It has been reiterated here over and over again that this amounts to a cut of $1,000,000,000 in the program, but I warn you that that cut cannot come out of the relief side of the program but must come out of the reconstruction side of the program. The relief side has to be taken care of first; merely keeping people alive on a reasonable standard of living. Reconstruction for the long run is what we are attempting because only reconstruction will allow these nations to stand on their own feet and maintain their present freedoms.

I am sorry that this matter has come up here. I have great respect for the members of the Appropriations Committee who have had a very hard task and are dealing with a tremendous number of intangibles in this program, but I think that the real problem that is facing us now is: Are we going to try to get this job done even though none of us can tell exactly how much it is going to cost? Are we going to stay on the safe side or are we going to take the risk of failure?

I hope, sir, this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I ask the members of the Committee: If we were at war with Soviet Russia at this particular time would we hesitate in a matter of this kind? Would we economize to the extent of in any way endangering our program? I do not believe we would. I believe we would realize that it would be far better to err on the side of providing ample rather than on the side of giving too little. But, gentlemen, we are in a cold war. We definitely are in an economic war. Last November we recall the setting up of the Cominform in the Soviet satellite countries, with headquarters in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Ever since that time the propaganda has been pouring forth from there and from Russia designed to wreck the effort of the United States to assist in the reconstruction of Europe. So, Mr. Chairman, we are in an ecoonmic war and we cannot consider this measure on the basis of ordinary international business relationships. The background of this entire problem is one of economic warfare and we should therefore be prepared to do the things that are necessary to win that economic war.

The psychology would be extremely bad if nothing else, if at this time we were to withdraw to the extent of 20 percent the help that was formally voted by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if you have been following the recent broadcasts from Russia and from its satellite countries that are put out day by day into Europe, Africa, China, Korea, and all over the world, you will realize what a real job is being done against the United States, a real job of hate against the United States by Soviet Russia and the satellite nations all over the world.

We would be giving them real ammunition by thus crippling the ERP. That is the thing we cannot afford to do. It is extremely important that we do not give them one single valid argument. The other day there came into my possession a series of newspapers published in Belgrade, Yugoslavia—Cominform newspapers—every article in which was dedicated to the wrecking of the ERP, every article directed to the various countries of the world, satellite countries of Russia and others.

We must keep in mind that this is not just an ordinary business proposition. This is a proposition of economic warfare. We hope it will never go beyond that.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I heard the gentleman from Wisconsin say that they are producing 25 percent more in every one of these countries that we are helping. It that wrong? Is the gentleman from Wisconsin telling us something that is not true?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I do not get the gentleman's point. I do not recall saying they were producing 25 percent more.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The other gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] did.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is very possible. I hope it is true. But they are so far down the ladder of economic necessity that they have a very long way to go before they are going to be able to stand on their own feet.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I say that if the job is not done this year, and within a very short time, the expenditures that will face this country will not only arithmetically increase but increase by the square and the cube, we will eventually become an armed camp if we do not defeat the effort of the Soviet Union and its satellite countries to wreck this European recovery plan.

I heartily support the pending amendment because it bears on the success of European reconstruction, which in turn bears upon the peace of the world. World War I cost us some 20 billions. World War II lost us 347 billions. Gentlemen the mind rebels at what an all-out world war III would cost. World war III must be the war that never was fought. The world cannot stand it. Russia is driving with all her power toward it. America is driving with all its power against it. This is a battle for the peace. I beg of you gentlemen not to cooperate with the Cominform by crippling or embarrassing the reconstruction of western Europe. In April we put our hands to the plow. Let us not stumble or look back. Let us not give ammunition to the Communist radios for the next few critical months when the life or death of world peace hangs in the balance. We are dealing here not only with money but with the lives of our children and our children's children. European recovery must not fail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the pending amendment that has the effect of increasing the amount of the appropriation almost a billion dollars. The amount of the entire appropriation for the 15 months is almost $6,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is possible to reduce this appropriation by a considerable amount and do no harm at all to anyone. You seem to forget the

amount in this bill, by and large, will be charged to and paid by the taxpayers of this country.

There are some items in this legislation that can and should be trimmed. I don't believe there is any one member on the floor of this House who can really justify the expenditure of $110,000,000 to buy tobacco for foreign people. There is no justification or excuse for it, except to get rid of a surplus of tobacco now in the hands of the Government. If this is an example, and I hope it is not, of the loose manner in which foreign-aid money is being spent, then we had better look this problem over before we pass on it. Let us take a look and make some comparisons. This bill provides for spending $110,000,000 for tobacco in the next 15 months. What about other items in the bill. According to the report you spend 117.9 million for sugar; which is little more than you are spending for tobacco. For meat you spend 83.6; so tobacco seems to be more important than meat; for dairy products you spend just a little more than tobacco; for eggs you spend 12 million; for dried fruits you spend 6.7 million. So tobacco is king in this bill. The Committee on Foreign Affairs tells us this money is for food, clothing, and housing. At the proper time I shall ask that the item of $110,000,000 be stricken, unless someone else offers such amendment. If offered I will support it. Here is a chance to save several million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, there is another item that should be reduced by 90 percent. It is the item of approximately ninety million for farm tractors and heavy farm machinery. I shall expect to offer an amendment to reduce the item by 90 percent. Instead of spending $90,000,000 for tractors, that the Europeans are not accustomed to operating, use about $10,000,000 and you buy horses and mules, and some horse-drawn machinery. The farmers of Europe are not accustomed to use of tractors. They are impractical anyway. The average farm in France, Italy, England, and Germany is from 5 to 21 acres. Anyone who knows anything about farming knows that tractor farming on such farms is absolutely impractical. Did it ever occur to you these farms are very much diversified. Seems strange you are anxious to send tractors to Europe when they are needed here and of no practical use over there. It does give an outlet for sale of farm machinery but what about the American farmer who has waited 3, 4, and 5 years, and then has to let this new machinery be sent abroad where some additional horses and their own implements would do the work.

I have just read a report that there are hundreds of farm tractors that are rusting in fields of Poland because of lack of repairs and oil. The report further states the farmers of Poland just don't know how to run them.

Then there is another item. I just cannot see why we should send millions of tons of coal abroad. The idea of using taxpayers' funds to pay for coal to Britain does not make sense. The British have huge coal mines. What about making a deal to use coal from Poland? What about the use of the coal in German mines? Shipment of a million and a half tons of coal per month from the United States is a lot of coal. Mr. Chairman, this measure provides for the shipment of millions of dollars worth of petroleum. We had better look that item over, too. There is a considerable amount of this appropriation to be spent for arms for other countries. Those items should be set out so the people may know how much money is going for arms and ammunition, and who is getting it.

Mr. Chairman, the mere fact that the Congress some time ago authorized a certain sum of money for European relief, is no reason why it should be spent without justification. I am very sure many millions of dollars can be pared from this bill, and at the same time carry on a relief program in cooperation with countries who are willing to cooperate with America in bringing relief to a stricken world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I was one of a number of more than 300 for, as against a small number who voted in opposition, who believed that one of the best efforts and the most efficient means that we could employ to preserve the peace of the world was to vote for that authorization, which made a declaration of purpose and faith, that by economic aid to the peoples of the world who were suffering and not able to stand on their feet we could contribute more to the preservation of peace in the world and the avoiding of war than any other way. And that this was the most sensible approach to make to the matter at hand. Having a recollection of what I did, I could not see that I would be justified in taking a chance to nullify that step that was taken by the Congress of the United States, through the reduction of appropriations below that which so many felt would be necessary to do the job. I say this with the highest admiration for the gentlemen of the committee and the subcommittee who, with great pains and great patriotism, undertook to see where they could save this country and the people of this country a given amount of money. I take my hat off to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and those who worked with him, who worked more than a month, not with any fancy of a profligate idea of reduction, but to see where reductions could honestly and safely be made.

The report came in and it increased the time by 3 months over the time for which this original amount had been thought necessary. I am afraid that that is a dangerous reduction. I cannot afford to take a chance on this most important matter. I want it to develop that the appropriations that we have made for large expenditures for the Army and the Navy and the Air Force shall be found to be unnecessary finally to be expended; that by efforts of this sort in which we are engaged today we may contribute so much to the peace of the world that the necessity of the use of these weapons will never come.

I hope in this connection that those gentlemen who are undertaking to, and will with great fidelity, I am sure, administer this program, will admonish the government of Greece and the government of China that we have a right to ask them to help us by making their countries democratic countries, realizing the value of a human being and the individual, every one of them of the millions of people that are in those two countries. We have the right to ask them to help us to avoid war and to establish peace and good will on the earth. This they can do by wise democratic action, and the fair treatment of the people within those governments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have sat here all afternoon and have heard a great deal said about the peoples of China and the rest of the earth, and heard a great deal of very proper concern expressed about them in connection with raising their standard of living and rehabilitating them and starting them on their way to a peaceful, happy, prosperous world. That is all magnificent. It is a splendid objective upon which we are all agreed. It is the objective the world has pursued for 2,000 years not entirely successfully. I have yet, however, to hear a word from anyone here about those poor beasts of burden who are going to carry the bag for this and all the other expenses this Congress is improvidently pouring on their shoulders, and I refer to those poor devils who work 8 hours a day from one end of the United States to the other, and pay their taxes and pay them and pay them and pay them.

In making our appropriations and in passing our authorization bills, they are sometimes the last fellows that are thought of. The members of the Committee on Appropriations, however, have the job, and no one else in Congress has that job, to try to reconcile the demands that are going to be made and that are made, and the burden which falls upon the American citizens who pay the taxes with the sweat of their brows.

Let me suggest to my fellow Members that when we leave here we are going back home among our constituents. We are going to be there when the prices rise, when the effect of this appropriation and the $5,000,000,000 additional Army, Navy, and other appropriations, makes itself felt in the price level and in the scarcities; and we are going to be responsible. All your Committee on Appropriations has done has been to try to spare the country, and Members of Congress, to a small extent from the inescapable storm of inflation that is going to fall upon the taxpayers and the storm of indignation that is going subsequently to fall upon the Members of Congress who have no regard for the taxpayer, the ultimate burden-bearer of this and similar appropriations. A very large sum is appropriated in this bill. It seems to me rather farfetched to argue, as the gentleman from Illinois argues, that the difference between 12 months and 15 months is going to make the difference

between success and failure of the program. This bill appropriates $6,000,000,000 of American sweat and labor for foreign aid. On top of all that have been added five billions for defense, uncontemplated, unthought-of, and unexpected at the time the authorization bill was passed and the Committee on Foreign Affairs came here and proposed the sum of $5,300,000,000. Nobody knew and nobody could know then that we were going to subsequently be asked to appropriate $4,000,000,000 additional for the defense forces, and $1,000,000,000 additional for odds and ends of defense, such as atomic energy, Maritime Commission, and other things.

One more point. Can any of us forget for a moment the indirect cost of this program? On every appropriation bill and every authorization bill that has come before the House, somebody has stood up in the well of the House and asked for more money. Why? He has pointed his finger at the foreign relief bill and said, "Look, you are willing to appropriate these untold billions of dollars for foreign assistance and rehabilitation, but you will not do something for somebody back home or some group back home." So I say to you members of the committee, this is a reasonable bill and should be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am constrained to disagree with my distinguished colleague and friend from New York who just preceded me, and for this salient reason: The people of the United States were universally in favor of the European recovery program. Member after Member voted in favor of the European recovery program, to the amazement of his colleagues, who had not generally voted in favor of an international measure of this kind before. Why? Because the people wanted it. And the people's instinct was good. The people knew it would cost money. My friend from New York is not telling them anything that they did not know. They knew that it would cost lots of money. But they knew that it would be cheaper than these enormous armament programs, if it would work.

The gentleman from New York has just told the committee that we were faced this very year with an expanded expenditure for armament of $4,000,000,000. The particular subject of this appropriation, the European recovery program, is what the American people consider as the American answer to the need for huge armaments next year and the year after. They believe that building up and reconstructing the economies of the free, democratic peoples of the world will give them the will to resist the very tides and forces which we are arming to protect against. When these peoples have the will to resist, when other nations have built up means equal to our own to implement the will to resist, then indeed can the world be defended by the aggregate of nations as it has never been defended before, and as the democratic world is to be defended now by our enormous armaments.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

MR. LODGE. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement. I would like to say that if the Dirksen amendment is approved there will still be a cut of $415,000,000 in the European recovery program because of three items: First, $245,000,000 specifically cut from the European recovery program by the Appropriations Committee. Second, the $20,000,000 authorized for assistance to Trieste has not been included in this bill and it is expressly stated in the report that assistance to Trieste must come out of the European recovery program. Third, neither does the bill contain the $150,000,000 requested for the recovery of Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus.

There will remain, therefore, a reduction of at least $415,000,000 even if the Dirksen amendment passes. This is a very sizable reduction, a reduction of at least 14 percent.

That in itself is a substantial cut.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this particular cut—which is done in a colorable way by just stretching the period, but is just as devastating a cut despite the method—I assure you, this particular cut is designed, unwittingly, I am sure, to do very serious damage to if not to kill this program. And let me show the committee why.

The Appropriations Committee's report itself says $2,250,000,000 is estimated by the Administration to be the amount required for food alone for a year. That leaves one and three-quarter billions for use for rehabilitation. So that the billion which is being lopped off is lopped off of that part of the program which is to be used for recovery, reconstruction, and rehabilitation. Is it not our intention in this program, at long last, to get away from a relief program, and to take these participating nations off their backs and off our backs? If the committee takes a billion dollars off this program it is taking it off of the top; taking it off where it hurts most; taking it off the very part which carries out the purpose of ERP, to permit the participating nations to rehabilitate themselves by self-help and mutual cooperation and not to make this a relief program.

I agree with the Appropriations Committee in this statement which it makes, and I would like to call attention to it. The committee report says that ERP is "an accepted prerequisite to the establishment of a lasting peace."

I submit to this committee that the American people will be agreeable to paying a billion dollars more for ERP, to make more sure its success, and that they will consider our economy today extremely short-sighted if we turn down this amendment.

I would like to reemphasize this statement from the Appropriations Committee's own report on the ERP as "an accepted prerequisite to the establishment of a lasting peace."

I trust the Committee of the Whole will vote that conviction, written by the Appropriations Committee itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] for 4½ minutes.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a significant fact that those speaking for the amendment do not specify one figure, one item, that can be pointed to as requiring a billion and a half more rather than a billion and a half less. We are still faced with the same generalities supporting this amendment that we faced in the original authorization 60 days ago. "We need this WPA appropriation. Just trust us on a world basis."

On the other hand, this committee went into specific facts to justify this reduction, and those facts have developed, many of them, since the authorization. For example, before the committee on authorization we had the need of Norway and Denmark for fats and oils, in order to relieve starvation and hunger. It was represented to us that there was a deficit of some 98,000,000 tons. This committee finds that Norway and Denmark have a tremendous surplus fo fats and oils. They are looking for a market for those fats and oils. We propose to dump fats and oils on the European market, to spoil the normal course of trade. That can be taken all the way through. France has said, and I quote from the New York Times, "Coal in France now exceeding industry needs. Paris official is jubilant. Says nation is within reach of full recovery." They are able to get coal from Poland and from the Saar and from their old source, England. But they will not buy it in the regular course of trade, and trade will be broken down, as it is in any economy, if we simply dump coal and give it to France. So the illustrations could go on revealing the facts which the Appropriations Committee alone have brought out justifying specifically the reductions proposed in ERP. France, of course, will take coal if we are going to give it to her. It is not now needed. All the nations of course will find tobacco and coffee and cotton and steel and wheat acceptable in any amounts as gifts. This committee finds that they are no longer needed in such quantities originally proposed. That saves a billion and a half reduction in terms of cold, hard, practical sense.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. It was my understanding when I voted for the original ERP bill that the items contained therein would be scrutinized, that the Appropriations Committee would carefully survey them, screen them, and come in here with a definite recommendation. Only with that understanding did I agree to vote for the original bill. Now, if we intend to scuttle the weeks and months of labor of this Appropriations Committee and put $2,000,000,000 of money back in here, when there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that this extra amount of money is indicated, then I definitely will vote against this appropriation at this time. I would rather be influenced by facts, rather than by fancy.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Finally, I would like to cover wheat. The committee found in the testimony and it was confirmed by Henry Hazlett in a news release lately that all of the 16 countries growing wheat they were all managing the prices so that the farmers reduced acreage ranging from 7 to 29 percent. That reduction reduced the wheat crop. America was the only free economy in wheat and we increased our acreage 29 percent. Thus, in the one free economy we have a surplus. So the lesson to be taught to Europe is not with more dollars and more wheat, but that they must quit managing prices and causing their own scarcities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for 4½ minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, during the late war I recall particularly our Subcommittee on Military Appropriations bringing in a bill one day, just one single bill, for $60,000,000,000 for the war program. That bill, big as it was, was only a relatively small item in the whole war effort, shall I say?

The thing that America must seek to avoid is having to expend money like that again in the future, not to mention the necessity for conserving life and liberty. Someone has expressed great regret that no one had spoken in this debate a word in behalf of the poor burdened taxpayers of this country. Those who have studied this program and who know its real purpose know that the main objective of this program is to help the American taxpayers. The idea of helping the 260,000,000 peoples of western Europe to maintain their independence has a very important relationship to the American taxpayer. If our foreign-aid program to date had not been reasonably successful, if there had been no foreign-aid program to date there is no doubt but that the 260,000,000 peoples of western Europe would in all probability have already been brought under the domination of Russia. We cannot afford to have the 260,000,000 peoples of western Europe and their industries harnessed by Moscow and arrayed against the United States. If that situation should come about and those countries should become satellites of the Kremlin, what would happen to the poor, burdened American taxpayers? And we are all taxpayers. If that should happen tomorrow, what would happen here? I should certainly be among those—and I think we would be in the majority—in this House who would rise and say that our liberties are so much imperiled that we must appropriate not $6,000,000,000 but perhaps three times $6,000,000,000 in order that we might begin to prepare ourselves for the inevitable conflict, and in that inevitable conflict we would have to stand alone.

If America is to be an armed camp from here on out, the poor overburdened taxpayer is going to be in an almost impossible situation. But if this foreign recovery, this American recovery program, succeeds and the 260,000,000 people of western Europe can stand on their own feet and be free from the Kremlin and be in a position to support us if the worst comes to the worst, then Moscow will find that democracy must and will live and the time will come when we can certainly diminish our tremendous appropriations for national defense. But we cannot take chances.

Mr. Chairman, this program is designed to be a program in the interest of America and the American taxpayers and it is upon that basis I am supporting it. I am very happy over the fact that while democracy has its imperfections and our country has made its mistakes, at least in some degree we are winning the battle against communism. I cannot subscribe to a philosophy of too little, too late. Let us start the program off right. If it is started right the chances of success are much greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the pending amendment. The committee's approach is not so much a matter of too little and too late, but a matter of too long and too thin. When it comes to the matter of appropriation of amounts and investigating figures, I am accustomed to yield to the great Appropriations Committee. I sympathize with that committee in its tremendously difficult job. But after spending most of my time for the past year and a half on this problem I know how difficult it is for them or for anyone to secure specific, accurate estimates because things change over there so fast. In this vast problem, the weather and the Soviets have a lot to do with it. If the committee are in doubt by a billion dollars as to the proper amount I do not think they are justified in cutting it by this method of legislation. When it comes to appropriating money I yield to them; when it comes to legislating, I reserve my own judgment. What we are doing here by this motion is restoring the legislative time period which was debated so strenuously for 3 months earlier this year. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of fenagling about this matter of the time in order to make figures seem easier. We started out with a $6,800,000,000 program for 15 months. If there is one thing that this House and the Congress decided it was that we are going to go at this thing not 15 months at a time, we are not going to appropriate for 4 years or 15 months. This was to be a 1-year proposition, and this amendment simply restores that legislative policy which was tampered with here in an effort to make the amount, as I say, too long and too thin.

In our legislation we provided for a so-called watchdog committee. That committee, of which the great watchdog of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] my beloved friend, is a member, has as its agent general a former Member of this House, Charles Dewey.

In my judgment he is going to do a great job in watching events and preventing mistakes before they occur, but if the Administrator himself is hamstrung by shortage of funds when situations develop while we are home, which I hope is going to be for a stretch of about 5 months, we cannot repair the situation. It seems to me that, since this great Committee on Appropriations has three times in the past year ended up by appropriating right up to the amount authorized for foreign aid, we should be careful about permitting them to juggle with legislation in reference to time in order to lower the amount. The thing for us to do is to make this a 1-year proposition as we started out, and that means passing the Dirksen amendment, realizing that the amount still will be far less than was asked for. Bear that in mind if attacks are made on the amount.

Now, we talk about the dear taxpayer who is so close to all of our hearts, particularly at this time of the year. If any of you think that this whole project is a charity bazaar, you should have voted against it in the first place. If you think it is a charity bazaar, vote to cut it all out. Unless you think this is for our security and not merely relief, that world recovery is necessary for our security—vote against it all. If you think, as I do, that it is for our own security, do not hamstring it by monkeying with the time. Leave it as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Well, my colleagues, we march up the hill and then we march down the hill. You say, "We want the Committee on Appropriations to very carefully scrutinize the requested budget estimates." The Committee on Appropriations does that and spends 8 or 9 weeks doing it. They bring in a bill, and then the distinguished gentleman from Illinois says, "Why, you should not do anything with this appropriation. You should give them just exactly what they ask for in the authorization bill that came from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs." And, I see most of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including the beloved and distinguished chairman of that committee, sitting here, perhaps champing at the bit to vote for the Dirksen amendment so as to restore this action right back where we were when we started.

Now, what is the use of having a Committee on Appropriations at all? What is the use of even going into the hearings? What is the use of even conducting a hearing? What is the use of even making an examination? I dare say that there are not 10 percent of the Members of Congress that have had time to read these hearings to know what is in them. They physically have not had the opportunity to read them. The Committee on Appropriations has spent over 8 weeks, and here this afternoon we have the same situation that we are always confronted with, a barrage of people from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, spearheaded in this case by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who has an unusual interest in this situation. I do not know what there is to it, but I read in the paper that he is one of Mr. Hoffman's advisers down there at ECA at the present time, and he has an unusual interest in this matter. It is a very unusual situation that faces us.

Now, I voted for the ECA program. I voted for every one of these programs, and I want to see them work, and I am not going to allow anybody to stand in the well of this House and say that unless I do just exactly as the Committee on Foreign Affairs says, I am going to please Stalin, or that I am going to see the radio and the newspapers over in Russia gloating over the fact that the Congress of the United States has destroyed this program.

That is a lot of tommyrot. If you will take the time to read these hearings, you will see there is no substance in that kind of an argument at all. Read the hearings, and read the testimony of Mr. Dodd of the Department of Agriculture, when he was questioned in connection with this matter. "Supposing, Mr. Dodd, we have a crop failure in America next year; what will happen to that program?" "Why," he said, "it would put it all out of joint." Then if you have a great crop abroad, should not that also give some benefit to the taxpayers of America? There are a lot of imponderables we have taken into consideration in this matter.

I want to see this program work. I know what it means. That is why I am voting for it; but at the same time my interest as a citizen of America does not lead me to the point that I must accept just exactly what these people hand us and abdicate my judgement as a Member of Congress after spending 8 weeks going through these estimates. You may do it if you want to, and then you go back and face your people, face your farmers when they cannot get any farm machinery at all, and you face them in the face of what happens. I have been back home. I know what my people are thinking. They want this program to go. There has not been a single person from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on down that has been able to stand here in the well of the House and show you by any facts or figures that the action of this Committee on Appropriations would destroy this program. Not one bit of testimony has been offered, just a lot of surmises and suspicions to get this blank check into the hands of these people, and then they will spend it exactly as they please. You can do it if you want to, but I shall not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I regret the necessity, or the feeling of necessity, to trespass upon your time at this hour of the day. I have been here quite a good while as a Member of this House. I have seen many good debates in the House, of which I was very, very proud. If today I should sink, or think I might sink, to anything like partisanship in what I am going to say, I would be ashamed of myself. This thing is deeper than parties. It is the deepest and the most far-reaching thing, in my opinion, that we will deal with in this session of Congress. So I am not going to get excited, I trust, nor am I going to say anything that might offend the sensibilities of the most sensitive person in the House. I trust that I may in the moment that I occupy this place appeal to the reasons of people.

I know, I remember how often I heard from this place before the second war that too much was being done, that we would be as well or better off if we did less and spent less of the taxpayers' money. We spent a good deal, but it was not enough to keep Japan from attacking us at Pearl Harbor. They did not fear to attack us at Pearl Harbor. Italy and Germany did not fear to declare war on us the very next day. The taxpayer? He is involved in this. If we had had 20,000 planes instead of 5,000, well accoutered with bombs and fighting men, in my opinion, Japan would not have attacked us at Pearl Harbor. They did attack us, and in less than 5 years it cost the American taxpayer more than $300,000,000,000 and thousands upon thousands of the lives of our precious boys. As a result of the wars that we have been in, a bill will come to us next week appropriating more than $6,000,000,000 to take care of the maimed, the halt, and the crippled and the dependents of those who did not come back.

I regret the action of this committee, and I shall deeply regret the action of the House if it does what I think it will do. I think it will cause smiles of derision to be cast at us in the Politburo in Moscow. One of the leading men in the politics of Russia said last fall: "We are going to do everything we can to sabotage this program." Reports of what has been published in Europe have come through on the wires today. From Oslo comes this report:

> Report will come as shock typical unstable moods American politics and American politicians.

Just a little while ago, after long hearings before the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, they reported, and the House adopted by a substantial majority a bill authorizing the amount asked for in this bill which we are now considering.

The press wire report reads further:

> Proposed amendment will upset all previous calculations. Obvious Russian propaganda will make use of the confusion concerning the appropriations. Moscow offer cancel half Finnish war debt after July 1 already given most flattering background as result of report. Indications Russians have offered Finns $5,000,000 loan will enhance this impression.

From Vienna, the Communist paper has this to say:

Headline: "Collapse of present plan—Black day for the Marshall satellites."

Then, it goes on to say—this is a Soviet paper speaking now:

> This Washington news item comes like sledge-hammer blow for the 16 governments who have staked all their hopes on Marshall plan. They are now forced to admit bankruptcy of their policies. Since all 16 nations had already considered previous ERP allocations as far below their absolute minimum requirements, the new cut constitutes a horrible blow.

Only today Secretary Marshall was asked what he thought of this plan, and this is what his comment was:

> The reduction would, I consider, alter the European recovery program from one of reconstruction to one of mere relief.

Talk about the money we have appropriated here for defense. It might be used as a reason why this Congress in its wisdom has appropriated more money for defense, was on account of world conditions. Everybody who has any reason knows that the world is tinder today, and some little satellite country looking toward his big brother in the Kremlin may start a war that will not only consume thousands, yes, maybe millions of lives, but billions upon billions of money.

Frankly, my friends, I do not like to appropriate the taxpayers' money any more than anybody else, but I am afraid not to do this. I know and you know, and every human being in the land who thinks knows, that this world would be a holocaust if we had another war.

Take away from this program all the humanity that is in it; forget the starving children of our allies through the earth; wipe away the thing that I think is vitally important, that is, the recovery of these countries so they can defend themselves and help us defend ourselves if the worst comes to the worst; lay that all aside and go to the cold dollars-and-cents proposition of the American farmer, the American businessman and taxpayer. It means much to the cotton farmer of north Texas that western Europe be put on its feet so that they can trade with us; so that we can have business with them; take their surplus and exchange ours for theirs. It is important to every industry and every farmer in America that western Europe be rehabilitated at the earliest possible moment; as much, and probably more so, for us as it is for western Europe.

These are dangerous days. I look upon this hour with more fright on account of the situation this world finds itself in than I did in 1938, and even in 1939. Let us not do too little. Let us carry out to those people who want to be our friends and our allies, the promise that they think we made to them only a few weeks ago.

I counsel you as an old and devoted friend; I plead with you not to do too little now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. REED of New York moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. REED of New York. I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate and particularly to the last gentleman, our distinguished former Speaker of this House. I have heard him speak a great deal about the amount of money that was spent because of the attack of Japan. We might just as well turn back the pages of history for just a little bit. It is a fine thing for anyone to stand up here who went through that outrage and not know why Japan struck

and why we had a large bill for the war in the Pacific.

When the Trade Agreements Act was put into effect the New Dealers claimed it was going to build up exports, but it did not build up exports. They started in shipping war materials to Japan to build up exports. I have the record. The record has been placed before this House many times. The New Dealers shipped them airplane engines, shipped them 10,000,000 tons of steel. They built their mechanized army. They built their planes, they built their navy. They sent them enough scrap iron and steel to build a navy twice our own naval strength. Protests were made on this floor trying to prevent arming Japan. This House was told at that time that Japan was building up a stock pile far beyond any ordinary peacetime needs and warned that war-material exports must stop. But no. It went on. They wanted to build up exports to make a showing under their war-creating trade agreements program, to show that it had worked, when instead it had dismally failed. They kept on shipping steel and scrap iron to Japan, and I remember the day when the representatives of the Secretary of State came before the Ways and Means Committee and, huddled around the table and told us the predicament that they were in. They said: "We are short of steel to build up our own defenses. We want the tariff taken off scrap iron and steel. We are going to send agents into South America to gather up scrap steel, scrap iron, old sugar mills, railroad tracks, anything, to build up our own defenses."

Mr. Speaker, the New Deal armed Japan. They struck the blow at Pearl Harbor with New Deal scrap iron. The blood is upon the hands of those who adopted the policy or arming Japan.

Now, let us get down to facts. Let us not make fools of ourselves in the name of just another emergency. It is time the internationalists restore sense to their thinking and other actions. It is time we thought about our own debt and I urge you wherever you can to cut needless expenditures of this Government, cut them from ERP and every other appropriation bill that comes to this House.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for 4½ minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the old squeeze play is on. Personally, I am getting a bit tired of being told that we must vote for something because somebody promised somebody, or because something has not turned out just as predicted.

When the vote came on the ECA bill, we were told we had to vote for it because a refusal would be misunderstood, because Europe had been led to expect it; but we were also told the Appropriations Committee would be expected to do its regular job in screening the request for appropriations under the authorizations. Now we are told the Appropriations Committee cannot provide a cent less than the authorization or it would be misunderstood abroad.

If I remember correctly, the same thing was said when the Committee on Foreign Affairs, itself, modified the original proposals of the Marshall plan.

And then I recall that when the original message came to Congress, we heard this argument: "Set up the foreign economic recovery program and you will save heavy military expenditures. Do this and you will avoid war."

But when General Bradley came before the Military Appropriations Committee he used the European recovery program as an argument for increased military appropriations. He said:

> Our political, economic, and psychological countermoves have no real force in being behind them. We have nothing to back up our peace-seeking efforts but the world-wide knowledge of our great potential. Unless we can show some power behind our policy, in addition to the other methods we take, we believe, in dealing with Russia, that it is not entirely effective.

As he went on, I said:

> You are thinking that these countries to whom we extend this economic aid will have the courage to accept it if they can see a little force behind it in case somebody frowns at them for accepting that aid?

General Bradley said: "That is correct."

In other words, the very step that had been urged as a way to avoid huge military expenditures became the argument to get them. We had to have force to back up the program, to make it work.

So, the administration sent up supplemental estimates for the Army and for the Navy and for the Air Force, and we have voted them. I thought they had merit because of the testimony of General Bradley, and others. We had made western Europe more inviting to communism, the unarmed nations would be fatter for the kill. So I was active within the Deficiency Committee to report the bill with an amendment to increase the money for the Air Force because that was the one thing that said to Mr. Stalin: "Stop!"

And I believe any fair, objective review will say that the bill for the 66- or 70-group air force has done more than any other one thing to ease off Russia's cold war. Power—air power—was the one thing that spoke the language Stalin understands.

A lot of the argument this afternoon has been on the subject of contributing aid to Russia, psychological or otherwise. There is one aspect of the aid to Russia in this program that has had little public attention. I refer to the fact that in this program, we are being asked, in effect, to pay Italian reparations to Russia.

During the hearings on this bill I asked Mr. Lovett how the $100,000,000 in treaty reparations from Italy was going to be paid to Russia. I said:

> Where will Italy get the $100,000,000?
>
> Mr. LOVETT. She will have to get it out of her exports.
>
> Mr. CASE. And we are going to help her build up those exports, are we not?
>
> Mr. LOVETT. Our recovery program is certainly designed to increase her ability to build up her economy.
>
> Mr. CASE. And make it clear that the United States is, in effect, to provide the $100,000,000 for paying the Italian reparations to Russia.

The gentleman from Texas offered us counsel as an old friend, and I am sure he feels sincere from his standpoint. But let us go back to an old friend who in a famous farewell address in 1796, said: "In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend" warned us that we should be careful in giving equivalents for nominal favors abroad lest "we be reproached with ingratitude for not giving more."

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries $6,000,000,000 to give to the rest of the world and on top of that a billion dollars more for the Export-Import Bank to loan under the public-debt-transaction sections and billions more in loans through the Bretton Woods set-up. Will we be reproached with ingratitude for not giving more? Is six, is seven billions in foreign aid nothing?

Here is the Myrdal United Nations report which the Foreign Affairs Committee sent out after the ERP bill had passed and said it was the latest word on the subject. The table on page 1 gives the figures to show that Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Sweden were all more than 100 percent of their 1938 or prewar level in 1947. To what level do the taxpayers of the United States have a responsibility to build them up?

What are the facts if you want to settle this on facts and not on sentiment? When the CEEC met in Paris last November, what did the countries ask for? How much did they think they needed?

In sugar they asked for 3,053,000 metric tons. But our world planners in March said we should give them 3,297,000 tons, an increase of 240,000 tons.

On processed milk the CEEC countries asked for 240,000 tons. Our people said, "Give them 357,000 tons."

When I asked Mr. Northrup who was before us "why", he said—and you will find his answers on sugar, milk, fruit and tobacco at pages 364–366 of the hearings:

> Mr. NORTHRUP. The same general comments apply there, as for sugar, 240,000 tons was low, in our judgment, in relationship to the need over there. We thought in this instance they had badly understated their requirements.

I have given you the figures on tobacco, an increase from 247,000 metric tons to 323,000 because our planners think we ought to give these countries more than they themselves have asked for.

Is it any wonder that the committee after weeks of hearings on this matter and getting evidence of that sort, day after day, thought it might be possible to spread the dollars requested over the 15 months' period and get this program on a fiscal-year basis—in line with our other aid programs carried in this bill,

and all other appropriations? Personally, I believe that if all members would read the printed testimony there would be no question how you would vote on this amendment.

And I do urge that, however your vote, you get and read the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for the remaining time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the question here is whether we want to go by facts or we want to go by emotion and by an implication that if we do not do this something else will happen. I spent long hours and weeks going over this matter. I have found certain facts and I think you should know them.

Already France is in sight of a 300,000,000-bushel wheat crop, or 7 bushels per capita, almost double what is consumed in the United States. Italy is in sight of 269,000,000 bushels, or about 4.9 bushels per capita. Maybe they need some help. If this program goes through the way it was laid out, Germany would have 300,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 6 bushels per capita.

The trouble with this matter is that it has not been analyzed up to date by the people who are talking in favor of this amendment. We have analyzed it. After we got through with the hearings, Dr. Fitzgerald, of the ECA, in charge of the Food Branch, appeared before us, and he acknowledged that my figures were correct. I had him submit tables for the record to prove it. They are found on pages 389, 389A, 389B, and 389C.

Now, if the House desires to go by a careful analysis made after 5 weeks of hard study, that is what I ask them to do. I believe, and I am sure, that there is ample money provided in here to carry this program through 15 months. I believe if it is properly and honestly administered that it can do everything that it should do to rehabilitate western Europe and the world. I hope that you will not destroy this program by making it a WPA program and giving to these people who are running it not alone what they need but more than they need so that they will destroy it by improper administration. It is time, folks, to think. It is time to realize that in these days we are up against a serious proposition. We should take proper care of these demands that are made upon us for relief and rehabilitation in Europe, but we should not go to the point where we encourage such things as enormous quantities of tobacco and more cotton than they ask for, and more wheat than they need, and all that sort of thing. Let us be honest with our souls. Let us be honest with the American taxpayer and see if we cannot put the United States and the rest of the world on the way to recovery. I have not the slightest fear but what we are providing enough money here, and I would not come to you and misrepresent it. I have been here too long; I do not care to do anything of that kind.

I ask you, on the basis of loyalty to honest government, to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 101, noes 127.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 2, line 22, after the word "Administration", strike out the balance of line 22 and all of lines 23, 24, 25 through 1948 and before the period in line 16 of page 3, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be expended for guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informative media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes from the bill on page 2 the amount of $10,000,000 which is authorized to be spent in the promotion of American publicity abroad through the American press and cinema industry. This proposed sum is intended to subsidize American newspapers, magazine and films circulated in the foreign countries which are beneficiaries under this European recovery plan.

Perhaps a number of you here in the House have not examined this appropriation measure in detail, and do not realize exactly what this particular item in the measure contemplates. If you have any doubt about the matter, I direct your attention to a detailed article appearing on the front page of a local newspaper, issue of June 2, written by a correspondent who has taken the trouble to examine into the full implications of this proposal, and to report them in detail to the American people.

While we are debating a measure which will almost certainly be approved, and which will allocate $6,000,000,000, the distribution of which will immediately benefit hundreds of domestic industries and businesses—it may seem ironic at first glance to object to this comparatively trivial sum to be awarded to a special group of outlets in this particular group of American business people. But let me say to you with all possible emphasis that this is not mere opposition to the American press and cinema industry. I believe there is not a more ardent and sincere advocate of a free and untrammeled press and movie industry in this body than I. I vigorously oppose this particular provision because I believe it would set up a dangerous practice; because I am convinced it would establish a vicious precedent.

Let me quote here the detailed story of this proposal, as reported in the Washington Times-Herald, issue of June 2:

$15,000,000 SUBSIDY TO SALVE SUPPORTERS OF MARSHALL PLAN—NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, MOVIE FIRMS TO GET UNITED STATES CASH, SECRET HEARING TOLD

(By Willard Edwards)

A selected few American newspapers and magazines which shouted the loudest for the $6,000,000,000 Marshall plan are to share approximately $5,000,000 a year under the project, it was learned yesterday.

Another $10,000,000 annually is to be divided between book publishers and motion-picture producers who similarly were active in the propaganda campaign for the foreign-spending experiment.

The $15,000,000 fund, contributed by American taxpayers, will be used to subsidize and boost the foreign circulation of those publications which earned the State Department's favor by zealous advocacy of the Marshall program.

The House Appropriations Committee heard the details at a recent closed-door session. Members caustically commented that the money obviously was a reward for services rendered.

A million-dollar-a-year subsidy for the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, one of the more vociferous exponents of the foreign-spending scheme, topped the list of benefits.

The Paris Herald would receive $827,000 yearly for a proposed sale of 75,000 copies daily in the occupied zone in Germany. The blocked German marks it receives for such sales would be turned over to the Government. Another $150,000 a year would be paid the Herald Tribune for circulation of its Paris edition in the occupied zone in Austria.

$110,000 FOR TIMES

The New York Times would receive $110,000 a year which was its estimated cost of selling 20,000 copies in the German occupied zone of its Sunday weekly overseas edition.

The principal magazine beneficiaries and the yearly sums they would receive for circulation are as follows:

Life magazine, $853,000, of which $663,000 would be for publication in England, $100,000 for publication in France, and $90,000 in Italy.

Time magazine, $360,000, of which $330,000 would be for publication in England and $30,000 for publication in Italy.

Newsweek magazine, $200,000, of which $129,000 would be for publication in England and $71,000 in Italy.

Reader's Digest, $305,000, of which $200,000 would be for a French edition and $105,000 for an Italian edition.

CIRCULATION BOOSTER

J. Noel Macy, assistant director of the Office of International Information of the State Department, who explained the secret plan to the committee, said these magazines could boost their foreign circulation by two-thirds with aid of the Government subsidy.

The yearly subsidy for publishing the magazines in Great Britain alone would be $1,168,454, under the plan. Another annual contribution of $6,018,422 would be provided for circulation of books in Britain.

"I supposed this is advanced as a part of the 'stop communism' theory of the Marshall plan," Representative WIGGLESWORTH, Republican of Massachusetts, noted at the hearing. "I should think England would be the last place where we would need this program."

KEEFE CAN'T UNDERSTAND

"Don't understand the philosophy of this program at all," commented Representative KEEFE, Republican, of Wisconsin. "Don't these magazines get paid in dollars for ad-

vertisements? They can use the foreign currency they receive for services, material, and rent in foreign countries."

"It's a way of telling the American story, supporting the work of the Voice of America," said Macy.

"It appears to be only a scheme to bail these people out," remarked KEEFE.

The European recovery program authorizes the $15,000,000 subsidy, Macy said, as a "guarantee of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media."

"These newspapers, magazines, motion pictures, nd books now going into Europe receive foreign currencies which they are unable to convert into dollars," he told the committee. "The fund would enable them to convert these foreign currencies into dollars."

All motion-picture companies which distribute films abroad would be eligible for this purpose, Macy added. These include Loews, Paramount, Fox, RKO, Universal, Warner Brothers, Columbia, Monogram, Republic, United Artists, and Selznick.

Macy asserted that the payments would cover only the actual dollar cost of production. No profits would be involved but present losses would be eliminated, he remarked.

Please consider the implications of the newspaper article I have just quoted. It is not my purpose here to support the implications in this article. I do not know that the funds proposed here are actually planned to salve and support those who have helped to sell this present aid program. I cannot honestly say that such a motive is behind this provision, even though I have heard the charge frequently made both in and out of Congress during the discussion of this measure.

But the administration forces here are skirting dangerously close to the specific prohibition in the criminal code, if, indeed, they have not run afoul of it in this case.

Here we have a number of private agencies which plugged for aid to Europe in the period when this policy was being determined in Congress. And now that actual awards in good American dollars are about to be authorized, these agencies are about to be appropriately rewarded. The story is that we need American sales promotion in these beneficiary countries. But there is no provision here to solicit help from other sections of our domestic press, radio, magazine, and movies in this big venture of selling America for a nice, fat fee.

The editor of a newspaper, magazine, or the boss of a movie studio may feel any way he likes on this issue. But I insist that he may not be rewarded by the Federal Government for thinking and preaching the way the administration wants him to think and preach. But here we apparently have such an attempt to reward such influences, in an indirect, but clear, violation of the criminal code. In this connection may I read to you the essential language of section 201, title 18, of the United States Code. This legislation was approved July 11, 1919, and reads:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress.

The final paragraph of the section establishes a fine of $500 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, upon conviction.

No question is raised here about the manner in which private persons may spend their own money. That is clearly their own business. If they have wished to promote the program of aid to Europe, no one in Congress can question their right to do so. But I do doubt that the administration may now legally reward the proponents of its policies, as it seeks to do under this provision. I do directly challenge the right of the administration thus to spend public funds by indirection for purposes which it could not legally support by direct expenditures.

If the administration cannot legally spend the American people's own money to sell the idea of sending our resources abroad in this program, can it now legally return money in this fashion to private persons and companies who did the job for it? I think the answer ought to be perfectly clear: What you may not legally do directly you may not legally do by indirection.

But suppose we establish the practice and make this a precedent, is it possible that the newspapers who will be rewarded and paid these sums of money will then be obligated to the department that pays them to support the program that they espouse? Suppose this program is a failure abroad, will those newspapers and magazines which are being paid this subsidy of $10,000,000 be expected to whitewash the failure, and cover the failure to the American people, as the hired agents of the administration, which is trying to sell this program?

When the taxpayers' money can be used for the purpose of propaganda, when it can be used to control the thinking of the people, then free representative government has become a fiction, and there is no need, indeed no future, for this representative body.

I appeal to the Members of this House to give careful thought to this amendment. Let us stop this vicious practice of Federal agencies using the taxpayers' own money to lead our thinking however Washington bureaucrats dictate. Do not scoff at the idea, please. My committee has repeatedly proved to you how our executive departments and agencies actually use this technique.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wanted to ask the gentleman if his amendment would also eliminate such agencies as moving pictures and the radio that are in the same class.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It does that. It prohibits the use of any of this appropriation for the purpose of subsidizing any of those groups which are producing and distributing informational matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know whether or not there is any evidence of record as to the media or publications which are to receive any of the money thus appropriated?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. The hearings state several of them. The New York Times is one of the newspapers. The New York Herald Tribune, and a number of magazines and a number of moving-picture producing companies and a number of book publishers are included.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It would be fairly easy to take those publications which did support the program, and the testimony here, and prove that regardless of what has been charged about themselves, the fact is it does subsidize those organizations.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. Now, the Associated Press, the International News Service, and the United Press are included in this only in the occupied territories. But I believe these news agencies actually want no part of this scheme. I think each expects to pay its own freight, and to gather and disseminate news without influence from any source. In fact, I understand that at least two of them have already disclaimed any interest or d sire to participate in this proposed program.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. For the purpose of emphasis I would like to say for the RECORD that the gentleman is making a point to which there is great merit. When representatives of the Appropriations Committee were before the Rules Committee on yesterday they were questioned as to the justification for this item, and it was not forthcoming.

To make the point clear, here is just what is proposed: This bill carries an item which the gentleman's amendment is intended to strike out, an item of $10,000,000 which is to be paid not in fulfillment of any commitment made by the State Department to anybody but in the nature of a reward for magazines and newspapers which advocated the adoption of the plan. That is the question and that is the entire question.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to take this position, as I said, but the principle involved is far greater than my desire to spend this money for American business.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to seek an agreement on closing debate on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Nine Members were on their feet seeking recognition. This

means a little more than 2 minutes apiece. The Members to be recognized will be Messrs. RANKIN, LODGE, CASE of South Dakota, TABER, STEFAN, HOFFMAN, VURSELL, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and Mr. KEEFE.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I was not seeking time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course I am in favor of this amendment. What a pity they had not known months ago that Congress was not going to pay this subsidy. You would not have had all these newspapers and magazines and motion pictures and radios propagandizing to have you go down into the pockets of the American people and dig up this $6,000,000,000 and pour it into the sinkholes of Europe.

Two days ago, on June 2, if you will turn to the RECORD, page 6943, you will find where I put this statement in the RECORD:

> This amounts to $15,000,000, $5,000,000 of which is to go to publications and newspapers; and another $10,000,000 is to be divided between book publishers and motion-picture producers who similarly were active in the propaganda campaign for the foreign spending experiment.

It goes on to name the papers, and I am sorry that my time is limited so that I will be unable to call the names of all of them. But it does go ahead and names the papers that have been carrying on this propaganda for months to have the Congress dig down into the pockets of the American people, into the pockets of their children and their children's children's children and take these billions of dollars and pour it into the sinkholes of Europe and Asia.

This bill provides a large amount for China. A young captain said to me down at home recently: "Why do you want to feed the Chinese? They have been starving to death by the roadside for thousands of years. I saw them starving by the roadside. I was over there in the Army 2 years and I saw them die by the roadside and the dogs eating their dead bodies and the other Chinese never even stopped to pick them up."

Now, you come in here and attempt to pass this under the bludgeoning of a propaganda to which the Congress seems to have capitulated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the inclusion of an amount to pay these newspapers would be silly if it were not so absurd. We will not let the big businessmen, we will not let the labor unions, pay out their money for political purposes. That is all wrong, yet here we take the taxpayers' money and let it be used to support the Foreign Affairs Committee. That does not look right to me. And this is why I say the provision is foolish.

Whom do we hire? Anyone who has been here for the last 10 years and who has been worth his salt has been bitterly condemned by the Washington Post because he did not follow that paper's ideas, yet we are subsidizing that paper to put their people in there, though we know that when we speak or vote it is for America—but the Post thinks otherwise; abuse is our reward. Everyone who has been here for 10 years knows that the Washington Post has been supporting parts of the Communists' program all through these years. It has paraded them, defended them, it has coddled them; it has condemned every Congressman who ventured to say anything against some of the policies of the Communists if they happened to be in high Government. While you are appropriating $6,000,000,000 here to fight communism abroad, we hire the Washington Post representatives to blow them up here at home and abroad.

It was the Washington Post which persecuted the so-called seditionists, later ashamed of its action, or at least caught in its vicious and unfair acts, admitted its folly.

The Post, if it follows its past policy, will encourage communism rather than discourage the spread of its ideas.

Oh, it is so silly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE.]

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, the section providing $15,000,000 for the guaranty of the convertibility of soft currencies into dollars for publications published in the 16 participating nations was adopted because it seemed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs that this provision is in line with the Mundt Voice of America bill and with the provisions of every foreign aid piece of legislation that has passed this body. We specified in these measures that there must be adequate advertising as to the source and the nature of the aid.

This body has gone on record as favoring private enterprise for the dissemination of information. It is, let us say, somewhat inconsistent to be opposed on the one hand to the dissemination of information by the Government and, on the other hand to oppose helping our private purveyors of information.

Now, this provision does not guarantee a risk; it does not guarantee a profit. It is not a subsidy. All that it does is to assure a certain modicum of convertibility of soft currencies into dollars. There are certain publications which would come within that provision. The New York Herald Tribune has a European edition. I think the New York Times Sunday supplement is published in Europe; also the Reader's Digest, Time, Life, Newsweek, and there may be others. This will enable American publications to publish in Germany, where, as you know, we need more thorough American dissemination of information. It will enable these publications to go in there and start working. If this amendment is adopted, this will be impossible. They have not been able to publish in Germany because they have to spend dollars on newsprint. Other costs of production and distribution must be paid for in dollars.

This is a temporary facility to disseminate the American point of view through private means.

I hope very much that this amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, 2 months ago when the Marshall plan was considered on the floor of the House, I offered an amendment to reduce the amount for this first year by $1,500,000,000. The House refused to approve the amendment.

After 6 weeks' study of this bill recently by the Appropriations Committee, after going over it carefully, this committee has reduced the amount by approximately $1,500,000,000, proving the justice of my contention in the first instance. The House is to be commended for just having taken such action by a substantial majority. The bill still carries more than is necessary, but the load of the American taxpayers is greatly reduced by the action just taken. I hope an amendment later to be offered to reduce the shipment of farm tractors and farm machinery so scarce in this country will also be adopted. Likewise, we should strike out the item of $150,000,000 for tobacco. Let us give them food when they ask for it, rather than tobacco. Mr. Speaker, I want to protect our own people by cutting out of this bill all billions and millions that are not necessary to European recovery, so we, who are against waste, who are willing to help these European people, can, in good conscience, support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, when I came back from Europe, particularly from Germany, after having been in conference with some of the high church leaders in Munich, Germany, I tried to interest the big newspapers of New York to donate and ship over a small amount of newsprint to be so used. They needed a small amount of newsprint to help fight back against communism. I was greatly impressed at this conference and I asked them to give me a list of what they thought they would need. I thought probably that these publishers who said they wanted to save western Europe, these millionaires in the publishing business in New York, might be willing to lend a helping hand with a few hundred tons of newsprint. I received a courteous letter from them, and finally one of their representatives called upon me, but there was nothing they would do to help. But, they would be glad, these millionaire publishers, to have the support of the Federal Government at the present time. I can see where it might be well to subsidize some book publishers to get some decent sort of literature and books into the countries over there, and I realize that they should have all of the proper kinds of information possible from our Government as to our way of life here, but I think it would be an unwise precedent to subsidize the publishers of New York or any place else as this bill provides.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, if I thought that this appropriation would be used to subsidize or reward any individual

or organization for propaganda to pass or oppose legislation I would support the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. The principle on which the gentleman bases his amendment is sound, but from what I know of this item, it is not the belief of the committee members that this money is for any sort of actual subsidy. The committee went into this matter very carefully. I know something about it personally because the original request for this money came to the subcommittee of which I am chairman. That is the committee which makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and the Federal Judiciary. When the requests came for appropriations for the OIE or what is commonly known as the Voice of America it was suggested that American newspapers, magazines, motion-picture people, and some book publishers could extend their circulation in foreign countries if they could be assured of better dollar exchange. This is the kind of American voice which in my opinion is the best. If we could get more American newspapers and magazines circulated into those countries to show the people there that we actually have a free press and that the voice of the free people is always heard in America, it would be of great value to the program we have under way to tell the story of America. The money provided here will not necessarily all be used. If so the foreign exchange should be of value to the United States Government. We can use it to buy strategic materials or we can use it for the payment of alien employees of which there are about 5,000 in the Foreign Service. The item really should not be in this bill but in the OIE bill. Or in some one bill. Some day, and, soon, we should coordinate all of our Voices of America, four or five of which are now operating over the world. The entire program should be combined into one foundation as suggested so many times by the Honorable William Benton, former Secretary of State.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. It seems to me you have four too many now. Why do you want to get a fifth Voice of America? We had better bring them back home where they belong, and stop writing newspapers to help soft soap America down the river.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, when the original bill was before the House I spoke against this provision. Now I am delighted to know that so many Members of the House are ready to go along with me in striking it out. I simply want to issue my protest against such expenditure at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to listen for just a moment and understand what we are doing. Then you use your judgment as to what you think ought to be done with respect to this proposal, but I do not think we ought to act emotionally and without some knowledge of what the facts are in connection with this program.

If you have read the ECA Act, you will find that the act provides for a total amount of guaranties of $300,000,000. This is just $15,000,000 set up in the act for guaranteeing the exchange of foreign currencies into dollars for those informational media. There is $300,000,000 involved in this program by which the Administrator of ECA can guarantee to investors who go into the foreign market, and who must accept the local currencies of the countries in which they are doing business in exchange for their goods or services, that they will be enabled to cash those foreign currencies back into dollars, at least for the cost they are put to to make the investment. It is not a case of subsidizing anybody, it is a case of a simple guarantee to an American investor or manufacturer who places an investment in a foreign country and is compelled to accept foreign currency in exchange for his service or product, and then cannot use that currency to get back dollars with which to buy products in the United States or pay dividends to his stockholders. That is what the situation is, as I see it. I think we ought to study the record. Look at page 883 of the hearings, where it is fully explained, and then make up your mind what you want to do with it. But do not vote unintelligently on this, vote as a result of some intelligent information as to what is proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, no one will accuse me of wanting to spread propaganda for ECA. No one who knows anything about my personal connection with newspaper work before I came to Congress, will accuse me of wanting a subsidized press. But I want to say to you I would rather see even the Washington Post, which took my name for a ride this morning, on the newsstands of Berlin and Munich and Rome and Paris than either the Communist publications which they see in abundance, or some of the tripe that has been put out recently in the name of the Voice of America.

This language, which the amendment seeks to strike, was put in the bill to make it possible for American newspapers and American magazines to continue overseas publication and distribution and, by visible proof, to show what freedom of the press in America means. I say to you that for them to read one good magazine or newspaper from America, even though it criticized every vote I cast, and even though it criticized me editorially every day, would mean more to demonstrate what we mean by freedom of the press than any essay someone might write or any broadcast which might be put out under the auspices of the Voice of America or anyone else.

Last fall I was in Prague and saw some American magazines on the newsstands there—I do not know whether they are there now or not—but last September they were. And I recall that on the front page of either Newsweek or Time, I saw a little table which gave the price of the magazine in various European countries, all based on the legal rate of exchange. I knew, and everyone who knew actual exchange rates on the market knew, that the publishers could not come out even at the legal rate of exchange if any substantial part of their publication costs had to be paid in dollars.

Later I heard that one of the publishers, Reader's Digest or Time, found they were losing so much on exchange that their foreign edition would have to be discontinued. As the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out, this item for information media is really only part of a larger currency exchange allowance in the original authorization. If the United States thinks it desirable to protect American business from currency exchange losses for other types of business, that encouragement should not be denied publishers.

Personally, as I have said, I regard the average American newspaper or magazine far better evidence of what we mean by a free press than all the doctrinaire talks or essays that could ever be put out on the subject.

I hope we can keep these papers and magazines on the newsstands and in the libraries and reading rooms of the world. I want the peoples of Europe to see for themselves the difference between the free press of this country and the controlled press of communistic Russia.

I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LODGE) there were—ayes 67, noes 117.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment, including the present section.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I was recognized, was I not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, do you intend to limit the debate to 5 minutes or 10 minutes?

Mr. TABER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 10, after line 23, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 203. Not more than $50,000,000 of the funds herein appropriated shall be used

for the purchase of farm machinery"; and renumber succeeding section numbers.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from a letter written to me by a friend in Denmark, which I received recently. I quote in part:

Denmark lacks the regular importation of corn, wheat, and fodder for the cattle so that we can produce somewhat more butter and pork for hungry Europe. Denmark is a participant in the Marshall plan and had counted on a large corn import, but now the United States wishes to send machines and tractors instead. And you know full well that Danish agriculture consists mainly of small farms, mostly with two or three horses, and therefore cannot be helped much by mechanization with tractors.

Is this not proof that we are making a mistake in this bill by permitting too many farm tractors to go to Europe?

I was home last month, and farmers in Minnesota could use today thousands of additional tractors with which to do their work. Yet, here it is contemplated to export a total of approximately 55,000 of our new farm tractors through this bill and an additional 87,000 tractors will go to such countries as Canada and others in normal trade channels.

My amendment simply states that instead of $81,500,000 which is allocated in this bill for the purpose of sending farm machinery abroad, that we limit that allocation to $50,000,000. I am not trying to entirely squeeze out of the picture farm-machinery exportation to Europe, but let us use a little common sense. Let us send them horse-drawn machinery that they can use to advantage. Let us not send farm tractors that your farmer friends and my farmer friends need badly. I have tried for 5 years to get a new tractor on my farm, and was successful only this last week, but many of my neighboring farmers have not been that successful.

Mr. Chairman, the question "How much of our farm machinery production should we permit to be exported this year" is very controversial, as evidenced by the pages of testimony in these hearings on the foreign aid appropriation bill.

As I study these hearings there come to me the impression that the State Department and the Department of Commerce are trying desperately, but ineffectually, to build up a straw house of plenty in farm-machinery production. Their representatives repeat time and again the very questionable argument that the farmers of America have available today four times the amount of new machinery than in 1939.

These men do not tell the Congress that the farmers of America could not afford, through the small farm-income years of the thirties, to buy the machinery needed to replace old implements. Then came the war and farm machinery production was cut to such a point that no farmer could find the machinery which he now had the financial means to purchase.

Nor do these representatives of the two departments, knowing very little about agriculture, explain in the hearings that manpower to the extent of hundreds of thousands have been stripped from our farms and, as a consequence, farmers have been forced to mechanize in order to survive. We must have tractors and power-drawn farm machinery so that one man today can do the work on our farms formerly done in the thirties by two men.

We as farmers in the lean thirties were able to secure good hired men for $45 per month and board and room. We could afford then to send that man to the field with four horses and a gang plow and were satisfied to get five acres a day plowed by that man and outfit.

Now, however, we pay men of similar ability $150 per month and board and room. If we were forced to put such men out in the fields with horses as power, we could not produce the food necessary for the Nation, when we consider the hundreds of thousands of our farm boys who have left the farm.

Naturally in view of the present circumstances, the demand here in our own Nation for farm tractors and farm machinery of all kinds is tremendous. On my own farm there is a backlog of needed equipment which illustrates here what I am trying to prove to you, and that is, we cannot afford to permit too many of our tractors to be exported under this bill.

One of my three farm tractors is 10 years old, another has seen 9 hard years of work, and my third, fortunately, is new. Our two older tractors did all of the work on that 725-acre farm during the war. I tried 5 years ago to buy an additional tractor. Only this spring did I finally manage to buy that tractor, which to our farm represents the difference between sufficiency and lack of power to accomplish the work.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, one can easily imagine the thoughts of less fortunate farmers than I, who have been unable to buy the power they need for their farm operations, when these, my neighbors, hear that it is contemplated to export this year 142,300 farm tractors, of which 52,165 are provided for in this bill.

The State and Commerce Departments bring out the fact that 667,800 farm tractors will be produced by us this year. After all, Mr. Chairman, when you deduct the proposed exports from this production, it only leaves us with a net supply of 540,500 new farm tractors for our farmers of America this coming year.

Now remember that we have about 6,000,000 farms and you can see where we will have only 1 new tractor for each 10 farms. You can well see why my farm has tractors 9 and 10 years old today, undependable and requiring costly upkeep in order to keep them moving at all.

I am offering this amendment in order to try to keep here in America as many as possible of our own farm tractors for our own farmers who are so desperately in need of them. When I purchased my new John Deere tractor from my dealer this spring, I could immediately have turned that tractor in the gray market for at least one-third more than it cost me. Any governmental employee who attempts, as they have in these hearings, to tell you and me that there is a sufficiency of farm-machinery production in our Nation, is talking through his hat. It will require at least a 50-percent increase in this production to satisfy the demand.

Our farmers can make better use of these tractors than can the farmers of Europe on their small farms which are a fraction of the size of ours on an average. Give our farmers the tools first, so we can produce to capacity. Do not continue this shortage of farm power here by wasting thousands of new tractors in inefficient operation abroad.

I do not object to horse-drawn farm equipment being given away under this bill to the foreign recipients of the generosity of our people. The European nations have ample men who have plenty of time to follow horses down the furrow. We farmers in America are short of manpower and need our tractors, if we are to produce at a maximum. I speak from personal experience—my farm needs another new tractor right now—and hundreds of thousands of American farmers, not Europeans, also need these symbols of power upon their farms. We cannot produce food to capacity with lack of power no more than can industry without its electrical power.

Fifty million dollars will buy a lot of farm machinery, horse-drawn machinery, and it is utter foolishness to send power machinery in any great quantity to people who cannot operate them, cannot service them, and who would be far better off with the type they know how to operate. I want to help these people, our friends in Europe, but I, at the same time, want to watch out for our own here at home.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Would the gentleman object to amending his amendment so as to make the limitation applicable only to power-driven farm machinery, such as tractors and combines?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; I could not. That would give them more power-driven farm machinery than they have now under the act. If time were available here now, I would like to accept the gentleman's suggestion. The Administrator will understand that is our main purpose, however.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What the gentleman said about small farms in Denmark is equally true of most of the farms in Europe, is it not?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; that is my opinion. I quoted that as an example of the farms throughout Europe. You gentlemen who have traveled abroad report that this is the general situation in most of western Europe. They have small farms, and they need horse-drawn equipment, not tractor machinery.

Mr. JENSEN. I am very glad the gentleman has offered the amendment. I think it is a good amendment. The gentleman is always watching out for the interests of the farmers of our Nation. The world is depending on America to feed its starving people, and certainly we

need machinery and tractors right here to do that job.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his kind statement, and furthermore, may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the European farmers have very little means of servicing these tractors. It will require the consumption of additional gasoline that is very precious. It is much better to let the farmers over there—they have ample manpower—follow the horses down the furrow, but let us give to our own farmers the tractors that we can use so we can get the work done on our farms and produce all our good lands can produce. Then we can help feed Europe.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my friend.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman's amendment as drawn cover tractors and power-drawn machinery?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It covers any line of farm machinery, I would think, as it is written.

Mr. TABER. This does not cover tractors.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Eighty-one million five hundred thousand dollars is allocated for farm machinery, Mr. TABER, and I would certainly feel farm tractors are farm machinery. I may be mistaken.

Mr. TABER. But a tractor is not farm machinery.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. A farm tractor certainly is, in my opinion, but to make sure, I will welcome suggestions for strengthening the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is used also as tractive power.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I may repeat to the gentleman from South Dakota that I will be glad to accept any modification of my amendment to accomplish the point we have in mind. We want exportation of farm tractors limited especially. Our farmers need these tractors and to make doubly sure we can include those words, "farm tractors."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would suggest that the gentleman add to his amendment the words "including farm tractors."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the words "including farm tractors" be inserted in my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not because I am in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, but I believe the way it is drawn now it would include other tractors, would it not?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will be glad, as I stated, if the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] will help put the amendment in such shape that it will do what we want it to do. We certainly want to make the wording absolutely plain as to what it means.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think if the gentleman were to include the phrase "including farm tractors" that the amendment would do what he wants to do. Obviously, many tractors are used as power tractors for moving dirt equipment and things of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment is corrected as suggested.

Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment as modified by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 13, after line 23, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 203. Not more than $50,000,000 of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the purchase of farm machinery including farm tractors."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota to modify his amendment as indicated?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I just recall, in conclusion, that of the three tractors on my farm today one is 10 years old, the other 9, and as I stated before, I was lucky enough to secure a new tractor this last month; and that new tractor means having sufficient power to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will receive favorable consideration.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there are two or three important things to keep in mind in connection with this farm-machinery problem which have not yet been discussed. Not only is it true, as the gentleman from Minnesota has well pointed out, that the average European farm is not suited to the use of large and heavy machinery, but it is also true that there are no facilities for the repair or the replacement of that machinery when it breaks down. It is also true that there is very little, if any, facility to provide fuel for tractors and whatever else we may send over there in the way of motive power. We must send the fuel along with the tractor, we must send repairs along with it, we must send spare parts along with it, and we must send mechanics along with it. When we have done all of that we have imposed an unnecessary burden upon the farmers of America with no compensating benefit on the part of the Europeans.

After all, why do we use heavy farm machinery? I mean motor-driven machinery. We use it in the United States for the purpose of reducing cost. We do not use combines and large tractor-driven machinery for the purpose of producing more food per acre. Anyone who has ever driven a combine will tell you that it loses three or four bushels of wheat per acre. You can actually harvest more wheat on any acre of land by going out and cutting it by hand than you can with a combine. It is true that motor-driven machinery does reduce unit costs on most American farms, but, generally, it does not increase the yield per acre.

What does Europe need? As I see it, Europe needs to get the most number of bushels of food off the smallest number of acres which may be possible. You can do that by the kind of farming the people of Europe have engaged in for thousands of years. They have the labor in almost all the countries of Europe to carry on as their forefathers did. Europe has enough labor to get the maximum per acre production by intensive hand cultivation.

The reason we use those large pieces of equipment in the United States is to save cost, to enable us to produce a bushel of wheat cheaper, not to produce more bushels per acre. If you are simply interested in making some money for somebody, of course, you would want to send these combines and these large power-driven machines over there; but if we are sincerely interested in producing the largest amount of food in Europe that we can, and feeding the largest number of people we can feed, then we will keep this machinery at home, put it in the hands of American farmers who are in position to use it and who will be able to increase the total food supply of the world instead of sending it to Europe where it will not add one single bushel to the amount of food of the world.

You have got to answer that question. Which are we trying to do by this bill? Are we trying to make money for someone or are we trying to feed the people of Europe? Are we trying to enable those people to take care of themselves or are we trying to sell some tractors? If we are trying to produce more food, let us vote for the pending amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary inquiry is this: If those in charge of this bill get tough and there is a motion offered for the reading of the engrossed bill, will that be ready tonight or will it go over until Monday?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will handle that situation when it arises.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, if we want to take only 6 minutes to give four or five million dollars away, that is all right with me. I tried to study the hearings on this bill a little last night and frankly I could not find where any of the money was justified by the witnesses who appeared before the Appropriations Committee. I would almost be willing to yield now to

the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he can say that any item in it was actually justified by the testimony.

Let us see what the committee itself says about this machinery business, and I read from the report:

The committee is not wholly satisfied with the large-scale mechanization of farms in participating countries that is apparently proposed in the program. The shortage of steel and petroleum throughout the world, plus the general unfamiliarity of the average European farmer with mechanical farm equipment might prove costly and, in the final analysis, unproductive. While farm production must further be increased in these countries the proportion of large farms that lend themselves to production by means of mechanized equipment is small. This program should be embarked upon with extreme caution, and should not require the $81,500,000 estimated for this purpose.

If that is not all the argument that anyone needs to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, I do not know of any.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. May I say to the gentleman that the Committee on Agriculture conducted a 2 weeks' investigation on the farm-machinery situation. We tried during that entire 2 weeks to find any justification for the figures on exports to Europe and we could not find any.

Mr. RIZLEY. No, and you will not find any.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The British are shipping to this country 20,000 Ferguson tractors this year.

Mr. RIZLEY. I do not know anything about that, but I know that this committee says that they do not need that much money, and we ought to adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a farm in my district. My district is only 4 miles wide and 8 miles long, and it is right in the center of the city of Detroit. But, I am going to support this amendment, not because of the fact that I lived on a farm for 8 years and I know something of the problems of the farmer, but because of the fact that I know that farm equipment is in short supply in this country, and I believe this, that first of all our country and our people come first.

Mr. Chairman, we in Michigan have another shortage. We had a shortage of fuel oil last winter and for 6 weeks, our industries in the city of Detroit were closed down because of a shortage of fuel oil and natural gas. It costs our industries over $150,000,000 because of those shortages. Now, this winter we are faced with a shortage of coal. Do you know what is happening with coal? They are shipping our coal from the United States of America to France, Italy and other countries at $21 a ton when these countries can buy coal in Europe at $10 a ton. But, the ERP countries will not buy European coal at $10 a ton. Do you know why? Because United States coal at $21 a ton under ERP is for free, is cheaper than $10-a-ton coal that they have to pay for. American coal at $21 a ton under ERP will never be paid for. They can buy European coal for $10 a ton, but they will not buy it because they will have to pay for it. Now, here is one of the things that this ERP program is producing, with this free money. Money is given away for nothing to ERP countries. That produces what? It produces beggars, it produces countries who grab and want everything they can get for nothing. When we are freezing next winter, then we can go and buy European coal. How can we be so stupid?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, on February 4 this year I stood before this House and gave some information on this very question that is brought up tonight. As our able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture well said, we had the then Secretary of Commerce before our committee, and he could not justify the shipping of one dollar's worth of farm machinery to Europe. Listen to the figures. Last September, traveling over nine nations in Europe, under the chairmanship of the gentleman in the front row [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], we saw what those countries needed. We know that they need steel. We know that they need tools that they can use with their hands, as the gentleman from Texas told you. They do not need great combines and tractors and disk harrows that every American farmer needs. Let me give you just a little illustration: The average-size farm in the great State of Texas is 329 acres and the size of the average farm in France is 24 acres. Let me go down to Italy. The size of the average farm in Italy is less than 2 acres per farm. What in the world do you mean by sending tractors to these countries? I ask you, what do you mean by sending these large disk harrows and these large combines to Europe? Nothing in the world but what the gentleman from Texas told you, except to help some manufacturer make a lot of money, and this will not help the European recovery program in any manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 3, line 16, after "1948", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "*And provided further*, That no funds made available under the authority of this act shall be furnished or paid to Great Britain."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly take up the time of the Committee again to repeat what I said earlier today with reference to the miserable conduct of Great Britain in the Middle East. Nevertheless, I feel it my duty to reiterate as often as I can, and with all the emphasis within me, this British misconduct, and for that reason I have offered this amendment to deny all and any aid under this bill for Great Britain, as a participating nation under the Marshall plan.

We have tried everything with Ernest Bevin, the Foreign Minister of England, in the interest of having him change his mind on the subject of Palestine. There have been discussions and conferences. We have tried logic and cajolery. But he remains adamant in his cruel attitude. Apparently there is too much fat around his heart for him to be either compassionate or just to the Jews in the Holy Land. Because of the poison in this man's system, because this one man refuses to act as a statesman and chooses rather to play the bully out of a sense of personal frustration, I say that the British honor is stained among all the peoples of the world, yes, even among the Arabs, who eagerly take the British aid but cannot help but smile among themselves at the British folly. The Arab chieftains give no allegiance to anyone, not even to themselves. Britain knows this, but Bevin in his intransigence insists upon a mad and a dishonorable course. Britain's badly shaken economy can hardly withstand the large sums she spends on Arab subsidies and military missions.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I should like to help the gentleman. I believe his amendment is out of order because there is no money here for Britain. Would he like to amend that to include the United Kingdom and its dependencies?

Mr. CELLER. I should be happy to accept that suggestion, if it were proper. Great Britain is a so-called participating country under the Economic Cooperation Convention of Paris. My amendment is perfectly sound and needs no change.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment comes too late.

Mr. CELLER. How can we with one voice decry this British duplicity and this British perfidy in the Middle East and with the other encourage Britain in her fantastic and sordid war against the Jews, whom she would drive into the sea?

Mr. Chairman, we must pause indeed and see whether we are not particeps criminis, partners in crime, if we give this money; and that money, in goodly part, is used for this fantastic and very cruel purpose.

Ten nations have now recognized the state of Israel—the United States, Russia, Uruguay, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Guatemala, British South Africa, Nicaragua, Yugoslavia, Hungary; Bulgaria will recognize Israel shortly.

How could we withhold recognition. We could not deny independence—the same independence we have zealously guarded for 172 years—to the Jews who have sought it for 2,000 years.

But Bevin refuses recognition.

The epithet "perfidious Albion" is well bestowed.

Ask the Irish in Ireland, the Boers in South Africa, the Chinese in Singapore, the Hindus in India, the Jews in Palestine.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman seems to feel that Mr. Bevin is entirely responsible for the situation complained of?

Mr. CELLER. I say that Mr. Bevin is entirely responsible for the diabolical methods used by Great Britain in the Middle East. He is the one man who is standing out against the rest.

Mr. COOLEY. Do you think, then, that it is well for us to withhold relief from all of the other people of Great Britain just because of one man, Mr. Bevin, and permit them to suffer as they have suffered through all these long years in the past?

Mr. CELLER. That is a very good question, and I will be happy to answer it. I do not want to see the British people suffer, but I do hope that the British people will take heed and will talk up to this man who is going on in this fashion, in this unjust and cruel way, and who is doing his best to scuttle the Jewish state in Palestine—the state the United States has recognized.

Britain claims she is stone broke. Where does she obtain the funds for Arab intrigue and Arab incitement to aggression against the Jews, unless from American sources.

Bevin excuses his meanness by citing treaty obligations. He is like a squid who retreats in a cloud of ink. Bevin masks his cunning in a cloud of empty words about treaties. How about Britain's treaty with the United Nations not to aid aggression.

His guilt is clear. He has tainted our money—not yet ERP money. He has diverted into blood money, much of our loan of four and one-half billions to Britain.

I do not want any ERP funds to become money for Arab plunder and rapine—hence my amendment.

If we stupidly give this money unconditionally, much of it will be used to destroy the state we have recognized and support.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the behavior of the British Government with respect to Palestine and the state of Israel richly deserves to have ERP assistance to it cut off. It has been caught red-handed backing the Arab Legion of Transjordan which turns out to be the only effective force in the Middle East. It is now demonstrated that it is their own force—a British satellite army. This is the force engaged in aggression against the Jews and against Jerusalem in direct defiance of the United Nations.

The Government of Great Britain has been caught red-handed in that activity by the stubborn and willful conduct of Mr. Bevin. If the Committee of the Whole adopts this amendment then the British Government will be getting what it richly deserves.

This amendment does not call for interfering in the foreign or domestic affairs of any nation we assist, because what the British Government has done is to make a mockery of the United Nations; and sustaining the United Nations is a direct obligation of this House as it directly involves the national security of the United States.

But knowing the fate that amendments that are offered from the floor are liable to suffer in Committee of the Whole, I would like to make two points, and they are very important. First, the mere fact that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was looking into this question of the British Government's defiance of the United Nations and launching an aggression it financed against Jerusalem and Israel, made the British Government give ground and draw 21 of their officers serving with the Transjordan Arab Legion out of the Palestine area. The British Government is also making half-hearted efforts to stop arms shipments to the Arab states. The loaded terms—against Israel—of the UN truce resolution Great Britain proposed, and the block on evacuating to Israel, innocent Jewish youths held captive in Cyprus show the British Government's persistent devotion to a pro-Arab policy. The very fact of its withdrawals and stoppages, now, show the extent of its implication and complicity in the acts of aggression which started months ago. Yet the response—quickly—to the investigation of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee shows what works with and influences the British Government the most—its financial jugular vein.

The second point of the greatest importance is that the President through the Administrator of Economic Cooperation, has power under the European Recovery Act himself to terminate assistance to Great Britain at any time that—

(2) because of changed conditions assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States. (Sec. 118, Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472, 80th Cong.).

So the President can do at any time hereafter, whether or not this amendment carries, what this amendment proposes.

Accordingly, whatever the House does with this amendment cannot be considered a precedent or a binding action as to the British Government's acts in Palestine. Events will show if the British Government will atone for its being caught red-handed and implicated in defying the United Nations, and aggression against Jerusalem and Israel. The President has the power to cut off ERP assistance to the British Government, whenever the national interest of the United States requires.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a similar amendment at the Clerk's desk, but I will not press it because I realize it is a little late, and we all want to get away. I just want to reply to the question that the gentleman from North Carolina propounded to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. Great Britain has admitted to giving the Arab states $46,000,000 a year. That includes Transjordan and all the other Arab states. In addition to that, the British are giving the Arabs arms and munitions and other things. If they can afford to do that, then they are not suffering; so the least we can do is to ask the question, Why should taxpayers of America be called upon to send money to Great Britain which they do not need?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I think the gentleman has made a mistake. We have not been sending them dollars, but we have been giving them pounds.

Mr. KLEIN. That is true. We have been sending them pounds. But of course, the equivalent in dollars is $46,000,000 a year. How can we justify giving them that money if they have that kind of money? I hope this amendment is carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, in the previous debate on ECA, I offered an amendment which provided that no funds be used for the purchase of Middle East oil. Now I rise to urge that no moneys be given to Great Britain—for it is money that will be used to spill Jewish blood in their land of Israel—money used to finance the Arab pestilence led by the Grand Mufti.

Many years ago Lord Byron wrote despairingly:

Tribes of wandering feet,
How shall ye flee away, and be at rest.
The wild dove hath her nest, the fox his cave,
Mankind their country—Israel but the grave.

But the grave is not the destiny of Israel.

All the monstrous and sadistic barbarism of Hitler could not exterminate the Jewish people.

All the infamy, treachery, and chicanery of Britain hidden behind ambassadorial urbanity could not extinguish their spirit.

All the betrayal by Britain, historic despoiler and breaker of faith, shall not conquer the new state of Israel.

When on May 15 this new Jewish state was proclaimed by the Jews in the Yishuv when it was recognized by the great powers of the world, open happiness was inculcated among the millions of depressed Jews. For them there was the rainbow of a new life. For the homeless and persecuted suddenly there was clear in the storm-laden skies.

It was in accord with the loftiest principles of international justice and of the highest dictates of humanity.

But even as the partition plan for Israel was betrayed, so the de facto recognition of Israel was reduced to an empty gesture.

Unless this administration agrees that not a single American dollar go to Great Britain, the recognition of Israel is like Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill—a meaningless, shabby political gesture.

Today's issue of the Nation states the case in definitive and convincing manner:

RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL AN EMPTY GESTURE

When President Truman recognized the state of Israel, it was generally assumed that the move would be backed with action, in and out of the United Nations. The assumption was a dream that lasted for exactly a week. Then the real and unaltered attitude of the State Department asserted itself, and the sapping operations began. After the Arab rejection of the Security Council's appeal to cease fire, the United States, instead of reintroducing its resolution invoking article 39, left it to the Soviet Union to do so, knowing full well the prejudice against any Russian-sponsored resolution. We neither backed the Soviet Union when it charged the Arab states with responsibility for the failure of the cease-fire appeal, nor challenged the British on their failure to carry out their pledge of April 17 to withdraw the Arab Legion from Palestine before the mandate ended. We did not vote down, as we should have done, the original British truce resolution, which was aimed directly at the Jews; we did not propose a single decent amendment to the British text; we did not answer the inquiry of Belgium and Canada as to what action we were prepared to take if article 39 were invoked. It was France which prevented the Security Council from banning Jewish immigration into Palestine during the 4-week truce. It was Colombia which asked the British whether they would continue to arm the Arabs even if they should refuse to cease fire. It was Canada which restricted the role of the mediator to the functions assigned to him under the resolution of the General Assembly of May 14. It was we who introduced an amendment under which the British and the Arabs alike could justify blockade of Palestine territorial waters, hemming in the Jewish state.

Had the Russian resolution passed, the Arab states would have been named as aggressors and exposed to political and military defeat. This the British prevented. Under the truce resolution as adopted, the Jews have been stopped in their tracks by an international arms embargo, while at the same time the Arab Legion, said to have an 8-months' reserve supply of British arms, and the other forces of the Arab states remain in position inside Palestine as a continuing threat to the Jewish state. It was for this that the United States eventually voted. Obviously the intention of the British is to destroy Jewish resistance and force a negotiated peace with a weakened Israel, reduced in size and prepared to accept terms that will insure Britain's firm control of strategic bases, with the Negev as one certain prize of war. Thus, British maneuvering has again succeeded, with State Department help, in undermining the decision of the President of the United States and the last fragment of United Nations authority. It is up to Mr. Truman now to show whether he or Mr. Bevin determines American foreign policy. The President can approve an immediate loan to Israel; announce that the United States will help arm Hanagah once the truce period is over; and, equally important, can tell the British people that this country will not continue to support Mr. Bevin's policy in Palestine.

The manner in which we here can most effectively tell the British that we will not support the anti-Semitism of Mr. Bevin is by denying them the use of American dollars to be used for arms to kill Jews.

For as in Biblical times, Isaac exclaimed, "The voice is the voice of Jacob but the hands are the hands of Esau." We here know that the "voice is the voice of the Arabs but the arms are the arms of Britain."

The facts are that since the beginning of 1946, resuming a policy which has been Britain's master plan for a century or more, Great Britain has embarked on a program of exploiting the untapped resources of equatorial and southern Africa, as well as the Middle East where she holds sway. Meanwhile democratic movements are shaping up against this policy, as witness the upsurge of the new nation of India in the short period of time since she has enjoyed autonomy from British overlordship.

Imperialist forces in Great Britain can ill afford to let Palestine give haven to the new state of Israel for the simple reason that Israel represents a bridgehead of democracy in one of the last great feudal areas of the world.

Democracy is catching, Mr. Chairman. If it should be allowed to flourish in Israel it would most certainly spread to feudal Araby.

This could well mean, Mr. Chairman, that a democratic Middle East would turn to the United States rather than remain quiescent and supine under British imperialism.

It is this perilous possibility that Britain seeks to forestall. This would indeed cut Great Britain's imperialist lifeline to its geopolitical spheres in Africa and the East.

Under our very noses, for example, the British in the last year have moved to recapture Iran from American influence.

There the 100-percent pro-American Premier Ghavam was forced out last December and a pro-British prime minister substituted. Whereupon the Iranian Government officially declared that it intended to turn away from the United States and toward Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, what is going on in Palestine is only in a small measure a conflict between Arabs and Jews. It is in the larger sense a conflict between British imperialism and peace; and in a special sense it is a conflict between British and American interests, influence, and varying political beliefs in the Middle East.

The joker in this greater conflct is that the British—by simply playing possum and letting our ERP program get into action—are placing the United States in the position of financing its own opponent, namely, Great Britain, in the struggle for the Middle East.

We are about to pay the bill, Mr. Chairman, for the ouster of the United States and American-style democracy as represented by the new state of Israel, from the path of British imperialism.

What, indeed, has been the most obvious result of our last great loan to Great Britain?

Has it put the British people on their feet economically? Has it lessened the "austerity" of their way of life, has it brought them comfort and a chance to rebuild?

No, the money has been spent in other ways and the most notorious returns from our investment in Britain have been a strengthening of the British position in the Middle East.

Brazenly, Great Britain has armed its puppet Arab states against Israel. Outrightly, Britain in the United Nations has forced or influenced stall after stall in the implementation of the United Nations' partition decision.

Flatly, Britain now tells us that she intends—not to call her Arab satellites to heel—but rather to continue to arm them with materials and moneys obtained from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, our country was once a colony of Great Britain. It took a revolution to put an end to that.

Now, a century and a half later, we find ourselves so thoroughly enthralled again by our old "mother country" that we are now plunging headlong into a proposal to finance her unchanging imperialist activities directed against our very selves in the Middle East.

Indeed the very language of our own State Department's report on the United Kingdom's participation in ERP, on page 46 of chapter XVI, recognizes that the United Kingdom is scheduling substantial production of equipment for the petroleum industry and furthermore that this is aimed at an expansion of the production, transportation and refining facilities in connection with British-controlled oil in the Middle East.

Furthermore, there is no injunction or prohibition in our plans for extension of ERP money to Great Britain which prevents her from manufacturing arms with our funds and materials for resale to her own armaments customers—chiefly the Arab states.

Hence we are now going blindly on our self-destructive way, uncomprehendingly handing out billions to Britain which will be used in great measures to oust us and our democratic influence from the Middle East; to undermine and eventually destroy the effectiveness of the United Nations as a world instrument for peace; and to make the pledged word of honor of the United States a mockery to democratic peoples the world over, who are watching eagerly and hopefully the efforts of democratic Israel to launch a people's nation in the midst of almost prehistoric feudalism.

I, for one, can think of a multitude of better, more honorable and far healthier ways of spending the hard-earned money of American taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those people who disagrees with England's policy on Palestine, but I do not blame the difficulties in Palestine entirely on Bevin. I blame the tragic situation to a great degree on the vacillations in policy of a man named Truman right here in the United States, and the weakness of the United Nations to implement its policies.

Secondly, this bill is not a reward. This bill is passed for the purpose of establishing a peaceful and prosperous world and for the maintenance of economic conditions that will give us that.

Great Britain, with her vast territories and with her vast industrial democracy, is one of the keys, along with Germany,

to this peaceful world. We need this legislation passed for the full amount of the original authorization for the participating countries including Great Britain, to provide an economic basis upon which we can all live and have peaceful democratic institutions.

So I ask that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that I am not in favor of this bill. But I am not in favor of insulting the British people. If a mistake was made by President Truman in recognizing the so-called state of Israel, it is not up to the Congress to rake his chestnuts out of the fire.

The British people, the English-speaking people, whatever you may say of them, are the best friends we have outside of the United States.

Let me say to these gentlemen from New York [Mr. CELLER, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. KLEIN] that Great Britain was the only country in which your people could lay their heads in peace for hundreds of years.

To get up here now and try to smear the British people and let it go out as the voice of the American Congress is the height of stupidity.

I say that this amendment should be voted down, and it will be voted down by an overwhelming majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, there are none so stupid as those who will not learn. We are not insulting Great Britain here. We are not finding fault with Great Britain for the days when she spoke and preached and practiced democracy. We are telling Britain or the British people, "Tell your leaders that democracy is still the way of this world and, if you want it, do not support anarchy."

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment, but I rose mainly at this time to ask unanimous consent on behalf of my colleague from New York [Mr. KEOGH] that his remarks in support of this amendment may be extended in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, the recognition by our Government of the state of Israel is an affirmative indication of our good will toward that newly created government. It is difficult for me to understand why any friendly ally of ours should undertake to pursue a foreign policy that is in direct conflict to ours. It is, of course, the right of any country to adopt its own foreign policy whether it conforms with ours or not but the country that does so run counter to the established policy of ours should not expect at the same time to be permitted to participate in any program of mutual cooperation and economic rehabilitation. For these and the reasons stated by more informed and capable Members, I believe that no aid under the Economic Cooperation Administration should be afforded to Great Britain unless and until it conforms its Palestine policy with ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 12, noes 145.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 10, lines 13 and 14, after the word "used", on line 13, strike out the following: "by any procurement agency of the United States Government."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the Chair inform the Members how the time is to be divided under the limitation? Will it be divided between the Members standing at the time the limitation was ordered? Or will it be controlled by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. How many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to determine how many amendments are at the desk or how many will be offered.

As many Members will be recognized for a period of 5 minutes each as may be possible during the 30-minute period set by the committee unless the committee directs otherwise.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it not be possible for the Chairman to determine the number of amendments now at the desk and then divide the time which has been apportioned among the sponsors of the amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. First, permit the Chair to suggest that those who desire amendments send them to the desk so they can be included.

The Clerk advises there are 10 amendments pending at the desk.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYNCH: Strike out the period on line 16, page 3, after the figures 1948 and insert a colon and add the following words: "*And provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein shall be paid over or transferred or placed to the credit of, or otherwise made available, directly or indirectly to Great Britain until the President of the United States, after investigation, certifies that he is of the opinion that Great Britain is not selling, leasing, lending, or making otherwise available war material to any member of the Arab League, and that he further certifies that Great Britain has given to the United States Government satisfactory assurance that it will not thereafter sell, lease, lend, or make otherwise available war material to any member of the Arab League, which will or may be used to render inoperative the recommendation of the United Nations General Assembly for the partition of Palestine made on November 29, 1947."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is legislation on an appropriation bill and requires additional duties of officials of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be good enough to withhold his point of order for a minute?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have presented is quite different from the one which you have just voted down so overwhelmingly. It has to do with providing that any moneys which may be given to Great Britain shall not be used for purposes either directly or indirectly of making the recommendation of the United Nations General Assembly relative to the partitioning of Palestine inoperative. I believe it is the sense of this House that the recommendation of the United Nations General Assembly should be carried out as far as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I desire in the brief time allotted me to say a few words with respect to the purposes of my amendment which reads as follows:

Strike out the period on line 26, page 3, after the figures 1948 and insert a colon and add the following words: "*And provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein shall be paid over or transferred or placed to the credit of, or otherwise made available, directly or indirectly, to Great Britain until the President of the United States, after investigation, certifies that he is of the opinion that Great Britain is not selling, leasing, lending, or making otherwise available war material to any member of the Arab League, and that he further certifies that Great Britain has given to the United States Government satisfactory assurance that it will not thereafter sell, lease, lend or make otherwise available war material to any member of the Arab League, which will or may be used to render inoperative the recommendation of the United States General Assembly for the partition of Palestine made on November 29, 1947."

On March 9, 1948, I spoke on the floor of the House and at the time stated that the Palestinian question was not solely a Jewish problem, but that it was an American problem, a world problem. Today I am more convinced than ever of the

soundness of my judgment and the truth of my words. I feel that subsequent events have justified the fears I expressed when, in my last address before you on this subject, I said:

I contemplate only with the deepest feeling of anxiety the plight of the thousands of Jewish people in Palestine today, many of whom escaped the concentration camps of Europe only to be faced with possible annihilation by the Arabs, as the United States and the other world powers, members of the United Nations, with unparalleled hypocrisy say, in effect: There is no outside aggression. This is a Palestinian domestic problem. There is no threat to world peace in Palestine.

Today we see the state of Israel in actual existence and its de facto government recognized by the United States. But, unfortunately, we also see the continuation of that policy of diplomatic duplicity that has so characterized Great Britain in the years gone by. Though pledged to a policy of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine we have seen in the last 30 years a policy of double-crossing and double-dealing on the part of the British Government with respect to Palestine that makes the average American, used to aboveboard dealing, sick at stomach and heart, whether he be Jew or gentile.

Today, in my judgment, the chaotic condition in the Middle East, resulting from the failure to enforce the Palestine partition decree, is a threat to the peace of the world. That threat has been encouraged by the aid that Great Britain has given in planes, arms, munitions, and war materials to the Arab states which in turn are being used to defeat the decree of the United Nations.

My amendment would prevent future such shipments by Great Britain to the Arab states and it would require firm assurances that the practice would not be resumed in the future. This amendment is one way to truly bring about a cessation of bloodshed in Palestine and is an aid in the enforcement of the recommendation of the General Assembly with respect to Palestine.

This amendment is in accord with a feeling I have long entertained and which I expressed as far back as October 14, 1945, at a dinner of the American Jewish Congress in New York when I said:

I appreciate the efforts of our President, but we must face the stubborn fact that there can be no appeasement of British imperialism. Whether the new British Government will accept the recommendation of President Truman seems doubtful, but whether it does or not, the real question as to whether the doors of Palestine shall be closed to the Jews by the British until the Arabs give their consent that they be opened, remains unsolved. It would not long remain unsolved if the United States, giving expression of its displeasure with a nation that repudiates its pledges, refused economic assistance to Great Britain, and to that end I pledge you my best efforts.

This amendment is the expression in positive action of my words of 3 years ago.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York contains a limitation upon an appropriation bill and also embodies legislation; therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

On page 2, line 19, after the word *"Provided"* and before the word "That", insert the following: "That of the amount herein appropriated not less than $65,000,000 shall be utilized for acquiring in the United States nonfat dry milk solids: *Provided further."*

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to impress upon every Member of this House that if this is a relief program we are letting something happen in the United States in connection with dried skim milk that we should not allow to take place. Two of the cheapest protein foods in the United States today are peanut butter, a vegetable protein and a vegetable fat, and the other is dried skim milk, a high quality animal protein food.

I am not offering this amendment because I happen to come from the great State of Wisconsin. Last summer in Europe I saw many evidences of the fact that we were not using our dollars wisely in procuring the most food that could be obtained for the dollar. Dried skim milk has 35.6 percent protein or about twice as much protein content as meat. The dried skim milk can be purchased for one-third or one-half what a pound of meat can be purchased for.

As a part of this relief program I feel that we should insist on using this dried skim milk that can be available in larger and larger quantities. There may be some information given to the Appropriations Committee as follows: "We will buy all the skim milk we can." Maybe that is the answer, but the only answer I want is the one that puts it in the bill and says that there are $65,000,000 to be used to buy the cheapest and greatest animal protein food that can be found in the United States. The children and the people of Europe need this animal protein food and if our food dollars are provided this is the place to use them to the best possible advantage.

No one wants to be misled by the expressions of would-be food purchasers that this product is not available in sufficient amounts. Much of it is being used for animal feeding today. The purchasing agents cannot expect to obtain it at one-half what it is worth as food. The price today is about the same as the OPA price and has not advanced like other foods have in price.

If this money is to be used as relief from hunger, let us make available the best possible food that can be obtained for the money expended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The suggestion of the gentleman is a very good and sound one, and I hope his amendment will carry.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. Everyone knows that in our national school-lunch program we are feeding our children the same defatted skim milk. Over 7,000,000 pounds were purchased for this purpose from section 32 funds. I am not putting anything over on the children of Europe or any place else. I want to give them the same that we in the United States give to our own children. I hope you will accept this amendment. It really has merit and makes nutritional sense and economic sense as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I doubt the wisdom of this amendment. As I understand the proposed program, it already includes $133,500,000 for dairy products. It is evident, therefore, that there is already in contemplation provision for the commodity which the gentleman has in mind. I doubt very much the wisdom of tying the Administrator's hands as this particular amendment suggests.

I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 61, noes 58.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: Page 10, line 16, after the word "Corporation", strike out "pursuant to act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or the Department of Agriculture pursuant to any price support or stabilization program."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a clarifying amendment. In section 202 it is provided that no funds shall be used to purchase goods at more than the market price except those commodities which are in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation and which have been acquired under the Act of July 1, 1941. That is the Steagall amendment. Now, the Steagall amendment is going to expire on December 31. It is going to be succeeded by legislation which will extend the price support program, but unless you include the language that I have offered there will be no way by which the commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Department of Agriculture after December 31 or commodities acquired under other legislation can be used under this program when the investment of the Government is more than the current market price. There will undoubtedly be commodities so acquired, and this amendment is offered so that those goods may be used under this program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid of this amendment, frankly. I am afraid it is an omnibus proposition which will bail out all the losses of all the set-ups all the way through, and that the ECA will be bankrupt because it cannot get the money to operate. That is the way it looks to me. I do not believe we ought to adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 59, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 3, line 16, after "1948" insert "*And provided further*, That all sums granted, lent or used to or for any country under this act shall be reduced by any and all sums granted, lent or used directly or indirectly by or for such country to or for the account or benefit of any country, State, or people engaged directly or indirectly in acts of aggression as determined by proclamation of the President of the United States of America or by the United Nations."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and requires additional duties of officers of the United States.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is different from the one that was ruled out of order a few moments ago. That sought to withhold all funds. This seeks to reduce the amount of any funds given to any country by the amount that country may be using to help any aggressor nations. In other words, it is a reduction in the amount of the aid. Therefore, I believe it is not legislation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COLE of New York). The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York contains legislation and, therefore, is subject to a point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the intention of this amendment is to reduce any aid given to Britain or any other country to the extent of any aid that such country may give to any of the Arab aggressor nations. It has been said on good authority that Britain has been giving and lending money to other countries quite aside from the help it is giving to the Arab aggressors. I am opposed to our giving any moneys to a foreign country to that extent also. There is no reason why Britain should use its money to help other countries, pretending to them that it is their benefactor, when Britain could never do that except that we made the money available to her. If any country is entitled to aid from us, we should give it to them directly. That question, however, was debated on the floor of the House previously and the objection such as I have raised here did not have the support of the majority of the House.

I am hopeful that now that it is admitted by Britain that she is spending upward of $46,000,000 a year to help maintain the Arab nations, and while the Arab nations flout every effort to establish peace in the Middle East, we will not be a party to indirectly helping them carry on their hostilities. If Britain will not do the right thing and withhold help from these aggressor nations, the least the Congress should do is withhold an equivalent amount of money from her. This will force her officials, who are not heeding the opinion and will of her people, to withdraw from the Middle East and give attention to her domestic problems.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 3, line 16, insert the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the purchase of tobacco."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill today will bring great joy to the groups of speculators throughout the world who have purchased hundreds of millions of dollars worth of cotton and other commodities anticipating that this legislation would be passed, and that they would be given the opportunity to profit by it. Cotton has been driven up 8 cents a pound, and other commodities have also been driven up. People from China, Mexico, and all over the world have gone into the commodity markets during these weeks and are now sitting by waiting to reap their reward at the expense of the American people. I have offered the amendment to prohibit the use of any of this money for the purchase of tobacco. The report states that the purpose of this aid was twofold. First, through direct grant to help feed, clothe, and house hungry and impoverished humanity. When the children of these countries come asking us for food which they must have, and which they must pay for in order to get, we offer them tobacco. When they ask for clothing, we offer them tobacco. When they ask for housing, we offer them tobacco. Yes, let us take care of them, but let us give them food, clothing, and housing, and not tobacco.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, the justification for the Marshall plan is twofold. One is to build up the European countries as a bulwark against communism. Secondly, and of equal importance to our country, is to provide and safeguard an export market for our commodities today and in the years to come. I am certain that Mr. Hoffman, and the others who are to administer the ERP, are well aware that these are the two chief reasons for the congressional approval of the Marshall plan.

Exhaustive studies by congressional committees, the State, Agriculture, and Commerce Department, commissions appointed by the executive branch, and private organizations have given us the needs of the western European countries as accurately as is possible. Congress in passing the legislative authorization for this plan has based its estimate of the amount of money needed on this research. The Administrator cannot, however, carry out these wishes of Congress and the people of our country, as expressed in Public Law 472, if he is to be hampered by punitive restrictive measures as to the commodities to be made available. This public law does not authorize either favorable or unfavorable treatment for any commodity, but provides for uniform treatment for all. None of the funds are earmarked for any commodity. The estimates as to dollar requirements are based upon estimates as to commodity requirements. If it should be decided that the funds could not be used for the purchase of any commodity, then the production of that commodity would have to be expanded in European countries with a proportionate reduction in the production of other commodities. The effect of this would be to establish an uneconomical pattern of production both in western Europe and the United States.

In writing this law, Congress was particularly mindful of the commodities now in surplus supply in this country. Chief among these are dried fruits and tobacco. There are those, however, who wish to go in the face of the "hands off" policy adopted by Congress in reference to commodity restriction and restrict or delete tobacco from the list of commodities needed by western Europe. There are various reasons for the inclusion of tobacco by the experts who have done the research on this matter.

Western Europe will not be on her feet again until her industrial production has been revived; even then it must be maintained on a high level. It was demonstrated during the war that industrial production can be maintained at a higher level when tobacco products are available.

If the governments of Europe are to take advantage of the Marshall plan and use it to build themselves up again, and keep its cost to the United States as low as possible, they must needs have sufficient revenue from their own sources to supplement Marshall-plan money. In most of the ERP countries the governmental monopolies on tobacco make this product an important and steady source of revenue. Listed below are some recent statistics on the governmental revenue derived from these monopolies in several ERP countries:

Country	Year	Amount of revenue from monopoly	Percent of total government revenue
Austria	1947	96 million dollars	33.7
	1948	131 million dollars (estimated)	25.0
Belgium	1947	74,448,750 dollars	7.2
France	1946	142 million dollars	10.5
Italy	1946–47	52.557 million lire	16.9
	1947–48	64.207 million lire (estimated)	12.9

In nonmonopoly countries, notably the United Kingdom, the import duties received from tobacco add greatly to the revenue of the government. For example, in the United Kingdom during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1947, the Government of that country received $1,798,619,015 from excises and customs on tobacco. This is 15 percent of the total income. The revenue of each country was taken into consideration in estimating the cost of the ERP and any curtailment of these revenues will result in either increased cost to the United States, if Public Law 472 is to be properly carried out, or the undoubted failures to balance budgets in many western European countries and thus perhaps the bringing about of a dangerous inflation. I do not need to say that a new wave of inflation in Europe would seriously endanger the success of the ERP.

In addition to money for the ERP we are also considering an appropriation for aid to China. The economic problems and conditions in China are equal to, and in some cases more severe than, those in western Europe. For a number of years the manufacture of cigarettes has been a major industry in China. At the present time it is the third largest industry of that country. Approximately 25 percent of the tobacco used in this industry is imported from the United States. The income from the tobacco industry is of vital importance to both the people and the Government of China. For example, from the excise taxes alone on tobacco, the Chinese Government receives approximately one-sixth of her total governmental income.

It has been demonstrated in the occupied countries that tobacco has been successful in improving the morale of the people. Undoubtedly, research would show this same thing to be true for any country laboring under the conditions now existing in Europe. The importation of tobacco into countries has helped greatly to break up black markets.

Congress has already taken cognizance of the importance of tobacco in rebuilding Europe. In considering the recent supplemental appropriation in the special session of this Congress, the Senate entered the following statement in its report to accompany H. R. 4748:

> Testimony before the committee (Appropriations) showed a pressing need for tobacco in Germany, to stimulate production, improve morale, break the black market, and rebuild a permanent demand for export grades of American-grown leaf tobacco which is now in surplus supply. The committee agrees that these are desirable ends and, therefore, recommends for the favorable consideration of the Department of the Army that an appropriate part of the import-export funds be used for the purchase of surplus leaf tobacco held by the Commodity Credit Corporation for use in the occupied areas and that said Corporation dispose of such tobacco on the terms suggested in subsection (e) of section 11 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947.

The countries of Europe want tobacco. Our research authorities say that it is necessary to the expeditious industrial recovery of western Europe. The tobacco farmer and exporter vitally need the rebuilding of our foreign markets. Therefore, in keeping with the desires of Congress as expressed in the legislative authorization for the ERP, I urge that there be no discriminations against tobacco or any other commodity in this appropriation bill.

This is no time for either sectional or party politics, rather for united action. Let us therefore follow the wishes of this Congress and the people on this bipartisan matter and appropriate the amount requested by this public law and allow it to be used at the discretion of the Administrator with the advice of the National Advisory Council and our own joint congressional committee thus assuring the efficient disbursement of this money in the most effective manner.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that the Government has already got its money invested in this tobacco, which we propose to send over there, and is it not true, also, that these people have requested it, and that if the amendment is adopted it would be a blow to the tobacco growers in all of the tobacco-growing States in the Union?

Mr. KERR. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] which, if adopted, would deprive the countries which are the intended beneficiaries of the European recovery program of the American tobacco which they earnestly desire and badly need. Their want for American tobacco is so great that there would not be a surplus pound of tobacco in this country if the countries of Europe had money to buy it.

Their need for tobacco was recognized by some of us who are Members of the House when we began holding meetings in January 1947 and conferring with tobacco growers, tobacco dealers, and officials of the Department of Agriculture about ways and means to satisfy the desire of European peoples for burley, flue-cured, dark air-cured, and fire-cured tobacco. We have continued our efforts through the months up to this hour when the realization of our hopes is threatened by this amendment to withhold any appropriation for tobacco as part of the European recovery program.

The importance of tobacco and tobacco products for incentive purposes was recognized officially by the able, industrious, and conscientious Herter committee; it was recognized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and approved by the Congress in the interim aid program. Eighteen months ago we cited a highly respectable precedent in the action of former President Hoover, who several years ago, in an article in Colliers, described his experience as an administrator of European relief for the United States following the First World War. He found it difficult to get enough coal mined in Austria, and decided to try tobacco as an incentive product to increase production. He used relief money to buy tobacco from the Army to give to coal miners to induce greater production, and the experiment proved successful. Tobacco was wisely included in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The European countries want it not only as an incentive commodity; not only as a splendid morale builder, which universal human experience has proved it to be. They want it to rehabilitate their industry; to start their prewar tobacco factories in operation. They want it to give useful, remunerative employment to their idle or poorly paid people. They want it to break the terrible black market in cigarettes which is fostering lawlessness and making criminals of their boys and girls. They want it because it is one of the most valuable sources of revenue for the empty treasuries of their bankrupt governments. Tobacco is the only product in the European recovery program that will supply the greatest need those governments have—taxes.

Their taste for American tobacco was cultivated by millions of young Americans in uniform, the greatest salesmen that ever went forth from any land. It behooves us to keep alive that taste for one of the most important products of the soil and toil of American farmers, the principal money crop and foundation of the economy of several sovereign states. We can satisfy their desire for burley, flue-cured, dark air-cured and fire-cured tobacco and, in so doing, lay the foundation of a permanent, continuing market that may help to solve the perennial surplus problems of American tobacco growers. Yes, the European peoples want tobacco, the farm product that paid $1,200,000,000 into the Federal Treasury last year; tobacco, the great incentive product and morale builder; the fragrant, aromatic, golden tobacco, whose spirit, when released by fire brings comfort and solace to countless millions of people of every race and every clime.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN) there were—ayes 66, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

EFFECT OF REDUCTION OF GREEK-TURKISH AID APPROPRIATIONS FROM AUTHORIZED $275,000,000 TO PROPOSED $200,000,000

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the report of the Appropriations Committee proposes a total appropriation of $200,000,000 for military assistance to Greece and Turkey under title III of Public Law 742, instead of the full amount of $275,000,000 authorized by that law. I have learned the amount of $275,000,000 is considered by the Department of State and our Military Establishment to be the minimum amount necessary in the fiscal year 1949.

The committee report justifies the proposed limitation on the appropriation mainly by assuming that the war against the Communist-led guerrilla forces in Greece will be successfully concluded in

late 1948 and that this event will permit curtailment of the rate of military assistance to Greece. The committee report also bases its recommendation partly on the existence of a substantial unobligated balance of fiscal year 1948 program funds as of April 30, 1948.

The military requirement for Greece is based on a continuation of the present level of support by this country of the Greek armed forces, engaged in a supreme effort to locate and destroy elusive guerrilla forces which are supplied from abroad and which threaten the Greek national integrity. The Greek armed forces cannot continue this war without our assurance of sustained support in event of need. No one can predict, and no United States military authority has undertaken to predict, just when the war against the guerrilla forces can be brought to a successful close by the Greek forces. Certainly the limited successful operations this summer do not yet assure victory. Certainly, no military supply program can ever be based upon such a dangerous assumption. The goal of victory was never risked in such manner by the United States in time of war.

The appropriation of an amount substantially less than the $275,000,000 authorized by the Greek-Turkish Aid Act of 1948 on the principal assumption that the Greek military campaign against the guerrilla forces will be successfully concluded in late 1948, and curtailment of military and naval assistance to Greece thereby rendered possible, would have very serious effects on the achievement of United States objectives in Greece.

Supplies and equipment which may be needed in the last half of the fiscal year 1949 can be canceled from the supply pipeline if successes of the Greek armed forces should make them unnecessary, with a resultant saving in United States aid funds. But the procurement lag of from 4 to 6 months which obtains in such supply operations would make their supply in time quite impossible, no matter how great the need in 1949 might be, if their procurement had not been initiated long before the question of need in 1949 had been conclusively answered.

Moreover, a reduced appropriation I believe would seriously undermine Greek military and civilian confidence in the ability of the Greek armed forces successfully to eliminate the guerrilla menace, and in the continuity of United States policy toward Greece. This would be singularly unfortunate at a time when the morale of the Greek forces and the Greek people has been greatly lifted by recent successful operations against the guerrillas.

The result of reducing the appropriation could be to prolong the Greek war against the guerrillas and greatly increase the cost of an ultimately successful conclusion. It might indeed even jeopardize the attainment of the fundamental United States objective of aiding Greece to preserve its national independence and territorial integrity, and to achieve economic recovery. A clear indication to the guerrillas that the bulk of the United States aid would be expended by late 1948 would invite them to avoid major engagements with the Greek armed forces until that time, when they might hope to face Greek forces whose supply lines had greatly diminished or been exhausted.

The reference of the committee report to unobligated funds is unfortunate in that it does not reflect the true status of funds under the fiscal year 1948 program. I am told the following facts are the true facts:

The total allocation of such funds to the programs of military and naval assistance to Greece and Turkey, amounting to $172,000,000 for Greece and $100,000,000 for Turkey, has as of this date been completely exhausted by commitment to the procurement of goods and services required in the fiscal year 1948 aid programs. In addition, fiscal year 1949 funds in the amount of $50,000,000 have been advanced by the RFC under the provisions of the Greek-Turkish Aid Act of 1948 and $40,000,000 of this sum allocated to the service departments for implementation of the fiscal year 1949 military and naval aid programs under that act. Of the $40,000,000, an amount of $22,000,000 has already been committed through issuance of procurement directives, and the remainder will shortly be committed.

In the case of Greece, the Army Department has as of June 4, 1948, issued directives to procure or supply a total of $154,000,000 against 1948 fiscal year funds which, with the reserve of $5,000,000 for price increases and other contingencies, entirely commits the funds allocated from fiscal year 1948 appropriations for Greek military aid under the Greek-Turkish Aid Act of 1947. The Army Department is also issuing similar directives amounting to $20,000,000 against fiscal year 1949 funds for Greek military aid advanced by the RFC and allocated to the Army Department under the Greek-Turkish Aid Act of 1948. Once such a directive has been issued, the funds that make its issuance possible become unavailable for any other procurement and cannot form the basis of future supply planning.

The Navy Department also has issued supply directives which similarly commit the entire amount of roughly $13,000,000 allocated to the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1948 Greek naval aid program, and is currently committing an amount of $2,000,000 under the 1949 fiscal year program from funds advanced by the RFC.

I have also been informed that the requirements of the Turkish military and naval aid program for the fiscal year 1949, underlying the request for a total of $275,000,000 for Greece and Turkey, were greatly reduced from those recommended by the Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey (the American Ambassador) and cannot be reduced further without seriously impairing the value of the fiscal year 1949 program as a complement of the first year's program to further the United States objective of assisting Turkey to create effective military and naval forces for purposes of defense. Consequently the diversion of funds from the Turkish to the Greek military and naval aid program would be extremely difficult. It would, furthermore, be a serious blow to the confidence of the Turkish people in the continued ability of their forces to defend their security and in the determination of the United States to assist them in their resistance to Communist pressures.

In the case of Turkey, all the $100,000,000 of the fiscal year 1948 aid funds have been virtually committed through issuance of procurement or supply instructions, or by earmarking for specific undertakings, except for a contingency reserve of $3,700,000 held against the possibility of price increases on supplies ordered and other contingencies.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 5, line 12, strike out the word "supervised" and insert the word "administered."

On line 14, strike out the words "requirements of supervision" and insert "administration."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would say to the gentleman that I will not object to this amendment. It is merely clarifying the language.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are entirely willing to accept the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 5, line 10, strike out "$400,000,000" and insert "$463,000,000."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain briefly what this amendment does. My amendment increases aid to China by $63,000,000. In February the State Department came up with $570,000,000 as the minimum economic and military aid for China. The actual justifications before the Appropriations Committee showed without contradiction that it should be at least $463,000,000. There is military aid in this amount for China, of $125,000,000, and economic aid of $338,000,000. China has 300,000,000 of her 450,000,000 people in the part that has not been taken over by the Communists so that the actual amount of aid is very small indeed compared to the aid being given per capita to Greece and other countries.

I understand that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations wanted the amount of $463,000,000, but the subcommittee was overruled closely in the full Appropriations Committee. I am not asking for a vote on this amendment at this time because of the limited time, but I hope the conferees will carefully consider the danger in China and am therefore raising the issue of restoring this appropriation to China. It was pointed out by our United States generals and admirals who came back to testify that China is safeguarding our flank. China has been a good long-time friend of the American people.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the gentleman is withdrawing the amendment?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for a vote at this time. I will ask that the next amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 7, line 21, strike out the colon and all the following down through and including the end of line 3 on page 8.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman this amendment refers to the increase of jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation. The provision as now written extends the jurisdiction of that committee to GARIOA, which means appropriations for government and relief in occupied areas. That field is really the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, and is not the jurisdiction of the new joint committee that was set up under the Senate bill, S. 2202, the authorization bill for the appropriations which we have under discussion. I am against extending the jurisdiction of special committees into fields where they do not belong. And let me say that I am a member of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation. However, it is the job of the Armed Services Committee to cover legislation in this field in conjunction with the Appropriations Committee and I think they are doing a good job. We Congressmen who were put on the joint committee should tend to our own knitting doing the job Congress told us to do as outlined under the Authorization Act, S. 2202. If we perform the watch-dog services as already outlined, we will continue to be very busy indeed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the gentleman asking for a vote on this amendment?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; I ask for a vote on it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this provision applies to the so-called GARIOA appropriation, that is the funds expended for Government relief in occupied areas.

This bill carries $1,250,000,000 for Government relief in occupied areas which is entirely distinct from the military appropriations for the Army in these areas. This deals with the economic program of assistance to the occupied areas. It comes under no congressional review today whatsoever. The only place it is ever reviewed is when this question of appropriations comes up. The economic policies followed by the military government in Germany determine the rate of recovery in Germany.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I have only a minute and a half.

And it should be remembered that the occupied countries do come under ECA as far as their rehabilitation programs are concerned; they tie in with the economic features of the GARIOA funds, the pure relief program, required under the occupation.

So the committee felt the economic programs in the occupied countries should be supervised together; indeed it would be difficult to say the so-called watch-dog committee should look at the ECA funds in Germany and not look at the GARIOA funds, both being used for wheat or fats or fertilizer, and so forth.

And the operations of the military government as distinguished from the army of occupation—the military government that is operating the policies and the economies of Japan, Korea, and Germany, should come under congressional review.

So we provided that the joint congressional committee which the Congress set up to supervise the ECA program also have an opportunity to look at what the military government is doing in the same field in the same country. It is a bipartisan committee. It represents both bodies of the Congress. That certainly is a fair proposition and it ought to stay in the bill.

The amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Time limit for debate on amendments to the bill was fixed at 30 minutes. Three or four amendments have been ruled out of order and on some amendments there was no debate at all. There should be about 12 minutes, according to the time table, left under the original motion of limitation.

How will that extra time be divided?

The CHAIRMAN. In accordance with the request put by the Chair when the Chair said there were nine amendments pending at the desk, a minute and a half was allowed for and a minute and a half against each of the nine amendments.

Mr. SADOWSKI. We have about 12 minutes left.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be no time left.

Mr. SADOWSKI. There should be time left under the original 30-minute limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. But subsequently the Committee agreed to the suggestion made by the Chair and there was no objection.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. FULTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 8, line 14, strike out the colon and the remainder of the sentence to the period on line 20.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I can explain this very quickly. This is an important amendment that affects displaced persons' camps.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee on Displaced Persons I wish to report that our members, the gentleman from New York, Congressman PFEIFER, the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman CHELF, the gentleman from New York, Congressman JAVITS, and myself, went all over the displaced persons' camps in Europe this last fall. I want to point out to the Committee that the section reads:

None of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for contribution to the IRO until such time as there are effective agreements—

And so forth. It does not say by whom the agreements shall be effected, whether by the IRO or by military authorities or by the participating countries. Also there are DP's all over the world in countries that are not participating countries, and some are in Trieste which is certainly not a country but a city. In addition the various zones in the same country are on different calorie levels, for example, the British and American zones in Germany.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that this language which the gentleman would strike out would force the United States to violate an international organization of which it is a member and violate the agreement it has made with this international organization?

Mr. FULTON. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. It certainly is a very stupid way to attempt to legislate on an appropriation bill to require a unilateral violation of the provisions of an international agreement in which we have taken part.

I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the agreement also provides for children, the infirm, and the sick, and aged?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, there are various categories of persons such as you have mentioned who are on a different calory level than the ordinary person. An additional classification are people doing heavy work. The provision as now written is unworkable, as who can set the calorie level prevailing in the country in which such camps are located, when the country is China. Also this method of drafting the provision would cut off all voluntary American charities and just wait until they realize the scope of what you are doing. American charitable organizations, wake up and make your protests heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Time has been fixed by the committee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The amendment offered by the gentleman would continue this distressing condition that exists in the DP camps, where they have two to three or four times the calorie rations that exist in the communities outside of the DP camps. This has resulted in the complete demoralization of those people, and, instead of getting out of there as fast as they can, they stay in. This makes for a very bad situation and creates a terrible feeling in places where the camps exist. I saw that myself, and I feel it is a situation that is crying aloud for correction.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I rebut what the gentleman said that they have double the calories. In Germany they have 1,550 calories as the basic ration. These people get that. Then the Army supplies them up to 2,000 calories. But the way you have drawn it here you cannot tell what the calories are, because you say, "In a country where they are." Now, there are displaced people in China, there are displaced people in Africa, there are displaced people in military zones and in the city of Trieste. They are not included the way you have it.

Mr. TABER. What we need to do is to get them to move out of those camps.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 37, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON:
On page 9, line 5, strike out all after the comma down through the colon in line 9.
Page 9, line 19, strike out all of line 19 down to the colon in line 23.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out the provision that requires a member of a labor organization to be kept off the pay roll under this act, if the officers of that union have not complied with the affidavit provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill. I never did like the provisions of that affidavit because I think it is a restriction on the freedom of speech and civil liberties of the American people and, secondly, I am sure they do not have people in Russia who are required to sign affidavits that they are not Americans. It is reducing the dignity of this Government to require it, and is probably unconstitutional.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to announce the program for next week because after the vote many Members will be leaving.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, upon conclusion of the consideration of the bill this evening it is our purpose to adjourn until Monday.

Monday is District day and I understand there are a number of bills from the District Committee to be considered.

A rule has been granted on H. R. 6396, the displaced-persons bill, which will be called up and debate started as soon as the bills on the District Calendar have been disposed of on Monday.

On Tuesday we will call the Consent Calendar, the Private Calendar, the omnibus bill, which contains certain private bills, the Railroad Retirement Act under suspension of the rules, and then will continue with H. R. 6396, the displaced-persons bill. It is probable that on that day we will plan to come in early. However, on Monday, we will come in at 12 o'clock.

Wednesday we hope to have ready for consideration the independent offices appropriation bill. That will be followed by H. R. 6248, a bill to extend the farm program, reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Then for the balance of the week, if rules are granted, we plan to take up H. R. 6263, extension of commodity credit; H. R. 6401, selective service; H. R. 6777, extension of social security; H. R. 6712, revision of the Internal Revenue Code, and H. R. 6227, home rule for the District of Columbia.

Those bills will not necessarily be called in that order. There are some other rules outstanding which may be called for the purpose of expediting the business of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 633, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 2, line 1, strike out "June 30" and insert in lieu thereof "April 3."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CANNON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to include in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole an article from the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $165, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the figures "2,335", insert the figures "$6,500", and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

H. M. KILGORE,
E. H. MOORE,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of $7,790 to Harriet Townsend Bottomley, for property damage sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy plane, on May 28, 1944, at Old Brookville (Glen Head post office), Nassau County, N. Y.

The Senate reduced the amount to $2,335, and at the conference, a compromise of $6,500 was agreed upon.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 296, to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 15, strike out all after "any" down to line 20, inclusive, and insert "(1) wage credits reported to the Bureau of Internal Revenue with respect to services performed prior to the enactment of this act; or (2) wage credits with respect to services performed prior to the close of the first calendar quarter, which begins after the date of enactment of this act in the case of individuals who have attained age 65 or who have died, prior to the close of such quarter, and with respect to whom prior to the date of enactment of this act wage credits were established which would not have been established had the amendment made by subsection (a) been in effect on and after August 14, 1935."

(c) (1) The Federal Security Administrator is directed to estimate and report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date (A) the total amount paid as benefits under title II of the Social Security Act which would not have been paid had the amendment made by subsection (a) been in effect on and after August 14, 1935, and (B) the total amount of such payments which the Administrator estimates will hereafter be paid by virtue of the provisions of subsection (b).

(2) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts reported to the Congress under paragraph (1).

(2) Page 2, after line 20, insert:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1948, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan with respect to each needy individual who at the time of such expenditure is sixty-five years of age or older and is not an inmate of a public institution, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any such individual for any month as exceeds $50—

"(A) three-fourths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $20 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose."

(b) Section 403 (a) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to dependent children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1948, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under such plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $27, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $27 with respect to one such dependent child and $18 with respect to each of the other dependent children—

"(A) three-fourths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $12 multiplied by the total number of dependent children with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to dependent children, or both, and for no other purpose."

(c) Section 1003 (a) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1948, (1) an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan with respect to each needy individual who is blind and is not an inmate of a public institution, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any such individual for any month as exceeds $50—

"(A) three-fourths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $20 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the blind for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the blind, or both, and for no other purpose."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of clearing up the confusion and misunderstanding created by opponents to House Joint Resolution 296, it is appropriate to point out briefly the real purpose and effect of this resolution which the House and Senate overwhelmingly agreed to.

This resolution merely proposes to continue the existing Treasury regulations setting forth the tests to be used in determining whether a given individual rendering service for another is an employee or not an employee under the Social Security Act for the purpose of establishing his rights to benefits under the insurance provisions of the law.

Opponents of the resolution have mislead many people into believing that it will exclude from coverage under the insurance provisions a great host of employed persons numbering anywhere from 500,000 to 750,000 or more. This is not true. The people it will affect have never been covered by the Social Security Act, were never intended to be covered by the Social Security Act and are not now covered by any act. They will not be denied the opportunity of establishing the fact that they are entitled to coverage if they can prove that their relationships with their employers are the relations of an employee under existing Treasury regulations.

The real objection to the resolution is based entirely upon the desire of the Federal Security Agency to arrogate to itself the right to determine who is and who is not entitled to coverage and to benefits under the Social Security Act. They want to do this under a proposed Treasury regulation which would permit

the use of any test that anyone can think of at any time for determining whether a given individual is an employee or is not an employee. They rely upon a series of court decisions as justification for this proposed regulation. Actually they do not rely upon the decisions of the Court at all, but upon purely incidental, prefatory language in the Court's opinions which confer no authority whatever upon the Treasury Department or the Federal Security Agency to decide for itself the matter of coverage under the Social Security Act. Rather than giving the Government a broader license than it now has, these decisions actually held in effect that the Government had overextended the power it already had under the existing Treasury regulation.

Notwithstanding this rebuff the Treasury Department brings forward a proposed regulation that would give the Department and the Federal Security Agency authority to make the very type of interpretation which the Court rejected in its opinions. Rather than implementing the Supreme Court decision the proposed Treasury regulation attempts to surmount, supersede, and negative them.

A sound analysis of these cases requires that the prefatory and random remarks of the Court which have been seized upon to supply a spurious gloss of validity to the proposed Treasury regulation shall be harmoniously related to the facts involved, the decisions, and to their moving rules. If this cannot be done these offhand comments by the Court or courts must be regarded as surplusages. The purpose of House Joint Resolution 296 can, therefore, be said to continue to treat employee relations under the existing regulations which are based upon fundamental principles of the common law, and which do not permit any wild guesses as to whether an individual is an employee or is not an employee.

Another purpose of the resolution is to prevent a large number of people from obtaining benefits under the Social Security Act without having paid the necessary taxes or premiums for such benefits. In other words, the resolution would prevent these persons from obtaining a "free ride" at the expense of others who contribute their money to the program. Unless the resolution becomes law there will be retroactive grants of coverage without any offsetting contribution of taxes.

This will impair the Federal old-age and survivors trust fund to the possible extent of approximately $100,000,000. This raises the all-important question of whether the integrity and soundness of the Social Security System will be maintained if the opponents to the resolution have their way.

Obviously the approximately 33,000,000 persons now insured under title II of the act look for the payment of their benefits out of the trust fund. They have bought their privilege with hard-earned tax dollars. Opponents of the resolution would disregard this fact and pay benefits to people regardless of the lack of contributions.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members, especially members of the Committee on Ways and Means, may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 296.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OLD AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. R. 640, Rept. No. 2225), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6777, to extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 641, Rept. No. 2226), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 418, to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PURCHASE OF MINERAL DEPOSITS FROM CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW INDIANS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 642, Rept. No. 2227), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 363) providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PARK COUNTY, WYO.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 643, Rept. No. 2228), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4462) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent if it has not already been granted that all Members who spoke on the bill may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include three tables.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. PFEIFER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper headline in the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some statistics from the Bureau of Labor on housing and employment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain excerpts.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Star by Dorothy Thompson.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each instance to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on public housing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. COTTON), until Tuesday morning, June 8, on account of official business.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JUNE 4, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration.

Respectfully,

JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JUNE 4, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration.

Yours respectfully,

TOBY MORRIS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDOWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GERHART EISLER

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, just 50 weeks ago an alien and an avowed enemy of the people and the Government and the Constitution of the United States of America was convicted of contempt of Congress and sentenced to the maximum fine of $1,000 and a jail sentence of 1 year. The convict, Gerhart Eisler, appealed his conviction to the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals some 2 months ago and no decision has been rendered on his appeal. This same man, Gerhart Eisler, a native of Germany, a boasted Communist, was also in the last year charged and convicted of swearing to false statements in an application for a departure permit. Found guilty of this charge, he was sentenced from 1 to 3 years in jail; he appealed, of course; he was given bond and his appeal has not yet been heard by the courts.

This year Gerhart Eisler, at my demand on this floor, was apprehended by the security officers of the Department of Immigration and lodged on Ellis Island, where he was held in custody for several weeks until he was again released on bond. The demand I made then for the arrest of this man was made because he, with several other haters of the United States, was touring the college campuses of our country preaching sedition and treason, and my demand, as was evidenced by the newspapers and the letters that arrived from all parts of the Nation, was in complete accord with the views of the American people. Gerhart Eisler was released from Ellis Island when that very learned and excellent judge, the Honorable Alan Goldsborough, declared that the Appeal Board of the Bureau of Immigration was made up of Government employees, a custom which has existed in the Department for a great many years—and Eisler was released from Ellis Island.

Mr. Speaker, there are now in the United States and out on bond exactly 50 aliens, all of whom are Communists and all of whom are waiting a hearing for deportation from this land, which they hate so thoroughly and whose Government they have been condemning and cursing and attempting to weaken for many years. It is a good guess, Mr. Speaker, that unless something happens all of these 50 people whose names I will place in the RECORD at this point will continue to remain here in the United States illegally for many, many years to come, to continue their sinister and insidious efforts to destroy the last great remaining Republic on earth.

Here are their names:

Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Charles A. Doyle (Scotland).

Boston: John Nebesha, of the CIO Shoe Workers (Russia).

Philadelphia: Frank Hellman, of the United Electrical Workers, CIO (Rumania).

Fairmont, W. Va.: Mrs. Theratesa Horvath (Hungary).

Cleveland: Alex Balint, David Balint, both of the CIO Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers (Czechoslovakia).

Niles, Ohio: Leon Callof, of the CIO Steel Workers (Greece).

Lorain, Ohio: Kondo Dimitroff (Bulgaria).

Detroit: Joseph Knerly (Hungary).

Gary, Ind.: James Mackay (Canada).

Chicago, Ill.: Julius Fritz (Germany); Peter Kushner (Ukraine); James Keller (Russia); Fred Lichota (Russia); Refugio Roman Martinez, of the CIO Packinghouse Workers (Mexico).

Milwaukee, Wis.: John Hilty (Lichtenstein).

Bettendorf, Iowa: Martin Karasek (Austria).

Minneapolis: Peter J. Warhol, of the AFL Upholstery Workers (Czechoslovakia).

Seattle: James Crain, AFL Building Service Workers (Ireland); William Bigelow (Canada).

Renton, Wash.: Julius Blichfeldt (Denmark).

San Francisco: William Heikkila (Finland); Juan Diaz, CIO Food & Tobacco Workers (Spain); John Voich (Yugoslavia); Frank Carlson (Poland); Nathan Yanish (Russia); Per Erickson, Swedish Seamen's Union leader (Sweden).

Los Angeles: Esther Sazer (Russia); Paul Cline (Russia); Fraincisco Corona (Mexico); Aron Grosberg (Poland); Joseph Boross (Hungary); Jaroslav Dowytrryk (Yugoslavia); Joseph Lubey (Hungary).

San Antonio, Tex.: Dr. John Greenberg (Rumania).

New Jersey: Luigi Mascitti (Italy).

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States at the urging of the President of the United States and his Secretary of State, the Honorable George Marshall, recently appropriated billions and billions of dollars to be sent to those other countries of the world who were being attacked by the international political conspiracy, controlled and directed by the head of the Soviet Government in Moscow, who also controls and directs the activities of Gerhart Eisler and his 49 colleagues, all out on bond here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as the time nears when the American people are going to the polls for their traditional duty of choosing a President and a Congress of the United States, more and more of the various aspirants for the presidency and for the Congress are referring to the frightening mass of communism which has made such horrifying strides in enslaving the free people of the world outside of the United States and most of them are talking about similar efforts that are going on here within the United States; largely led by these 50 alien enemies, even while their efforts are beginning to become apparent about us. Mr. Speaker, let me get back again to Gerhart Eisler, the German Communist who has been in America for many years, who has shuttled back and forth from the United States to Moscow, usually on forged and fradulent pass-

ports, and let me discuss for a minute why it is and how it is that the strongest nation in the world finds itself helpless and completely bogged down in a maze of jurisdictional red tape, and how and why it is that this man at this very minute is free and unhampered in the United States. These various candidates for the high offices to which they aspire have at various times referred to the situation that the United States now has 27 laws on the statute books created to deal with the subversive activities in the United States, many of which are directed at activities created by aliens. Well, we have 27 laws. Among others, we have the Smith Act written and created by that great jurist from Virginia, our colleague, Judge HOWARD SMITH, of Fauquier County. We have the Voorhis Act which it appears to me would fit some or perhaps all of these 50 alien Communists. The act created by the brilliant young statesman from California who is so well remembered in this House. We have the McCormack Act, a bill created and written by one of the most distinguished Members of the present Congress, the well beloved gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, who was the first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Despite the fact that we have these acts and 24 others, there has been no attempt either to prosecute any of these known and acknowledged enemy aliens; despite the fact that these laws are cluttering up the books of the Government of the United States, to date no prosecutions have been brought on Gerhart Eisler and his 49 disloyal comrades under the Smith Act, the Voorhis Act, or the McCormack Act. This, despite the fact that America's great protector against the evil things that attach themselves to Government, J. Edgar Hoover, who has said that Gerhart Eisler is the No. 1 Communist in the United States; that Gerhart Eisler is the voice of the comintern here in the United States; that Gerhart Eisler, who has been here since 1928, largely illegally, is the actual voice of Joseph Stalin in the United States; and Gerhart Eisler writing in the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, said in the edition of Wednesday, June 2, 1948:

> Whether the conditioning of the American people to accept as normal a new way of life which has been cast aside in a big part of Europe, and exists there only as a gruesome memory, will succeed even temporarily only time will tell.

But there is one law which nobody can escape: "He who sows the wind will harvest the storm." In this same article of the day before yesterday, Mr. Speaker, this little gnome whose hands are dripping with the blood of countless unknown Chinese and were stained thusly when he was sent to China by Stalin to be the fingerman to learn the art of a terrorist by putting to death those Chinese who were struggling to preserve their country from the inroads of communism.

Mr. Speaker, it is traditional in America that one of the most distinguished bodies of the American Government is the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of the United States. To this committee of the other body are designated those great Americans whose judicial knowledge is over and beyond most other American lawyers. It was with a great shock and total dismay that we learned that in the last 10 days the leader of the Communist Party of the United States, William Z. Foster, in testifying before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary holding hearings on the Subversive Control Act of 1948 so overwhelming passed by the House of Representatives a few weeks ago, that this Foster stared into the eyes of the committee members who were present, pounded the desk and informed the distinguished members of the committee that no matter what law the Congress of the United States passed to control the treasonable activities of the Communists of either America or of the world, here in the United States, the Communists would not obey the law. William Z. Foster, who has been quoted for years as being completely subservient to the dictates of the head of the Communist Party in Moscow told the Senators in just so many words that in the event of a war between our Nation and the Communist-controlled nations of the world his 70,000 Communist followers in the United States would commit treason or at least he would urge them to commit treason.

Mr. Speaker, our billions are even now going to Europe and Asia to help other people control communism. Mr. Speaker, if the action of William Z. Foster can go unnoticed by the Government of the United States we had better now save those bilions for the inevitable trouble we are going to have to face. Mr. Speaker, if the 27 acts now on the law books of the people of the United States are not sufficient to punish this man for his sedition, then our great Republic has begun to die but the pain has not yet set in.

Mr. Speaker, there is here in the city of Washington a brilliant young assistant district attorney who in his brief span in public life has made one of the most distinguished prosecuting records in the history of American courts. His name is William Hitz, whose energy, ability, knowledge, and eloquence have sent many malefactors of this city and of this land toward the safety and security of the jail, the safety and security being for the people of the United States and their Republic.

I call now, Mr. Speaker, upon the President of the United States and his Attorney General to set up a test case on this William Z. Foster and to assign Assistant District Attorney Hitz to prosecute this case by means of any one of the 27 laws that now exist to curb this sort of dangerous international controlled sedition. I call upon the Attorney General to immediately begin to prosecute the head of the Communist Party of the United States—not next month—not after the elections—not next year—not next week, but tomorrow, so that 140,000,000 people may have knowledge and sleep easier that the Government that costs them so many of their hours of toil and sweat is actually beginning to protect them.

And, Mr. Speaker, if a citizen is needed to swear to an information regarding these charges of sedition—I offer the Attorney General my own name and oath.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the hour is so late that I will not take time. However, I want to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Birdsall of the Veterans' Administration regarding loans, which is extremely significant and shows the importance of needed legislation.

Also, to express great pleasure that the Speaker apparently notified the press that veterans' legislation was on the "must" agenda.

The letter is as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1948.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Further reference is made to your letter of June 1, 1948, requesting information in regard to the relation of the incidence of default between loans made under section 500 (a) and section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. A table is enclosed setting forth the results of a special survey of the incidence of home loan defaults under section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act compared with other guaranteed and insured home loans under that act.

It will be noted from the table that for the United States as a whole 31,373 home loans had been reported in default as of April 25, 1948. Of this total, 29,827 were defaults on first mortgage loans (sections 501 and 507) and 1,546 were defaults on 505 (a) loans. Due to the fact that a large proportion (74 percent) of the 505 (a) loans were originated within the last year, and hence have not been exposed to the possibility of default for nearly as long as the bulk of first-mortgage loans, it is felt that the best comparison of default incidence is obtained by relating the current number of defaults to the number of loans in each group that are now 1 year or more old. Such a comparison shows that the number of defaults on 505 (a) loans amounts to 6.6 percent of loans closed 1 years ago, compared with 4.9 percent for first-mortgage loans. This would seem to indicate a somewhat higher incidence of default on second-mortgage loans than on first-mortgage loans.

Perhaps an even more significant picture of the relative default incidence may be obtained by examining certain areas of the country separately. In the South and southwestern parts of the United States, for example, a tightening of 4-percent mortgage money available for GI first mortgage loans became apparent at a much earlier time than in other sections of the country. As a result, a substantial proportion of home loans to veterans consisted of combination FHA-VA loans with Veterans' Administration guaranteeing a second mortgage under section 505 (a). Veterans' Administration Branch 10, consisting of Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, is typical of this section of the country. As indicated in the enclosed table, defaults reported on 505 (a) loans in this branch area amounted to 13.4 percent of loans closed one year ago as contrasted with

a ratio of 7.7 percent on first-mortgage loans. Not only were the default ratios less favorable to 505 (a) loans in this branch area but the proportion of defaults cured was lower on 505 (a) loans (60 percent) than on first mortgage loans (73 percent).

Only a small proportion of home-loan defaults have resulted in payment by the Veterans' Administration of claims against the guaranty or insurance. In the United States as a whole, only 1,096 home-loan claims have been paid thus far. Of this total, 1,043 claims resulted from first-mortgage loans and only 53 claims resulted from second-mortgage loans. Expressing claims paid as percentages of loans closed a year ago, it will be noted that only a small fraction of one percent of the loans resulted in claim payment. The ratio for 505 (a) loans (0.23 percent) was somewhat higher than for 501 loans (0.17 percent).

Very truly yours,

G. H. BIRDSALL,
Assistant Administrator for Legislation.

Comparative incidence of defaults and claims for first- and second-mortgage home loans guaranteed or insured by the Veterans' Administration (cumulative as of Apr. 25, 1948)

Area and item	Second-mortgage loans (sec. 505 (a))	First-mortgage loans (secs. 501 and 507)	Total home loans
United States total:			
Defaults reported:			
Number	1,546	29,827	31,373
Percent of loans closed to date	1.7	2.8	2.7
Percent of loans closed 1 year ago	6.6	4.9	4.9
Defaults cured:			
Number	858	15,097	15,954
Percent of defaults reported	55.5	50.6	50.9
Claims paid:			
Number	53	1,043	1,096
Percent of loans closed to date	0.06	0.10	0.10
Percent of loans closed 1 year ago	0.23	0.17	0.17
VA Branch 10 (Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi):			
Defaults reported:			
Number	358	3,216	3,574
Percent of loans closed 1 year ago	13.4	7.7	8.1
Defaults cured:			
Number	215	2,354	2,569
Percent of defaults reported	60.1	73.2	71.9
Claims paid:			
Number	3	46	49
Percent of loans closed 1 year ago	0.11	0.11	0.11

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $85,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 4721. An act to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy;

H. R. 6407. An act to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1641. An act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Air Force, Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

S. 1676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $85,000, to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 4721. An act to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy;

H. R. 6407. An act to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, June 7, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1618. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $2,900 for the National Capital Housing Authority (H. Doc. No. 696); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1619. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 in the amount of $28,500 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 697); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1620. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $40,000,000 for the Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 698); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1621. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 686, 79th Cong.), relating to lump-sum payments of compensation for accumulated annual leave and current accrued annual leave to certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from the active service of the United States as a result of the expiration of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 72), by providing therein for the payment of such lump-sum settlement to the personal representative of any such deceased officer or employee, extending the time within which notice of election to receive such payments may be filed, and authorizing the appropriation of funds; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1622. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Luz, Maria, and Raquel Porrata Doria 1.56 acres of land, more or less, in the municipality of Ceiba, P. R.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1623. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Kaare Paul Zakariassen from those 298 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of January 15, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1624. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Young Ten Po or Young Tin Po from those 205 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of March 15, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1625. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 397. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; with amendments (Rept. No. 2196). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. A report on organization functions and relative costs of personnel officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 637. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6396, a bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 638. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6248, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agriculture commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2152. An act to increase the maximum travel allowance for

railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2432. An act to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2202). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators; without amendment (Rept. No. 2207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico; without amendment (Rept. No 2208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 2209). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; without amendment (Rept. No 2210). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Resolution 618. Resolution authorizing studies by a joint board of Army, Navy, and Reclamation engineers to investigate and report on the feasibility from the standpoint of national defense and other beneficial purposes of the conservation of fresh water at the northerly end of San Francisco Bay; with amendments (Rept. No. 2211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5555. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6660. A bill to improve conditions among the Navajo Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 2213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Funds. H. R. 6767. A bill to authorize the participation of States, Territories, and insular possessions in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, to provide for the acquisition of land within certain areas administered by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6297. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for money due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 2215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6452. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6295. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5047. A bill to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 2220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6136. A bill to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 2221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6695. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 2222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6007. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 640. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6777, a bill to extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2225). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 641. A resolution providing for the consideration of S. 418, an act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2226). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 642. A resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 363, a joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 2227). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 643. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4462, a bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; without amendment (Rept. No. 2228). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5655. A bill confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include sec. 2, T. 11, S., R. 6 E., Louisiana meridian, containing 139.62 acres; without amendment (Rept. No. 2203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036); without amendment (Rept. No. 2204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2040. An act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 2205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6327. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette; without amendment (Rept. No. 2206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 6814. A bill to extend capital-gains treatment to certain distributions under employees' trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 6815. A bill relating to the eligibility for hospitalization and medical treatment of honorably discharged veterans of service in the armed forces of the United States in time of peace; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6816. A bill to authorize the United States to purchase undivided inherited interests held by individual Indians in trust or restricted lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6817. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 6818. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 6819. A bill to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. J. Res. 420. Joint resolution to authorize a sum not to exceed $80,000,000 to provide adequate protection from flooding of the Minnesota River in the Minnesota River Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. Res. 635. Resolution authorizing and directing the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives to study and investigate the granting of concessions within national parks; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. Res. 636. Resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to approve payment of gratuities during the recess of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. Res. 639. Resolution to authorize and direct the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives to study and investigate the granting of concessions in the national parks; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6820. A bill for the relief of Oscar and Fredericke Neustadt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 6821. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Logan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. Res. 644. Resolution for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2062. Mr. CLASON presented a petition of Springfield Palestine Seminar, at Springfield, Mass., urging the President of the United States, the United States delegates to the United Nations, the Secretary of State, and the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts to settle the Palestine dispute on principles reflecting justice, morality, the laws of God, and the teachings of Christ within the framework of the United Nations, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Edward B. Willingham, pastor, National Baptist Memorial Church of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, with reverence we bow before Thee. From everlasting to everlasting Thou art God. We would be still and humble in Thy presence.

With thanksgiving we acknowledge Thy blessings upon us individually and Thy favor upon our land. We thank Thee for the faith of our fathers, which looked unto Thee for guidance, wisdom, and strength in past generations. Grant unto us to be true to our heritage, that we may be a God-loving and God-fearing nation.

Bless our President and all who direct the destinies of our country. May Thy presence be a constant reality with the Members of our Senate as they face problems and questions which concern the welfare of our people and relate to our place in the world family of nations. Direct them by Thy wisdom and shield them from mistakes as they deal with forces and groups which would influence their leadership and as they sincerely seek to do that which is right.

O Thou spirit of the ever true, keep Thou the pressure of Thy way upon them. May they be channels through which Thy spirit may work with divine power.

Grant that our Nation may lead in peace. Bless all nations with the light of Thy truth and overrule the wrath of man, to the glory of the spirit and name of Christ, Thy Son. This, our prayer, is in the spirit and the name of Christ, Thy Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 4, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 3, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1006. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, and the Potassium Act of February 7, 1927, in order to promote the development of certain minerals on the public domain, and for other purposes; and

S. 1035. An act to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., and Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, for use as domiciliary facilities by the Veterans' Administration.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1676) to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROHIBITION AGAINST PARKING ON CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

EXPLORATION FOR STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL METALS AND MINERALS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to stimulate exploration for strategic and critical metals and minerals, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SIMPLIFICATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF LAWS RELATING TO DUAL EMPLOYMENTS

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify and consolidate the laws relating to the receipt of compensation from dual employments under the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC-BUILDING CONSTRUCTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain public-building construction work in or near the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Petitions of several citizens of the States of California and New York, praying for the enactment of the so-called Mundt un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of members of the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., of New York City, N. Y., praying for an investigation of the Government's policies and activities in its occupation of Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from George William Lang, Jr., of Menlo Park, Calif., relating to Paul Robeson's appearance and testimony on the so-called Mundt un-American activities bill before the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram from Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, chairman, National Catholic Resettlement Council, St. Paul, Minn., embodying a resolution adopted by that organization at its north central meeting in St. Paul, Minn., expressing appreciation to the Senate for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of 200,000 displaced persons to the United States over a period of 2 years; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Lathers' International Union Local No. 190, Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon un-American ac-

tivities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Lathers' International Union, Local No. 190, Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for the drafting of 19- to 25-year-old boys; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Boyle Heights Chapter of the American Veterans Committee, Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Mundt un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2418. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1516);

H. R. 4856. A bill to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1517);

H. R. 6096. A bill to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1518);

H. R. 6113. A bill to transfer land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1519); and

H. R. 6114. A bill to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1520).

By Mr. FLANDERS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 5174. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 1515).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 19. A bill relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; with amendments (Rept. No. 1510);

S. 20. A bill to regulate the review of judgments of conviction in certain criminal cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1526);

S. 21. A bill to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1527);

S. 850. A bill to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1511);

H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1512);

H. R. 2634. A bill for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528);

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone; without amendment (Rept. No. 1529); and

H. R. 3641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield; without amendment (Rept. No. 1513).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 4830. A bill for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1530).

By Mr. WILEY (for Mr. FERGUSON), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 826. A bill to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1514).

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 29. A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; with amendments (Rept. No. 1531); and

H. R. 6116. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1532).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 784. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 595. A bill to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 90 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; with amendments (Rept. No. 1521);

S. 2772. A bill to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1533);

S. 2773. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1535);

S. 2774. A bill to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 1523);

S. 2806. A bill to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational rehabilitation purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1522);

S. 2807. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for certain investigation reports in connection with insurance claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534);

H. R. 3889. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases; with amendments (Rept. No. 1536); and

H. R. 6489. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of lead; without amendment (Rept. No. 1524).

AMERICAN ELEVATOR & MACHINE CO.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution providing for reference to the Court of Claims of the bill (S. 2208) for the relief of the American Elevator & Machine Co., and I submit a report (No. 1508) thereon.

There being no objection, the report was received, and the resolution (S. Res. 251) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2208) for the relief of the American Elevator & Machine Co., with the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of section 151 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. Code, sec. 257), for such action as the court may take in accordance therewith.

MR. AND MRS. LEM MOTLOW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution providing for reference to the Court of Claims of the bill (S. 890) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lem Motlow, and I submit a report (No. 1509) thereon.

There being no objection, the report was received, and the resolution (S. Res. 252) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 890) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lem Motlow, with the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of section 151 of the Judiciary Code (28 U. S. Code, sec. 257), for such action as the court may take in accordance therewith.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 7, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1676) to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 2815. A bill for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2816. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2817. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2818 (by request). A bill to amend section 22 of the Internal Revenue Code; and

S. 2819 (by request). A bill to provide a reduced rate of tax on certain types of income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (by request):

S. 2820. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 2821. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 2822. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wandaleen V. Kincaid Schallen; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate joint resolution 229, to change the name of the site of Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State to Chief Joseph Dam,

which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

CHANGE IN NAME OF FOSTER CREEK DAM ON COLUMBIA RIVER TO CHIEF JOSEPH DAM

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which proposes to change the name of Foster Creek Dam, on the Columbia River in Washington State, to Chief Joseph Dam.

Foster Creek has no historical or engineering significance that I can find; in fact, it is only the name of a dry wash that runs down the slopes into the Columbia River.

The name Foster Creek would be a misnomer to this great and necessary undertaking on the Columbia River. The name has hindered us in the development of this project; I have even been asked why millions of dollars is needed to dam a creek. Actually, this dam would be constructed on the Columbia River by the Corps of Engineers 65 miles downstream from Grand Coulee Dam and near the town of Bridgeport, Wash. The structure will be more than 200 feet high and 1,628 feet long, and, when built and operating, will generate more than 1,000,000 kilowatts of electricity which will be less costly per dollar invested than any in the Nation.

This joint resolution proposes to change the name to Chief Joseph Dam, after the most famous Indian Chief in the history of the Pacific Northwest and one of the greatest in American history. American Army officers often have termed Chief Joseph the "Indian Napoleon."

Chief Joseph was endowed with unusual abilities, blessed with a forceful physique and magnetic personality and was a great crator, diplomat, and warrior. When he appeared before Government commissions to plead for his people and his lands, the commissioners were continually amazed at his great oratorical powers. The War Department states that Chief Joseph conducted the most scientific campaign against the United States Army ever generaled by an Indian.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Corps of Engineers agree to the change in name; in fact, these Government agencies also believe the new name would be most appropriate. The Indians on the Colville Reservation in northern Washington State would be greatly honored to have the name of their famous leader applied to this dam. I know of no objection to the changing of this name.

Chief Joseph was leader of the Nez Percé Indians during the Nez Percé Indian War of 1877, which was the last important contest between the Indians and the United States Army. During that year Chief Joseph and his Nez Percé Tribe fought a running fight against veteran troops that lasted 2 months and stretched almost 2,000 miles across mountains, over blind, winding passes, in deep canyons and through valleys. At the peak of the pursuit, Chief Joseph faced or dodged 2,000 infantry and cavalry backed with Gatlings and howitzers. He accomplished military feats of the first magnitude, his Indian force met United States troops 11 different times and lost only once. For the freedom of his people, Chief Joseph fought with a puny force of never more than 400 warriors against veteran troops fresh from victory at Appomattox.

After it was all over, General Sherman wrote for the War Department:

> Thus has terminated one of the most extraordinary Indian wars of which there is any record. The Nez Percé Indians throughout displayed a courage and skill that elicited universal praise; they abstained from scalping, let captive women go free, did not commit the usual indiscriminate murder of peaceful families and fought with scientific skill, using advance and rear guards, skirmish lines, and field fortifications.

I request that the joint resolution, together with a brief résumé of the great Indian chief's life, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the joint resolution, together with the résumé, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 229) to change the name of the site of Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State to Chief Joseph Dam, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That the dam site known as Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River shall hereafter be known as the Chief Joseph Dam, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of Foster Creek Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Chief Joseph Dam.

The résumé is as follows:

The story of Chief Joseph is a saga of military genius and of the thrilling and tragic adventures he shared with his people. He was born in eastern Oregon about 1840, the eldest son of the hereditary chief of the Lower Nez Percé Indians.

The Nez Percé received their name from French traders who applied the name of "Nez Percé," or nose pierced, because a few members of the tribe used to pierce their noses to insert a shell for ornament, although the habit was not a tribal custom. The tribe called itself "Numipu," which means "we people."

The Nez Percé Indians are a tall, handsome, big-boned people, dignified and erect. Religion plays a large part in their lives. Originally a mountain tribe, they roamed the Pacific Northwest and once every year they crossed the Bitterroot Mountains into what is now Montana to hunt buffalo. The tribe originally lived in what was known as the Valley of the Winding Waters, stretching from north central Idaho into southeastern Washington and northeastern Oregon.

In 1805, this tribe played host to the Lewis and Clark Expedition for 2 months, and expedition records clearly state that along with one other tribe the Nez Percé Indians were the finest and highest type of Indian to be met during the entire exploration trip.

In 1832, Captain Bonneville's expedition, made famous by Washington Irving, came into contact with the hospitable and friendly Nez Percé and of all the tribes in the Northwest the Nez Percé were the only ones willing to trade with Americans.

Captain Bonneville later wrote: "The Nez Percé are the least barbarous, most gentle, friendly, and religious of all native tribes whom I encountered. Their honesty is immaculate and they are certainly more like a nation of saints than a horde of savages." Similar expressions of the character of this tribe are found throughout history.

In 1855 a council of chiefs and tribes met with American military and civil leaders, and a majority of the Indian leaders agreed to live on certain reservations in the Pacific Northwest. However, so far as the chief of one tribe binding, by his assent or signature, the chiefs and members of other tribes—that would have been much like the Governor of Washington State having power to bind the Governor of Oregon. The American authorities failed to understand this and the misconception left its traces on the entire history of the treatment of the Nez Percé Indians.

At the council which made the treaty of 1855 one particular band of Nez Percé Indians was represented by Chief Joseph's father, known as Old Joseph, and he, for himself and his band, refused to consent to the treaty until his demands were met and his tribe given the right to live in the Valley of the Winding Waters.

Old Joseph and 37 other chiefs refused to sign any agreement and for the next 20 years conditions gradually grew worse, although the Nez Percé Tribe boasted up until 1877 that white man's blood had never been shed by them. Old Joseph died in 1870 and Chief Joseph, his son, became chief.

In 1873 President Grant granted these Indians their ancestral lands, but there was an outcry from the white settlers and 2 years later the President revoked his grant and the Indian land became public domain. Various attempts at conciliation were made until 1877, when the first stage of the war began when settlers and Indians began individual fights.

When troops were sent to run the Indians off the land, Chief Joseph withdrew to mountain valleys. He outflanked the first attack of American troops and won a signal victory.

At first, like Gandhi, Chief Joseph pursued a policy of noncooperation with the whites, and when this failed he turned to force and his subsequent efforts are unparalleled in the military annals of America. Far more remarkable was Chief Joseph's strict adherence to the white man's civilized code of war.

Chief Joseph's strategy in battle won plaudits from all his enemies. Brig. Gen. Oliver O. Howard, hero of Antietam and Gettysburg, and Joseph's greatest foe, declared: "The leadership of Chief Joseph was indeed remarkable. No general could have planned a battle more skillfully."

One of his most unusual military feats came when he held off General Howard with a small detachment while another small force slipped around one side and cut off the enemies' supplies. Then he formed 40 of his men in columns of 4 and in the dusk of early night pulled a surprise attack—General Howard's sentries thinking that by the orderly formation they were part of the American cavalry.

After fighting from Oregon to Montana, the end came October 4, 1877, on Snake Creek on the north slope of Bear Paw Mountain in Montana, near the Canadian line. Chief Joseph surrendered, and the force he led into the American military lines consisted of 87 warriors, 40 of them wounded, 184 women, and 47 children. They were taken back to Idaho, and, in 1885, the remnant of this audacious band was sent to northern Washington State, a country similar to their beloved Valley of the Winding Waters. It was here that Chief Joseph died in 1904.

Some of this great chief's sayings are worthy of recording. In his orations we find these statements:

"Cursed be the hand that scalps the reputation of the dead."

"The eye tells what the tongue would hide."

"Big name often stands on small legs."

"Finest fur may cover toughest meat."

"It does not require many words to speak the truth."

"Look twice at a two-faced man."

And when he surrendered, he told the Americans: "We are all sprung from a woman; we are just as we were made by the Great Spirit; then, why should children of one mother quarrel. I do not believe that the Great Spirit chief gave one kind of man the right to tell another kind of man what he must do."

One of Chief Joseph's greatest orations was made in Washington, D. C., at the turn of the century, when he went east to appeal for help for his people. Newspapers of that day carried long accounts of his speech, in which he said, in part:

"I have shaken hands with a great many friends, but there are some things I want to know which no one seems able to explain. I cannot understand how the Government sends a man out to fight us and then when peace is made it breaks its word. Such a government has something wrong about it.

"I cannot understand why so many white chiefs are allowed to talk so many different ways, and promise so many different things. I have seen the great father chief (the President), the next great chief (Secretary of the Interior), and many law chiefs (Congressmen), and they all say they are my friends, but while their mouths all talk right I do not understand why nothing is done for my people. Good words do not last long until they amount to something.

"I know that my race must change. We cannot hold our own with the white man as we are. We only ask an even chance to live as other men live. We ask that the same law shall work alike on all men. If you tie a horse to a stake, do you expect he will grow fat? You might as well expect the rivers to run backward as that any man who was born free should be contented penned up and denied liberty to go where he pleases. If you pen an Indian up on a small spot of earth and compel him to stay there he will never be contented nor will he grow and prosper. We ask to be recognized as men. If the Indian breaks the law punish him by the law.

"I hope that no more groans of wounded spirits of men and women will ever go to the ear of the Great Spirit chief above and that all people may be one people."

It is after the great chief who spoke these words that we desire to name this monument in the Pacific Northwest.

INVESTIGATION OF CONCESSIONS WITHIN NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 254), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas, in various hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, it has been shown that the Department of the Interior, through the National Park Service, in its relations with concessioners within the national parks, has been following a policy which has discouraged improvement and extension of existing facilities erected, maintained, and operated for the benefit of the public; and

Whereas said policy has been manifest in the following practices:

1. Refusal to renew concessions when they expire;

2. Refusal to include provisions granting preference of renewal to those who have concessions;

3. Offering of contracts that leave in doubt return of invested capital;

4. Issuance of rules and regulations that work unwarranted hardship on concessioners;

5. Lack of a definite long-time policy as regards concessions within national parks;

6. Insisting on a policy of acquiring the concessioners' fixed assets;

7. Encouragement of non-profit-distributing corporations as concessioners and a further desire to convert these corporations into "regularly established Government corporations";

8. Insistence on an "option to purchase" clause in contract without regard to concessioner's willingness to sell;

9. Establishing a policy that will eliminate eventually all present concessioners and substitute Government-owned facilities operated by Government corporations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate is authorized and directed to study and investigate the granting of concessions within national parks.

The committee shall report to the Senate (or to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session) on or before December 31, 1948, the results of its investigation and study, together with recommendations of policy for the National Park Service in its relations with concessioners that will result in private enterprise expanding and enlarging facilities within national parks so as to give more adequate and better service to those who visit these great national playgrounds.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the Senate is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGE IN NAME OF FOSTER CREEK DAM ON COLUMBIA RIVER TO CHIEF JOSEPH DAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6419) to change the name of the site of Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State to Chief Joseph Dam, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'CONOR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL PLANTS FOR PROCESSING AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6096) to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent to submit amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2318) to provide a coordinated agricultural program, and I request that the amendments, together with an accompanying statement prepared by the Senator from Washington explaining these amendments, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments, together with the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments and explanatory statement are as follows:

AMENDMENTS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON TO S. 2318

On page 49, line 7, between the words "revenues" and "for", insert the words "and funds."

On page 81, line 17, after the word "*Provided*", to insert "That the foregoing provision shall not prohibit Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any operation to support the price of any such perishable, nonbasic agricultural commodity to the extent that the reserve for the postwar price support of agriculture established pursuant to the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 8) and such other funds as are specifically appropriated for agricultural price support are sufficient to cover any losses which may be incurred in connection with such operation: *Provided further.*"

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

On page 81 of S. 2318, lines 8–13, the committee has adopted language designed to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation from excesive losses resulting from operations in support of nonbasic and perishable agricultural commodities. The evident intent of the committee is to protect the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation from the almost unlimited losses which might occur if that Corporation's entire resources were thrown into price support of perishables.

The committee accomplishes this objective by prohibiting the Corporation from carrying out "any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable in ordinary commercial warehouses or elevators without excessive loss or excessive cost."

In my judgment this language is so restrictive as to preclude legitimate price-support activities of the Department of Agriculture in regard to perishables utilizing funds other than those borrowed by CCC. I, therefore, have suggested the above amendment and below outline more specifically a justification for its adoption:

1. In its present form S. 2318 authorizes the use of section 32 funds for the support of perishable commodities. However, it does not limit the use of those funds to such commodities. Furthermore, a large percentage of the funds established by section 32 have been earmarked for use in the school-lunch program and the balance of such

funds is available for use in the European recovery program under section 112 of the Economic Cooperation Act. In the circumstances, the funds available under section 32 may be wholly inadequate to meet the price-support needs of growers of perishable commodities. Accordingly, a part of the postwar support fund should be available for supporting prices of perishable commodities, which it would not be under S. 2318 in its present form. The suggested amendment to S. 2318 does not disturb the prohibition, implicit in the present bill, against the unlimited use of Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing power for supporting prices of perishables.

2. Commodity Credit Corporation normally handles purchases under the school-lunch program, which purchases are sometimes in the nature of a price-support operation. Perishable agricultural commodities are sometimes appropriately purchased pursuant to such program. The present language of S. 2318 may be read to preclude Commodity Credit Corporation's participation in the program insofar as certain perishable commodities may be involved.

3. In its present form, S. 2318 would preclude any use of the $500,000,000 fund for the postwar price support of agriculture for certain perishable commodities. That fund was paid to Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to the act cited in the proposed amendment and is used to offset losses incurred by Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from price-support operations. The fund was established, not for use with respect to a limited number of agricultural commodities but for use in the postwar support of agriculture generally. There is no reason for rendering certain perishable commodities ineligible for support from this fund, although that is an indirect effect of S. 2318 as written.

4. The suggested amendment to S. 2318 leaves the question of support of perishable commodities within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the considerations provided for in section 302 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as it is proposed to be amended by S. 2318. In other words, S. 2318, amended as suggested above, will continue the availability of price-support assistance to perishable commodities such as fresh fruits so that serious hardship to the growers of such commodities may be avoided to the extent that funds are specifically appropriated for agricultural price support.

5. Under more normal circumstances when the Economic Cooperation Act no longer results in a serious drain on section 32 funds, the provision included in S. 2318 for the accumulation of section 32 funds up to $300,000,000 may result in the development of a reserve adequate to meet emergency situations arising with respect to perishable agricultural commodities. In the meantime, however, to be sure that means are at hand to avoid possible disaster in the perishable commodity branches of agriculture, it seems necessary to assure the availability of funds in addition to those provided for in section 32, and it is entirely appropriate to continue the availability for such purpose of the fund established for the general postwar support of agriculture.

6. The amendment, page 49, line 7, simply brings the declaration of policy into line with the main amendment on page 81.

OPEN LETTER FROM SENATOR WILEY TO EDITORS OF THE DAILY WORKER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject Your Party, Your Paper, and Its Tactics, written by him to the editors of the Daily Worker, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY BEFORE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on April 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PORTLAND'S INDUSTRIAL FUTURE—ADDRESS BY CHESTER K. STERRETT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Portland's Industrial Future, delivered by Chester K. Sterrett, manager of the industries department, Portland Chamber of Commerce, before a joint meeting in the East Side Commercial Club and the Portland Chamber of Commerce Members' Forum, Portland, Oreg., May 24, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND BEFORE THE YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF WEST VIRGINIA

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the State convention of Young Republicans of West Virginia, at Bluefield, W. Va., on June 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FREEDOM TO DISAGREE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO BEFORE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Freedom To Disagree," delivered by him before the convention of the Young Democrats of Colorado, at Pueblo, Colo., on June 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAJ. GEN. PATRICK J. HURLEY

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks prepared by him on Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, which appear in the Appendix.]

NATIONALIZATION OF RAILROADS—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Has Never Worked," published in the Indianapolis Star of May 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY TRAINING—REPORT BY FANNY MAY BALDRIDGE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report on military training made by Fanny May Baldridge, of Brooklyn, N. Y., which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY FRANK P. GRAHAM AT THE WOMAN'S COLLEGE, GREENSBORO, N. C.

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the commencement address delivered by Frank P. Graham at the Woman's College, Greensboro, N. C., on May 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH HAS BECOME A SPECIAL PRIVILEGE—ARTICLE BY WALTER LOCKE.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent column by Walter Locke which appeared in the Miami Daily News on February 23. In it Mr. Locke recounts facts which will be of interest to all of us, and on the basis of those facts, wonders whether health is rapidly becoming a special privilege in this country. He asks what the doctors are going to do about the situation set forth, what the people are going to do about it, and what we in the Congress intend to do. My own suggestion, which I have been making repeatedly, is that the doctors aid the people and their representatives in the Congress in drafting a measure which will solve the problem, and be acceptable to all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH HAS BECOME A SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

Half a billion teeth need filling in the United States and are not being filled. Two reasons: Shortage of dentists; the law of supply and demand.

Small supply and large demand increase the price. The owners of the teeth cannot pay the price. Good teeth, like fur coats, become the luxury of the few.

One in three of our people in an average year will be sick once. One out of seven will be sick twice. One out of twenty will be sick three times.

When serious illness strikes the family, that means new expenses. Families with incomes under $3,000 need help to meet this cost (inflation makes it worse).

Two out of three families where serious sickness strikes lack the means to meet the emergency. Sickness for the two-thirds means debt—or charity, or lack of proper care. Here the undertaker, another cost of sickness, comes prematurely in.

There are 150,000 practicing physicians, including the teeming specialists, in the United States.

There is 1 general physician for every 1,500 inhabitants. The need is for 1 for each 1,000 inhabitants.

In 500 counties there is only 1 general physician for each 3,000 inhabitants. Eighty-one counties have none at all.

The medical schools need to produce a half more doctors than they do.

Making doctors is expensive. The boy or girl who is to be a doctor must go 16 years to school and university; then 4 years at great expense for training in medicine. Who has the money for such a course? Doctors become a luxury.

Health and freedom from sickness and toothache become a luxury—the privilege of a few.

In the United States are 6,511 hospitals with beds for 1,738,944 patients. There are 7,000,000 sick today. Only one in four of the sick could find room in the hospital.

Hospitals cost much money to build and operate. Hospitals are a luxury which only a few of us can afford.

Sickness costs the country 600,000,000 mandays of labor annually. The people spent $5,000,000,000 in 1947 for medicine and medical care. (They spent a half more that that for alcoholic beverages, another luxury.)

Congress last year voted $29,866,200 for research in the control and cure of the disease of plants and animals.

Congress last year voted $28,000,000 for research in the control and cure of the diseases of human beings. (The Nation, publicly and privately, was spending $450,000,000 on industrial research—ways to produce other wealth than human health.)

Eight million Americans are sick mentally. One of every two patients in hospitals is a mental patient. One in each 17 suffers some form of mental illness. Half the 1,239,454 patients in hospitals are mental patients.

Thirty-eight percent of the 5,000,000 men rejected for military service in the war were disqualified nervously, mentally. One out of eight of all the 15,000,000 men examined were rejected for mental disability.

There are 575 hospitals for mental patients, with 674,930 beds. By 1960, 155,000 additional beds for mental patients will be required.

America, a democracy, stands or falls by its people's sanity. How shall we save our sanity.

To deal with mental diseases, psychiatrists are required.

There are now 4,241 practicing psychiatrists. There is need of one psychiatrist for each 150 patients. That would call for 14,544 psychiatrists more. There is need for 47,000 psychiatric nurses. There are at present 2,205.

One in every three deaths is due to heart or artery disease. Cancer takes only one-third as many, tuberculosis one-eleventh. Half a million of us will die of heart disease in 1948. Congress has but begun to talk about research in heart disease.

Health is the foundation of a people's strength. Health has become, like diamonds, a luxury. What are the doctors to do about it? The people? The politicians? Hurry! A lot of us are about to die because health has become a special privilege, a luxury.

WALTER LOCKE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained consent that Mr. MAGNUSON be excused for the balance of this week.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Finance Committee to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate today.

He also asked and obtained consent that the Committee on the Judiciary and a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to hold hearings this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to Senate bill 2655, which is the unfinished business. This amendment has to do with nonsegregation in the armed forces.

I may say that this question was generally discussed at length in the committee. The specific amendment now pending was not presented to the committee, but the actual idea of the amendment was generally discussed in our deliberations, which lasted over 9 weeks.

It was the consensus of the committee, at many meetings, that Senate bill 2655 is of paramount importance to the national defense. While members of the committee may have feelings one way or another with regard to civil-rights measures, still there is a general acceptance of the idea that at a time when voluntary enlistments will not keep the manpower of the Army and other forces up to strength, the monthly increments not being sufficiently large, in fact, being so small, on the voluntary basis, that the size of the armed forces is going down monthly, civil-rights legislation must stand on its own feet, and certainly is not germane to the pending bill.

Further, I wish to advise the Senate that many studies are being made of this problem, and it is the belief of the committee that the armed forces are handling it in a good way. Progress is being made, and certainly the evidence given to us shows that every opportunity is being given to all races. Each year there seems to be a better understanding, and more efficiency is apparent in the way the problem is being handled, to the best interests of national defense.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move at this time that the amendment be laid on the table.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota lettered "B" be laid upon the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ives	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Langer	Thye
Cain	Maybank	Vandenberg
Feazel	Russell	Wherry
Flanders	Stennis	White
Gurney	Taylor	Williams
Hayden	Thomas, Okla.	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official committee business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on official business at important committee meetings.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CAPPER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. SMITH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WILSON answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant-at-Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KEM, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BALL, Mr. MALONE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. TAFT, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. UMSTEAD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is not debatable, the Senator will understand.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand that the amendment pending before the Senate is the one designated "B"?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay that amendment on the table.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea", and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business, and is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea", and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on official business at an important committee meeting.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—67

Ball	Connally	Ellender
Barkley	Cooper	Feazel
Brewster	Cordon	Flanders
Buck	Donnell	Fulbright
Butler	Downey	George
Byrd	Dworshak	Gurney
Cain	Eastland	Hawkes
Capehart	Ecton	Hayden
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Stennis
Hill	Millikin	Stewart
Hoey	Moore	Taft
Holland	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	Thomas, Utah
Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel	Thye
Kem	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Knowland	Pepper	Umstead
Lodge	Reed	Vandenberg
Lucas	Revercomb	Watkins
McClellan	Robertson, Wyo.	White
McGrath	Russell	Wiley
McKellar	Saltonstall	Wilson
Malone	Smith	
Martin	Sparkman	

NAYS—7

Ives	Taylor	Young
Kilgore	Wherry	
Langer	Williams	

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken	Ferguson	Magnuson
Baldwin	Green	Morse
Bricker	Hatch	Myers
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	McCarran	Tobey
Bushfield	McCarthy	Wagner
Capper	McFarland	
Chavez	McMahon	

So Mr. LANGER's amendment lettered "B" was laid on the table.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now ask for the immediate consideration of my amendment lettered "C."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

PROHIBITION UPON SEGREGATION OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WHILE TRAVELING IN INTERSTATE CARRIERS

SEC. —. (a) No member of the armed forces of the United States shall be denied the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and provisions of all common carriers, subject only to such conditions and limitations as may be applicable alike to persons of every race and color. As used in this section, the term "common carrier" means a carrier for hire of passengers in interstate commerce by land, air, or water.

(b) Any person who, or any partnership, corporation, or association which, violates any of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, shall for each and every violation thereof be liable to a penalty of not less than $50 nor more than $500, to be recovered by the person aggrieved thereby or by any person to whom such person shall assign his cause of action, in the United States district court for the district in which any such violation may occur.

(c) Any person who, or any partnership, corporation, or association which, violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to the penalties prescribed by section 12 of this act.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement, which will take only a few minutes. I do not at the moment intend to make a motion to table.

Mr. President, before the quorum call, I made a short explanatory talk in connection with the amendment which the Senate has just tabled. Now that there are more Senators on the floor, I want to say that during our extensive series of executive hearings, as well as open hearings, the Committee on Armed Services examined the racial-segregation question pro and con, in great detail. I feel that the question is a basic national issue which extends far beyond the Military Establishment. It is not an issue which should be dealt with in a piecemeal fashion. Various proposals dealing with segregation, if enacted, would have a most serious effect upon the morale of the armed forces, in that they would make an immediate issue of the whole matter of race and color throughout the services, in many places, both in this country and abroad. So far as the committee has been able to judge, the majority of the officers and men now in the armed forces are perhaps less conscious of the so-called racial issue than is the case in a great many communities in all parts of the Nation. Forcibly to inject the issue into the situation at this time could not help but have serious effects. The services are today meeting the problem intelligently, and there does not appear to be any danger that the long-range evolutionary plan now under way will be abandoned.

I therefore feel that such amendments as these are, first of all, not necessary; secondly, and most important, I feel that their adoption would constitute the very serious mistake of making almost overnight a morale problem of the first magnitude, because it would make all personnel in the armed services and all personnel who are required to register far more conscious of the problem and far more concerned than is the case today.

I wish specifically to call to the attention of the Senate the wording of the proviso, as it appears, beginning in line 12, page 14, of the bill:

Provided, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of the proceedings of the Republican National Convention of 1944. Before going into a discussion of a certain resolution adopted in connection with segregation in the armed forces, I desire to read the names of some of the delegates who attended that convention:

Colorado: Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut: Raymond E. Baldwin, John A. Danaher.

Delaware: C. Douglass Buck, John G. Towsend, Jr.

Idaho: John Thomas.

Illinois: Dwight H. Green, C. Wayland Brooks, James S. Kemper.

Iowa: Harrison E. Spangler, Bourke B. Hickenlooper.

Kansas: Alf M. Landon.

Kentucky: Simeon Willis.

Maine: Sumner Sewall, Wallace H. White, Jr.

Massachusetts: Leverett Saltonstall.

Michigan: Alex J. Groesbeck, formerly governor and attorney general.

New Jersey: Albert W. Hawkes.

New Mexico: Mrs. Albert G. Simms.

New York: Edwin F. Jaeckle, J. Russell Sprague.

North Dakota: Orris Nordhaugen, Leeds; Alfred Spoklie, Minot; Gerald Olson, Mooretown; R. L. Fraser, Washburn; Harry Polk, Williston; Phillip Blank, Mandan; Kenneth Fitch, Fargo; Verne Lord, Cando; A. H. Reed, Wats-

ford City; C. A. Childs, New England; Paul Mann, Dickinson.

Ohio: Clarence J. Brown.

Oklahoma: E. H. Moore.

Pennsylvania: Edward Martin.

South Dakota: C. A. Christopherson, Sioux Falls; Walter H. Burke, Pierre; John A. Boland, Rapid City; Mrs. Maxine Frescoln, Winner; H. G. Rempfer, Parkston; Luther Johnson, Redfield; J. M. Lloyd, Yankton; L. W. Robinson, Mitchell; Mrs. Martha W. Garwood, Aberdeen; O. J. Fett, Timber Lake; Harold S. Black, Deadwood.

Tennessee: Carroll Reece.

Washington: Arthur B. Langlie.

West Virginia: Walter S. Hallanan, now arranging the rooming and the seating for the next convention, to be held in 2 or 3 weeks; Chapman Revercomb.

Mr. President, certain resolutions were adopted at the convention. I call attention first to page 145 of the proceedings of the Republican National Convention, referring to the proceedings of the 27th day of June 1944:

Racial and religious intolerance.

I might say that at this convention a platform was drawn up, and it was called the Republican platform for 1944.

Mr. President, I am a Republican, and I believe in carrying out the planks of the party platform. I do not believe a platform is made to run on and get elected on, and then promptly forgotten.

Among the resolutions was this one:

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

We unreservedly condemn the injection into American life of appeals to racial or religious prejudice.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the next one, and I read it, because of all the votes cast in the Senate, I appreciate most of all that cast by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. This is what the Republican platform promised on June 27, 1944, when they were looking for votes:

We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in our armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and the adoption of corrective legislation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. IVES. I merely wished to ask the Senator if he had noted how I voted on the motion to table his amendment.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator voted "nay."

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator voted against the tabling of the amendment, and, therefore, I wish to congratulate him, and to tell him how much I appreciate the vote of the distinguished Senator from New York. I am very grateful for it, and I am sure that 16,000,000 Negroes and hundreds of thousands of Indians are grateful, also.

The platform then proceeded:

We pledge the establishment—

We pledge the establishment—

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Mr. President, I was not a delegate to that convention, but some of the distinguished gentlemen whose names I have read were there, and I hold in my hand a copy of the official proceedings. I have read some of the promises made by the convention, but it went further and made additional promises. I read:

ANTI-POLL-TAX

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

ANTILYNCHING

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

INDIANS

And, Mr. President, some of the bravest men in the last war were Indians from my own State.

We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation. We will take politics out of the administration of Indian affairs.

So, Mr. President, here is the record. I am told Congress will adjourn on the 19th day of June. I totally disagree with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in the two statements he made this morning, particularly the first one, and I call the distinguished Senator's attention to the names of those at the Republican convention representing South Dakota because I happen to know that a majority of the delegates were friends and political associates of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I ask him, Where could my amendment be more germane than in the pending measure, in view of this promise made by the Republican Party on the 27th day of June 1944? I read my amendment. This is the one which was just tabled:

No person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under this act shall be discriminated against, or be subject to segregation, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, or religion, in assignment to duty or quarters in the armed forces, in assignment to organizations or units of the armed forces, in assignment to camps or stations, or in any other matter relating to his service in the armed forces.

(b) In the selection of persons for induction or enlistment under this act, no person shall be discriminated against because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion. Quotas for selection prescribed by section 5 of this act shall be established and filled without regard to the race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion of the persons subject to selection.

Mr. President, on Friday last I read into the RECORD a statement showing that of 7,798 officers of the Marine Corps, not one was a Negro.

In 1944, when my party needed votes so badly, they said, "We have to get the Negro vote, and we have to get the Indian vote." And what did they say in the platform? They said:

We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in our armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and the adoption of corrective legislation.

Yet, Mr. President, not one thing has been done by the Republican Party to carry out that pledge.

What was done when the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] introduced his bill for the establishment of a fair employment practice commission, which the platform pledged to support? Who made that pledge? Let me read again some of the names of the distinguished gentlemen who were at the convention and were delegates. Let me read some of them again, because this shows that they have had opportunity to introduce bills in the Congress to carry out the pledge:

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado; RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, of Connecticut; C. DOUGLASS BUCK, of Delaware; C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; WALLACE H. WHITE, of Maine; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts; EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota; ALBERT W. HAWKES, of New Jersey; CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio; E. H. MOORE, of Oklahoma; EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania; CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia.

Mr. President, I like to have the friendship, the warm affection, of every Member upon this floor. It happens, however, that I took the same oath of office that was taken by every other Senator in this body. I took an oath of office to do my duty, and when the day comes, Mr. President, that I cannot represent the rank and file of the people of the country, whether they are Japanese or Chinese, whether they are Koreans or Puerto Ricans, whether they are red or black or white or yellow—when that day comes I shall get out of this Chamber, and I shall do so with my head up and chest out; I shall go out as an American citizen should go out, having kept every single promise I have made so far as it was in my ability so to do.

I recur to the record again and speak of the plank which the Republican Party adopted in its platform with tears in its eyes on the 27th day of June 1944, and I shall show from the record the treatment which has been accorded the Negroes in the Army, the Navy, and in the Air Force. The Republicans were going to clean up the situation which prevailed. They met in Philadelphia for 4, 5, or 6 days, as I remember, and thoroughly discussed the subject. They were going to correct conditions. The people of the country took the Republican Party at its word. We have had a majority in the House and a majority in the Senate for 2 years, and yet not one thing has been done about this matter. The bill introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], it is true, is on the calendar, but the antilynching bill is still in committee, not yet having been reported to the Senate.

President Truman came out for the whole civil-rights program. He appointed a Committee on Civil Rights. I wish to read a portion of the report of that committee as it appears on page 7152 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 4. The committee appointed by President Truman says that in the

Marine Corps, of 7,798 officers, not a single one is a Negro. The same committee says that of 2,981 Coast Guard officers—believe it or not, Mr. President—actually there is 1 Negro. One Negro was finally found who could be an officer. I read from the report:

Similarly, in the enlisted grades, there is an exceedingly high concentration of Negroes in the lowest ratings.

The report of the President's committee further states:

Almost 15 percent of all white enlisted marines are in the three highest grades; less than 2½ percent of the Negro marines fall in the same category. The disparities in the Coast Guard are similarly great. The difference in the Army is somewhat smaller, but still significant: Less than 9 percent of the Negro personnel are in the first three grades, while almost 16 percent of the whites hold these ranks.

What did the committee further find? It found that:

Some of our servicemen are all too often treated with rudeness and discourtesy by civil authorities and the public. There are numerous instances in which they have been forced to move to segregated cars on public carriers.

I have an amendment here, Mr. President, the purpose of which is to to wipe out that condition also.

Why did not the Republican Party keep its promises? I do not know. In the State of New York under Governor Dewey the legislature passed an FEPC act and the Governor signed it. I have been in New York a great many times during the last 2 years, and the law seems to have worked very well. There is not anywhere near the complaint in that State that I find in some of the other States.

The President's Committee on Civil Rights had this to say about the subject matter of discrimination against and segregation of members of the armed forces in common carriers:

When an individual enters the service of the country he necessarily surrenders some of the rights and privileges which inhere in American citizenship. The Government in return undertakes—

The Government promises something also, Mr. President, to these boys who enlist or are drafted.

The Government in return undertakes to protect his integrity as an individual and the dignity of his profession. He is entitled to enjoy the respect which should be shown the uniform of the United States by all persons. Unfortunately, however, the uniform is not always accorded the esteem it warrants.

Yet I know of the case of a young serviceman in our Army who went into a restaurant to buy a cup of coffee, and laid 10 cents on the counter for it, but the girl behind the counter said they were not allowed to serve Negroes, even though, Mr. President, at that time the man was in Army uniform, and wore the uniform when he came to my office not 10 minutes after the incident took place. That is what the Republican Party was going to wipe out, Mr. President. The Republican Party has been in control in Congress for 2 years and yet it has not passed one single measure to wipe it out.

The Republican Party is going to hold a convention, I understand, beginning on the 21st day of June in Philadelphia, the same city in which it held its previous convention. It met in the city of Philadelphia in 1944. That city is called the City of Brotherly Love. So I thought the Republicans, after their convention in that city was over, were going to love all people so much that, following the adoption of the resolutions I have referred to, of course, it would only be a very short time after they came into control before they would at least enact some of the legislation.

Mind you, Mr. President, telegram after telegram has been sent urging the Republican Party to do something about this program. Mr. Robert R. Church, of Chicago, president of all the minority groups of the country, whether they are aliens, Mexicans, Negroes, no matter what they are, sent telegrams to all the leading Republicans asking them to carry out their pledges. He sent such a telegram to practically every leading Republican in the country. I understand that some of them did not even do him the courtesy of answering the telegram.

Mr. President, I do not blame the Democrats for voting today to table my amendment. I do not blame them at all, because, as I showed upon the floor of the Senate one day, in not one single platform have the Democrats ever promised to wipe out segregation in the armed forces. In some years the Democrats had merely a blank platform in that respect. At least the Democrats have been honest about it.

But here is the Republican platform. I cannot read it too often. Note the language. There is nothing equivocal about it. The Republican Party says:

We pledge—

They do not say that they are going to make an investigation—

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

That language is clear. There can be no misunderstanding about it. This is the only chance left before we adjourn for carrying out our promises. I care not if every single Republican in this body votes against the amendments which I have offered. If their consciences permit them to do so, it is their consciences, not mine. But certainly, as a Republican from North Dakota, I shall leave nothing undone to carry out what my party promised to carry out.

I have not read the names of all the distinguished men who were present at that convention. Some of them were not delegates. As I remember, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] seconded the nomination of Mr. Dewey and the record so shows. I will say for the Senator from Minnesota that at least he was not a delegate.

The report of the President's Civil Rights Committee further states:

There are numerous instances in which they have been forced to move to segregated cars on public carriers. They have been denied access to places of public accommodation and recreation. When they attempt to assert their rights they are sometimes met with threats, and even outright attack. Federal officials find they have no present authority to intervene directly to protect men in uniform against such abuses.

To secure those rights, it would be necessary to enact amendments B and C, which I have offered. Amendment B has already been tabled today. Let me say in passing that I am grateful also to the acting majority leader, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who kept the pledge of the Republican Party when the question came to a vote.

Mr. President, I can document the assertion I made a moment ago with a number of specific examples taken from the records of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in which local officials or private individuals failed to give the respect and honor due the uniform of the United States because the soldier in the service of his country clothed in that uniform was a Negro. In my State I can make the same assertion as applied to Indians, because some of the soldiers who were treated in that manner were Indians.

On October 23, 1944, 11 Negro soldiers, including Sergeant Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., were arrested while on furlough en route to Aiken, S. C. Why? Because they protested a bus driver's striking of a middle-aged Negro woman who requested the return of her fare when there was standing room only, and the bus driver refused to ask a white passenger in the Negro section to move.

What else did they do? They sat in the front of the bus when it was otherwise empty, and the bus driver was not in the bus. This was on October 23, 1944. One would imagine that sensible and sound justice would require that such minor infractions of the law—if they were conceded to be such—would demand at the most a suspended sentence and perhaps a warning, particularly since the individuals involved wore the uniform of their country. But no. Each of these Negro soldiers was fined $25 or $15, and sentenced to 30 days on the South Carolina chain gang. As they had no money they served several days each before money was brought for their relief.

That experience could not fail to injure their morale in the midst of a war against fascism, with its racist ideas and persecution.

Now they are needed again. It was thought when World War II was over that 25 years would go by, and many of those young Negroes would forget the kind of treatment they received. It was expected that it would be at least 25 years before there would be another war. But today the military authorities are asking for them again. Can we in the Senate again ask citizens of Negro blood to don the uniform of their country and fight in its defense, and still submit to this humiliation and degradation? Can we again ask them to fight in defense of democracy and deny them the basic democratic right of dignity as a human being? I say that this basic democratic right should not be denied to any citizen, regardless of his color, creed, or national origin. Why? Because the United Nations Charter, for which practically every Senator voted, said that the entire situation would be changed.

I have before me a copy of the Charter of the United Nations. It makes that statement not once, but twice. Let me read it the first place where it occurs, in chapter I. Assuming that all Senators may not have read the United Nations Charter in its entirety, it is a safe assumption that most of them read the first chapter. The very first chapter, in the third paragraph, sets forth certain purposes of the United Nations. This is the Charter for which the Senate voted on July 28, 1945. One of the chief purposes is—

To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

In case some Senator did not read all the first chapter, but skipped over to article 55, let me read all of article 55, which says:

With a view to the creation of conditions—

Mr. President, this is not article 55 of the report of President Truman's committee. It is article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

a. higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

b. solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

c. universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without discrimination as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. President, that statement is to be found twice in the Charter of the United Nations. It is at the beginning and it is at the end. So when the distinguished Senator from South Dakota this morning read three or four sentences of the bill, they meant nothing to me, because if there is going to be no segregation in the Army or the Navy or elsewhere in the armed forces, why not say so?

I say we cannot ask a Negro or an Indian or a Mexican to don the uniform of the country, and in the same breath tell him that he will not have the same rights, the same privileges, and the dignity of his fellow soldier who wears the same uniform, but whose skin is of a different color.

A few weeks ago I picked up a newspaper in which was a statement that MacArthur had done such a good job in Japan that if we had a war, there would be hundred of thousands of Japanese enlisting, ready to fight for this country. Mr. President, if that happened, should they be discriminated against? Should they be segregated?

At one time I had a long talk with General Stilwell about China. He said, "The Chinese are great fighters. They are as good as almost any fighters in the world; but I found that when we had them fighting, the thing was to put American soldiers in with them in the ratio of about 1 to 10." Mr. President, there was no discrimination there under General Stilwell. If there is to be no discrimination, why not say so, instead of having more instances similar to the examples to which I shall refer.

On December 23, 1944, Pvts. Gladys Blackman and Roberta McKenzie, both members of the WAC, stationed at Camp Sibert, Ala., were brutally beaten and dragged from a Crescent Motor Lines bus by police at Gadsden, Ala., and detained until released by military authorities, because they refused to surrender their seat in the Negro section of the bus to a white passenger. They were where they had a right to be. They were in uniform as Wacs. Nevertheless, they were taken from the bus and were brutally beaten, on the 23d of December—almost on Christmas eve.

In July 1944, Pvt. Booker T. Spicely was shot and killed by a bus driver in Durham, N. C., after a misunderstanding about segregated seating arrangements on the bus on which he was traveling—a man in uniform, shot and killed.

Mr. President, the Republican Party promised and pledged, on the 27th day of June 1944, not only an FEPC, but placed itself on record in favor of an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination among Negroes who are in our armed forces was impairing morale and efficiency. Of course, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota says that has nothing at all to do with the pending bill by which we are trying to draft thousands more—435,000 additional soldiers, to be specific. But the Republican Party said it did have something to do with it, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota to the contrary notwithstanding. When the Republican Party needed votes, it promised an antilynching law and an anti-poll-tax law, and pledged the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission, and said there would be an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in our armed forces was impairing morale and efficiency; and the Republican Party pledged itself, further, Mr. President, to the adoption of corrective legislation. I did not make that record; I was not a delegate to that Republican National Convention. But I went all over North Dakota supporting that party. It was my party, Mr. President. The Non-Partisan League of North Dakota, of which I am a member, had endorsed every candidate on the Republican ticket.

Here is another example: On the 21st day of March 1947—and I may say here that tabling these amendments does not worry me at all, but I shall always be grateful that I obtained a yea-and-nay vote, because the American people are entitled to such a vote, and I am glad they got it. I want to know whether a member of that convention says one thing in order to get votes, and then upon other occasions speaks otherwise. I am responsible only for my own vote in the Senate, but I am fortunate enough and lucky enough to be able to control my own vote. I am not here asked to control the vote of any other Senator upon this floor; so long as I am here I am going to control my vote.

The Republican Party pledged itself to lower taxes and do certain other things, which were all done. Those promises were kept. Income taxes were lowered and the excess-profits tax repealed. But when it came to taking care of the poor people, the Indian, the Mexican, the Puerto Rican, some Japanese citizens, and some Chinese citizens, they failed.

Mr. President, in Oregon a Legion post is named after a young Japanese citizen who lost his life in the war. His grandfather came to this country many years ago.

I cite another example: On the 21st day of March 1947, Capt. Oscar C. Allen was arrested in Alexandria, Va., and held overnight in jail. He was in uniform. His offense was that he refused to move to a back seat in a Greyhound bus en route from Washington, D. C., to Charleston, W. Va. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to eliminate such practices and to wipe them out. We are not living in a foreign country; we are living in America. Under our Constitution all men are presumed to be equal. There is not a Member of the Senate who would submit willingly to the discrimination, segregation, and degradation suffered by our Negro troops while wearing the uniform of the armed services. Any Member of the Senate would resist and would take the case to the highest court. I know that each one of us would insist on his right to equality and respect for his dignity. He would insist upon his right to stand up as a human being. I say the Senate would be derelict in its duty if it did not insist that the same rights be afforded to our fellow citizens who may have skins differing in color from our own.

The Supreme Court has spoken on this question, in the case of Morgan against Virginia. Mark this well, Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Morgan against Virginia has held that the States cannot require segregation in interstate commerce. The President's Committee on Civil Rights read that opinion very carefully, and had something to say about it. They said:

Legislation is needed to implement and supplement the Supreme Court decision in Morgan against Virginia. There is evidence that some State officers are continuing to enforce segregation laws against interstate passengers. Moreover, carriers are still free to segregate such passengers on their own initiative, since the Morgan decision covered only segregation based on law.

That is why my amendment is so important. That is why the little clause read by the Senator from South Dakota has such meaning in it.

On the basis of the Supreme Court desion which I have cited, the President's committee found:

There is evidence that some State officers are continuing to enforce segregation laws against interstate passengers. Moreover, carriers are still free to segregate such passengers on their own initiative, since the Morgan

decision covered only segregation based on law. Congress has complete power under the Constitution to forbid all forms of segregation in interstate commerce.

That is what I am trying to do to prevent segregation of soldiers on interstate accommodations.

We believe that it should be made prompt use of.

Mr. President, I desire to show how very reasonable I am. My amendment does not go so far as does the report of the President's committee. The report asks for complete elimination of segregation on interstate carriers. My amendment asks for the elimination of segregation only so far as members of the armed forces are concerned. Although I agree fully that it should apply to all persons, yet in the amendment I am asking for its application only insofar as the armed forces are concerned.

In my judgment, no Member of this body can in good conscience vote for a bill that says to the young men of the United States, "We are going to draft you, we are going to take 435,000 of you," and at the same time deny to the citizens thus taken the fundamental rights guaranteed them under the Constitution and in the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, let us consult the persons who are discriminated against, citizens to whom the Republican Party made promises, every one of which was broken, in connection with the matter concerning which I speak. What do the citizens subjected to such discrimination think about it? Ah, Mr. President, I wish every Member of the Senate could have been present a few days ago when the Mundt bill was being considered by the Senate committee. A young Negro who was a veteran was being interrogated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

I turn to page 812 of the testimony on the Mundt bill, which was given in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. I read:

Senator FERGUSON: Mr. Guinier, will you raise your right hand, please? Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in the matters now before the committee, so help you God?

This was the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. President, of which I have the distinguished honor of being a member.

Mr. GUINIER. I do.

The first observation I would like to make——

Senator FERGUSON. Will you identify yourself for the record, please?

Mr. GUINIER. Ewart G. Guinier, international secretary for the United Public Workers, CIO, 2 Lafayette Street, New York City.

The first observation I would like to make is the contrast in what is seemingly an attempt to return this bill with a deliberate stalling on the antilynch bill that has been in this very committee room since February. It has been pondered and repondered and double-pondered by this committee as to its constitutionality. All the members of this committee are willing to forget and to waive the constitutional questions about the Mundt bill.

Senator FERGUSON. I think you are wrong on that. They are still arguing.

Mr. GUINIER. From the questions I heard you ask today, Mr. Senator, you are asking witnesses whether they should not leave it up to the Supreme Court to decide these constitutional questions.

Yet on the antilynch bill, you keep it bottled up in committee while Negroes are being lynched in the South, and Members of this very Senate and House of Representatives incite white people to violence against Negroes.

I do not hear you condemning JOHN RANKIN when he gets up and raves his filthy anti-Negro insults in the House of Representatives.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you want to testify before this committee?

Mr. GUINIER. Yes; I do.

Senator FERGUSON. Then lower your voice and talk into the microphone.

Mr. GUINIER. I think when a Negro sees that there are Representatives that are——

Senator FERGUSON. If you know anything about the action of this committee, you would know that the present chairman is trying to get that very bill that you are talking about in the committee.

Mr. GUINIER. You know, I have been in the South, Mr. Senator. I was in the United States Army.

Mr. President, when I get through I want the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who made a motion to table my amendment, to place himself in the position of Mr. Guinier. It happens that the Senator is white, and it happens that the whites are in the majority; but I want the Senator to put himself in the minority for a little while.

I continue reading from the testimony:

Mr. GUINIER. I volunteered for the infantry in the last war. I went to Alabama, and I would like you to know that the first day I went to Fort McClellan, I had to go to the United States Government post office to buy stamps to write home, and I was fearful, because I didn't know what kind of reception I would get, because I was Jim Crowed on my way there.

Here is a young man in the uniform of the United States Army. He is in the United States, under the great Constitution. Every so often Senators rise and make beautiful speeches with reference to the Constitution. I have done so, myself, on Constitution Day. It is referred to as the greatest document ever penned by mortal man. When Senators finish talking about the beautiful Constitution, they talk about the very, very beautiful Bill of Rights. Here we have this young man in uniform. He could not get postage stamps where the other men got them, so he went over to the post office.

I had volunteered, and I was ready to give my life for my country, and yet I didn't feel I had protection when I was in Alabama, so if I may seem a bit moved about this it is because of the hell I have been through because I am a Negro.

Mr. President, I might say that I have had that same thing told to me by Chinese and by Japanese. If any Senator wants an interesting trip, let him go to California and talk to some of the Japanese citizens of the State of California.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I cannot yield, because if I do, I shall have to yield the floor. I am very sorry; I deeply regret being unable to yield to the Senator from Illinois, but the Senator from South Dakota has raised an objection, and I have to abide by the rule, apparently.

I read further:

I think this committee ought to show more consideration for the democracy that Negroes are denied and should bring out some of this legislation that is an attempt to make this a fuller democracy and to do the job against the people that are threatening us with present danger.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand that you see no menace in the Communist Party?

Mr. GUINIER. Well, all I know about the Communist Party is what I read in the newspapers. I have some friends that are Communists, and one of them is Ben Davis, who went to the same college that I did. I know what it stands for, and I have discussed things with him and he with me, and what it stands for is something I stand for. I stand against lynching.

If that be a criterion of the beliefs of Communists, then all the delegates to the Republican convention on the 27th day of June 1946 were Communists, if this young man's definition is correct. He said:

I stand against lynching. I am against the poll tax, and I am for FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, that is what the Republican Party said. The Republican Party stood for exactly what this witness stood for, and yet this young man defines it as communism, because the Republican Party did not carry out its promises. The Republican Party said, on page 146 of the official proceedings of the Twenty-third Republican National Convention:

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

This young man, who says he is a Communist, tells the Senator from Michigan that he is a Communist because his friend, Ben Davis, stands for certain things, and he is with him. He says:

I stand against lynching. If that is communism, I am a Communist.

Then he says he is against the poll tax. What did the Republican Party do about that? All the delegates to the convention, including the Senators whose names I have read, said, as appears on page 146 of the official proceedings of the Republican convention:

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

Not one thing has been done about that. The bill providing for its abolition is still in the Committee on the Judiciary, although I moved to take it up. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] moved that it be taken up, and I seconded his motion, and he seconded my motion; but it is still there.

Third, this young man says, "And I stand for FEPC legislation." The Republican Party promised the enactment of such legislation on the 27th day of June 1944, nearly 4 years ago. They said:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] introduced a bill to carry out that pledge, and he had hearings on it, and I was present when the distin-

guished Senator rose in the Republican caucus and plead to have the FEPC bill reported to the Senate. Finally, after a long time, it was placed on the calendar.

This young man said that in addition to standing against lynching and the poll tax, and for the FEPC—

I stand against covenants, and I stand for full equality for Negroes in every standard of life, and I want that, and I don't want to wait a thousand years for it.

This young man made it plain that he was not going to wait a thousand years for the Republican Party to make good its promises. He continued:

I think Negroes are full-fledged American citizens and should have all the rights of American citizens, and should have it today.

Why should they not? The Republican Party promised it to them on the 27th day of June 1944, but has not yet carried out its promise.

This young man continued:

In Washington—

Here, in the Nation's Capital—

I could not sleep in the hotel because of the filthy Jim Crow system here. I came here Friday and could not find a place to sleep.

This was the testimony of a young man who wore the uniform of his country, who testified that he offered his life for his country, and the Republican Party promised to wipe out segregation in the armed forces, but today voted to table the amendment I offered providing that it should carry out its promises to the people of the country.

Mr. President, the day will come, and I personally do not think it is very far off, when the Republicans, so-called, of this country will have an awful time with the people of whose votes they want, because the people will remember that a candidate of the Republican Party for President, when he was taxed with making promises and was asked why he did not keep them, said it was all campaign oratory. So I ask today whether it was campaign oratory when distinguished Senators on this floor, who were delegates to the Republican Convention on the 27th day of June 1944, made a promise and said, "We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission." Were they on the square then, or were they making campaign promises? Was it campaign oratory when they said, "The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections, and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition?" Did they mean to keep that promise, or was it campaign oratory, when they went to Pittsburgh and to Indianapolis and to the South Side of Chicago looking for votes? Which was it? I say that when they voted to table my amendment on segregation they supplied the answer.

The same applies to what they said in the platform about lynching. When this boy said he could not get a place to sleep, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] asked:

Do you see any menace in communism in America?

Mr. GUINIER. The menace that I see, Mr. Senator, is where our Congress——

Senator FERGUSON. We are trying to get light on that.

Mr. GUINIER. Yes; I am giving you the menace that you ought to pay attention to, and that is the menace where fourteen or fifteen million Negroes—there is no place for them to turn to feel that they are protected.

They turn to Truman and what does he say? He says he has given an order to the Secretary of Defense to abolish discrimination in the armed services. Two weeks later, the Secretary of the Army, Kenneth Royall, states that he is not going to do it. Last week, Kenneth Royall states that he is going to maintain discrimination in the armed services.

What is the situation now, Mr. President? What can this poor colored man in uniform do? The Republican Party does not keep its promises. The President of the United States says that he has given an order to the Secretary of Defense to abolish discrimination in the armed services, and 2 weeks later Kenneth Royall, Secretary of the Army, says that he is going to maintain discrimination in the armed services.

This young man says:

What sort of thing is it when the President of the United States says the Secretary of Defense must abolish discrimination and the Secretary of the Army tells the President of the United States to go to hades?

I do not think that that is something that this committee can be quiet about. I agree with the point that Senator LANGER made that this Congress should abolish discrimination and Jim Crow in the armed services, and that is something of immediate moment; that is the clear and present danger.

He continued:

I am ready to go back into the Army if it is necessary. I am not afraid of dying to preserve my country—

That is pretty good, Mr. President, for an extemporaneous speech before a United States Senate committee. It was not a prepared speech. This young man was talking from the very bottom of his heart.

I am ready to go back into the Army if it is necessary. I am not afraid of dying to preserve my country, but I say to you that you are doing everything to incite me not to want to go (back) into the Army by allowing Jim Crow to remain there in the Army. You are neglecting your duty—

He is talking to our Judiciary Committee, Mr. President, and I say he is right—

You are neglecting your duty. There is a clear and present danger of 15,000,000 Negroes being turned against their country because of the absence of action on the part of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the lack of action on the part of the Congress of the United States.

My union has brought cases of discrimination against the Negroes in the Federal service. Is anything done about it? No.

I can read you and I can give you photostatic copies of interoffice correspondence among the offices, when the application is from a Negro, the color is marked down on it including the State Department of General Marshall.

What are we supposed to do; take it?

Why do you not investigate the discrimination in the Federal departments? We are citizens, we have the right to have a job in the Federal departments without Jim Crow.

The New York Times, in January of 1947, carried a story showing that there were 14 different Federal departments today that discriminate against Negroes in one form or another.

Have you done anything about it?

Mr. President, I shall omit the next 2 pages and come back to Mr. Guinier's testimony on page 819. He is talking still to our Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] presiding. This young Negro man who has been in the Army said:

The point I want to make is there is absolutely no way to fight against discrimination without being accused of inciting to racial violence. It is impossible, for example, if you believe in democracy, to go to Georgia, or to go to Alabama, as Senator TAYLOR went to Alabama, and to believe in democracy in Alabama and to want to be able to want to go into a Negro church in Alabama as Senator TAYLOR wanted to do and was arrested and convicted.

Senator TAYLOR, a Member of the United States Senate, arrested in Alabama for what? For going into a Negro church; because he is a white man.

Now Senator TAYLOR could be accused under this bill of inciting racial upheaval, of wanting to overturn the traditions of the South. Well, my God, I want to overturn those Jim Crow practices. I will never agree to the Jim Crow practices of the South even if Rankin should be President of the United States or Attorney General of the United States. I will never accept it.

My forefathers did not accept the Dred Scott decision and they were right in not accepting it because the Dred Scott decision, if accepted, would have meant that we would have had perpetual slavery in this country. So I say to you, do not try to intimidate people, do not try to intimidate people. If we are right we can let things go to the ballot and make a decision there.

This is another part of Mr. Guinier's testimony on page 820, starting at the bottom line:

I think it is something that the Judiciary Committee ought to take notice of, and they ought to stop intimidating American citizens because in 1776, we were not intimidated.

I repeat what I said on Friday, Mr. President, that the first man killed in the Revolutionary War was a Negro who was killed in Boston. Go there and you will see the plaque containing the name Crispus Attucks. Mr. Guinier said:

We were not intimidated in 1776.

Then he further said:

There were Negroes in the Civil War, right in the Confederacy, that were not intimidated, they fought back because they were fighting for freedom and they are going to fight today. They went into the army, a million Negro veterans, and 700,000 of them in the South cannot even get their terminal leave. Why? Because when they go to the post office and ask for blanks of terminal leave, they are told, "We do not have any."

When they try to go some place to get them notarized, they are told they cannot notarize it. Why are you not looking to those present dangers of the democracy? Why do you not stop raising this red bogey the way Hitler did? Hitler raised the bogey that the Communists set fire to the Reichstag. At Nuremberg what did the prosecutor bring out? They brought out the fact that Goering set fire to the Reichstag.

Here is another point which is very important. If any Senator upon the floor says that we have been too busy to take

care of the antilynching bill, the anti-poll tax bill, and a bill to create the FEPC, I suggest that he read what this young Negro told the Committee on the Judiciary.

You should defend the rights of the American people instead of trying to put over a bill like this.

It is the Mundt bill we are talking about.

Why do you not investigate the profits that the big industries have been making? Do you know that in 1935 to 1939 corporate business after taxes made $5,000,000,000?

In 1947 these same corporate businesses, after taxes, are making $17,000,000,000, over three times as much as they did before the war. Why do you not do something about that? Why did you take off the excess-profits tax in 1945, so that these companies can make four times or three times their profits? Has there been any worker that makes three times the wages he made before the war?

When the Congress met the leaders of the Republican Party had a great deal to say about keeping our election promises to the people. They said, "We must reduce income taxes. We promised the people we would reduce taxes; and an election promise is made to be kept." The walls of this Chamber resounded with the voices of Republican leaders who wanted to reduce taxes because they said it was a campaign promise. I have looked through the promises made by the Republican Party. I cannot find that the party said it was going to reduce income taxes. However, I find on page 146 of the proceedings a very solemn pledge. The Republican Party said:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

That is a line and a half. I have not counted the number of letters. Probably there are 100 letters in it. But it is very simple. The Republican Party, including all the distinguished gentlemen whom I have named, some of whom were Senators, made that pledge. No one voted against it. The party said:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

The next heading is "Antipoll tax." The Republican Party pledged itself to the elimination of the poll tax.

When it came to the poor Indians, the Republican Party also made a pledge with respect to them. Some of them have had claims pending in the courts for more than a hundred years. The original Indian is dead, his son is dead, his daughters are dead, and now the grandchildren come along. The claims total billions of dollars. The Republican Party said, "It is not right to have that happen to the Indians. It is shameful."

Senators should have heard some of the beautiful speeches which I listened to over the radio, coming from the Republican Party. Some wonderful speeches were made at that convention. There were speeches by all kinds of distinguished persons. They were very anxious to make a good impression over the radio. On page 43 of the proceedings is found a part of a speech made by my friend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. I heard this over the radio, too, Mr. President. Let me quote it. The Senator from Pennsylvania said:

We hear too little about our fighting men. So much of their magnificent work is unknown to us here at home.

He is speaking, among others, about 1,000,000 Negroes.

The sacrifices made by the seaman in the hot hold of the ship who feeds the shells to the guns, the engineer who builds bridges under fire, the gunner in the fighting plane, the signalmen who lay the wires to the blazing front line, the medicos who evacuate the wounded, and the foot soldiers who are always in contact with the enemy are little known to the American people.

I agree with every word he said. Here is another paragraph from the speech of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania at the Republican convention:

It is a complicated organization hundreds of miles from the homeland. Its sole purpose is to help the foot soldier to gain and hold his objective. The foot soldier is the hard core of the fighting forces. His principal weapons are the rifle and the bayonet.

He moves toward the enemy's position. He is never out of sight of his foes. He crawls in the mud. He falls back. He goes forward. He cuts wires. He lies in water. He buries himself in the ground.

He waits. He swears. He prays. He sees comrades blown to pieces. He hears the moans of the wounded.

Yet he holds on. Then he goes forward again. With cold steel he makes the final rush. The objective is reached. He digs in. The line is consolidated. The counterattack is repulsed. The victory is won.

Among those millions of brave soldiers are men of black color, men of yellow color, and men of red color. I say that they should be treated alike in the armed forces of our Government. Certainly when one reads the eloquent speech made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania he must realize the sacrifice that is made by human beings of every color. I submit that it is a powerful argument in behalf of those who today, in my judgment, and in the judgment of President Truman's committee, are being discriminated against and are being segregated in the armed forces.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which appears in the current issue of a Lutheran magazine called the Eleventh Hour, published by the Lutheran Research Society of Detroit, Mich. This article bears the title "The Koch Treatment."

It describes the science developed by Dr. William Frederick Koch, of Detroit, Mich., for the treatment of prevailing diseases to which our twentieth-century civilization is heir.

I have personally watched the progress of this system of treatment over a period of years. I feel that it is deserving of the attention of everyone who is interested in the health of the American people.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this illuminating document printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KOCH TREATMENT

Fortunately for Canadian farmers in the Province of British Columbia, the Minister of the Department of Agriculture possessed an open mind.

This fact is saving cattle raisers into the millions of dollars annually. It is assuring them of better cows, steers, and beef than previously known.

Such ailments as Bang's disease, Johne's disease, and other fatal diseases that customarily make devastating demands upon dairy herds, are no longer fatal in British Columbia. Thanks to the integrity and foresight of Canadian physicians, veterinarians, and Government experts who recently completed a series of successful experiments with the Koch system for treating virulent diseases.

More about these investigations a little later.

But, be it known as a further warning against trying to suppress truth, that farmers in various parts of the United States are rising up in indignation, demanding the right to enjoy the same advantages as their Canadian brethren. Cattle raisers in South American countries, notably Brazil, have for years demonstrated the validity of the Koch treatment.

As an index to the stir now being created by American men of the soil, your editor has before him a document which may well become one of historical importance. It is a petition, drawn up by a group of Michigan farmers and submitted for signature to members of State legislature for their respective districts. It is dated April 1948, and says:

"We the undersigned members of the Michigan State legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States, through an appropriate committee to investigate the injunction imposed by a Federal court on William Frederick Koch, Ph. D., M. D., a pioneer in the field of research and treatment of cancer, inasmuch as recently discovered methods of treatment confirm the research of Dr. Koch, with the end in view of requesting the Attorney General of the United States to have said injunction dismissed, so that Dr. Koch can continue further research and practice in his field without restriction."

The document bears the signature of 25 legislators.

More about Dr. Koch's persecution a little later. * * *

Suffice to say that Michigan farmers are not letting their herds die while waiting for bureaucrats to lift an injunction that should never have been imposed. They are using Koch therapy anyway, thereby saving themselves and the public substantial sums of money in terms of cattle, beef, and dairy products.

Injustice temporarily denies the learned physician the right of recommending his treatment. But men living close to nature, who know values when they see them, are using the discovery just the same.

This reminds us of the man of old who insisted the world was round and that it moved on its axis. In stocks, suffering excruciating pain, he cried out that his tormentors were right—the earth was flat and stationary. But when given his freedom, he confided to a friend that the earth had been moving all the time.

Denial of the earth's rotundity did not cause the solar system's wheels to stop.

Dr. Albert L. Wahl, a New York physician of enviable attainments, says in his book, A Least Common Denominator in Antibiotics: "In the philosophy of medicine, the last word has not been said. Nor, of course, is it presumed that the present writing en-

compasses the final dictum. But in the words of the Old Testament, 'God has worked a new thing,' and this new thing (the Koch treatment) is substantiated by extensive clinical observation. And the facts press hard upon our present concepts, not only of clinical pathology, but of the chemistry of immunity, and clamour for a revision of our philosophy of medicine."

Dr. William J. Hale of the Dow Chemical Co. says: "Dr. William Frederick Koch is modern Pasteur."

Prof. Joseph Maisin of Louvain University, Belgium, stated to the Canadian Cancer Commission in 1940: "The Koch formula should not be called merely a cancer cure. It is a very important step in medicine and is apt to change the whole picture of medicine and pathology. Dr. Koch is doing wonderful things."

It is an interesting story how Koch therapy began to be applied to animals:

Dr. D. H. Arnott, of London, Ontario, first applied the system in the cure of human diseases in 1926. Other physicians and scientists became deeply interested in the cures effected. While convinced that Dr. Koch had discovered new and useful therapeutic chemicals, the kind of data customarily accumulated by animal experiments was lacking. This led to the amazing results that farmers are now enjoying.

The Honorable K. C. MacDonald, Minister of Agriculture of British Columbia, called a group of experts together at Vancouver on October 4, 1944. It was agreed that the Koch method of treating diseases which were then ravaging fine dairy herds, should be carefully studied.

Two divergent views were expressed at this meeting: (1) Educational, scientific, and administrative authorities present, took the position that reports of cures were fantastic and too good to be true, (2) Practical men, farmers who had seen the demonstrations with their own eyes, testified that results were being realized exactly as claimed.

On page 16 of his 1944 report, the Minister stated: "There were many dairymen present who made astounding claims for the Koch treatment. In practically all cases the dairymen claimed that their cows responded almost immediately. These cattle owners were emphatic in their request that no action be taken which would prevent their obtaining Koch treatments when required."

One leading breeder told how the Koch treatment had saved an especially good cow given up to die. He explained that it developed mastitus during lactation. A veterinary surgeon advised him to have the animal removed from the herd and slaughtered. There was danger of the infection spreading.

Instead, the Koch treatment was applied. The action consisted of one dose of the thereapeutic reagent being administered by hypodermic syringe under the skin of the neck. Recovery was instantaneous and within a week the cow's milk was being sold to the creamery.

Other breeders related similar experiences. Thereupon it was unanimously agreed that the Department of Agriculture should investigate the merits of the system. The official declaration appears on page 16 of the agricultural department's 1944 report: "The Minister stated that it was his desire to form an opinion based upon accurate investigations and he named a committee to undertake this investigation."

Mr. MacDonald's words of instruction were: "I am Minister, and gentleman, I am determined to get at the truth."

Two veterinarians were appointed by members of the committee to work together. Animals were to be examined and their diseases classified. It was agreed that no clinical problem would be rejected because of the severity of the disease. The joint opinion of the owner and the two veterinarians was to be accepted as final. Field work was begun in November 1944 and completed in September 1945. A Government laboratory and a private laboratory duplicated each other's work and checked up on the bacteriology and other analyses required for the test.

The results were nothing short of astounding to members of the committee. Everything that the Koch Laboratories, located at 8181 East Jefferson Avenue, in Detroit, anticipated, came to pass. It was fitting that the final report published by the Government of British Columbia should have contained a statement by Dr. Arnott. He summed up the Koch theory of treatment as follows:

"Life is promoted, sustained, and reproduced by the use of food. For good health the supply must be adequate in amount and in variety. For the best normal results it is necessary that the food be well digested, and also that the potential energy contained therein be transferred into living energy throughout the body at a vigorous rate, burning the food properly in each individual cell where it unites with oxygen for this purpose.

"This living chemical reaction is spoken of by medical science as 'internal respiration,' and it must take place continuously because nature has not provided any reservoir wherein oxygen may be stored, to be drawn upon at will or in time of need. It is upon the degree approaching perfection with which food is thus turned into living energy consistently that conditions requisite for good health are best maintained, that diseases are best resisted, that life is best reproduced.

"It is Dr. Koch's belief that a normal supply of these essential carbon compounds often can be renewed by the hypodermic administration of the reagents which he discovered."

The committee adopted a closing resolution which contained the following commendatory clause:

"That the observations justify a recognition of the working hypothesis of biological oxidation of the Koch treatment, meriting its further use in veterinary therapy."

And so, our Canadian friends are profiting from the wonderful achievements of the Koch science.

Dr. Koch began the treatment of cancer in 1918 and other diseases later.

He soon discovered interests existing in the United States that did not welcome recoveries from these deadly enemies of society to reach the public. Since that time he has had to constantly beat down the opposition in order to continue his work for the relief of suffering humanity.

The fundamentals of the Koch science may be succinctly stated as follows:

1. That the chemistry of natural immunity in the body is able to destroy the toxicity of germs.

2. When the body is invaded by toxic bacteria so full of poison that they spill over into the system, the oxidation mechanism must burn off these poisons or the person becomes ill.

3. The less able the system is to burn, or oxidize, the poisons, the weaker the person becomes. When the oxidation mechanism fails to burn off any poison, the victim dies.

4. The Koch Laboratories have developed synthetic antitoxins which act as a catalyst in helping the body build up its oxidation mechanism equal to the task of destroying these toxins. When natural immunity is restored the person recovers.

5. Cancer behavior is a protective response to a toxic product generated within the body. Dr. Koch summarized the matter many years ago in a scientific paper from which the following sentences are reproduced:

"Clinical observation discloses the persistence of toxemia over a period even as long as 20 years previous to the advent of the growth. After the growth has come these toxic manifestations disappear, or nearly so. After surgical removal of the growth they return and with recurrence of the growth again disappear. We designate these symptoms as the progrowth symptoms, for they differ from these consequent to the activity of the growth itself.

"The strongest and the sufficient proof that cancer is a response of protection against a definite toxin, however, rests with the fact that removal of the toxin and destruction of the toxin source is followed by complete involution of all cancer tissue, complete healing of the regions involved, return to health with absence of growth and progrowth symptoms, and the absence of recurrence."

6. Diet occupies a prominent place in the practical application of the system.

Testimonials like the following by Dr. Wahl could be multiplied to fill several large volumes:

"Over a year ago, my sister was dying of lymphosarcoma, a disease which the profession regards as invariably fatal. The diagnosis was made by Dr. H. H. Permar, of Mercy Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa., on the basis of biopsy study No. 1171, May 1, 1946. The medical staff of Mercy Hospital had previously made a diagnosis of lymphosarcoma or Hodgkin's disease.

"The case was far advanced at the time, my sister having been practically bedridden for 6 months because of weakness and recurrent infections. The masses of lymphoid tissue did not have to be palpated; they stood out on the sides of her neck and in her axillae and groins like bunches of grapes mixed with walnuts.

"When the diagnosis of lymphosarcoma had been made, and I had received written commiseration from a top-ranking staff member of Mercy Hospital, it never occurred to me to do other than offer my sister the straw hope of deep X-ray therapy. Everyone who examined her thought she would be dead within a few weeks.

"I refused to listen to my father's recommendations that my sister be treated with a substance built up from the conjugated systems of carbonyl and ethylene linkages. Because of American Medical Association propaganda, I believed that the results previously reported with this therapy 'approached the acme of quackery.'

"However, my father did have my sister treated, since he personally knew of cases of cancer which were cured and remained cured after its use. This type of cancer is fatal in 3 to 6 months, as a rule.

"My sister was in the last stages and was said to have only a few weeks to live, according to the best knowledge on the subject. She recovered after one dose in characteristic fashion.

"Then and there, I decided to undertake an independent investigation of the treatment. I have been irrevocably convinced of the great value of this treatment.

"The American Medical Association is not yet convinced after 25 years. But that is an old story."

William Frederick Koch was graduated bachelor of arts at the University of Michigan in 1909 and later received the degrees of master of arts (1910), and doctor of philosophy (1917). He received his medical degree at the Detroit College of Medicine.

During 1910–13 he was instructor in histology and embryology at the University of Michigan, and for 5 years, 1914–19, professor of physiology in the Detroit Medical College.

Comparisons are odious, but Dr. Koch has been described by authorities as "the world's greatest living chemist"; "the discoverer of a new science which charts the future course

of the medical profession"; "one who cannot be bought, coerced, or intimidated"; "a Christian gentleman of courage and distinctive attainments"; and "a man of amazing capacities."

No one who knows him well and understands the humanitarian spirit that animates his every deed will deny that the foregoing descriptions apply.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if this bill for the armed services is so good, even without my amendments, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota why the 12 leading Protestant churches are against it. They have met, and they have discussed the plan. All 12 leading Protestant denominations are against it. Surely those church people are not unpatriotic. Later in this debate I shall place in the RECORD the resolutions adopted by them.

Mr. President, it is very strange, indeed, that nearly all the presidents of institutions of higher learning are opposed to this plan. In my own State we have a board of higher education, which has jurisdiction over our agricultural college, our State university, and our State normal schools. That board adopted a resolution—I believe it was unanimously adopted—against universal military training. Why? Mr. President, one day I received from the president of the State Normal School of North Dakota, with headquarters at Ellendale, N. Dak., a letter with which was enclosed a very beautiful pamphlet telling all about the beauties of a college of universal military training at Knoxville, Tenn. Up until that time, I did not know the Army was operating a universal military training program. That was 17 months ago. We decided to investigate the personnel of that universal military training college in Tennessee; so a subpena was issued and the officials of that college were brought before the Civil Service Committee. We wished to find out who had given them authority to organize a universal military training college. To our surprise, we found that it had been in operation for quite some time; two classes already had been graduated, with 600 in each class; and a third class was about to graduate—thus making a total of 1,800 graduates. When we asked the officials of that college, whom we subpenaed, who organized that college, we were told that it was done by direct orders of General Eisenhower. The general never denied it. Later he gave an interview saying that he had ordered it. So it is obvious that when the Army officials were getting ready to have passed a bill providing for universal military training, they had had some experience along that line. So far as I know, that school in Tennessee is still running, and still sends pamphlets to Idaho, California, Arkansas, and other States; and in those pamphlets the boys in those States and other States are told, "Come to Tennessee, to the School of Universal Military Training. Quit where you are going to school now"—as the boys at the normal school at Ellendale, N. Dak., were told in the pamphlet they received—"Quit where you are now, and come down to Tennessee." In the pamphlet were beautiful pictures of boys at the College of Universal Military Training walking down an avenue lined with lovely trees and fine recreation places; and such publications were sent all over the United States; they were sent to places where, in my opinion, those responsible for the pamphlet thought they could do the most proselyting.

So, Mr. President, the Army is all ready for universal military training.

As I asked the other day, Who is running this country, anyway? It is not the Senate of the United States. As the Army and Navy bulletin said—and I quoted it on Friday—this country is being run by the Army. If any American citizen is foolish enough to believe that the Congress is running the country, he should read the Army and Navy Bulletin, which states how the Army is running the country. Although the Congress did not appropriate one dollar for a universal military training college in Tennessee, such a college has been running there for 3 years, and it has graduated three classes. Of course, we appropriate money for West Point and for the Naval Academy and for the armed forces; but General Eisenhower said, "I want a college in Tennessee to teach young men universal military training, and I will establish it"—and he did, and three classes of 600 each have already been graduated from that college. When we brought the officials of that college before our committee, they paid very little attention to us, because they took their orders from General Eisenhower; and at that time he was head of the Army, so why should they worry about a little thing like establishing a school which graduates 600 students every few months? Of course they did not worry.

Mr. President, I have some other amendments which I shall offer in due course. I wish to present the record. First, I should like to refer once more to the Republican Party's platform, which was adopted by the Republican Party on June 27, 1944. That platform was not arrived at simply by reaching up into the sky and bringing down one plank at a time. Oh, no; that is not what happened. At the Republican Party's convention which adopted that platform, the delegates sang the National Anthem. Those men wanted to do a good job, so they appointed a committee. The committee went out to draw up a platform. While the committee was doing that, a great Republican made a speech—the Hon. Earl Warren, of California. That speech commences on page 45 of the booklet of the official proceedings of the Republican Party at that convention. He began as follows:

Delegates to the Republican National Convention, fellow Americans, we are here to do a job for the American people, and we mean business.

At which point there was great applause.

What is our job? Ask any American. Ask the anxious American mother and father. Ask the anxious wives and sweethearts of our fighting men.

They, Mr. President, are the very men my amendments are designed to help.

Ask our fighting men themselves. They will tell you what our job is.

Mr. Warren continued:

They will give you the keynote for this convention. They will tell you out of their hearts, and what they say will be the same—East and West, North and South, it will be the same. For now the same anxieties are on every American heart; the same hour-to-hour concern for what the day may bring forth; the same steadfast courage to sustain them; the same dreams; the same hope that they will have a chance to make their dreams come true.

This is what is on their hearts. This is our job:

To get our boys back home again—victorious and with all speed.

It is then stated there was a great deal more applause. The distinguished Governor of California continued:

This is our job: * * *

To open the door for all Americans; to open it, not just to jobs, but to opportunity.

Our job is to open the door for all Americans, Mr. President, not merely for white Americans.

To make and guard the peace so wisely and so well that this time will be the last time that American homes are called to give their sons and daughters to the agony and tragedy of war.

Mr. President, listen to this:

We know there is only one answer to these questions.

Governor Warren continued:

We know also that that answer makes our job. To get that job done is why we are here. This convention and this election are not time out from the job of winning the war and the peace. This convention and this election are part of that job. We are here to speed the cause; to help America to speed the cause for which our fighting men are giving their lives. We are here to make the road on which America can march toward victory, toward opportunity, toward peace.

Listen to this, from the keynote speech of the Republican convention:

In that spirit we can be confident of the future. It will not be easy. We have nothing easy to offer. Dark days lie ahead. We have no tricks to escape them. We expect tough going and we are ready for it. There is no pessimism, no defeatism, no bitterness, no jauntiness among us. Too much that we love and cherish is at stake. And of one thing we are sure: America can come through these trying, desperate times a finer, happier, better-spirited America. It is our purpose to see to it that America does come through that way.

That is what the American people expect the Republican Party to accomplish. They are already turning to us for its accomplishment. That is why, in so many streams of late, they have been changing so many horses. That is why—in city halls, courthouses, and State capitols, where government is closest to the people, the people have returned to Republican government. That is why, in election after election, they are restoring Republican leadership to Congress.

The people did this not just because they wanted a change; they did it because they wanted a chance. As times become more critical, as their problems became more complex, as strange policies and questionable practices added to their difficulties and increased their confusions, they instinctively returned to the Republican Party.

In Congress, from 16 Republicans in the Senate in 1937, the people have now elected 37; from 88 Republicans in the House of Representatives, the people have now elected 212.

At that, the convention rose in great applause.

From 8 Republican governors in 1938, the people have now elected 26. Three out of every four Americans now live under Republican State administrations. In Washington, where the bureaucrats live, there is still a Democrat in the White House. But out where the people live, the country is predominantly Republican.

That is the kind of speeches which were made.

In those 26 Republican States, the people have already elected the kind of government which the job ahead of us requires.

They are determined, this year, to have more of that kind of government. They are determined to have more of it in the States. They are determined to have more of it in Congress. They are determined to have more of it—a great deal more of it—in the White House.

I particularly call the attention of the distinguished Senator from California to what the great Governor of California said when he was delivering the keynote speech on the 26th day of June 1944. That is when they needed votes—v-o-t-e-s—and lots of them. So my distinguished friend, the Governor of California, in making the keynote address, said:

In those States where the people have returned to the Republican Party, government is not only for the people, but of and by the people.

That means not some of the people, but all of the people.

Then there was great applause.

Their kind of representative government ranges from ocean to ocean and from border to border. It extends to both sides of the tracks. It includes every citizen. That is why the platform of this convention will be one on which all of us can stand together—not divided by race or creed, not as minorities or majorities, but as fellow Americans.

No party that stands for less than that can unite America. A better world for others must begin with us. That is where in 26 of our States it has already begun.

Mr. President, that was a great speech. I commend it to the Republican leadership of the House and the Senate.

I read further from the speech:

In those States which are already Republican you will find the record of public administration is progressive, enlightened, and in the public interest. In those States you will find increased emphasis upon the public health, upon free education, upon care for orphaned and neglected children, upon support for the aged, for the victims of industrial accidents, for those handicapped by physical disabilities, and for the victims of economic misfortune.

Mr. President, this speech of Governor Warren is so good I think every Republican Senator and Representative should read it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Hon. Earl Warren, of California). Delegates to the Republican National Convention, fellow Americans, we are here to do a job for the American people. And we mean business. [Applause.]

What is our job? Ask any American. Ask the anxious American mother and father. Ask the anxious wives and sweethearts of our fighting men. Ask our fighting men themselves. They will tell you what our job is.

They will give you the keynote for this convention. They will tell you out of their hearts, and what they say will be the same—east and west, north and south; it will be the same. For now the same anxieties are on every American heart; the same hour-to-hour concern for what the day may bring forth; the same steadfast courage to sustain them; the same dreams; the same hope that they will have a chance to make their dreams come true.

This is what is on their hearts. This is our job:

To get our boys back home again—victorious and with all speed. [Applause.]

To open the door for all Americans; to open it, not just to jobs but to opportunity.

To make and guard the peace so wisely and so well that this time will be the last time that American homes are called to give their sons and daughters to the agony and tragedy of war. [Great applause.]

Isn't that a plain and homely story? But is there any other story which any American would put in place of it? Is there any other thing which, in his heart, any American wants more than these? Is there any American who would not give everything he has to bring these things to pass?

We know there is only one answer to these questions. We know, also, that that answer makes our job. To get that job done is why we are here. This convention and this election are not time out from the job of winning the war and the peace. This convention and this election are part of that job. We are here to speed the cause; to help America to speed the cause for which our fighting men are giving their lives. We are here to make the road on which America can march toward victory, toward opportunity, toward peace.

That is the biggest job Americans have ever undertaken together. It is too big a job for little Americans; it is too big a job for a quarreling America. There is room for honest differences among us. There is no room for disunity. We can be of differing minds, but we must be of one heart. [Applause.]

That singleness of heart is not something we can wait for. Our boys in Normandy, in Italy, in India, and China, in the far reaches of the South Pacific—they are not waiting for it. They are of one heart. What a highly courageous, steadfast heart it is.

What they ask of us, what they have the right to expect of us, is singleness of heart here at home. Freedom is in the balance. We dare not be found wanting.

For so great a venture together, we must be together. Here and now, we can begin to get together. That is our purpose. It is the purpose of this convention to put the public welfare above private self-interest [applause]; to put the Nation above the party [applause]; to put the progress of the whole American community above special privilege for any part of it [applause]; to put indispensable principles, one and for all, above indispensable men. [Great applause.]

The choice of me as a keynote speaker was not made because of any personal attribute of mine. There were others far abler who could have been chosen.

The only good reason I was chosen was because I come from the great, hopeful, energetic West. [Applause.] Ours is the youngest part of America. My own State of California was a child of 4 years when the Republican Party was born.

Growth and change and adventure are still a part of our daily life.

In the West there is little fear of failure and no fear of trying. [Applause.] That spirit of youth is the spirit of this convention. [Great applause.]

Certainly we are not here to look for a road back to some status quo. There is no status quo to which we could or should return. The future cannot be overtaken in reverse. Neither are we here to work out some easy sounding scheme whereby America can stand still. We believe that America wants to get going and keep going. A forward-going America is what we are here for. [Applause.]

In that spirit we can be confident of the future. It will not be easy. We have nothing easy to offer. Dark days lie ahead. We have no tricks to escape them. We expect tough going and we are ready for it. There is no pessimism, no defeatism, no bitterness, no jauntiness among us. Too much that we love and cherish is at stake. And of one thing we are sure: America can come through these trying, desperate times a finer, happier, better-spirited America. [Applause.] It is our purpose to see to it that America does come through that way. [Applause.]

That is what the American people expect the Republican Party to accomplish. They are already turning to us for its accomplishment. That is why, in so many streams of late they have been changing so many horses. [Applause.] That is why—in city halls, courthouses, and State capitols, where government is closest to the people—the people have returned to Republican government. [Applause.] That is why, in election after election, they are restoring Republican leadership to Congress. [Applause.]

The people did this not just because they wanted a change; they did it because they wanted a chance. [Applause.] As times became more critical, as their problems became more complex, as strange policies and questionable practices added to their difficulties and increased their confusions, they instinctively returned to the Republican Party.

In Congress, from 16 Republicans in the Senate in 1937, the people have now elected 37; from 88 Republicans in the House of Representatives, the people have now elected 212. [Great applause.] From 8 Republican Governors in 1938, the people have now elected 26. [Great applause.] Three out of every four Americans now live under Republican State administrations. [Applause.] In Washington, where the bureaucrats live, there is still a Democrat in the White House. But out where the people live, the country is predominantly Republican. [Applause.]

In those 26 Republican States, the people have already elected the kind of government which the job ahead of us requires.

They are determined, this year, to have more of that kind of government. [Applause.] They are determined to have more of it in the States. They are determined to have more of it in Congress. They are determined to have more of it—a great deal more of it—in the White House. [Great applause.]

In those States where the people have returned to the Republican Party government is not only for the people, but of and by the people. That means not some of the people, but all of the peaple. [Applause.] Their kind of representative government reaches from ocean to ocean and from border to border. It extends to both sides of the tracks. It includes every citizen. That is why the platform of this convention will be one on which all of us can stand together—not divided by race or creed, not as minorities or majorities, but as fellow Americans. [Great applause.]

No party that stands for less than that can unite America. A better world for others must begin with us. [Applause.] That is where in 26 of our States it has already begun.

In those States which are already Republican, you will find the record of public administration is progressive, enlightened, and in the public interest. In those States you will find increased emphasis upon the public health, upon free education, upon care for orphaned and neglected children, upon support for the aged, for the victims of industrial accidents, for those handicapped by physical disabilities, and for the victims of economic misfortune.

Those are the States of this Union where labor has achieved its highest dignity; where labor and management have come to their best understanding; where they have learned to work together most effectively; where, together, they are doing the best job. [Great applause.]

What is the result of that kind of government? I can tell you. I can tell you in terms that every American with a son fighting overseas will understand. To win the war in the air, those Republican States have been called on to produce more than 81 percent of all our airplanes. [Applause.] To win the war at sea, those States have been called on to produce more than 76 percent of all our ships. [Applause.] To win the war on land, those States have been called on to produce more than 87 percent of all our ordnance—and more than 83 percent of all our other fighting equipment. [Applause.]

The American people were introduced, not long ago, to Dr. Win-the-War. From the record of these States it is clear that Dr. Win-the-War is a Republican. [Great applause.]

But this war cannot be fought and won as Republicans or Democrats. This is an all-American war. There is a place for every American in it. There is no place of honor for any American who is not in it.

In or out of office, Republicans and Democrats share the responsibility of winning the war. We want to share it in the same spirit in which the sons of all of us fight from the same fox holes, through the same jungles, across the same beaches, in the same ships at sea and in the air. [Applause.]

The generals who command our armies, the admirals who command our fleets, are no more Republican or Democrat than the armies and the fleets which they command. They are not a product of politics. They are products of our nonpolitical Military Establishment. Their concern is not with the party in power—whether it is Republican or Democratic. Their concern is how to get the men and the materials out where the war will be won. They know how to run the war, and we will see to it that they have the opportunity to run it without political interference. [Great applause.]

Our purpose is to see that the country is responsive to their military leadership; to stand back of them through good days and bad; to see to it that they get the materials needed for victory.

How well that victory can be won; how magnificently it can be won when government unites all the people to win it, is plainly written in the record of those 26 States whose governments are now Republican. That is what needs to be done for the Nation as a whole. To that we dedicate ourselves as our first objective; to keep the war out of politics and politics out of the war [applause]; to strengthen, among us, that spirit of single-mindedness, of unity, of self-forgetfulness that will hearten our military leaders, strengthen their hands and speed the day when having bivouacked along the main streets of Germany and Japan, they will lead our boys victoriously home again. [Great applause.]

But when the war is won, what then? We will have 11,000,000 men and women out of uniform. We will have millions of war workers whose war work has stopped. We will have tens of thousands of businessmen whose war contracts have been canceled.

What will those millions of Americans want? They will want what is the right of every American to have. They will want jobs. By jobs, they do not mean made jobs, with the Government as employer. That is not what we mean either. They mean money-making jobs in private industry. Those are the kind of jobs we mean, too. [Applause.]

But these young people will not be satisfied with just jobs. We will not be satisfied, either. These young people will want good jobs and a chance to get ahead. Hundreds of thousands of them will want to set up in small businesses for themselves; to be their own boss; to have their own farm; to own their own filling station; to run their own store, or operate their own little factory. [Applause.]

We will see to it that they get that chance. [Applause.] We can see to it because we know what it is that makes jobs and opportunity. We know that Government does not make them—not the kind of jobs the people want and which we aim to help the people to get. Government is nonproducing. It lives off the production of others. Government-made jobs can be a crisis necessity. But such jobs are not good enough for the long pull. For the long pull, the American people want a highway, not a dead-end street. [Great applause.]

The belief that we have come to the end of the road, that a dead-end street is all that we have ahead of us—that will not produce jobs and opportunity either. That belief is defeatism. The fruit of defeatism is an economy of scarcity. We know what scarcity produces. It produces scarcity of jobs, of opportunity, of the good things of life.

We know what it is that makes jobs and opportunity. We know that private production makes them. We know that our productive system going full blast can make enough of them. It is the Republican Party that has kept that knowledge alive in America. We have kept it alive against great odds. And now the country knows how important it is that the Republicans kept that knowledge alive. For that confidence in our productive system and the know-how to get that system into full-blast production made the difference, when war came, between life and death. The same knowledge and the same know-how will make the difference when the war is won

But we Republicans also know that full-blast production—and the jobs and opportunity which it makes—can only come in a climate that is friendly to production. A climate that is friendly to production requires a government that is friendly to production. It requires a government which believes that our economic soil, far from being worn out, is still life-giving; a government which believes that those who work honorably and well to make that soil produce, far from being a threat to our well-being, are the hope of it; a government which, far from penalizing production, encourages it; a government which believes in an economy of plenty because its aim for all the people is abundance.

In such a climate, labor and management will not be set off, one against the other. They will realize—government can help them to realize—that they do not represent two different systems; that they are, rather, part of the same system. They will understand that they are partners in that system. If, for any reason, one partner fails, both will be destroyed. They will understand, also, that such a partnership system exists for more than profit; that its even more important reason for existence is the increasing security and well-being of all the people.

With such an understanding of their relationship to each other and their responsibility to the community, labor and management can reconcile their day-to-day differences in order, together, to make full production possible. It is a Republican responsibility to foster that climate and speed that understanding. That we will do. [Great applause.]

In such a climate also the farm will no longer be set off against the city, the city against the farm. Farmer and city dweller will come to see that they do not represent two rival economic communities; that, in fact, they are partners in the same community. They will understand that bad times for one mean bad times for the other; that good times for one must include good times for the other. It is a Republican responsibility to speed that understanding and foster a climate in which prosperity is possible for both. That also we will do. [Great applause.]

We know that this can be done. We know that the people expect us to do it. They have turned to us because, under the threat of war, they wanted to get going. When the war is won they want to keep going toward full, peacetime production that will insure not jobs alone but opportunity and a fair and increasing share of life's good things. To that we dedicate ourselves as our second objective. [Applause.]

But to insure such a future this war must end in something better than an armistice. This war must end in peace. [Great applause.] For our homes, our sons, and our daughters this time must be the last time. [Great applause.]

In their hearts the American people know what kind of peace they want. They may differ upon details, but they are agreed upon the things that are really important. What is needed is effective leadership, honestly and vigorously to carry into realization the aspirations upon which our people are united.

We want a peace that will be lasting. That means a peace that will be just. That means not only justice for the few and powerful but justice also for the many and less powerful. [Great applause.]

We want a peace that is based upon realities and not upon the insecure foundation of mere words or promises. That means a peace which, being mindful of the interest of other nations, does not neglect or sacrifice the interests of our own Nation. [Great applause.]

None of these aspirations can be realized under a leadership that plays power politics on a world-wide stage. They cannot be achieved under a leadership which neglects the interests of America. No such leadership can hope to keep the world's respect or to unite America in helping to solve the world's problems. Nor can they ever be achieved by a leadership which holds itself superior to the wisdom of the people. [Great applause.]

As Republicans, we are united in uncompromising opposition to aggression. [Applause.] We are prepared to take a definite stand against aggression, not merely to denounce it but to resist it and restrain it. [Great applause.] That calls for effective cooperation with all the peace-loving nations of the world; for the establishment of a tribunal for the settlement of international disputes which otherwise might lead to war. We are agreed, too, that if such a program is to be effective, the friendly cooperation of the war's principal Allied combatants—the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China—is as essential as the keystone of an arch. [Great applause.] But beyond that is the task of establishing order, maintaining peace, and extending prosperity. We stand ready to welcome every nation that is prepared in honesty and good will to join with us in the accomplishment of that purpose. [Applause.] And we know that if we are to maintain respect among the nations of the world, if we are to be able to keep our own commitments and to compel recalcitrants to keep theirs, we must keep America ever strong and self-reliant. [Great applause.]

The Republican Party has not waited to declare these principles. At the Mackinac Conference we blazed the way for them. The future of America and the happiness of our children depend on their establishment.

Whatever the exact procedures, on these principles the American people, in their hearts, agree. I do not believe that any sound American political party could say more. I am sure that in good conscience, no such political party can say less. [Great applause.]

This is the job we are here to do. These are the things about which we mean business: To get the boys victoriously back home; to open the door to jobs and opportunity; to make a peace that this time will be lasting. This is too great an undertaking for petty politics, for name calling or for hate making. There is no place among us for malcontents. We are in no mood for torchlight jubilation. Whether we win as a party is of less importance to us than whether we win as a Nation. [Great applause.]

There has been progress in every decade of American history. Progress is an American habit. We do not propose to deny the progress that has been made during the last decade. Neither do we aim to repeal it. Whatever its source, if it is good we will acknowledge it. If it is sound we will build on it. If it is forward looking we will make use of it as we go forward from here.

Neither do we aim to turn the clock back and make an issue of every administration mistake in the past 11 years. We are less concerned about these past errors than about the direction in which for the future we are going. [Applause.]

We believe the New Deal is leading us away from representative government. We believe that its centralization of power in the numerous bureaus at Washington will eventually destroy freedom as Americans have always understood it—freedom in the home, freedom of individual opportunity in business and employment, freedom to govern ourselves locally. [Great applause.]

We believe the New Deal is destroying the two-party system. [Applause.] The New Deal is no longer the Democratic Party. [Applause.] It is an incongruous clique within that party. [Applause.] It retains its power by patronizing and holding together incompatible groups. It talks of idealism and seeks its votes from the most corrupt political machines in the country. [Great applause.] The leaders of its inner circle are not representatives of the people. [Applause.] They are the personal agents of one man. [Applause.] Their appointments to public office are not made on the basis of efficiency or public approval, but on the basis of loyalty to the clique only. [Applause.] Under their rule, the Constitution has been short-circuited. The Cabinet has ceased to be a voice and has become an echo. [Applause.] Congress, wherever possible, has been circumvented by Executive decree. Both Congress and the judiciary have been intimidated and bludgeoned to make them servile. [Applause.] Over all of this—and over all of us—is the ominous, gargantuan figure of an arrogant, power-intoxicated bureaucracy. [Applause.] Nowhere in its vast domain has it been satisfied with merely one bureaucrat, if by hook or crook desks could be found for two. [Applause.] These bureaucrats of the New Deal tell the farmer what to sow and when to reap—sometimes without regard for either the seeds or the season. [Applause.] They require him to work in the fields all day and keep books for the Government all night. [Applause.] These same bureaucrats tell the worker what union he shall join, what dues he shall pay, and to whom he may pay them. They soon will tell the worker where he can work and where he cannot work. Then the workers of America will be a long way down the road toward that kind of government which our Nation is now resisting with all its power. [Great applause.]

These bureaucrats encumber the small-business man with a multiplicity of rules, regulations, orders, and decrees which entangle him, stifle his business, and darken his future. They move in, like political commissars, to watch over the shoulders of our industrialists, to say what, where, and how industry can produce.

They have threatened our free press. They have intimidated our free radio. They are using every device and excuse to insinuate themselves into control over the public schools of our States. [Applause.] They have injected a low grade of politics into the administration of relief and social welfare.

They have bypassed the governments of the States in an effort to destroy State effectiveness and compel the people to rely solely upon the New Deal clique at Washington for the solution of all their problems. [Applause.]

For years they have deprived entire regions of representation in the policy-making agencies of the Federal Government. [Applause.]

To perpetuate themselves in power the New Deal clique has always capitalized upon some crisis. It has always had the indispensable man—the same man—for each succeeding crisis. [Great applause.] The first time it was the depression. The second time it was the recession. Last time it was to keep us out of war. [Applause.] This time it will be to achieve peace. [Applause.] The next time—who knows what crisis it will be? That there will be one and that the indispensable man will still be indispensable, we can rely upon the New Deal clique to assert. [Applause.] The New Deal came to power with a song on its lips: Happy Days Are Here Again. That song is ended. Even the melody does not linger on. Now we are being conditioned for a new song, Don't Change Horses in the Middle of the Stream. That melody isn't likely to linger either. For 11 long years we have been in the middle of the stream. We are not amphibious. We want to get across. We want to feel dry and solid ground under our feet again. [Great applause.]

The life of a nation is a succession of crises. War and peace and economic and social adjustments have always followed each other in endless succession. No party, clique, or individual can rightfully claim priority in government because a crisis occurs during its administration.

The Republican Party was born in a great crisis. The American people turned to it because they wanted to get safely, speedily through that crisis and get on their way again. Then as now, the Republican Party was called by the people to displace a regime of men who had grown tired, complacent, and cynical in the business of Government. [Applause.] Then as now, the Republican Party was called upon to replace a party that was torn with dissension and in revolt against itself. Then as now, the Republican Party was called by the people to furnish youth and vigor and vision.

Now as then, the Republican Party will respond to that call. It will represent the Nation, the whole Nation, and nothing but the Nation. [Applause.] It will devote itself fervently to the problems of the people and in everything it does the Constitution of the United States of America will be its guiding star. [Great applause.] It will function through established law and not through the caprice of bureaucratic regulation. There shall be one law for all men. [Applause.] Its greatest concern will always be for those who have the greatest need. It will conduct government openly where the people can see, discuss, and decide. It will operate less from the Government down and more from the people up. [Applause.] It will make wise and careful use of the people's money. It will keep the public's books in such a way as to allow the people to see how their money is used. [Great applause.] It will see that taxes are just, visible, and designed to stimulate rather than to punish. It will strengthen our great public-school system, keep it under the control of State and local government, where it is responsive to the people, and prepare it to play a stronger part in the life of the Republic. It will promote peace in industry by stimulating good will between labor and management. It will free the agencies of public information from the domination of government. It will make fully effective the immeasurable strength of the Nation by promoting good will and unity at home. It will not be cocksure in good times or depressed and cynical in bad times. [Applause.] It will direct our combined material and spiritual resources against the enemies of our country. It will make any sacrifice to achieve victory even one day sooner so our boys can come home. [Great applause.] It will see to it that they are cared for when they do come home. [Applause.] It and we will honor them the rest of our lives. [Great applause.]

But we will start building right now that finer America, which during their night vigils these men in arms dream of as they look at the stars from their fox holes on land and from their gun turrets at sea and in the air; the America that to them spells happy homes and freedom of opportunity for all; the America that represents unity at home and peace with the countries of the world.

It takes faith to build such an America—a strong faith, the same faith that now sustains our fighting men; a faith that is truly "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

With such a faith—which is our faith—we shall march under God toward victory, toward opportunity, toward peace.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to another paragraph in this great speech by Governor Warren. It is on page 55 of the convention proceedings, and reads as follows:

Now, as then, the Republican Party will respond to that call. It will represent the Nation, the whole Nation, and nothing but the Nation.

No other country, Mr. President; only America.

It will devote itself fervently to the problems of the people, and in everything it does the Constitution of the United States of America will be its guiding star.

Mr. President, that is the most beautiful language I have ever read. We have a Constitution which says that everybody shall be treated equally. So, when I offered my amendment I was surprised to find that some of the delegates who were at the convention at the time did not agree with me that the Constitution of the United States covers some of the problems whose solution was endorsed by the Republican Party. I thought they were covered, but, assuming they were not, I refer again to the Charter of the United Nations. Some of these very Senators voted for the United Nations Charter on the 28th day of July 1945.

I ask unanimous consent that section 3 of article I of the principles and purposes of the United Nations may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental

freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. LANGER. That included minorities.

I desire to recur to article 55, in the last part of the Charter. It is a most interesting article. I read it once this morning, but I am afraid that some of my Republican friends were out of the room at the time, and since there are so many of them present at this time, I want to read it again. It is headed "Chapter IX—International economic and social cooperation":

ART. 55. With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being, which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of people, the United Nations shall promote:

(a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

(b) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

(c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Of course that is pretty clear language, but it is not quite so clear as the Republican platform. The Republican platform, without any equivocation, in such language as the very simplest person could understand, contained the plank I have read. They wanted it in language so simple that every voter might be impressed by reading it and might understand it. They were looking for votes, and of course they had to have clean-cut, unequivocal language so that the voters could understand what they meant. Therefore the Republican Party, on the 27th of June 1944, adopted this platform, and many of my distinguished colleagues who are now on the floor of the Senate were present, at a time when they were looking for votes.

Mr. President, it is impossible not to admire this simple language. There is no equivocation about it. They said:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

That was all there was to it. It is so simple that no one can misunderstand it.

Then the very next paragraph has the headline "Anti-poll-tax." I wonder if some Republicans have read the platform. It says in large type, "anti-poll-tax," and this follows:

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

They were going to do it right away. They did not say, "We favor submission of a constitutional amendment for the abolition of the poll tax," oh, no, but they said, "We favor immediate submission." They were in a hurry about it.

The same is true of antilynching. They were like the boy whose testimony I read, who said he did not want to wait a thousand years for the antilynching law and the FEPC. This Republican convention was in dead earnest. They said:

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

I fear the distinguished Presiding Officer did not get these two points, and I want to be sure that he understands them, and realizes how very pertinent they are to the debate. Here was the Republican Party in convention assembled. It had sung the National Anthem, there had been a great speech, and they had appointed a committee on resolutions. The committee had gone out, and its desire was to write the very best kind of platform, in order to get votes. I call the attention of the Presiding Officer to the very simple language they used in order to get the votes. Here was the great Republican Party, which was out to redeem the world. They were not satisfied with redeeming America, they wanted to redeem the world. Some of my distinguished colleagues sat there and voted for this platform, and they made the language unequivocally clear:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation—

"Federal legislation." They did not merely say "legislation," they said "Federal legislation." These men voted for that.

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Either they meant that or they did not mean it. By their votes this morning, without criticizing a single one of my distinguished colleagues, whom I love so much, I say they did not seem to be in a great hurry. That is why I take up the next paragraph:

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

An "immediate" submission. How much longer will we have to wait before our Judiciary Committee reports the bill? As the colored boy said, "I do not want to wait a thousand years more."

Then we come to the antilynching paragraph of the Republican platform. They might have said, "We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its enactment," but they did not say that. They said:

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

Then we come to my friends, the Indians. The Indians have waited more than a hundred years to get what was due them. The Republican Party did not merely say they were going to take care of them, but they said:

We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation. We will take politics out of the administration of Indian affairs.

The Republicans are going to have another convention on the 21st of this month, and I suppose they will have some of the same clauses in the platform of this year which appeared in the platform of 1944. Perhaps this time they will drop the word "early" and will leave out the word "immediate." In any event, Mr. President, I want the country to know that one Republican believes that when campaign promises are made they should be kept.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is designed to assure to the members of the armed forces, insofar as it may be done by law, freedom from discrimination as practised by governmental officers or employees and those engaged in the business of providing public accommodations.

Despite the discrimination which has been practiced against minority groups in our country and in the armed forces, the members of those groups in our armed forces have served our country well. I believe, however, that it should be clear to every Member of the Senate that it is impossible to expect the last measure of devotion, the highest degree of morale, from those who suffer unjust discrimination on account of their race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion.

Moreover, discrimination in military service has a significance far beyond its effect upon those who are its direct victims. The damage to those who witness it and who are obliged to implement a policy of discrimination may well be greater. The President's Committee on Civil Rights has said:

It is impossible to decide who suffers the greatest moral damage from our civil rights transgressions, because all of us are hurt. That is certainly true of those who are victimized. Their belief in the basic truth of the American promise is undermined.

When do Senators suppose the child of a Negro or of a Mexican, or of a Japanese, or of an Indian, or of a Chinese, loses his faith in American institutions? It is when such a child for the first time realizes that because of his color he and his parents are being discriminated against.

The President's Committee continues:

But they do have the realization, galling as it sometimes is, of being morally in the right. The damage to those who are responsible for these violations of our moral standards may well be greater. They, too, have been reared to honor the command of "free and equal." And all of us must share in the shame at the growth of hyprocrisies like the "automatic" marble champion. All of us must endure the cynicism about democratic values which our failures breed.

The United States can no longer countenance these burdens on its common conscience, these inroads on its moral fiber.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield for a question. There is a rule which has been invoked under which I cannot yield for anything else.

Mr. MORSE. Then, I will wait until I secure the floor in my own right.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry that the rule has been invoked, because I do not know of any Senator to whom I would rather yield than the distinguished Senator from Oregon. However, I under-

stand the rule is being enforced at the request of the Senator from South Dakota. Otherwise I would be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). If the distinguished Senator from North Dakota will permit the Chair to say so, the Chair will say that he is in considerable sympathy with the situation in which the Senator from North Dakota finds himself. The Chair will point out, however, that what the Senator from South Dakota has requested is that the rules of the Senate be enforced. The Chair does not believe the Senator from South Dakota has requested anything other than that which is his privilege and which is proper for him to do.

Mr. LANGER. With that interpretation, Mr. President, I will yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota can yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question. It is that rule with respect to yielding which the Senator from South Dakota is asking to have enforced.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I can yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The Senator cannot, under the rule, yield for any other purpose.

Mr. LANGER. I understand the Senator from Oregon did not want to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon might want to ask a question. The Senator from North Dakota can yield for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. If I may explain, what the Senator from Oregon sought to do was to make a statement for the RECORD in regard to the vote which was taken in his absence earlier today. The Senator from Oregon thought the RECORD should show his position, but if I cannot make the statement while the Senator from North Dakota has the floor, I shall wait until I can make it at a later time. I probably shall make it at greater length than I would if I were permitted to interrupt and make it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Lynchings and riots find their place in the news and have an impact upon the conscience of millions. The daily practices of discrimination which violate the elementary concept of "fair play" which we are taught from infancy, eat into the moral fiber of our Nation.

By this bill every citizen, to whom its provisions are applicable, regardless of his station in life and regardless of his race, color, creed, or national origin would be required to enter the military services because the bill declares that it is necessary for the protection of the country for them to do so. If it is right for us to compel the youth of our Nation thus to serve in time of peace, we cannot fail to recognize our duty to assure them equal treatment within the armed services, and equal treatment in places of public accommodation. Should we now fail to accord this protection to the men called into service, they, together with all other Americans, will have just cause to doubt the sincerity of our commitment to democratic principles. Equality in military service assumes great importance as a symbol of democratic goals. The absence of such equality would also be a symbol and it would be recognized as such not only here at home, but also abroad.

In a letter to the Fair Employment Practices Committee on May 9, 1946, the Honorable Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State, said:

> The existence of discrimination against minority groups in this country has an adverse effect upon our relations with other countries. We are reminded over and over by some foreign newspapers and spokesmen that our treatment of various minorities leaves much to be desired. While sometimes these pronouncements are exaggerated and unjustified, they all too frequently point with accuracy to some form of discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin. Frequently we find it next to impossible to formulate a satisfactory answer to our critics in other countries; the gap between the things we stand for in principle and the facts of a particular situation may be too wide to be bridged. An atmosphere of suspicion and resentment in a country over the way a minority is being treated in the United States is a formidable obstacle to the development of mutual understanding and trust between the two countries. We will have better international relations when these reasons for suspicion and resentment have been removed. I think it is quite obvious * * * that the existence of discriminations against minority groups in the United States is a handicap in our relations with other countries.

That is what Dean Acheson said when he was on the State Department. He said—

> The existence of discrimination against minority groups in the United States is a handicap in our relations with other countries. The Department of State, therefore, has good reason to hope for the continued and increased effectiveness of public and private efforts to do away with these discriminations.

Discrimination against a minority group, especially within the armed forces and when directed at those who wear the uniform of our country, has in the past outraged, and will again outrage, a large portion of the world's population. The way in which we treat the members of our armed forces can have a vital influence upon the reservoir of good will which this Nation still enjoys in many parts of the world.

If we are to convince other people that our way of life is worthy of acceptance as the best way to fulfill the needs and aspiration of all people, we have the responsibility to give greater reality to our democratic ideals. Should this amendment be rejected, it will mean that the United States is not prepared to accord to those who are called upon to offer up their lives, if need be, for the safety of the Nation, the simple assurance of freedom from discrimination while they perform the duties Congress imposes on them. Not only do I say that that is true if my amendment is rejected, but it is true also if a motion is made to lay it on the table and the motion is carried.

Let us instead provide to all our people and to the world unmistakable evidence that we not only believe in equality, but also insist that it be accorded at least to the members of our armed forces.

Mr. President, in the last analysis we come back to the platform of the Republican Party. That was a great convention. Just think, Mr. President, who were some of the delegates at that convention. In my opinion that was one of the greatest Republican conventions ever held in the history of America. Who were some of the distinguished men in that Republican convention who represented their States? That was a great day in the history of the Republican Party. First of all, they met in the city of brotherly love. The red man, the yellow man, the white man, and the black man were all going to be brothers and sisters under the skin, according to the Republican platform. Here are the names of some of the distinguished men, outstanding jewels of the Republican Party, who voted for this great platform if they were present—and I assume they were present——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator care to define the word "jewel"?

Mr. LANGER. As a Republican, I should say that a jewel in a Republican convention would be everything that a Democrat is not. [Laughter.]

There were present at that convention these great jewels, Mr. President: Eugene D. Millikin, from Colorado; Raymond E. Baldwin, from Connecticut; C. Douglas Buck, from Delaware; John G. Townsend, Jr., a former great Senator, and still one of the outstanding individuals in the United States, representing Delaware; Dwight H. Green, of Chicago; C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois; James S. Kemper, of Illinois; Harrison E. Spangler, of Iowa; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Wallace H. White, of Maine; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts; our former colleague, Sinclair Weeks, of Massachusetts; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota. The other distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Ball, must have been present, because I notice that he seconded the nomination of Mr. Thomas E. Dewey. Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. Not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio; E. H. Moore, of Oklahoma; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; Carroll Reece, of Tennessee; and Chapman Revercomb, of West Virginia.

Those delegates put their heads together and said, "We are going to draw

up one of the finest platforms ever drawn up in the history of America. Of course, being human, the same as you and I, Mr. President, they wanted a platform which would attract votes, especially the votes of Indians and the votes of Negroes, and I suppose some of the votes of Mexicans in California. So they put in the platform, in unequivocal, simple language, so that a child could understand it:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation—

Not by a fine law such as the State of New York enacted. New York did an outstanding job in passing its FEPC bill. It is my understanding that the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. IVES] the distinguished Senator from New York, played a very important and leading part. By so doing he earned the everlasting gratitude of all the minorities in America.

These men and women, looking for votes, said:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent fair employment practice commission.

The platform continued:

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor the immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

This is what they said to the Indians:

We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation. We will take politics out of the administration of Indian affairs.

So far as I know, no single law taking the administration of Indian affairs out of politics has been passed. We passed a few Indian laws, in behalf of one tribe or another; but the general law applying to Indians still exists. On the contrary, one of my Republican colleagues has even introduced a bill to abolish the Indian Claims Commission, although some of the claims are 100 years old. The original claimants have died, the sons and daughters have died, and the grandchildren are trying to prosecute the claims.

Now I come back to the United Nations Charter. I have read the third subparagraph of article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations. Some of the very men now members of the Senate voted for the United Nations Charter and pledged themselves definitely that all over the world socially and culturally there should be abolished all discrimination as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Finally, Mr. President, I appeal to my Republican colleagues to support this amendment for the good of the country, for the sake of the Nation. But if some of them do not agree with me as to that, then I submit that they have promised these minority groups—and they did it at the Republican convention, as shown at page 146 of the proceedings of that convention—that they would take care of discrimination and segregation; and I read their promise:

We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in our armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and the adoption of corrective legislation.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment C, offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I was in attendance at a meeting this morning of a group of Senators and a group of Members of the House of Representatives from the Pacific Northwest who were considering the flood-control problem in that section of the country a record vote was taken on the first amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. It was a vote on the amendment which seeks to bring to an end segregation in the armed forces of the United States. The bell in the room of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs did not ring this morning, and that is the only reason for my nonattendance on the floor of the Senate at the time the vote was taken. I have explained the reason for my absence to the officials of the Senate, who have charge of notifying Senators of pending votes. They knew of my position on this particular amendment so they arranged a pair for me with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

However, in order that there may be no question about the position I would have taken had I been on the floor of the Senate this morning, Mr. President, let me say that I would have voted against tabling the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, just as I shall vote against tabling the amendment which he now offers.

Very briefly—because it is not my intention to speak at any great length—I wish to make a few extemporaneous remarks on the pending bill and amendments. First, I wish to commend the Senator from North Dakota for his commendable endeavor to bring to an end in the armed services of the United States discrimination because of race, color, or creed. I speak as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and I also speak as one who intends to vote for the final bill which will go from this body to the House of Representatives.

I shall vote for it because as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am satisfied that it is the best bill we could get from the Armed Services Committee by way of compromises which necessarily had to be entered into between and among the members of the committee. I hope we can adopt a few amendments on the floor of the Senate which will improve the bill. However, I certainly would not be fair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, if I did not make very clear to the Senate and for the RECORD at this time that the Senator from South Dakota has my highest commendation for the leadership he gave to the Armed Services Committee during the many weeks we worked on this bill. He was patient and very fair to each one of us as this bill passed through its various stages in the committee.

It was not an easy task which confronted the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. President, for a great many reasons. It was not easy because, at the beginning of our executive sessions, after long public hearings on proposed military manpower legislation, the Senator from South Dakota was confronted with a committee which was considerably divided among its members in points of view as to what form the final legislation should take. It was not easy, either, Mr. President, for the Senator from South Dakota, the chairman of the committee, because in the early weeks of our consideration of this proposed legislation we received such a diversity of points of view from the various branches of the armed services, such a conflict in their testimony, such, may I say, jurisdictional differences between and among the several branches of the armed services, that only through the leadership of such an able chairman as the Senator from South Dakota was there any hope that we could come forward even with a bill as good as that which finally reached the floor of the Senate from our committee.

On another occasion, Mr. President, I said on the floor of the Senate that I voted in committee to report the bill from the committee to the Senate because I was satisfied that we had reached the best composite point of view which we could possibly reach so far as any further consideration in the committee was concerned. I made very clear, in the brief speech which I made at that time on the floor of the Senate, that the bill was not the one I would write if I were writing a bill from beginning to end. However, as all of us know, the legislative process is one of reasonable and conscionable compromise, and calls upon a Member of the Senate, if he is to represent effectively his constituents and the people of the country as a whole, to agree to compromise on certain points, in order to adjust to the points of view of other Senators. The test I try to follow is not to sacrifice what I consider to be a matter of principle.

Although I think there are certain amendments which should be made to the bill on the floor of the Senate—and I shall offer one or two before the debate closes—nevertheless I think that, by and large, we have brought to the Senate the best possible bill which a majority of our committee could agree upon. We were

not unanimous even then, Mr. President. We found, in the closing days of the committe's discussions, that we could not reach unanimous agreement. One member of the committee voted against the bill, as I think the record will show, because he simply could not go along with the general plan of the bill. Other members of the committee voted against the bill because the committee rejected what has become known as the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The Russell amendment still pends, subject to debate on the floor of the Senate.

I think our greatest problem was created for the committee by the armed services themselves. I have spoken at length on that subject, so today I shall refer to it only in passing. Some weeks ago, when I introduced a revision of the existing law as to the integration of the armed services, I said on the floor of the Senate that today we do not have in the United States a unified armed-services establishment. I said, on that occasion a few weeks ago—and many things have happened since that speech to verify and supplement what I then said, that we have unification of our armed services in name only.

I repeat that so far as the unification bill of last year is concerned, the integration of the armed services is only an integration on paper. A few weeks ago I said—and I repeat it today—that we have no integration, in fact, of the armed services; but, instead, we have three independent branches of the armed services—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—each, in my judgment, guilty of the same degree of waste and lack of coordination which characterized their functioning prior to the passage of the unification bill of last year. In fact, I am not so sure but what the situation is even more serious than it was before we passed the so-called unification bill.

In a large measure, Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense has no real authority over the armed services and he will not have any real authority over the armed services unless and until Congress enacts a new statute which will assure him the necessary staff, the appropriate number of under secretaries, and enable him to call before him the heads of the various armed services and crack a few of their heads together. That is what the armed services of the country need.

I say, Mr. President, without fear of successful contradiction that the waste which characterizes the armed services of the United States is absolutely unpardonable so far as the Military Establishment or the Congress are concerned. It is no explanation, it is no justification for our present inaction to say, as certain Members of this body have said, that it is going to take a great many years to work out a true unification of the armed services. The people of the United States should not be called upon to wait a single year in order to bring to an end some of the extravagance and some of the waste that characterize the armed services. I am satisfied that one section of the bill I introduced some weeks ago, the one calling for a single Office of Procurement, would save—I said on that occasion—a billion dollars a year. I say now, Mr. President, on the basis of information given to me by men in the armed services themselves, since I introduced the bill, it would save a minimum of $3,000,000,000 a year on procurement alone. Three billion dollars a year is no small amount.

It would be interesting, in fact, if it were not so serious, Mr. President, it would be somewhat amusing, to repeat the comments which have been given to me, since I introduced that bill, by men rather high in the armed services. Oh, yes, they have had to see me in private; they have had to exact from me in advance an assurance that I would not disclose the source of my information. I have had to pledge to them I would keep confidential the identity of the source of my information. But, Mr. President, if the Armed Services Committee of the Senate would undertake to conduct an investigation into the expenditures of the three branches of the Armed Services and into the procurement practices of the Navy, the Army, and the Air Forces, it would find out for itself that by such a proper Senatorial investigation there could be saved to the taxpayers of the country millions upon millions of dollars through adoption of a central procurement office alone.

Although I shall vote for the pending measure, Mr. President, I want to say that the passage of the bill will not end the job of the Senate Armed Services Committee in checking the spending practices of the Military Establishment. I am confident that under the able leadership of the chairman of our committee we may look forward to proceeding with a necessary investigation of the Armed Services to the end of bringing about the necessary economy and economical practices in the Armed Services to which the taxpayers of the Nation are entitled.

I have said before, but I repeat for emphasis today, that the free enterprise system of the United States, the private-property economy program, cannot long endure the expenditures of the huge funds which are going into the Military Establishment in peacetime. It is no answer to me, Mr. President, to say that if we become involved in another war we shall spend many times the expenditures now being called for by the armed services. Of course, in that event, we shall spend many times the sum of $15,000,000,000 in round numbers, which I think the final recapitulation will show will be the expenditures for the armed services if we merely go ahead with the program which will be put into effect on the passage of the pending bill and include other expenditures already authorized. I have grave doubts, Mr. President, if our private-property economy, with all the other necessary expenditures of Government which we will have to face, can stabilize itself for very long with a constant outlay of $15,000,000,000 a year for the armed services. At least, Mr. President, I think it behooves us to make absolutely certain that not a single dollar of the $15,000,000,000 is spent wastefully or uneconomically.

I say we cannot answer the challenge which is being made to us by many Americans today when they ask us to give them assurance that a program of effective economy characterizes the operation of our armed services. I happen to be one who believes that an investigation of the record will show that economy does not characterize the operations of the armed services. I think they would greatly strengthen themselves in public support and public prestige if instead of resisting certain of the proposals which are being made in order to bring about a more businesslike operation of the armed services, they would give their wholehearted support to proposals for a more businesslike expenditure of their funds. However, instead of helping work out reasonable and needed economies they engage in behind-the-scenes resistance; to vesting more jurisdiction and power in the Secretary of Defense. I am advised that my bill to unify and integrate the armed services caused consternation in the Pentagon Building. I know that the armed services know that my bill would check many wasteful practices of the Military Establishment. My bill not only is going to die in committee, it is not even going to receive a hearing before the Armed Services Committee prior to the time we adjourn. But, here and now I serve notice on the Senate and on the members of the Armed Services Committee, that, come January 1949, I shall make the passage of that bill one of my major fights in the next session of the Congress.

I think by that time the Members of the Senate are going to discover that I shall have widespread support for the bill throughout the Nation. The taxpayers are going to ask, and are going to demand an answer to, the questions, "What is the Congress doing to eliminate some of the waste that characterizes the expenditures of the three branches of the armed services? What is the Congress doing to give to the Secretary of Defense the power he needs in order to exercise integrating control and jurisdiction over the three branches in an effective way, so that he can bring about an end to the waste that now characterizes so much of the expenditures of the armed services?"

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that probably Mr. Forrestal will not be Secretary of Defense very long after the next session of Congress convenes, but I think it only fair to the present Secretary of Defense to say that throughout our public hearings, throughout our executive sessions with him, I found him a great source of inspiration. I found in him a true example of a public servant who recognizes that, after all, our private economy can stand just so much by way of military expense. I paraphrase him when I point out that many times during discussions with the committee the Secretary of Defense, Mr. James Forrestal, cautioned the committee to recognize that there is a limit to the burden of military expense which our private-property economy can stand. I commend him for the support which he gave to us in the committee discussions in paring down expenses for military operations. When we get through with this legislation, Mr. President, when we add up the costs of other military legislation which we have already passed, I think it is only

proper to give clear notice to the American people the total cost of preparedness. They should fully understand that with this legislation they will be paying a military-preparedness bill of at least $15,000,000,000 a year. They must understand, when we considered tax problems and the other problems of Government expense, that we cannot have such increases in Government costs for very long without having higher taxes.

So I say, Mr. President, the American people need to be told also that if we should become involved in another war we would, for many years to come, lose our private-property economy as we cherish it today. In fact there is a serious question as to whether we should ever recover it in the event of a new war. Therefore, in speaking in support of the bill, I desire that the American people be given clear notice of some of its future implications.

I shall support the bill, because I happen to be one who is convinced that my country is not in a position properly to defend itself at the present time, if some international incident should throw us into war. I shall support it, in the second place, Mr. President, because I believe that we are dealing—and let us be frank about it—with a foreign power today in the field of international relations, namely, Soviet Russia, who must be made to understand that the American people, through their Congress, intend to keep our country sufficiently strong to enforce peace at a moment's notice in case Soviet Russia should decide to follow an aggressive policy which might threaten to disrupt the peace.

I realize that is plain language, Mr. President, but I intend to speak in terms of plain language when I discuss issues vital to from 145,000,000 to 150,000,000 Americans.

As the evidence unfolded before the Armed Services Committee, and as we came to recognize that we could not put into the field, at the time we were considering the bill, more than two and a half divisions of fully equipped men, I then recognized that I could not justify to my conscience as a Member of the Senate a failure to vote at this session of Congress for legislation which would put the armies of the United States in a better position to protect my country in case of an international incident which might lead to war. When I sat in committee, Mr. President, and heard testimony and weighed evidence which satisfied my judgment that we were lagging behind Soviet Russia in the manufacture and development of the most modern submarines, I said to myself, I cannot sit in the Senate of the United States and keep faith with my conscience and not vote for military legislation which will put my country in a better position to defend itself against presently superior Russian submarines should Soviet Russia decide to start an aggressive attack upon the peace of the world.

When I heard testimony and weighed evidence which convinced me that we were lagging behind Soviet Russia in the development of modern airplanes I knew that I was duty bound to vote for a more adequate air defense. I satisfied myself that if some unfortunate incident should plunge us into a war at this time we would not be in a position to carry on successfully bombing operations against Soviet Russia, even from bases in England. When I appreciated the seriousness of that fact I said to myself I cannot sit on the floor of the Senate and keep faith with my conscience and not vote at this session of Congress for legislation necessary to put my country in a stronger position to defend itself in the air, on the land, and at sea.

Then, Mr. President, when I reflected upon the record of Soviet Russia in the field of international relations since VE-day and VJ-day, when I took into account the fact that she has confronted us chiefly by a record of noncooperation in international negotiations and councils, I said that the people of my country have the right to expect from me in the Senate of the United States a vote in support of legislation which will put us in better position than we are at this time to enforce the peace.

It was a matter of deep disappointment to me to find that, although last year we passed what was supposed to be a unification bill unifying the armed services, during the many weeks this year of conferences, public hearings, and executive sessions with representatives of the armed services, all the old jealousies, all the old jurisdictional disputes between and among the armed services, crept out again. We were confronted with the stark reality that, in fact, we did not have a unification of the armed services. Not only that but it was my personal judgment that each one of the branches of the armed services, at least in the early days of our negotiations with them, took the position or the attitude that now is the time for them to ask for more than they really needed. They took advantage of a great disturbance in public opinion which had swept this Nation concerning the unfortunate position, so far as preparedness was concerned, in which we found ourselves. I am satisfied that time and time again they made requests upon us for amounts far in excess of what were necessary in order to put the country into a position where it could adequately defend itself in case of an international incident.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I would rather not yield until I finish my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me go on. Until the Congress makes crystal clear to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces that there is a limit beyond which we do not intend to let them go in making requests for funds from the Congress we will be met with excessive demands. To stop the extravagant demands of the Military Establishment we must pass legislation which will require them to clear their requests for funds through the Secretary of Defense. I think we owe it to the Office of the Secretary of Defense to give that office power to reject some of the exorbitant and extravagant demands which the various branches of the armed services will make unless we put the necessary check upon them into the hands of the Secretary of Defense.

If we should become involved in war—and this was an argument some of the men in brass and gold braid made before us—even a figure such as $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 would be a small amount compared with the cost of such a war, and how well we know that.

If we should have to fight another war it would be a total war, so far as American economic life is concerned. Let me say to those American businessmen who are very anxious that Congress provide an adequate defense program, that I join with them in their anxiety over the lack of preparedness today. However, I call their attention to the fact that from the standpoint of our private enterprise system they should join with those of us in the Congress who are insisting that reasonable checks be placed upon the financial demands of the armed services.

If we should become engaged in war, aware as we are of the total character it would assume, we would find ourselves very soon in a completely governmental regimented economy. We could not fight the next war on any other basis. In a real sense we would wage war and lose democracy. There would have to be vested in the Government at that time the power to tell American businessmen how they shall operate their plants, where they shall operate them, and what new plants, for example, shall be constructed. The entire economy as well as men would have to be mobilized for war. That is why I say that in this fight for preparedness we must also join, coincidentally therewith, in a fight for peace.

Mr. President, in this legislation today we are tackling only one segment of the great problem which now confronts the country. The Nation today is certainly preparedness-minded. There is no doubt about the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American people want us to build up our defenses to whatever point our judgment, in the light of the facts presented to us, convinces us should be reached in order to protect the national security.

I wonder if the American people are as fully conscious of the importance of our making a fight for peace. I wonder if they are fully cognizant of the importance of the Congress of the United States, recognizing that we cannot win the next war, no matter how much we prepare for it, judged from what that war will do to our economy. We will lose our free-enterprise system in that war. At least that is one of my great fears. I am afraid, also, that for a time, so far as our inalienable rights are concerned, the only victor in such a war will be chaos itself. We will remain a united people in a common cause, I am sure, but we will have to sacrifice many of our economic freedoms in another war, and to a greater degree than we did in the last. I fear that too many people do not recognize that our economic freedoms and our political freedoms are inseparable. We cannot go into a regimented economy and not regiment many of our political rights, too.

I am not convinced that the American people, as of this hour, are sufficiently

aware of the importance of our sacrificing for peace as they are of the importance of our sacrificing for preparedness. I join with them in their desire to sacrifice for preparedness. I plead with them, Mr. President, to recognize the importance of sacrificing for peace.

Yet, there are signs abroad which lead me to believe that because the fight for peace is never so dramatic as the fight for preparedness, because of the fact that so many people, living as of this hour in what appears to be safety and comfort, lulled into a false security by a materialistic approach to democracy, too many of our people are not aware of the fact that we are not making the sacrifices for peace which we should.

To what signs do I point? When one great branch of the Congress of the United States makes the cut which the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has made in the European relief program, I say the peace is endangered. I say that the House Committee is probably reflecting the point of view of too many Americans who have not grasped the importance of sacrificing for peace. I think such cuts as the House committee proposes play right into the hands of Soviet Russia. I think the action taken by the House Committee on Appropriations on the funds for foreign relief will be received as glad tidings and with great joy by the Communist leaders of Russia. The propaganda of the Communists for months past, over Russian-controlled radios, has been to the effect that the Americans will never deliver on the promises. The Russians have been saying to the French, Italians and others that we in America cannot be trusted to Marshall plan in accordance with their deliver on our promises. They represent to the countries of Europe that we make promises, raise hopes, present high-sounding plans for economic rehabilitation but cannot be counted upon to deliver on those representations. They claim that democracy is too inefficient, too unstable, too political to be trustworthy in world conferences and negotiations. I deny that the Russians are right, and I deplore that the House committee is giving any ammunition to the Russians to use in such propaganda.

Mr. President, the issue of foreign aid is an issue which I do not think we can ignore when we come to vote on the national defense program entailed in the bill now pending before the Senate. While we are voting billions of dollars, as we should, for defense, we should also support the leaders of our Government in both parties in making sacrifices for peace. Those sacrifices call for the expenditure of every dollar, in my opinion, for which the Senate of the United States voted when we adopted the so-called Marshall plan. To adjourn this session of the Congress and vote less will be retreating in the fight for peace, when the order should be "Advance, advance, and advance for peace." It was a relatively few billion dollars which we voted for the economic rehabilitation of Europe, and to vote less will not result in the rehabilitation of Europe; it will result only in filling bellies. We shall not win the peace in Europe by merely filling stomachs. We must reestablish the economic life of those countries in which people are still making a fight for freedom.

Mr. President, that leads me to an issue I wish to present to my party, for whatever my party may think it is worth. Judging by experience, and the extent to which some of the leaders of my party have followed my advice in the past, I assume this advice will not be accepted. Nevertheless, I believe the time will come when millions of American people are going to tell the Republican Party the advice I shall give today was sound advice. I say to the Republican Party that simply because it finds itself now in such a favorable position that it will win the election in November come what may, it is not justified in adopting an attitude, so far as the Marshall plan is concerned, which will be interpreted by the American people as a retreat in the fight for peace. Therefore I not only recommend, but I plead with the Republican Party this afternoon, to rally its forces and make clear to the Members of the House of Representatives that when we passed the Marshall plan through the Congress of the United States, we, the Republican Party, undertook a clear moral obligation to deliver on the Marshall plan the full amount which was contemplated in the historic debate on that occasion. Unless we do that, Mr. President, we shall give the Russian Communists, the Russian propagandists, both in the United States and outside, ammunition for their assault upon our system of freedom in this country far in excess of anything they possibly could devise for themselves.

Let there is be no doubt, if the funds for the Marshall plan are cut any such amount as has been proposed by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the full responsibility will rest upon the Republican Party, which has a majority in both Houses of the Congress at the present time. We cannot escape that responsibility, and the American people should recognize that any cut in the Marshall plan is by act of the Republicans in the Congress—I care not how many Democrats may vote for the cut. We Republicans have control of this Congress and the responsibility is ours.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, the chips are down in this fight, or "gamble," shall I say, for peace. I want to see my party live up to its great ideals, and one of those ideals is to follow a peaceful course of action so far as international policy is concerned. The best evidence of our intention to live up to that ideal, which has always been one of the ideals of the Republican Party, is not now to retreat in the battle for peace by cutting any such amounts from the Marshall plan as the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has recommended.

I have made these comments, Mr. President, on this issue of how much shall finally be appropriated for the economic recovery program for Europe because I do not think we can separate that issue from this national defense bill. I do not think we can separate the European recovery plan issue from the issue of voting billions of dollars for national security. If we do make propaganda for the Communists, since then, with their usual tactics of misrepresentation and talking out of context, and puffing out of proportion, they will seek to spread the poisonous propaganda that what we are doing is preparing for war while at the same time we sell short the freedom-loving people of Europe who are engaged in a fight for freedom.

Let me make another comment on what that fight for freedom is all about, Mr. President, because its significance, I think, is being missed by a great many people in the United States. There are some in America who have been seeking to put across a program of foreign policy one plank of which proposes that none of the funds we appropriate for European relief and recovery shall be used by any country which seeks to use any of those funds for the nationalization or socialization of any industry. The advocates of that proposal—I care not who they may be, Mr. President, and there are too many of them in this country—the advocates of that proposal I charge have lost sight of what the fight for freedom is all about; in fact, I wonder if they even recognize what the fight for freedom involves.

I said on another occasion and I now repeat that the fight for freedom in the world today is a fight for the right to exercise freedom of choice in determining the political and the economic forms which shall govern a people. It is a fight for self determination. It is a fight for the right to exercise freedom at the ballot box in determining what form of economy shall prevail in a given country—what political system and policies shall be enacted into law. Those who are advocating that American money appropriated for the economic rehabilitation of Europe should be based upon a condition precedent that none of the funds should be used in connection with any proposal which seeks to socialize or nationalize any of a nation's industries have not grasped the significance of the fight for freedom.

I say that, Mr. President, as one who does not like socialism or nationalism in any form. I would not vote for the nationalization, for example, of the American railroads, but I do not propose to tell the people of Great Britain whether they should or should not vote for the nationalization of the British railroads. That happens to be their business, not mine. That happens to be within the sovereign rights of Great Britain, and not within the sovereign rights of the United States. I think it is a great fallacy for the United States to argue, "But if you are going to ask us for money then we have the right to lay down the terms and conditions under which the money shall be spent in respect to the type of political form or economic form which shall govern you." I deny that, Mr. President. Not only that, but I say that for us to lay down such a condition as that puts us in a position of doing exactly what the Russian propagandists have from time to time accused us of doing. They have charged us with trying to buy support in Europe for our economic system with

American dollars. Or, to put it bluntly, the Russian propaganda has been that there is a new form of imperialism now abroad in the world, American imperialism, the imperialism of the American profit dollar. I do not want the Russians to be in such a position that they can with any truth whatsoever make any charge of any form of imperialism against my Government. They will be in that position, Mr. President, if we accept the proposal of some industrialists and businessmen and some politicians who would lay down as a condition precedent to the passage of any final appropriation bill for European recovery that none of the money can be used in any program to nationalize or socialize any industry.

I am advised, and I am satisfied, Mr. President, that in part it is true, that there are some Members of Congress who are particularly displeased because that condition was not accepted as a part of the Marshall plan. I am told that behind the scenes the failure to accept that condition is playing a part in various proposals to cut drastically the full amount of appropriations called for by the Marshall Plan as it passed the Congress.

I want to get that opposition out into the open. I am perfectly willing to let the American people decide whether or not we should seek to interfere with the political and the economic life of European countries by laying down any such condition as that. I am satisfied that once the American people come to understand the proposal to require the money to be spent as we dictate, and its significance, so far as a charge of American imperialism is concerned, they will by an overwhelming majority make perfectly clear to my party and to the members of the opposition party, too, that they do not approve of such interference in the political and economic life of any European country. They will make clear that in their opinion the principle of self-determination is no empty cliché.

It seems to be true, Mr. President, that sight has been lost of the fact that European countries, particularly the Scandinavian countries, and to some extent England itself, have always adopted to a much greater degree than we have in the United States, various facets of a socialized economy. Take Sweden, Norway, or Denmark, for example. They have led the way in the world for a great many years in the field of moderate socialism. It is bound to exist in any country confronted with an economy of scarcity rather than abundance. We cannot at this time by a retreat in the fight for peace give any aid or comfort to the Communist forces in the world which are bombarding the remaining countries of freedom with false propaganda or give any support to their propaganda that we are seeking to dictate to the remaining free countries their political and economic policies.

So I close this segment of my speech by again saying to the Republican Party and the Congress of the United States that I happen to think that the eyes not only of Republicans and independent voters, but of all Americans, are on my party. I know full well that in November my party is going to come into power—as I think it should—but I know that the people of the country will watch it very closely as to the stand it takes in the dying days of this session of Congress so far as full support of the European recovery program is concerned. Therefore I hope that, in the hearings and debates which are about to open in the Congress of the United States on the appropriation for economic relief for Europe, my party will rescind the action taken by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives on this issue. If it does not, I am perfectly willing to venture the suggestion today that in due course of time such failure will lead to defeat in future elections.

We had better think right now of our program for 1952 and 1956. The fact that we are going to win in 1948 does not automatically accomplish the great job we have to do for America. We need a victory in 1952 and in 1956. In my judgment we are now laying the foundation either for victory or for defeat in 1952 and 1956. If we follow any such course of action as the House Appropriations Committee is recommending in regard to appropriations for the Marshall plan, we shall have laid the foundations for a pavement which will lead to defeat in 1952, because by then the American people will have recognized what a colossal blunder we made in 1948, in the closing days of this session of Congress, by having voted—if we do so vote—for any such cut in the appropriations for the economic recovery plan as recommended by the House committee.

I wish to repeat also, Mr. President, that we cannot separate the basic issue which underlies both the European economic recovery program and the national defense program. They are inseparable. They are bound together. We need to pass legislation such as is now pending before this body in order to strengthen our national security so that we can protect this country and other freedom-loving countries of the world in case Soviet Russia proceeds with an aggressive, warlike policy. We need to do something more. We need to take steps which will make sure that economic freedom also is assured and preserved, both in this country and in countries which are cooperating with us in the fight for freedom.

Returning to the pending bill, I am sorry that it does not contain a non-segregation clause. I regret that the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota are not acceptable to the Armed Services Committee. I commend him for raising the issue. I commend him for making the fight, but I will say to him and to my other colleagues in the Senate that I think it is perfectly clear that we should face the political reality which confronts us. It is a reality to which we cannot blind ourselves. At the present time neither the Congress nor the people of the United States are ready for any such proposal as the Senator from North Dakota is making.

He may say to me—and rightly so—"How can you prove the latter statement? How can you say that the people of the United States are not ready for it?" He may disagree with my conclusion and my judgment on that point. But all I can say to him in reply is that, as one who has fought for civil rights as hard as I know how, and who is going to continue over the years, so long as it is my privilege to serve the people of this country in any public capacity, to fight for the full measure of civil rights as guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States, I am nevertheless convinced that as of this hour neither the Congress nor a majority of the people of the United States are ready for a proposal which would provide for abolition of segregation in the armed services of our country.

Had I been present today I would have voted against the motion to lay the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota on the table, because I believe that we should debate it on its merits and vote it up or down on its merits, and not use a parliamentary strategy, by way of a motion which is not debatable, in order to kill debate on the amendment in the Senate. Although I would have voted against the motion to lay on the table, I would be less than honest if I did not frankly state for the RECORD this afternoon that in my opinion the amendment cannot be adopted because the Congress is not ready for it, nor are the people of the United States ready for it

That is a hard and sad confession for me to make. It is a confession which will not be very popular in some quarters, because there are those who do not recognize that the movement toward the final goal of full enjoyment of civil rights under the Constitution will require much time. There is not a civil-rights organization in this country and not a single advocate of civil rights that has ever received from the junior Senator from Oregon any false encouragement with regard to the speed with which we can accomplish a full civil-rights program.

On the contrary, I have always leaned over backward by calling the attention of various groups to the fact that they cannot have legislation passed which is too far ahead of prevailing public opinion. I recognize that the legislative process is itself an educational process. That process itself performs an educational function. But let us be honest and realistic about it. We have to carry the people of the country along with us. Any piece of legislation which does not have the support of the great majority of the people of the country has no chance of successful administration and operation.

I wish I could share the view of the many idealists who do not have to sit here and work within the framework of the fact that to a certain degree politics is, after all, the science of the possible; I wish I could share the views of those idealists who do not have to work within the framework of the fact that in passing legislation we can go only as far and as fast as we can arrive at reasonable, conscionable, and workable compromises. It takes a majority of votes to pass legislation, and the Senator from North Dakota and I do not have those votes today.

I am also aware of the fact that we must have men who are constantly willing to make the type of sacrifice which the distinguished senior Senator from

North Dakota has demonstrated he is always willing to make. I know that there are times when those of us of a liberal philosophy must always be willing to step up to the plate and make a sacrifice hit in the interest of constitutional liberalism. I shall always be willing to do so whenever I am satisfied that by so doing I can advance the cause of the game, the game in this instance being the cause of civil rights. But I hope I shall always be sufficiently realistic to realize when there is a fighting chance for victory, and when the cause, as of any particular time, is hopeless. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I not only discussed with the committee but I surveyed the possibilities of some clause or section in the pending legislation which would advance the cause of civil rights just a little. Again I am raising my voice today on the floor of the Senate in a plea for such a provision. But I say to my friend from North Dakota that he and I are thoroughly outnumbered in any such fight at the present time. That is why, save and except for the speech which I am now making, and a few brief comments which I shall make on several amendments to the bill on different subject matters, I shall not speak further on the bill. I do not intend to engage in lengthy debate on the Langer amendments on civil-rights issues because my view in support of those issues are very well known. I think it is important that we come to an early vote on the bill after each Member of the Senate has used what time he wishes in discussing the merits of the situation as he sees them.

I wish to say this about the issue of civil rights, Mr. President: I do not know how much time it will take; I do not know whether I shall live long enough or whether any other Member of this body will live long enough to see put into legislation the provisions necessary to eliminate from our democracy discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed. However, I know that day is coming. I know it is just as certain to come as it is certain that day will follow night. I know it because wherever one goes throughout this land—and in all parts of the land, interestingly enough—there is general recognition that there is need for great improvement in the field of civil rights. I know that great educational processes are at work; I know that whenever the Senator from North Dakota, for example, makes what looks like a futile fight on the floor of the Senate for civil rights, nevertheless he does a tremendous job of teaching throughout the land. Oh, yes; he will be subject to severe criticism in many sections of the country; false charges will be made against him, as so frequently they are made against the junior Senator from Oregon in his fight for civil rights. Of course, that has been the experience and the record of liberals throughout the history of the Senate of the United States. Those liberals who have preceded us have had to face attacks upon their liberalism, but eventually their points of view have prevailed. We know that one does not follow the course of action which we liberals on either side of the aisle follow in the Senate of the United States—and there are some of like views on the other side of the aisle—without its costing us dearly, so far as political consequences are concerned. But, Mr. President, after all, it is a question of having each man act according to his own lights; it is a question of having each man serve the people of the country in accordance with his own convictions.

So, although I think I disagree with my good friend the Senator from North Dakota as to the strategy which probably he would pursue if he could obtain sufficient support on the floor of the Senate for prolonged debate on this matter, nevertheless I wish to commend him for raising this issue and letting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speak, for all history, of the fact that in 1948 he raised his voice in defense of the principle that the Constitution should be applied equally to all citizens who come within the jurisdiction of any exercise of Federal power. Of course, when we are dealing with the Army of the United States we are dealing with Federal jurisdiction and Federal power. So, speaking out of the deep conviction of my heart, I wish to say that full civil rights in the Army will never exist in this country until every man wearing the uniform of our country in the service of his country is free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed. That time will not come until the principles inherent in the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota become a reality.

But, Mr. President, I repeat: Sad as it is by way of commentary, the fact is, in my judgment, that the people of the United States are not yet ready for the program proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. I do not think that should stop us from voting in support of what we believe to be great constitutional guaranties. That is why I have never hesitated, and never will hesitate, to vote for the giving of a full measure of civil rights to all our citizens, irrespective of race, color, or creed. But here we are in the closing days of a very important session of the Congress, with many major items yet confronting us. We cannot win this fight for civil rights in the Army this year. I wish I could look into some crystal ball and, for the RECORD, be able to leave a notation here this afternoon that I was able to predict when this fight can be won. But I cannot. However, a great many things can happen in this country and in the world in a relatively short period of time so as to rapidly hasten the day when the battle for civil rights for men in the Army can be won in the Congress of the United States. But it will not be won in June 1948. Hence, Mr. President, as one who wishes we could win it, as one who has taken a very clear stand in support of such proposals as those the Senator from North Dakota is offering, I close my record on it for this year by saying that I can be counted upon year after year, so long as it is my privilege to remain here, to fight on the floor of the Senate for civil rights and to support the principles inherent in the proposals of the Senator from North Dakota.

There is one other point which I wish to make in closing: Although I have said that I am satisfied that neither the Congress nor the people of the United States are ready for the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota, I wish the RECORD also to be clear that there are many millions of American people who are ready for them; and, in my judgment, those millions are not going to appreciate the fact that we have not advanced the cause of civil rights in some form, either in this bill or in some other bill, at this session of Congress. So, by way of additional gratuitous advice to my party, Mr. President, I wish to suggest that it is still not too late between now and June 19 for the Congress to pass some civil-rights legislation. I think a majority of the American people are ready for some such legislation. For example, I am convinced that either legislation involving elimination of poll taxes or an anti-lynching bill would receive the acclaim of an overwhelming majority of the American people. I recommend to the leadership of my party in the Senate that before we adjourn on June 19 at least one of those bills, or preferably both of them, be called up for final action. I think it will look a little amusing, and I am not sure but that it will look a little hypocritical, for us to sit in Philadelphia, come June 21, and write those same old words—oh, of course, the adjectives may be changed a little, but in effect they will be the same old words—"The Grand Old Party stands for civil rights." I doubt if the people will swallow such a plank in the Republican platform, written in June at Philadelphia. I think we should deliver on this issue of civil rights, and I think I have a right to say that, in view of my record, as one who has tried to deliver on the civil-rights issue. In fact, in some instances I have delivered in the field of civil rights as much as anyone within the ranks of my party.

Mr. President, I have referred to the fact that there are many millions of American people who are ready for civil rights legislation, and there are many millions of people ready for a provision in the pending bill that will eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed. I now desire to make a passing comment upon the movement in this country for civil disobedience.

I am a little alarmed and somewhat disappointed that so many people who have been writing to me because of my opposition to a program of civil disobedience have not recognized the difference between the constitutional right of a citizen of the United States to refuse to bear arms in time of war because it conflicts with his religious faith, and a proposal to refuse to bear arms in defense of his country by way of a civil disobedience program, because he does not like the fact that the Congress of the United States has not eliminated Jim Crowism from the United States Army.

I want to repeat to the proponents of the civil disobedience program, on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, that they will receive no aid or support from me. I assure them that so far as the

junior Senator from Oregon is concerned he will oppose to the fullest extent possible any program of civil disobedience based on inability of its proponents to get a nonsegregation clause in the pending bill.

I shall oppose it, Mr. President, because, save and except for the constitutional right which is given to a person in the name of religious freedom in this country to refuse to serve in the Army I think it cannot be reconciled with patriotic obligations. Except for that one religious exemption, I take the position that every able-bodied man in this country has the clear obligation under our constitutional form of government to don the uniform of his country and defend it in time of war when asked to do so.

I hope, if I have not made myself clear on that point, I make it clear now. There is no justification in my judgment for a program of civil disobedience merely because a group is not successful in getting through the Congress a piece of legislation it is demanding. Mr. President inherent in such a proposal as that is a principle of duress and coercion to which no Member of this body in my judgment can give aid or comfort. I repeat now what I have said in letters to some of the proponents of civil disobedience. By following their course of action I think they are doing more to set back the progress of civil-rights legislation in the Congress of the United States than any other one suggestion they can make. Although their motives are undoubtedly of the best, I repeat their judgment in this case is ill-advised. They are doing great harm to the fight for the eventual victory we are working for in the field of civil rights.

In conclusion, Mr. President, although I shall vote against the motion, which I am sure will be made, to table this second Langer amendment, I hope the Senator from North Dakota will recognize the hopelessness of the fight, will make his record on the merits of his amendments, then will permit us to proceed to have an early vote on the bill. I am aware of the fact, because I have had the representations made to me, too, that there are many great organizations in this country who feel that a prolonged fight should be made at this time for the passage of a nonsegregation clause in the bill. But it cannot be won. I do not think, in view of the other issues confronting this session of the Congress, that we would be serving the American people well by making that type of fight when, as individual Senators, we know full well what the ultimate result is going to be.

Mr. President, except for this speech and the few comments I shall make respecting an amendment on conscientious objectors, and an amendment involving the medical section of the bill, and probably one on two other amendments, I am not going to say any more on this legislation, save and except to vote for it in its final form when the roll is called for the vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure from the Senator's remarks he could save the country perhaps $3,000,000,000 a year. The Congress is not going to meet again until January. It would take some time to enact his bill. I suggest to the distinguished Senator, if he can save $3,000,000,000, that by tacking his amendment onto the pending bill, and if the amendment were adopted, he could save the country nearly $2,000,000,000, I for one would certainly vote for it, hoping we could get that into the bill by way of amendment and thus save the people $2,000,000,000 that is now being wasted.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that there is no chance under the present unification law of making the saving I am satisfied can be made. In my judgment, the Secretary of Defense simply does not have the power to force the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to make the saving which could be made through a centralized procurement office. I want to say further to the Senator from North Dakota, there is not even a chance of getting hearings on my bill before adjournment on June 19. I have done my best here this afternoon to make perfectly clear to my friend from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, what my intentions are as to future action on my bill when we reconvene in January. I shall reintroduce the bill in January 1949 with such perfections as may be worked out during the summer. I shall work as hard as I can in the next session of Congress to get early hearings on the bill and to have it placed on the calendar for final action. I shall, at every opportunity I have, urge public support of my bill wherever I speak in this country—and I know of no one in the Senate of the United States, except certain Members who are running for high office, who make a greater number of speeches in more parts of the country than the junior Senator from Oregon. I shall in the months ahead press for all I am worth to secure support of my military bill, because I am convinced that once the American people become cognizant of the fact that they do not have unification of the armed services in fact, they are going to insist in the good old democratic way that their Congress take action in support of my bill. I am satisfied that once the American people understand my bill they will insist that action not be delayed, as has been suggested, for some years while we work out the difficulties in the unification law which Congress passed last year. The matter cannot be worked out under that law. The law must be drastically revised and power must be centralized in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the Senator from Oregon is aware of the fact that during the war the Navy constructed a large number of flat tops, particularly for off-shore defense against the submarine menace. I wonder if the Senator from Oregon is aware that since the end of the war, mostly within the last year, the Navy has disposed of 49 of those flat tops, which cost us on an average of $10,000,000 apiece, for about $90,000 each, or less than 1 cent on the dollar. They were sold to shipping companies, who have reconverted them; they were sold, in part, to foreign countries, and in part, into the merchant ship use.

During a hearing before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I asked the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Andrews, who authorized the sale of the ships at such a figure as $90,000 apiece, for ships that were built on C–3 bottoms to a considerable extent. He said he did not know.

I wonder if the Senator from Oregon is aware that the Munitions Board declared surplus its ordnance plants and, toward the end of March, disposed of many of them. In the last part of March, when the war talk was at its height, the administrator of the War Assets Administration wrote to the National Defense establishment and asked them, in view of such occurrences and such talk going around Congress, within committees and otherwise, if they really wanted to dispose of their ordnance plants. He did not hear anything from them for 2 weeks, but along in April they finally withdrew them from the surplus list.

That is only a sample of what is going on—selling $10,000,000 ships, only a few years old, for $90,000 each. The Navy offered hospital ships as surplus. Apparently they were not much worried about war or the need of hospital ships. That is, as I say, a sample of the way the money is handled. It is very difficult to vote for appropriations for the armed services, knowing that they will deliberately waste billions of dollars. Yet, we get into positions in which we have to vote the money. It is one of the worst conditions existing in our Government today, probably next to the situation existing in the Department of State. It is equal to the confusion, wastefulness, and inefficiency that exists in other branches of the Government. It is a toss-up between the armed services and the State Department as to which is in the worst condition. They are both simply terrible.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his contribution to my discussion of the economic features of the subject. I say to him, in all honesty, that I was not familiar with the particular items he has mentioned, but I am familiar with several scores—and I use that figure advisedly—of similar instances involving waste of Federal property.

Mr. AIKEN. No doubt. I simply mention the instances with which I happened to be familiar.

Mr. MORSE. I say to my friend from Vermont that my opposition to waste of Federal property is why I think it is important to maintain a constant watch over the Armed Services in the expenditure of their money until we pass some such bill as that which I have proposed. I think the legislation whch I have proposed will more or less automatically

check much of the gross waste which characterizes the military establishment at the present time.

I desire to make perfectly clear that I do not mean to be only a negative critic of the armed services. I am sure that the Senator from Vermont knows that when we are in the midst of war we cannot think very much in terms of expenditures when we are trying to save the lives of American boys and win the objectives of the war with as little expenditure of lives as is possible. I know the Senator shares my views on that subject. War is, by its very nature, wasteful thing. We cannot, under the emergencies of the moment, avoid spending huge sums when we are at war. Of course we necessarily spent millions upon millions of dollars during the war which later proved to have been unnecessary from the standpoint of actual use, but we did not know that at the time. The point at the time of the expenditure was to get equipment constructed, so that if it were needed for the use of our boys, it would be available. It is true that a great many military materials were later sold for a pittance, so far as their original cost is concerned.

I think the Senator from Vermont is well aware of the series of fights I have made on the floor of the Senate, one of them as recently as last Monday, in opposition to dispensing Federal property at low salvage prices when we well know that in many instances it will be put to very profitable use by the purchasers thereof. Thus, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to the extent that it has fallen within the jurisdiction of a subcommittee of which I am a member, I have taken the position that I think we need to scrutinize very carefully the disposal of Federal property. I am sure the chairman of the committee, Mr. GURNEY, would say, with a smile on his face, that I have been a stickler on his committee with reference to the proposition of insisting we receive a fair value for Federal property falling within the jurisdiction of our committee.

I think that in the early disposal of surplus property, not only that of the armed services, but of every other department of Government, millions of dollars' worth of property of the taxpayers was given away for practically no return, or for an insignificant return to the taxpayers. We should have stopped it at that time. I raised my voice in protest then. I have done so periodically ever since, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate. I shall continue consistently to do so, because we not only should take the profit out of war during the war, but we should take profit out of the war accruing by way of benefits from the war materials and property after the cessation of hostilities. There are many persons who have made huge sums of money out of the war by way of the disposal of surplus property which was manufactured for war purposes. I think the Senator knows how I feel regarding that matter.

I am aware that under this bill the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, by way of procedural action within the committee, has appointed a subcommittee which we call the watchdog committee, to watch over the operation of the act, which I assume will include, at least to some extent, some watching over expending money under the act. The Senator from South Dakota has been kind enough to make me a member of that subcommittee. I can assure the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that, so far as my work on the subcommittee is concerned, I shall constantly have my eye on the question as to whether efficient and economical spending is being practiced by the armed services under the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. O'DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to announce that, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, we shall proceed under the announcement made last week. We should hold ourselves in readiness for night sessions this week and next week, whenever we feel that night sessions are necessary, with daily sessions beginning at 11 o'clock in the morning each day and proceeding until at least 6 o'clock in the evening, if we do not hold night sessions. Until assurance is given that night sessions will not be held, I hope Senators will keep themselves in readiness. I am referring to tonight, tomorrow night, and any other night it may become necessary to hold night sessions. Some Senators have asked me if they should make arrangements to be here tonight. I trust they will make such arrangements, because we may just as well proceed now, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, and have a night session tonight, tomorrow night, and the next night, unless announcement to the contrary is made in advance.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, when the warmongers commence to beat their drums for another war, about the first thing they will think of will be the drafting of the boys to do the fighting, and the last thing they will consider will be the drafting of war profits. We are not supposed to be in a war now; we may technically be in a state of war, commonly known as a cold war, but the fighting has ceased and all our so-called enemies have surrendered. But some folks cannot wait until we get into another war before drafting the boys at this time. There is now before the Senate a bill to draft the boys to go out and do the fighting and the dying.

Every once in a while we hear someone say, "Yes; we will take care of the profits made out of war; there will be no more war millionaries made, as there were made in the last war." We heard that statement many times when we were getting into World War II. In fact, the President of the United States at that time made the statement that there would be no war millionaires coming out of that war.

It seems to me it would be a good idea now, when we are not yet in world war III, to give a little serious consideration to tying the two drafts together. While we are drafting the boys to go out and fight why not draft the war profits which will be made by individuals and corporations in case of another war? If we will just give that a little consideration, but do not take any legislative action on it, nothing will be done. We will go into the next war and many boys will be killed. The future lives of many others will be burdened with the national debt, just as those still living who fought the last war are burdened. They and their children will be burdened in the future with the cost of the war and our national public debt.

Those who are in favor of getting us into war periodically want to take care of these two items. First, they want to get somebody else to do the fighting and the dying and the sacrificing. Second, they want somebody else to shoulder the responsibility of paying the debt. It is true that many of them may buy war bonds; but who is going to redeem the war bonds? We have an accumulated debt now arising out of the last war of around $250,000,000,000. That is a debt which must be paid by the citizens of this Nation, or be repudiated.

With that in mind and thinking that now would be the opportune and the proper time to give consideration to this subject I have prepared an amendment to the pending bill, S. 2655. The amendment would change section 20 of the bill, which now reads:

> This act shall become effective immediately.

My amendment would change that to read:

> This act shall become effective on the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations and individuals 100 percent of all profits and earnings in excess of the average annual profits and earnings of such corporations and individuals for the 3-year period immediately preceding such date.

Mr. President, there are some who believe that all profits should be taken during a war to pay the costs of the war. This amendment does not go that far. It is designed to retain our private system of industry and our profit incentive and profit motive, and take only the excess profits, the profits which are made by individuals and corporations during the period of the emergency in excess of their peacetime earnings or profits, to be determined by some formula to be set up by Congress, the basic formula being to determine the average peacetime earnings for the period of 3 or 5 years preceding the emergency.

It is thoroughly understood that we cannot legislate on tax matters in the Senate, that is we cannot originate a tax bill in the Senate as it must be originated in the House of Representatives. Consequently, I am unable to make any proposition as to the exact wording of the tax bill. But the amendment which I am now offering presupposes that a tax bill will originate in the House that will tax all war profits 100 percent from the effective date of the emergency.

Mr. President, I realized that such a suggestion should be taken before the appropriate committee considering a bill.

I therefore wrote a letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee on May 3 which I wish to read. It was a suggestion that the amendment I am now proposing, or a similar amendment, be added to S. 2655 while the bill was yet in committee. The letter reads as follows:

MAY 3, 1948.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your committee is now preparing a bill designed to draft our boys into our armed forces. I propose and strongly recommend that you insert a provision in this bill which will make it effective only when Congress passes a law that will tax all war profits 100 percent. By war profits I mean all income of corporations and individuals in excess of their proven legitimate peacetime income. Surely when an emergency justifies drafting our boys, war profits should also be drafted simultaneously. Tax legislation must originate in the House of Representatives. I feel sure that to amend the draft law as I propose would assure the passage of such a tax bill. If we are to take the profits out of war it will have to be done at the same time we draft the boys or it will never be done.

It has long been recognized that the desire for war profits breeds war and prolongs war. It has long been recognized that when war profits are prohibited we will have taken the most important step toward peace.

At the beginning of every war pious platitudes have been proclaimed about preventing the making of war millionaires, but no definite laws were ever enacted to accomplish the purpose. Only as late as the beginning of the last war our President promised that there would be no war millionaires made out of World War II. We all know now that there were more riches made from the blood spilled in the last war than in several previous wars combined. It will be the same in future wars, if we do not draft war profits at the same time we draft the boys. The only way this can be done is to provide that the effective date of the draft bill will be the effective date of a 100-percent war-profits tax bill.

I believe legislation of this nature will receive almost unanimous approval from the rank and file of our American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Texas.

Mr. President, my amendment was not inserted in the bill in committee; that is why I am on the floor of the Senate today making this statement, and sending to the desk an amendment which I intend to offer later. I ask, Mr. President, that the amendment may be received, printed, and lie on the table, subject to being called up at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, and be printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the pending question is the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] lettered "C"; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, should they wish to go into the question of how the Army is handling segregation, I call their particular attention to the Senate hearings beginning on page 652 and continuing through to the middle of page 661. Should any Senators wish to read this part of the hearings, I am sure they will find a considerable amount of information, and will agree that the Department of the Army is handling the question in a forward-looking and in an intelligent way. I believe that matter should appear in the RECORD in full at this point. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the portion of the hearings beginning on page 652 and continuing through to middle of page 661, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIRCULAR NO. 124
WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1946.

(Effective until October 27, 1947, unless sooner rescinded or superseded.)

UTILIZATION OF NEGRO MANPOWER IN THE POSTWAR ARMY POLICY

To effect the maximum efficient utilization of the authorized Negro manpower in the postwar period, the War Department has adopted the following policy:

Negro manpower in the postwar Army will be utilized on a broader professional scale than has obtained heretofore. The development of leaders and specialists based on individual merit and ability, to meet effectively the requirements of an expanded war Army will be accomplished through the medium of installations and organizations. Groupings of Negro units with white units in composite organizations will be accepted policy.

IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY

In order to develop the means required for maximum utilization of the authorized manpower of the Nation in the event of a national emergency the following will obtain:

1. The troop basis for the postwar Army will include Negro troops approximately in the 1 to 10 ratio of the Negro civilian population to the total population of the Nation.

2. To meet the requirements of training and expansion, combat and service units will be organized and activated from the available Negro manpower. Employment will be in Negro regiments or groups, separate battalions or squadrons, and separate companies, troops, or batteries, which will conform in general to other units of the postwar army. A proportionate number of these units will be organized as part of larger units. White officers assigned to Negro organizations will be replaced by Negro officers who prove qualified to fill the assignment. In addition, Negro manpower with special skills or qualifications will be employed as individuals in appropriate overhead and special units.

3. Additional officer supervision will be supplied to units which have a greater than normal percentage of personnel within the AGCT classification of IV and V.

Fifty percent or more class IV and V, 25 percent increase of officers.

Seventy percent or more class IV and V, 50 percent increase of officers. Increased officer personnel will be of company grade.

4. The planning, promulgation, implementation, and revision of this policy will be coordinated by the assistant for planning and policy coordination, office of the assistant chief of staff, G–1, War Department general staff.

5. Officers will be accepted in the Regular Army through the operation of the present integration policy without regard to race.

6. The present policy of according all officers, regardless of race, equal opportunities for appointment, advancement, professional improvement, promotion, and retention in all components of the Army will be continued.

7. Negro Reserve officers will be eligible for active-duty training and service in accordance with any program established for other officers of like component and status. All officer requirements for expansion of the Regular Establishment as distinguished from the Regular Army and for replacement, regardless of race, will be procured in the existing manner from current sources; namely, ROTC honor students, Officers' Reserve Corps, direct appointments, graduates of officer candidate schools, Regular Army appointments from the Army of the United States, and graduates of the United States Military Academy.

8. All enlisted men whether volunteers or selectees will be accorded the same processing through appropriate installations to insure proper classification and assignment of individuals.

9. Surveys of manpower requirements conducted by the War Department will include recommendations covering the positions in each installation of the Army which could be filled by Negro military personnel.

10. At posts, camps, and stations where both Negro and white troops are assigned for duty, the War Department policies regarding use of recreational facilities and membership in officers' clubs, messes, or similar organizations as set forth in paragraph 19, AR 210–10, WD memorandum 600–45, June 14, 1945, and WD letter, AG 353.8 (July 5, 44) OB–S–A–M) July 8, 1944, recreational facilities, will be continued in effect.

11. Considering essential military factors, Negro units will be stationed in localities and communities where attitudes are most favorable and in such strength as will not constitute an undue burden to the local civilian facilities.

12. Commanders of organizations, installations, and stations containing Negro personnel will be responsible for the execution of the War Department policy. Maximum latitude is authorized in the solution of purely local problems.

13. Commanders of all echelons of the Army will insure that all personnel under their command are thoroughly indoctrinated with the necessity for the unreserved acceptance of the provisions of the policy.

14. WD letter (AG 219.21 (10–9–40) M–A–M) October 16, 1940, War Department policy in regard to Negroes, is rescinded since the policy expressed therein has been amplified and superseded by the policy enunciated herewith.

15. The above-stated policy is the direct result of the report made by a board of officers on utilization of Negro officers in the postwar period, convened October 4, 1945, by the direction of Secretary of War. The following approved board report is published for the information of all concerned:

"REPORT OF BOARD OF OFFICERS ON UTILIZATION OF NEGRO MANPOWER IN THE POSTWAR ARMY

"FEBRUARY 26, 1946.

"I. PURPOSE

"A. Statement of the problem

"The board in a memorandum dated October 4, 1945, to prepare a broad policy for utilization of Negro manpower in the Military Establishment, including the development of means required in the event of a national emergency.

"The proposed policy and means will cover:

"1. Broadening the professional base of Negro personnel in the Regular Army.

"2. Organization of Negro units.

"3. Implementation and revision of policies by a staff group.

"4. Induction and training of Negro personnel.

"5. Indoctrination of all ranks throughout the service in the policy promulgated.

"The plan proposed is based upon the lessons of experience and envisions maximum efficiency in the use of all authorized manpower in the event of another emergency straining every resource of the Nation.

"B. Plan of investigation

"The board has concerned itself with an examination of past and present War Depart-

ment policies, their effectiveness during the period between world wars and in World War II, and the advisability of continuing these policies during the postwar period. In the course of its proceedings, the board has obtained a free expression of the views of representative military and civilian leaders.

"Essentially the problem has resolved itself into the following questions:

"1. How shall Negro personnel be utilized in the Army in the event of another national emergency?

"2. What basis of Negro personnel is necessary in the postwar Army in order to provide for rapid expansion in time of war?

"3. What shall be the scope of the War Department General Staff and of subordinate commanders in implementing any policy adopted?

"4. How shall authorized Negro personnel be selected, processed, trained, and assigned?

"5. Shall changes in policy be adopted and promulgated immediately?

"II. FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

"A. General aspects of Negro manpower potential

"The United States of America has just successfully concluded a global war which strained her manpower, industry, and material resources to the utmost. Every citizen of the democracy was called upon to exert the utmost effort as part of the national team. That every citizen did so, to the limit of his or her ability, is history.

"The natural and artificial resources of any nation are dependent upon and reflect the vigor of her manpower. An intelligent patriotism is imperative, if the nation is to vindicate the past, maintain the present, and rise to its future destiny.

"Lessons gained from World War II: Lessons of primary military interest gained from the experience of the last 5 years are:

"That there is a limit to the amount of manpower available in the Nation to form a modern military organization capable of prosecuting the major war;

"That the manpower available, of itself, varies in quality.

"The principle of economy of forces clearly indicates, therefore, that every effort must be expended to utilize efficiently every qualified available individual in a position in the military structure for which he is best suited. It follows logically that we must always strive for improvement in the quality of the whole.

"The Negro manpower potential: The Negro constitutes approximately 10 percent of the civilian population of the country and thus becomes no small part of the manpower reservoir available for use in time of peace or in the event of a national emergency.

"An impartial review and analysis of the progress made by the Negro citizen between World War I and World War II, particularly in the last 5 years, has led this board to the conclusion that comprehensive study involving the Negro manpower of the Nation in the Military Establishment is timely.

"The Negro is a bona fide citizen enjoying the privileges conferred by citizenship under the Constitution. By the same token, he must defend his country in time of national peril. Testimony presented to this board has indicated that the Negro is ready and eager to accept his full responsibility as a citizen.

"It follows therefore:

"That the Negro, desiring to accept his legal and moral responsibility as charged by the Constitution, should be given every opportunity and aid to prepare himself for effective military service in company with every other citizen who is called.

"That those charged with the utilization of manpower in the Military Establishment have an equal legal and moral obligation under the Constitution to take all steps necessary to prepare the qualified manpower of the Nation so that it will function efficiently and effectively under the stress of modern battle conditions.

"Assignment difficulties in World War II: During the national emergency just concluded, approximately 909,000 Negroes, including Reserve and volunteers, were selected for use in the Army. These men were obtained from a reservoir of approximately 2,463,000 Negroes who registered for service. In the placement of the men who were accepted, the Army encountered considerable difficulty. Leadership qualities had not been developed among the Negroes, due principally to environment and lack of opportunity. These factors had also affected his development in the various skills and crafts.

"Corrective measures: In the opinion of the board, many of these difficulties can be overcome by forward planning, and by the development of a broader base of trained personnel, both officer and enlisted, than that which existed prior to World War II. This nucleus can assimilate a much larger proportion of the available Negro manpower than was done heretofore.

"Effects of the war: No study would be complete that failed to evaluate the collateral education gained by every Negro man and woman during the war years. The imprints of travel, of bettered living and health conditions, plus the increased financial resources, have left a mental stamp which will persist and continue to become more articulate.

"During the last few years, many of the concepts pertaining to the Negro have shown changing trends. They are pointing toward a more complete acceptance of the Negro in all the diversified fields of endeavor. This trend has been noticeable to a greater extent in the Northern and Western sections of the country. The Negro to a greater extent has been accepted in industry, and in administrative and scientific fields, both as individuals and groups, with good results. This acceptance has resulted in better wages which automatically raised his standard of living. Of more importance from a military viewpoint, however, are the opportunities which have been afforded the Negro to expand his knowledge of the trades and skills. The latter have a ready market in the intricacies of a modern military machine.

"Many Negroes, who, before the war, were laborers, are now craftsmen, capable in many instances of competing with the white man on an equal basis. This change in the industrial status has further allowed the Negro to give his children more and better education. In many colleges and universities of the North and West, the Negro student is accepted solely on the basis of his individual merit and ability. This rise in the technical and cultural level of the Negro has, in turn, given him a more articulate voice in government.

"Related pertinent data: The Negroes' increasing capability for participation in society and government is evident from consideration of the facts below:

Growth in educational attainments

	All Negroes, World War I	Negroes of 12 Southern States, World War II	Other Negroes, World War II	Whites of United States, World War II
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1 to 8 years grade school	95	64	40	26
1 to 4 years high school	5	32	53	62
1 or more years of college	Few	4	7	12

Rate of Negro emigration from the South

Ratio of Negroes who came from north of Mason and Dixon's line:

World War I ..... 1 to 5

World War II ..... 1 to 3

Increase in Negro participation in Government

	1938	1944
Percent of all persons employed by Federal Government in Washington who were Negroes	8.4	19.2
Percent of above Negroes whose jobs were custodial	60.0	40.0

"Increase in industrial experience: The great expansion of industry during the war gave the Negro greater opportunity to gain industrial experience than ever before. The War Manpower Board reports that Negro participation in defense industries increased from 3 percent in 1942 to 8.3 percent in 1944, or over 100 percent. This increase in industrial experience is an important factor when considering manpower from the standpoint of national defense.

"Factors affecting future utilization: These three factors of education, craftsmanship, and governmental participation have enhanced the military value of the Negro. A broader selectivity is now available than was heretofore possible, with a resultant beneficial effect on military efficiency.

"Scope and nature of policy: While the lessons learned from the service of the Negro in the war just concluded are still fresh in our minds, and while the people as a whole are still military-minded, it is the considered opinion of this Board that a progressive policy for greater utilization of the Negro manpower be formulated and implemented now, if the Nation is to establish its military structure on the experiences of the past. The Nation should not fail to use the assets developed through a closer relationship of the races during the years of war.

"The policies prepared by the War Department should be progressively flexible. They should envision the continued mental and physical improvement of all citizens. They should be implemented promptly. They must be objective by nature. They must eliminate, at the earliest practicable moment, any special consideration based on race. They should point toward the immediate objective of an evaluation of the Negro on the basis of individual merit and ability. They should point toward a long-range objective which visualizes, over a period of time, a still greater utilization of this manpower potential in the military machine of the Nation.

"Required action: Courageous leadership in implementing the program is imperative. All ranks must be imbued with the necessity for a straightforward, unequivocating attitude toward the maintenance and preservation of a forward-thinking policy.

"B. Summary of evaluation of combat performance—World War II

"1. General: A careful analysis of the combat service performed by the Negro in World War II indicates clearly that:

"The participation of the Negro in World War II was in many instances creditable, and definitely contributed to the success attained by our military forces.

"No analysis would be complete, however, that fails to evaluate the disadvantages under which the Negro entered the conflict and which militated against his success.

"2. Disadvantages accrued to the Negro:

"The records and testimony indicate that—

"(1) Although it was definitely known that the Negro manpower would amount to approximately 10 percent of the manpower available for war, plans were not prepared prior to World War II for mobilization and employment of major units of all arms. This resulted in some instances in a disproportionate allocation of lower-bracket personnel to combat elements.

"(2) Likewise, no provisions were made initially for utilizing the Negro manpower in

supporting type-combat units. These eventually embraced all categories. This latter condition apparently resulted from the pressure initiated by the Negroes themselves.

"(3) The initial lack of plans for the organization and utilization of the wide variety of combat units was reflected in frequent reorganization, regrouping, and shifting from one type of training to another. For example, some engineers and artillery were thus affected.

"(4) Evidence indicates that in some instances units were organized without definite T. of O. and E. and without a general prescription as to the missions for which organized. This was an expediency to offset the lack of plans when manpower was suddenly made available in large numbers.

"(5) The above factors, when added to the definite lack of information as to ultimate time and place of assignment and mission to be assigned the various units, was undoubtedly confusing to the Negro mind and may have become a contributing cause for some of the reported failures in combat.

"(6) Official reports on Negro units do not reflect many factors which may have been contributing causes of the substandard performance in combat.

"An over-all far-reaching factor which affected adversely the efficiency of combat units of all types was the shortage of trained subordinate leaders. This shortage stemmed directly from limitations for which the Army was only partially at fault. Environment and lack of administrative and educational advantages in prewar days greatly handicapped the Negro in the performance of his wartime duties.

"3. Advantages accrued to the Negro: Likewise in estimating the combat record of performance, careful scrutiny must be given to the advantages which accrued to the units from the Negro manpower and the resultant benefits derived therefrom. Consideration must be given to the facts that:

"(1) First-class equipment, and material, and ample munitions for training purposes, were made available.

"(2) Favorable training areas and aids were placed at the disposal of commanders and in many cases, especially in combat units, normal training periods were extended to insure adequately trained units.

"(3) Experienced white commanders were assigned to direct training and to lead the major elements into action.

"(4) The combat units were carefully staged into the theater of operations and all echelons of command were briefed meticulously prior to entry into action.

"(5) Reorganization and regrouping were practiced with the objective of enhancing the chances of success of the units involved.

"4. Deductions of facts. Certain facts were deduced from a careful check of and records and the testimony of commanders, observers, and participants in the war just terminated, and arrived at after weighing the advantages and disadvantages previously outlined.

"These are: (1) There is substantial evidence to indicate that the least proficient performance has been derived from combat units which were required to close with the enemy to accomplish a prescribed mission.

"(2) In general, relatively slight losses were experienced by Negro infantry units.

"(3) There was ample evidence to show that in certain instances small infantry composite units, Negro platoons in white companies when ably led, were eminently successful even though relatively heavy casualties were suffered.

"(4) The board likewise was convinced from evidence that the Negro soldier will execute in satisfactory manner, combat duties in a supporting type unit; for example, an artillery battalion.

"(5) Evidence definitely indicated that the largest use of Negro manpower was in the service-type units, and that in this field they demonstrated their highest degree of efficiency. However, some service units functioned directly in support of combat units, being to all intents and purposes a part of them. Many of these elements performed most creditably.

"5. Summary: From the evidence presented by the most experienced commanders, the board cannot fail to conclude that the results obtained by all units are in direct proportion to the leadership demonstrated. The failures of Negro units have in almost every case been attributed to the lack of leadership qualities of junior officers and noncommissioned officers. Leadership, therefore, must be stressed and the development of all attributes which contribute to this and must be the prime objective of those responsible for the training of the postwar Army. In this endeavor, most benefit will be derived from the broader scope of activities which have been opened to the Negro during 5 years of war.

"A corollary to this first objective is clearly defined, for it leads directly toward the second objective.

"Infantry must be made more effective. When the quality of the close combat elements composed either wholly or in part from the Negro component is raised to the level desired and expected, the Army of this Nation will be immeasurably improved.

"In implementing the recommended program, all types of Negro units should be included in the peacetime Army. These units should eventually be officered by Negro officers. In organizing units, a preference should be given to combat-type units, especially infantry units, in which the Negro has demonstrated the least degree of efficiency. The training of these units should stress initiative and command ability on the part of the Negro soldier in order to improve his character and confidence, educate him to assume responsibility, raise his morale, and better prepare him to assume the duties of a combat soldier.

"After weighing the evidence carefully and objectively, it seems evident that certain remedial action can and must be taken. By so doing, the War Department will enhance the military value of this potential and thereby increase the efficiency of the armed forces of the Nation.

"III. CONCLUSIONS

"Having considered the factual and other official materials made available by the War Department and the oral testimony of over 60 military and civilian witnesses, this Board has arrived unanimously at the following conclusions:

"1. A comparison of the selective-service records in two wars indicates that the Negro manpower which may be expected to become available to the Army in case of another national emergency will no doubt exceed that of World War II.

"2. Considering the advances made by the Negro civilian during the period between World War I and World War II and the increase in numbers available for military service, it is concluded that adequate plans were not prepared for the ultimate utilization of this manpower.

"3. The advancement of the Negro in education, skills and crafts, and resultant economic betterment definitely indicate that if prompt and adequate steps are taken at this time, a greater and more efficient use can be realized from this manpower in the Military Establishment of the future.

"4. In the light of past experiences, it is believed that many of the difficulties and much of the confusion encountered in the placement of the Negro manpower during the selective-service period of World War II could have been eliminated had War Department policies been fully implemented.

"5. The experiences gained in the utilization of the Negro manpower in two major wars lead to the definite conclusion that, if remedial action is taken by the War Department at this time, many of the apparent deficiencies of the Negro soldier can be eliminated and more efficient results derived from this manpower in the future.

"6. Many of the deficiencies of leadership attributed to the Negro soldier in the past can be eliminated by creating in the postwar Army, for purposes of expansion, a broader Negro base of both officers and enlisted men to assist in the training of the peacetime Army and to provide cadres and leaders to meet more efficiently the requirements of the Army in the event of a national emergency.

"7. Creation of a broader Negro base in the postwar Army logically includes organization of appropriate elements of any female component.

"8. To insure understanding and a basis for planning purposes, there must be established a ratio of Negro to white manpower in the postwar Army. This ratio, for the present, should be that which exists in the civil population.

"9. In World War II some types of Negro units demonstrated greater proficiency than others. In general, service units have performed in a more satisfactory manner than combat units. Likewise, some units have consistently better combat records than others. In organizing or activating Negro units to create a broader base in the postwar Army, it is concluded that combat units be stressed.

"10. For efficient results, the implementation and progressive development of a general policy in preparation for full utilization of Negro manpower in a national emergency will require the closest cooperation and coordination with the War Department, between the War Department and field commanders, and between local commanders and local civil officials.

"11. Creation of a War Department General Staff group of selected officers, experienced in command, who can devote their time to problems involving minority racial elements in the Military Establishment is necessary to insure adequate and continuous coordination and cooperation in implementing policy. Creation for the same purpose of a similar group on the staff of each major command is necessary.

"12. The War Department policy announced for the administration and utilization of minority groups in the postwar Army should be carefully coordinated with policies of the sister services.

"13. Testimony before this board has indicated that units composed largely of personnel classified in the two lowest grades on the AGCT scale require more officer supervision in training and in the field than units composed of personnel of normal distribution. It is concluded, therefore, that attachment of officers to units including abnormal proportions of personnel in grades IV and V on the AGCT scale is necessary when time is the critical factor, as it will be under war conditions or under a system of universal military training. This procedure is not necessary in the Regular Army in peacetime.

"14. The training advantages accruing from favorable climatic or terrain conditions should be evaluated against the factor of unfavorable community attitude with its resultant effect on both training and morale. Troop locations should be selected after a consideration of these opposing factors, due regard being given in all cases to the fact that small civilian communities are incapable of absorbing large numbers of military personnel regardless of race. Exceptions to this principle may be necessary in the event of universal military training, for general efficiency of the Military Establishment, or in the interest of national security.

"15. Regardless of source of procurement and of racial antecedents, all officers of all components of the Army should be accorded equal rights and opportunities for advancement and professional improvement as prescribed by law and regulation; and all officers should be required to meet the same standard for appointment, promotion, and retention in all components of the Army.

"16. The sources of potential officer material can be extended and fostered through the medium of a more comprehensive ROTC and an Army leadership school program.

"17. Processing of all personnel entering the Army, whether volunteers or selectees, through reception and training centers promote and maintain the efficiency of the Army and will insure proper assignment of individuals.

"18. The high reenlistment rate of professional privates in Negro units has in the past denied entry into the service to much potential officer and noncommissioned officer material. Economy and efficiency demand that men of low intelligence and education who have proved incapable of developing into specialists or leaders be eliminated from the service at termination of the first enlistment. Any policy implemented should include all races.

"19. There are many places in the framework of the overhead units at Army installations where Negro personnel with special skills can be utilized to advantage as individuals. Periodic surveys of the installations are necessary to determine such positions.

"20. Experiments and other experiences of World War II indicate clearly that the most successful employment of Negro units occurred when they were employed as units closely associated with white units on similar tasks, and a greater degree of success was obtained when small Negro organizations were so employed.

"21. Experience, education, and tolerance on the part of all personnel of the Army will serve to rectify many of the difficulties inherent in a mixed or composite unit.

"22. Present War Department policies pertaining to the administration of educational, recreational, and messing facilities and of officers' clubs at posts, camps, and stations where racial minority elements are located are considered adequate for the present and should be continued in effect.

"23. The adoption and promulgation without delay of a broad, comprehensive, and progressive policy for the utilization of Negro manpower in the postwar Army will stimulate the Negro's interest, eliminate some of the frustrations, improve morale, and facilitate the development of individual ability and leadership.

"24. The adoption and promulgation of a policy for utilization of Negro manpower in the Military Establishment will not in itself achieve the desired result. Steps must be taken concurrently to inform and indoctrinate all ranks of the Military Establishment concerning the importance to the national security of the successful accomplishment of the program.

"25. The approval and promulgation of a constructive and progressive policy involving the utilization of this manpower potential should be effected without delay. By such procedure the War Department will indicate clearly an endeavor to capitalize on and benefit from the lessons learned in the school of war.

"26. Existing laws, regulations, and official publications should be examined for determination of any conflict with the proposed policy envisaging a greater utilization of Negro manpower.

"27. Publication of the approved policy by the War Department will facilitate an understanding attitude insofar as the press of the Nation is concerned and thereby indicate that a progressive program aimed directly at the objective of more effective manpower utilization is being implemented.

"IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

"A. Policy

"In order that authorized Negro manpower may be utilized with maximum efficiency during the postwar period, this board recommends that the War Department adopt, promulgate, and implement the following policy:

"To utilize the Negro manpower in the postwar Army on a broader professional scale than has obtained heretofore and, through the medium of installations and organizations, to facilitate the development of leaders and specialists to meet effectively the requirements of an expanded war Army.

"B. Implementation of policy

"In order to develop the means required for maximum utilization of the authorized manpower of the Nation in the event of a national emergency, it is further recommended—

"1. (a) That combat and service units be organized and activated from the Negro manpower available in the postwar Army to meet the requirements of training and expansion and, in addition, qualified individuals be utilized in appropriate special and overhead units.

"(b) The proportion of Negro to white manpower as exists in the civil population be the accepted ratio for creating a troop basis in the postwar Army.

"2. That Negro units organized or activated for the postwar Army conform in general to other units of the postwar Army, but the maximum strength of type units should not exceed that of an infantry regiment or comparable organization.

"3. That, in the event of universal military training in peacetime, additional officer supervision is supplied to units which have a greater than normal percentage of personnel falling into AGCT classifications IV and V.

"4. That a staff group of selected officers whose background has included command troops be formed within the G–1 division of the staffs of the War Department and each major command of the Army to assist in the planning, promulgation, implementation, and revision of policies affecting all racial minorities.

"5. That there be accepted into the Regular Army an unspecified number of qualified Negro officers; that officers initially selected for appointment in the Regular Establishment be taken from those with experience in World War II; that all officers, regardless of race, be required to meet the same standard for appointment.

"6. That all officers, regardless of race, be accorded equal rights and opportunities for advancement and professional improvement and be required to meet the same standard for appointment, promotion, and retention in all components of the Army.

"7. That Negro officers to meet requirements for expansion of the Regular Establishment and for replacements be procured from the following sources:

"(a) Reserve officers, including ROTC graduates, who shall be eligible for active-duty training and service in accordance with any program established for officers of like component and status.

"(b) Candidates from the ranks.

"(c) Graduates of the United States Military Academy.

"(d) Other sources utilized by the Army.

"8. That all enlisted men, whether volunteers or selectees, be routed through reception and training centers or other installations of a similar nature to insure proper classification and assignment of individuals.

"9. That reenlistment be denied to Regular Army soldiers who meet only the minimum standards.

"10. That surveys of manpower requirements conducted by the War Department include recommendations covering the positions in each installation of the Army which could be filled by Negro military personnel.

"11. That groupings of Negro units with white units in composite organizations be continued in the postwar Army as a policy.

"12. The principle that Negro units of the postwar Army be stationed in localities where community attitudes are most favorable and in such strength as will not constitute an undue burden to the local civilian population be adopted, exceptions to this principle to be premised on the basis of military necessity and in the interest of national security.

"13. That at posts, camps, and stations where both Negro and white soldiers are assigned for duty, the War Department policies regarding use of recreational facilities and membership in officers' clubs, messes, or similar social organizations be continued in effect.

"14. That commanders of organizations, installations, and stations containing Negro personnel be fully cognizant of their responsibilities in the execution of the overall War Department policy, and conversely that they be permitted maximum latitude in the solution of purely local problems.

"15. That the War Department, concurrently with promulgation of the approved policy, take steps to insure the indoctrination of all ranks throughout the service as to the necessity for an unreserved acceptance of the provisions of the policy.

"16. That approval and promulgation of a policy for utilization of Negro manpower in the postwar Army be accomplished with the least practicable delay.

"17. That, upon approval of this policy, steps be initiated within the War Department to amend or rescind such laws and official publications as are in conflict therewith.

"18. That the recommended policy as approved by the War Department with reference to the utilization of the Negro manpower in the postwar Army be unrestricted and made public.

"ALVAN C. GILLEM, Jr.,
"Lieutenant General,
"United States Army, Chairman.
"LEWIS A. PICK,
"Major General,
"United States Army, Member.
"WINSLOW C. MORSE,
"Brigadier General,
"United States Army, Member.
"ALN D. WARNOCK,
"Brigadier General,
"United States Army,
"Recorder Without Vote."

APPENDIX

The board of officers, in a supplementary memorandum, approved the following statement with regard to the objectives of its report:

"Objectives: The board visualizes at this time only two objectives:

"The initial objectives: The utilization of the proportionate ratio of the manpower made available to the Military Establishment during the postwar period, the manpower potential to be organized and trained as indicated by pertinent recommendations.

"The ultimate objective: The effective use of all manpower made available to the Military Establishment in the event of a major mobilization at some unknown date against an undetermined aggressor, the manpower to be utilized, in the event of another major war, in the Army without regard to antecedents or race.

"When and if such a contingency arises, the manpower of the Nation should be utilized in the best interests of the national security.

"The board cannot and does not attempt to visualize at this time intermediate objectives. Between the first and ultimate objective timely phasing may be interjected and

adjustments made in accordance with conditions which may obtain at this undetermined date."

[AG 291.2 (20 Apr. 46).]

By order of the Secretary of War:

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the problems faced by the Nation in mobilizing more than 12,000,000 men were staggering in their magnitude and complexity. In the early days of the war the movement of large numbers of individuals in uniform by common carrier, by bus, or by train, brought the segregation issue squarely to the front. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that we had a number of unfortunate and vexing experiences, but I submit we would have had these irritating episodes whether we had a law on the subject or not. The point I wish to make is this: By the end of the period of hostilities a workable compromise had been developed by reason of our national good sense and by the simple process of trial and error, and the problem had largely disappeared.

Today it is causing no difficulty, unrest, or hardship. The Nation adapted its thinking to the realities of the day. A law was not necessary. The Nation proved itself in fact to be sufficiently mature to meet the situation without recourse to legislation.

I repeat my remarks which I made earlier in the day, and last Friday. The pending amendment is not necessary. It would, if agreed to, have the really tragic and disturbing effect of injecting a major morale problem into the everyday lives of our citizens whether in uniform or not. A bill to increase the number of men on active duty with the armed forces is no place for the amendment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the amendment presently before the Senate be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the pending amendment be laid on the table.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Maybank
Ball	Gurney	Millikin
Barkley	Hawkes	Moore
Brewster	Hayden	Morse
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Murray
Buck	Hill	Myers
Butler	Hoey	O'Conor
Byrd	Holland	O'Daniel
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Chavez	Kem	Revercomb
Connally	Kilgore	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Cordon	Langer	Russell
Donnell	Lodge	Saltonstall
Downey	Lucas	Smith
Dworshak	McCarthy	Sparkman
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Ecton	McGrath	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	Taft
Feazel	McMahon	Taylor
Flanders	Malone	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	Martin	Thomas, Utah
Thye	Watkins	Williams
Tydings	Wherry	Wilson
Umstead	White	Young
Vandenberg	Wiley	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], being amendment C.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I was rather hopeful that this afternoon we could at least dispose of the amendments which have been submitted by the Senator from North Dakota. They are all on the same general subject.

I appeal to Senators to assist in every way possible in expediting consideration of the bill. I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota would like to assist in any way he could in expediting the business of the Senate. I should like to ask him at this time if he would agree to offer his remaining amendments en bloc?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I could not do that, because the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has an amendment to offer. After that is disposed of, I shall proceed to offer my amendments. I have given my word to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments to be proposed——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the series of amendments submitted by the Senator from North Dakota. I might as well speak to all of them. They are all addressed to one subject, the question of civil rights in the armed forces.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, if that is the purpose of the speech, I am wondering if the Senator from North Dakota would be willing to offer his amendments at this time. Will the Senator from Idaho yield so that the amendments may be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from North Dakota so that he may offer an amendment, or amendments?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota object to having his remaining amendments considered en bloc, so that the Senator from Idaho may discuss all of them?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I prefer not to have them considered en bloc. I now offer my amendment lettered "D."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will it be satisfactory to the Senator from North Dakota if his amendment is incorporated in the RECORD at this point without being read?

Mr. LANGER. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

The amendment offered by Mr. LANGER was, at the end of the bill, to add a new section, as follows:

PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—DEFINITIONS

SEC. . (a). Any assemblage of two or more persons which shall, without authority of law, (1) commit or attempt to commit violence upon the person of any member of the armed forces of the United States because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, or (2) exercise or attempt to exercise, by physical violence against the person, any power of correction or punishment over any member of the armed forces of the United States in the custody of any peace officer or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension or trial or punishment by law of such member, or of imposing a punishment not authorized by law, shall constitute a lynch mob within the meaning of this section. Any such violence by a lynch mob shall constitute lynching within the meaning of this section.

PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING OF MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES

(b) Any person whether or not a member of a lynch mob who willfully instigates, incites, organizes, aids, abets, or commits a lynching by any means whatsoever, and any member of a lynch mob, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 20 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

PUNISHMENT FOR FAILURE TO PREVENT LYNCHING OF MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES

(c) Whenever a lynching of a member of the armed forces shall occur, any officer or employee of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof, who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching, but shall have neglected, refused, or willfully failed to make all diligent efforts to prevent the lynching, and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who shall have had custody of the member of the armed forces lynched and shall have neglected, refused, or willfully failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such member from lynching, and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof, who, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, shall neglect, refuse, or willfully fail to make all diligent efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute the members or any member of the lynching mob, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

DUTY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

(d) Whenever a lynching of any member of the armed forces shall occur, and information on oath is submitted to the Attorney General of the United States that any officer or employee of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to protect such member from lynching, or who shall have had custody of the member of the armed forces lynched, has neglected, refused, or willfully failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such member from lynching or that any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, has neglected, refused, or willfully failed to make all diligent efforts

to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute the members of any member of the lynching mob, the Attorney General of the United States shall cause an investigation to be made to determine whether there has been any violation of this act.

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF LYNCHING

(e) (1) Every governmental subdivision of a State to which the State shall have delegated functions of police shall be responsible for any lynching of a member of the armed forces occurring within its territorial jurisdiction. Every such governmental subdivision shall also be responsible for any lynching of a member of the armed forces which follows upon the seizure and abduction of the victim or victims within its territorial jurisdiction, irrespective of whether such lynching occurs within its territorial jurisdiction or not. Any such governmental subdivision which shall fail to prevent any such lynching or any such seizure and abduction followed by lynching shall be liable to each individual who suffers injury to his person, or to his next of kin if such injury results in death, for a sum of not less than $2,000 and not more than $10,000 as monetary compensation for such injury or death: *Provided, however,* That the governmental subdivision may prove by a preponderance of evidence as an affirmative defense that the officers thereof charged with the duty of preserving the peace, and the citizens thereof, when called upon by any such officer, used all diligence and all powers vested in them for the protection of the member of the armed forces lynched: *And provided further,* That the satisfaction of judgment against one governmental subdivision responsible for a lynching shall bar further proceedings against any other governmental subdivision which may also be responsible for that lynching.

(2) Liability arising under this section may be enforced and the compensation herein provided for may be recovered in a civil action in the United States district court for the judicial district of which the defendant governmental subdivision is a part. Such action shall be brought and prosecuted by the Attorney General of the United States in the name of the United States for the use of the real party in interest, or, if the claimant or claimants shall so elect, by counsel employed by the claimant or claimants, but in any event without prepayment of costs. If the amount of any such judgment shall not be paid upon demand, payment thereof may be enforced by any process available under the State law for the enforcement of any other money judgment against such governmental subdivision. Any officer of such governmental subdivision or any other person who shall disobey or fail to comply with any lawful order or decree of the court for the enforcement of the judgment shall be guilty of contempt of that court and punished accordingly. The cause of action accruing hereunder to a member of the armed forces injured by lynching shall not abate with the subsequent death of that member before final judgment but shall survive to his next of kin. For the purpose of this section the next of kin of a deceased victim of lynching shall be determined according to the laws of intestate distribution in the State of domicile of the decedent. Any judgment or award under this section shall be exempt from all claims of creditors.

(3) Any judge of the United States district court for the judicial district wherein any suit shall be instituted under the provisions of this section may by order direct that such suit be tried in any place in such district as he may designate in such order: *Provided,* That no such suit shall be tried within the territorial limits of the defendant governmental subdivision.

(f) The crime defined in and punishable under the act of June 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 326), as amended by the act of May 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 781), shall include the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of any member of the armed forces unlawfully abducted and held for purposes of punishment, correction, or intimidation.

(g) The penalties provided in this section for a lynching of a member of the armed forces shall be in lieu of the penalties provided in section 12 for violations of the provisions of this act generally.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

(h) If any particular provision, sentence, or clause, or provisions, sentences, or clauses, of this section, or the application thereof to any particular person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this section, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to make it very plain that I am in full accord with the views expressed in the amendments submitted by the Senator from North Dakota. I believe that all human beings are created equal, and should receive equal consideration in all matters—most certainly in this great country of ours, where we have set ourselves up as a model for democratic rights and privileges of which we boast before all the world.

It seems to me that the failure to prevent segregation and discrimination in the armed forces is part and parcel of the failure to carry out any of the fine recommendations and promises with respect to civil rights which have been made by leaders of both parties. The Senator from North Dakota has taken his own party to task very severely because it has had glowing planks in its national platforms for lo these many years, promising equal rights to the Negro people. The Democratic Party has done likewise. I think it is time for action of some kind. If we cannot get the bills reported—and it seems impossible to have that done at this session—why not at least make a step in the right direction, and break the ice a little at a time, instead of "giving them the works," so to speak, all at once?

The Senator from Oregon has said the people are not ready for complete equality. Of course, when I think a thing is right, I do not stop to consider whether the people are ready for it. If it is the right thing to do, since the people of my State elect me to work 24 hours a day, if necessary, for the right thing, I think they expect me to arrive at my own conclusions, possibly before they do, and then go ahead and do what I think is right about it.

Both parties pay lip service to civil rights; but in the test, neither party will support legislation such as the amendments of the Senator from North Dakota—amendments which will make civil rights a reality for the Negro and for other minority peoples in this country, especially in the armed services. Just as the Senate Judiciary Committee has bottled up the antilynching bill for months, and the Senate leadership on both sides of the aisle have failed to act on the poll tax and the FEPC bills before them, so now, too, the leadership of both parties are trying to dodge the issue of equal rights for Negroes and protection of Negroes in the exercise of those rights. The President has it within his power to abolish segregation in the armed services. He has promised that that shall be done. In his civil-rights message he said he had instructed the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, to "take steps to have the remaining instances of discrimination in the armed services eliminated as rapidly as possible."

Immediately after that message, a practical test arose. Under the nonsegregation policy of the New Jersey Constitution, the Governor of New Jersey wrote to the Secretary of the Army asking whether the State's nonsegregation policy could be carried out within the National Guard and still be in conformity with the Army's policies. Secretary Royall, of the Army, wrote back that the Army will continue to segregate Negroes in separate units within white Army battalions. Here is the text of Mr. Royall's answer to Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey:

On January 8 you addressed to me a telegraphic inquiry concerning the utilization of Negro manpower in the militia of New Jersey. I have had the matter carefully reviewed by the military staff of this Department and have myself given it full consideration.

In accordance with a report of competent and experienced officers, the War Department on April 27, 1946, issued regulations which, among other things, required (subject to certain exceptions) that when Negroes are employed in Army units below the battalion, they will be organized into separate units.

This provision was considered to be in the interest of national defense, and both the staff and I feel that this is still the case. Therefore, these regulations will be continued in force for the Regular Army and, subject to the exception noted below, will also be effective for the federally recognized civilian components of the Army.

I have noted the fact that the people of New Jersey by direct majority vote have provided in their constitution that, no person shall * * * be segregated in the militia because of race, color, * * *. While the authority to determine all questions relating to the federally recognized National Guard must necessarily be exercised by the Department of the Army, yet I recognize the importance to a sovereign State of a constitutional provision such as yours, and I have determined that, for the present, Army militia units of New Jersey, if otherwise qualified, will not be denied Federal recognition on the ground of nonsegregation.

Mr. President, I think the fact that New Jersey voted, by popular vote, a constitutional provision outlawing segregation in their militia would seem to cast some doubt on the correctness of the estimate of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the American people are not ready for legislation giving full rights to the Negro people.

I have before me a clipping from the New York Times which says, in part:

President stands on antibias order to armed forces. He says his instructions that discrimination be ended as soon as possible remain.

Yet, Mr. President, we see Mr. Royall saying that he is going to keep segregation in the Army. We begin to wonder, sometimes, whether the Army simply considers itself above God and man and the Senate and everyone else. It looks that way, judging from a number of

things that have been happening lately. Recently I read in the newspaper that the general who has charge of our operations in Turkey stated we had spent nearly $1,000,000,000 in Turkey. Mr. President, as I recall, only $100,000,000 was appropriated for Turkey by the Senate. I have been wondering where the other $900,000,000 for Turkey came from. Congress did not appropriate it. It seems to me that if $900,000,000 can be chiseled for Turkey, possibly another $900,000,000 can be chiseled for Pendergast politics, or for Pew politics, for that matter. I have asked the State Department—although perhaps that is the wrong department to ask; perhaps I should ask the Army—where it got the money to spend in Turkey—money which the Congress did not appropriate.

Mr. President, this disagreement between the President and Mr. Royall raises a very basic issue. According to the President's own words, he had stated that he had ordered Secretary Forrestal to remove discrimination. But along comes a subordinate of Secretary Forrestal's. What does he do with the President's order? He openly and publicly defies it.

What is the meaning of this performance? Does this mean that on the issue of segregation and discrimination the President does not mean what he says?

Or is there perhaps a more dangerous meaning to this incident? Does this incident illustrate that the military regard themselves as already superior to the civilian authority, even the highest civilian authority in this Nation? Does it mean that the military mind has already gained the ascendancy over the civilian in direct contradiction to our entire history and Constitution? If a simple order to remove segregation and discrimination can be openly flouted by the Secretary of the Army and his military advisers in peacetime, what other orders of the Commander in Chief are being flouted secretly or openly by the military? If this is the behavior to be expected of the military, why should the Senate vote to give them greater power under this bill, extend their sway, give them a larger army in which to practice more segregation and discrimination, and give them more funds and more officers and more men so as to increase their ability to evade civilian orders?

The Army and Navy Bulletin proudly announced some months ago, as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota pointed out on Friday last, that the military were running the country, especially our foreign policy. This is proof positive that they feel themselves strong enough to defy even the President, their Commander in Chief, and the highest executive authority under the Constitution.

PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

I am perfectly willing to believe that the Secretary of the Army was not consciously disobeying the Commander in Chief in this incident. He may well have received approval of his stand from that same Commander in Chief. That is also a very likely explanation. It fits into the pattern of fine words and promises accompanied by no performance that we have come to expect. The President has issued a statement on civil rights. But he has failed to carry out any of the promises made in that statement or in the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

Of course, it begins to look as though nobody is running this country. Our foreign policy especially is in the hands of a bipartisan coalition. It simply begins to appear, Mr. President, as though there is no leadership at all in foreign affairs. Behold the example on the Palestine question. First, we would have partition. I think the President thought he was going to get the Jewish vote with partition, so we handed that to the United Nations. They dutifully considered it for an appropriate length of time and then agreed to it. Even the Russians agreed to it. Possibly that is why we did not want it. Anyway, we later disagreed; we decided we did not want partition.

I am more inclined to think, Mr. President, it was because the Arabs kicked up their heels a little bit, and Mr. Forrestal said, "Now, look, Mr. President, our oil is in danger over there; we had better not have this partition." Of course, Mr. Forrestal has interests in Arabian oil—he did have connections that could have caused him to have interests in Arabian oil other than his desire to obtain oil for the armed forces, because we all know that Mr. Forrestal was formerly president of Dillon, Read & Co., the Wall Street financial house, which was very active in financing Adolf Hitler to power. Dillon, Read & Co. is also the principal financial agent for Texaco and Standard Oil, and Texaco and Standard Oil own Arabian-American Oil Co. We get back to the fact that Mr. Forrestal was formerly president of Dillon, Read & Co. Anyway, we called off partition.

Then we were for a trusteeship. We handed that to the United Nations. We did not ask them to write it out. We do not do these things. We fix it up and hand it to them and simply tell them, "Deliberate a while, and bring in the verdict." whichever way we want it. We wanted partition, so the United Nations started deliberating. In the meantime we told the Jews in Palestine, "Now do not set up a free government. We do not want it. We absolutely will not have it." But those Jews are apparently a little rambunctious, and they figuratively told us we could go to a warmer climate than the one we were then in. They set up their free and independent government.

When Mr. Truman heard of it they had already set it up, it was a fait accompli, one of those things about which we cannot argue. So the President told the boys, "Quick! recognize them before anybody else does. The fat is in the fire, anyway, and it may be we will get the Jewish vote back yet." So we recognized them. I have forgotten how long it took, but it was done in record time—10 minutes, 15 minutes, I do not remember the exact number of minutes. We shall not argue over a matter of 2 or 3 minutes, one way or another. It was all done in such great haste, such lack of usual diplomatice procedure, that none of our ambassadors anywhere in the world knew what was going on. They were caught flatfooted.

Our representative at the United Nations was on his feet. The rumors came over the wire that we had recognized Palestine. Mr. Sayre, who I believe had the floor at the time and was representing us, was asked, "Has your country recognized Palestine?" He had to act like a 16-year-old boy making love to his girl for the first time. He was bashful and taken aback. He did not know what to do. He had to admit he did not know what his Government was doing. The press reports state that the representatives of the other nations, representatives of all the world, laughed out loud in the face of our representative. In other words they laughed in the face of the United States. Never, never, Mr. President, has the prestige, the honor, the dignity of this great Nation fallen to such a low estate as it has in the last few months and weeks in the misconduct of our foreign affairs.

But I have digressed from the question in hand, the question of nonsegregation and discrimination in our armed services. This is another thing, Mr. President, that is lowering our standing in the world, doing us more damage than all the billions of dollars we are spending could possibly offset. It must be remembered that the white people on earth are very few in number compared to people whose skins are colored. When the word goes out all over the world, as it does, they never miss an opportunity to play up the fact that we discriminate against people with colored skins.

Certainly if Senators think this through, if they have the best interests of their country at heart, even if they have sincere feelings against people with colored skins, I should think their sense of patriotism, their realization of the good will we could gain all over the world by abolishing discrimination, good will that we cannot buy with the billions of dollars which have been appropriated, certainly that consideration should outweigh petty personal considerations, if Senators have the interests of the Nation generally at heart.

Without action by Congress, the President has had the power to abolish seggregation and discrimination in the armed services. He has failed to do so. He has had power to abolish discrimination and segregation in Federal employment simply by issuing an Executive order. He has failed to do so. He has had power to recommend the setting up an effective civil-rights division within the Department of Justice, instead of a small and ineffective section on civil rights. He has failed to do even that simple thing.

In short, Mr. President, we have seen no action by the President to implement his fine statements about civil rights. Yes, there have been actions—publicity actions, such as his visit to the Virgin Islands, with pictures sent back to the mainland for the purpose of influencing the Negro vote in this country, but nothing that resembled action on real civil rights for Negroes in those areas where the President has had the power himself to secure those rights.

Both of the old parties stand condemned on this question, Mr. President—the Republicans, because, having a majority in the Congress, they could have done something; the President, because he has had the power to deal with it in the armed services and in the executive departments, and has failed to do so.

Failure to support the amendment to abolish discrimination in the armed service flies in the face of the recommendations of two very fine committees appointed by the President, namely, the Advisory Commission on Universal Training, and the Committee on Civil Rights. Both are Presidential committees, appointed by the President. Both issued fine reports. But what is the purpose of those reports, Mr. President, if they are to be completely disregarded by both the Congress and the Executive? Are they mere window dressing? Do they serve to expound fine ideals in order to conceal bad practices?

The President's Committee on Civil Rights, the Wilson committee, was established by Executive Order 9898 on December 5, 1946. I should like to read an excerpt from that report. I think it is very appropriate for this occasion:

The committee's first task was the interpretation of its assignment. We were not asked to evaluate the extent to which civil rights have been achieved in our country. We did not, therefore, devote ourselves to the construction of a balance sheet which would properly assess the great progress which the Nation has made as well as the shortcomings in the record. Instead we have almost exclusively focused our attention on the bad side of our record—on what might be called the civil rights frontier.

I think, Mr. President, that is as it should be. When we are trying to improve ourselves, it does little good to look back and see how much improvement there has been and console ourselves on the inaction by saying we have accomplished something in the past, and content ourselves with seeing what is undone and what we can do about it.

The necessary emphasis upon our country's failures should not be permitted to obscure the real measure of its successes. No fair-minded student of American history or of world history, will deny to the United States the position of leadership in enlarging the range of human liberties and rights, in recognizing and stating the ideals of freedom and equality, and in steadily and loyally working to make those ideals a reality.

I can hardly agree with that statement in toto, Mr. President. We do have more freedom in the political field for most of our people, but in the field of race relations I must say that South Africa and the British Empire are about the only ones that could compare with us in the ill treatment we afford to minorities because of their racial extraction or the color of their skin.

Whatever our failures in practice have been or may be, there has never been a time when the American people have doubted the validity of those ideals. We still regard them as vital to our domestic system.

If our task were to evaluate the achievement in our civil-rights record, mention would have to be made of many significant developments in our history as a nation. We would want to refer to the steady progress toward a goal of universal suffrage which has marked the years between 1789 and the present. We would want to emphasize the disappearance of brutality from our society to a point where the occurrence of a single act of violence is a shocking event precisely because it is so out of keeping with our system of equal justice under law, and we would want to point to the building of our present economy which surely gives the individual greater social mobility, greater economic freedom of choice, than any other nation has ever been able to offer.

But our purpose is not to praise our country's progress. We believe its impressive achievements must be used as a stimulus to further progress rather than as an excuse for complacency.

That has been my argument, Mr. President. It is all very well to be proud of our achievements, but let us not kid ourselves that the job is done, or nearly done, or that we are ahead of schedule and therefore we can take it easy now; that we do not need to adopt the amendments offered by the distinguished, patriotic, sincere Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I disagree with that. Let us keep moving ahead.

At an early point in our work we decided to define our task broadly—to go beyond the specific flagrant outrages to which the President referred in his statement to the committee. We have done this because these individual instances are only reflections of deeper maladies. We believe we must cure the disease, as well as treat its symptoms. Moreover, we are convinced that the term "civil rights" itself has with great wisdom been used flexibly in American history.

For our present assignment we have found it appropriate to consolidate some individual freedoms under a single heading, to omit others altogether, and to stress still others which have in the past not been given prominence. Our decisions reflect what we consider to be the Nation's most immediate needs. Civil rights, after all, are statements of aspirations—of demands which we make on ourselves and our society. We believe that the principles which underly them are timeless. But we have selected for treatment those whose implementation is a pressing requirement. Throughout our report we have made use of specific data for illustrative purposes.

This report deals with serious civil rights violations in all sections of the country.

That is correct, Mr. President. There are violations of civil rights all over the country. Sometimes people think of the South as being the only place where civil rights are violated. Such violations are probably more widespread there, because there are more persons who belong to minorities in the South. Recently the gentleman—I think he is a police chief—in Birmingham, Ala., who was instrumental in having me thrown into jail there, evidently read the Idaho Codes and found that in Idaho orientals could not vote. So he issued a blast at me and said I should straighten out my own State before I came down to Alabama and tried to straighten out things there. Frankly, it had never been brought to my attention that orientals could not vote in the State of Idaho. I am not a lawyer. I had not gone through the codes. I did not know that anyone was deprived of voting in Idaho. The press asked me about the statement by Mr. Connor that I had better get my own house in order before I came down to Alabama. I simply stated, Mr. President, that I should be happy to have Mr. "Bull" Connor come up and help me to straighten things out, and I would go down and help him to straighten things out. I want them straightened out every place, and I shall start doing what I can about anything that is wrong in Idaho.

I continue reading:

Much of it has to do with limitations on civil rights in our Southern States. To a great extent this reflects reality; many of the most sensational and serious violations of civil rights have taken place in the South. There are understandable historical reasons for this. Among the most obvious is the fact that the greater proportion of our largest, most visible minority group—the Negroes—live in the South.

I have commented on that previously.

In addition to this seeming stress on the problems of one region, many of our illustrations relate to the members of various minority groups, with particular emphasis upon Negroes. The reasons are obvious; these minorities have often had their civil rights abridged. Moreover, the unjust basis for these abridgements stands out sharply because of the distinctiveness of the groups. To place this apparent emphasis in its proper perspective one need only recall the history of bigotry and discrimination. At various times practically every region in the country has had its share of disgraceful interferences with the rights of some persons. At some time members of practically every group have had their freedoms curtailed.

Mr. President, I think that is a very significant statement: "At some time, members of practically every group have had their freedoms curtailed." When I see the Catholic War Veterans now whooping it up for the Mundt bill, to curtail somebody else's freedom, it is a strange spectacle, when we remember that only a short while ago the Ku Klux Klan was setting up the Protestants as the perfect ones, and baiting Catholics; and now we find the Catholics baiting somebody else. It looks as if we would learn sometime, Mr. President, that freedom is indivisible. We are either going to have freedom, we are either all going to enjoy rights, or the rights and the freedoms and the privileges of all of us are going to be jeopardized.

Now, back to the report:

In our own time the mobility of our population, including minority groups, is carrying certain of our civil-rights problems to all parts of the country. In the near future it is likely that the movement of Negroes from rural to urban areas, and from the South to the rest of the country, will continue. Other minority groups, too, will probably move from their traditional centers of concentration. Unless we take appropriate action on a national scale, their civil-rights problems will follow them.

The protection of civil rights is a national problem which affects everyone. We need to guarantee the same rights to every person regardless of who he is, where he lives, or what his racial, religious, or national origins are.

Mr. President, I now ask, what is the sense, what is the use of assembling a committee of distinguished representatives, outstanding American citizens, to make a study—and they spend money doing it—and submit a report, and then see it all go down the drain, without doing anything about it, without doing a

thing, but going back to the political conventions again and writing some more planks in the platforms?

Mr. President, the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Training was another interesting document. The President's Committee on Civil Rights was particularly concerned with civil rights. The distinguished citizens appointed by the President to his Advisory Committee on Universal Training were interested in the problem of military training for national security. That committee was headed by Karl T. Compton, an outstanding scientist, and include among its members such leaders of opinion as the President of Princeton University, a distinguished Protestant minister, a distinguished Catholic teacher, Judge Rosenman, Joseph Davies, a famous industrialist and financier, and a distinguished diplomat, whose services, incidentally, I think we could make good use of at the present moment. So far as I know, its members did not include any labor leaders, and only one Negro leader.

I should like to note some points made by that report on UMT. In a section entitled "Essentials of an Integrated National Security Program," on page 19, the report says:

> Our success must be built on the unity of our people and on the vigor and vitality of our democracy. * * * Evidences of economic instability, racial discrimination, and group conflict within our Nation are seized upon by our enemies at home and abroad to undermine faith in the ability of democracy to provide work and happiness for its citizens.

Mr. President, the first essential for our national security, this Commission finds, is "a strong, healthy, educated population." Instead of spending possibly more than a billion dollars, perhaps several billions, to finance this universal military training proposal, or draft proposal, or whatever it may be called, would it not be better to put the money into schools, into a health program, to build hospital facilities, so that everyone, even poor people, could get doctors and remain well, instead of becoming sick? Would it not be better to make some arrangements to see to it that underprivileged children have orange juice in the morning and other proper food?

During the last war it was necessary for the Government to turn down thousands upon thousands of young men merely because back in the 1930's children did not have the proper things to eat. I saw piles of oranges in California, back in those dark days, 10 feet high, and half a mile long, laid out to rot, if one can conceive of such a staggering amount of oranges. If anyone had taken one of those oranges he would have been arrested for stealing. Yet we raised a generation of children with rickets, and they were unfit for military service.

I think using the money for health and development purposes among children would be a more sensible way to prepare for any eventuality than this business of just teaching a young fellow how to carry a gun, especially when, as I am convinced, there is no immediate prospect of him having to carry the gun, unless our cartelists persist in getting us into war.

I quote further from this report on UMT, page 21:

> Want, ill health, ignorance, race prejudice, and slothful citizenship are enemies of America as truly as were Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo.

Mr. President, that is from the report of the President's committee. Of course it is true; but how unexciting to cite those things. How much more fun it is, how much bigger headlines we can get from a reactionary press, if we rise and denounce Russia, say "We must get ready to fight Russia, we much have larger appropriations." One can get headlines for that kind of talk, but if one says we have to look after the health of our people, and their education, and the other things the President's committee says are so vital, it does not get much attention.

In giving its recommendations for a system of universal military training, the committee lays down three principles, as found on pages 42 and 43 of its report:

> First, it must be universal in its application to all persons of a given age or status, and the obligations which it imposes on each must be substantially equal.

That is what the amendments of the Senator from North Dakota would do; they would implement the findings of this report.

> Second, it must provide equality of privilege and opportunity for all those upon whom this obligation rests.
>
> Third, the program must be made a responsibility of the American people as a whole, rather than the exclusive or even principal responsibility of the military authorities.

Now, these are fine principles—they are principles of equality of sacrifice and burden. They impose equal sacrifices on all, they are made a national, that is, civilian responsibility. The advisory committee is quite explicit that this means the removal of discrimination, for it says on pages 42 and 43:

> Neither in the training itself, nor in the organization of any phase of this program, should there be discrimination for or against any person or group because of his race, class, national origin or religion. Segregation or special privilege in any form should have no place in the program. To permit them would nullify the important living lesson in citizenship which such training can give. Nothing could be more tragic for the future attitude of our people, and for the unity of our Nation, than a program in which our Federal Government forced our young manhood to live for a period of time in an atmosphere which emphasized or bred class or racial differences.

That is what any draft or universal military-training program will do, Mr. President, if it does not specifically outlaw discrimination. Many young men will be brought in contact with the idea of a superrace, the Hitler philosophy, for the first time when they go to the military camps and see some other Americans segregated because God made their skins a different color.

Mr. President, this important document has been the mainstay of all those who have favored the draft and universal military training. Some have said, "Oh, this committee of distinguished citizens said we needed a draft, that we needed universal military training." That, however, is as far as they go in reading the recommendations. They do not quote the parts which get down to the fundamentals, the machinery, the workings of this proposition. The members of this committee were the principal witnesses, apart from the executive agencies, for the bills being considered. Their recommendations were particularly carried out by the committees hearing them. Their report became a standard weapon of propaganda throughout the land; it was widely carried in the press.

For that very reason this essential of nondiscrimination must be written into the bill. For the very reason that it was considered essential by the members of the President's Committee, the abolition of segregation and discrimination are fundamental to this program. All the amendments of the Senator from North Dakota are germane to the bill. It is of the very essence that the amendments be adopted. They are fundamental.

I have read statements from many worthy men that this issue does not belong in the consideration of the pending bill. That such a contention is untrue is apparent from reading the report of the President's Advisory Commission. The President's experts considered nondiscrimination absolutely essential to a system of military training of whatever character, existing or future. Those who argue that civil rights must be discussed separately, as though civil rights were something that existed in a vacuum or worthy of debate only by professors, are themselves ignoring the fundamental recommendations of the President's Commission.

The President's Committee discusses at some length the kind of training, particularly training in citizenship, that must be required of the boys who are to be brought under UMT.

> Trainees—
>
> The Committee says—
>
> must be taught the why of their training.

That appears at page 62 of the report. It then goes on to say:

> The individual must be surrounded during each of the 24 hours in every one of the days of his training with the kind of influences and environment that give life and substance to the lessons in the information courses themselves. One important phase of such environment must be the opportunity for every boy to mingle on a basis of full equality with other boys of all races and religions, and from every walk of life and many different parts of the country.

That appears at page 63 of the report.

The bill, unless it provides for nondiscrimination, completely violates this recommendation of the President's Advisory Committee.

The omission of the nondiscrimination requirement nullifies the purpose of the pending bill and the alleged benefits of military training propagandized by its proponents.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President. I hope to speak possibly later on the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "D"

offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Thye
Dworshak	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Malone	Umstead
Ecton	Martin	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Watkins
Feazel	Millikin	Wherry
Flanders	Moore	White
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
George	Murray	Williams
Gurney	Myers	Wilson
Hawkes	O'Conor	Young
Hayden	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE OWENS, OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 645) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 7, 1948.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, it is with profound sorrow that I announce to the Senate the unfortunate death of a dear friend and colleague, Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS, Republican, Member of the House of Representatives from the Seventh Illinois District in the city of Chicago.

Mr. OWENS died at 3:15 this morning in the Naval Hospital at Bethesda following a brief illness. He was admitted to the hospital on May 23 after being stricken by a heart attack.

Congressman OWENS was elected to the Eightieth Congress on November 5, 1946, and was a candidate for reelection this year, having been renominated by his constituency in the Illinois primary on April 13.

He was a native and lifelong resident of Illinois, having been born in the city of Chicago on December 1, 1897. He was educated in St. Bridget's Parochial School in Chicago, at Northwestern University, De Paul University, and Loyola University, holding the degrees of LL. B., and LL. M. Mr. OWENS was admitted to the bar in 1927 and practiced law in Chicago.

He held membership in the Chicago, the Illinois State, and American Bar Associations, the Delta Theta Phi law fraternity, and the North Shore Post, No. 21, the American Legion, having served in the United States Army in World War I.

Survivors are his widow, Emma Florence Ekberg Owens; one son, Charles John; two daughters, Colleen Joan and Carol Jane; his mother, Mrs. Hannah Owens; three sisters, Mrs. Mary G. Rinn, Mrs. Margaret Cronin, Mrs. Kathryn Shelly; three brothers, Maurice L. Owens, James W. Owens, and John E. Owens.

As a leading member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. OWENS devoted himself diligently to the study of legislation before it, and attended many important subcommittee hearings in various parts of the United States. These travels, coupled with his many other duties in Washington and in his district, undoubtedly brought about the strain and worry which contributed to the condition causing his untimely and obviously premature death.

Mr. OWENS served his constituency with loyalty, distinction, and devotion. I might add that from the standpoint of population, his district, the Seventh Illinois District, was the largest of the 435 congressional districts throughout the United States, consisting of approximately 1,050,000 persons.

Despite warnings by his physician, he delayed going to the hospital for more than 2 days because of his desire to answer roll calls and attend other duties in the House of Representatives. Had Mr. OWENS taken a rest when ordered, I might not today be paying tribute to his memory.

To these constituents, to his Government, to this Congress, and to the loved ones who mourn him, TOM OWENS has truly paid his last full measure of devotion.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 253) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BROOKS at the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment D offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks in connection with the amendment. It is the one prohibiting lynching of members of the armed forces.

The pending bill, which the Senator from South Dakota has reported, will require military service by all Americans of certain ages. If the bill is passed, it will call upon Negro Americans, as well as white Americans; Jews as well as gentiles; naturalized Americans as well as native born; and the sons of immigrants, as well as the children of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The bill will take each American boy of certain age out of his native environment, and will put him at the disposal of the armed forces. It will result in having our young people placed in training camps all over the United States. Indeed, if what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said is correct, they will be in every country in the world except Australia. They will be in places strange to the trainees and in circumstances very novel to them.

It becomes incumbent upon the Government, therefore, to afford the fullest possible protection to those who will be called upon in this fashion, particularly to take all possible steps to protect them from attacks upon them because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

The amendment I have submitted has exactly that purpose. It is based upon the present-day realities of religious and racial hatred in this country, and it must have the support of everyone who has in mind our experience with the problem in the last war, and particularly our experience since the actual termination of hostilities some time ago.

It is a fact that there is more discrimination against Negroes today than at any time since the turn of the century. It is a fact that one of the greatest dangers of our Nation lies in racial hatreds, which are paving the way for the sort of national shame and disaster which befell Nazi Germany. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that Congress take the precaution of preventing further incitement and further evil from these causes,

especially as they may affect members of the armed services.

Mr. President, the treatment of returning Negro servicemen and servicewomen since the war is sufficient evidence to indicate the need for the adoption of this amendment, which will give to members of our armed forces Federal protection from physical assault or violence because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. There must be no more Isaac Woodward cases—cases similar to that in which a Negro's eyes were gouged out by a police officer because the Negro said "Yes," instead of "Yes, sir"—cases for which no punishment is a sufficient deterrent.

Mr. President, in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for weeks and weeks and months and months the antilynching bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has been considered. Whenever it is discussed in the committee, every possible technicality which human ingenuity can devise is raised against it and is made a part of the record in the committee. So the weeks and the months have gone by. As I have said before, although time and time again the Senator from Michigan has moved that the bill be reported from the committee, and although time after time I have seconded the motion, nevertheless the bill has not yet been reported. When, in the absence of the Senator from Michigan, I ask that the bill be reported and make a motion to have it reported, the result inevitably seems to be the same.

So it is my calculated judgment that no antilynching bill will be reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee in time to give this Congress a chance to vote upon it.

If that be true, if the Senate is not going to have a chance before the 21st of June to vote for an antilynching bill, then the Republican Party will not have kept faith with the people of the United States, because, as the distinguished Senator now occupying the chair, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is well aware, on the 27th day of June 1944, nearly 4 year ago, the Republican Party, at its meeting in Philadelphia, in one clear, concise, coherent sentence, with every word placed in exactly the right spot, made the declaration to which I have already referred a part of the Republican Party's platform. At the beginning they put the word "antilynching," and they mailed it all over the United States. They sent hundreds of thousands of copies of it to some of the States where they said minority groups have the balance of power. What did the Republican Party say in its platform in regard to the antilynching bill? It said:

> We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

That was 4 years ago, Mr. President. The Republican Party did not simply say "enactment," but it said "early enactment." That was 4 years ago; and the Republican Party, my party, has now been in control in Congress for approximately 2 years. Nevertheless we have not even had a chance to vote on an antilynching bill. It seems to me that there could be no more opportune time than now to have the amendment I have submitted attached to the bill now before the Senate. It is bad enough, I think all will agree, to have a man lynched at any time. It is bad enough to have a man who everyone feels is guilty of murder lynched. It is bad enough to have a man who may be suspected in a sex case, and where the proof is almost 100 percent, lynched. But all my amendment says is that no man wearing a uniform, no man in the armed services, shall be lynched.

Certainly, Mr. President, I cannot very well see why this is not a good beginning for the Republican Party to carry out its pledge.

I repeat, the treatment of returning Negro service men and women since the war is sufficient to indicate the need for the provisions of this amendment, which will give Federal protection to members of our armed forces from physical assault and violence because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. There must be no more Isaac Woodward cases, of eyes gouged out of a Negro in uniform by a police officer because the soldier says "Yes" instead of "Yes, sir," with no punishment to act as a deterrent.

We know that there was resentment in the last war and after because the Negro was given reason to aspire to a better life, because the Negro was shown a better life, because he was taught higher skills, because he was brought into contact with people to whom discrimination was unknown and because he was accorded the dignity of an Army or Navy uniform. To those for whom Negro subservience is a necessity, economically and psychologically, these things were abhorrent.

Mr. President, what I say about the Negro is also true of the Indian. I remember very well that in my own State, in Emmons County, an entire family was once massacred by the Indians. The Indians were suspected of murdering the Spicer family at a little place called Winona, a place no longer existing, but which was once situated a little way from the Missouri River. Some people really thought if they lynched those Indians they would put fear of the white people in the remainder of the Indians. The effect was just the reverse. They hanged or lynched about four Indians. The Indians were not given a trial. The result was that, not only in North Dakota but in South Dakota as well, the entire Indian reservation rose up as one man. There were killings which would never have resulted had the Indians received a fair and legal trial.

With the large-scale induction of men into our armed forces which is called for by this bill, and with the end of the patriotic fervor which was induced by the war, these things will be even more menacing today. It is essential, therefore, that we afford protection, through the only available means, the Federal Government, to those who are being called upon for service. These men are being taught to die for their country and to give up their livelihood and accustomed method of living. Fairness requires that we in turn give them the fullest possible protection.

Mr. President, the testimony of Mr. Guinier, a man who had already served in World War I and who was willing to serve in World War II, according to his testimony, shows conclusively how reprehensible lynching is.

One additional point needs be made. The bill we are considering has been advanced to us as necessary because of the need for extending and preserving democracy and democratic institutions. This is the justification being given to the American people, and it is the justification being advanced abroad. What a mockery it would be if in the Army and Navy and Air Force set up for this ostensible purpose, there were citizens who did not have the protection of their country from those who would assault them because of their color or religion or race.

And how ineffective American foreign policy would be if we did not set an example to other nations of democracy at work here. Deeds speak louder than words. We cannot inspire democracy by prating of it in empty words. We cannot achieve acceptance of our sincerity except by deeds.

America needs the full support of its citizens of all colors, creeds, and religions. There are dangerous indications, in increasing numbers, that such support is being weakened by the discriminations and indignities which a large portion of our population is being forced to suffer daily. Let us win back the full and wholehearted support of each of our citizens by passing this amendment to the bill—to show that we do not have democracy in words alone—that we practice it.

Mr. President, I quote from the President's Committee on Civil Rights. On the subject of lynching, the report says:

> While available statistics show that, decade by decade, lynchings have decreased, this committee has found that in the year 1947 lynching remains one of the most serious threats to the civil rights of Americans.

Mr. President, this is not the statement of a group of irresponsible persons. It is a statement by the President's own Committee on Civil Rights. They continue:

> It is still possible for a mob to abduct and murder a person in some sections of the country with almost certain assurance of escaping punishment for the crime.

Think of it! In this year of our civilization, a mob can attack an absolutely innocent man, kill him, and know they will be absolutely immune from punishment.

> The decade from 1936 through 1946 saw at least 43 lynchings. No person received the death penalty, and the majority of the guilty persons were not even prosecuted.
>
> The large number of attempted lynchings highlights, even more than those which have succeeded, the widespread readiness of many communities to resort to mob violence. Thus, for seven of the years from 1937 to 1946 for which statistics are reported, the conservative estimates of the Tuskegee Institute show that 226 persons were rescued from threatened lynchings. Over 200 of these were Negroes.

That is from the report of the President's own committee, at pages 23 and 24.

The actual and attempted lynchings are only a small part of the injury which

the Negro people suffer. Lynching is but the ultimate threat by which the asserted inferiority of the Negro is driven home. As a terrorist device, it reinforces all the other disabilities placed upon him. The threat of lynching and violence is a dreadful burden which always hangs over the head of a Negro in the South.

The President's Committee on Civil Rights recommended certain things. I ask again, Mr. President, who selected the President of the United States, Mr. Truman? The selection was made by a Democratic convention, made up of Democrats from every State in the Union. I have been talking about the Republicans, who met in Chicago, but it will be remembered that approximately 2 weeks after the Republican convention, the Democrats met. They looked all over the United States for a candidate for Vice President. Of the 143,000,000, they wanted to get the best possible candidate. They wanted a man in whom the Democrats had confidence. The convention said that former Vice President Wallace, who presided over the Senate so well and so ably for 4 years, did not have the necessary confidence of the people. They said many other things about Mr. Wallace, which I need not enumerate today, the overwhelming majority of which, in my opinion, were untrue. But, anyway, the Democratic convention did not want Mr. Wallace. They said, "This time we are going to get a real man, one in whose judgment we have absolute confidence." The word was passed around in the convention hall that the man to be selected for the Vice Presidency would in the natural course of events almost certainly become President. Some one thousand five hundred or one thousand six hundred Democrats, the very leading Democrats of the United States, Senators, Representatives, and governors from all over America, from Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands, were brought together. By ballot they selected the best Democrat in the whole United States, the man who should succeed Mr. Roosevelt in case it became necessary.

At that time an overwhelming majority of Senators were Democrats. The convention had all these illustrious colleagues of mine from whom to select. They had Democrats from more than half the States of the Union. They had innumerable Representatives and many governors. But the Democrats in the national convention looked over the field and said, "Harry Truman is the best Democrat of them all. He is the best man to succeed Franklin Delano Roosevelt, if anything untoward happens to him." Speakers at the convention lauded Mr. Truman. They praised him to the skies. Mr. Truman did not seek the office. He did not care to be Vice President, but the Democrats in that convention literally forced upon him the nomination. So Mr. Truman finally raised his right hand and took the oath of office.

He had for some time presided in this Chamber, and practically every Senator knew that Mr. Truman was an outstanding, honorable citizen who stood foursquare for the laws of the Nation and for their enforcement. Mr. President, how well do I remember the day that Mr. Truman succeeded to the Presidency. Not only the Democrats called on him, but Republicans rose on the floor and said, "We are with him. We are praying that he will make a great success as President of the United States." There was not even the faintest suggestion that Harry Truman would not enforce the Constitution of the United States. There was not the faintest suggestion that he would not carry out the Bill of Rights.

Looking back through the newspapers of some 3 years ago when he became President, we see that Senator after Senator rose and said how very fortunate the country was in having in the President's chair a man of the characteristics and the outstanding ability of Harry Truman, in view of the very untoward event that had occurred in the loss of President Roosevelt.

Mr. Truman has been doing his duty. He has been enforcing the laws. He has appointed various committees. Among those appointed was one to deal with the subject of civil rights. Mr. Truman has protected oil men, farmers, apple growers, lawyers, everyone, all over the country. No one claims that he has done any dishonest act. To me the Constitution of this country means something. The President says, "I shall see that the humblest citizen, whether he be white, black, or yellow, shall have the benefits of the Constitution and of the Bill of Rights."

All of a sudden he is no longer satisfactory to many persons. In heaven's name, what do they want? Do they want a man for President who enforces one law but not another law? Do they want a President to enforce laws against manslaughter but not against murder, or laws against perjury and not against arson? Do they want a President who will decide what laws shall be enforced and what laws shall not be enforced? In short, are we to have a country ruled by law and justice and not by the mere caprice of one individual?

I think the President of the United States has been doing a good job. He appointed a Committee on Civil Rights, composed of honest, outstanding men. They have made their report. I want to quote a portion of that report issued by men who were appointed by the President, to whom some Democrats referred as being the best Democrat in the United States to succeed the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The committee which he appointed had this to say with regard to lynching:

> Action by private persons taking the law into their own hands to mete out summary punishment and private vengeance upon an accused person; action by either public officers or private persons meting out summary punishment and private vengeance upon a person because of his race, color, creed, or religion—these too must be made crimes.

Mr. President, we cannot escape the fact that our treatment of minorities has been and is an issue in world politics.

There is not a Senator or a person within the sound of my voice who did not hear Hitler say over the radio, before we got into the war, "They say I should not go into the Sudeten territory. But look at the treatment the United States gave the Sioux Indians."

There was not a single American who could deny what Hitler said about the treatment we accorded the Sioux Indians. This was a country owned by the Indians. We took it away from them. We cooped them up on little reservations. They are there yet. After all these decades, they are still there. In some instances they are hungry and starving. But that is the American way of life, about which we like to boast so much. That is American enterprise. Free enterprise is to take those poor Indians and coop them up and starve them to death, as we have been doing with the Navajos and some of the California Indians.

So, Mr. President, I submit that we cannot escape the fact that our treatment of minorities has become an issue in world politics. The representatives of our Government stand forth as champions of human rights in the commissions of the United Nations and in other councils of nations. Yes, Mr. President, whenever someone in the United Nations Council makes a great speech on human rights, it is usually an American. But the world's press and radio are full of the things we do that violate human rights. No example is called upon with greater effect than the cruel and inhuman practice of lynching, or other violence in our land, based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

If we here and now refuse to extend the protection of our Federal Government even to the youth we would now draft into the armed forces, allegedly for the protection of our democratic institutions, we make our pretentions to champion human rights in the councils of the world appear as an empty fraud. I hope that we shall afford the world a demonstration of our determination to redeem the promise of human rights for all, by adopting this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brooks	Hill	O'Daniel
Buck	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Butler	Holland	Pepper
Byrd	Ives	Reed
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Capper	Kilgore	Russell
Chavez	Knowland	Saltonstall
Connally	Langer	Smith
Cooper	Lodge	Sparkman
Cordon	Lucas	Stennis
Donnell	McCarthy	Stewart
Downey	McClellan	Taft
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Feazel	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the statements I made previously during the day respecting other amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] apply with even greater force to the amendment now pending than to the others. For instance, the records show there have been no lynchings in any of the armed services all during the war period. We are getting along fine without the amendment. Therefcre I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to lay on the table the amendment lettered "D" offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Those in favor——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. I understand the motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been asked for. Is the request seconded? [After a show of hands.] There is not a sufficient number seconding the request. It is necessary that there be 10 Senators who second it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I contend that more than 10 Senators raised their hands. I request that there be a recount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well. Those who desire to second the request will raise their hands.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from South Dakota, and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—61

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Buck	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hoey	Pepper
Byrd	Holland	Reed
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cooper	Knowland	Smith
Cordon	Lodge	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stennis
Downey	McCarthy	Stewart
Dworshak	McClellan	Taft
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Young
George	Moore	
Gurney	Myers	

NAYS—7

Capper	Langer	Wherry
Chavez	Morse	
Ives	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—28

Baldwin	Hayden	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Jenner	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Kem	Tobey
Bricker	McCarran	Tydings
Bridges	McFarland	Wagner
Brooks	Magnuson	White
Bushfield	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
Green	Robertson, Wyo.	
Hatch	Taylor	

So Mr. GURNEY's motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer my amendment lettered "F."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to offer several amendments en bloc?

Mr. LANGER. No. They are so important that I find I cannot so offer them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, after lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

(i) No person who is inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this act shall be required to receive any training or render any service in any State which requires by law the segregation of persons because of their race or color in places of public accommodation, resort, or amusement, or in public conveyances.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall discuss this amendment very briefly. It is a simple amendment. It provides that no person who is inducted, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this act shall be required to receive any training or enter any service in any State which requires by law the segregation of persons because of their race or color in places of public accommodation, resort, or amusement, or in public conveyances.

My State has a very small percentage of Negroes. It has an average number of Indians. Some of the Negroes in the State would not care to go to a State where there was a segregation. In my State the Negro children go to public schools with the white children. They are used to growing up and associating with white children. It seems to me to be eminently unfair for a Negro, living under such circumstances, whether he be from Iowa, or any midwestern or northern State, to be sent by the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force down South, or to some other place where for the first time he becomes aware of discrimination. I think it is wrong to send such persons to States where there is segregation, so long as they come from a State where there is no segregation.

I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment lettered "F," offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offered my amendment lettered "G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

SEC. . (a) No member of the armed forces shall be discriminated against in any manner because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion by (1) any officer or employee of the United States, of any State or any governmental subdivision thereof, of any Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, (2) any other member of the armed forces, (3) any common carrier, (4) any hotel or other place of public lodging, (5) any restaurant or other place engaged in the business of serving food or drink to the public, (6) any place of public amusement, or (7) any business or service engaged in commerce.

(b) The penalty provisions of section 12 of this act shall be applicable to any violation of this section by any person enumerated in (1) or (2) of subsection (a), by any firm, company, or business enumerated in (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), or by any officer or employee of any such firm, company, or business acting in the scope of his employment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, very briefly, this amendment provides that no member of the armed forces shall be discriminated against in any manner because of his race, color, origin, national ancestry, or religion, by any officer or employee of the United States or of any State or Territory or any other member of the armed forces, or by any common

carrier, or by any hotel or other place of public lodging, or by any restaurant or other place engaged in the business or serving food or drink to the public, or by any place of public amusement, or by any business or service engaged in commerce.

Let me refer again to the case I mentioned before, in which a young man who had lost an arm in the service—a young man who was only half colored—came to my office and said that while in uniform he went several blocks from the United States Capitol and attempted to buy a cup of coffee. He said he placed his 10 cents on the counter, but was refused service.

Under this amendment, anything of that sort would be impossible, not only on the part of a restaurant but also on the part of any hotel or any common carrier. Under this amendment, common carriers would have to treat all members of the armed forces alike. That would do away with Jim Crowism. Under the amendment, any member of the armed forces would be able to go to a theater, and the theater could not discriminate against a member of the armed forces, nor could any business or service engaged in commerce do so.

It seems to me that if the Constitution of the United States means anything, it means that all people shall be treated alike when they go to a restaurant or a hotel or when they buy a ticket on a railroad or go to a theater or go into any business that is engaged in interstate commerce.

That, briefly, is the subject of this amendment. I believe it should apply particularly to all members of the armed services of the United States, who offer their lives in the service of their country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment G of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment lettered "H," and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

NONDISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES REQUIRED OF COMPANIES SUPPLYING GOODS OR SERVICES TO BE USED BY OR FOR PERSONS INDUCTED OR ENLISTED UNDER THIS ACT

SEC. . (a) Every contract entered into by the United States for the supplying of goods or services to be used by, for, or in connection with any person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under the provisions of this act shall specify, as a condition thereof, that the company or individual with whom the contract is made shall not discriminate in the employment of any person, or in the terms and conditions of employment of any person, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, and shall specify that a breach of such condition shall result in the termination of such contract. It shall be the duty of every contracting officer making a contract on behalf of the United States for the supplying of such goods or services to terminate immediately any such contract when he is satisfied that the condition prescribed by this section has been breached.

(b) No member of the armed forces or person in the employ of the United States shall procure any goods or services to be used by, for, or in connection with any person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under the provisions of this act from any company or individual which discriminates in the employment of any person, or in the terms and conditions of employment of any person, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion.

(c) Any contracting officer who violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section and any member of the armed forces or person in the employ of the United States who violates subsection (b) of this section shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in section 12 of this act.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, briefly stated, the amendment provides that when the Government has a contract with any business which discriminates because of race, color, or creed, such contract shall be terminated as soon as it is proved that such discrimination occurs.

I may add that in some respects the amendment is similar to some of the labor laws which we have had in the past, whereby certain articles manufactured in prisons have been barred from interstate commerce. Therefore, there is ample precedent for this amendment.

I ask for a vote on the amendment, but I do not request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment H of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now offer and send to the desk my amendment lettered "E," and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, line 13, after the period it is proposed to insert the following:

No person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this act shall, during the period of such service, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, be required to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the language of this amendment is about the same as that of the provision which appeared in the Wartime Voting Act. In fact the language of the amendment is specifically like one paragraph of the act Congress passed during the war.

I cannot say that our committee would accept this amendment, for the committee did not consider this subject in any way. Certainly, every member of the armed forces should have a chance to vote in elections to national offices. That is the way I myself feel about the matter. Many of us voted for the act during the war.

Other than that, I simply say that I believe the amendment is entitled to a vote on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the Senator from South Dakota accepting the amendment?

Mr. GURNEY. I cannot accept it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from South Dakota to say that he agrees to this amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. GURNEY. No; I said I could not accept it. I said I had voted for the act similar to the amendment during the war, for at that time I voted for practically the same language. But I said I could not accept the amendment for the committee.

I am of the opinion that perhaps language of this sort is presently the law, for the act passed during the war provides, I believe, that in time of war these conditions shall apply to the members of the armed services and they shall be entitled to vote. I do not believe that law has been repealed. If it is still in effect in time of war—and I think we are technically at war at the present time—probably there is no use for this amendment, although I am not fully informed as to that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, I am quite certain that the Wartime Voting Act has been repealed. My understanding is that it is no longer in effect.

Section 2 of the act passed in 1942, I believe, provided that no person in military service in time of war should be required as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

That act was in effect. Regardless of whether it is constitutional, the Southern States, the States requiring the payment of poll taxes, did not question it. I think there is no question that in most cases those States suspended their own poll-tax laws in order that the members of the armed forces might vote without paying a poll tax. The actual payment of a poll tax is almost an impossible feat for anyone in the Army in Germany or in Japan. It seems to me very clear that there should be in effect now the same provision that was in effect during the war.

I understand the Senator from South Dakota himself as an individual is willing to vote for the amendment; but, of course, he has no authority from the committee to accept any amendment. Am I correct in that supposition?

Mr. GURNEY. The statement I made was that I could not accept it for the committee. I also stated that, in order to be consistent, I certainly could not now object to a proposal for which I had once voted. I am sure I voted for the bill when it was passed in 1942.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret very much that the Republican leadership has seen

fit to seize upon this amendment and endeavor to write it into this bill. I realize, of course, the tremendous appeal carried by the argument that there should be no poll tax collected from any member of the armed services, but this amendment has no place in this bill. The Senator from Ohio states it would be absolutely impossible for a man serving in Korea or in Japan to pay this tax.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is impractical. I did not say "impossible."

Mr. RUSSELL. "Impractical." I accept the Senator's correction.

I should like to point out that it certainly would not be more practical for him to be able to get his vote into a box somewhere back in his home State than it would be to pay the poll tax.

Mr. President, I do not rise here as a defender of the poll tax as such. I think it is a method of raising revenue that is completely outmoded. The question involved here goes beyond the mere question of an ancient tax being retained by States that see fit to retain it. It goes far beyond the mere matter of exercising the right of casting votes by those in the armed services. It goes to the very heart of the Constitution of the United States. For that reason the amendment should not be adopted.

My State does not impose a poll tax. If the six or seven States that still retain it would listen to me, they would repeal it by action on the part of the States, because, though one of the oldest taxes known to man, it has served its purpose in this modern day and should be supplanted by other means of raising revenue.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has no power on earth under the Constitution of the United States to wipe out a poll tax which is imposed by a sovereign State through its constitution, in the case of a soldier, or of a civilian. The subject matter of this amendment is placed beyond the statutory powers of Congress by the Constitution.

It so happens, Mr. President, that this provision in the Constittuion protecting the rights of the States to preserve the qualifications of their electors is the only one that appears twice in identical language in that document. I am sure Senators are familiar with the fact that section 2 of article I of the Constitution by its express terms vests in the State the right of prescribing qualifications of electors. It says:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

All the proceedings and deliberations of the Constitutional Convention show that the founding fathers were determined to preserve to the States the right of controlling the suffrage of the electors, and never intended that the Federal Government should have any right or power to prescribe the qualifications of electors. If the Federal Government may prescribe the qualifications of electors as imposed through the poll tax, it has a right to prescribe all the qualifications of the electors within the several States by statute. Congress could by statutory provision lower the voting age to 18 or to 16, just as well as it could say that a State shall not impose a poll tax by constitutional provision. The Congress has jealously protected the right of the States to prescribe the qualifications of the voters.

When the seventeenth amendment was adopted providing for the election of Members of this body by popular election, rather than by the legislatures, as had been the case up until that time, under the Constitution, this identical language was restated in the Constitution. Amendment seventeen, which changed the whole method of selecting the Senate, inserts the identical language that appears in section 2 of article I. I shall read from that to show that the Congress in proposing that amendment to the people and to the States adopted the same principle the founding fathers had recognized of protecting the rights of the States to prescribe the qualifications of voters. The identical language is there. I shall read the whole paragraph:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

It does not say, Mr. President, that the Congress of the United States may prescribe the qualifications of electors when they are in the Army. The Constitution by express terms delegated to the several States the right and power of prescribing the qualifications of all electors. I might say that power of the States was never seriously challenged till within the past decade. All of the original States had a poll tax or property or other qualifications at the time the Constitution was adopted.

I well remember, when the first poll-tax bill reached the floor of the Senate, how the late William E. Borah literally tore it to shreds on constitutional grounds, saying that no man who had any regard for the rights of the States could seek to evade those rights by a Federal statute of this kind, to strike down the power, which is vested in the States, of prescribing the qualifications of electors.

I may say, Mr. President, that there is nothing more fundamental in protecting the rights of the States and in preventing them from becoming mere political satrapies of the Federal power than is the right of fixing the qualifications of the electors within the States.

This provision of the Constitution does not say that the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors to the most numerous branch of the State legislatures, unless the elector be a soldier or a sailor; and, much as we might like to make every condition of service of these men as pleasant as possible, much as we might like to see that they had every opportunity to exercise the right of franchise, we cannot here constitutionally and legally by a simple statute repeal these provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

As I say, it was never seriously contended until very recent years that the Federal Government had the slightest power in this respect.

Mr. President, when the Republican Party wrote its platform for the repeal of the poll tax, they evidently had some lawyers on the resolutions or platform committee who knew the Constitution, because they recognized the fact that the right to levy the poll tax was protected by the Constitution, and they advocated the repeal of the poll tax by constitutional amendment. It cannot be repealed and wiped out by statute, merely because our sympathies are excited to help the young men who are being called to the service in their right to vote.

I said, Mr. President, and I reiterate, that I for my part do not think such a provision as is contained in the amendment could be valid under the Constitution but there has been more misrepresentation and bunk about what an onerous thing the poll tax is than has ever been indulged in respect to any other issue that ever reached the floor of the Congress of the Unted States.

I heard a distinguished Member of Congress delivering a radio address on one occasion, in which he said that of course the poll tax meant a tax on the right to vote, and the word "poll" referred to a polling precinct. The poll tax goes back so far into antiquity that it was in effect before anyone had the right to suffrage. The poll tax has nothing to do with polling places. The old Saxon word "poll" meant the head of a man. It means a capitation tax. That people would go so far afield as to say that it would apply to a polling place because it was called a poll tax is absolutely ridiculous. It was the earliest tax ever levied on the head—a poll tax. There is nothing new about it. Some of the States imposed the poll tax at a time when they had absolutely no wealth on which to levy taxes. It was essential to collect $1 per capita as a head tax in order to keep alive the rudiments of an education in those States because they had no other source of revenue.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It first started in South Carolina as a defense tax, for defense against the Indians. It was called a head tax or poll tax, and was in effect long before the Constitution was written. Then it was written into the Constitution in two places, as the Senator from Georgia has said.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have been thinking over my personal reaction to the amendment. I have said I could not consistently vote against it. I have examined into the situation and find that our wartime voting privileges for members of the armed services were provided for in separate legislation. I now feel,

after having had time to look into the matter, that if we handle it now we should do so through separate legislation. Therefore, even though I am in favor of the principle as set forth in the amendment, I think I shall personally vote against the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the question. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding regarding the poll tax. It has been amazing to see how most of the experts on the subject come from areas in which no poll taxes are levied. I have heard it stated by one of these alleged experts that the poll tax was never levied until approximately 1890, as a prerequisite for voting. That is an amazing error. The record shows that in my own State of Georgia, in 1773, a poll tax of two shillings was levied. It was a prerequisite of the right to vote for members of the Colonial Assembly in Georgia. It has been in every constitution my State has ever had, until it was abolished in 1944. I hold no brief for the poll tax. I am opposed to repealing two provisions of the Constitution of the United States by statute. I respect the Constitution and the oath I have taken to defend it. This amendment is in conflict with the Constitution and it is our duty to reject it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not want to go into the general question of the constitutionality of a Federal law. I have never felt that a poll tax was a proper qualification under the Constitution. The subject has been debated over and over again. There have been different points of view. My own view has been that the qualifications requisite for electors are personal qualifications. A State cannot say that a man must have $20,000 worth of property or he cannot vote. It has no relation to his personal qualifications. I recognize the historic argument against that view, but I still feel very strongly that there is as much danger in going the other way, that a State cannot say that Mr. X must do this, that, or something else which has been imposed upon him by the State, before he can vote. I do not think States have that power. I feel that in this particular case the Federal Government is deliberately taking men from their homes and moving them perhaps to Germany or to Japan, making it, therefore, more difficult for them to do the act which is required by the State as a qualification for voting. Therefore, it seems to be perfectly proper for the Federal Government to undertake to say that the particular act which the Federal Government itself has made more difficult shall involve a proper qualification for voting.

On this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the Senator should wait until the question of ordering the yeas and nays has been decided.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may the Senator speak after the order is entered?

Mr. WHERRY. After the order is entered Senators can be recognized. The order would not preclude their speaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not propose to take up a great deal of the time of the Senate on this subject, but I know that if the amendment should be adopted it will be referred to later, perhaps at this session, as a precedent for the passage of a more far-reaching bill.

I want briefly to challenge some of the arguments which have been made and which perhaps will be made with reference to this subject.

First, on the matter of qualification, I do not believe any Member of the Congress has the right to put his own personal interpretation on any word in the Constitution. Whether I believe that the word "qualifications" means a certain thing, or whether some other Senator believes it means another thing, is beside the point. The question is, What does it mean in the law? The question is, What did it mean in the Constitution at the time that document was written? The same word has been rewritten and reenacted not only in congressional acts, but in the Constitution itself down to fairly recent times.

I state as a matter of fact, based on historical research, that the word "qualifications" as used in the Constitution itself at the time it was written meant the various requirements found in the laws of the various States with reference to becoming an elector who could cast a legal ballot. The men who wrote the Constitution were not making a new language; they were not trying to reform the language; they were writing a Constitution. The words used were used in the common legal acceptation of the time. That was true with reference to the words "qualifications of electors," and true in the light of all the years which intervened down to 1916 when, again, the word "qualifications" was written into the Constitution. The common acceptation of the term at that time was that it referred to whatever requirements were prescribed by law in the various States which a man must meet before he could cast a legal ballot.

I respectfully submit that this is altogether a new theory, an argumentative theory, which has been invented to try to cut down language which cannot be legally eradicated from our Constitution.

I do not have at the moment a prepared special argument on this subject, but I wish to challenge now the right of the Congress to go into the question of suffrage. Suffrage, taxation, and police power are three of the main provisions, as I see it, of any democratic form of government, and whatever their reason might have been, the Constitution makers left this field of suffrage, except for some minor regulations with reference to the method of holding elections, in the jurisdiction of the States. Whether or not their decision was right or wrong, that was their decision.

I call attention now, with all deference, to the fact that I do not see how any man with a clear conscience can do violence, by voting for such a bill as that before the Senate, to the language I am about to quote. Article II, section 1, the second paragraph, of the Constitution of the United States, provides:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors—

Let us get that language—

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors.

Then those electors shall elect a President of the United States. Let us stay with that language. An elector has been held to be a State officer. So each State shall appoint certain State officers who shall elect a President of the United States.

"Each State shall appoint." It does not say "elect"; it does not say "by popular ballot." It is to be done in a manner to be decided by the legislature of the State.

How can we in good conscience, and with respect to this language, which is as simple as the A B C 's, come in and cut that down and find that we, the Congress of the United States, have any semblance of power whatsoever to enter that field? Still, there are bills introduced providing that in voting for President of the United States a poll tax shall not be required.

Mr. President, I cannot see that anything other than an entire abandonment of the Constitution. "Abandonment" is just what it means. It does violence to language; with all deference, it is a disregard of the plain, simple, unmistakable terms, plain as A B C, written here, in which there has never been any change, in a lawful way, throughout the years of our history.

The courts have passed on these matters many times. There is a long line of decisions, with consistent, straightforward reasoning. I have before me a brief report, my individual views, which I filed along with the report on the so-called poll-tax bill which is on the calendar of the Senate. I shall review just briefly some of the reasoning I tried to set forth in this brief report.

As a matter of historical fact, in our Constitutional Convention there were three fields of thought with reference to provisions regarding the election of Members of the House of Representatives, the election of Senators not having been provided for at that time. One group wanted to define in specific words in the Constitution just who a qualified elector would be, or put the qualifications in specifically word by word. That group did not prevail.

Another group wanted to give the power to the Congress to say just what the qualifications should be. That thought did not prevail. In other words, the very question which is at this time before the Senate was before those who framed the Constitution of the United States, men like George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison. That proposal did not prevail.

Finally someone suggested that in prescribing the qualifications for electors to

vote for the Members of the House of Representatives — and remember, the Senate and the Presidency were not mentioned, because another method was selected—they should just adopt the qualifications prescribed by the various States of the proposed Union. That was the plan adopted.

After the idea had been accepted, it went to the Committee on Drafting, and they came back with these plain, simple words, the same section which has already been read.

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, that was one of the chief arguments, one of the most popular arguments, and one of the most persuasive arguments, carried back to the people when the question was before them as to whether or not they would adopt the Constitution of the United States. That was what they considered their protection, and it was presented to them in that light, according to the record. Remember, there were rather close votes in many of the States, and the old records disclose that was one of the most persuasive points made, and I submit one of the most persuasive that could be made, "You, the people, are going to have the right to choose the lower branch of the Congress, and the Federal Government is not going to have anything to do with prescribing who may vote in the elections, because that matter rests entirely within the States."

The people accepted that argument, and that remained the law of this land, without serious challenge, for more than a hundred years, indeed, for almost 150 years. Then the same matter came back before the people again. I am talking about the people, now. They decided they wanted to elect the Members of the United States Senate by direct vote of the people. They wrote that into a proposed constitutional amendment. But when they got down to the point about who was going to be qualified to vote in the elections, what did they say? Did they go to any superficial or imaginary definition of the word "qualifications"? Did they leave that matter to any individual to interpret? They went back and adopted the time-proven, time-tested, words which had served them so well for 150 years, a plan that was workable and which they liked, they went back and adopted the selfsame words used in the provision adopted in the Constitutional Convention, providing that United States Senators should be elected by the people of the various States, and that the qualifications of the electors should be the same as those prescribed for the Members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, I do not think we can brush aside such language as that. With all deference, it was brushed aside during the war, as a purely war measure. Everybody knows that. No one will seriously dispute it. It was a war measure, for the benefit of the boys on the fighting front. It was purely a war measure. Still, it is the only serious authority that is cited in the majority report which accompanied H. R. 29 with the recommendation for its passage.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that that provision was never challenged in the Federal courts because all States, with possibly one or two exceptions, passed legislation of their own which waived the poll tax for those in the armed services. No precedent was established by that action. The constitutionality of the provision was seriously challenged in both branches of the Congress and has not been passed upon by the Supreme Court. So far as I know it has not been passed on by any of the United States district courts.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his contribution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The argument was made to sustain the bill in which the amendment appeared, that we had the authority to pass it under the war powers of the Congress, and it was under the alleged war powers that it was passed. Certainly that argument cannot be made now because the Congress is now adopting a peacetime draft.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Mississippi for their very fine contributions. They have given me light on the subject. I was not a Member of the Senate at the time they speak of. I know, though, as a practical matter, that on the home front those who were familiar with the subject looked upon it purely as a war power. I did not know that the argument was made here to that effect, and that it was presented on that basis. But I know that a man in those communities, or in almost any other community, would be considered a semitraitor if he challenged anything during the war that might have been designed for the supposed benefit of those who were fighting our battles. So I respectfully submit that that is not a test, and it is not entitled to be cited seriously as a precedent.

Mr. President, let us remember that this is the Constitution with which we are dealing, and let us remember further that this is that delicate and dangerous subject of suffrage with which we are dealing. We are not only dealing with a sacred instrument but we are dealing with a sacred subject within a sacred instrument, and it should not be and I do not believe that it can be seriously brushed aside or set aside.

With your indulgence, Mr. President, I want to speak a little further about this simple declaration found in this section of the Constitution.

The Constitution having spoken on the subject, the Congress cannot change the rule. If in any State payment of a poll tax is required to vote in an election for a member of a State legislature, then it is required in the Federal election.

That is simple. It has worked out. It has worked out all right. As I said, it had been tested by almost 150 years of experience, when the people passed on that subject again, and they adopted the self-same rule. But I will pass on over that argument.

I am going to move down to what the courts have said. Senators know it is very easy, especially for us lawyers, to differ respecting the interpretation of opinions of any court. But I respectfully submit that these matters are as clear as a bell with reference to this subject, and I do not believe there are five lawyers in a hundred—in fact I do not believe there is more than one in a thousand of those who have really studied the law, and then practiced it from the practical standpoint, who know life up and down, who know law up and down as they learn it in the courtroom, who will come here and seriously say to the membership of this great body that they believe such a law as this has a sound constitutional base. They may have a theoretical base for it, but in the practical affairs of life and in the practical interpretation of the provisions of our Constitution by lawyers who have been up against the practical side of it, I do not believe we will find one in a thousand who can seriously and honestly contend, with reason to back it up, that these laws have a scintilla of sound constitutional basis.

The Supreme Court passed on these matters in 1884 in the case of *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651) and used this language:

> The States, in prescribing the qualifications for voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine.

That is an answer to the argument that the States should not have any power to prescribe the qualifications for voting for Members of Congress. This is what the Court said:

> They (the States) define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same person shall vote for Members of Congress in that State.

Listen—

> It adopts the qualification thus furnished as to the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

That is not talking about what the Congress has done. It says the Constitution adopts for its own what has been prescribed by the various States. That decision was in 1884, and I respectfully submit that it is absolutely decisive of the questions raised by this subject matter now.

I shall pass on to more recent decisions. The Supreme Court in 1937 decided the case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277). There is a good deal of language, in his opinion, but when it got right down to the gist of the matter—this is the gist of the matter this is the Court's holding, that the suggestion that a poll-tax payment as a qualification for voting in a State or Federal election is unlawful, appears to be of recent origin. This is where they brought in the argu-

ment made here by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] respecting what the word "qualifications" means.

Probably the first case to reach the United States Supreme Court is Breedlove against Suttles, decided in December 1937. These are the facts. The plaintiff, a citizen of Georgia, attempted to vote in a State election and also in the Federal election held at the same time, for a Representative in Congress. Let us get the facts. No lawsuit is any better than the facts on which it rests. Here is a man who was a citizen of Georgia. There was a State election to be held at the same time that a Federal election was to be held. He offered to vote in the State election and in the election for a Member of Congress. He was excluded from voting in both elections by reason of having failed to pay the poll tax. Justice Butler delivered the unanimous opinion of the Court. Much of it was devoted to the question whether the poll-tax law contained provisions amounting to undue discrimination on account of sex or otherwise. The essential part of his decision was:

> To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

And the report cited four leading cases.

The most recent case is one which went to the Supreme Court of the United States, but the Court did not render an opinion thereon.

About 2 years after the Breedlove case, a decision somewhat similar arose in Tennessee, where it became necessary to hold a special election in the Third Congressional District to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives. This was a Federal election. Only one office was to be filled, and that was the office of Member of the House of Representatives. The election was held on September 13, 1939. Of course, no State election was held at that time, and the case was free from the complication which existed in the Breedlove case. The plaintiff, being fully qualified except that he had not paid his poll tax, demanded the right to vote, but was excluded on this ground. He brought suit in Federal court, which reached the circuit court of appeals of the sixth circuit, where judgment against the plaintiff was affirmed in a unanimous decision of three sitting judges on March 8, 1941. The opinion of the court of appeals follows the opinion of Justice Butler in the Breedlove case. A petition was filed in the United States Supreme Court to review this judgment on a writ of certiorari. That petition was denied by the Supreme Court without any opinion or statement on October 13, 1941, Justice Jackson taking no part therein. This means that the Supreme Court upheld the lower court. It also means that this man, who had not paid his poll tax, but who offered to vote in an election where only a Member of Congress was to be elected, was denied the vote on that ground. The action of the election commissioners was upheld by the circuit court of appeals. The case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and apparently the law was so obvious and conclusive on the point that the Supreme Court would not even render an opinion, but affirmed the decision of the lower court and denied the petition. That was as late as 1941.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Unhappily I was called from the chamber and did not hear the Senator's statement with respect to the last case. Would it be too much of a burden for him to state succinctly what the facts in that case were?

Mr. STENNIS. That was the case of *Pirtle* v. *Brown*, found in 118 Federal (2nd) 118. A writ of certiorari was denied (314 U. S. 621). The facts in that case were that there was a special election in Tennessee. The only office to be filled was that of Member of the House of Representatives. The man offered to vote and was refused a ballot on the ground that he had not paid his poll tax. I have forgotten just what legal machinery was employed, but the case reached the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, which upheld the election commissioners in refusing him a ballot, standing on the Breedlove case.

The case then went to the Supreme Court of the United States and in 1941, without opinion, the Supreme Court denied certiorari.

Mr. PEPPER. There was no Federal statute involved in that case, limiting the effectiveness of the poll tax, or curtailing it, or in any way preventing it, was there?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. I have not read the case today. It has been several weeks since I read it; but as I recall that case was bottomed solely on the Breedlove case, which had been decided approximately 2 years before.

I respectfully submit that this is not merely a question of States' rights. It is an instance in which the Constitution adopts the qualifications prescribed by the State laws, and uses them as the qualifications for voters in the election of Federal officers. That is the method which was adopted. Some other method could have been adopted, but my point is that it was not. Further, my point is that some other method can be adopted now. There is a legal method wide open, and that is a constitutional amendment. That is the way we have always done these things before, and no one ever thought of going to the contrary. I have asked older lawyers if they ever heard any suggestion or intimation to this effect when Senators were made elective, and they have stated that they never heard the question brought up in that connection.

Even later than that, in 1919 I believe, we adopted the nineteenth amendment. No lawyer I have ever heard of, and no one in public affairs, to my knowledge, remembers that anyone suggested that Congress had any power with reference to qualifications, whether of male or female voters. No one suggested that Congress could enact a law on the subject.

It could be argued with equal force that that is a matter which does not pertain to qualifications; but no one suggested it. The people wanted a constitutional amendment, and a constitutional amendment was enacted. The people may want a constitutional amendment in connection with this subject. I am not arguing the point as to whether or not they want it. I say that if they do, the way is open; and that is the only legal way. That is the only constitutional way. I submit that that is the only way we can do it and have respect for the Constitution.

Not in a facetious vein, but in a most serious one, I cite one illustration of the soundness of that position, and that is the Republican platform of 1944. Someone who was a constitutional lawyer sat with that committee. Someone who not only knew the Constitution, but had a great understanding of its spirit and depth wrote that clause in the platform. There are many other statesmanlike statements in that platform. I read the entire platform while reading that section. It points the way, and the only way. It says:

> The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

Someone may say, "That does not mean that we do not favor other ways." That may be true; but in their calmer moments, in deciding national policy on which a great party was to stand before the people, something with a sound foundation, that is what the Republicans said. That was the best thing they could have said. It was the soundest thing they could have said. Was there any reason to play with language, or to say, "Because we said it, that does not mean that we cannot also do something else." I cite it as an illustration of the soundness of the position taken here, that that is the only lawful way. I am willing to rest this case on that simple proposition.

Let us remember that we are not at war. We are not expecting any immediate war. I think the worst war we are in right now is a war to try to tear apart and destroy the Constitution. I do not attribute that motive to any Senator supporting this legislation, but I am speaking about the Nation as a whole. We are not at war. There is no great emergency on this point. Just as certainly as we adopt this method as a fine gesture toward the men who are to be drafted, it will be cited as a precedent, bit by bit, inch by inch, foot by foot. In that way the water cuts under the foundation, and finally undermines the building and it topples over. By changing a period, then a comma, then a letter, then a word, then a clause, then a sentence, then a section—that is the way the Constitution can be frittered away.

Mr. President, I submit there is no necessity, demand, or urgency for legislation of this kind. However, much we

may wish to favor these men, we have no moral right, no political right, no constitutional right to strike down the great fundamental protective provisions of this immortal document, the Constitution of the United States. Let us remember that we are dealing with the Constitution; and, more than that, let us remember that within the Constitution this question is one of suffrage, one of the most serious and at the same time one of the most sacred rights we have under our Government. We must protect it. Whatever we do, we must have a sound legal basis for our action.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Mississippi is not only an eminent Senator but he is also a distinguished jurist. I am sure he has made a careful study of this subject. Does he recall any case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States or by any other Federal court in which a Federal statute under an asserted authority, under the Constitution, dealing with the poll tax or limiting its exercise, has been held unconstitutional?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not think there has been such a case. So far as I know no statute on that point has been passed. The only one passed by the Congress was during the war, as a war measure.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The main reason why the Supreme Court has not passed on it is because Congress has never been foolish enough to pass such an act.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "E" of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota is in my opinion a desirable one. It has already been stated by the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee that the amendment is in almost identical form, or at least substantially identical form, with the language on this subject which was embodied in the Federal voting law which was passed during the war and was applicable to the armed forces of the United States, although the able Senator did point out that the legislation to which he referred was handled in a separate bill and was not in the Selective Service Act itself.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that during the war—in 1942, as I recall—we passed the bill to which the Senator has referred, and it was quite a lengthy piece of legislation. It was supposed to make it possible for members of the armed forces to vote by mail from wherever they might be stationed during the war. Many legislatures of States which did not have absentee voting laws convened in order to make this Federal ballot, so to speak, legal in their States, so far as elections to Federal office were concerned. That is one of my reasons for saying that if we wish to take care of this poll-tax requirement, we should reenact the wartime voting bill in its entirety, and not simply pick out a small portion of it—section 2, in the case of the amendment now before us. As the Senator knows, this amendment is very short; it is but a small section of the Wartime Voting Act. That is why I believe we should not tack the amendment onto this selective-service bill at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask the able Senator from South Dakota if he recalls whether that provision of the Federal voting law was incorporated in the original bill as it came from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or whether the amendment was inserted on the floor of the Senate. I may be in error, but it is my recollection that the amendment was adopted by the Senate after being proposed on the floor; and I think the author of the amendment which actually was adopted was the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. I recall that I had an amendment in the identical language of the amendment which was adopted. I had it placed upon the desks of Senators. The Senator from Illinois was interested in the same subject, and he offered an amendment to the same effect. As I recall, although I may be in error, his amendment was adopted by the Senate.

But, be that as it may, the fact is that during the war the Congress did enact legislation eliminating any requirement that members of the armed services pay a poll tax when they were in the process of voting for Members of Congress or for President or for Vice President or electors for President or Vice President.

Mr. President, I repeat that that statute eliminating the poll-tax requirement is a salutary law. If ever there was a time when there was justification for the requirement of the payment of a poll tax, that time has passed. If ever there was a time when it was regarded as being a proper subject of qualification for voting to possess property or to possess a sum of money or to pay a sum of money, that time has long since passed. I submit it is out of harmony with our modern concept of the qualification of voters to require that a voter pay a sum of money before he can exercise the privilege of the franchise.

We have had considerable experience with the enlargement of the ballot when the poll tax was eliminated. If I correctly recall, in the State of Louisiana there was an increase of 77 percent in the number of women voters participating in a white primary after elimination of the poll tax. There was a larger participation, even in a white primary—this is no racial matter in any sense of the word, Mr. President—when the poll tax was eliminated. So how can anyone insist today that whether a person at a certain time pays a sum of money or whether he has the sum of money to pay is a criterion of his qualification to be a voter for Members of Congress in any of the States of the Union?

No doubt it is true that historically a poll tax was required; and no doubt it is also true that the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as the inferior Federal courts, has upheld the requirement by a State that a poll tax be paid before a citizen of that State can participate in a State election, and in the Pirtle against Brown case, before a voter can participate in an election of a Member of the Congress of the United States. But as the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] stated a moment ago, following my inquiry, I do not believe there has been a case in which the Supreme Court of the United States or any other Federal court has held illegal and unconstitutional and in excess of congressional authority an act of the Congress of the United States outlawing the poll tax and eliminating a requirement that a poll tax be paid as a condition precedent to voting for a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator know of any such statute in existence?

Mr. PEPPER. I know only of the statute which has already been referred to, which was passed in 1942 or 1943.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was in time of war.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the entire history of the United States up to the time of the enactment of that measure, does the Senator know of any such act as the one he speaks of, which Congress passed—an act providing that a poll tax should not be paid?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida does not know of the passage of such an act, and there is the precedent that no such act was adopted by the Congress prior to the one adopted during wartime.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. However, that is not an argument against the constitutionality of such an act of Congress, but it is simply an affirmation that Congress has not seen fit heretofore to exercise its authority, as alleged, under the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the case of the wartime act I think most of the States voluntarily took action to repeal their poll-tax requirements or to exempt from the payment of poll tax the men who were in the armed services.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. So there is no likelihood of a need for such a measure at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. But I point out that, technically, today we are still at war, and, of course, we possess the same power we had in 1942, when the provision referred to, outlawing the poll tax, was adopted.

In the second place, Mr. President, I shall refer to another provision in the Constitution. Under the Constitution of the United States Congress is given power to raise and support armies. If Congress in the exercise of its authority in raising and supporting armies deems proper to

eliminate from the burden of the armed forces the requirement that a poll tax be paid before voting for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, I submit that is a matter within the discretion of the Congress itself, as coming clearly within the provision of the Constitution giving Congress great latitude in determining the means by which it shall serve the constitutional ends it is authorized to pursue under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a very few moments. I think I am able to cite to the Senate language in a United States Supreme Court decision sustaining the right and the power of the Congress to adopt the amendment offered by the able Senator from North Dakota. The case I have in mind is *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 315), from which I shall read an opinion written in 1940 by then Chief Justice Stone. I read from page 315:

> While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases) this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article 1—

I ask the Senate's attention to this language—

> to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution, "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Mr. President, section 4 of article I referred to, under which Congress has the power to regulate the elections, reads as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Further in the same opinion, Chief Justice Stone has the following to say—and I am reading now from page 317 of the *Classic case* (313 U. S.):

> Nor can we say that that choice which the Constitution protects is restricted to the second step, because section 4 of article I, as a means of securing a free choice of representatives by the people, has authorized Congress to regulate the manner of elections, without making any mention of primary elections. For we think that the authority of Congress, given by section 4, includes the authority to regulate primary elections when, as in this case, they are a step in the exercise by the people of their choice of representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, I now turn to page 319 of the same decision, and read further from the language of Chief Justice Stone in the Classic case:

> Unless the constitutional protection of the integrity of elections extends to primary elections, Congress is left powerless to effect the constitutional purpose, and the popular choice of representatives is stripped of its constitutional protection save only as Congress, by taking over the control of State elections, may exclude from them the influence of the State primaries. Such an expedient would end that State autonomy with respect to elections which the Constitution contemplated that Congress should be free to leave undisturbed, subject only to such minimum regulation as it should find necessary to insure the freedom and integrity of the choice. Words, especially those of a constitution, are not to be read with such stultifying narrowness. The words of sections 2—

I interpolate, Mr. President, that section 2 is the language which has been referred to by other able Senators in which the States are given authority to prescribe the qualifications of electors for Members of Congress, and they are to those of the most numerous branch of State legislatures. I read further:

> The words of sections 2 and 4 of article I, read in the sense which is plainly permissible and in the light of the constitutional purpose, require us to hold that a primary election which involves a necessary step in the choice of candidates for election as Representatives in Congress, and which in the circumstances of this case controls that choice, is an election within the meaning of the constitutional provision and is subject to congressional regulation as to the manner of holding it.

I shall read ahead:

> Not only does section 4 of article I authorize Congress to regulate the manner of holding elections, but by article I, section 8, clause 18, Congress is given authority "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof. This provision leaves to the Congress the choice of means by which its constitutional powers are to be carried into execution. "Let the end be legitimate; let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional." *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat, 316, 421). That principle has been consistently adhered to and liberally applied, and extends to the congressional power by appropriate legislation to safeguard the right of choice by the people of Representatives in Congress, secured by section 2 of article I.

The last excerpt I read was on page 320 of Three Hundred and Thirteenth United States.

Mr. President, what could be clearer than that the Chief Justice of the United States, speaking for the Court, was saying that sections 2 and 4 of article I must be read together? And that when the States were given authority to prescribe the qualifications of electors for Members of Congress that must be read in connection with and in the light of section 4 of article I, which gives to Congress the power to regulate elections for Senators and for Members of Congress.

Not only that, Mr. President, but it is stated in the quotation which I have read, that Congress has the authority to leave the election for Members of Congress undisturbed, or it has the authority to step in and to exercise its authority under the constitutional provision giving Congress the right and the power to regulate the time and manner of choosing Members of Congress, and that, Mr. President, according to the decision to which I have adverted, means in substance anything that concerns the conduct of the election, the manner of holding it, not in any superficial sense, but the whole subject of holding elections for Members of Congress in the several States.

What does that mean, Mr. President? It means that when Congress has not acted, the States are supreme in the field. When Congress has not asserted its authority, the States may assert their power, and their power may be properly recognized.

Mr. President, that is no new principle. In certain respects, even relative to interstate commerce, as to which unquestionably Congress has the superior authority and the preeminent right, if the Congress does not choose to exercise its authority in that field and the States act first, if there be nothing in the Federal law contradictory to the State action, the State action stands; it is proper, lawful, and legitimate. But once let Congress invade the field where it has the superior right, let it assert its preeminent authority and power, then the States are powerless to contradict the Federal action in such a case.

So, Mr. President, Congress has not in the past, it is true, prior to 1942, chosen to strike down the poll tax with respect to any segment of the citizenry; but the fact that Congress never acted before certainly does not mean that Congress has no power or authority to act now. Day after day Congress establishes a precedent by acting upon a subject or in a field as to which it never before acted. Surely Senators would not contend that the absence of a precedent means the absence of the power on the part of the Congress of the United States to act. On the contrary, we have a precedent of Congress having acted in this field in 1942 by the adoption of an amendment in substantially the same language as the amendment now before the Senate which has been offered by the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Was that action of the Congress questioned by any State or its representatives? Was it brought into question in any court? If so, did any court declare it to be illegal as in excess of the congressional power? Not so far as I have ever heard. It stood as the law of the land. I doubt not that the reason it stood was because it appealed to the justice of the courts and of the country that these men, called upon to go forth to war, should not be disfranchised because they had not paid in response to the requirement of some local law a sum of money to vote for a Member of the Congress of the United States.

We speak of the duality of our Federal system. We have a double orbit, the State and Federal Governments. Surely it was never intended that the States should have the power to destroy the Federal system. Surely there must be some limitation which Congress could lay upon an act of a State legislature to prevent it from paralyzing the Federal Government or from restricting the franchise to such a few persons that it would not be based broadly enough to sustain the Federal Government and the Federal Union.

So, Mr. President, I say the time when the poll tax can be required or should be required has passed, and it should be outlawed by every State in the Union. The State of Florida, Mr. President, I proudly recall, abolished the poll tax in 1937. It was a progressive and forward-looking piece of legislation on the part of our State legislature. I honor all those who had a part in it. But, Mr. President, while I prefer that the States shall eradicate the poll tax as an appendage of the past, no less outmoded than the appendix in the human body, if the States do not do it, if they are remiss in their duty, if they still assert the right to impose this onerous burden upon citizens striving to vote for Members of Congress, then Congress, I venture to say, has the duty to protect the right to vote for Members of Congress and for Federal officials, and when it exercises that duty, Mr. President, it acts pursuant, in my opinion, to the authority conferred upon it by the Constitution and recognized in the Classic case to which I have referred.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was interested in the Senator's legal discussion, but I was rather amazed when he referred to the poll tax as being a very burdensome tax. I do not know what the tax is in other States, but before it was repealed in my State—and I was glad to endorse its repeal, and participated in a minor way therein—it amounted to $1 a year. This great, onerous burden upon citizens, preventing them from voting, amounted to $1 a year, which is less than 2 cents a week.

I hold in my hand a package of cigarettes on which the tax is 7 cents. Cigarettes are widely used by rich and poor alike. I have never been able to subscribe to the argument that a tax which amounted to less than 2 cents a week was an onerous or burdensome tax, even upon those who might almost be on relief. One dollar a year is not an excessive amount to contribute to the cause of education and for the right to vote.

I agree with all the Senator says about the tax being outmoded. I have used that expression myself in discussing the poll tax. It is indeed a heritage of antiquity, because it imposes a flat tax per head without regard for ability to pay. If it were an excessive tax, such as the one levied in the State of Washington in 1927, of $5 a year, it could be burdensome; but I have never been able to subscribe to the view that a tax of less than 2 cents a week could be very burdensome.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Georgia is correct in respect to the relatively small amount of the tax. I think, however, he should recall that in the State of Alabama the tax is cumulative, under the constitution of the State. A person must show he has paid the tax every year from 1901 up until the time he asserts the right to vote. If he misses paying the tax in any of those intervening years, he has to pay that amount of money. It might be a dollar or $2, or it might theoretically be a larger amount than that. In my State the tax used to be $1 a year, but, as I recall, since the elections were held every 2 years, a person had to pay $2 when he paid the tax.

In the State of Virginia I believe the tax is $1.50 a year, but if it had to be paid for 2 years at a time it would amount to $3.

Mr. President, many times $3 or $2 or $1 may be a burden upon the person who has to pay it. We are considerably better situated in the Senate than is the average citizen who has to pay a poll tax in States in which that requirement still exists. I realize that in amount it is not an insuperable obstacle, but in the case of the housewife going outside the scope of this immediate amendment, which has to do with the armed services—in the State of Louisiana there was an increase of 77 percent in the number of women voting in a white primary. I grew up on a farm. I know that when my mother wanted a dollar to buy a little material for a dress, she got together some eggs and chickens and took them to town, because there were not very many loose dollars lying around in the family purse. There are today many people in that situation in States which require the payment of a poll tax. Such a tax has to be paid within a certain time. If it is not paid within that time, the person owing the tax cannot vote. It may be burdensome, in States where the poll tax is cumulative, to get $2, $3, or $10 to the right person at the right time, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out. That may be so in the case of a soldier who is on the other side of the earth serving his country in the armed forces of the United States. So, as a practical matter, in the amount paid and in the requirement that it must be paid at a certain time there is an onerous obligation.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator from Florida contend that under the Constitution the Congress of the United States has the power to make it obligatory upon States to eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting?

Mr. PEPPER. For Members of Congress, and possibly for Presidential electors.

Mr. O'DANIEL. For Members of Congress?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. The Senator from Florida contends that it is within the power of Congress to strike down, as an unreasonable qualification or as an onerous condition upon the exercise of the franchise, a State requirement for the payment of a poll tax before one can vote for Members of Congress, or possibly, not quite as clearly, electors for President and Vice President.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Inasmuch as that is the opinion of the Senator from Florida, would he then contend that the Congress of the United States, by virtue of having the power to eliminate the poll tax, would also have the power to make the poll tax a prerequisite for voting, prescribe that the voters of the various States would be required to pay a poll tax?

Mr. PEPPER. I think it would be an illegal exercise of congressional power, and I think that if Congress itself were to lay down such a qualification, the United States Supreme Court should strike it down as not a proper standard or qualification. However, I will say that there is nothing in the Constitution and there is nothing in the Classic case which limits the authority of the Congress. In fact, if the Senator will recall, I quoted a while ago Chief Justice Stone, who said:

> Not only does section 4 of article I authorize Congress to regulate the matter of holding elections, but by article I, section 8, clause 18, Congress is given authority "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof." This provision leaves to the Congress the choice of means by which its constitutional powers are to be carried into execution, "Let the end be legitimate; let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

My able friend from Texas will recall that I said the United States Supreme Court should strike down, and I believe it would, any requirement which Congress might impose for the payment of a poll tax before one would be qualified to vote. But surely it is up to the Congress to exercise broad latitude in the exercise of the means for carrying out the constitutional powers.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The point I am trying to make is that if it is within the constitutional authority of the Congress of the United States to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite, Congress would likewise, if the rulings are consistent, have the right to make the poll tax mandatory as a prerequisite.

Mr. PEPPER. I must repeat what I said before, although there is clear logic in the question the Senator asks. I say the Senator must recall that the United States Supreme Court says that Congress may adopt any means which are appropriate, and which are plainly adapted to the end. I think the Supreme Court would hold, if it were logical, that a requirement that a poll tax would have to be paid before one could vote for a Member of Congress was not the exercise of legislative power.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It would be a matter for the Supreme Court to decide whether it was logical or not. The point I make is that if Congress has the right to abolish the poll tax, Congress would also have the right to require a poll tax.

Mr. PEPPER. There is persuasive logic in that, but it does not necessarily follow.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Perhaps our wise forefathers had something like this situation in mind. If we digress from the path we have trodden for 160 years, and establish a precedent by enacting legislation every once in a while that shows that Congress does have the right to

abolish the poll tax, since the personnel of the Senate changes from time to time, the time might eventually come when there would be other Senators here and other Members in the House of Representatives who might think that a dollar in the way of a poll tax was not sufficient enough, and they could prescribe some other regulation. They might say, "Here is the precedent, established back in 1948, and under it we have the right to require a poll tax or to repeal the poll tax." They might then say, "We will set up as a prerequisite for voting that everyone who votes in a State for a Member of the United States Congress must present at the voting box an income-tax report showing that his income is $1,000, or $5,000, or $10,000." They could do that; that is within the realm of possibility. If we digress and get away from the Constitution of the United States, and get out on a detour, we may come to a place where we will strike many obstacles on the detour, muddy places, we may strip a gear, we may run out of gas or blow out a tire. The point I am trying to make is that if we attempt to set such a precedent now we are possibly doing a great injustice to the people of this Nation.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very glad to have the views of the able Senator from Texas, but he must recall that every power Congress possesses, every power vested in the Congress by the Constitution, is subject to the rule of reasonableness, and subject to the scrutiny of the Supreme Court and the other courts of the land. So the fact that Congress might abuse this power is no argument against the fact that it has the power. One of the functions of the courts is to see that the Congress stays within the scope of its authority, and does not go outside.

The argument made by the able Senator might equally apply to the State legislatures in respect to local laws. If they were given the power, without review, to levy a poll tax in any amount they might see fit, the same conditions imagined by the able Senator from Texas might come to exist, and there might be a reactionary or selfish group of men in power who might say one had to be a freeholder, or had to have a large plantation, or had to have a department store, before he could vote for members of the State legislature. I believe that if a State were to attempt that by itself it would run afoul the Constitution.

Mr. President, all I am saying is that under our dual system of government Congress has the right to protect electors who vote for Members of Congress from onerous conditions or unreasonable qualifications which might be imposed, in the opinion of the Congress, by the several States.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I might say to the Senator from Florida that I am opposed to the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, and as Governor of the State of Texas I recommended a constitutional amendment which would abolish the poll tax as a prerequsite. But I adhere to the philosophy that the power is within the State; if the State of Texas wishes to have a poll tax, that is its business, and not the business of the Congress. So, as a citizen of Texas, or as the chief executive of Texas, I would fight for the abolition of the poll tax, but as a Member of the United States Senate I would oppose to the bitter end the effort of Congress to alter, or amend, or change, or nullify the constitution of the State of Texas.

I think our forefathers were very wise, because it is quite likely that the members of the legislatures and the people of the various States and the State governments are not apt all to go haywire at the same time, which might happen in the case of the Congress of the United States.

In addition to the protection that is given all along by the Constitution, the Members of the United States Congress have the veto power. If the people of a State elected someone objectionable to the United States Senate, or elected a Representative who was objectionable to the Members of the House of Representatives, the United States Senators or Members of the House by mere vote could reject such a Member. So they have a right to choose their own membership.

I contend that we should leave this provision as the forefathers intended when they wrote that great document, the Constitution of the United States, which I consider the greatest document, outside the Holy Bible, ever written by civilized and Christianized man. I think we should adhere to the spirit and letter of the Constitution, and let the people back home in the States determine whom they will elect, and who shall do the voting.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. He always makes an interesting contribution to any question to which he addresses himself. But the Senator must not imply that this is an innovation, that there has been some new provision written into the Constitution. I am quoting from the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States is the final authority in determining what the forefathers intended. The United States Supreme Court has said that the forefathers reserved unto the Congress the power to protect electors voting for Members of Congress from onerous burdens which the States might attempt to impose. They did that, no doubt wisely, to preserve the integrity of the Federal system along with the integrity of the local system of our Government.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield to the Senator from Texas, though I am anxious to conclude.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator contend that the Supreme Court of the United States should decide for each Senator what the Constitution means?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is rather an accepted principle that the judiciary of the country interprets the meaning of the Constitution, and I know of no escape from the authority of the courts when they interpret the meaning of the Constitution. If someone does not like it he does not have to follow it, but certainly the authentic definition of what the Constitution is and what it means is made for us by the judiciary of the country, and especially the court of final resort, the Supreme Court of the United States. So I know of no better criteria of what the Constitution does mean than the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the decision of the Supreme Court represents the proper way for the laws passed by Congress to be interpreted, and I think that all citizens are subject to the rulings of the Supreme Court, but in enacting legislation I do not believe the United States Supreme Court has any right whatever to interpret, or that a United States Senator is under any obligation to accept the interpretation of any member or of the entire membership of the Supreme Court in connection with the enactment of legislation or the repeal of legislation or action by Congress in any way. I think that is our responsibility, and that the people chose us believing that we had sufficient intelligence correctly to interpret the Constitution as it was intended, and that we should exercise our own authority and not be guided or bossed around by the Supreme Court.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator has a perfect right to repudiate the decision of the United States Supreme Court if he chooses to. He can also repudiate the King James version of the Bible, but there are a great many of us who are willing to rely on the fact that the inspired ones wrote what the King James version of the Bible said they wrote, by having interpreted it for us.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator from Texas has no intention to repudiate the rulings of the Supreme Court.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The point I have tried to make is that as Senators we have the right to interpet the meaning of the United States Constitution as we enact legislation in this body.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. Nobody can tell a Senator how to vote on the Senate floor. I am sure the record of the able Senator from Texas establishes his own independence, and that he will preserve his own independent point of view so long as he is a Member of this body.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am sure the Senator from Florida has the same right to vote as he chooses, and the same independence in voting.

Mr. PEPPER. I assuredly will exercise my independence in voting, but I think the Senator from Florida, in making his own decision, will be very much influenced by decisions of the Supreme Court heretofore rendered.

Mr. President, we are asking men to enter the armed services of the country, to go to the ends of the earth, to serve this Nation's interest and to perform the

duties with which they are charged. By the very fact that they are members of our armed services, Mr. President, they ought to have established their citizenship in the sense that they should not have to pay a sum of money for the privilege of its exercise. So, Mr. President, I say, the Senator from North Dakota has done a service to this legislation, to make it crystal clear that it is out of harmony with the democracy the soldiery is selected to defend to make them pay a sum of money before they can vote for the Senator and the Representative who sent them from their homes to the far reaches of the earth to perform patriotic duties.

So I hope the amendment of the able Senator from North Dakota will be adopted, and I shall with great pleasure cast my vote for its adoption.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I realize that the yeas and nays have been ordered, and that the Members of the Senate are anxious to vote on the amendment and bring to an end a long and tedious day.

I have given considerable study, Mr. President, to the power of the Congress to legislate on the subject of the qualifications of voters. In fact, I have prepared and have before me tonight a discussion of over 100 pages on that subject, starting with the debates in the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in 1787, the discussions in the Federalist Papers by both Madison and Hamilton, the debates in three different States which refused to ratify the Constitution until assured that the Congress would have no power to legislate on the qualifications of their voters, and I have analyzed all the cases the Supreme Court of the United States has decided on this subject.

I regret, Mr. President, that so vital a matter as a direct attack upon the Constitution which every Member of this body has taken a solemn oath to uphold and defend has been brought up in this collateral way, and in a manner that will affect relatively few people. There is no analogy whatever, I may say, to the wartime voting act which waived registration, which waived poll taxes and provided for an absentee ballot on the ground that there is no law that rises higher than the emergency of war. We accepted that theory, and it was never tested in any court.

Now we are in peacetime. There is not the faintest suggestion in the bill of making it possible for these soldiers to vote. Not the faintest. And there is no provision that they do not have to register—and registration is required in every State of the Union except one. Nothing is said about that. There is no provision if we take 200,000, 300,000, 400,000 of them and send them abroad, that they could vote by mail. There is nothing about that in the bill. There is no concern about whether or not the soldiers can vote.

This is a proposal to do one of two things: Either to throw a roadblock in the path of the draft bill, or to furnish an entering wedge for the broader program that the Congress shall legislate on the subject of the qualifications of voters in direct contravention of the clear wording of the Constitution, and in contravention of every decided case by the Supreme Court on that subject.

As I said, I shall not speak at length. If a future effort shall be made on the Senate floor to bring up this program again and apply it to all voters of the United States, I shall certainly speak at great length. But even tonight, Mr. President, I feel very deeply on the subject of what we are being asked to do.

Oh, it may be said that, "It is merely a little stone that will be pulled out of the Constitution. What difference does a little stone make?" It will apply to only 400,000 or 500,000 men in the Army, and three or four hundred thousand men in the Navy. Many of them will not register. Not many of them will try to vote. The fact is that seven States having the poll tax written into their constitutions will have no opportunity to change them between now and the primary elections this summer and the general election this fall. It is said, "Do not bother about that. It is only a little stone pulled out of the Constitution."

I cannot let go unchallenged the statement made on the floor today by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the statement just made by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] that Congress has the legal right to legislate on this subject. I wish Members of the Senate would read the history of legislation affecting the qualifications of electors. All the States started with property rights as a test. They were very jealous that the Congress should not prescribe for them who should vote and who should not vote.

To ease the test on those who could not acquire land, or could not obtain sufficient property to qualify, many States said, "If you will only pay a poll tax, we will say that you have contributed something to Government, and that you have an interest in government." If Senators could read that history, they would not misinterpret, as the senior Senator from Florida has done continually, the holding in the case of United States against Classic. In all my experience in 16 years in Congress I have never heard so brilliant a man as the senior Senator from Florida so misread and misinterpret the clear decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in a vital case.

What was that case? It was somewhat similar to the Yarborough case, and involved the prosecution of Classic and others for interfering with voters in a Louisiana primary election. The main point in the case was whether the constitutional protection applied to voters in a primary as well as in a general congressional election. The Court decided that it did. But the Court proceeded to cite the Yarborough case, which the distinguished senior Senator from Florida did not cite, following the ruling in that case and holding that the right to vote in either a primary or general election for Members of Congress was given only to persons qualified under State law to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The senior Senator from Florida quoted Mr. Justice Stone, but he did not quote the sentence which is the heart of the decision in that case.

The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] asked, "If the Congress can knock down a poll tax, can it not put up a poll tax?" The junior Senator from Texas was 100-percent correct. If we can control the qualifications of the voters in a State, if we can say to the States, "You may not impose a poll tax," we can also say, "No one shall vote for a Member of Congress unless he pays a poll tax of $10," or whatever the majority in Congress may fix.

The Senator from Florida went so far as to accuse the junior Senator from Texas of disregarding a decision of the Supreme Court. I wish to quote from that very decision, to show that the junior Senator from Texas was 100 percent on the line, and that the senior Senator from Florida totally misread and utterly misinterpreted the meaning of the Court in that case.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Constitution provides that an elector for a Member of the National House of Representatives shall have the same qualifications as fixed by the State for an elector for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If the Congress of the United States can say that a poll tax is not a qualification, does not the Senator agree that the Congress would have the power to fix qualifications for electors for the National House of Representatives, which is the argument the Senator from Florida makes, when carried to its conclusion?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely. We could go into seven States north of the Potomac River and say, "You now prohibit paupers from voting in your State. We want all the paupers in your State to vote."

Mr. EASTLAND. The qualifications must be the same.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. EASTLAND. Therefore, when the Federal Government fixes the qualifications for an elector for a Member of the National House of Representatives, the same qualifications must be the qualifications for an elector for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The Federal Government would therefore fix the qualifications of an elector in the State of Florida.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It would indeed, because they would have to be the same.

Mr. EASTLAND. Thereby depriving the people of their God-given right to control their own elections, and fixing the qualifications of voters in Florida.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator from Mississippi is 100 percent right. It works both ways. If the Federal Government has the right to control the qualifications, it controls them not only with respect to Members of Congress, but with respect to State officials and members of the most numerous branches of the State legislature. The Constitution clearly says—and I am sure the Senator from Florida will not

deny it—that the qualifications must be the same.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the Senator from Virginia will not deny the language which the Senator from Florida read from the Classic case, which stated that section 2, article I, of the Constitution, which provides that qualifications are those of electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and section 4 of article I of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to regulate the elections in which Members of Congress are involved, must be read in the light of each other. The Senator would distinguish one from the other, reading each utterly in isolation from the other, when the Supreme Court has said that they must be read each in the light of the other.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. With all due deference to the distinguished Senator from Florida, I am coming to that very point, and I intend to show that he jumps from what Congress has the power to do under section 4 with reference to the time, place, and manner—which is all we have the power to regulate—over to the qualifications, including poll tax and residence.

The State of Idaho did not want the Mormons to come into Idaho, and it adopted a provision in its constitution as long as one's arm to the effect that if anyone comes into the State of Idaho and even looks in the direction of two wives he cannot vote in Idaho. That provision is still in the Constitution of Idaho, and no one has challenged the right of Idaho to adopt such a provision.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not the fight behind this question based upon an attempt to take away from the States the right to fix the qualifications of their voters and lodge that right in the Congress of the United States, thereby destroying the States and destroying the very elemental safeguards of human liberty which the Constitution threw around the people of this country? Would it not lead to the domination of Florida, Mississippi, and Virginia by Harlem, and the slums of New York, Philadelphia, and other metropolitan centers?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Exactly; and that is the reason I say that although this may be a little stone——

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not that the fight behind this whole controversy?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It may be a little stone that is being pulled out of the foundation; but it is pulling out the little stones which finally will tumble the foundation of that delicate balance between national rights, State sovereignty, and personal freedom which we have always referred to as American constitutional liberty, just as the Senator from Mississippi has said.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I have not yet reached the real holding in the Classic case. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to quote from that case.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. My moments are going very rapidly. I promised to speak for 10 minutes, but already I have been on my feet for 20 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will place the responsibility upon his interrupters he will be exempt from any liability for exceeding his promise. The arrangement to jump from a discussion of the Negro to a discussion in the political field was made so that we might confine the argument to the constitutional aspects of the matter, and I shall endeavor to continue to do so.

Mr. President, I wish to make it very clear that no one who has advocated this amendment or who has spoken of the right of Congress to adopt it if it chooses to do so has spoken of anything except having the Congress act to protect the integrity of the right of voters to vote for Members of Congress. In my opinion, it is clear that the Congress does not have the power, at least according to the present decisions of the courts of the land, to regulate the qualification of electors in the several States for the election of State officials. That is why the Breedlove case in Georgia was correctly decided. We are not talking about the qualification of voters for elections in the several States or the conditions which may be imposed upon the exercise of that franchise. I can imagine an abuse of that power, even by a State legislature; but that is not what is involved here. In this instance we are speaking of the power of the Congress to strike down an onerous condition or an unreasonable qualification upon a person voting for a Member of Congress, and nothing more.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I feel flattered that I have stimulated the Senator from Florida.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is behind this controversy, if the argument of the Senator from Florida prevails, is that the people of the various States will be deprived of all authority to fix the qualifications of their electors, both State and national. I say that is behind this entire controversy. It is an attempt to take away from them the very elementary safeguards of human liberty and the power of control over local affairs, to cut their government to fit local needs and local traditions, because that power is exercised through the control of the ballot box.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I have before me 75 pages, although I do not intend to use all of them tonight, which deal with the political implications of destroying States' rights and developing an overpowering central government which perhaps would lead to some of the consequences which have just been mentioned by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Mississippi.

What I wish to do tonight, in as brief a time as possible, is merely to challenge the proposition from a legal standpoint, and to say that the Congress never has had, does not now have, and never will legally have, the right to fix the qualifications of voters in the elections in any State.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator agree with the statement I have made?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I fully agree with that statement.

Mr. Justice Stone said in the Classic case:

> Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity with the requirements of State laws—

I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida please to bear that in mind—

> subject to the restrictions prescribed by Section 2 and the authority conferred on Congress by section 4—

To do what?—

> to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections of Representatives.

And the Court proceeds to say:

> We look then to the statutes of Louisiana here involved to ascertain the nature of the right which under the constitutional mandate they define and confer on the voter.

The Court also said in that case:

> The right of the people to choose * * * is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right.

Then followed this paragraph, Mr. President, which has mistakenly been relied upon by the advocates of Federal action:

> While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on this subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

As I recall, Mr. President, that is the section of the Constitution which the distinguished Senator from Florida read from the case he cited, and it is the section on which he is relying. What does that mean? It means only that the office of Representative in Congress was created by the Constitution; but the opinion of the Court still says that the States are authorized to legislate as provided by section 2, which is the only one which refers to the qualification of voters, and that their authority may be limited by the Federal Government under section 4, which covers only the times, places, and manner of holding elections.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator from Virginia concede that the right to vote for a Member of Congress is a right

derived from the Constitution of the United States, and not from the constitutions of the several States?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not. I say that the office of a Member of Congress was created by the Federal Constitution; but I say that the right of citizenship, which gives the right to vote, was created by State citizenship; and a dual citizenship was acquired when the States said, "We will have some Federal offices; and we will yield, under the Constitution, to the Federal Government the privilege of fixing the times, places, and manner in which those Federal officers shall be chosen; but under no circumstances will we ever yield the right of the States to determine the qualifications of those who vote for those offices."

Now, let me finish the references to the legal case, and then I shall yield the floor to the Senator. I ask him please to let me finish.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I have already taken more time than I wished to take; but I cannot conclude this discussion without calling attention to a case on which the Senator from Florida relied in appearing before a committee in 1945, after he had cited the Classic case. He then said that the case of Pirtle against Brown has been decided wrong by the Circuit Court of Appeals. He testified that it was an ideal case to test the right of the Congress to legislate. He said:

> I predict confidently that when that case goes to the Supreme Court, the Circuit Court of Appeals will be overridden.

Mr. President, what was that case? It grew out of a complaint of a citizen of Tennessee, otherwise qualified, who was refused the right to vote in a special election to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives because he had not paid his poll tax. The district court found against him, and the decision was affirmed unanimously by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, whose opinion followed closely the reasoning of Mr. Justice Butler in the Breedlove case.

The Supreme Court was asked to review the case; but on October 13, 1941, the petition was denied without any opinion or statement. This case is highly significant, because only a special election for a Member of Congress was involved, and the refusal of the Supreme Court to review it came as a great disappointment to those who had tried to discount the Breedlove case on the ground that both a State and a Federal election were involved.

Mr. President, I shall not now take more of the time of the Senate, at this late hour, on this question.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask the Senator from Virginia to yield to me in order that I may express my appreciation of his defense of my contention in the previous colloquy with the Senator from Florida. The able jurist and junior Senator from Virginia has proved by the ruling of the Supreme Court that I was, as he said, 100-percent right in the legal phase of this argument, and also 100-percent right in the logical conclusion drawn from the Constitution of the United States.

The Senator from Florida took the opposite view. Both the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Florida are able Senators, and both are referring to the rulings of the United States Supreme Court. In my opinion that proves conclusively that the Senators on this floor cannot rely on the rulings of the United States Supreme Court, but must revert to that rock of ages, the Constitution of the United States, the solid foundation upon which the liberty and freedom of all Americans is founded. We must decide for ourselves what is in the Constitution, because all the rulings of the Supreme Court that have ever been made have not altered one word or sentence or section or article of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, as Lord Bacon said in his Essay on Truth, " 'What is truth?' said jesting Pilate, and would not stay for an answer." They wrote the truth in the Constitution. I recognize that there was a farmer in Mississippi who not long ago said, "Things are not as unconstitutional as they used to be." But at the same time, Mr. President, there are certain things so fundamental in the Constitution that we should not deliberately abandon them. Our guide and our light, as I have said, are the debates in the Philadelphia convention, the Federalist papers, the debates in the State ratifying conventions, and, as my distinguished friend from Florida said, the 14 decisions of the Supreme Court that come right down the line, never once deviating from the fundamental principle that the Congress has no power to control, in any way or form, the qualifications of voters in the States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a second? I am wondering if I can——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, the Senator can, in about 5 minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. If I could do that, I should be glad to yield to the Senator at any time.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Virginia has spoken about the 14 decisions of the United States Supreme Court. The able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I think, correctly stated the law when he said there was no case involving the question at issue in which a United States court had held unconstitutional an act of Congress. There never was an act of Congress on the subject until 1942. That act of Congress has never been attacked. It has never been declared invalid by any court. Nobody asserts it has. So, Mr. President, that is a precedent for the validity of the amendment which is proposed here today.

In the second place, Mr. President, it is very clear that in the past we have been dealing, therefore, with acts of the State legislatures which have been brought into question in the Federal courts, and the Federal courts have not stricken down those acts. But that is no authority for the proposition that the Congress does not have the power to outlaw the poll tax.

The able Senator from Virginia spoke about Pirtle against Brown, the Tennessee case. That was a previous case. The case of Breedlove against Suttles, which came up from Georgia, was a case in which a citizen went to a State official claiming to be qualified to vote in both local and Federal elections without paying the poll tax. Nobody would contend that he could qualify to vote in a State election without meeting State requirements.

The Pirtle case was the first one where the right to vote for a Member of Congress without paying a poll tax was clearly presented. The writ of certiorari was denied by the United States Supreme Court.

As I have said before, it is therefore clear that a State law imposing qualifications, in the absence of an act of Congress, is not invalid. But, Mr. President, when Congress acts pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, that presents an entirely different question, because the right is derived from the Federal Constitution.

The Senator from Virginia is not very clear on the subject of the origin of the right. If the Federal Constitution creates the right, then the Congress may condition the right because they come from one and the same source. So, Mr. President, the very logic of the matter is that if the Constitution creates the right, it is Federal in character; therefore it is subject to Federal supervision, restraint, and circumscription.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTON of Virginia. Did the Federal Government create the States or did the States create the Federal Government. Whence came the power?

Mr. PEPPER. The question of who created the States was not a part of the argument. I ask the Senator from Virginia, whence was derived the right to vote for a Member of Congress?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. From the State law.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, the Senator from Virginia says, "from State law." I quote from page 315 of the Classic case:

> While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States.

The Court might have had in mind the Senator from Virginia and others who loosely speak of it as derived from the States.

The Court then cites Minor against Happersett, United States against Reece, and Breedlove against Suttles, where the Supreme Court itself had loosely said the right to vote for a Member of Congress is derived from the State constitution. But Chief Justice Stone—and I would like the Senator to show that this language has ever been reversed by the United States Supreme Court—proceeded:

> This statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action

by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

One other thing: Had it not been that the right to vote for a Member of Congress was derived from the Federal Constitution, the defendent in that case could not have been convicted. It was a criminal prosecution based upon the alleged violation of a Federal statute making it a Federal offense to deprive a citizen of a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. If the right to vote for a Member of Congress did not derive from the Constitution of the United States, the Federal statute would not have been applicable and the defendant Classic could not have been convicted. It was a necessary holding on the part of the Supreme Court as to the nature of the right.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senate is now ready to vote on the pending amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that we may have a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Myers
Ball	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Daniel
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Capehart	Kem	Russell
Capper	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Smith
Cooper	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Lucas	Stewart
Downey	McCarthy	Taft
Dworshak	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McKellar	Thye
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Maybank	Watkins
George	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	Wiley
Hawkes	Morse	Williams
Hayden	Murray	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "E," offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few moments with regard to the pending measure. I feel duty-bound to say a word or two in opposition to the amendment. It was my understanding when we started to discuss this extremely important bill in behalf of national defense that all of the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota were to be tabled. Most of the Members on this side of the aisle went along with that agreement and voted at the proper time to table all such amendments offered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. How could the Senator have any idea that there was any such agreement, and what kind of an agreement does the Senator refer to?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have any particular agreement with anyone, I will say to the Senator from Ohio, but there was a general understanding, from what I could learn, on the part of members of the Armed Services Committee, that such was to be the procedure. I may be incorrect in that statement. If I am, I stand corrected. There are some tentative agreements made which the Senator from Ohio does not know about. I know it displeases him a little when such arrangements are made. But be that as it may, whether there was an agreement or an arrangement, the important question now before the Senate of the United States involves a most serious question on national defense. The poll-tax amendment offered by the able Senator from North Dakota involves a highly controversial question which should stand or fall in a separate measure, and not be attached to the bill which is pending before the Senate. That is the basic reason, when all of the amendments heretofore offered by the Senator from North Dakota came to a vote, certain members of the minority on this side of the aisle submerged their convictions for the sole purpose of trying to pass a defense measure without creating a situation in which some Members might inaugurate a filibuster upon certain amendments dealing with civil rights.

Everyone knows where the Senator from Illinois stands with respect to an anti-poll-tax bill, and other civil-rights measures. My record has been made by my votes in the Congress. If the Republican majority want to report an over-all poll-tax bill tomorrow as a part of the policy of the majority of the Senate, the Senator from Illinois will join them in seeing that it is passed at this session of the Congress. But I do not propose to stand by without protest and permit the Senator from Ohio, or other Senators, to use this method of telling the American people that we have passed a poll-tax bill for the soldiers but not a poll-tax bill for every other citizen of the United States affected by this tax. That is exactly what is in the air, and they cannot fool the Senator from Illinois with respect to this subject.

I am somewhat astonished and somewhat amused to find my good friend from Ohio so sympathetic toward and so interested in the soldiers in Germany and other parts of the world who might be denied a vote in the event that this amendment is not adopted. My memory is not very short, Mr. President, on certain fundamental issues which have come before the United States Senate. I go back to February 1944 when the Senator from Ohio was the most vigorous leader and champion of the fight against the soldier's vote bill. He was not too particularly interested at that time in seeing that the soldiers overseas got the ballot.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Not for the moment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will not the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not remember what the position of the Senator from Ohio was at that time, but there were many of us who took the position that we should not have a bobtail ballot, that the soldier should be permitted to vote a full ballot, including voting on State officials. That was the issue.

Mr. LUCAS. I know what the issue was better than does my good friend from Colorado. He just sat on the side lines and listened. He took his orders at that time from the Senator from Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado takes his orders from no one, and in that matter he voted for a full ballot instead of a bobtail ballot, and his vote was sustained by the absent soldiers of his State.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand all about the issues raised at that time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. They did not vote the way the Senator expected they would.

Mr. LUCAS. Be that as it may, we elected a Democratic President, much to the surprise of my friend from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But not in Colorado.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not know that Colorado was the entire United States. I thought it was only one of the 48 States in the Union.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator should inform himself on those important matters.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will restrain himself for a moment, I will conclude. I did not know I was going to get into a debate with the able Senator from Colorado. He seldom takes up the cudgels for anyone on his side of the aisle unless he is vitally interested in some issue. But I am always glad to debate with my good friend, because when the Senator from Colorado asks a Senator to yield, it is a tribute and a compliment to him, since he seldom does it. He is a close student of what is going on in government. He understands a thing or two, and what was said must have disturbed the Senator just a little. In other words, I think I know what I am talking about, and the Senator from Colorado knows that I know what I am talking about. The fact that he interrupted me in connection with this subject convinces me that it disturbs him quite a lot to have someone relate a little history.

I intend to vote against the pending amendment, as I stated in the beginning. I have to vote against it if I want to be consistent with my position on the rest of the amendments which have been offered from time to time and voted down practically unanimously, or with only six or eight votes for them. The Republican majority should let those who desire bring in a complete anti-poll-tax bill, and not a half measure through the side door. This affects only a few soldiers in a few States. Other citizens are entitled to the same privilege.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has begun.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the amendment lettered "E."

Mr. WHERRY. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment itself, and not on a motion to table.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Capper	Flanders
Ball	Cooper	Hawkes
Brewster	Cordon	Ives
Brooks	Donnell	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Dworshak	Kem
Capehart	Ecton	Knowland
Langer	Pepper	Watkins
Lodge	Revercomb	Wherry
McCarthy	Saltonstall	Wiley
Martin	Smith	Williams
Millikin	Taft	Young
Morse	Thye	
Murray	Vandenberg	

NAYS—35

Byrd	Hoey	O'Conor
Cain	Holland	O'Daniel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Downey	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Eastland	Lucas	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McGrath	Stennis
George	McKellar	Stewart
Gurney	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Moore	Umstead
Hill	Myers	

NOT VOTING—24

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Green	Reed
Bricker	Hatch	Taylor
Bridges	Jenner	Tobey
Buck	McCarran	Tydings
Bushfield	McFarland	Wagner
Chavez	Magnuson	White
Feazel	Malone	Wilson

So Mr. LANGER's amendment lettered "E" was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 35, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Flanders	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brewster	Ives	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Kem	Taft
Cain	Knowland	Thye
Capehart	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarthy	Watkins
Cooper	Martin	Wherry
Donnell	Millikin	Wiley
Dworshak	Morse	Williams
Ecton	Murray	

NAYS—35

Byrd	Holland	O'Daniel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Cordon	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Eastland	Lucas	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McGrath	Stennis
George	McKellar	Stewart
Gurney	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Moore	Umstead
Hill	Myers	Young
Hoey	O'Conor	

NOT VOTING—26

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Green	Reed
Bricker	Hatch	Taylor
Bridges	Jenner	Tobey
Buck	Lodge	Tydings
Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	White
Downey	Magnuson	Wilson
Feazel	Malone	

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the trouble?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the result stated?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I should like to have the result stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The result is a tie—the yeas are 35 and the nays 35.

Mr. LUCAS. And the motion is lost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is lost.

The question now recurs on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What did the Chair say was the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Langer amendment E was agreed to. The motion just voted upon was the motion to table the motion to reconsider. The motion to table was lost. Therefore the question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, is it too late to call for a verification of the vote?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is a recapitulation in order after the result has been announced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The result has been announced.

The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Langer amendment E was agreed to.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Chair again state the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Langer amendment E was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, has the roll call been answered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The roll call is well under way.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What Senator answered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will reserve my remarks.

The Chief Clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Was I given the "run around" a moment ago?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator was given the correct answer. The Senator from Vermont voted in the negative when his name was called. The Senator can be sure that the Chair is always honest.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 35, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—35

Byrd	Hoey	O'Conor
Cain	Holland	O'Daniel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Ecton	Lucas	Russell
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McGrath	Stennis
George	McKellar	Stewart
Gurney	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Moore	Umstead
Hill	Myers	

NAYS—35

Aiken	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Ives	Saltonstall
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Kem	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Capehart	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarthy	Watkins
Cooper	Martin	Wherry
Cordon	Millikin	Wiley
Donnell	Morse	Williams
Dworshak	Murray	Young
Flanders	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—26

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Green	Reed
Bricker	Hatch	Taylor
Bridges	Jenner	Tobey
Buck	Lodge	Tydings
Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	White
Downey	Magnuson	Wilson
Feazel	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is again a tie, 35 yeas and 35 nays; and the motion to reconsider is lost.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I now call up his amendment B and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 22, it is proposed to add the following subsection:

SEC. 2. (b) (1) The Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized until June 30, 1950, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army not to exceed 50,000 in number from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age nor more than 35 years of age for an enlistment period of not less than 5 years for service outside of the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions.

(2) Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlist in the Regular Army under the provisions of section 2 (b) (1) of this act nor to their dependents and beneficiaries.

(3) So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads "; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army" is hereby suspended until June 30, 1950.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to inquire whether any Senator who voted with the prevailing side or who did not vote on the amendment which has just been the subject of debate can now enter a motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that only one motion to reconsider can be made.

The Chair will read rule XIII, under the heading "Reconsideration."

1. When a question has been decided by the Senate, any Senator voting with the prevailing side or who had not voted may, on the same day or on either of the next 2 days of actual session thereafter, move a reconsideration; and if the Senate shall refuse to reconsider, or upon reconsideration, shall affirm its first decision, no further motion to reconsider shall be in order unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the reading of the rule, it would appear that a motion to reconsider is not in order. But it would seem that when a motion is lost by a tie vote there should be another opportunity to vote on the motion.

However, the rule does not refer to a tie vote, so I suppose there can be no such opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule does not refer to a tie, so the Chair assumes that the procedure stated in the rule will have to be followed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a series of amendments which I wish to comment on at the present time, and I wish to have the amendments printed in the RECORD, so that the amendments and my comments on them may appear in the RECORD for reading tomorrow.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Louder!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair observes that if the Senate were more quiet, the Senator from Oregon would have less difficulty in being heard. However, he is not talking very loudly. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my colleagues certainly compliment me unexpectedly. I thought I was simply speaking for the RECORD tonight; but I shall be glad to speak sufficiently loud so that if Senators really wish to hear what I have to say, they may do so.

I was saying that I have a few brief comments to make on a series of amendments which I should like to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. If I should wish to have the Senator from Oregon yield to me at this time, would I have to proceed via the Senator from Nebraska?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair points out that the Senator from Nebraska has the floor, and has yielded to the Senator from Oregon. Therefore, it would be necessary for the Senator from Illinois to proceed via the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think that would be quite the proper parliamentary procedure, if the Senator from Illinois made a point of order. I might wish to ask the Senator from Oregon some direct questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is sure that could be arranged.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield at any time to the Senator from Illinois, to permit him to ask the Senator from Oregon a question. I was about to move that the Senate take a recess, but I was yielding at the last moment to Senators who wish to make insertions in the RECORD. I understand that the Senator from Oregon intends to offer some amendments, and to request that they be printed and lie on the table, so as to be available tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to propound a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Not at this time. I merely wished to propound a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair has answered it, and I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is welcome.

The Senator from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the first amendment I offer goes to page 62, line 25, of the pending bill. At that point I suggest that the word "fifth" be changed to the word "second."

I have discussed this amendment with a considerable number of the Members of the Senate this afternoon, in the cloakrooms. I am inclined to think that if my colleagues will pause long enough in the consideration of this bill to study the implications of this amendment, tomorrow when we come to vote on the amendment it will be adopted by a substantial majority.

I think the RECORD should be perfectly clear that in view of page 62 of this bill, if it is passed in its present form, we shall in fact be passing a bill which seeks to put a draft into operation for 5 years. World conditions and our own domestic problems are so uncertain that we should not, as I think this section does, even indirectly commit our country to a policy of a draft that may extend for 5 years. Furthermore, I think we should adopt a draft proposal that certainly does not extend beyond 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will please suspend until the Senate is in order. There is no point in the Senator's trying to continue until the Chamber is quiet. The Senator cannot be heard when there is so much confusion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not have any illusions about the importance of the Chair's suggestion at this hour. I was perfectly willing to speak to the RECORD tonight in order to make this material available, so my colleagues may read it. I agree with the Chair, however, that even when one does not try to speak to the full Chamber, he ought to have a little order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Order is pretty well restored. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was stating that I think we not only should amend this provision of the bill. First, we find it on line 25 reading, "to apply on the fifth anniversary." My proposal is to make that clause read: "to apply on the second anniversary." I think we should place the definite responsibility on a Congress 2 years hence to review the whole matter and decide then whether or not it wants to continue the draft, and under what terms and conditions it may want to continue it, if at all.

I cannot stress too strongly, Mr. President, what I consider to be the importance and all the implication of my amendment. Changing that little word "fifth" to the word "second" is of tremendous importance. I point out that we are at peace, and I pray that we not only may remain at peace, but that international conditions may so improve that there will be no necessity for letting draft legislation remain on the statute books 2 years hence.

I think, Mr. President, this amendment of mine serves clear notice on all countries of the world that we are not in fact preparing for war, but that by this legislation we seek only to prepare for reasonable protection of the security of our country until the clouds of noncooperation which presently prevail in international councils lift and we can have the assurance of all countries of the world, including Soviet Russia, that there will be united action in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Charter. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, it has been with great hesitation but at the same time after much thought that I have reached the conclusion to offer this amendment; but I believe that my amendment will serve clear notice on the world that we have none but a peaceful intention to take the steps necessary to protect our national security.

I am fearful, Mr. President, that the bill in its present form will be subject either to the interpretation or to the propaganda technique seeking to give the impression to other peoples of the world that America is in fact preparing for war when it adopts what amounts to a 5-year draft proposal.

I offer the amendment and send it to the desk with a request that it be published as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 62, line 25, strike the word "fifth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "second."

Mr. MORSE. The next amendment I offer, Mr. President, refers to page 6, line 23, where I propose to strike the number "twenty-four" and insert in lieu thereof the number "twelve." In other words I propose that the draft shall take men into the armed services for a period of 12 months instead of 24.

I am satisfied that if the amendment is thoroughly studied and all its implications are considered, it, too, when we come to a vote on it, will be adopted.

I hope that on both amendments, Mr. President, I may have the courtesy of the yeas and nays when a vote is taken on them, because I think the amendments will receive great attention on the part of the people as a whole.

In support of this amendment I desire the RECORD to show these brief remarks tonight. I think it is a very serious thing to take young men in peacetime—and I repeat, we still are at peace, and I think the chances are very good that we can remain at peace if we use our heads and demonstrate a willingness as one of the United Nations to make the necessary sacrifices for peace—I say, being at peace, it is a very serious thing to take young men from civilian life and disrupt their lives for a 2-year period by placing them in the Army under a peacetime draft.

I know there are arguments with considerable merit to the effect that my proposal may in effect increase the cost of the draft, but I do not think the cost of the draft is nearly of the same importance as the right of young men in this country to be protected from being required to serve longer than is necessary to protect the Nation by way of a reasonable national security program.

I know also that my proposal to reduce the service from 24 months to 12 will raise the argument that it will not produce so efficient an army. But I am satisfied from the hearings and from the record made before the Armed Services Committee that 12 months' service under the draft law will give these men the basic training they need for future service in the Army. If following the 12 months' period they go into the various branches of the Reserve I think the final bill, with my amendment in it, will then give us the national security we need and will accomplish in the main all we seek to accomplish by the pending measure on the 24 months' basis.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that at one time we were talking only in terms of a universal military-training program. We were talking then in terms of a 6-months service with subsequent service in the Reserves. I think there is no doubt about the fact that the armed services themselves never reached unanimity of opinion against a 6-months' universal military-training service in preference to a draft.

Let us all be frank about it. A part of the suggestion was pretty much an afterthought, because the movement for a national-security bill was for months discussed on Capitol Hill in terms of a 6-months' universal military-training bill. It is because of certain disturbing events occurring in Europe, due principally to Russia's failure to live up to her obligations under the United Nations Charter,

that it became clear that we should go beyond a 6 months' training program, and we should take the necessary steps to build up our Army, so that if an international incident should occur we could put a larger body of men into the field than we are at the present time able to do. But I am not convinced, Mr. President, that it is necessary to adopt a 24-months' service-training period in order to accomplish that objective. I say that in advance of the arguments which I fully expect to meet in the debate tomorrow when we discuss this amendment at greater length as to the wishes and the desires of the Military Establishment for a 2-year draft. But I want the RECORD to emphasize tonight that I believe 12 months training will provide the basic training necessary for a future Army in case of an international incident which might cause us to mobilize all of our manpower at a very rapid rate.

I add this point, also, Mr. President, that we should not forget that this bill as presently formulated will result in the drafting of only a very small percentage of the young manhood of America.

I have taken the position throughout the consideration of military manpower legislation that the draft principle is a sound Democratic principle to apply in raising military manpower; but I want to keep it on as broad a democratic base as is possible. I point out, Mr. President, that when we are confronted with the fact that only a relatively small number of men are to be drafted under this bill in comparison with the total manpower supply, it is not very democratic to take a small number for 2 years when we can supply our country with the basic military training needed for an effective army by broadening the base and taking a larger number of men on a revolving basis for one year at a time. I do not think it is fair, to take a smaller group for two years, and put them into the Army for that length of time, when, by the adoption of my amendment on a revolving basis, we can take a larger number for 1 year and give them the basic military training they need in case an international incident should occur calling for the mobilization of a large segment of our manpower quickly for total war.

From a military standpoint I am satisfied that my amendment will provide a stronger Army, in case of a war within the next 5 years, than if we should proceed now on the basis of drafting a smaller number of men for 2 years. It will spread out among a larger group of our citizens the patriotic obligation to serve our country in a peacetime draft.

I expect strong opposition to this amendment, but I am satisfied that, if my colleagues will study its implications, they will see the democratic fairness of it. In fact, I think that, so far as our Reserve and its building up are concerned, the drafting of more men on a 1-year basis will, in a very short period of time, give us a stronger Reserve Army than we shall have if we draft a smaller number of men for a 2-year period.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 6, line 23, strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next amendment I offer is an amendment which goes to page 7, line 6, of the bill; page 8, line 4; page 8, line 8; and page 8, line 17. It is an amendment which I have also discussed with several of my colleagues in the Senate. In effect, it places osteopaths on the same footing in the bill as medical doctors and dentists. The subject has been before the Senate in other legislation, and we have constantly put it off, as the RECORD will show, with the representation that it ought to come in a more general bill. Here is a general bill, a very broad bill. I think we should vote up or down the proposition as to whether we intend to put osteopaths on the same footing with medical doctors and dentists in our military legislation.

I ask consent to have the amendment incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, to be available for a vote tomorrow.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 7, line 6, after the word "medical", insert "(including the osteopathic)."

On page 8, line 4, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

On page 8, line 8, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

On page 8, line 17, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to another amendment, which is more complicated than any one of the three which I have just mentioned.

It is an amendment which I offer because I am satisfied, after studying it very carefully, that it presents a much more workable and fair procedure for the handling of conscientious objectors than do the provisions of the pending bill.

At the Armed Services Committee meetings when the question of conscientious objectors came up, together with the procedure that would be followed in the bill for handling that subject, I said to my colleagues on the committee that I disapproved of the way it was proposed to handle the question of conscientious objectors in the bill, but I recognized that as of that time the committee was not favorably inclined to such an amendment as I am now about to offer. I also want to say, in fairness to my colleagues on the committee, that I do not think I had my amendment, at the time of the committee hearings, in the condensed and brief form to which I have now reduced it.

Because I do not want to be misunderstood in my attitude on conscientious objectors, I desire to preface my remarks on the presentation of this amendment by saying that I am at a loss to understand the psychology of conscientious objectors. They perplex me. It is simply impossible for me to figure out how they reach the conclusion that they should not serve in the armed services of the United States because of a claim, and in most instances, a good-faith claim, that such service conflicts with their religious beliefs. But the fact that I am perplexed about it, that I cannot share their point of view, and that I am at a loss to understand how they reach the conclusions they reach in regard to military service, does not justify my advocating a procedure which in any way limits or defeats their right.

I say, Mr. President, that we cannot have religious freedom under the Constitution of the United States and then in practice deny it, even by way of limiting religious freedom by the procedure which we adopt and impose upon those who seek to exercise their full religious freedom under the Constitution. I am satisfied that the procedure covering conscientious objectors which has been incorporated in the bill is not the fairest procedure we can or should devise.

I say that I cannot understand conscientious objectors. I remember there was a student of mine at the University of Oregon who became a young lawyer in my State, and who in the last war developed a very strong attitude in regard to conscientious objectors. I felt he almost developed somewhat of a martyr complex, and I felt he was giving an indication of going to make a martyr out of himself.

He wrote to me for some "Dutch uncle" advice as to the course of action he should follow, and in the course of his letter he pointed out that this was a matter of deep religious conviction to him, and he wanted me to be of assistance to him in securing a Government job.

At that time I was a member of the War Labor Board, and I was somewhat shocked that this young conscientious objector failed to give any evidence in his letter that he recognized that from an ethical standpoint he should not consider that he had any right to seek to serve in a Government position on the ground that he was a conscientious objector, when many of his own classmates already were on the battle lines in Europe, and some of them had already made the supreme sacrifice.

In a letter which met the test of "Dutch uncle" advice, but which was very clear and pointed in its meaning, I told him that under no circumstances would I help him get a civilian job in the Government of the United States on the ground that he was a conscientious objector and refused to put on the uniform of his country in the service of his country's Army during war. I said, "So far as I am concerned, I think you should recognize that you have control over your body, and you ought to offer your body to your country and your conscience to your God."

Mr. President, that represents, as well as I can put it, my attitude toward conscientious objectors. But although I have this feeling concerning their failure or refusal to serve their country in time of war in a military capacity, I nevertheless recognize their right, their freedom, under the Constitution of the United States, to exercise their religious liberty so long as it is a matter of honest

conscience and of good faith in religious principle.

Hence, Mr. President, being a constitutional liberal, I can do no less, it seems to me, than support procedure in connection with the pending bill, which I think is in keeping with the true spirit of the Constitution so far as procedural rights are concerned with respect to conscientious objectors.

Therefore I am offering this amendment, which briefly does the following: It strikes out, beginning with the word "religious", on page 26, line 12, to and including the word "direction", on page 27, line 1, and inserts the following:

A National Commission on Conscientious Objectors to be composed of three or more civilians to be appointed by the President shall prescribe the conditions under which persons claiming exemption under this subsection shall (a) be inducted into the armed forces, (b) be assigned to noncombatant service, (c) be assigned to special service of national importance with governmental or approved private agencies operating in the public good at home or abroad, or (d) be deferred.

Mr. President, this places the duty of handling the rights of conscientious objectors upon a civilian commission. I think that is consonant with the constitutional freedom which is given to conscientious objectors. I think we should recognize the realistic fact that conscientious objectors believe that imposing upon them a procedure which gives to the military, as the bill in effect now does, jurisdiction to render decisions on the disposition of their cases, is itself rather irreconcilable with their views concerning religious freedom.

I think the Army is better off, I think the military personnel are better off, if we take completely out of the jurisdiction of the military the handling of conscientious objectors. Therefore I am proposing this amendment providing for the creation of a civilian commission with powers and authority and jurisdiction to handle the whole troublesome question of conscientious objectors.

I propose also on pages 27 and 28 to strike out beginning with the word "Upon" on page 27, line 5, to and including the word "forces", on page 28, line 17, and insert the following:

If such claim is not sustained by the appropriate appeal board, the person claiming exemption shall be entitled to an appeal to the National Commission on Conscientious Objectors. The said Commission after notice and hearing shall, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, determine the validity and sincerity of such claim and whether the person claiming exemption shall (a) be inducted into the armed forces, (b) be assigned to noncombatant service, (c) be assigned to a special service of national importance with governmental or approved private agencies operating in the public good at home or abroad, or (d) be deferred. The National Commission on Conscientious Objectors shall have authority to establish such subordinate boards as may be necessary and prescribe, with the approval of the President, such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this section, including pay and dependency allowances.

Mr. President, in checking with officials who had the troublesome task of handling conscientious objectors in the last war, I found that it was one of the most difficult jobs assigned to any of those who helped in the prosecution of the war on the home front. Conscientious objectors are a difficult group to handle. It is difficult to determine which among them are malingerers, so to speak, those who in fact are not conscientious in their objections, but are using this particular exemption guaranteed to people under the Constitution to escape their military service obligations. Then there are many of them, the evidence is pretty clear, I think, who suffer from personality problems, who develop martyrdom complexes, who find, through their conscientious objections, a form of psychological escape. Their problems require study and, in my opinion, the consideration of a civilian board which does not work under the jurisdiction and the procedures of the military. I think the civilian aspects of my amendment should commend themselves to the Senate.

I should like to have printed at this point in my remarks, Mr. President, excerpts from the annual report of the Attorney General for 1944, prepared by the then Attorney General, the Honorable Francis Biddle, in which he discusses the problem of conscientious objectors. I think if one will read his report he will find ample evidence and ample support for the general principles, at least, which I am seeking to include in this proposed law by way of my amendments. I ask unanimous consent to have these excerpts printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IV. SELECTIVE SERVICE AND CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The administrative and enforcement functions imposed upon the Department by various provisions of the Selective Service Act continued to occupy a prominent place in departmental activities.

A total of 383,389 investigation have been concluded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the act. During the fiscal year, however, only 85,789 new cases were investigated as compared with 119,984 for the previous year. On the other hand, the number of convictions increased from 4,202 to 4,756.

When it is considered that no means of enforcement are available except by resort to the penal sanctions of the act (see *Billings* v. *Truesdell* (321 U. S. 542)), the relatively small number of convictions demonstrates the almost complete public acceptance of the most comprehensive conscription law in our history. Out of 45,000,000 registrants, approximately 31,000,000 were subject to service; and as of June 30, 1944, over 8,500,000 men had been inducted into the armed forces. Yet only 10,782 delinquents were convicted from the date of the first registration through June 30, 1944. While willful violators of the act have been vigorously prosecuted, the entire program of enforcement has been predicated upon the theory that the primary purpose of the law is to furnish qualified selectees to the armed forces for military service. In investigating and prosecuting delinquents, therefore, every effort is made to secure compliance with their obligations before the criminal sanctions of the act are invoked.

The determination of conscientious objector claims under section 5 (g) of the Selective Service Act for the purpose of making recommendations to the boards of appeal of the Selective Service System is a function of the Office of the Assistant to the Attorney General. One hundred thirty-one special assistants to the Attorney General serve without compensation as hearing officers in the various judicial districts to assist the Department in disposing of such claims. On July 1, 1943, 2,094 such cases were pending in the Department, and 2,111 new cases were received during the year. A total of 3,644 cases were disposed of either by formal recommendation or by return for such reasons as lack of jurisdiction, withdrawal of claim, of administrative irregularity. Out of 2,699 cases in which definite recommendations were made, the boards of appeal failed to follow the departmental recommendation in 132 cases. (In disposing of these cases, the Department recommended that the registrants be classified in class IV-E (objector to both combatant and noncombatant military services) in 912 cases; that they be classified in class I-A-O (objector to combatant military service only) in 855 cases; and that the claims for exemption be not sustained in 932 cases; 945 cases were administratively disposed of by means other than formal recommendation. A total of 11,295 conscientious objector cases were referred to the Department from October 16, 1940, through June 30, 1944, and on the latter date 561 cases were pending.)

In the treatment of the conscientious objector problem we have profited, I believe, from our experience in the last war. Nevertheless we have not met this problem—or, more accurately, this series of problems—with entire satisfaction, and it may be appropriate to take stock of the situation at this time.

The present law made two important departures from the provisions of the 1917 act. That act had defined conscientious objectors narrowly to include only those who belonged to an established religious sect teaching opposition to war, and it required such objectors to be inducted into the armed services for noncombatant duty. The difficulties thereby raised were so great that by Executive Order in 1918 provision was made for detached service for those inductees found by a special Board to be sincere conscientious objectors to all forms of war. In the present law, the requirement of membership in a pacifist religious group was elminated, and separate classifications were established for those who were objectors to combatant service and those who were objectors to noncombatant service as well. The latter were assigned to work of national importance. But the law, while liberalizing the definition of "conscientious objector," does require that such objection be held by reason of religious training and belief. In applying this test in individual cases, a construction has been given it that is as broad as is consistent with the statutory language, taking into account the fact that Congress declined to extend the classification to all sincere objectors to war, whether by reason of religious, philosophical, social, or political beliefs.

A number of distinct and troublesome problems have emerged. We may put to one side the class of artful dodgers who seek to appropriate the conscientious objector label and who tend to bring discredit on the entire group. They are ordinary violators of the law and are dealt with as such. Beyond this, the largest numerical group commonly included in the objector category are the Jehovah's Witnesses, of whom about 3,000 have been convicted, constituting roughly three-fifths of all those convicted who professed some form of conscientious objection. The special difficulty posed by this group is that they generally decline to accept a conscientious-objector classification, maintaining that they are entitled to the absolute exemption accorded to ministers. This difficulty can hardly be resolved unless Con-

gress is willing either to alter the ordinary concept of ministers, or to grant absolute exemption to conscientious objectors.

The next group, presenting the most intractable administrative problem, consists of those who are frequently termed absolutists, who object to all forms of conscription. They have resisted, passively or belligerently, the modes of treatment available under existing law. Many of them have gone to prison rather than to the public service camps for conscientious objectors which have been organized with the sponsorship and support of virtually all religious groups. The absolutists have been given separate classification and exemption under the English law. Short of this, they will continue to be a constant source of difficulty, taxing the resources of firmness and understanding with which the administrative authorities have attempted to deal with them.

There remains the group assigned to the public service camps or to special projects, whether by original classification as conscientious objectors or by parole after imprisonment for failure to comply with the law. Of about 7,000 assigned to public service camps at the close of the fiscal year, 45 percent had been detailed to special projects, which included such diverse activities as hospital work, farming, fire-fighting by parachute jumping, and "guinea-pig" medical experiments. Relief work in devastated areas overseas had been planned as another of these activities but was prevented by a rider to the Military Appropriations Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 350). While most of those still attached to camps are there by preference, it is clearly in the national interest that the maximum number possible be placed in work on vitally useful projects. The men receive their maintenance and $15 per month for expenses; where work is done for private employers the balance of the prevailing wage is placed in a general fund; it has been recommended by the Selective Service System that this fund be used to make dependency allotments, and I concur in this recommendation.

It is evident that many complexities have been encountered on both the legislative and administrative levels, and that while greater flexibility has been achieved than in the last war there is again presented an opportunity to profit from experience. In any further consideration of the selective-service legislation, or any future adoption of peacetime military training, it will be necessary to weigh the administrative, psychological, and ethical problems of conscientious objection which have not yet been fully solved. The Congress may well consider the desirability of meeting these complexities by establishing a board to deal especially with conscientious objectors, having final discretion with respect to their proper individual classifications as well as their prompt assignment to suitable and useful work.

Mr. MORSE. In summarizing my position on the conscientious objectors' amendment, I wish to make several brief points.

My amendment places broad general authority in a national commission to deal with the extremely complicated and difficult problem of conscientious objectors and seeks to obviate the weaknesses that were developed in the administration of the previous Selective Service Acts. Incidentally, it follows in broad outlines the methods followed by England and Canada.

I am sorry that the section on conscientious objectors of the bill now pending before the Senate does not show that we are talking advantage of some of the lessons we learned during the last war in the handling of conscientious objectors. I think my amendment does take advantage of those lessons, and I think it recommends itself to us for that reason, as well as for others I have mentioned.

Next I want to point out that my amendment is aimed to simplify and make more flexible those provisions of the previous act which sent many men to jail and into unproductive and costly kinds of work. It is a practical method of utilizing for the general welfare the energies and talents of young men who cannot conscientiously participate in military service and would at the same time make it possible to screen out intelligently and deal effectively with the dodgers, the subversives, and the "phonies."

Let me make it clear tonight, Mr. President, that I am not proposing in my amendment that conscientious objectors should be guaranteed a full employment bill either during a peacetime draft or during a war draft. I think the idea of getting jobs for conscientious objectors in which they receive full civilian pay, while other young men have to serve their country at Army pay, cannot be reconciled with ethics or good conscience. I want the conscientious objectors to know that in submitting the amendment for a procedure which I think will more effectively assist in solving the conscientious objectors problem I am not at all sympathizing with the position insofar as conscientious objections are concerned. I only recognize their constitutional rights to entertain those objections. But I shall not be a party to the abuse of any proposal that would make it possible for them to benefit through a full-employment bill during a national emergency by way of the procedures which may be adopted governing their case. If we take jurisdiction over them and assign them to any work, Mr. President, I am not in favor of their receiving any more pay at least than the men in the armed services, in the rank of private, receive; in fact, I shall be entirely open minded on the whole pay question as to whether or not that much allowance should be granted. But I think the problem of pay, and procedures connected with it, should be left to a civilian commission to make a complete study of these cases, and then decide by way of rules what the pay structure for conscientious objectors should be.

Next, my amendment will provide forthright means for security uniformity of classification and treatment of widely varying groups of nonconformists and extremists.

Next, it would lighten the path of the local boards in dealing with a problem of the utmost sensitivity and assist them in determining many difficult religious and ethical questions.

During the last war, Mr. President, the local draft boards in many sections of the country spent many hours on the problem of conscientious objectors, and I think they should be relieved of it in this peacetime draft proposal.

Next, my amendment recognizes the right of conscientious objectors to a fair hearing and a determination of their claims and assignment by nonmilitary personnel.

Next, it would lighten tremendously the burdens upon the Federal courts and law-enforcement agencies.

Finally, it would save the Government considerable money since it would streamline procedures, reduce enforcement costs and, at the same time, give recognition to the views of religious groups to the maximum extent possible without jeopardizing the public safety or weakening the Selective Service Act in any particular.

Mr. President, I think my amendment is so far superior to the section of the pending bill on conscientious objectors that a careful study of the amendment will result in its adoption by the Senate. I therefore send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MORSE was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pages 26 and 27: Strike out beginning with the word "religious", page 26, line 12, to and including the word "direction", page 27, line 1, and insert the following: "A National Commission on Conscientious Objectors to be composed of three or more civilians to be appointed by the President shall prescribe the conditions under which persons claiming exemption under this subsection shall (a) be inducted into the armed forces, (b) be assigned to noncombatant service, (c) be assigned to special service of national importance with governmental or approved private agencies operating in the public good at home or abroad, or (d) be deferred."

Pages 27 and 28: Strike out beginning with the word "upon", page 27, line 5, up to and including the word "forces", page 28, line 17, and insert the following: "If such claim is not sustained by the appropriate appeal board, the person claiming exemption shall be entitled to an appeal to the National Commission on Conscientious Objectors. The said Commission after notice and hearing shall, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, determine the validity and sincerity of such claim and whether the person claiming exemption shall (a) be inducted into the armed forces, (b) be assigned to noncombatant service, (c) be assigned to special service of national importance with governmental or approved private agencies operating in the public good at home or abroad, or (d) be deferred. The National Commission on Conscientious Objectors shall have authority to establish such subordinate boards as may be necessary and prescribe, with the approval of the President, such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this section, including pay and dependency allowances."

THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE—ARTICLE BY ALLEN DRURY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a very excellent article written by a young Republican, Mr. Allen Drury, one of the correspondents in Washington, in a column headed "Westerner in Washington." The title of his article is "The Fundamental Issue." In this article he calls the attention of the Republican Party to some of the great issues and problems which confront us. He points out in essence what I said earlier today in my remarks, that

our party in the closing days of this session is, after all, in a large measure laying the stones on the highway of the elections for 1952 and 1956, and that we will determine in a large measure in the next 2 weeks both by the legislation we pass and that we do not pass whether or not we will win the confidence of the American people in 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

(By Allen Drury)

In the Republican tendency to either cut outright (on the plea of budget-trimming) or put off to a later day (which, some of them hope, will never come) all programs of social betterment now pending or proposed before the Congress of the United States there is demonstrated to the full the weakness which may ultimately prove fatal for the party—not in the coming election, which it will probably win, but in the elections after that.

One by one the measures which have as their essential purpose the simple proposition of trying to help people have a better life are being watered down, cut to bits, or laid on the shelf. From reciprocal trade to housing and back again the emphasis is being placed on less government, less money, less assistance—less heart. It is a process which has speeded up in recent months. If victory comes at the polls in November, it will continue headlong.

With some justice, Republicans argue that this is what they were elected to do. They say people have had too much government, too much paternalism, too many attempts to take care of their myriad ills and uncertainties—and in ways which, in many instances, have increased the ills and added to the uncertainties. They say the trend proves that there is a revulsion from New Dealism, that the country wants a rest, and that they are going to give it one.

Within narrow limits of immediate political reality, this is probably correct. But it is not within those limits that the idea is confined. It spreads over the whole field of political philosophy. It amounts to a state of mind.

It is a fundamental point of view which is involved. You either think that government exists to do nothing and save money, or you think that it exists for the benefit and the welfare of its people. If you accept the latter thesis the dollar sign (within the limits of economic stability, which certainly haven't been reached yet) becomes relatively unimportant. You spend as much as you need to spend to do the job; and if it makes people healthier and happier and helps them to live a better kind of life, you don't worry too much if the pennies don't add up. You conclude finally, when you come to the point of ultimate choice, that a balanced life for human beings is a greater desirable than a balanced budget for lifeless dollars. In this you run afoul of all sort of hysterical charges, but your reward is manifest in human happiness; and the shame does not lie upon you but upon those who have the colossal gall to put the dollar sign on human progress.

This fundamental cleavage inevitably colors the two parties in their relation to one another. Although there are proponents of both points of view in each party, the edge for humanitarianism, in the popular mind, goes to the Democrats, and the edge for money to the Republicans. This may be just and warranted, unjust and unwarranted; but it is the fact. And because it is, there will be millions voting in November who, while they will probably vote Republican, will do so with many misgivings and only because they feel instinctively that after 16 years the need for change is temporarily the overriding need. It will not be because they feel, deep down inside, that the Republican Party is going to go out of its way to lend a helping hand to the American people.

The Republicans, quite possibly, are being given their last chance. If they come into office and follow a scrounging, cold-blooded, mean-minded policy and then run head-on into another depression, they will in all probability be out for good in 1952, since it will be impossible to convince the country that their policies did not bring on the disaster. Even without a depression, if they block social programs, kill off many which exist, duck out from under the obvious necessity for some aid to lower-income groups in the fields of health, education, and housing, the end result may very well be the same—and justly so.

There was much that was evil and much that was bad in the Roosevelt administrations; but there was a residue of ultimate good which remains after all the other is washed away. Generations will debate whether this was done by the man who led the administrations or whether it came about simply because his Government furnished the intellectual and political atmosphere in which others could do it; but whichever it was, it happened. And it left a mark on the American soul which cannot be erased.

To a certain extent, whether he deserved it or not, Franklin Roosevelt is going to remain the touchstone of political good will for generations to come. He will be the reference to which the country goes back when it wants to test the sincerity and ultimate purpose of an administration or a party. By that reference it will test the Republicans when, as now looks probable, they come into full power next year.

Woe betide them if they deal in pennies and forget about people; for the reckoning will not be long delayed.

INVESTIGATION OF UNLAWFUL RESTRAINTS AND MONOPOLIES

Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 255), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and methods of prevention of monopoly and monopolistic practices, as provided for in, but not limited to, S. 72 and S. 104.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report of its findings to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than March 1, 1949, together with such recommendation for changes in the presently existing laws relating to said matters as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, or other assistants as it deems advisable.

The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Thomas J. Lynch, of Ohio, to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy; and

Austin J. Mahoney, of Rochester, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y. (reappointment).

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe the work of the Senate has been completed for tonight. Therefore, under the order previously entered, I move that, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative Thomas L. Owens, of Illinois, the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 8, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 7 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

William Ford	Henry I. Kohn
Lorin E. Kerr	Reuben F. Reider

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Charles G. Dobrovolny
Willard T. Haskins

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

To be major generals

Lt. Gen. Lewis Hyde Brereton, AO3132 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Junius Wallace Jones, AO3554 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Harold Mark McClelland, AO6660 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Eugene Lowry Eubank, AO10580 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Frederick Mercer Hopkins, Jr., AO11307 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Orvil Arson Anderson, AO11497 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, AO15502 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Lyman Perley Whitten, AO14850 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Bob Edward Nowland, AO10823 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Orval Roy Cook, AO14951 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Charles Trovilla Myers, AO15223 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. John De Forest Barker, AO11416 (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Arthur William Vanaman, AO10506 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. William Eugene Farthing, AO7122 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Richard Cox Coupland, AO9792 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Clayton Lawrence Bissell, AO10474 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Wrathall Spry, AO14953 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Patrick Weston Timberlake, AO15165 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Smith, AO15249 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. John Maurice Weikert, AO15290 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Lloyd Richardson, AO15586 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus, AO16339 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Leon William Johnson, AO16429 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, AO16777 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, AO17055 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Roger Maxwell Ramey, AO17231 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Samuel Egbert Anderson, AO17244 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Truman Hempel Landon, AO17268 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Francis Hopkinson Griswold, AO17959 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings, AO18005 (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
June 7, 1948.

I hereby designate Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Msgr. Joachim Vilallonga, S. J., ecclesiastical superior, Ahmedabad Mission to India, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, from whom all favors come, graciously grant to those who make up this House of Representatives that their deliberations and decisions may reflect Thy divine wisdom.

Because the world in which we live is in turmoil, there is clear need of a lively spirit of justice and a true atmosphere of charity. Infuse these graces into our souls, we pray Thee. Because in our groping search we have not found a clear path to harmony in living, we turn to Thee, Heavenly Father, as the one secure source of peace of soul.

Keep us ever mindful that the discussions offered here will affect the happiness of millions of people, men and women and little children, not only here in the United States, but throughout the world. Keep ever before the minds of the representatives of the people that these same people are your children.

To fulfill the duties incumbent on them, these Members of the Congress need the enlightening brightness of Thy grace; they need, too, the invigorating support of Thy grace to bolster their patience and courage. This is the help we pray.

Our warrant for a suppliant's hearing is the certainty that these men and women Members of the House of Representatives are willing and eager to forget self in the interests of the whole people.

Bless, Heavenly Father. Shower on them your choicest favors. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 4, 1948, was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, before the Journal is approved, I do not think the Journal as read correctly carries the proceedings of last Friday, and I refer especially to the action taken Friday evening, I might say, with relation to House Joint Resolution 296. Mr. Speaker, according to the RECORD, at that time one Senate amendment to the resolution was called up and that one Senate amendment was agreed to, when in fact there were two amendments to be considered by the House. The important amendment was not considered by the House, and the RECORD so shows. Therefore I make the request that the approval of the Journal of Friday lay over until tomorrow until we have had time to look into the matter and so the Members and the people may know if in fact only one or both the Senate amendments were agreed to. The Senate amendment which I believe was not agreed to is an amendment increasing in many instances the old-age assistance grants by the Federal Government provided the States do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I make the request that the approval of the Journal go over until tomorrow and we have a chance to look into it. This can be done on a day when we will not have any memorial services, we hope.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say that the Journal as prepared and read states the true facts and the true record of the situation. The Chair may say to the gentleman that if the RECORD is in error, that, of course, can be corrected. The gentleman could ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD and have it state the true facts in conformity with the Journal. Again, the Chair will say to the gentleman that the Journal as prepared and read today does state the true facts and does reflect the true action taken by the House to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, then the RECORD must be wrong in three separate instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the RECORD and is of the opinion that the RECORD is in error. To change the Journal and make it state what is not the true fact would not add anything to clarification of the situation. The RECORD is in error, and, of course, the RECORD can be corrected. The Journal does state the true situation. So, as far as adoption of the Journal is concerned, the Chair is of the opinion the Journal should be approved as read.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether anyone who was on the floor of the House at that time is prepared to say that this very important Senate amendment was read, or even considered as read, because there is no motion to that effect in the RECORD at all. In the absence of any certification or statement by a Member definitely to the effect that the amendment was read, or that an inspection of the notes of the House Official Reporters will show to that effect, I think approval of the Journal should go over, because the RECORD has gone out all over the country with only the adoption of one Senate amendment. This is very important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not wish to prolong this discussion in view of the circumstances that confront us today, which I am sure the gentleman is familiar with. However, the Chair was on the floor at the time this matter was presented. The Clerk was directed to report the bill and the Senate amendments, and that was done. The Chair may also say that he was informed that the matter at that time had been cleared with the ranking members of the committee on the minority side.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In view of the Speaker's statement that he heard the two Senate amendments read, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly, to show the true facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the Journal as reported this morning disclose that the Senate amendments were considered and agreed to?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It does.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the present request is merely to make the RECORD conform to the Journal as reported?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved as read.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for the purpose of extending their remarks in the RECORD and not for 1-minute speeches.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rules of the House, it may be in order for the balance of this session to consider general appropriation bills at any time after they are reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to consider business reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia under the general rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article setting out typical American success.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Post under date of June 6, 1948, relating to western power projects.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am sure the Members realize the situation under which we meet today, and I am wondering where these extensions of remarks will appear in the RECORD and whether or not they are going to precede whatever statements are made about the deceased Member. Otherwise, if they are going to appear before that proceeding, I am going to object to all of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the extensions here asked for will appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, notwithstanding the fact that the statement may slightly exceed the two-page limit.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item by George Sokolsky appearing in the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles in each.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a statement by the Hawaiian Economic Foundation and in the other a statement by the Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of national transportation.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper and other articles.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in regard to the eminent churchman who delivered the opening prayer to the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning the Columbia River Valley floods.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Member of Congress, entitled "Transfusing Your Own Blood."

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered Friday entitled "Law in a Changing World."

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article relating to Gen. Ray Hufft, the new adjutant general of Louisiana.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by W. K. Kelsey, of the Detroit News, dealing with the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each of two instances an editorial.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by John E. Thompson.

Mr. HESS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. LARCADE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was granted leave of absence for 4 days on account of official business.

THE LATE THOMAS L. OWENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker,

There is a Reaper whose name is Death,
And with his sickle keen,
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath,
And the flowers that grow between.

This Grim Reaper has again appeared in our midst, somewhat startlingly, and has removed from among us one of our colleagues, THOMAS OWENS. Compared to some of us, TOM OWENS was a youngster—only 50 years of age—active, aggressive, virile. Why he should be taken and some of the older Members, such as myself, left, is very hard to understand. But he was taken—cut off, you might say, in the flower of his full manhood—and we are left. I do not know the outstanding facts about his life. They will be given by others. I shall confine myself to a few chosen words—not my own—to express consolation, hope, and solace to those who were close to Tom and also to the bereaved. An unknown poet expressed this thought of consolation in very beautiful words. The title of this poem is "There Is No Death." These are the words:

THERE IS NO DEATH

There is no death! The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain or mellow fruit
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death! Although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms;

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread
We bear their senseless dust to earth,
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead! they have but passed
Beyond the mists that bind us here
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet;
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

Those words are comforting. They intimate that although departed, our loved ones still remain, and our thoughts will remain with them. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in times like these, we must look to that all-embracing Providence that guides our destinies and controls the future.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that TOM OWENS, one of the most promising young men of this House, now should be taken from us. He was a new Member, but during all my years of service here I never had seen a more active, hard-working, sincere Member than was TOM OWENS.

He succeeded one of the quietest Members, Mr. Link, representing the largest district in Illinois, with a population of over one million. The fact that he succeeded a very capable, sincere, and resolute gentleman shows how he stood in his district and the confidence the people had in him. And it was deserved.

TOM OWENS has been the most active Member of our delegation, and perhaps of the entire membership of this House. He was attentive to his duties, as much as any other Member that I can recollect. He was in the House and in the well most of the time, trying to obtain additional information, trying to improve legislation from time to time by many constructive amendments that he offered. It is to be regretted that such an active force for good should be taken away when manhood's morning had little more than touched noon.

He was renominated without opposition. Though he served only one term, he leaves a splended, enviable record. I regret exceedingly, and I know that all of us who knew him, regret his passing. He leaves a widow and three children, to whom I express my sincere compassion. I hope that all of us will realize that, physically, we can stand only a certain amount of trials and tribulations. Had our honored dead not been so active and so desirous to give the country, with a zealotic devotion, all he had of mind and body, the chances are he would still be here with us.

I mourn his untimely passing, and once more express my deepest compassion for his bereaved wife, three children, and kinsmen.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is something inexplicable about life. It is hard to understand why one who had devoted himself to such an abundant life as TOM OWENS should be removed from our midst during his first term.

As I think of his fortuity, I think of a little story written for the Saturday Evening Post recently. The author was telling about some youngster with tow-colored hair, who had landed on one of the islands in the Pacific. He was full of life and spirit. When he saw him next he was cold, in death. Protruding from the pocket of his blouse was a little book that he carried. The major peered over to see what the title was. It was visible. The title was: "Our Hearts Are Young Again."

Those are difficult things to explain, and I think we know that man does not stand alone and that the hand of the great Architect of the universe is behind it all. As I think of those who leave us I think of the epitaph of Benjamin Franklin. He wrote it when he was feeling cheerful. It is one of those interesting things. He said:

The body of Benjamin Franklin, printer, like the cover of an old book, its contents torn out, and stripped of its gilding and lettering, lies here, food for worms. But the work will not be lost.

No matter how short the term or the time when he was here, the work that he performed for his State, for his community, for his country, will not be lost. It will persist.

I make a special and particular effort to come to these memorial occasions, because as we get older it means a little more. As one is removed from our midst we think of the long journey and of the life that is ahead. Always on this occasion there occurs to me that interesting fellowship between Job and his three friends, Bildad, Zophar, and Eliphaz. It would have been a great conference to attend, these three, while Job was being afflicted. And there he asked what today in modern parlance would be called the $64 question: If a man die, shall he live again? We find the answer, and the answer will be echoed in this Chamber. We find it all around us in nature. We know that the work will live and that there will be a higher sphere of activity for those who are removed from us.

Yes; TOM OWENS was indeed, an aggressive young man, who as I say, devoted himself to abundant living. It is a little bit different from the abundant life. Abundant living means to live abundantly on all fronts without too much regard for the creature comforts and for the rewards that may stem therefrom. In a nutshell, I think that would sum up the very vigorous and virile life of TOM OWENS. I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and others in extending to the widow and those three children my sincere sympathy. May they carry on for the country which he so nobly and so graciously served.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, TOM OWENS has departed for his greatest adventure. For two long weeks he fought valiantly. He loved life; he loved people; he loved his family and those with whom he was associated; he loved his service in this House. He strove hard to remain. There was a weakness in his armor—a fault in the shell that enclosed his inner self. That weakness, that fault was beyond human repair. This morning it gave way and his soul went to meet his Maker.

I recall when a schoolboy reading and reciting the account of the Wonderful One-Hoss Shay and how it finally collapsed because there was somewhere "a weakest spot." The great pent-up energy of TOM OWENS found his weakest spot.

Serving his first term, TOM OWENS made for himself a reputation. Sincerity was one of his outstanding virtues. Honesty was inherent in him. Men like him will ever be needed in public life.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, once again the Angel of Death has come to our midst. Our good friend and colleague, TOM OWENS, has answered the last call. Right at the heighth of his career, and what we might well term "in middle life," Tom was stricken with a heart ailment which has caused his untimely death.

Although I had, in a casual way, known TOM for several years before his coming to Congress, since his being a Member of the Eightieth Congress it has been my privilege to become well acquainted with him and to recognize TOM OWENS as a great American, one who was always thinking first of his country and the people he represented and last of himself. Since his being a Member of the House of Representatives, TOM worked day and night in an effort to do the best kind of a job he knew how. The strain of such arduous labor finally broke down his health. Therefore, TOM OWENS, because of his application to duty, because of his sincere love of country and his patriotism, has given his life as a servant of the people.

The Nation and our State of Illinois have lost a splendid legislator and valued public servant. All of us will miss TOM OWENS and we mourn his passing. We extend our most sincere and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Owens and the children. May He, whose peace passeth all understanding, watch and care over the family.

Goodbye, good friend,
In God's good time,
In God's good clime,
We'll meet again,

And in that land
Where we shall know
No pain or woe,
We'll understand.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, although I have known of the physical condition of our friend, the late THOMAS L. OWENS, the news of his death, which came to me this morning, was a distinct shock.

I have known TOM OWENS ever since he became a Member of Congress. He was a man of real ability—courageous, honest, and sincere; and always working for the best interest of the people of his district.

I found him to be a hard-working man, who followed his personal convictions and an independence of spirit.

The Seventh District of Illinois has lost a great public servant. I join with my colleagues in extending to his family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was a shock to me this morning when I heard over the radio of the death of my friend and colleague, THOMAS L. OWENS. I knew he was sick but had hoped that he would recover. I inquired about his condition several times, and was told that he was improving. I had hoped that he would soon recover, knowing that he was getting the best medical attention it was possible to get.

TOM OWENS was born and raised in the locality where I live in Chicago. He rereceived his early education there. Later he moved to the North Side of Chicago. I often talked to him about his old neighborhood, and many of his friends and acquaintances are my close friends. I knew him as a lawyer in Chicago and know the fine reputation he enjoyed among the judges and members of the Chicago bar. He was a tireless worker, an outstanding patriotic citizen. He was a veteran of World War I. We all know how hard he worked as a Member of the House. He represented his district with honor and distinction. He distinguished himself here as one of the hardest working Members. He took part in every important bill before our body. He was well informed on all pending legislation. He represented his constituents faithfully and diligently. He loved our country and gave it the best in him. They lose a very fine Representative. The country loses a fine legislator. We will all miss him here.

I regret with deep sorrow the loss of a personal friend. We will miss his wise counsel and advice.

To his wife and family I extend my sincerest heartfelt sympathy at the loss of their husband and father.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand in the well of this House today with a very heavy heart. The country has lost a great American. Our colleague, TOM OWENS, offered his life in the service of his country as sure as any soldier on the field of battle. I know of no man who assumed his responsibilities and duties as a Member of Congress more seriously than TOM OWENS. I know of no Member of this body who spent more time on the floor of this House when bills were being considered under general debate and read for amendment than TOM OWENS. I know of no Member of this body so well informed on legislation in its entirety as was TOM OWENS. TOM OWENS possessed those fine qualities of character that we admire in men. He was devoted to his family. He was deeply religious. He shunned bad habits. He lived what might be termed an exemplary life. We shall miss his genial nature and dogged determination to make right prevail Because of the service he wanted to render to his country, and the people of his district, he never considered himself. He gave his full energy to his duties as a Member of this body, and greatly overtaxed his strength. TOM OWENS' name will go down in history as one of those rare individuals who made a thorough study of legislation and fought for what he considered to be right and just and in the best interest of the people of our glorious country. It can truly be said that TOM OWENS sacrificed his life in the service of his country.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family, his friends, and may God rest his soul.

> And God will find for such a friend
> Some sweeter slumber in the end.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, my heart was very much saddened this morning when I learned of the passing of my colleague from Illinois and good friend, the Honorable THOMAS OWENS. His untimely death has brought to all of his colleagues much sadness, and I join with them in extending to his devoted wife and family my deepest sympathy.

TOM, as we affectionately called him, was one of our ablest Representatives from Illinois and he will be sorely missed. He was a young man and had many years of useful service ahead of him, but when the Grim Reaper calls that call must be answered.

In his passing the Congress has lost a conscientious and hard-working Member, the country has lost a true public servant, and I have lost a sincere friend.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN].

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the news of the passing of our colleague from Illinois, THOMAS L. OWENS, has been received with genuine grief. To me it represents a real loss because of our association over a period of many years. TOM OWENS was one of the first men I knew when I came to Chicago nearly 30 years ago. Those who knew him well knew him to be a devoted husband and father, and admired him for his courage and ability. He was never afraid to express his true feelings on any subject. He was candid and honest in all of his dealings and activities. He fought hard for the principles in which he believed, but always fairly and without malice. As a Member of Congress he devoted his entire time to his duties and made noteworthy contributions to the various important pieces of legislation that were considered by this Eightieth Congress.

TOM OWENS was deeply religious and one of the finest exponents of the Roman Catholic Church, of which he was a devout member. His family has reason to be proud of his accomplishments and this Congress has suffered a great loss by reason of the untimely passing of THOMAS L. OWENS.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] and I were with Mr. OWENS on the last evening he was in full health. It was a shock the following morning when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] and I were notified of what had taken place at 4 o'clock on that Sunday morning when he was first stricken. TOM knew he was not well. His courage has been referred to repeatedly. The fact that he gave his life is without question. We all recall that on the Wednesday before the Sunday when he was stricken he was on the floor of this House working very hard. His amendments on the highly controversial bill that was before us then were all adopted, and all resulted in the improvement of the bill. All of the time TOM was working so hard he realized the condition of his health.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the first days of TOM OWENS' service in this House I formed a warm close friendship with him. I join my friends and colleagues from the State of Illinois in paying this tribute to his memory.

Like the others I was shocked at the news of his passing. I had known of his serious illness but recent inquiries had led me to believe he had passed the crisis and would recover. We shall all miss his genial companionship. I cannot recall ever seeing him without a pleasant smile, nor have I ever talked to him when he was not expressing deep concern over his work in this House.

TOM OWENS was serving his first term in Congress, but already he had become very well known to almost every Member of this body because of the exceptional interest he had shown on all matters of business before the House. His voice was frequently heard in the well of the House as he made helpful suggestions on legislative matters and sought to improve measures which he believed to be in need of improvement.

I had a great fondness for TOM OWENS and I believe every Member of the House had the same feeling. I admired his sincerity, his honesty, his frankness. I was amazed at his boundless energy, his great interest in his work, his tireless efforts in behalf of his constituency. He was faithful in his attendance of the sessions of the House, he knew what was being done and he conscientiously cast his vote on every measure for his country's best interest.

I shall miss him, and so will his district and the Nation. He was my friend.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that every Member may have the privilege of extending his remarks at this point in the RECORD on the death of THOMAS L. OWENS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, due to intensity, concentration, and hard work, the heart of TOM OWENS required a rest about 10 days ago. That same heart was unable to recover. We of Illinois deeply regret his passing, knowing full well how hard he put his heart and

soul into his work here. Mrs. Owens, his son, and two daughters know it far better than we. They are the ones who will suffer the greatest of all concerned. Friends and associates in time, in a busy America forget; an immediate family never.

TOM OWENS, like many Representatives in Congress who have preceded him, worked his heart out, with no relaxation. TOM just did not have time for such things. His every action showed it. Truthful, conscientious, honest, capable, and hard working—typical of most public officials today, whether serving their country, State, county, or city. That was TOM OWENS, and we all know it. While TOM lived, no one can say that he did not live a full, useful, and helpful life for 50 years in his capacity as veteran of the First World War, as an attorney in the city of Chicago, as a too-active Member of the House, and, more important to him than any other thing, Mrs. Owens and their three children.

Mr. Speaker, I hope sincerely that the citizens of the Seventh Illinois District appreciate with regret the sacrifice TOM OWENS has made in their interests, as we of the Congress knew it existed.

Mr. Speaker, At the Last:

AT THE LAST

There is so little to be said
Within the presence of the dead.
Altho so calm and still they lie,
They know what friends are standing by.
Whose eyes are filled with tears, and who
Have hurried in their tasks to do,
The years have taught them all these things,
Who heeds the doorbell when it rings
Who is the first to come and stay,
And kneel beside the bier and pray:
They know whose hands the flowers arranged,
And if they didn't 't would be strange.
If love has prompted us to give
Devoted service while they lived,
They know that we will carry on
And still be true altho they're gone.
They know we'll do the last sad tasks
Which love or friendship ever asks.
There is so little to be said
Within the presence of the dead,
For always in the lonely room,
Made lovely by a bower of bloom,
Their peaceful faces seem to say:
I knew that you'd be here today.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, among those newly elected to the Eightieth Congress there was none who more sincerely or assiduously served his country and his own constituents than TOM OWENS.

As the Representative, I believe, of the most populous congressional district in the Nation, containing over a million people, he naturally had an inordinate amount of business to transact for his own constituents. Yet he found time to study with unusual care every important measure which came before us.

One never fully appreciated TOM OWENS' service until he found himself in disagreement on some issue. Then it was that he discovered the detailed attention TOM had given to the problem and the thorough mastery of the issues he had attained.

This is the first break in the ranks of the new Members. We are inexpressibly saddened. During the last 2 weeks, since he was stricken, TOM, a devout Catholic, has constantly been in the thoughts and prayers of all of us, without regard to religious faith.

We loved him for his buoyant personality, his ready spirit of cooperation, and his almost unparallaled devotion to his duty. The country has lost a valuable legislator and his colleagues as true a friend as ever sat in this Chamber.

To the people of his congressional district, to his colleagues from Illinois, and particularly to Mrs. Owens and his children, and to his brothers who were unusually close to TOM, we offer the deepest sympathy of an admiring, though saddened, House of Representatives.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we will all miss TOM OWENS. He was a friendly man who attracted people to him, but more than that his intense passion for what he believed to be right and his living Americanism inspired all his many friends.

His life was not long as years are counted, yet his great achievements in those years are a noble monument. His unselfish and devoted life will always be a comfort to his family and to his friends.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the ranks of the Eightieth Congress again have been broken—this time by the death of our colleague, THOMAS L. OWENS, of Chicago, Ill.

A soldier in his fight for better government has passed to his reward. In his devotion in carrying out his duty to the Government throughout the past, and this session of Congress, he overtaxed his strength. He, in fact, sacrificed his life in an effort to be of greater service to his country.

THOMAS L. OWENS was one of the outstanding men of the group elected to Congress in 1946. He was a man of exceptional ability, with a most friendly disposition, yet with a dynamic intensity which caused him to attempt to drive himself further in his work than his health would permit, which resulted in his early death.

From a humble beginning, he battled his way up against constant odds to one success after another, acquiring a college education, admittance to the bar, and success as a practicing attorney.

A patriot, he rendered outstanding service in World War I, and after the war took an active part as a member of the American Legion in an effort to be helpful to the disabled veterans throughout the past number of years. His life and achievements epitomized the opportunity for success in America for those who are willing to struggle to achieve it.

I join with the other Members of the Illinois delegation, and with the membership of this House in extending words of condolence and comfort to his wife and children. His deeds and record in life and in this Congress will be a consolation throughout the future to his family and friends, and a lasting memorial to his life and contribution to the Nation.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, it has been said: Life is a short space between two eternities. Out of the one and into the other runs the relentless race of man.

My friend and colleague, THOMAS L. OWENS, has run his race; he has answered the final call, all too soon in the prime of his life. Although his career in Congress was short, he gave to his State and to the Nation the type of service that stamped him as a statesman. Always mindful that a public office is a public trust, his sterling character never permitted him to waiver in the performance of conscientious duty. Without reservations, he put all of himself into every undertaking, no matter how small or how great. Gentle, cheerful, able, honest, attentive to duty—the virtues of noble manhood characterized his life.

A lawyer of prominence, a veteran of World War I, a statesman, an able member of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, TOM OWENS can best be described as a gentleman who served his country well. The great and towering monument of public achievement, benefaction, and patriotic service which he left will continue to live in the hearts of a grateful people and his many friends.

May his charming wife and fine children find solace and comfort in the knowledge that their loved one has moved further along toward his cosmic destiny beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, that he has realized that peace of which we here may catch but a dreaming glimpse.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am shocked to learn of the death of TOM OWENS. I am proud to boast that he was my friend. Just last week, in order to show how human and thoughtful he was, just last week when I was addressing this House TOM was sitting on the front row here and because my voice was not being carried properly over the microphone he rose, came up here and lifted this mike closer to my face. That was the last time I saw TOM OWENS. It has been my privilege to have served with TOM on an investigating subcommittee. This spring Mr. OWENS and I along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] conducted an investigation in TOM's home city of Chicago. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] and I were received most hospitably and there was nothing that TOM could not do for us to add to our enjoyment during our stay in that city.

It is a difficult thing, this saying, in effect, good-by to an old and trusted friend. We who remain here in this House have lost so much that we will never be able to recapture because TOM OWENS has made his mark among us and established a place in our affections. I join with all these gentlemen from Illinois in expressing condolences to his widow and children. May the good Lord bless them in their bereavement is my prayer.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add the tribute of Idaho to those already so sincerely given by our colleagues from Illinois and elsewhere. I first became acquainted with THOMAS L. OWENS last year when, like him, I was commencing on my first session of Congress. My tribute is dedicated to a great and good man in whom was combined the finest traits of private character, as well as energy and ability as a legislator, that made him outstanding among the many able men with whom it has been my privilege to associate during the

Eightieth Congress. He represented a constituency larger in number than any other Member of this body, and literally burned himself out in devoted service to his country and to the people whom he represented. I know how general has been the concern of all of us during the past 2 weeks at the hospital when he made his tenacious struggle for life. This has been evidenced by the numberless quiet conversations at which the latest reports as to his condition were exchanged, and I am sure there have been countless quiet personal prayers that he might be spared us. We can take satisfaction in the thought that if ever a man who has crossed to the other side deserved just reward, TOM OWENS, who was possessed of such deep religious convictions and lived so exemplary a life, has well earned peace in that beyond to which he has departed. It is hard to believe that a man of such tireless energy could be stricken down, but the answer must be that in his complete selflessness, he undertook too much. It was always a marvel to me that he could care so well for the needs of his huge constituency and still devote so much time in following on the floor every major piece of legislation that has come before us. We shall miss TOM OWENS, and his country could ill spare such a man at this crucial time. It was a great privilege to have known him. We can take inspiration from even the brief time we were associated with him. His was a work well done. Let us strive to emulate his record of constructive service.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I join with saddened heart in the tribute by my colleagues to THOMAS L. OWENS who passed away this morning.

I did not know TOM OWENS until we met as Members of the Eightieth Congress. Our offices are located opposite each other in the House Office Building and this arrangement provided many opportunities to accompany him to and from the sessions. Further opportunity for promoting a most pleasant and genuine acquaintance was provided by the fact that, until recently, we lived in the same hotel where we took a number of meals together and from which hotel we had many times walked, when the weather permitted, or came in the same taxi to our offices. Frequently, we returned to the hotel together from our offices, one waiting for the other.

It was because of these many meetings that a close friendship grew between us, that I learned to admire and respect TOM OWENS, that I knew of his great love for his wife and children, that I learned of his many experiences in public life, noted his keen analysis of pending legislation, and observed that TOM OWENS was a true Christian, a cultured gentleman.

The Representative of the Seventh District of Illinois was an untiring worker for his large constituency. TOM OWENS appreciated the responsibility of that office and was true to his trust. He was able, affable, energetic, persistent. He was deeply and sincerely concerned with the well-being of his fellow men.

The earthly career of TOM OWENS has ended. My deepest sympathy is extended to his family, relatives, and great number of friends in their great loss and sorrow. As far as I personally am concerned, in the passing of Congressman THOMAS L. OWENS, I have lost a close friend whose friendship I greatly valued. He has entered the greater field—the eternal realm—finding there the reward that comes of honest, helpful service to fellow men.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of TOM OWENS, of Illinois. I was personally grieved on yesterday to learn of his untimely passing. It happened that he and I served on the Eudcation and Labor Committee together—he on the majority side and I on the minority. He was a leading advocate of labor reform legislation and entertained the deepest sympathy for the rights of the laboring man. With that feeling in mind, he helped write the so-called Taft-Hartley Act, which includes a bill of rights for the wage earners of the country. It was my privilege to work with him on that committee and on a number of rather important subcommittee assignments. He never flinched when his duty was involved. Political considerations with him were always secondary. His thought was to do what was right, regardless of consequences.

During my 6 years of service in this House I can truthfully say that I have not yet observed a Member more devoid of demagogery and more sincerely devoted to his trust than TOM OWENS. He was an able man and a tireless worker. When there was a job to do he was always ready. I have heard him question witnesses in his incomparable manner. They simply could not evade him, and if there was a weakness in their positions OWENS picked it up and made the most of it. He asked no quarter and gave none. It is truly tragic that such men should pass on. God give us more men like TOM OWENS.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to serve on the Labor Committee with TOM OWENS—he liked to be called TOM. In the Labor Committee we were seatmates ever since January 1947 when we both came to Congress. In the Labor Committee meetings we sat together and discussed on an intimate personal basis, as members do under such circumstances, all the legislation and testimony which came before that committee. We sat together through the months of hearings on the labor law. It was then that I came to know TOM OWENS. In my opinion he was the greatest authority on labor law in the United States Congress. The breadth of his experience in this field was unmatched by any other Member and his broad knowledge proved extremely beneficial to the entire committee on many occasions.

Much has been said here today of the fine qualities of TOM OWENS. I concur in those remarks except I believe they understate his fine character. We have not found suitable words to express his exemplary qualities. From my close personal relationship with him I found him ever able, informed, courageous, and sincere. He knew his subject and he spoke with conviction for the right as he saw it.

I especially wish to pay tribute to two specific contributions to the national labor relations law passed at the last session, to which he gave valuable support. He was one of the new members on the committee who joined in a small group to preserve what he and others of us considered to be fundamental rights of the individual. As a result of this endeavor the legislation which resulted provided protection of the union shop and industry-wide bargaining. This was a substantial contribution to this legislation and TOM OWENS played a major part in preserving these features that are so necessary if labor and management are to meet on a basis of equality. TOM, we will miss you. Hail and farewell.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my acquaintance with Congressman OWENS dated from the occasion of a radio broadcast from one of the Washington radio stations early in January 1947, at which some of the new Members of Congress were being interviewed. As I came to know him better my respect and friendship for him increased. I liked him because he was courageous, sincere, and honest. There was nothing artificial or affected about him. He did not care whether his convictions were on the popular side of a question or not. His love for America and her institutions was not limited by any narrow sectionalism. He represented all sections of America—north, south, east, and west. In his passing our country has lost a valuable and faithful public servant.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned this morning of the untimely passing of my good friend, THOMAS L. OWENS, of Chicago, Ill. I did not have the pleasure of knowing TOM OWENS until we were sworn in as Members of the Eightieth Congress on January 3, 1947. In this short period of time I learned to know TOM as a real American who was greatly interested in the welfare of his country, his State, and his district, and he was willing to expend all of his energy in carrying out his responsibility to the people he represented.

Mr. Speaker, TOM OWENS was one of the most industrious Members of this body, always full of vim, vigor, and enthusiasm. It is almost unbelievable that a man so robust and vigorous, at least on the surface, should be stricken and removed from our midst so quickly.

On occasions of this kind I always like to think of the poem, "He is not dead; he is just away," which reads as follows:

You cannot say, you must not say,
That he is dead; he is just away.
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand
He has wandered into an unknown land,
And left us dreaming how very fair
It needs must be, since he lingers there;
So think of him faring on, as dear
In the love of there as the love of here;
Think of him still as the same, and say,
"He is not dead, he is just away."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to the loved ones of THOMAS L. OWENS at this time of their great bereavement. May God grant them strength, fortitude, solace, and faith to bear up under their loss of a faithful husband and loving father. May God rest his soul in peace forevermore.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, the death of my colleague, Representative TOM OWENS, of Illinois, has saddened me greatly. It seems only such a short time ago that I talked with him, and now he has gone from among us. In life, we are in the midst of death.

TOM OWENS was a fine, sincere, and intelligent Member of Congress. He was tremendously interested in the problems of this Nation in particular, and of the world in general. He was an earnest and hard-working man, and his intense application to his job undoubtedly hastened his death.

We served together on the Education and Labor Committee, and as the months passed, I learned to respect him and to value highly his friendship. He would go out of his way to assist an associate in meeting a difficult situation. TOM OWENS is one of those human beings who will be sorely missed by those who were acquainted with him. He was a clean, honorable man, a devout churchman, and a credit to Congress, the governing body of this great Nation.

I do not know his family, but they have my heartfelt sympathy in this their unfortunate period of bereavement. My sincere hope is that a loving, understanding God and the passage of time will ease for them the pain of his departure.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am moved with a deep sense of personal loss to mark the passing of our beloved friend and colleague, THOMAS L. OWENS, and to join with the Members of this House in paying tribute to his outstanding service in behalf of his community, his State, and the Nation.

It is my privilege to enjoy the close friendship of a near neighbor and constituent of Brother OWENS, and that fact served to bring us closely together in the opening days of our first session. From that early and cherished acquaintance there grew with me an appreciation of TOM'S fervent zeal and great energy, and I found myself not infrequently lamenting the fact that I could not even approximate the high type of service he rendered his constituents from the start.

Now he is gone—a casualty in this eternal warfare to bring order out of the chaos into which our governmental processes have deteriorated. Now he has shed the habiliments of the warrior he was and we are left to mourn his recall at a time when he is needed most.

To those loved ones who are left to mourn his going away, we can only offer our heartfelt condolences, and at the same time commend them to an abiding faith in that great design through which we will all be reunited in a better land with those whom we have loved and lost for awhile.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our friend and colleague, TOM OWENS, was a shock to all of us and in his going I feel a personal loss.

I first met Mr. OWENS in Chicago shortly after the 1946 congressional elections. At that time Mr. OWENS and his wife and Mrs. Smith and I were the guests of mutual friends, Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Niehoff of the city of Chicago. Our hosts were constituents of Mr. OWENS, and since that first meeting we have been warm personal friends.

Mr. Speaker, I came to appreciate the character and integrity of our departed colleague by discussing with him the merits of legislation before this House. He was a vigorous young man and at all times considered the interests of his country above personal, political advantages. His work on the Taft-Hartley bill will forever be a monument to his endeavors as a legislator. TOM OWENS was a man of great industry and that was evidenced by his work not only on the floor but also in his social contacts. He was always the life of the party on every occasion.

His loss is a considerable one to this body and to his country. His wife and children have suffered irreparable loss, but they can be comforted in the fact that as a husband and father he has left his impact upon this body and his district. We shall miss TOM OWENS in the days ahead. He had a very bright future. Only God in his wisdom can understand Tom's departure from this life. May God bless his soul.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind the Members of this House that the late TOM OWENS, of the Seventh Illinois District, had a wide interest in matters of government and was a keen student of the process of government.

Not long before he was tragically stricken, he initiated a study in his own office of the perplexing problem of improving relations between the States and the Federal Government, in the technical sense—that is, in improving the mechanics for Federal-State relationships.

He took a keen interest in the unique position of the American Vice President who is officially regarded as an executive but performs only legislative duties, that of presiding over the United States Senate. Believing this important official of our Government should be given greater responsiiblities of a character in which, ordinarily, he is most admirably fitted, Representative OWENS commenced study of a proposed draft of legislation that would accomplish this result.

Tom did not live to see the results of what he had started, but I feel that the Members of this House, and all students of Government matters, will want to see what was developed at his initiative.

I am therefore introducing today, as I am sure Tom would if he had lived, for consideration and discussion between now and the next session of Congress, a bill designed to cover these purposes.

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our distinguished colleague, Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS, came as a distinct shock to all Members of the House of Representatives and particularly to the members of the Committee on Education and Labor of which he was a valuable member. He was also a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of which it is my honor to be chairman.

In all of the hearings before the full committee and also before the Subcommittee on Education, TOM always took an active part. He had a keen mind, was very aggressive, but always fair. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I desire to say with all sincerity that Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS will be greatly missed. He undoubtedly spent much time in the study of questions before the committee as well as before the House for he always had accurate information. Although this was his first term in the House, he was rapidly becoming an outstanding Member in that body.

To his wife and children, we express our deepest sympathy and know that they, like, Tom, will put their trust in Him "who doeth all things well."

But I will not say he is dead, for his life and deeds will live on and on.

No; I cannot and I will not say
That he is dead.
He is just away!
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand,
He has entered into that unknown land,
* * * * *
Think of him still as the same, I say.
He is not dead. He's just away.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without adding my voice to those of my colleagues who have expressed their deep regret at the passing of TOM OWENS

As chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, let me say that Representative OWENS' absence from this body will be felt most seriously.

Although he was serving his first term in Congress, Tom had a breadth of experience and background in labor law and its administration that placed him in the forefront of all the discussions in this field. His contribution to the development of the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be underestimated.

Aside from my official regret at the passing of a man who was an expert in the field with which I am most familiar, I want to say that I feel an even deeper personal loss.

TOM OWENS was my friend in the finest sense of the word. I always felt I could depend upon him whenever the going was toughest.

At no time was my confidence and trust misplaced.

This Congress and the Nation has lost a statesman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply grieved to learn this morning of the death of my good friend the distinguished gentleman from the State of Illinois, THOMAS L. OWENS. His passing is a great loss, not only to the State of Illinois but to the Nation. I join in extending my sincere sympathy to his widow and three children in their great loss and sorrow.

For many years he has been active in the public service—as a practicing lawyer, an various committees of the Illinois State Bar Association and American Bar Association, and as an arbitrator in labor disputes by appointment of the United States circuit court of appeals.

He was elected to the House of Representatives in November 1946 and has served the Seventh District, which is one of the largest districts of the United

States, untiringly and with distinction. His untiring effort in the service of his country was always for what he believed was right. He loved his service because he strove always for the right. It is tragic that a man of such ability should die so young. It is a tribute to his ability that he was able to accomplish so much in a short and busy life.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Friday, just before leaving to take a train for the west coast, I called the office of TOM OWENS, as I had been doing regularly, and was heartened to hear that he was improving. I just got off the train from the west coast a couple of hours ago. When I reached the Capitol Grounds there was the usual sign that tells us that one of our number is gone—the flag at half-mast.

If you will pardon me at this moment, I want to tell you that I was attending a world conference on moral rearmament in Los Angeles, which was attended by the most prominent leaders of 27 nations. Their one underlying theme is the preservation of Christian democracy. I know of no other living creature that portrays that theme better than TOM OWENS did. He was courageous. He loved his country and was sincere at all times. As one of the other Members has stated, he was, in effect, a casualty in the war against subversive movements. He worked hard—he gave his life. In every Congress there are always a few outstanding men. TOM OWENS was one such man in the Eightieth Congress. He stood out among all the rest. His courage, sincerity, and constant attendance to duty might be emulated by all of us.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL].

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, TOM OWENS has left us—but in our hearts will ever remain the indelible impress of his memory.

The traditions of this body have been enriched beyond measure by the intensity of his devotion to his country—an intensity that was directed without thought of personal sacrifice to the affairs of our Nation and which took toll of his physical strength beyond endurance.

TOM OWENS gave his life to his country as heroically as a soldier on the battlefield, and he has earned an honored place among those immortals whose memories are cherished by a grateful Nation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago Saturday on a beautiful sunny afternoon at about 5 o'clock, I was walking near the House Office Building. I met Tom on the sidewalk. We stopped a minute and talked. I had been troubled about a certain problem which was bothering me pertaining to legislation. It was my problem at the time, but I mentioned it to him, and in his usual spontaneous, sympathetic manner he tackled it as though it were his own.

He gave me some very good advice. He took the problem unto himself. The average person probably would have brushed the trouble aside, but Tom did not do that. It was typical of him to take every problem that was presented to him, very sincerely, very directly, and to give his best to the solution of the matter, even though it meant nothing to him personally but his own grief.

Together with the others who have spoken today, I tender my deepest sympathy to his widow and his children. But there is in Congressman TOM OWENS' last 2 years of life, during which we knew him, a great consolation to his widow and his children in the fact that he truly was a casualty of this Congress; a willing sacrifice for his country in its present grave difficulties and conflicts. TOM OWENS did die for his country.

This Congress has been one confronted with the most fundamental problems and conflicts, more so than any Congress since the beginning of our country. Tom was close to those problems. He was a member of the Labor Committee, and there I worked by his side and learned of his keen insight into that most difficult of modern questions, labor-management relationship. Then you will recall how he threw himself into the ERP legislation, a measure that will affect the fate of the world and answer the question of world peace. We are, of course, in that conflict now, in a cold world war III. Tom was in the middle of that war, in the major battles of that war. He contributed much to the solution of it. He fell fighting in that war as any great soldier falls.

Draped around him now is the flag that bedecks this room. The white of his purity of purpose and sincerity; the blue of his passion for truth; the red of his courage with which he approached his duty. He fell fighting for his country as a great patriot and a great statesman. The heart of THOMAS OWENS burst with love of his native land. He loved his fellow men.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 645

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following Members on the part of the House to attend the funeral: Mr. TWYMAN, Mr. VAIL, Mr. BUSBEY, and Mr. O'BRIEN.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 8, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1626. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Commission, covering activities of the 1947 fiscal year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1627. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to simplify and consolidate the laws relating to the receipt of compensation from dual employments under the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1628. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1629. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain public building construction work in or near the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

1630. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to stimulate exploration for strategic and critical metals and minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1631. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 11, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Lake Worth Inlet, Fla., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 19, 1945, and November 20, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 704); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2028. A bill to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6451. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage

Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5596. A bill to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 2231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 6822. A bill to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6823. A bill to exempt admissions to religious, educational, and charitable entertainments and to certain concerts from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 6824. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the payment of prior construction costs of certain hospitals approved as projects under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 6825. A bill to repeal the excise tax on electric, gas, and oil ranges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6826. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 with respect to the eligibility for benefits of certain employees on furlough on the date of enactment of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 6827. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands to provide for the issuance of leases of oil and gas lands by competitive bidding in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. Res. 646. Resolution to print the prayers offered by the Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, 1945–48; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina introduced a bill (H. R. 6828) to provide for the retirement with pay of Lt. Comdr. Harold Kaminski, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2063. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Three Lakes Taxpayers Association, Three Lakes, Wis., in opposition to the Federal aid to education bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2064. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harold E. Lachel and others, of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement and passage of postal salary legislation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2065. Also, petition of the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation of certain conditions relating to the conduct of our occupation of Germany and the policy and activities of our Government relating to German war industries; to the Committee on Rules

2066. Also, petition of William M. Parmely, of Port Tampa City, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to suit against the Veterans' Administration for the violation of constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2067. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau and others, of St. Petersburg, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, deliver us from the fear of what might happen and give us the grace to enjoy what now is and to keep striving after what ought to be. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. IVES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 7, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on investigation of national resources for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

S. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University; and

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING TODAY'S SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I announce that it is the intention that the Senate stay in session through the afternoon and on into the night to complete the work in hand.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL PICKET BOATS TO CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the city of Philadelphia, Pa., had requested the Navy Department to transfer two picket boats for use by the fire and police departments of that city, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITION

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE) presented the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolutions relative to the recognition of the state of Israel and the lifting of the embargo on arms to Palestine

Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts on February 13, 1919, resolved that the national aspirations and historic claims of the Jewish people with regard to Palestine be recognized; and

Whereas the general court on March 29, 1922, urged the Government of the United States to recognize the status of the Jewish people in Palestine; and

Whereas the Government of the United States on May 14, 1948, recognized the state of Israel: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hail the recognition of the state of Israel by the Government of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts favors and urges the lifting of the embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, and to the Members of Congress representing Massachusetts.

In senate, adopted, May 27, 1948.

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, May 27, 1948.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FLANDERS, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2279. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1537).

By Mr. MOORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2192. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to agents of carriers subject to part I of such act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1538).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2744. A bill to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; with amendments (Rept. No. 1543).

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2034. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541); and

S. 2401. A bill to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1542).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5822. A bill to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1550).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2820. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public park and golf course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1551); and

S. 2821. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1552).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1545);

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Henry Hill; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546);

S. 2359. A bill for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1547);

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553);

H. R. 1222 A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs M. C. Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554);

H. R. 2766. A bill to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725); without amendment (Rept. No. 1544);

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rice Tablot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555);

H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken; without amendment (Rept. No. 1556);

H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Deiman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1548);

H. R. 4663. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners in fee simple of the land leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1549); and

H. R. 5330. A bill for the relief of W. W. DeLoach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557).

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill, to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1539) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2829) to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill, to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and I submit a report (No. 1540) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2823. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1934, to provide for allowances to the heirs, representatives, and assigns of Frank J. Boudinot, deceased, in the event of favorable determination by the Indian Claims Commission of certain claims of the Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2824. A bill for the relief of William K. Burlen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. IVES):

S. 2825. A bill to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2826. A bill to authorize the advancement on the retired list of Col. Benjamin Oliver Davis to the grade of brigadier general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2827. A bill for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2828. A bill for the relief of James Stewart Corp. and James Stewart & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 2829) to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE, also from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to correct the service records of Navy veterans of the War With Spain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT, 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. KILGORE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 22, line 20, before the period insert a colon and the following: *"Provided, however,* That such amounts shall not be expended for the construction of any aircraft carrier in excess of 40,000 tons unless the construction of such carrier has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Defense."

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO REPORT HOUSE BILL 6556

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to file a report on House bill 6556, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, by midnight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Committee on the Judiciary to sit and hold hearings during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

He also asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Public Works to meet during the session today.

He also asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Steel of the Small Business Committee to sit during the session today.

THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS' SERVICE FOUNDATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of remarks prepared by him on the subject of the DAV, Service Foundation; which appears in the Appendix.]

DEATH BLOW TO PRIVATE PENSIONS?—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article en-

titled "Death Blow to Private Pensions?" by David Lawrence, from the United States News and World Report for April 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT OF FREE ENTERPRISE?—ADDRESS BY T. COLEMAN ANDREWS

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What of Free Enterprise?" delivered by T. Coleman Andrews before the Virginia Bankers Association at Lynchburg, Va., on May 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF BOOK, A NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE OIL INDUSTRY

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Here Is Danger," published in the Economic Council Review of Books for June 1948, being a review of the book, A National Policy for the Oil Industry, by Eugene V. Rostow, professor of law and a member of the graduate faculty of economics at Yale University; which appears in the Appendix.]

1948 IS THE YEAR TO VOTE AMERICAN—ARTICLE FROM COLLIER'S MAGAZINE

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "1948 Is the Year To Vote American," published in a recent issue of Collier's magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

A SETTLEMENT WITH RUSSIA—ITS NECESSITY FOR WORLD FEDERATION—ADDRESS BY GRENVILLE CLARK

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Settlement With Russia—Its Necessity for World Federation," delivered by Grenville Clark on February 7, 1948, to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; which appears in the Appendix.]

CARRYING OF MAIL ON STAR ROUTES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 263) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3951 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 434), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Postmaster General may, in his discretion and in the interest of the postal service, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3949 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 429), by mutual agreement with the holder of any star-route contract, renew such contract at the rate prevailing at the end of the contract term, for additional terms of four years with such bond as may be required by the Postmaster General. Any such contract may be terminated at the end of any 4-year term at the option of the Postmaster General or the contractor or terminated at any time by operation of any existing law.

"The Postmaster General may, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, with the consent of the contractor, and without regard to the provisions of sections 3958 and 3961 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, secs. 438 and 441), readjust the compensation of a star-route contractor for increased or decreased costs occasioned by changed conditions occurring during the contract term which could not reasonably have been anticipated at the time of making his original proposal or executing his bond for a renewed contract as provided herein."

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION BY CENSUS BUREAU

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 554) to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the Director of the Bureau of the Census, hereinafter referred to as the Director and the Bureau, respectively, is authorized and directed to take, compile, and publish the censuses of manufacturers, of mineral industries, and of other businesses, including the distributive trades, service establishments, and transportation (exclusive of means of transportation for which statistics are required by law to be filed with a designated regulatory body), in the year 1949 and every fifth year thereafter, and each such census shall relate to the year immediately preceding the taking thereof: *Provided*, That the census of manufacturers shall not be taken in 1949. The censuses herein provided for shall include the United States and its Territories and such possessions as may be determined by the Director with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) That the Director is further authorized to make such surveys as are deemed necessary to furnish annual and other interim current data on the subjects covered by the censuses provided for in this and other acts.

SEC. 2. That the following sections of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), shall apply to the censuses and surveys authorized by this act: Section 3, as amended by section 404 of Reorganization Plan No. II (53 Stat. 1436), and sections 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15, except that the Director may also authorize the expenditure of necessary sums for travel expenses for attendance at training courses held by the Bureau: *Provided*, That in connection with any survey conducted by the Director pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), with respect to the answering of questions and furnishing of information, shall apply only to such inquiries as are within the scope of the schedules and of the type and character heretofore used in connection with the taking of complete censuses under the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), or in connection with any censuses hereafter taken pursuant to section 1 (a) of this act and the act of June 18, 1929: *Provided further*, (a) That sections 9 and 10 of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), shall apply to surveys conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act only after publication of a determination with reasons therefor certified by the Director with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce that the information called for is needed to aid or permit the efficient performance of essential governmental functions or services; or has significant application to the needs of the public, business, or industry and is not publicly available from nongovernmental or other governmental sources; (b) that in the case of any new survey said sections 9 and 10 shall apply only after public notice, given by the Director at least 30 days in advance of requesting a return, that such survey is under consideration; (c) that the provisions of said section 9 and 10 shall not apply to any survey more frequent than annual conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act; and (d) that the provisions for imprisonment provided by said sections 9 and 10 shall not apply in connection with any survey conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act.

SEC. 3. That inquiries, and the number, form, and subdivisions thereof for the censuses and surveys provided for in this act, shall be determined by the Director, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. To the extent that the provisions of this act conflict with the provisions of any other act, pertaining to the Bureau of the Census, the provisions of this act shall control: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to revoke or impair the authority of any other Federal agency with respect to the collection or release of information.

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that the pending question is the amendment which I have proposed to Senate bill 2655 authorizing the Secretary of the Army to enlist qualified aliens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts adding a new subsection on page 3, after line 22.

Mr. LODGE. I will say, Mr. President, that I have been trying to obtain a hearing for this proposal on many occasions, and I have always had the experience of no one being ready to listen to me when I made my presentation. I believe that if Senators will listen to me they will be convinced. Of course, if they are not present when I speak they cannot be convinced.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Brooks	Hoey	Reed
Buck	Holland	Revercomb
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stennis
Cooper	Lodge	Stewart
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I address myself to the amendment which I offered to Senate bill 2655, to authorize the Secretary of the Army, until June 30, 1950, to enlist qualified aliens between the ages of 18 and 35, in an aggregate number not to exceed 50,000 men. This would, of course, reduce the manpower demands contemplated by the pending bill to the extent of 50,000 men, although that is not the prime reason for which I am offering the amendment.

The amendment is similar to Senate bill 2016, which I introduced, and on which hearings were held. It would authorize the Army to conduct this experiment for a 2-year period, at the end of which time the permission would expire, unless previously renewed.

The number 50,000 is about 15 percent of the proposed total of our Regular Army and is the number which qualified experts believe can be most efficiently absorbed.

At the end of 5 years of satisfactory service these men can become American citizens. It is the plan of the Army to use them in Alaska, the Far East, and the Caribbean.

Secretary of State Marshall stated with reference to the proposed plan that he believed it "worthy of very serious consideration as one means of limiting the necessity for exercising the selective service power." That is General Marshall's opinion of it.

General Marshall added that he thought this proposal formed the basis of the action which is being carefully looked into at the present time. I have been orally advised that the Department of the Army also approves. In early February there was some misunderstanding in certain so-called levels of the State Department about this idea, and some objections were raised; but I believe those objections rested on a rather complete misunderstanding of what the bill was about; and they have since been cleared up.

There are many young men of Polish, Czech, anti-Nazi German, Russian, Byelorussian, and other European stocks who would gladly serve, and who are neither Communist nor Fascist in sympathy. Their hearts and emotional loyalties are directed toward the kind of thing for which this country stands.

It is true that today the Secretary of the Army has technical power to enlist aliens, but I do not believe, and he does not believe, that such an important step should be taken on a technical basis. It should be taken only after receiving the deliberate approval of Congress. I have never heard an argument made against it. I have tried to imagine what some of the arguments could be. It might be said, perhaps, that the Russian Government might not like it. So far as that statement is concerned, it seems superfluous to say that our efforts to please the Russians have not been crowned with success, and that the Soviets are sure to vilify us no matter what we do. Having already compared our President with Hitler, it is hard to see what there is left for them to say. Moreover, they have not criticized the French Foreign Legion, which is not the same as my proposal, but is similar in the sense that it enlists aliens into the service. So we could not be consistently criticized for recruiting aliens. There are many reports to the effect that the Russians have done the same thing, and that there were many men in the Russian Army during the war who did not even speak the same language. I do not think that is disputed.

Senators will recall the remark of a certain very wise man who said, "The Russian Government can be neither appeased, conciliated, nor provoked." So I do not think we need to worry about that factor; if we decide that it is a proper step for us to take, let us take it.

Although it is not an exact parallel, it is interesting to note that Britain, in her zone in Germany, has eased her manpower problem by using Danish, Norwegian, and Belgian units. It should also be noted that we ourselves are at present employing non-American citizens to guard our supplies and our various logistical installations in Germany. So in that sense no drastically new principle would be established.

This is not a foreign-legion proposal. It is not a measure under which a group of foreigners would be recruited and put into a unit together, where they speak their own language. It is not a proposal which seeks to attract mercenaries. On the contrary, it is a provision which, if well administered—and I have every reason to believe that it would be—would give us young men who would be, in fact, extremely valuable citizen candidates.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Would not the men who come in under this provision be subjected to the same requirements for admission to the armed forces of the United States in a particular component in which they enlisted, as would American citizens, except that these men would not have American citizenship?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. They would have to meet the same physical and mental standards; and, of course, they would be questioned and examined from the standpoint of loyalty to a degree that we probably would not go with our own people. I am glad that the Senator from Connecticut asked that question, because it is very pertinent.

There is a great moral difference between a liberty legion of young men who, attracted by America and what it stands for, want to turn their backs on the disillusionments and sufferings of the Old World and become American citizens in an honorable and manly way, and a foreign legion of mercenaries established for an entirely different motive. The two things are not at all the same.

These young men would be spread through the Army in units with American soldiers, in exactly the same manner that aliens have been spread through the United States Army many times before in our history. Anyone who had contact with the Regular Army in the days before World War II, and who has attended one of the horse shows at Fort Myer and observed the men knows that there were a great many aliens among our soldiers at that time. No one objected. Not only did no one object, but those men furnished some of the finest noncommissioned officers we had when the bullets began to fly.

We would be using the services of these young men not only as we have done in the past, but just as the British Army has enlisted aliens in the integral units of the British Army ever since Queen Victoria's day. That is a fact which is substantiated by the record. I received a letter from General Gascoigne, of the British military mission on that very point. I believe the letter is in the RECORD.

This amendment would take pressure off our young American men, as I have said. It would give us young men whose special backgrounds and knowledge of foreign languages and foreign customs could be of great and unique military value to us. Their special qualifications could not be duplicated in this country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether the aliens who would be permitted to enlist in the Army under the terms of the amendment would be temporarily residing in the United States, or whether they could enlist while residing abroad.

Mr. LODGE. They could enlist abroad.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding is that if an alien in Britain, for example, wanted to enlist in the United States Army, he could do so in Britain.

Mr. LODGE. I believe he could enlist at the office of the military attaché in London.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was my thought. The reason I asked the question is that, as the Senator knows, one of the finest armies we had in the last war was the Polish Army, which was more or less disbanded in Italy.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been advised that there was no unit in any of the allied forces that fought with greater valor and efficiency than did that army. I have likewise been advised by high ranking members of the United States Army that

it was a pity that some provision was not made to take a great many of those men into our own Army, not because of their military prowess but because of their democracy, character, and general all-around ability as citizen candidates. I am very glad, therefore, that the amendment is broad enough—as I thought it was—to permit the remnants of this force to join our own Army, because I believe that they would be a real contribution to the efficiency of our own armed forces.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Maryland for that remark. The Senator from Maryland has a very distinguished war record, and these factors are very real to him. He speaks very accurately, indeed, when he refers to the services rendered by the Polish Corps in World War II. It so happened that I had a little knowledge of what they did in storming Cassino in Italy. Cassino was an obstacle which had held up a great many troops. The Poles came along and did the business.

During the consideration of the displaced persons bill I heard some discussion on the question of admitting some of those Polish soldiers to this country. Of course, under this bill it would not only be possible but altogether probable that a substantial proportion of the 50,000 would be former Polish soldiers, because they are very obviously the type of men our Regular Army would like to obtain.

Let me say this in response to the observation the Senator from Maryland has made: When he asks about enlisting such men abroad and about whether an Englishman would be able to join the Army through the office of the military attaché at the Embassy, let me say that when I introduced the bill which corresponds to the amendment and when the Associated Press carried dispatches about it abroad, a large crowd of men applied to the Embassy because they misunderstood the announcement and thought the bill had become law. I can produce a large file of clippings showing that large numbers of men went to the United States Embassy and wished to join the United States Army, when they thought it possible to do so.

I yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall make one or two suggestions relative to the Senator's amendment which I think perhaps are worthy of consideration in connection with it. I notice that the amendment provides for a period of not less than 5 years of service outside continental United States. It occurs to me that anyone enlisting probably would spend 6 months or even a year in this country in being trained to be a soldier, particularly those who had not previously been soldiers. If the amendment provided for at least 4 years of service outside the United States, I think that would give the Army a chance to train any aliens who enlisted for the first time, and thus the Army would have an adequate opportunity to train them before sending them abroad. Such a procedure might be in the interest of efficiency.

Another suggestion I make to the Senator—who has given this matter more thought than I have, of course; and my suggestions may not hold water on more profound thought regarding them—is that if he would reduce the number provided in the amendment from 50,000 to 25,000, I think he would improve the chances of the adoption of the amendment. There are some Members of the Senate with whom I have talked who would favor this proposal provided it was on a smaller scale, but they might, perchance, oppose the amendment if it continued to provide for such a large number as 50,000. So I think the Senator would be well advised if he would consider reducing the number provided by the amendment from 50,000 to perhaps 20,000 or 25,000, until the plan is tried out and until we see how well it works.

I make that suggestion, not in opposition to the purpose of the amendment, but in an effort to aid in having the amendment placed in the bill, in the first place, and, in the second place, to aid in its retention later on, if it is adopted by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think that is a very reasonable observation. I provided for 50,000 because that is 15 percent, and I had been advised by various persons in the Regular Army to whom I talked that the Army could absorb that number. But I am not at all wedded to it, and I think the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland is a very reasonable one. I can quite understand that there might be Senators who would prefer to proceed a little more gradually in this matter.

So, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection to making that change.

I also have given considerable thought to the Senator's other point, the one relative to making it possible for these men to serve in the United States. Finally, after a great deal of study, I decided not to include such language in the amendment because of the danger of absence without leave and because of the problems which might arise in the United States if we had these young men over here and if they did go absent without leave. I thought that, on the whole, for the first 2 years, for the first group of men of this sort, we should proceed on the basis suggested in the amendment. Later, after experience with this arrangement, we could see whether it would be wise to change the law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to modify his amendment?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I modify my amendment in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland; namely, on page 1, in line 4, to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-five."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be perfected as indicated.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. The point I am about to make may have been covered in the discussion on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, because once or twice I have had to step out of the Chamber. But my recollection is that when the Senator first presented this proposal to the Senate he had in mind the use of this group of aliens in the occupied areas. I judge now, from what the Senator has said earlier, that the proposal is to have them used in the Caribbean and in Alaska and elsewhere outside both continental United States and Europe. Am I correct in my recollection of that matter? Let me inquire whether the Senator has changed his point of view with regard to it.

Mr. LODGE. I did give some thought to having them serve in Europe; but the Army itself has arrived at a conclusion on that point which I accept, and which I think is very well thought out. That is to say, the Army wishes to use these men in the Caribbean and in Alaska and in the Far East. If we arrange to have that done, then there will be no possibility that a recrudescence of old wartime emotions can occur. Personally, that point has never bothered me, because I think the type of men who would go into the service under these conditions would be men very susceptible to discipline, and I think they would have so much at stake and would be so eager to make a good record for themselves that they would not cause the problems in Europe that some persons have feared. But under the policy which is now contemplated, that could never occur.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Apropos of the question which has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I am wondering whether it would be more appropriate to leave a matter of this kind for the determination of the Army itself, rather than to try to decide it here. It seems to me we could not possibly be sufficiently acquainted with conditions which might arise, or which even exist at the present time, to be able satisfactorily to answer a question of that nature. Am I correct in that observation?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is perfectly true; and this amendment does not specify where they should be used. I simply stated to the Senator from Vermont and for the information of the Senate that it would be the policy of the Army to use these men in the Caribbean, in Alaska, and in the Far East; but that would be an administrative decision, and it ought to be such. We should not attempt to set that out in the statute.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish the Senator would make clear for the RECORD whether these troops would have certain rights to become citizens.

Mr. LODGE. They would become citizens at the end of 5 years of satisfactory honorable service.

I read from the report of the Attorney General on that subject:

> Section 324 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C. 724) provides that a person who has served honorably in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for a period of 3 years, may be naturalized

without having resided in the United States for at least 5 years, if a petition for naturalization is filed while the petitioner is still in the service or within 6 months after honorable separation from such service.

I omit a portion of the report, and then continue to read from it, as follows:

Should the bill under consideration be enacted, an alien who enlists in the Regular Army under its provisions, either within or beyond the continental limits of the United States, would be eligible for the special naturalization privileges of section 324 of the Immigration Act of 1940 (supra) after having served 3 years, provided he is stationed within the United States at the time he petitions for naturalization. Such a law may prove to be an inducement for aliens to enlist in the Army as a means to gain admission to the United States and acquire citizenship in a relatively short time—

And so forth. I read further:

Under the provisions of the instant bill it would be possible for aliens of such nationalities to enlist in the United States Army overseas for a term of 5 years, and after 3 years of service be brought to the United States in a military capacity rather than as quota immigrants, where they could petition for naturalization under section 324 of the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suppose it is contemplated by this amendment that if such a foreigner who enlisted in our Regular Army had ability and was recommended, he might be promoted to the rank of officer.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, very definitely; yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the RECORD should show that in the debate, and should show that there is no disposition to hold these men down to the status of enlisted men during their entire 5 years. Many of the Polish officers, for example, are well educated and speak English fluently; and if they were induced to enlist, so that they might become citizens of the United States eventually, it is not unlikely, in view of their education and training, that they might progress quickly to the rank of officer. So I think it should be stated in the RECORD that that is the understanding, so that there may be no doubt about the matter.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, very much so. Let me say in response to the very interesting question of the Senator from Maryland that in World War II the United States Army has had to work in a very close relationship with the armies of other countries. We have had a great deal of experience that we have never had before in Americans commanding foreign troops. General Devers, for example, commanded more Frenchmen than any non-Frenchman in history. He had the first French Army which was on the western front. He had the Army detachment of the Atlantic, all those Atlantic pockets the Germans had there. He had the Army detachment of the Alps on the Franco-Italian frontier. All those things involved American handling of troops.

It is not hard to imagine circumstances in which it would be extremely useful once again to have young officers of proven ability and proven loyalty, but who had the linquistic equipment and a knowledge of conditions that it would be impossible to duplicate in this country. So I hope very much that the young men who join under the terms of this amendment may all be of officer material, and I think it is not at all far-fetched to believe that they might be.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has put his finger on one of the most valuable contributions this policy would bring forth. Certainly in any future war, the ability to enlist men and officers speaking several languages will be of more importance than perhaps it has ever been in the past, if we should ever have another large-scale war. It occurs to me that the men who might come in under the provisions of the amendment would be the nucleus of the force that should already have the ability to converse in many languages, which would be of incalculable benefit and assistance in any future military operations. That ought to be one of the assets of this policy, which would differentiate it from the average enlistment of a citizen of the United States as against the enlistment of someone of foreign nationality.

Mr. LODGE. There is no question about that. Speaking from intimate personal experience in the last 6 months of World War II, I felt the lack, and how desperately serious was our lack of officers who spoke foreign languages. There is no question about it, it is a factor that can be the equivalent of many divisions in terms of military effectiveness.

So, Mr. President, we do not have to stretch our imaginations very much nor peer into the future very far to realize how valuable these men would be, particularly if the proposed integration of the Atlantic community becomes an accomplished fact. I think if Senators will look into the future they will see the merit of this amendment from that standpoint.

Then, Mr. President, from the letters which I have received from all over the world ever since I have made this proposal, and from the knowledge which the Army has of the young manhood of Europe due to our Army's occupation of Germany, I am confident that we shall get wonderful citizens as a result of this process, that the screening which the Army will conduct will be far more thorough and, of course, extend over a much longer period of time than anything our normal immigration services could possibly do.

Mr. President, you would be surprised to see the floods of letters I received from all over the world, when the press carried the announcement that I had introduced this proposal. I submitted a great many of them for the RECORD, but I shall merely read one here from a young Frenchman, which I think is typical. It comes from Marseille, France. This is a translation:

Mr. SENATOR: I must first make my excuses for the liberty I take in writing you these few lines to draw my case to your attention.

I learn through the Weekly French Samedi Soir about your bill to establish an American Foreign Legion comprised of young men recruited in Europe. This news has caused great joy. Why? I must tell you that I love America with all the strength of my 19 years and that I have tried every way to go there, but so far without luck. That, sir, is why I bother you with this note. I see in this article the only way of proving my love for that country and also of going there. I do not, Mr. Senator, want you by any possibility to think that America is to me only the country where they make good films and much jazz music; but it above all is the country of Washington and Lincoln and of others like them, the country of liberty, the rights of man, and finally the great Nation which is in the forefront of civilization.

Pardon, Mr. Senator, this revealing of my heart, but I hope that you will understand what it is to be very far away from the land which one loves but cannot reach. In any case I shall be the first to enlist in the legion of my certain future country.

Excuse again my clumsy letter.

I beg you, sir, to believe me. Your devoted and respected servant.

That is from a 19-year-old boy. Here is a letter from a Dutch boy in Scheveningen, Holland:

DEAR SIR: By the radio I have hearth, that by the American troups strangers can come for occupation.

Christmas I was to New York en have see the affiches, but my steamer started for Curacae, now I'm arrived this week to Holland and like me the militair service by the American-occupation troups best.

My age are 20 jears, we are bombarded at Rotterdam and the Haaghue, have lost my father and brother, the whole family from my father is murdered at Germany—the German soldiers have stolen al us studie insurances—now I wil go out from Europe to forgotten al this misere and troubles—Can You understand this? Wil you help me please?

Inclosed I sent stamp for your answer.

That is from a 20-year-old boy. Yes, I can understand it, and I guess you can understand it, Mr. President, and I guess we all can. We would get the cream of the young manhood of Europe. That is what we would get if this experiment were properly conducted, and I have every reason to believe it would be. But, transcending all these arguments is the fact that there are millions of people the world over who look to the United States as the guardian of democracy. It is only right that the young and able-bodied men among these people should have the privilege of helping us carry the torch. For many reasons, they cannot put their own armies into the field. But their young men can help, and should be enabled to do so. We may well recall the help which Lafayette, Kosciusko, Steuben, and Pulaski rendered in the War of the Revolution and which their descendants gave in the Civil War.

Every Senator knows that when this country is in trouble, the more allies we have the better. We have gone to great lengths and much trouble and expense in order to leave no stone unturned to have as many allies as possible in this troubled world. That is evidenced by the ECA bill and other pieces of legislation designed in the hope that they will

make some friends for us abroad and perhaps enable us to have some allies in case of trouble. The young men whom I would enlist in our Army are individual allies of the United States, citizen candidates, young men from foreign countries who want to wear our uniform.

Mr. President, how can anyone say that the ally who is in the uniform of a foreign country is a better and more valuable friend than is the ally who is wearing the uniform of Uncle Sam? There are some persons who say it is a sign of weakness for a nation to enlist selected aliens. Such persons should visit the Revolutionary War monument at Yorktown and read the names of the foreign soldiers who fought to create the United States. I know the President pro tempore has been there and has read the names. They should go to the battlefield of Gettysburg and read the names of the Irish dead who lie buried under the Celtic cross, the German dead who fought in large numbers to preserve this country, and the working people from the mill cities of Lancashire in England. In fact, there were lovers of liberty from all over the world who fought to preserve our Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the Senator say that a soldier selected from the cream of a European country would wear the uniform of the United States more proudly than a Communist who was drafted into the Army of the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a very truthful observation and is unanswerable. Mr. President, if we go to the shrines at Yorktown and Gettysburg, or to any place where blood has been shed to preserve this Nation, we shall find there were aliens there who wore the uniform of this country. Would anyone say that their service to the United States weakened this country? Is there a Senator who will say they disgraced the uniform of the United States?

Mr. President, in the interests of our own young men, in the broader interest of the Army as a whole, and for the sake of our country which wants good citizens for the future, I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that many more young men in Europe would volunteer than we could possibly accommodate?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that the very fact that such a large number of men would volunteer in order to help us to preserve freedom in Europe—because that would be one of the purposes of the Army—would itself be clear notice to Soviet Russia that our fight for freedom is gaining headway in the world?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is true. That is a very interesting observation. I think the Senator is correct. It would show the popular support which exists over there for the kind of thing that the Senator is talking about.

That concludes my remarks, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I am interested in the Senator's amendment. I should like to ask the Senator if he has submitted his amendment to the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. LODGE. I have. I will tell the Senator exactly what has happened. The Secretary of the Army has approved it. It then went to the State Department, and at a certain level in the State Department it was disapproved, the reason resting largely on a misunderstanding. Then it reached Secretary Marshall, and he made the statement which I quoted at the beginning of my remarks. He said:

> It is worthy of very serious consideration as one means of limiting the necessity for exercising selective service power.

There the matter stands. The Army was for the amendment as an Army proposition. Then the State Department, I think largely due to a misunderstanding, interposed an objection, and the Army withdrew its support for that reason, not because the Army did not believe in the amendment as a military matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I notice in lines 1 and 2 of the amendment the words, "The Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe." Could the Senator tell us anything about what such regulations might involve? For instance, would the enlistees wear the identical uniforms worn by the United States Army?

Mr. LODGE. The plan is to put them into existing units among American soldiers.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There would be no distinguishing feature as to the uniform at all?

Mr. LODGE. No. It would not be like the French Foreign Legion, the members of which have a distinct uniform.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Would they receive the same pay as American soldiers?

Mr. LODGE. They would.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Would citizens of Russia or of her satellite nations be eligible?

Mr. LODGE. The purpose of giving the Secretary of the Army the right to prescribe regulations is to enable him to make every arrangement he thinks is necessary for security, so that only men whose worth is absolutely proven will be be admitted. It seems to me that the best way is to give the Secretary of the Army the power to make such regulations, because he may have to change them from time to time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I agree with the Senator from Oregon, who stated that there will probably be more men willing to enlist than it will be possible to take into the Army. The rate of pay in the United States Army is so much greater than that of foreign armies it would naturally be a great incentive to join.

Mr. LODGE. I should amend my earlier reply to the Senator by saying that the Secretary would not have to pay the full amount of the pay of American soldiers. It might very well be that he would enlist them at a very much lower rate and increase the pay as the men showed their worth.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. At the end of 5 years they might be on full pay. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I think that can be done at the beginning, because we do not need to take in a lot of gold-brickers. There are so many young men that would join the Army because they believe in what this Nation stands for that we do not need to try to attract the kind of young men who might be attracted simply by the amount of money involved.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Has the Senator thought about what kind of an oath these enlistees would take when they join the Army?

Mr. LODGE. I have not gone into it. I understand they would take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. They would have to take a pledge of loyalty to this country. I think we can find many who would do that with a very sincere mind.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that I am 100 percent for his amendment. I cannot see why there should be any objection whatever to it. All along I have been for a limited selective service bill. I believe the bill as now written goes a bit too far. I do not think the Army has taken full advantage of training through ROTC, the National Guard, Reserve units, and so forth. There are many units throughout the United States that are sadly neglected at the present time.

There are other provisions in the bill of which I am not in favor. I do not see why in peacetime we have to register doctors up to 45 years of age and omit others. Unless the bill is amended considerably, I shall be forced, reluctantly, to vote against it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have concluded my statement on the amendment. I should like a vote on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, as modified.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I desire to state the committee's position on the amendment. Some Senators have indicated by their questions addressed to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that they might be in favor of an idea of this kind. I want to call particular attention to the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts, that we would undoubtedly have applicants from among the cream of the young manhood of Europe. In my opinion, that is a very important statement. Certainly I agree that in the United States the cream of the young manhood of the Nation comes to the colors in a time of emergency.

I know that is true. We all admit it. Certainly the advantages of becoming a citizen of the United States will hold forth a great attraction to the cream of the crop in European countries. Possibly the cream of the crop have some very patriotic views as regards their own country. Therefore, I am not quite ready to agree that the cream of the young manhood of each nation in Europe will actually apply for enlistment in our Army to become citizens of the United States. Probably the cream of the crop in those countries are wanted at home. Probably the cream of the crop in Britain—I heard that nation mentioned—would like to stay home and keep that country moving forward. Possibly they will want to enlist in their own army. I would think that the cream of the crop in each country would want to put forward the ambitions of that country in order to build it up.

If this amendment should be agreed to we would still have some applications from some very excellent material, and by that I mean young manhood in foreign countries. Possibly we would have applications for enlistment in our Army with the thought in mind that the wives and dependents of the enlistees might thereby, too, become citizens of the United States. It is not covered fully in the amendment, as it now appears before the Senate, as to whether or not the dependents of the prospective enlistees might also have offered to them citizenship rights.

In any event, I have not yet touched on the main objection considered by the committee to the amendment, which was presented to the committee by the Senator from Massachusetts, and was considered at the time the bill was voted out of the committee, and was not approved by the committee.

There is no doubt that such a proposition would provide a source of additional manpower, thought not much; the number is not particularly large. However, the committee felt that this proposal should not be coupled with the selective-service plan. The reason for that was that we knew that there was before the Senate the matter of displaced persons, and the changes to be recommended in our immigration laws.

Heretofore, in World War I and World War II, enlistments of aliens have been available in our Army. Such alien enlistees have been taken into the Army just as though they were citizens. They have not been put in units by themselves. They have had a chance to intermingle down to the squad level. In that way they have been taught American principles. It is not set forth in the amendment whether or not these 25,000 or 50,000, or whatever number may be agreed on, would be intermingled at the squad level, only one or two or five or six in a company, or whether they would be put in units all by themselves.

I believe that under the amendment the enlistees could come to the United States, but they could not serve in the United States. It provides for service outside continental United States. I would feel personally more favorable to the amendment if it were set forth specifically that the alien enlistees should come to the United States for training, and possibly then serve outside the United States. I say that because these enlistees are to become citizens of the United States at some time. We want to have them get a chance to have the principles of America inculcated during the training period.

In reality this would mean a fundamental change in our national policy. We have heretofore said to aliens, "If you are in the United States under our immigration laws you can apply for enlistment not only in the Army, but in any branch of the armed services." The amendment limits the enlistments to the Army, not providing for enlistments in the Air Force or the Navy. Therefore it is a fundamental change.

There are many people who feel that the United States should rely upon its own citizens in matters of security, and this is the most important point. There are many who feel that a move on our part such as that contemplated would subject the Nation to the criticism that our own people are not willing to bear arms in defense of the Nation and will not take care of our present obligations completely.

On that point I might mention the fact that the other countries, from which the applicants might come, sorely need them at home. The objection might be made by some nation that we were offering the young men of European countries a chance to leave their countries, when they are sorely needed at home right now, in the rehabilitation period. It is possible treaty complications might arise.

These are but a few of the controversial issues which arise from the proposition of enlisting aliens who are not residing in the United States. In view of the fact that none of these issues has been resolved, I feel that it would be unwise at this time to attempt to resolve them by attaching this proposal to the selective service bill. On the contrary, it can best be dealt with separately, and I think to some extent it has been dealt with separately in the fact that a few days ago we passed a displaced-persons bill allowing immigration to this country. I think there would be an appropriate time when the issue could be taken up and discussed so that it would not be submerged in the broader issues of selective service.

The committee considered the proposal, and I am speaking for the committee, although I realize that some of the members of the committee were not present when the actual vote on the amendment was taken.

For the reasons I have stated, I hope the amendment will not be attached to the pending bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I feel that the bill now pending is a measure to which we should attach this amendment. When we are about to draft the young manhood of this country, I think it is appropriate to give a very convincing showing that every alternate method for obtaining manpower has been used, and that we are not taking the young men of America except when we really have to. That is why I have urged that measures be taken so that the number of civilians in the Army be as large as possible, and that all work which could be performed by civilians in the service should be handled by civilians, so that the number of military personnel would by that number be reduced. That is why I have urged that this proposed action be taken at this time. I think the pending bill is a pertinent and appropriate measure to which to attach the provision.

I do not criticize the Senator from South Dakota at all, because it is not his fault, it is the fault of the situation in which we find ourselves in the Senate, but when I had my hearing, of 13 members of the committee only 4 were present, and I do not think I would do any better if I had a hearing at any other time. I do not believe I would be any better off if I were to take the amendment up separately as a bill. The Senator from South Dakota has been a Member of the Senate for a long time, and he knows very well that there is not any chance at all of getting what I am proposing done at this session unless it is done now. So let us not talk about taking it up as a separate measure. If we wait to have it taken up as a separate measure, it will never be taken up.

I have stated many times that of course what is proposed is not to be done in any way so as to offend any foreign nation. It is not going to be done unless a treaty or agreement is reached with a foreign nation authorizing it. So let us not talk about that, because that is not in question at all. It cannot be in question. When the Senator from South Dakota mentions that, he is mentioning something which could not occur.

I have stated many times—and the Army has indicated it clearly, and I am sorry the Senator from South Dakota was not aware of it—that the men to be brought in under my amendment would be mingled at the squad level, would be put into American units with American young men. That is not set forth in the amendment. It should not be set forth in the amendment. We should not put things like that in statutes. I do not believe the Senator from South Dakota would favor our saying how many men there should be in an infantry rifle company, or how many stripes a first sergeant should wear. I do not think it is the business of Congress to do things of that kind. But it is the plan of the Army to take these young men and put them in the existing units, sprinkle them through. If anyone knows of a better way to Americanize aliens than to put them with groups of young American men for 24 hours a day, then I do not know what it is.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I fully agree with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. However, it occurs to me that if the plan he is proposing is to be carried out as he is proposing it, the provision now in his amendment in lines 7 and 8, namely, "for service outside of the continental United

States, its Territories, and possessions," might well be omitted. Otherwise I am afraid the Senator would find that there would be a lack of flexibility, so that the amount of training would not be available, the desired work, and the desired approach which perhaps would be needed in this connection could not be exercised in any way, shape, or manner. So if it would meet with the approval of the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to move to modify his amendment by eliminating the words which I have just read in lines 7 and 8. I should like to inquire also if that would meet with the approval of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. First I should like to know exactly what the amendment is. I understand that there is some change proposed to be made in the language appearing in line 7.

Mr. IVES. Rather than deleting the words I have indicated, in order to leave the discretion entirely with the armed services, and in order to make it more clear, I would add words. I would leave the ones that are now in the amendment as they are, and in line 7, after the word "years", I would insert "for training in the United States and."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. As I see it, then, one of these enlistees could be sent to the United States for training, and would be placed with a unit, and the unit might be ordered to duty outside the United States or might not be. If it was ordered to duty inside the United States, the applicant would have to be selected out of that unit and sent to another unit which would see service outside the continental United States. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. LODGE. The modification proposed by the Senator from New York would make it possible for the Army to take these young men to the United States for training if they wanted to be trained here. They would not have to be trained here. I understood the proposal of the Senator from New York was made in an attempt to meet the suggestion made by the Senator from South Dakota in his earlier statement.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; but it would make it absolutely necessary that after the enlistees are trained they be assigned only to units that are outside the continental United States. Therefore, there would have to be two classes of combat units, one for the enlistees from overseas who could not serve in this country, and another kind of unit that could be assigned for duty anywhere, including inside the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that with only 25,000 that would not present a very formidable problem of classification. The modification proposed by the Senator from New York does not make it mandatory at all on the Army. The Army can bring the enlistees to the United States if the Army wants to do so, and then can put them in units which the Army knows are going overseas. That would not be an insuperable administrative task at all.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out that the amendment as now presented is intended to be sufficiently elastic to be interpreted appropriately by those in command of the armed forces.

Mr. LODGE. I accept the proposed modification of the Senator from New York, and will modify my amendment so that in line 8, after the word "years" there will be inserted the words "for training in the United States and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The change is in line 7.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, in line 7.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. After the word "years."

Mr. LODGE. After the word "years", insert the words "for training in the United States and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It may be out of order, but the Chair would like to make it quite certain that the interpretation given is clear in the RECORD. It seems to the Chair the language is mandatory and requires training in the United States.

Mr. LODGE. That should not be. The enlistee should not have to be trained in the United States if he does not want to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. We are having it pointedly presented to the Senate that a proposition of this kind has patently not been thoroughly thought out.

I may say further that this amendment certainly would complicate the problems of the Army in placing troops where they can best be used, for as the language is now modified, the amendment specifically says that the individuals have to be trained in the United States, and then after they are trained they cannot be placed where they can best be used, but must be used outside the continental United States; whereas we very well might want to use them in the Panama Canal Zone, in Alaska, or elsewhere. It certainly would complicate the picture for the Army, and in my opinion the mechanics of the amendment have not been thoroughly worked out.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have the amendment in proper form. In order to carry out the thought, I ask that my amendment be modified by striking out the language proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and in line 8, after the word "possessions", and insert a colon and the words "*Provided, however*, That enlistees may serve within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, for a training period not to exceed an aggregate of 6 months."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts has modified his amendment as he has just stated the modification.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that that is in accord with what the Army authorities want to have done. The amendment is well thought out. It is simply because it has not been given the consideration it should that we are obliged to do this kind of thing on the floor. But the basic principle of the amendment has been very well thought out, and it would not impose an insuperable administrative task on the Army at all.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to address an inquiry if I may, to the Senator from South Dakota. Unfortunately it has not been possible for me to be present during all the debate on the subject now under consideration, but I think I understood the Senator from South Dakota to say some minutes ago that one of the basic reasons he had for opposing the amendment was that he felt that in terms of patriotism Americans generally would provide the necessary manpower for any crisis. I wonder if the Senator would restate his position in that respect.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I presented several points during the course of my discussion of the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, but the basic reason why the Members of the Senate in attendance at the committee meetings when the amendment was considered opposed it was that there are those who feel that such a move on our part would subject the United States to the criticism that our own people are not willing to bear arms in the defense of the Nation, to do the complete job.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if that is a legitimate position when actually we are now considering the need, if I understand correctly, for a draft, and only for one reason, which is that on a volunteer basis we are not finding it possible in the United States to provide for the personnel needs of our Military Establishment. Does that happen to be a fact? Is that why we are actually grappling with this proposed draft?

Mr. GURNEY. That is actually the condition. The Senator has a point there. There is no question about it. Volunteers are not coming in in sufficient numbers to supply our manpower needs. Nevertheless, ours is the only country which today does not have a selective service system in operation. In time of emergency we have always had a selective service system, and every other nation has a selective service system. Whenever there are good times in a country, when there are opportunities for civilians to find desirable employment, it is difficult to find a sufficient number of volunteers. Certainly if a shooting war began we would secure more volunteers than we are securing now. We are betwixt and between. Therefore the boys do not know which way to go. I certainly do not believe that the country wants to acknowledge that we cannot get 25,000, the number mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. It happens to be my opinion that in the event of a fighting war and violent trouble we would get all the volunteers we needed. The Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Washington happen to be in complete agreement on that score.

The junior Senator from Washington intends to support the legislation presently before the Senate; but I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is deserving of all the positive study and consideration we can possibly give to it. On the basis of my own experience in other countries, I have a very high regard for the young men of other nations between the ages of 18 and 35, which I believe is the limit in the amendment. They are precisely the same types, so far as character and ability are concerned, as the immigrants who helped so materially to make this great country what it has become in the twentieth century. I believe that if we could lessen, in an intelligent way, the military-preparedness burden on the American people by utilizing the fine young men of Europe, many of whom found their sympathies and activities on our side during the war, for the betterment of this country and the maintenance of our far-flung commitments throughout the world, we would be fortunate indeed. I would not construe it as an insult to a single American citizen domiciled in this country if we were so wise as to use the best of the rest of the world and hold out to them the strength of this democracy, of which they could become citizens if they earned that right over a 5-year period.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I invite the attention of the Senator from Washington to another problem, which is a big problem before Congress, and that is the problem of successfully operating the several plans which we have approved for the rehabilitation of the countries of Europe. We are spending great sums of money to send food to Europe, and to build up the economy of European nations. For what purpose? To get those countries back on an operating basis. Can those countries get back on an operating basis if at the same time—to use the words of the Senator from Massachusetts—we offer to the cream of their citizenship, the young men between 18 and 35, the opportunity for American citizenship, and say to them, "You do not need to stay over there and make your country work. Join our Army and come to the United States." That is the point. It seems that we are hauling one way and pulling the other.

Mr. CAIN. It seems very clear to me that this country, for the most natural reasons known to man, is trying a great many experiments throughout the world, many of which are not based, by any stretch of the imagination, on the obvious merit of the experiment which is included in the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. When the Senator from South Dakota says that draining off 50,000 men among the cream of Europe to serve our purposes would defeat the reconstruction purposes of all of Europe, I do not think it is a valid position.

Mr. GURNEY. The amendment has been modified to provide for 25,000 instead of 50,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota has now placed himself in the position where his strongest argument against the amendment is that to take 25,000 young men out of Europe would scuttle the Marshall plan, he is hard up for arguments. I do not believe that that would be true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. We ought first to agree that the number is only 25,000, and not 50,000, as I have heard in the cloakroom.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment was modified to 25,000, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the quota provisions of our immigration laws we are allowing people to come into this country each year. All they have to do is go to the consul in some foreign country and get on the quota list. In return for the privilege of coming here and ultimately becoming citizens of this country, they assume absolutely no responsibility whatsoever. If we do not want anyone to come into this country, and say so, that is certainly a logical proposition. But here are men who agree, for five long years, to assume the responsibilities of citizenship by serving in one of the most difficult positions in which a patriotic citizen of this country is called upon to serve, namely, in the Army. They agree to be subject to the call of the Government, to be ordered anywhere on the face of the earth. Those men agree to do that for five long years, and then they are offered the privilege of becoming citizens.

My point is this: An immigrant to this country comes here and becomes a citizen under our laws without any responsibility whatsoever for service to the Government. These men, in order to show that they love the country, in order to show that they are patriotic, in order to show that they want to become citizens of the United States, agree to serve for five long years in the armed services. In other words, they qualify by the highest test of their worthiness to become citizens of the Republic. The other immigrants whom we admit discharge no responsibilities whatsoever. They do not qualify in any other way, except that they are not imbeciles and they are not Communists. That is about all we require of the immigrants who normally come to this country under the quota system. Under the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts these men discharge, for five long years, the highest obligation of citizenship, which is to contribute something, to put something into the Government of the United States.

This is a new proposal. It is only natural that it should meet with some opposition and run into rough water. Only the other day an amendment was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] which was somewhat similar to the amendment which we are now discussing. The Senator from Illinois proposed to allow men who had served with the American forces a special preference under the displaced persons program. I certainly hope that the same logic will apply to this instance. If we are to allow people to come to the United States from all the countries of the world under a quota system, when they do nothing whatsoever to promote the sum total of the welfare of this country as a prerequisite to becoming citizens, it seems to me that we can let a mere 25,000 go into the armed services when they agree in advance, as a condition of citizenship, that they will serve 5 long years in the armed services. An honorable discharge is required before they can become citizens.

Now that number has been cut in half, I hope that the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee will at least take the amendment to conference. If he is unable to support it in conference, we shall understand that. But I believe that it ought to go to conference so that members of the House Committee, as well as Members of the Senate, may discuss the problem with Army officers and see whether or not there is real merit in the proposal.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I take issue with the Senator from Maryland when he says that these men would serve for 5 long years. They would be 5 short years.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why so?

Mr. GURNEY. I think we feed our soldiers quite well and clothe them quite well. We take care of them very well, compared with the conditions which prevail in other countries. I think that is the attraction. I am only citing the position of the committee, and a few views of my own. If the Senate wishes to settle the question, it is perfectly agreeable with me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The period of service would be 5 long years. It is no easy thing to leave one's home, his place of nativity, his loved ones, his friends, and his family, and go far beyond the sea to a strange country where a strange language is spoken. I believe that the period of service would be 5 very long years. The statement that it would be 5 short years is a mere assertion. It is not the statement of a fact. Those men would pay a high price for citizenship; and, having paid that price, they would be worthy of our consideration.

I renew my plea that the Chairman of the committee take the amendment to conference in the hope that the House will agree.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to propound one or two inquiries regarding this

amendment. A few moments ago the able Senator discussed what the Army wanted in respect to modification of the amendment. My question is whether the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Army favor this amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator entered the Chamber, I said the Army has favored it. The Army wrote a letter favoring it. Then the matter went to the State Department, because of the diplomatic aspects. In the State Department it got one of the wrong levels where these matters are not understood, and eventually an unfavorable report came from the State Department. Thereupon, the Army withdrew its letter. Then Secretary Marshall said, when the matter finally reached him, that he thought the proposal was worthy of serious study.

So, to answer the question specifically, several months ago the Army approved the amendment. The Army did not withdraw its approval because of military reasons, but it withdrew its approval because of State Department objection. Later, the Army approved it again. We have three or four letters on it.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that the proposal is that if any such soldiers are taken into the service of the United States, the arrangement will have to be satisfactory to the countries in which the soldiers retain their citizenship.

Mr. LODGE. It could be done only as a result of a treaty or agreement with those foreign countries.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to say, before concluding, that it seems to me this amendment is highly meritorious. Like the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I sincerely hope the amendment may be taken to conference, where serious study can be given with a view to attempting to incorporate in the bill something along the line of the amendment the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Illinois for what he has said, and I am also much obliged to the Senator from Maryland for the dramatic way in which he has expressed the difference between a young man joining our Army for 5 years and a normal immigrant.

Mr. President, this project requires some imagination. If one takes a routine, dry-as-dust view of this proposal, it may appear a little frightening. But how else are we to obtain soldiers who speak various languages, soldiers who will be so utterly vital to us?

Mr. President, I predict that if this proposal becomes law, both the Navy and the Air Force, if trouble ever begins again, will be looking for some of these young foreign officers because of their linguistic accomplishments; and in case of conflict, both the Navy and the Air Force will need them as much as the Army will.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In the event that any of these soldiers, after having served 5 years in our armed forces, desired to return to their native land—perhaps conditions might be such at the end of 5 years that they would not wish to stay in the United States, but would wish to return to the country of their birth—I undertake to say that after 5 years of experience with an American Army, no finer education could be obtained by them for the purpose of spreading the democratic way of life in the country from which they originally come. It seems to me that would be a wonderful way to help thousands of men learn the democratic way of life—men who perhaps would wish to return to their own soil, rather than to establish themselves in the United States.

Mr. LODGE. That is a novel point, and I think it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington would like to make a further observation in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. Among other things, in these troubled days we are looking for the very best Army we can get. We are not looking for anything short of the best. During the war, and in company with many other American soldiers, I saw quite a good deal of what were known as the American-Japanese soldiers, commonly called Nisei. I know of no single instance in which there was a detrimental mark against the record of any Nisei unit as it served during the whole of the last war in the American Army, and I think those men achieved that completely meritorious record because of their appreciation of the opportunities this country gave them and their respect for the obligations this country imposes upon them.

Therefore, because their appreciation would be comparable, it is my most considered opinion that if we were so fortunate as to carefully select 25,000 of the young men of the nations referred to by implication in the amendment, we would have at our disposal and disposition a corps of men who would turn out to be among the finest defenders of our faith that America has ever known.

Admittedly this is an experiment; but in these days, when, as the Senator has so well stated, we need the application of imagination, I think it is more likely that we would make—aye—a thousand mistakes in other directions before we would make a mistake by giving these young men an opportunity to work for and through this country.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we live in a day when, at this time, we engage, not in a war of bullets, not in a war of gas, not in bacteriological warfare, but in a war of ideals and ideas. In support of the suggestion, made both by inference and also in positive form by the Senator from Illinois, I judge that if we took 25,000 of the progressive, imaginative, uncynical young men of Europe and trained them in our ways, either as soldiers wearing our uniform or as citizens of this country, eventually to be returned to the land of their birth, that group of 25,000 would do more to sell America and our ideals to others than could be done by all the billions of dollars the Congress has voted in the last 18 months. During the time I have been in the Senate, I can think of few things so vitally important and deserving of support as the proposition advanced by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I have not been in the Chamber during all the discussion of the Senator's amendment. I wish to ask what would be done, under the amendment, in the case of the wife and children of such aliens who would be taken into the Army, and thereafter would become citizens of the United States? As the law now stands, a naturalized citizen has a right to bring his entire family into the United States.

Mr. LODGE. The present naturalization law would apply in such cases, just as in all similar cases today. No special arrangement would be made for them.

Mr. HAWKES. In other words, the families of such persons would enter the United States under the quotas for the respective countries from which the aliens have come; is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. The families would enter the United States just as happens today in the case of families of naturalized citizens. The amendment makes no change at all in that respect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been in the Appropriations Committee during the morning, and I have missed considerable of the debate in the Senate Chamber. I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I believe his amendment has a great deal of merit, and I am inclined to vote for it. I came in at a point when the Senator was saying, in answer to a question, that it would be necessary to obtain the approval, by agreement or otherwise, of the governments in Europe before such persons could enter our forces.

I should like to ask this question: What about the situation of some Balts whose country has been taken over by Russia by a unilateral decision by Russia? Those Balts have no government existing in their own country, although there may be a government in exile, somewhere. The same situation may apply to the Poles, who feel that they cannot go back to Poland, and yet they fought very well for the allied cause during the war.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to my friend from California that I made a rather complete statement on that point. I think a very large proportion of the men would come from the displaced persons. Of course no approval from any foreign government would be necessary for such men. If it were desired to get enlistees from England or France or

Italy, or other countries with a constituted government, in that case arrangement would have to be made with that country. But I believe as a practical matter the Polish and Baltic people and other displaced persons would supply a very large number of men.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was at the same meeting on appropriations the Senator from California has been attending. I should like to ask what nationals would be entitled to membership in the proposed unit? For example, would there be a German quota?

Mr. LODGE. There is no immigration quota required at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Are people of German extraction eligible?

Mr. LODGE. As I said in my opening statement, anti-Nazi Germans of course would be eligible, and I think the Army would get quite a number of them.

Mr. WHERRY. Would people beyond the Curzon line, who are of German ethnic origin, also be eligible, if they were anti-Nazi?

Mr. LODGE. That would be entirely within the discretion of the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator just answered the Senator from Nebraska that anti-Nazi Germany would be eligible. The Senator's amendment does not read that way.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. GURNEY. It refers to aliens of all nationalities.

Mr. LODGE. To aliens, that is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. It would include not only anti-Nazis but all Germans.

Mr. LODGE. It would include anybody.

Mr. GURNEY. I have no particular objection to that.

Mr. LODGE. The Army could enlist anybody it wanted to.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I want to make is, I want them to be made eligible.

Mr. LODGE. They are eligible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to ask the distinguished Senator, What was his reason for retaining in his amendment, over the objection, as I understood from the remarks a few moments ago, by the distinguished Senator from New York, the words "for service outside of the continental United States, its Territories and possessions"?

Mr. LODGE. Let me reply to the Senator from Florida by saying that while he was out of the Chamber I modified the language so as to add, after the word "possessions", a comma and the following: *"Provided, however,* That enlistees may serve within the United States, its Territories and possessions, for a training period not to exceed in an aggregate of 6 months." That means that they could be brought over here for a training period and would then serve in Alaska, the Caribbean and the Far East, because that is the plan, that is the desire of the Army as to where they want to use them. I also felt it might cause some anxiety if they could come here and then be stationed at Army posts all over the country. I think they could become Americanized very much quicker if they were overseas with American boys.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was in the Chamber when the amendment the Senator has just mentioned was placed in his amendment, but I still find in his amendment the words which to me are objectionable, "for service outside of the continental United States, its territories and possessions, and which under the rewording of the amendment still make it very clear that this provision is designed to secure some alien soldiers who, after a brief period of training here, will then necessarily be used in service outside the United States.

I may say to the able Senator I question the wisdom of that provision very greatly because I think it is fundamental to the American viewpoint toward military service and military affairs to distrust the idea of the use of mercenaries or hired troops. I think that this attitude is so fundamental to the viewpoint of our American people and so firmly established in all the pages of our history that it would discredit very largely the effort, the very fine effort, which the Senator is making.

I call to the attention of the Senator, and I suspect that his recollection of his own boyhood days in the study of history has already brought the memory back, that there is perhaps no one page in our history of the Revolutionary War which has caused more concern and more continuous feeling on the part of Americans toward the tactics that were employed by Great Britain at that time than the employment of mercenaries.

I recall that the feeling on that point was so strong that in the Declaration of Independence, among various recitals which were cataloged by the able pen of Thomas Jefferson as reasons to show that in fact "the history of the present King of Great Britain," as he referred to the then King, "is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations," was the recital, "He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death," and so forth.

I think the conviction is deeply rooted in the United States to disapprove the idea of the use of mercenaries. I call the attention of the able Senator to the fact that he is here giving a weapon to those who are interested in impugning by propaganda every motive of ours, no matter how good. He is giving them a weapon which will surely be used, if he keeps in his amendment these words which mark the aliens for preferred and exclusive service, not in America, but on foreign shores.

I call further to the attention of the distinguished Senator the fact that in my judgment he is making a departure from something that has been found to be very sound policy in the history of our Army. The first unit to which the junior Senator from Florida was assigned as an officer in World War I was a little coast artillery battery serving at Key West. Two of the very finest soldiers in that outfit were Irish sergeants, both of whom had served with the Lancers in the British Army during the Boer War. They had come to America, they had enlisted in our Army, and had gone up step by step. One of them still lives at Key West. He is one of our honored citizens there now, retired from the Army, of course, and long ago having become an American citizen.

For years, under this provision, we attracted many men who could qualify otherwise to come into our Army, and then gave them under our laws preferred standing in their applications of citizenship, after they had served, I believe, 3 years with our armed forces.

I call attention of the Senator to the fact that in my judgment he is not only giving a weapon to those who will strike at the worthiness of the very fine motives which are animating him, but he is also departing unnecessarily from what I think has been found to be very excellent policy in connection with inviting enlistment by fine aliens into our armed forces.

So I am hoping the distinguished Senator will see fit to strike the words, "for service outside of the continental United States, its Territories and possessions," because otherwise it seems to me he puts himself in the position not only of changing the fine and well-established principle of inviting elistments from good men among the aliens, but he also puts himself in the position of marking the enlistees as fit only to be with us for a brief period of training and then as required to go to foreign soil for service, where very certainly they will be charged with being mercenaries, and, though we are now the outspoken advocate of democracy in all the world and so regarded, we shall be charged, it seems to me with some justice, with having done exactly the thing to which we objected so seriously on the part of Great Britain when she sent the Hessian mercenaries over here during the Revolution.

I am hoping that the Senator will, for those reasons, if they appeal to him, delete those words, which would leave the matter purely and simply on the basis of authorizing the enlistment of 25,000 men from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age or more than 35 years of age, for an enlistment period of not less than 5 years. I believe that would accomplish the Senator's purpose. I believe it would guard the proposal against very powerful objections which will be addressed against it on this side of the water by American citizens who do not like mercenaries, and also protect it against criticism by people on the other side of the water who are anxious to criticize everything we do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will state why the language is in the amendment, so that the other Members of the Senate may see whether it is in for a good reason. Let me say, first, that we will have our motives questioned, no matter what we do. If we do not do anything, we will have our motives questioned. I do not believe we have to worry very much about that. We must try to make up our minds as to what is right,

do it, and then let events decide whether we were right.

I put this language in the amendment because I know where the Army would want to use these men. It is a very hard thing to take young Americans out of America in time of peace and send them to Korea. It has a very depressing effect. It is not that they cannot "stand the gaff" physically; it is not a reflection on their courage; but we have such a wonderful country that our people do not like to leave it. In the old world, where there are famine, disease, the ravages of war, and other bad conditions, a young man goes overseas with a great deal of enthusiasm. If a young German or a young Pole were accepted and sent to Korea in the United States Army, their morale would be high. It would not be at all the serious thing for them that it would be for an American soldier.

So the amendment accomplishes two things. It relieves us of the need of imposing service on our own young men which they find extremely disagreeable; it enables young aliens to render service which is not disagreeable to them at all, and it sets up the whole thing on a basis of mutuality, which is the only successful basis. They get citizenship, which is something we give them, and they render us a useful and unique service which we cannot do as well for ourselves. These men are no more to be compared with the Hessians than black is to be compared with white. There will be only 25,000 of them. That is less than 7 percent. They will be sprinkled through the Army. If anyone can say that that makes Hessians out of them, he is capable of saying anything. They will not be drafted, anyway.

Those are my reasons for the language. Maybe my statement does not convince the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the answer of the Senator. I want to call his attention, in closing this feature of the debate, to the fact that everything he has said with reference to the desirability of using these enlistees in foreign service is capable of being wholly fulfilled if he accepts the amendment which I have suggested, because if it be true that the Army wants to use such alien enlistees primarily for service on foreign soil, it certainly may so use them, because the Senator will remember the old saying, "He's in the Army now," which will apply to each soldier covered by this amendment and he will be used wherever the Army wishes to use him.

I respectfully call the Senator's attention to the fact that the retention of these words subjects his amendment to criticism on this side of the water, and to what is more serious, misunderstanding and misrepresentation on the other side of the water. If the very thing he wishes to do can be done with complete ease and assurance, without including the questionable words, what, then, is the wisdom of insisting upon their inclusion?

I again express the hope that the distinguished Senator will see fit to amend section 2 so as to end it after the words "5 years", and strike out the reference to compulsory service outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is an experiment. It is one that appeals to a person's imagination. I think we would arouse a good deal of apprehension if the language were not in the amendment. I have told the Senator why it is in, but I have not convinced him. But there it is.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, as the one who first proposed eliminating the words to which the Senator from Florida points at the present time, I would say that it seems to me that the Senator from Massachusetts has given very good reasons why, in the present instance, it is just as well to leave the amendment as it is. That is why, after proposing the deletion of the words in question, I yielded to him, and he left in the phraseology which now stands in the amendment as a part of the modification. Therefore, it seems to me, under those circumstances it would be well to let the amendment rest as it is, modified as it is, and try to adopt it if we can.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to add to the debate except to make one statement, namely, whether the amendment suggested by the Senator from Florida is adopted, or whether the original language remains, the amendment will be wide open in conference, and if it be desirable to change it there, after consulting with the Army authorities, either version can then be agreed upon by the conferees. So we are not passing final legislation at this stage of the game, and we should act with that in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], as modified, adding a new subsection on page 3, line 22, of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hawkes	O'Conor	
Hayden	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, during the call of the roll I had opportunity to confer with some Members of the Senate regarding the provisions of the first section of the amendment. I now realize that it perhaps is better to leave the matter in the discretion of the Army. Therefore, I have modified the amendment by putting a period after the word "years", on line 7, and striking out the remainder of the sentence, so that as modified the amendment will read:

The Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized until June 30, 1950, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army not to exceed 25,000 in number from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age nor more than 35 years of age for an enlistment period of not less than 5 years.

The remainder of the amendment is as printed. I ask for a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts has been modified as he has suggested. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays. This is a very important amendment. I shall have to ask for another quorum call if the Senator from Massachusetts is not willing to have a yea and nay vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think a yea and nay vote is necessary, but if the Senator from Virginia desires to have one, it is satisfactory to me.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May the amendment again be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 22, it is proposed that a new subsection be added, as follows:

SEC. 2. (b) (1) The Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized until June 30, 1950, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army not to exceed 25,000 in number from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age nor more than 35 years of age for an enlistment period of not less than 5 years.

(2) Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlist in the Regular Army under the provisions of section 2 (b) (1) of this act nor to their dependents and beneficiaries.

(3) So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat. ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads "; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army" is hereby suspended until June 30, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHITE. My colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. He has authorized me to say that if he were present he would vote "yea" on this amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea."

The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Holland	O'Mahoney
Ball	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Tydings
Capehart	Lucas	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Feazel	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Flanders	Morse	Young
Fulbright	Murray	
George	Myers	

NAYS—33

Byrd	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cooper	Langer	Sparkman
Cordon	McClellan	Stennis
Eastland	McGrath	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Maybank	Umstead
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Williams
Hickenlooper	Pepper	Wilson

NOT VOTING—20

Barkley	Dworshak	Magnuson
Brewster	Hatch	Reed
Bricker	Jenner	Saltonstall
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Bushfield	McCarran	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Wagner
Downey	McMahon	

So Mr. LODGE's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida;

S. 424. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the district of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins, and others;

S. 692. An act to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business;

S. 873. An act for the relief of Warren H. McKenney;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1249. An act authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes;

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, organized reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes;

S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036);

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen;

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946;

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army;

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174);

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels;

S. 1861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service;

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.;

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.;

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes;

S. 2288. An act to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction;

S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft;

S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances;

S. 2479. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States;

S. 2496. An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described;

S. 2553. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.;

S. 2592. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings;

S. 2593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.; and

S. 2643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3628. An act to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; and

H. R. 5065. An act to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of

the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HORAN, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. BATES of Kentucky, and Mr. FOGARTY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 8, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1025. An act to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska; and

S. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the first of my four amendments for consideration at this time, the amendment being the amendment lettered "F." This amendment deals with the procedure for handling conscientious objectors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On pages 26 and 27, it is proposed to strike out, beginning with the word "religious" on page 26, line 12, to and including the word "direction" on page 27, line 1, and insert the following:

A National Commission on Conscientious Objectors to be composed of three or more civilians to be appointed by the President shall prescribe the conditions under which persons claiming exemption under this subsection shall (a) be inducted into the armed forces, (b) be assigned to noncombatant services, (c) be assigned to special service of national importance with governmental or approved private agencies operating in the public good at home or abroad, or (d) be deferred.

On pages 27 and 28, it is proposed to strike out beginning with the word "upon", on page 27, line 5, up to and including the word "forces", on page 28, line 17, and insert the following:

If such claim is not sustained by the appropriate appeal board, the person claiming exemption shall be entitled to an appeal to the National Commission on Conscientious Objectors. The said Commission after notice and hearing shall, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, determine the validity and sincerity of such claim and whether the person claiming exemption shall (a) be inducted into the armed forces, (b) be assigned to noncombatant service, (c) be assigned to special service of national importance with governmental or approved private agencies operating in the public good at home or abroad, or (d) be deferred. The National Commission on Conscientious Objectors shall have authority to establish such subordinate boards as may be necessary and prescribe, with the approval of the President, such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this section, including pay and dependency allowances.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on this amendment. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that yesterday I discussed this particular amendment. My discussion will be found on pages 7277 and 7279 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

By way of recapitulation and reiteration of what I said yesterday, I wish again to make it perfectly clear that I hold no brief for conscientious objectors. As I stated yesterday, I find it difficult to understand their point of view and their conviction that in time of war they should not bear arms in defense of their country. However, under the Constitution of the United States conscientious objectors holding their convictions on grounds of religious faith are entitled to protection from service in the armed forces, insofar as combat service is concerned.

We have in this country groups of devoted religionists who see in war service a conflict with their religious convictions. I have the highest respect for such deep religious convictions, although I do not share their particular religious belief in this respect. I point out to the Senate, for example, that in my opinion, no finer citizenry exists in this country than the Friends, or Quakers, as they are so frequently called, many of whom hold convictions of conscientious objection insofar as military service is concerned.

They have made a valuable contribution in the history of our country. In fact, the Constitution of the United States would not be what it is today, the greatest document of freedom in the world, were it not for the contributions of the Quakers in the constitutional convention. Therefore I believe that in the passage of this bill we should be very careful to see to it that we are exceedingly fair to the Friends and to other religionists who hold conscientious objections so far as military service is concerned. We should see to it that the procedures which we adopt for the handling of conscientious objectors also square with the constitutional guarantee which is theirs.

As I indicated yesterday, I recognize the fact that there are those who seek to take advantage of the constitutional protection of religious freedom by alleging a conscientious objection to service in the military when, in fact, such objection does not spring from religious conviction and faith. But I think it is possible procedurally to separate those who are truly conscientious objectors from those who are malingering and who claim to have religious convictions which they in fact do not possess. I recognize that we must watch out for those who may seek to escape a draft or military service under any guise they can adopt in order to free themselves from serving their country in the armed forces.

I feel that we should profit from the experiences we had in the last war in the handling of conscientious objectors. The record is perfectly clear that the true conscientious objector, the person who holds his convictions against military service out of deep religious faith, is a person of great courage. Conscientious objectors of this type have so demonstrated over and over again, not only during the last war, but also in the preceding World War. The true conscientious objector is no physical coward. In the last war, for example, we had—operating on a civilian assignment—a group of conscientious objectors who functioned as paratroopers in connection with fighting forest fires in the United States. Some of them served in the great Pacific Northwest. Although their parachute jumps were made under circumstances somewhat different from those attaching to parachute jumps made under combat conditions, nevertheless, I think each Member of the Senate will agree that anyone who parachutes from an airplane under any circumstances is anything but a physical coward. We also have had conscientious objectors serving in other capacities in which great physical danger to their bodies existed. Of course, I am speaking of the true conscientious objector who as a matter of religious faith cannot reconcile military service with his religious convictions.

In the last war we had much experience with conscientious objectors; and yesterday I placed in the RECORD a report of the Department of Justice on conscientious objectors, submitted by the then Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Francis Biddle. It will be found that his report is printed on page 7278 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the beginning of the third column of that page it will be seen that the Attorney General informs us that a total of 11,295 conscientious-objector cases were referred to the Department of Justice from October 16, 1940, through June 30, 1944, and that on the latter date 561 cases were pending.

The report further says:

In the treatment of the conscientious-objector problem we have profited, I believe,

from our experience in the last war. Nevertheless we have not met this problem—or, more accurately, this series of problems—with entire satisfaction, and it may be appropriate to take stock of the situation at this time.

The present law made two important departures from the provisions of the 1917 act. That act had defined conscientious objectors narrowly to include only those who belonged to an established religious sect teaching opposition to war, and it required such objectors to be inducted into the armed services for noncombatant duty. The difficulties thereby raised were so great that by Executive Order in 1918 provision was made for detached service for those inductees found by a special board to be sincere conscientious objectors to all forms of war. In the present law, the requirement of membership in a pacifist religious group was eliminated, and separate classifications were established for those who were objectors to combatant service and those who were objectors to noncombatant service as well.

In this report the Attorney General discusses the experience they had in the handling of conscientious objectors. He closes the report with a paragraph which I think is highly significant to the Members of the Senate in connection with a consideration of the amendment now pending. This is what the then Attorney General said in his report on conscientious objectors, based upon the experience they had with the procedure worked out during the war; and I suggest that these words be marked carefully, because I think they should be given great weight in determining our final vote on the amendment I have offered:

> It is evident that many complexities have been encountered on both the legislative and administrative levels, and that while greater flexibility has been achieved than in the last war there is again presented an opportunity to profit from experience. In any further consideration of the selective-service legislation, or any further adoption of peacetime military training, it will be necessary to weigh the administrative, psychological, and ethical problems of conscientious objection which have not yet been fully solved.

Mr. President, I emphasize this sentence:

> The Congress may well consider the desirability of meeting these complexities by establishing a board to deal especially with conscientious objectors, having final discretion with respect to their proper individual classifications as well as their prompt assignment to suitable and useful work.

It was because I was convinced that the Attorney General, on the basis of the experience set forth in his excellent report, which I included in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was entirely correct when he suggested that a separate board be set up to handle the conscientious objector problem, that I proceeded to make a study of this matter.

I do not offer this amendment on behalf of any organization. I offer it on behalf of myself, on the basis of my own study of this problem. It is true that many organizations endorse my amendment; but I wish to make very clear that in standing here today advocating this amendment, I do not do so as the mouthpiece of any organization which may be seeking to have the amendment adopted, but I am advocating the amendment because I think that from the standpoint of both the principle and procedure proposed in the amendment it is an exceedingly sound one.

I wish to make some statements in support of the amendment; but first, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear for future reference, it will be noted that I have provided for a national commission on conscientious objectors, to be composed of three or more civilians. In that connection I emphasize the word "civilians."

In the second part of the amendment I provide for an appropriate appeal procedure, thus giving to conscientious objectors what is so dearly cherished in the United States, namely, the right to have an appeal in case they feel that the so-called lower commission has not dealt correctly with their case, I have provided for an appeal procedure which gives them the right to have a final determination made, in keeping with the wise judicial process in this country of having the rights of the individual subject, in case of litigation, to review on appeal.

The first point, a point which goes to the question of an important principle that I want to emphasize as strongly as I can. We are dealing here with a problem arising out of the Constitution of the United States itself. The problem has no connection whatever with military jurisdiction. It is not a problem that invites the Military Establishment to exercise any control or jurisdiction over it whatever. It should be separated from the general draft procedure. The problem, if it is proper to characterize any problem as a civilian problem, is clearly civilian in its nature. It goes to the question of civilian rights under the Constitution of the United States.

I restate it this way: I am raising my voice in a plea here today for something which is pretty dear in the American system, namely, that the rights of the individual, the civil rights of the individual, the civilian rights of the individual, shall be determined by civilian personnel and by procedure administered by civilian personnel. The determination of the facts and the evidence inherent in the question as to whether or not Mr. X, to use a hypothetical person, is or is not a conscientious objector in the sense that the Constitution of the United States gives him religious freedom, should be determined not by men in the military or draft boards administering a military draft act, but by representatives of a civilian board separate and distinct from a board administering a military act. After all, ours is a civilian Government. I do not think it wise, I do not think it augurs well for the future, to vest in military personnel jurisdiction and power and right to pass judgment on whether or not the facts dealing with my hypothetical man, Mr. X, properly exempt him under the Constitution of the United States from military service.

The second point I desire to stress is a very human one. I said yesterday in my few remarks on this amendment that we are dealing with a group of our people and our citizenry whom many of us cannot quite understand. They perplex us so far as their convictions are concerned. We never have shared their religious experience, we have never shared the spiritual drive which has conditioned them to form the conviction which causes them to say as a matter of religious scruple, "Loving my country as I do, I love my God more, and I believe that, as a matter of religious faith, I would not be true to my God if I fought my fellow men in war." We do not understand that type of religious conviction Mr. President. Those of us who do not share the point of view of the true, sincere conscientious objector feel—and I think I state it rather accurately when I put it in this way—that, after all, as to temporal matters, as to those things which affect our civilian duties, we have a patriotic obligation to serve our country in time of war, even by means of taking human life in order to protect the national security of our land, and we leave to our God questions of our conscience.

But the fact that we cannot understand and do not understand and fully appreciate the religious faith and the spiritual beliefs of the conscientious objectors I think should make us overcautious and cause us to lean over backwards to make certain we deal with exceeding fairness with the conscientious objector. We should make very sure that we give to him all the protections to which he is entitled under the Constitution.

One of those protections to my mind, is to have his case passed upon by a separate civilian board. It is a psychological problem, too. The feelings of conscientious objectors involves a great many psychological considerations. I have talked to many of them as I have worked on this amendment, and they have told me without a single exception that they do not feel that persons of their point of view can possibly be convinced that they will get the type of fair hearing to which they are entitled under the laws of the land if their cases are to be passed upon by military personnel or by draft boards obligated to administer for the military this act. I do not share their distrust of the military. I do not share their views that men in uniform will not render judicial judgment on the basis of the evidence and the facts presented to them. But the fact that I feel that way in no way changes the psychology of the conscientious objectors. They look upon themselves as civilians; and they are, of course. They feel that they are standing for a civilian right. They feel that, under the Constitution, they are entitled to a procedure which brings their cases before a separate independent civilian commission for consideration and final determination.

It is difficult to read the report of the Department of Justice on the handling of conscientious objection problems during the war without realizing that, after that very valuable experience, the Attorney General himself came to the conclusion that the question of making provision for a civilian board should be given very careful consideration by the Senate when determining the Federal procedure designed to cover conscientious objectors. I cannot read the sentence which appears in the Attorney General's report

on page 7279 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with any other meaning, when he said:

> Congress may well consider the desirability of meeting these complexities by establishing a board to deal especially with conscientious objectors, having final discretion with respect to their proper individual classifications as well as their proper assignment to suitable and useful work.

One other point, Mr. President, and I shall be through with respect to this amendment.

The Senate would find, if it talked to men in our Military Establishment, that they have no serious objection to this particular amendment. They have not sent to us any letters or messages endorsing the amendment—and I shall be very interested in hearing what the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my good friend from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], has to say on the attitude of the armed services regarding my amendment—but, if I am correctly advised, the heads of the armed services have no strong objections to it. In fact, I think it is proper to say that most of them would tell Senators, off the record, that they would welcome being relieved of this very troublesome problem. It was a troublesome problem for them throughout the war. As I said yesterday, many hours of local draft board time was consumed in connection with conscientious objection problems. Some officers in the Pentagon Building found it constantly one of the troublesome issues on the domestic front which confronted them throughout the war. I think, Mr. President, particularly in a peacetime draft—although I would propose the same amendment for a wartime draft—conscientious objectors should be relieved from the jurisdiction of the military and the draft boards functioning under this act. Note, Mr. President, the statement I am about to read. It was very interesting to me when I read the Attorney General's report to find the amount of labor that went into the consideration of the cases of conscientious objectors by the personnel required to handle the question. He says, for example, in his report:

> On July 1, 1943, 2,094 such cases were pending in the department, and 2,111 new cases were received during the year. A total of 3,644 cases were disposed of either by formal recommendation or by return for such reasons as lack of jurisdiction, withdrawal of claim, or administrative irregularity.

He also says in the report that they had working on the problem 131 hearing officers, devoted to the task of hearing cases of conscientious objectors and passing final judgment upon them. We need a simplication of the procedure that was used during the war. My amendment will provide it in accordance with the report of the Department of Justice.

Before taking my seat, Mr. President, I want to say that I was greatly aided in the preparation of this amendment by a study of the British system of handling conscientious objectors. Of course, the concepts of religious freedom are as dear to the British as they are to Americans. It will be found that under the British system they recognize the importance of the civilian approach to a problem which, after all, certainly is not a military one. The procedure followed in England and Canada in handling conscientious objectors is similar to the procedure set out in my amendment.

I shall ask for approval of my amendment after I hear the Senator from South Dakota. I shall ask for a record vote on this particular amendment, and I trust that my colleagues will give me the courtesy of such a vote.

In summary, I think there is involved a very important constitutional principle which ought to be handled on a civilian, rather than on a military, basis, In the second place, I think from the psychological standpoint of the conscientious objector himself he is entitled to a civilian judgment upon his case and not a judgment by the military man or draft boards which handle all types of draft cases. Thirdly, I think the form and the procedure of my amendment will do the job in a very commendable and efficient fashion. Therefore I offer the amendment to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Holland	Reed
Buck	Ives	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Cooper	Lucas	Sparkman
Cordon	McCarthy	Stewart
Donnell	McClellan	Taft
Dworshak	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McKellar	Thye
Ecton	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Malone	Umstead
Feazel	Martin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon provides for a change in the method of handling conscientious objectors under the Selective Service Act in force during World War II. It proposes that a separate board or commission be set up to take care of the conscientious-objector problem. It also provides, in the last line of the amendment, that the Commission, with the approval of the President, may authorize "pay and dependency allowances."

Our committee believes that the way the conscientious objectors were taken care of during the war worked out very well, generally, with the full approval of the country. The bill which is now pending follows the 1940 act, with very few technical amendments, worked out by those in Selective Service who had charge of the conscientious-objector problem during the war.

The committee also recommended that in case a conscientious objector doing civilian work was disabled, or died during the work because of an accident, he should receive compensation similar to that provided for any other civil-service employee, or his estate should be compensated accordingly. The committee recommends that that provision for death and disability be incorporated in the bill, and it is in the bill as presently before the Senate. As I said, it parallels very closely the 1940 act.

Basically, the proposed amendment proposes fundamental changes in the treatment of conscientious objectors. In the first place, it would create a national commission. The commission would to a marked extent intervene in the functions performed by the local boards. The Senate must understand that during the war the local boards had almost full control over the question as to who was a conscientious objector and who was not. If a local board disapproved of a claim for exemption, the finding went to the State board, and there was the right of appeal to the national board. As Senators will remember, conscientious objectors who wanted to serve in noncombatant troops, such as medical-aid men or corpsmen, were put in uniform but not given combat duties. I may say that they performed yeoman service. Those whose conscientious objections did not go to the point where they did not want to put on uniforms were given noncombatant work and came under military control, but were always kept out of combat. Those whose religious beliefs prevented them from engaging in combat work, or prevented them entirely from putting on a uniform, were put into conscientious objectors' camps and, as will be remembered, performed service in civilian hospitals, worked at farm labor, in parks, and so forth. But the local board first made the findings.

The Commission which is proposed to be created by the amendment would also exercise a sort of dual responsibility with the armed forces with respect to this class of registrants. Actually, as the bill is now written, conscientious objectors are treated very liberally and very fairly. The contention that they are under the thumb of the military is not borne out, even by the most casual reading of the bill. The bill clearly states that conscientious objectors who refuse any type of service in uniform are to be assigned to work under civilian not military control.

The problem of dealing with conscientious objectors is a most difficult one, and I can see no merit to a plan which, as its only recommendation, simply creates another commission superimposed on top of our already complicated administrative structure, to prescribe

conditions of treatment for conscientious objectors.

The second amendment in this proposal, which would strike out the major portions of pages 27 and 28, does not seem to do anything really constructive for the conscientious objectors. Heretofore, the Department of Justice has investigated appeals which the objectors make from the local boards. The amendment places the duty upon the newly created commission. What we are after really are the facts, and the Department of Justice has always shown itself perfectly capable of uncovering the facts. A new commission for that purpose is not necessary.

The local selective service board, which classifies these men, would have no way in which to ascertain whether or not they were simply attempting to evade service, rather than having a bona fide conscientious objection. Therefore, striking that part of the section having to do with investigation by the Department of Justice would preclude the thorough investigation needed in these cases.

The plan suggested in the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would require the establishment of a separate government agency appointed by the President, to operate a program for conscientious objectors. If the amendment were adopted the time between the passage of this measure and the adjournment of Congress would preclude the obtaining of a budget for such a project. Therefore it would not be possible until Congress reconvenes in 1949, next year, to carry out the provisions of the amendment. The Office of Selective Service Records has already prepared the budget for the operation of a program as outlined in the presently prepared legislation, and it is now being considered by the Bureau of the Budget.

It is contemplated that the operation of a program under the selective-service system for conscientious objectors in work of national importance shall be under the control of civilians. It was under the control of civilians during the war. The National Selective Service Board handled it, with civilian advisers. The proposed operation under the bill will be about as follows: The Director will appoint, from representatives of churches to which men who claim conscientious objection are members, an advisory board to aid him in establishing the character and type of work of national importance which will be done by men exempted on the ground that they are conscientious objectors.

If the amendment prevails, and no agency is provided to receive conscientious objectors from local boards when so classified, it will mean that they will simply be deferred without any responsibility for any type or character of service, and this particular classification will then be very attractive to those who have already indicated that they intend to evade service through civil disobedience.

The bill as now written provides no authority for pay for conscientious objectors who are opposed to any type of military service. This parallels in identical detail the act which was in effect during the war.

Actually, providing pay for these individuals imposes a hardship on them—strange as that may seem. If they are paid by the Federal Government they can properly work only for the Federal Government; they cannot work for private individuals or institutions, because in such an event the Federal Government is in the obvious position of subsidizing the individuals or institutions for whom the conscientious objector works. The net effect, therefore, is that the conscientious objector cannot be assigned to work in a civilian hospital, on a State reclamation program, or on privately owned farms. Should he be assigned to such work the Federal Government is subsidizing the program; and should the hospital or the State or the individual farmer pay him a salary, the conscientious objector is in the position of earning much more than men who are in the armed forces. The only employment left would be in large work camps operated by the Federal Government, and this deprives the conscientious objector of the best fields for his endeavor. The procedure followed during World War II, when the local agency or individual paid the salary, has therefore been adhered to.

In view of these reasons, and possibly others, the committee recommends that the amendment be not accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I shall reply to the Senator from South Dakota very briefly, because I think my amendment clearly speaks for itself. When the Senator from South Dakota says that the procedure provided by the pending bill follows very closely and is very similar to the procedure which was followed in the handling of conscientious objectors during the last war, in my judgment he proves my case. He is proposing for a peacetime draft the continuation of a procedure for the handling of conscientious objectors which is almost identical with the procedure which was followed during the war. Thereby he confesses that he is not willing to take advantage of the lessons we learned during the last war in the handling of conscientious objectors. He confesses that he is not willing to put into effect the findings of the Department of Justice itself, from which I quoted at length in my main remarks last night and today, insofar as handling conscientious objectors is concerned.

My plan, Mr. President, effectuates the views of the Attorney General of the United States, whose Department functioned as the hearing department and the appeal department during the war. On the basis of that experience the Attorney General said in his report:

> The Congress may well consider the desirability of meeting these complexities by establishing a board to deal especially with conscientious objectors, having final discretion with respect to their proper individual classifications as well as their prompt assignment to suitable and useful work.

I simply say to the Senator from South Dakota that we now have an opportunity to put into effect what the Department of Justice, on the basis of its experience with this problem, advises us in the Attorney General's report is the type of procedure we should adopt.

The second point I wish to make in answering the argument of the able Senator from South Dakota is that I consider him quite wrong when he takes the position that the procedure of the bill as it comes before the Senate is free from military control and domination. I do not believe the Senator from South Dakota has given sufficient attention to the psychological effect of having the question of the civilian rights of conscientious objectors, insofar as their constitutional privileges are concerned, determined by draft boards and officials which pass judgment upon the application of a military draft law. So long as we keep them under the military draft law, we shall create the psychological effect in the minds of the conscientious objectors that they are being treated as though they were in the Army, when in fact their religious faith and convictions make it impossible for them to accept Army procedure and Army dictates. After all, our selective service system, at the top level, is administered by the military, and the conscientious objectors know that fact. All I can point out to the Senator from South Dakota is that the churches and the religious groups that seek the type of procedure for which I am asking in my amendment are solidly behind the procedure which I advise, and solidly opposed to the procedure which the Senator from South Dakota recommends. They feel and fear the bill in its present form provides in fact for military domination.

The third point I wish to make in my answer to the Senator from South Dakota is with respect to his comment upon the financial provisions of my amendment. I think he is distinctly in error when he seeks to give the Senate the impression that under my amendment there would not be funds for the administration of my proposed method for handling conscientious objectors. The funds will come from the funds which are set aside for the administration of the draft law. The amendment would be a part of the draft law, and it would not require a separate appropriation. It would be part and parcel of the draft law; and the appropriation which covers the draft law would cover the administration of this procedure for the handling of conscientious objectors. Therefore I respectfully submit that there is no merit in the argument made by the Senator from South Dakota as to the claim that my amendment does not provide for funds with which to administer it.

Lastly, without reiterating what I placed in the RECORD last night, I wish to put the issue this way: The question is whether or not in our country, which is still governed by a civilian Government, we are to have the constitutional rights of conscientious objectors determined as suggested by the Attorney General in his report, by a separate civilian board, or whether we are to classify the conscientious objectors within and under a military procedure for the determination of their rights.

I close by reiterating what I stated earlier. I do not understand the psychology of conscientious objectors. I do not share their point of view in regard to military service. But I recognize their constitutional rights to exemption on the grounds of religious faith if they in fact have such a deep religious and spiritual faith. I say that in keeping with the civilian ideals of this country, their rights should be determined by such civilian procedure as I recommend in my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—22

Aiken	Ives	Sparkman
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Millikin	Watkins
Cain	Moore	Wherry
Capehart	Morse	Wiley
Dworshak	Murray	
Flanders	Robertson, Va.	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Hawkes	Maybank
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Brewster	Hill	O'Conor
Brooks	Hoey	O'Daniel
Cooper	Holland	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Donnell	Kem	Revercomb
Eastland	Knowland	Russell
Ecton	Lucas	Saltonstall
Ellender	McCarthy	Smith
Feazel	McClellan	Stewart
Ferguson	McGrath	Thye
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
George	McMahon	Umstead
Green	Malone	Vandenberg
Gurney	Martin	Williams

NOT VOTING—26

Barkley	Hayden	Stennis
Bricker	Jenner	Taylor
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	White
Connally	Magnuson	Wilson
Downey	Reed	Young
Hatch	Robertson, Wyo.	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up the second of my four amendments, the one identified by the letter "H."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 6, after the word "medical", insert "(including the osteopathic)."

On page 8, line 4, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

On page 8, line 8, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

On page 8, line 17, after the word "surgery", insert "or osteopathy."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last evening I discussed the amendment very briefly, as appears at page 7277 and following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall not discuss it at any considerable length at this time, other than to point out that I now hold in my hand a letter which I have received from the representatives of the osteopaths. I wish to call attention to one paragraph of the letter, as follows:

Congress provided for osteopathic physicians as medical officers in the Navy (Public Law 604, 79th Cong.); and as medical officers in the United States Public Health Service (Public Law 425, 80th Cong.), which, under Executive order, is at this time a military organization. The Army is also authorized to grant medical commissions to osteopathic graduates. During the Seventy-seventh Congress (Public Law 580, 77th Cong.), Congress specifically authorized osteopathic graduates as interns in Army hospitals with the understanding, as evident in the hearings at the time, that such internships lead to commissions as medical officers in the Medical Reserve Corps. In 1946 Congress provided for osteopathic graduates as physicians in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration (Public Law 293, 79th Cong.).

Mr. President, I think we can dispose of this amendment, if the Senate wishes to vote on the merits of it, by this one argument: All branches of the armed service use certified osteopathic physicians. Inasmuch as in the past we have incorporated in a series of Federal laws specific authorization for the use of osteopathic physicians, then certainly in this draft law they should be placed on the same basis as medical doctors and dentists.

Mr. President, with that statement I close, except I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the letter which I have received this morning from the osteopathic physicians, and also a copy of Bulletin No. 41, issued by the National Headquarters of the selective-service system on December 14, 1942, with special reference to the drafting of osteopathic physicians.

There being no objection, the letter and bulletin were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1948.*

In re Morse osteopathic amendments to S. 2655.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Section 4 (c) makes it clear that doctors of medicine and dentists up to 45 years of age will not be inducted unless the needs of the Armed Forces for their professional services require it. That is in deference to the acknowledged fact that there is an over-all shortage of medical and dental care for the civilian population, and the draft should not be permitted to aggravate that shortage except to the extent absolutely necessary to meet the medical and dental needs of the Armed Forces.

Doctors of osteopathy render the same scope of services in many States as do doctors of medicine. They are licensed in all the States. They practice obstetrics in all but about five States. They are licensed in major operative surgery in more than 30 States. They staff more than 300 hospitals. In a number of jurisdictions they evidence their comparable training by taking the same State examination and receiving the same or equivalent licenses to practice as do doctors of medicine.

Congress provided for osteopathic physicians as medical officers in the Navy (Public Law 604, 79th Cong.); and as medical officers in the United States Public Health Service (Public Law 425, 80th Cong.), which under Executive order is at this time a military organization. The Army is also authorized to grant medical commissions to osteopathic graduates. During the Seventy-seventh Congress (Public Law 580, 77th Cong.), Congress specifically authorized osteopathic graduates as interns in Army hospitals with the understanding as evident in the hearings at the time, that such internships lead to commissions as medical officers in the Medical Reserve Corps. In 1946, Congress provided for osteopathic graduates as physicians in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration (Public Law 293, 79th Cong.).

In his opening speech on the bill, Senator GURNEY explained as recorded on page 7002 that osteopathic physicians were not included with doctors of medicine and dentists because, said the Senator: "The shortage of doctors (M. D.'s) and dentists left in civilian communities was acute—the same cannot be said to have been true as regards the others." The Senator apparently overlooked the fact that as early as December 1942, the War Manpower Commission certified to Selective Service that the practice of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and veterinary medicine were critical occupations, and the Selective Service System after citing that fact issued a directive on December 14, 1942, listing doctors of osteopathy with doctors of medicine and dentists as engaged in critical occupations. (See attached Selective Service Occupational Bulletin No. 41.) That grouping of doctors

of medicine, dentists, and doctors of osteopathy in the same category by selective service continued thereafter throughout the tenure of selective service.

Doctors of osteopathy should not be drafted except for the purpose of filling the needs of the Armed Forces for their professional services, and then only from communities which can best spare their professional services. To that end, it is vital that section 4 (c) shall expressly include members of the osteopathic profession.

Very truly yours,

L. L. GOURLEY,
Legal Counsel,
American Osteopathic Association.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1942.

Occupational Bulletin No. 41.

Effective: Immediately.

Subject: Doctors, dentists, veterinarians, and osteopaths.

1. Persons qualified.

There are certain persons trained, qualified, or skilled in the practice of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and osteopathy, who, if engaged in the practice of their respective professions, are in a position to perform vital service in activities essential to war production and to the support of the war effort, and in activities the maintenance of which is necessary to the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

2. Critical occupations.

The War Manpower Commission has certified that in the practice of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and osteopathy, and in training and preparation therefor, there are critical occupations, which, for the proper discharge of the duties involved, require a high degree of training, qualification, or skill. Attached is a list of "critical occupations" in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and osteopathy.

3. Consideration of occupational classification.

The War Manpower Commission has certified that there are serious shortages of persons trained, qualified, or skilled to engage in these critical occupations. Accordingly, careful consideration for occupational classification should be given to all persons trained, qualified, or skilled in these critical occupations and engaged in activities essential to the health, safety, and welfare necessary to war production and essential to the support of the war effort, and persons in training and preparation therefor.

4. Students in preprofessional training.

A registrant who is in training and preparation as a premedical, predental, preveterinarian, or preosteopathic student, pursuing courses in liberal arts or sciences in a recognized university or college, may be considered for occupational deferment after completion of his first academic year in such preprofessional course, and thereafter, if he is a full-time student in good standing, if he continues to maintain good standing in such course of study, and if it is certified by the institution that he is competent and that he gives promise of successful completion of such course of study and acquiring the necessary degree of training, qualification, or skill.

5. Students in professional schools.

A registrant who is in training and preparation as a medical, dental, veterinary, or osteopathic student, in a recognized medical school, dental school, school of veterinary medicine, or school of osteopathy, shall be considered for occupational classification during the period of such professional course, provided he is a full-time student in good standing, he continues to maintain good standing in such course of study, and if it is certified by the institution that he is competent and that he gives promise of the successful completion of such course of study and acquiring the necessary degree of training, qualification, or skill to become a recognized medical doctor, dentist, doctor of veterinary medicine, or osteopath.

6. Interns.

A registrant who has completed his preprofessional and professional training and preparation as a medical doctor, dentist, or osteopath, and who is undertaking further studies in a hospital, institution, or dental clinic, giving a recognized interneship, shall be considered for occupational classification so long as he continues the interneship, but for a period not to exceed one complete year.

7. Opportunity to engage in profession.

When a registrant has completed his training and preparation in a recognized college or university, or in a recognized hospital, institution, or dental clinic, and has acquired the high degree of training, qualification, or skill in one of these professional fields, such registrant should then be given the opportunity to become engaged in the practice of his profession in the armed forces, or in a civilian activity necessary to the public health, safety, or welfare, necessary to war production, or essential to the support of the war effort. In many instances following graduation from a recognized college or university, or the completion of an interneship, a certain period of time will be required in the placing of such persons in an essential activity. When a registrant has been deferred as a necessary man in order to complete his training and preparation, it is only logical that his deferment should continue until he has had an opportunity to put his professional training and skill to use in the best interest of the Nation. Accordingly, following graduation in any of these professional fields or following an interneship, a registrant should be considered for further occupational classification for a period of not to exceed 60 days, in order that he may have an opportunity to engage in a critical occupation of his profession in the armed forces, war production, support of the war effort, or in an activity essential to civilian health, safety, or welfare, provided that during such period the registrant is making an honest and diligent effort to become so engaged.

8. Deferment permitted whether or not commission is pending.

The official statement of any recognized premedical, predental, preveterinary, or preosteopathic college or university, the official statement of any recognized medical, dental, veterinary, or osteopathic college or university, or the official statement of any hospital, institution, or dental clinic, giving a recognized interneship, showing that a registrant satisfies the requirements of this bulletin, shall be sufficient for the consideration of such registrant for occupational classification on occupational grounds solely. Registrants will be considered for occupational classification as prescribed in this bulletin without regard for the fact that a commission in the armed forces may be granted to him or is pending.

9. Procurement and Assignment Service.

In order that every doctor, dentist, or veterinarian may render the greatest professional service to the Nation, the President has created the Procurement and Assignment Service for the purpose of gathering information with respect to the supply of qualified medical doctors, dentists, and doctors of veterinary medicine. To work with headquarters of the Procurement and Assignment Service, there have been appointed for each State and the District of Columbia, a State chairman for medical doctors, a State chairman for dentists, and a State chairman for doctors of veterinary medicine. When considering the classification of any registrant who is a medical doctor, dentist, or doctor of veterinary medicine, the Director of Selective Service desires that local boards, through the State Director, shall consult with the respective State chairman of the Procurement and Assignment Service.

10. List of State chairmen.

Names and addresses of the respective State chairman of the Procurement and Assignment Service will be provided to State directors from time to time.

11. Effective period of this bulletin.

This bulletin is effective until July 1, 1943, unless sooner amended. During the effective period of this bulletin the War Manpower Commission is giving further study to the training and preparation and utilization of persons trained in these professional fields.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

OCCUPATIONAL BULLETIN NO. 41

CRITICAL OCCUPATIONS—MEDICAL, DENTAL, VETERINARY, AND OSTEOPATHIC

Preprofessional student after completion of his first academic year in such preprofessional course: Premedical, predental, preveterinary, preosteopathic.

Professional students during full professional course following completion of preprofessional course: Medical, dental, veterinary, osteopathic.

Intern in hospital, institution, or dental clinic, giving recognized internship following completion of professional studies: Medical interns, dental interns, osteopathic interns.

Persons engaged in practice of their respective professions: Medical doctors, dentists, doctors of veterinary medicine (engaged in care of animals raised and maintained for work or food or in the inspection of meat food products), osteopaths.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we used osteopathic physicians during the war. If we are going to make use of them in the future, I think we should put them on the same basis as medical doctors and dentists.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement by Dr. Chester D. Swope, of the American Osteopathic Association, on the Selective Service Act of 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. CHESTER D. SWOPE, AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION, ON SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

SUMMARY

During World War II, doctors of osteopathy and a number of dentists and some doctors of medicine were drafted as privates.

It took 7 years beyond high school to train them as doctors, yet not a single osteopathic physician was commissioned and utilizied as a doctor. They served as privates or petty officers.

Such waste of medical manpower is indefensible, but it will happen again unless this legislation shall require that every osteopathic physician selected for service under the act shall be commissioned as a medical officer and utilized in his professional capacity. Such an amendment is submitted.

The doctor of osteopathy is trained in drug therapy and major surgery. In a number of States he passes the same State board examination in those subjects, and receives the same license to practice, as do the medical graduates. But he is especially schooled in body mechanics, and skilled in manipulative treatment restoring the proper relationship between the structure and function of the body, and it is in this phase of practice that the members of the armed services need him most.

Any director of aviation training would agree with Capt. Tom Hamilton, Director of Naval Aviation Training during World War II, that aviation trainees need osteopathic care.

Regular and Reserve medical officers who served with them during World War II recommended that doctors of osteopathy be commissioned as medical officers. They could then have been assigned to aviation training centers, or otherwise used in their professional capacity, but service medical policy denied every application for appointment.

The contention of the military and naval medical departments is that medical appointments for osteopathic physicians would bring about disharmony. The same argument was made when the Veterans' Administration law was pending before Congress and it was repudiated by the Congress when the law was passed. There has been no disharmony in the Veterans' Administration.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY DR. CHESTER D. SWOPE, WASHINGTON, D. C., CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS, AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION, ON SENATE COMMITTEE PRINT NO. 5, ENTITLED "SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948," SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, APRIL 23, 1948

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity of submitting a statement in regard to Senate Committee Print No. 5, cited as the Selective Service Act of 1948.

The American Osteopathic Association, you may be sure, favors revival of selective service whenever Congress finds the national security requires it.

Some 11,000 osteopathic physicians or surgeons are legally licensed and practicing in all the States, and approximately 80 percent are members of this association.

Six schools of osteopathy and surgery and sixty-seven training hospitals are inspected annually and accredited by the association. These institutions are recognized by the State licensure agencies, and their graduates are acceptable to the Veterans' Administration and the United States Public Health Service for appointments as medical officers.

All osteopathic colleges require a minimum of 2 years' preprofessional college work (60 percent of current freshman classes have had 3 years or more), and 4 years' professional college work, making 7 years' training (including 1-year internship).

An annual average of 442 graduate from these schools in normal years. Current graduating classes are very small due to unavailability of preprofessional students during war years.

There is an acknowledged shortage of physicians and dentists serving the civilian population. An expansion of the armed forces will increase the over-all medical manpower needs because service personnel require more doctors and dentists per thousand than do civilian personnel.

The national interest, therefore, requires that the professional services of all physicians (allopathic, homeopathic, and osteopathic) and dentists shall be utilized to capacity.

During World War II doctors of osteopathy and a number of dentists and some doctors of medicine were drafted as privates and their professional services wasted.

It took 7 years beyond high school to train them as doctors, yet not a single osteopathic physician was commissioned and utilized as a doctor. They served as privates or petty officers.

Such waste of medical manpower is indefensible, but the same thing will happen again unless this legislation shall require that every osteopathic physician who is selected for service under the act shall be commissioned as a medical officer and utilized in his professional capacity.

The doctor of osteopathy is trained in drug therapy and major surgery. In a number of States he passes the same State board examination in those subjects, and receives the same license to practice, as do the medical graduates. But he is especially schooled in body mechanics and skilled in manipulative treatment restoring the proper relationship between the structure and function of the body, and it is in this phase of practice that the members of the armed services need him most.

Capt. Tom Hamilton, director of naval aviation training during World War II, asked for osteopathic care for his trainees. In his official recommendation he said:

"The medical staff should be carefully selected for these centers. Competent doctors are necessary. However, their governing policy must be the same as the rest of the centers; namely, to produce strong, tough men and, outside of necessary treatments, there will be no mollycoddling of these cadets. Certain injuries are inevitable in such a program, but due to precautions for safety having been taken, the whole program should not be allowed to slow down by fear of contracting injuries among a small minority of the students, thus softening the mental attitude of the majority. In addition to a regular sick-bay or hospital staff, one or two sports physicians should be attached to the athletic staff to administer to the bruises, sprains, etc., as well as to consult on matters of posture, instruct in matters of camp hygiene, etc. A staff of trainers should work under the direction of these sports doctors. At the risk of being branded for heresy, I further recommend that one of these sports doctors be an osteopath or one full acquainted with osteopathy methods."

Any director of aviation training would agree with Captain Hamilton, but his recommendation came to naught because it was stymied by Navy medical policy.

Assuming that aviation trainees ought to have osteopathic care, no so-called policy should be permitted to deprive them of it. There is pending before Congress a measure for greatly expanding the Air Force, which will require many thousands of trainees—a compelling reason that this legislation require medical commissions for osteopathic physicians selected under the act, in order that their professional services can be made available, particularly in the air-training centers.

Time after time during World War II the Congress indicated in annual appropriation acts that doctors of osteopathy should be given medical commissions by the Navy. Finally, a permanent statute was enacted, approved August 2, 1946, as follows:

"The President, in his discretion, is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy as commissioned medical officers in the Navy, in such numbers as the President should determine to be necessary to meet the needs of the naval service for officers trained and qualified in osteopathy" (title 34, sec. 21b, U. S. C. A.).

The bottleneck of naval medical policy has thus far prevented appointments under that law.

When the question of appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration was pending before the House Veterans Committee in October, 1945, Gen. Paul R. Hawley said: "We used osteopaths in the rehabilitation hospitals in the European theater of operations. That service in one hospital, was headed up by a man who was both a doctor of osteopathy and a doctor of medicine, and the men who worked under his supervisions were doctors of osteopathy." Yet none of these men were given commissions as medical officers in the Army. Congress passed the bill for osteopathic appointments as medical officers in the Veterans Administration, and several doctors of osteopathy have been appointed. The Veterans' Administration law reads:

"Any person to be eligible for appointment in the Department of Medicine and Surgery must— * * * in the Medical Service—hold the degree of doctor of medicine or of doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator, have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia" (title 38, sec. 15d, U. S. C. A.).

By Executive order, the United States Public Health Service is at this time a part of the armed forces. By act of Congress, approved February 28, 1948, osteopathic graduates are expressly eligible for appointment as commissioned medical officers in the Public Health Service, and the Public Health Service has indicated that appointments will be made. The law reads:

"Graduates of colleges of osteopathy whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy in a majority of the States of the United States, or approved by a body or bodies acceptable to the Administrator, shall be eligible, subject to the other provisions of this act, for appointment as commissioned medical officers in the Public Health Service" (title 42, sec. 209d, U. S. C. A.).

It is not a question of professional qualifications which has kept osteopathic physicians from obtaining medical commissions in the Army and Navy. The contention of the military and naval medical departments is that medical appointments for osteopathic physicians would bring about disharmony. The same argument was made when the Veterans' Administration law was pending before Congress and it was repudiated by the Congress when the law was passed. There has been no disharmony in the Veterans' Administration.

Letters from osteopathic physicians in the services during World War II indicated that many medical officers felt that the osteopathic physicians should be given medical commissions so that there would be no question about their right to render professional care for the members of the armed services.

Medical officers with whom they served offered to vouch for their professional background and that they were excellent officer material. For example, regular and reserve Navy medical officers with whom he served recommended Dr. Samuel Henderson Scott, an osteopathic physician, for a commission in the Medical Corps of the Navy. Their letters of recommendation are included in full at the end of this statement.

Doctors of osteopathy are professionally trained to administer penicillin, sulfas, streptomycin, narcotics, and other drugs, and in some 300 osteopathic hospitals throughout the country they are competently performing the full range of major surgical operations. Many are certified by American osteopathic boards in the various specialties.

Osteopathic physicians definitely are professionally equipped for general medical assignment in the armed services. As they excel in manipulative therapy, however, their professional services ought to be utilized in that field wherever possible.

To insure maximum utilization of osteopathic manpower both in serving the needs of the armed services and the civilian population, the following amendments are respectfully requested, namely:

1. Sec. 105 (o), strike the words "member of the medical, dental, and veterinary professions" and insert in lieu thereof the words "doctors of medicine, doctors of osteopathy, dentists, and veterinarians".

2. Sec. 105, add a new subsection (p) as follows:

"(p) Any individual selected for service under this act (1) who is a graduate of a medical or osteopathic or dental school whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy or dentistry in a majority of the States of the United States or who was so eligible at the time of his graduation; and (2) whose physical and mental fitness for such service has been satisfactorily determined, shall be eligible to apply for a commission as an officer in the Medical Reserve Corps or Dental Reserve Corps of the United States Army or the United States Navy, and upon such application shall, in lieu of induction into the armed forces of the United States for such service, be granted such a commission and subject to order into active service."

The purpose of this amendment is to insure that doctors of osteopathy who are taken into the armed services shall be commissioned as medical officers and utilized in their professional capacity.

The inclusion of doctors of medicine and dentists in the amendment is not intended as a commitment of those professions, although the American Medical Association suggested a similar amendment during World War II (p. 22, hearing on S. 783, 77th Cong. Senate Committee on Military Affairs).

3. Immediately following the language proposed in amendment No. 2, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(q) (1) Students who are pursuing preprofessional courses of study in recognized colleges or universities who shall present an affidavit from the dean of such school or university that they are full-time students who are competent and give promise of the successful completion of such courses of study and an affidavit from a medical or osteopathic or dental school whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy or dentistry in a majority of the States of the United States that they are accepted for admission for professional studies upon completion of such preprofessional courses; (2) students who are preparing for the degree of doctor of medicine or doctor of osteopathy or doctor of dental surgery or doctor of dental medicine at medical or osteopathic or dental schools whose graduates are eligible for licensure in a majority of the States of the United States who shall present an affidavit from the dean of the school that they are full-time students who are competent and give promise of successful completion of the preparation and training for such professional degree; (3) hospital interns and resident physicians and hospital dental interns and resident dentists who are graduates of medical schools or osteopathic schools or dental schools whose graduates are eligible for licensure in a majority of the States of the United States or who were so eligible at the time of their graduation from such medical or osteopathic or dental schools, but for a period not to exceed one complete year; (4) teachers at medical or osteopathic or dental schools whose graduates are eligible for licensure as doctors of medicine or doctors of osteopathy or doctors of dental surgery or doctors of dental medicine in a majority of the States of the United States who shall present an affidavit from the dean of the school and from two members of the executive committee of the faculty of such school that they are teachers essential to maintain teaching in such institutions shall be exempt from service (but not from registration) under this act."

This amendment substantially confirms the policies pursued by selective service during World War II, except that deferrability of preprofessional students would be uninterrupted.

The sources of supply of medical manpower must be preserved.

National headquarters of selective service and the local boards in general during World War II were cognizant of the necessity for insuring an adequate number of trainees in the healing arts, and they are to be commended for the sympathetic understanding with which they approached the problem. They did a very creditable job under great difficulty.

This amendment will aid the Selective Service System.

UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION,
FLOYD BENNETT FIELD,
Brooklyn, N. Y., November 23, 1942.

To Whom It May Concern:

I have known Samuel Henderson Scott, pharmacist's mate (second class), for the past 6 months and have been deeply impressed by his ability and conscientious endeavor. He is an outstanding young man, with an excellent professional background.

I have found him adaptable, cooperative, and highly personable. He is of excellent officer material, and I sincerely trust that he will be so honored to receive a commission in the Medical Corps of the United States Naval Reserve.

SAMUEL ZURIK,
Lieutenant (MC), United States Navy.

UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION,
FLOYD BENNETT FIELD,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

To Whom It May Concern:

Samuel Scott has been attached to this station for the past 7 months, as a pharmacist's mate (second class). During this time he has been in charge of the physiotherapy room and has also set up the X-ray department of a new 50-bed dispensary. He has shown himself to be well trained in physiotherapy and X-ray work and capable of taking charge of and running either of these departments by himself.

In addition to this, he has been used on other hospital corps details and has proved to be capable of handling any of them. He is neat in his personal appearance and about his work and intelligent and well educated. He accepts responsibility readily, can be depended upon to carry out assignments, and I would unhesitatingly recommend him for a commission in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

S. C. BOSTIC,
Lieutenant Commander (MC),
United States Naval Reserve.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the temporary absence of the chairman of the committee I should like to reply briefly to the Senator from Oregon. The committee omitted osteopaths because it did not want to have anyone specially drafted unless absolutely necessary. The committee was informed by Army authorities that they could get all the osteopaths they needed on the voluntary basis when needed. It will be noted that in line 7, on page 7, the President may call full "allied specialist categories" if they are needed.

I personally go to osteopaths at times. I have great respect for them, but I see no need for putting anybody into the pending measure to be drafted, to be taken from his ordinary profession, unless absolutely necessary for the good of the service.

I call attention to the fact that the committee omitted veterinarians, who are in the House bill. Veterinarians were included in the previous law. The committee felt that veterinarians were not needed in the bill at this time, so that provision was omitted.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted, because I think we should not include anybody within the provisions of the bill unless it is absolutely necessary for the good of the service. We can get osteopaths if we need them. We respect them. The Army uses them, but it can get them on a voluntary basis.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the argument made by the Senator from Massachusetts was made before the committee. The osteopaths themselves do not agree with the Senator. I read, for example, from their letter to me, in which they say:

In his opening speech on the bill, Senator GURNEY explained as recorded on page 7002 that osteopathic physicians were not included with doctors of medicine and dentists because, said the Senator: "The shortage of doctors (M. D.'s) and dentists left in civilian communities was acute—the same cannot be said to have been true as regards the others." The Senator apparently overlooked the fact that as early as December 1942, the War Manpower Commission certified to selective service that the practice of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and veterinary medicine were critical occupations, and the Selective Service System, after citing that fact, issued a directive on December 14, 1942, listing doctors of osteopathy with doctors of medicine and dentists as engaged in critical occupations. (See attached selective service occupational bulletin No 41.) That grouping of doctors of medicine, dentists, and doctors of osteopathy in the same category by selective service continued thereafter throughout the tenure of selective service.

The failure to include osteopaths in this particular bill has created great alarm and consternation among this branch of the medical profession. Rightly or wrongly, the fact nevertheless is that they fear it is an attempt to weaken their position in Federal legislation. They have been included in the Federal legislation I have already cited during the debate, and they believe the discrimination against them which they feel is contained in the draft bill will do great damage to their profession. I think it is a complete answer to the Senator from Massachusetts to say that, of course, under the law, if not one of them is needed by way of the draft, he is not to be drafted. What harm is there, then, in including them as we have done in other Federal statutes along with the doctors and dentists.

In answer to the argument that veterinarians are not included in this proposed draft law, but were included in the original draft law, it should not be forgotten that when the war first started there was still a great need for veterinarians in the armed forces but since then the need for veterinarians in large measure has been eliminated. We have eliminated all of the horse units in the Army. I understand that for the most part in the later days of the war, veterinarians were used primarily for the inspection of meat. That was a tremendous waste of professional manpower, because veterinarians were not needed to perform the perfunctory work of inspecting meat.

If we are to recognize, as we do in Federal statutes, that osteopathy and the service of osteopaths should be made available to men in the armed services—and we do make them available in all

the Army and Navy hospitals—then certainly we should not discriminate against them by discriminating against them in the pending bill.

I reiterate no harm would be done by including them. If in fact they are not needed, they need not be drafted. They should be given the same treatment under this law as is accorded to doctors and dentists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to reply with a word or two to what the Senator from Oregon has said. Osteopaths are included in affirmative legislation concerning the Navy, and, I think, the Army, where they are on equal terms with doctors and other professional men. It is nothing derogatory to the osteopathic profession not to include them among those to be drafted, when it is unnecessary to draft them. I certainly hope we shall not put any more men under the draft provision, no matter what the professions or categories may be, than is absolutely necessary. That is the reason we reduced the age limit from 30 to 26, in order to leave free as many people as possible and still obtain the necessary men to fill up the armed forces.

I repeat, sir, I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered H, submitted by the Senator from Oregon. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MORSE. A division, Mr. President.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to ask consideration of my amendment lettered "G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the word "fifth" and substitute in lieu thereof "second."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is an exceedingly important amendment. It is one on which I trust I may have the courtesy of a yea-and-nay vote. It is an amendment proposing on page 62 of the bill, in line 25, to change the word "fifth" to the word "second." In my opinion, this amendment has tremendous national implications. I express the view that in a national referendum the American people, by an overwhelming vote, would vote for my amendment, because the American people are well aware of the fact that we are at peace. We are proposing a draft law to meet what we have come to recognize as an emergency situation. There is great alarm in America, and there is cause for it, that we may be moving too far in the direction of an over-militarized state. I think my record in support of necessary preparedness has been perfectly clear through the many weeks in which we have considered this bill. I am convinced that the international situation is such that we need to take some rather drastic steps to build up our military establishment so that we shall be in position to enforce the peace if some untoward affair or incident should thrust us, all of a sudden into a war.

I have said on this floor in times past, Mr. President, that a false sense of security also is entertained by too many Americans. Too many of our people do not realize the low ebb to which our preparedness has presently fallen. But meeting an immediate emergency is one thing, and passing a bill which at least gives sanction to a program for a 5-year draft is another thing. It is no answer to say to me that Congress, at any time it will, can vote to repeal the draft law. I think most of our people recognize that once we pass a statute such as this, which authorizes a draft for 5 years, the chances are great that we shall have a 5-year draft. Furthermore, I think we are dealing with a subject matter which is so close to the interests, the rights, and the freedom of the American people that there should be an affirmative requirement in the bill that Congress shall, in 2 years, automatically review the question as to whether the draft shall be continued.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator recall how long the draft was to last under the bill which was enacted in 1940?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Senator inform me as to that.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will refresh his recollection, was it not 1 year?

Mr. MORSE. In the first instance.

Mr. PEPPER. The act was renewed at a subsequent time. I was wondering if the Senator thought that the likelihood of danger is greater and more imminent at the present time than it was in 1940 when Congress enacted a 1-year draft law.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution, because it helps clinch my point. Of course the danger was much greater then than it is at the present time.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator feels, no doubt, in the advocacy of his amendment, that if the danger is still imminent 2 years from now Congress should review the legislation——

Mr. MORSE. It should be made the responsibility of Congress 2 years hence to take affirmative action on the continuation of the draft, if the emergency still exists at that time. The duty should be placed on Congress to review the matter and vote as to whether the draft should be continued.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I imagine it is the Senator's opinion, as at least it is mine, that while we should prepare the country for any emergency, at the same time we should look forward to the happy day when all countries will discontinue selective service and all forms of compulsory military training and adopt a genuine disarmament program.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Surely, if we find it necessary to continue this program, it can be done in 2 years.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. President, the next point I desire to make is that if we are believers in the democratic processes, as are all Members of this body, then I think my amendment should be adopted so that the continuation of the draft by way of placing an affirmative obligation on Congress 2 years hence either to continue the draft or do away with it will be clearly a political issue in the elections 2 years hence. In 1950 we shall once again be conducting a Federal election. I think this is an issue which the people should have brought before them in that election. Are we afraid to give them a chance to consider it at an election? I hope not. My amendment makes clear that we are willing to submit this issue to a political campaign discussion and decision by the voters at the polls. If at that time the emergency still exists, then, of course, the people of the United States, given the facts, will instruct their candidates to continue the draft, but if, in their opinion, an emergency does not exist, then I think they will make that fact crystal clear in the election. Under my amendment the continuation of the draft will automatically require affirmative action by Congress in 1950.

It will do something else, Mr. President, which is the next point I want to make. It will serve clear notice on the Military Establishment that by passing this bill, if it contains my amendment, we enter into no sort of a moral commitment, directly or indirectly, to the Military Establishment for a continuation of the draft beyond 2 years. Having had an opportunity, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to watch the way in which the Military Establishment works, I say it will be very advisable for us to make perfectly clear by way of my amendment that the Military Establishment had better cut its cloth accordingly, knowing full well that in 2 years the draft issue will automatically pass before us for review and affirmative or negative action at that time.

The last point I desire to make, Mr. President, is that I think passing this bill with the 5-year clause in it would have some very serious repercussions on international relations. I am convinced that we are a peaceful nation. I believe many foreign peoples believe that we are a peaceful nation. But I do not think that we should fool ourselves into thinking that the peoples in all freedom-loving countries are absolutely certain as to what our motives are. A great battle of ideologies is proceeding in the world. There is a powerful propaganda machine in the form of Soviet Russia that takes advantage of every opportunity to distort, to twist, and to falsify the position of the United States. I say, Mr. President, that leaving the bill as it now stands, with the 5-year provision, will be looked upon by the Russian propagandists as an opportunity to give the impression, false though it will be, but nevertheless to give the impression, that we have undertaken by passage of a draft

bill a highly warlike policy. It will be represented by the Russians as a commitment on our part to a 5-year draft and to the building up of the tremendous army that can be built up through a 5-year draft procedure for war purposes.

I said yesterday, in a speech on another subject, and I want to repeat today, that I think we are also engaged, Mr. President, in a fight for peace in the world. I do not think we should do any unnecessary act—and I underline the word "unnecessary"—which would give aid and comfort to those falsifiers in the world who would try to make us appear to be a warlike nation.

I think my point is completely proven when I say that inserting the word "second" for the word "fifth" on line 25, page 62 of the bill, will in no way weaken the bill. If it will weaken the bill I want to hear in what manner it will weaken it. Rather my amendment reaffirms a pledge to the world on the part of the United States that we are striving for peace, that we seek not to follow warlike measures. But a 5-year draft proposal will be interpreted to be rather irreconcilable with the concept that we are seeking only after peace.

Therefore, in conclusion, Mr. President, for the latter reason, and for the reasons previously emphasized, my amendment is consonant with the democratic process in its best aspects. I say that because my amendment will place the clear affirmative duty upon the Congress to take action 2 years hence. Further, my amendment will clearly make the issue a part of the political campaign in 1950, as I think it should be, and therefore, I recommend to the Senate the adoption of the amendment. It does not deprive the Senate of a right to take affirmative action on the continuation of the draft in 2 years and it gives to the people a clear opportunity to express themselves at the ballot box on this time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I understand that the pending bill provides that its provisions, with certain exceptions, shall terminate on the fifth anniversary after the date when the act becomes effective.

Mr. MORSE. The exact language is, "shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the fifth anniversary of the date of enactment of this act or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date."

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. And the Senator's proposal is that it shall cease to be operative on the second anniversary, unless the Congress sees fit to take affirmative action to continue it?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I believe the Senator said, in effect, that we now need some agency to make a peace, because the United Nations was intended to preserve peace, but it never started out with any peace, and for that reason the Senator thinks we should now strengthen our Military Establishment, with the hope that that will contribute to our intention and our program and desire to make peace in the world, which we can then turn over to an international organization to keep. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The position of the junior Senator from Oregon on that point is that after careful study of the evidence which came before the Armed Services Committee, of which he is a member, he became convinced that our lack of preparedness today would endanger the security of the American people if some international incident should throw us into a sudden war. Furthermore, the noncooperative attitude of Soviet Russia, not only in the United Nations, but in all international dealings with us since VJ-day, convinced the Senator from Oregon that we should strengthen our Military Establishment so as to make perfectly clear to Russia that we are a united people, determined to enforce the peace.

Therefore, I think an emergency in fact does exist, but I do not believe the Senate should pass a draft measure containing a 5-year provision, when the Congress could take affirmative action, under my amendment, at the end of 2 years, to decide whether the same emergency then existed to justify a continuation of the draft.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. And if we could get the cooperation of Soviet Russia for world peace, would the Senator from Oregon then favor international control of the atomic bomb, if we had the right of inspection in other countries, as we would give it to them?

Mr. MORSE. It is my prayer, I may say to the Senator from Virginia, that in the not too distant future we can, by international negotiations and agreements, bring to an end the dangers of another war, which would mean, of course, that the atomic bomb would have to be brought under international control, with such conditions and safeguards as those to which the Senator alludes. It means, in the last analysis, what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has pleaded for so many times on the floor of the Senate; namely, recognition on the part of all the peoples of the world that we must stop the mad race in armaments, if we are to save civilization itself.

It means also a recognition on the part of all the peoples of the world that no nation is going to win the next war no matter when it comes. Chaos alone will be the victor, and we in this country, if we become involved in the type of war in which we could right now become involved with Russia, would find that we would lose this very precious thing we call our private-property economy. A war would mean an almost total regimentation of the economy of the United States for a great many years if not permanently.

We must win the fight for peace, but I recognize, as one who knows that, after all, we must keep ourselves in a position to protect ourselves from an aggressor if he insists on committing aggressive acts, that we are in no position today to defend ourselves against Soviet Russia, at least in Europe, if she follows an aggressive course of action.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In other words, as Winston Churchill recently said, no one can condone the suicide of a state, but if we protect our own safety, then the Senator from Oregon, like the Senator from Virginia, would welcome an international program for world disarmament.

Mr. MORSE. That is a correct statement of my views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I will say that under perhaps more normal circumstances I should be inclined to favor it, but I think it is only fair to say that we have witnessed, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, a congestion, to say the least, which has prevented action by the Senate and the House on legislation which it is generally agreed is essential to the national defense. There is still grave doubt whether we shall be able to have a bill on this subject passed at all at this session of the Congress.

We have been faced with a situation in the Congress this year which I, for one, do not want to see repeated 2 years from now. A great mass of important legislation is being held up and blocked because of the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves. For that reason, Mr. President, I believe that there is more soundness and reason in acting on the bill as it came from the committee, so that what it provides for will be in existence for 5 years, and so that we will not confront this type of a situation two short years from now.

No man is wise enough to look into a crystal ball and foretell what conditions will be 2 years or 5 years from now. Of course, we all join with the Senator from Oregon in hoping that the peace of the world will be preserved for ourselves, our generation, and for our children, but I am convinced we are more apt to preserve the peace of the world if we demonstrate beyond any doubt whatever that this Nation is going to maintain its national defense in A–1 order, that the means of defense are going to exist in fact and not on blueprints.

I do not think there is a person sitting in the Kremlin today who is going to be awed in any degree by the mere discussion of an air force, the discussion of a navy, or the discussion of an army. Those men are realistic, and the only thing to which they will pay any attention is our having an air force in being, and an army and a navy in being.

I merely wish to say in conclusion that I am not impressed by the argument that those who would misrepresent the American position abroad will use the enactment of this bill as propaganda. It matters not what the Government of the United States does, what position we take on any side of any international issue or in the matter of national defense; whatever we do, whenever we do it, it is going to be misrepresented time after time. That is the Communist technique. We have to expect it, and I

for one certainly shall not be guided in my determination of national policies which are needed by the fact that we may be subjected to some criticism from that sector of the world.

Mr. President, I am convinced that we are not going to save the peace of the world by following the program the world followed at Munich. Rather than it being the road to peace I think that is the sure road to war.

I happened to have served in the Army for 3 years as an enlisted man and an officer. I have a son who is 17, and who will soon be 18. I wish it were not necessary for the Congress to enact legislation of this kind.

We talk about the rights of young men as American citizens, and I agree that they should be proud of having those rights, but they also have responsibilities of citizenship, and being prepared to defend their Nation in time of war is one of those responsibilities.

I think by and large the committee has done an excellent job with a difficult bill. I hope that, without too much further delay, we may act on the remainder of the amendments, and can pass the bill by an overwhelming vote in the Senate of the United States. I hope our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol Building will take early action to do the same, and I think if that news goes out to the world we will have made our greatest contribution to preserving the peace.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will not prevail.

I agree with the very eloquent and pertinent remarks made by the Senator from California. We all hope and pray that the present emergency will be a short one; that the present crisis will not last long. But one reason why it will be a short one, one reason why it will not last long is that we are strong. The crisis will not last long if we show that we mean business, if we show that we can back up with force our word in the United Nations and in the various councils if it is necessary to do so.

The committee discussed the question of whether to provide for a period of 2 years or 5 years, and it decided on the longer period for the very simple reason that the universal training provision was eliminated. Therefore the selective-service bill was made to cover a maximum of 5 years in order that we could build up our trained reserves. The purpose at this time is to build up our trained reserves in order to strengthen our Nation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon said, "Let us make the question an issue in the next election campaign if necessary to show that we can end the draft." I call the Senate's attention to the fact that the Senator's amendment would simply reduce the period from 5 years to 2 years, and would allow Congress to shut off the operation of the bill even sooner than in 2 years if necessary. It would require the passage of a joint resolution by Congress to extend the period in 1950 if it were proposed that we extend it at that time. I personally agree with the report of the committee to the effect that it is much better to provide for the longer period. Then, when we are satisfied respecting our trained reserves, when we are satisfied that world conditions have become stabilized, we can suspend the operation of the law by the enactment of a joint resolution. We can stop the operation of the law 10 days after we put it into effect if we want to, but in the meantime it will give us an opportunity to build up the trained reserves and afford the men who are in the age group affected by the bill an opportunity to be trained. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. President, I sincerely trust that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will not prevail.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon. I intend to vote for the bill itself in whatever from it is finally presented to the Senate for action. I will do so because I am certain that in the circumstances in which the world finds itself today an adequate military establishment is necessary for the security of this Nation and its people. I could not in conscience fail to vote for a measure which will assure minimum security in the coming years. I will vote for every measure which will protect the country.

I shall vote for it also because I believe that, properly used, it will be an instrument toward peace. As an expression by the Congress of its determination to support the foreign policy of this country it will give hope and confidence to countries which are struggling for economic and political stability, and it can dissuade aggression.

Nevertheless I do not want to vote for the bill without giving expression to my own belief that it should be limited solely to the actual duration of the emergency, an emergency which, to my mind, gives us the only right we have to vote a draft measure in peacetime. I make that statement, Mr. President, because it is my conviction that the conscription of men and enforced military training in peacetime are not in accord with and are in fact repugnant to the democratic traditions of our country. For that reason I do not favor the provisions in the bill which assume that the emergency which makes the proposed action necessary will exist for 5 years, or that enforced military service will be required for 2 years. The subject can be reviewed by the Congress next year to determine whether such an emergency exists at that time as to make necessary the continuation of the draft which, I repeat, is not justified in peacetime without the existence of some great emergency.

Mr. President, I make this statement with full regard for the work the committee has done upon this subject. I have great respect for the members of the committee and for its distinguished chairman, Senator GURNEY. It is difficult to assert one's judgment against the judgment of a committee which has worked faithfully upon this matter.

I make my statement also without derogation of the armed forces. I am not in accord with those who are continually derogating our military leaders and the armed services. Like my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], it was my opportunity to serve in the recent war, and I consider it a great honor and my greatest experience to have served. I honor our military leaders, their ability and patriotism, but I assert that it is our responsibility, and not theirs, to determine if there is justification in requiring men to serve in the armed forces for a longer period than the emergency requires.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator agrees, does he not, that the operations of the bill can be ended at any time by the passage of a joint resolution by Congress? Will the Senator further agree with me that it is much easier to pass a joint resolution to stop the operations of the bill—for everyone would joyfully vote for such a joint resolution—than it is to extend its operations? As was so well pointed out by the Senator from California, it has taken us a long time to pass such a bill as is now before us, and it would take us a long time to pass legislation continuing its operations. Does the Senator agree with me that it is much easier to end the operations of the bill than to extend them?

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator, but I do not think his suggestion is an answer to the proposition I am making. My position is that we are embarking upon this program solely because an emergency exists. So far as I am concerned, I do not want today to assume that the emergency must continue, or that conscription must continue, any longer than the emergency actually continues. I think we can with reason say that it will continue at least a year or 2 years. If it lasts longer, the Congress can take the necessary action.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has a very distinguished war record. Does he not agree with me that men cannot be trained overnight, and that time is required to build up trained reserves?

Mr. COOPER. I could spend some time discussing that question upon the basis of my own limited experience. I should say that certainly within a year the reasonable requirements for training could be met. I believe that anyone who has had military experience will support that view.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. With respect to the draft bill which was passed in 1940 when we were preparing for the Second World War, was that for 1 year or 2 years?

Mr. COOPER. I am unable to answer the question of the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was for 1 year. Can the Senator see any reason why this bill should be for longer than 2 years?

Mr. COOPER. I must say frankly that we have more information and experience now than we had in 1940, and it might be argued that our experience in 1940 makes the length of this program necessary. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to vote for peacetime conscription for a period longer than the emergency actually exists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I express my thanks to the Senator for being able to answer the Senator from Mississippi. The purpose of this bill is completely different from the purpose of the bill passed in 1940. Then we were afraid that we were going to get into a war. We had a very small military force, and we wanted to build it up. Today we have a substantial military force. We need more, but essentially we need trained Reserves to keep our country strong and to keep our word in world councils strong in the next few years. I submit to the Senator from Mississippi that the purposes are completely different from the purposes in connection with the situation in 1940.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate longer. The reasons which have been given by the Senator from Oregon are unanswerable. There is no point in reiterating those reasons. I merely wished to state my own position on the bill, and I have done so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky two questions. I have a great deal of confidence in his judgment and in the manner in which he approaches a question and studies it through.

My first question is this: What could take place in the world which would eliminate the emergency with which we are now confronted?

The second question is: How long would it take to overcome the emergency which compels us to vote for the draft today? That is the question in my mind, whether we vote for a 2-year period or a 5-year period. If I thought that we could overcome the emergency and settle the crisis in the world in 2 years, I should say that we should not have the draft for more than 2 years. But if more than two years are required to perfect the United Nations organization—and in my opinion that is the only organization which will maintain peace in the world—we might better vote for selective service on the basis of more than 2 years—possibly 5 years.

Those are the two questions which I wish to ask the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend that he has asked me questions which every person in the world would like to have answered. I cannot answer those questions. If the circumstances which obtain at present continue next year, I am certain that the Congress will continue this measure. I am always hopeful, however, that there may be a change in circumstances, and that the continuance of this measure will not be necessary. Whether that be true or not, I return to my original principle, that I do not believe it is good policy, or that we have the moral right, to continue conscription in peacetime for any period longer than the actual emergency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I express my gratitude to the Senator from Kentucky for yielding. I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota, in answer to his question—if I may give my answer—that if he will look back into our history, it required 13 years after the close of the Revolution to adopt the Constitution. It required at least 10 years after the distressing Civil War before conditions became anywhere near normal. We all hope and pray that the United Nations will become effective. However, time, patience, courage, and much thought will be required. In the meantime we should be strong.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In reply to the Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that what he has stated is my conviction. I fear that we shall not have accomplished what we hope for in the United Nations within a period of 2 years. I feel that 5 years will be required to perfect the United Nations and incorporate into it the policing power which can maintain peace and order throughout the world. In order to accomplish that objective more than 2 years will be required. For that reason, I shall support the position of the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise to support the committee with respect to the 5-year provision in the bill. The 5-year period was not a number which was pulled out of the thin air. In the first place, in drafting the bill we had in mind establishing in the United States what General Bradley called a "realistic readiness," and what Secretary Marshall, paraphrasing the words of George Washington, called "a military posture." It seems to me that any period short of 5 years is utterly inadequate to indicate that we mean business in the establishment of a trained armed force of the necessary number.

In his testimony before the committee Secretary Marshall said this:

> The clear-cut issue is whether or not this country will stand before the world for at least the next 5 or 10 years in a position appropriate to its leadership in furthering the perpetuation of free governments and avoiding their transition into police states.

That was the Secretary of State speaking. He ought to know—and I believe he does know—more about the details of the international situation than can anyone who is not as directly concerned with them as he is. He says that we need this "military posture," as he described it, for a period of at least 5 or 10 years, because he envisages the possibility that the unsettled international situation will continue for at least that length of time.

The late war was fought on gigantic proportions. It involved more nations, more peoples of the earth, and more areas than were ever involved in a war before. As we look back on World War I, we know that there was a long period of time before conditions settled down, and before there was a reasonable degree of peace. Then it was a comparatively short time before things were stirred up again. Following World War I we immediately disbanded our Military Establishment. We withdrew our forces from everywhere. We all came home and put our rifles away and immediately attempted to resume normal peacetime living. We tried to forget what had been happening for the 3 years or more we were in the conflict.

As I previously stated, it was a long time before conditions settled down. Following World War I we did practically nothing to maintain our Military Establishment.

In 1923, believing that we had won a world war, we called a Disarmament Conference. We made very earnest and sincere gestures. We went further than gestures. Other peoples made gestures, but we actually put into operation, so far as our Nation was concerned, a disarmament program. Now we are able to witness what can fairly be said to be, in part at least, the result of our policy at that particular time. Therefore, it seems to me, that it is wise to continue the draft, or indicate that we intend to continue it, for a period of at least 5 years. If, in the meantime, the situation improves and conditions quiet down, there will be nothing to prevent the Congress from discontinuing the draft at that time. From our brief experience at this session and at the last one, it is perfectly apparent that the Congress is able to undo things much faster than it can do them; and that is certainly true of legislation of this particular kind.

I agree with what the distinguished Senator from California has said, namely, that if 2 years hence, after a political campaign, we were faced with the problem of continuing the draft, we would in the meantime have drafted men and we would have started to build up our Military Establishment and the Reserves; and then we would find ourselves in the middle of a discussion of whether we should continue it. This is a program which, I think, above almost all others, must be continued on a fairly long-range basis.

I should also like to quote from the testimony of General Eisenhower. There was considerable discussion and testimony before the committee as to whether the United States needs manpower and whether we are approaching an era of so-called push-button war. As I recall, either at that time or on other occasions, in his appearance before our committee, General Eisenhower stated that, with all the talk about push-button war, he thought it might be wise for the people to know that, so far as his knowledge of it was concerned, about all we had with which to conduct a push-button war was a push button and nothing else, and that for a considerable time to come

we need manpower. In referring to the particular question as to whether we need manpower over a period of time, he said:

> What the future implications of 10 or 15 years from now will be none of us can tell. But for the moment we do know that any war of the approximate future, 3 to 5 years, will look, to some extent, at least, like it has looked in the late war.

So, Mr. President, we need manpower, not on a 2-year basis but on a 5-year basis, because that proclaims to the people of the world that we mean business; that in taking this step we are going to continue on the same path for a period of 5 years—reserving always, of course, the right of the Congress to discontinue the draft in that period of time.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in view of the international situation we now confront, it is a great deal better to adopt a policy by which we say to the world, "We are ready; we intend to be ready for a substantial time to come in the future. We are making our preparations to cover a period of discontent and unsettlement which we anticipate may be as long as 5 years, unless conditions improve in that time." The question whether during that period conditions will improve must in every instance be left largely to the other fellow, because he is the one who now can make the gestures; he is the one who now can make the moves, if he is thinking of aggression in the next 5 years. Certainly we have made every possible gesture in the direction of peace. Certainly we have manifested in every way our desire for peace and have shown our intentions for peace. But our gestures have not been regarded; our intentions apparently have not been believed.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is only one alternative open to us, and that is a period of realistic readiness until such time as the world generally manifests a desire to be at peace. If that time comes—and God grant that it may come in that period of 5 years—then in the course of an afternoon here in the Congress we could discontinue the draft. It will be a very simple and a very happy thing to do when we are ready for it; but that time has not yet arrived.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall be as brief as possible.

In the first place, I wish to compliment and congratulate the Committee on Armed Services for the very splendid job which has been done in the preparation and presentation of this proposed legislation. When one considers the conflicting interests which have had to be reconciled insofar as it has been possible to reconcile them, and which have had to be faced, and in spite of which this proposed legislation has been produced, one is filled with a great deal of admiration for the accomplishments of that committee. So I pay tribute to the Armed Services Committee.

Naturally, Mr. President, I do not agree with everything that is in this bill. I doubt that any Member of the Senate or for that matter, any Member of the House would agree with everything in this kind of bill. Naturally, I can understand the attitude of those who do not wish to vote for selective service. There is no one in this Chamber, I dare say, who will take any pleasure in voting for this kind of legislation. However, that is not why we are going to vote for it. It is not why I am going to vote for this bill, no matter what its form, when the Senate has disposed of the amendments which now are before us.

I shall vote for the bill, Mr. President, because I believe, as has already been pointed out, that we in the United States must be adequately prepared. This is all a part of an integrated program, as I see it: Selective service; universal military training, if it is to be agreed upon; the 70-group air force; the European recovery program. All of these—our armed forces and our economic efforts—are a part of an integrated program to try to help bring peace to the world.

There is nothing warlike in what we are contemplating here. There is nothing warlike in anything we are attempting to do here. That is not our purpose. Never has it been in our minds. Rather, as I have said before, our objective is peace.

So it seems to me that in the consideration of this particular bill, which deals primarily, as I understand, with selective service, it would be well for us to consider whether this bill is primarily aimed at peace. I know that is the purpose of this bill. From what has been said by those who have spoken previously, I understand that 5 years may be a period which may be required for that purpose. Mr. President, if selective service is as we suppose it to be—merely a stopgap between one condition and another, a present condition which may become much better, and which we prayerfully hope will become much better; and a condition which may become considerably worse, and which we prayerfully hope will not become considerably worse, but will improve—then it seems to me this proposed legislation should be geared accordingly. Consequently, it seems to me that 5 years is too long a time for this proposed law to be in effect, for the law is aimed primarily to fill a gap, to be a stopgap measure and a temporary expedient.

I do not agree with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon, in regard to the suggestion for a 2-year period. I agree, rather, with the distinguished Senator from California. I think 2 years would be a very bad limitation, just as now it is very unfortunate for us to be considering this type of legislation, when we are confronted with a political campaign. This matter should never be a political issue in the United States. This question of preparedness should be something on which all Americans are agreed. To allow it ever to enter into a political campaign as a political issue would seem to me to be most unfortunate. It is not a question primarily of returning to the voters, with an idea of getting the voters' expression. I am sure that every one of our constituents wants us to exercise the best judgment of which we are capable in dealing with this matter; and if we exercise judgment of that type, whether they have an opportunity immediately thereafter to vote insofar as we are concerned and insofar as our return to office is concerned, or have to delay a year or so in voting, should make very little difference. The important thing about the consideration of proposed legislation of this type is that there be an opportunity for its full and complete and ample discussion all during the time it is under consideration.

I very much fear that 2 years hence, just as is true in the present instance, we shall be faced with a situation when there is inadequate time for proper consideration in the two Houses of the Congress. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest to the able Senator from Oregon a compromise between the 2-year point that he proposes and the 5-year point which is in the pending bill—the 5 years, which I feel is too long, and the 2 years, which for reasons I have indicated seem to me to be inappropriate. I would therefore ask him kindly to submit a modifying amendment to change his proposal from 2 years to 3 years, which would fix the termination of selective service at a time when we would not be facing an election, but in a year when it could be given adequate consideration. This would still afford a sufficient length of time, which would seem to me to be altogether appropriate under circumstances which have been cited.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from New York that an adequate national defense should never be a political matter. That prompts me to ask the Senator this question: Should the Senate assume responsibility for saying when an emergency exists and determine when men shall be called to meet it or should the Senate pass that buck to the President?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not think that is a very difficult question to answer. In line with what I have just said, the matter of a national emergency, if there be a true national emergency, rests with all of us, both with the Executive, with the Senate, and with the House. There never should be a time in this country when any one particular branch of the Government, unto itself, and of itself alone, in the face of a real national emergency—and that is what I am talking about—should be left to meet it or to act upon it alone.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am only going to talk for a minute on this amendment, for I feel the ground has been very well covered by other members of the committee. I remember the remark made by the Senator from New York a moment ago, that the military policy of the country should be geared to world conditions. That statement was made I am sure in support of his contention that we cannot look forward 5 years. He has now suggested the amendment be changed to 3 years. Personally, I think the manpower strength of our armed forces should be geared constantly to the world situation. I think the pending measure does that.

I do not think it is necessary to wait 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, or 5 years.

As I said in my opening remarks on the pending bill, each subsequent Congress should look at the world situation and come back to the bill, which is flexible, and set the maximum figures each year for each branch of the service, the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy.

By examining page 3 of the pending bill it will be found that each service has a maximum strength fixed by Congress. Should the House agree with the idea—and I think they do, as shown by the bill presently on the House Calendar—that is the way to gear it each year to the world situation.

If Congress by joint resolution can fix the maximum strength necessary, in view of world conditions a year from now, or 2 years from now, why not keep the bill in its entirety on the books, looking to each subsequent Congress to accept its responsibility just as this Congress is accepting its responsibility in setting the maximum strength of each branch of the service? That is one point I should like to make.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if he does not consider selective service to be fundamentally something of a very temporary nature in and of itself?

Mr. GURNEY. Absolutely.

Mr. IVES. It is not universal military training, though it might be the beginning of it. Selective service is merely a stopgap; is it not?

Mr. GURNEY. No; it is very necessary in case of an emergency.

Mr. IVES. A stopgap is generally vital. I did not mean it was unnecessary. It is necessary.

Mr. GURNEY. We hope it is a stopgap.

Mr. IVES. That is its real function; is it not?

Mr. GURNEY. We hope it fills the gap. The pending legislation can be simply a stopgap, keeping in mind the possible danger. Each subsequent Congress should look to its responsibility and make it a stopgap for the world situation by adding improvements from year to year.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Let me finish the answer, if I may. I have not yielded. Let us see how it operates. In the first place, there is set for the Army a maximum strength of 790,000. Do we expect to call under selective service 790,000 men between the ages of 19 and 26? The answer is we do not. How do we propose to get them? Some of them are in the service now. There are some who will remain in it. There are some who will reenlist. The enlistments of some of them have not yet run out. Others will volunteer.

The best estimates I was given run from 190,000 to about 300,000 who will have to be drafted under the pending measure during the next 12 months. It is not the intention to draft the whole 790,000. Next year, if the situation improves, the maximum would be lowered. Possibly none would be drafted. But the bill will remain on the books. The volunteer provisions will remain, the training provisions will remain. There will be a building up of the Reserve by reason of the provisions of the pending measure.

The bill, when passed, should remain in effect. If it becomes unnecessary to call more than 300,000 as the maximum strength of the Army, the other provisions should remain, so that the strength would be built up elsewhere, and it would soon be possible to discontinue drafting men at all. That is the purpose of the pending measure, to build up strength elsewhere.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I have one more point. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I would ask the able Senator one question. He pointed out that the pending measure should be reviewed year by year. I gathered that from his remarks. I agree with the Senator that, no matter what is done, it ought to be reviewed year by year by the Congress.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts pointed out in his remarks the fact that by joint resolution we can drop this whole procedure, this whole plan, any time we want to. That is definitely understood.

The fact still remains, does it not—and I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota—that with a 3-year period it would be perfectly practicable to set up the plan and put the program into operation. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. It is also possible under 5 years.

Mr. IVES. Of course, it would be possible under 50 years, too.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. I understand that. I can understand how under 1 year it would not be very practical, but I say it would be practical under 3 years.

Mr. GURNEY. Not quite.

Mr. IVES. Substantially it would be practical to do it that way, would it not?

Mr. GURNEY. No, it would not.

Mr. IVES. I thought the Senator just said it would be.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is pinning me down now.

Mr. IVES. I am trying to.

Mr. GURNEY. I am trying to state why it would not be practical.

Mr. IVES. The Senator may get technical, and I do not want to be technical. For all substantial purposes, it could be limited to 3 years without doing damage to anyone.

Mr. GURNEY. I do not agree with the Senator. I will tell him why. This bill not only gives us strength for the Regular Establishment, through all the methods of reenlistment, volunteering, and selective service, but it also establishes a program for Reserves. If we get started on the program, in 2 years it would be possible that the Congress would not have to appropriate such huge amounts of money as are now necessary for the Military Establishment.

Mr. IVES. I can appreciate that.

The Senator from New York would like to make an observation. I am thinking of another angle in this connection. I do not know whether the Senator realizes it, but if it is a 5-year proposition with which we finally have to deal, every year, beginning next year, pressure will be applied to have us, by joint resolution, get rid of it. If we have it for 3 years, or even 2 years—I do not like the 2-year idea because of what I said about it—but if it be 3 years, we shall have ample reason to say, "No; it has not gone far enough. We have not had time to see how it will work." I can fully understand what might occur at the end of 3 years, or at the end of 4 years. We might be getting rid of it under pressure. So it seems to me, from every angle from which one wants to look at it, the 3-year proposition is the most sensible.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, while I have been sitting here I have been hearing a great deal about the testimony of experts such as General Bradley and General Eisenhower. It seems to me that some of my Democratic friends have not considered the testimony of a gentleman who testified before the committee. His testimony is at almost complete variance with the testimony of General Bradley and General Eisenhower.

After all, Mr. President, it was only a few years ago that the Democratic Party nominated for the Vice Presidency a man by the name of Henry A. Wallace, and it was only about 3 years ago that he very nearly secured the majority of the votes in the Democratic national convention. If he had received them, he today would be President of the United States. I do not pretend to agree with all the testimony which he gave before the committee, but, certainly, so long as we are hearing from other experts, I think the Senate should consider the testimony of Mr. Wallace, because there may be one chance in a hundred that he is right.

So I want to call to the attention of the Senate some of the testimony of the man whom the Democratic Party nominated and almost renominated for Vice President. His testimony appears on page 542 of the hearings, as follows:

> The American people want peace. They want lasting peace achieved through world cooperation in the United Nations. They want a strong and prosperous America.
>
> The American people hate war.

Mr. President, I remember very well reading some of Mr. Wallace's speeches during the war against Hitler. I do not remember hearing any speeches made by anyone that was more warlike than were the speeches which Mr. Wallace delivered upon various occasions some 3 or 4 or 5 years ago. He says:

> The American people hate war. Yet step by step they are being taken down the road to war, the country is being progressively weakened, and unless the people reverse this dangerous trend we face national disaster.
>
> The bipartisan foreign policy of the administration assumes that war is inevitable. Remobilization, if authorized by Congress, will set off an international armaments race.

I think no honest man can dispute that statement.

> World fears and tensions will increase. Mobilization and countermobilization will lead to world war III.

Mr. Wallace continued:

> Our country is in danger. But the danger comes from our own policies which will bring

war—unnecessary war—upon our country. The crisis lies in the war fever itself—not in real threats of invasion but in the synthetic threats of invasion pumped up to support the arms program.

The administration wants us to believe that a world crisis has arisen which threatens our security.

I submit, Mr. President, that certainly Mr. Wallace, in view of the fact that he was head of the Department of Agriculture and head of the Department of Commerce, to both of which positions he was confirmed by the Senate of the United States, must have been a good Cabinet officer. The Democrats in this body said he would make a good Secretary of Commerce. They said he would make a good Secretary of Agriculture. The Democrats all over the Nation, in national convention assembled, said that Henry A. Wallace would make a good President if anything should happen to Franklin D. Roosevelt. At that time they must have trusted him. At that time, when they picked him out of 140,000,000 people, they said to the American people, "He is the man we want for President in case anything happens to Mr. Roosevelt." Certainly, Mr. President, when Mr. Wallace talks about the administration today he speaks as one who was on the inside, a man who attended Cabinet meeting after Cabinet meeting, and who, time and time again, was a close confidential adviser to President Roosevelt.

He said in his testimony:

The administration wants us to believe that a world crisis has arisen which threatens our security. But it has presented no facts to substantiate this.

Then Mr. Wallace said:

I charge an artificial crisis was deliberately manufactured to stampede Congress and the people into accepting universal military training and conscription.

Then, strangely enough, Mr. Wallace quotes the Wall Street Journal as one of his authorities. He says:

On March 19 the Wall Stret Journal made a pointed comment on the President's all too frequent declaration of crises.

He quotes the Wall Street Journal as follows:

When these crises are proclaimed, they seem always to call for the speedy enactment of measures which the administration previously has recommended but failed to obtain.

This one calls for resumption of the draft and universal training.

This administration never wanted to give up the draft and it has worked hard to have Congress approve universal training.

That is a quotation from the Wall Street Journal of March 19 last. Mr. Wallace continued:

The administration is again using the "crisis" technique. The objective of this fear campaign is to paralyze the will and mind of the American people so that they will accept the plans to militarize America.

Mr. President, there may be something to what Mr. Wallace says. I am sure I do not know, because I do not profess to be an expert, but one thing is certain, namely, that the 12 leading Protestant denominations of America have met and almost unanimously have declared against the pending measure.

That is not all. As every Senator knows, leading educators all over the country, some of them the very men who testified in favor of our getting into World War I, and said we had to get into that war, today testify just to the contrary. So, as I have said, there may be something to what Mr. Wallace stated. He proceeded:

The security of the United States is not threatened—except from Washington.

He asked this question before the committee:

Are we threatened by the Soviet Union?

He answered it himself by saying:

That nation lost 10,000,000 lives in the war. The most productive sectors of its economy were destroyed. After 2½ years of reconstruction its production has just regained the prewar level. It will take the Soviet Union many years to attain an industrial output equal to one-half our current production. Meanwhile, if we do not squander our resources in preparations for war, the United States can increase its output by 50 percent in the next decade, raise itself to an undreamed-of prosperity, and help promote the prosperity of the rest of the world.

Mr. President, so long as some Senators are quoting experts, quoting General Bradley, General Eisenhower, and other authorities, it seems to me we should have the benefit of Mr. Wallace's views, whether we agree with him or whether we do not, in view of the fact that he held these many interesting and important positions in the Democratic Party.

Mr. Wallace asked another question:

Does anyone seriously believe that the Soviet Union wants another war? The most ardent advocates of the unsuccessful, 2-year-old, get-tough-with-Russia policy admit that the Soviet Union does not want war. They even concede that the Soviet Union fears war. The single fact is that the Soviet Union cannot attack the United States. As the Wall Street Journal cynically said, if the Russians wanted to attack us, "they would have to swim to get here."

Mr. Wallace further said:

There is no military threat to our national security. The administration has concocted a nonexistent threat to force through unpopular legislation. What is happening today was frankly described by James Reston, correspondent of the New York Times, more than a year ago.

Reston said, March 16, 1947, that the administration believes "the most successful way to introduce foreign policy in Congress is to oversell it piecemeal in an atmosphere of crisis."

This crisis technique subverts the democratic process and leads to the regimentation of thought. It seeks to stifle criticism with fear. Thought control by fear has been described by Dr. A. M. Meerlo of the Inter-Allied Pyschological Study Group which functioned in England during the war. He pointed out that:

"Fear paralyzes the human mind, hypnotizes it, as it were, and makes it passive. Hitler always made the Germans believe that they had to defend themselves against alleged encirclement."

Then Mr. Wallace continued:

Today, the technique of fear is directed against Americans. A war hysteria has been generated so that Americans will accept the militarization of their economy and life.

Mr. Wallace said:

I don't think it will work.

There are too many millions of Americans who are waiting, as I am waiting, for some real proof that our national security is threatened.

Mr. President, I have read this testimony because I became very much interested in the question of universal military training. Nowhere—and I challenge the distinguished Senator in charge of the pending bill—nowhere, from one cover to the other of the volume of the hearings, is there any real proof that the security of America is threatened.

Said Mr. Wallace:

I am waiting for the industrialists and financiers who now profit from these war preparations to say—

Mr. President, what I am going to quote now should be said time and time again. Mr. Wallace said:

I am waiting for the industrialists and financiers who now profit from these war preparations to say—

Before I quote what he said, remember, Mr. President, that in World War II industry went on a strike. Industry said:

We will not produce unless we are guaranteed profits.

But when there was a little labor strike somewhere, there were full-page advertisements saying how unpatriotic labor was. So the record today is replete with the enormous profits industries made out of World War II.

Mr. President, I was the first Senator to rise on this floor and ask that the $106,000,000,000 of war assets be not wasted, and that a commission be appointed by the President so as to save every single penny we possibly could. What has happened to our $106,000,000,000 worth of property? As I remember, three men were appointed as a commission, in October. One of them was one of our former colleagues, Senator Gillette, of Iowa. October passed, November passed, December passed, and January came before Mr. Gillette finally, waiting until the expiration of his term as Senator, joined the other two men on the commission.

What happened after Mr. Gillette joined the others? The people of my State wanted to get some of the war material, and they offered to pay every single penny it was worth. In the law creating the War Assets Commission it was provided that the United States Government itself should have the first chance, the first preference, in buying war materials. Next came various States, then the counties, and so on, then the universities. But January, February, and March went by, and finally three Senators went to the office of the War Assets Administration, one the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], another the distinguished Senator Chandler, at that time representing Kentucky in the Senate, and myself.

Three months after January, Mr. President, the rules providing for the

sale of that property still had not been drawn up. That is the sort of administration we had at the hands of the Democratic Party at that time. Then what happened? Two of the members of the Surplus Property Board, one from Rhode Island and one from California, could not get along with the member from Iowa. They quarreled and finally the member from Iowa resigned.

Then Congress passed a new law and placed one man in charge instead of three. A short time thereafter the man in charge resigned. Congress then created a new agency and another man was put in charge of it, and he was in office 5 or 6 months, and, lo and behold, he was promoted, and another vacancy occurred.

In the meantime, what has happened to the $106,000,000,000 worth of surplus property? I need not tell the Members of this body what happened to it. The very tractors, the very trucks, the very caterpillars, the very road machinery we wanted was kept from being sold to the people of the country because the big manufacturers, the war profiteers, who are described by Mr. Wallace in his testimony before the committee saw to it that that machinery, which was in foreign lands, was not even returned to the United States of America. In Italy it was sold for 1 cent on the dollar. In other countries it was given away. In a few other countries we said, "Under lend-lease we are giving it to you."

There is much talk today about Russia. Russia herself received nearly $12,000,000,000 worth of war assets in machinery, planes, and money. I remember when the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the late Senator Scrugham, of Nevada, and I, as a committee went to Alaska. At that time the Government was giving planes to Russia. This ally of ours would not even let the United States fly the planes which were given Russia for nothing, within a thousand miles of Russian territory. Those planes were not delivered at Nome. Nome is 45 or 46 miles away from the coast of Siberia. The Russians said, "You cannot come so close to Siberia. We will come and get the planes at Fairbanks." That is where the planes were delivered to the Russians. When we were discussing the matter with some Russians who came to fly the planes back to Russia, did they say "Thank you" for the planes? They did not. They said, "Harry Hopkins promised us 385 planes a month, and the United States is not delivering that many. Besides," the Russians said, "the planes which are being delivered are much smaller than the planes we thought we were going to receive."

I read again what Mr. Wallace said in his testimony before the committee:

> I am waiting for the industrialists and financiers who now profit from these war preparations to say:
>
> "We are patriotic Americans. We are alarmed at threats to our country. For the duration of the crisis we are giving up all profits, all dividends, all huge salaries. Everything above normal living expenses belongs to the Treasury of the United States, and we want the Congress to put this into law until the emergency ends. We refuse to take a penny of profit for the defense of our country. We stand with the boys who are drafted in making sacrifices for freedom."

Whether we agree with Mr. Wallace or whether we do not, the fact nevertheless remains that hundreds of thousands of our citizens are waiting for these financiers and industrialists to say what Mr. Wallace is waiting for them to say.

Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said upon the floor of the Senate that we paid $10,000,000 apiece for 45 ships, and then after the war sold them for $90,000 apiece. The Senator said something about an investigation. But, Mr. President, what good is an investigation after we have sold the ships and the money has been paid? Who received some of those ships? Some of the very officials who were appointed by the President, who knew where the surplus property was located, resigned, and bought some of it for almost nothing on the dollar. So I say that Mr. Wallace in his testimony before the committee strikes a tender chord when he says he is waiting for some of the industrialists and financiers to say that they are not going to make a single penny out of our preparations for war, the money for which we have been voting.

Mr. Wallace continued:

> I am waiting for that proof; and for proof that those who talk of a conscript army to defend freedom actually believe in freedom. I am waiting to hear the Defense Secretary say:
>
> "We are not hypocrites. We really believe in freedom. We are devoted to democratic principles. We are abolishing—utterly and completely abolishing—all discrimination and segregation for reasons of race, creed, or national origin."

Mr. Wallace continued:

> But today the cries of danger are suspect. When pressed to reveal what they mean by the threat to national security—

All these fellows who are yelling about preparing for national defense, worrying about national defense—

> when pressed to reveal what they mean by the threat to national security, the drumbeaters for militarization bring out another alleged danger—"political aggression." That is described as "Communist infiltration" in Europe and Asia.

Those words are not mine, Mr. President, I am quoting from Mr. Wallace, and I say there is perhaps one chance out of a hundred he is right.

In any event I submit that a man who has been Secretary of Agriculture, appointed to that office by the President and confirmed by the Senate, a man who has been Secretary of Commerce, appointed by the President and confirmed by this body, a man who was selected out of 140,000,000 people by the Democrats of the United States of America in their convention, and elected by the people of the United States at the election to be their Vice President, a man who for 4 years presided over this body—certainly his views are entitled at least to be considered. I do not say I agree with him. But when a Senator a few moments ago read two lines from the testimony of General Bradley and another Senator quoted three or four lines from General Eisenhower, then certainly this body is entitled to have the views of a man who has held so many important governmental positions.

Mr. Wallace continued:

> These phrases confuse the realities of a world in transition. They are every bit as loose in their use of the word "Communist" when they speak of policies abroad as they are when they attack as "Communist" liberal proposals here at home.

I have in my office, and will be glad to show to the distinguished Senator occupying the chair [Mr. CAIN] or to any other Senator, not one, not a dozen, not 20, 30, or 40, but more than 100 letters saying that ROBERT A. TAFT is a Communist and Socialist because he advocated the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Some men who disagreed with him and did not like the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill promptly called the Senator from Ohio a Socialist and a Communist. So, as Mr. Wallace says:

> These phrases confuse the realities of a world in transition. They are every bit as loose in their use of the word "Communist" when they speak of policies abroad as they are when they attack as "Communist" liberal proposals here at home. President Truman and the bipartisan supporters of his anti-Communist crusade are saying in effect that American security is threatened by the endeavors of backward countries everywhere to lift themselves from feudalism into the modern world of the twentieth century. Change anywhere in the world is labeled "aggression" by the bipartisans.

Does anyone doubt that statement? Is there any testimony disputing what Mr. Wallace said? Mr. Wallace continued:

> Today we are supposed to believe that a democratic election in Italy can be an act of political aggression if the results displease us. But the threat comes only from the free choice of the Italian people—and it is the Italian people whom the militarists fear.
>
> Fear of necessary change cannot halt the progress of mankind. Neither guns nor atom bomb can erase the need for land reform in nations where farms are small and the land is poor.

A few days ago a very distinguished man came over here from Spain. He had been in Italy. I invited the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to meet him. We heard him tell how over in Italy eight families own an entire province. So when Mr. Wallace speaks of land reform, I submit that he is on pretty solid ground.

Mr. Wallace continued:

> Radioactive gas will not quench the thirst for knowledge of illiterate peoples. Bacteriological warfare will not halt the drive to modernize and expand industry in undeveloped countries where productivity is low.
>
> The peoples of the world are on the march toward a more abundant life.

I am sure that my Democratic colleagues will all remember the words which were used so often—"again and again and again" by a man who only recently occupied the office of President of the United States. We heard a great deal about the "more abundant life."

Mr. Wallace continued, in his testimony on this bill:

> Their struggles for progress are very much like those which marked the development

of our own country. Their aspirations for a better life do not threaten the American people. In fact, the peace and prosperity of the American Nation is tied up with the development of backward countries, with their transition from poverty to plenty. This world-wide movement away from feudalism threatens only the special interests and entrenched privileges of international big business.

Why was it that when our military authorities went into Germany American capitalists did not go among the people and say, "We want you to organize a bank, and we will lend you the money?" I challenge any Senator to name a single South American country into which American capital went and said, "We will lend you the money to establish a bank." After the League of Nations Charter was adopted, we were all going to be sisters and brothers. The people of South America were going to be our sisters and brothers, and we were going to help them. But I defy any Senator to name a single South American country where our industrialists and financiers said to the people, "You have young men and women here who are graduates of some of the best colleges in the United States. There is no question that you can operate banks. We will lend you the money to establish a bank." Did our industrialists and financiers say that to the people of Peru, for example? Instead, what did they do? They established the bank; and they are out to get the last drop of financial blood they can get out of the people of Peru. That is true of every other South American country.

When we went to Europe we did the same thing over there. As our occupation forces went into Germany and other countries, the Chase National Bank of New York City was establishing branch banks. It had an opportunity to expand. There was no purpose on the part of the American administration to let the people of the occupied countries rehabilitate themselves by establishing institutions which they themselves controlled. That has not been the policy. Our policy has been a policy of expansion in all the countries, including especially China, where American industrialists and financiers could expand their sphere of influence and get every single dollar that they possibly could out of those people who, under the League of Nations agreement, were supposed to be our brothers and our sisters.

Mr. Wallace continued:

Their aspirations for a better life do not threaten the American people.

Mr. Wallace further said—and nowhere in his cross-examination by members of the committee who heard him was the statement gainsaid, because I have the record before me:

If we are to compete with communism we had better get on the side of the people.

I submit that that is pretty good doctrine. It is not answered anywhere in this book.

We must practice the democracy we preach. If we do we shall have allies which bribes and arms cannot buy.

The remobilization demanded by the administration is a program which would protect international privilege and add to the profits of large corporations as they become the major partners in European and international cartels.

Did the members of the committee interrogate Mr. Wallace and dispute his statement? Quite the contrary. What is the record? When Mr. Wallace talks about monopolies and cartels, at least he brings to my recollection the fact that the Sherman antitrust law was passed in 1890. We should read the congressional debates at that time. When in this very room the Sherman antitrust law was passed, it was stated that it would do away with unlawful conspiracies to concentrate wealth in the hands of the few. In the Sherman antitrust law there was a provision that if that act was violated, those who violated it could be sent to jail for a period of 1 year and could be fined $5,000. I challenge any Member of the Senate to name one person who, from 1890 to the present time, under any Attorney General, has been sent to jail for violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. Perhaps in a moment some Senator will state the name of one such person. There was only one man who was sent to jail in connection with the Sherman Antitrust Act, and that was Eugene Debs. He was sent to jail, not by a jury, but by a judge, who had issued an order which Mr. Debs violated.

Mr. President, at this time I send to the desk an amendment, which, if adopted, I think, will do much good. The amendment provides that on page 65, in line 4, after the word "compensation", there shall be inserted the words "but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital." As thus amended, that portion of the bill will then read:

(d) Fair and just compensation, but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital, shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the wish of the Senator from North Dakota to have the amendment printed and lie on the table?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. President, Mr. Wallace continued as follows:

The remobilization demanded by the administration is a program which would protect international privilege and add to the profits of large corporations as they become the major partners in European and international cartels. The dollars of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys are to be spent in bolstering these interests. While the propagandists mix fear and the language of humanitarianism, we shall be repressing the forward movement of peoples towards enlightenment and well-being.

Mr. President, we cannot get rid of Henry Wallace just by shrugging our shoulders. I am a Republican. Nevertheless, I realize that for 4 years Mr. Wallace presided over this Chamber. He was picked by approximately 26,000,000 voters, according to my recollection, who voted the Democratic ticket at the time when he was elected Vice President of the United States. Before that, he was nominated by Democrats representing all the United States. They must have thought he was a very good man, or else they would not have nominated him. Later, when he was named Secretary of Commerce, the Democrats were still in control in this Chamber. They knew all about him. Every day they saw him here. They could read in the newspapers what he stood for. After he had been Secretary of Agriculture for a long time and after he had presided here in the Senate for four long years, the Members of this body said he would make a very good Secretary of Commerce, and they endorsed him. He was appointed by the President to be Secretary of Commerce, and the Senate confirmed the appointment.

References have been made to Mr. Marshall, not as a general, but as Secretary of State. He has not had the experience in the office of Secretary of State that Mr. Wallace had as Secretary of Agriculture, later as Secretary of Commerce, and also as Vice President of the United States.

Remember, too, that Mr. Wallace took various trips. Before Mr. Truman even was nominated to be Vice President, the administration sent Mr. Wallace to China; and for six long weeks Henry Wallace was representing President Roosevelt in China, and our Government paid the bill. The Democrats must have believed he was a very good man or else they would not have sent him to China for 6 weeks.

Mr. Wallace continued at the hearings as follows:

The Forrestal-Truman program for the draft and UMT is a program of aggression. The Wall Street Journal recognized this when it said:

"A large army is a first consideration only if you expect to attack and occupy territory."

The legitimate defense needs of our country bear no resemblance to their proposals. American boys and dollars must not be used to support native reactionaries in suppressing the demands of people for change.

The President's demand for conscription and compulsory military training carries the Truman doctrine to a new stage—military action. In its first stage, the Truman doctrine was described as a diplomatic effort to "contain" the Soviet Union. The European recovery program was the second stage—economic warfare to implement diplomacy. According to the Journal of Commerce, March 18, 1948, ERP will now be used in large part to ship munitions.

In its third stage the Truman doctrine calls for the application of military force. In the words of the Wall Street Journal, "the progression of this doctrine has been relentless. Its progression, indeed, was inevitable once the Government accepted its basic principles." That principle is that war is inevitable.

War today is total. The whole economy must be militarized to support the war machine. Military conscription must therefore be followed by labor conscription.

I call attention to the fact that here we have a great Democrat speaking, the man who for a long time was Secretary of Agriculture in a Democratic administration, who for 4 years, as a Democrat, presided over this body, the man whom the Democratic majority in this body thereafter confirmed as Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, he was one of the precious jewels when it came to the campaigns. He was the man whom the Democrats sent all over the great Northwest to tell the people how he had saved the farming industry of the United States. The Democrats were proud of him. Wherever he went he was wined and dined, second only to President Roosevelt himself. It was Mr. Wallace who carried the ticket to victory—as the Democrats said, "to glorious victory." I maintain today that although there may be only one chance in a hundred of his being right, at least this body is entitled to his views. Mr. Wallace continued:

Civilian consumption must be subordinated to the production of weapons of destruction. The economics of aggression dictate the following progression. Butter and guns are followed by guns and butter and finally by guns and dry bread. While the people tighten their belts, the huge corporations profit on war orders.

Mr. President, I have before me a number of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to certain speeches made upon this floor, speeches which I believe are very germane to the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon and germane to the bill itself.

On Monday, May 10, 1948, Representative VAN ZANDT spoke on the subject, "Veterans of Foreign Wars support H. R. 6258, a bill to take the profits out of war." Aside from the very small minority of men in this country who own or who are interested in large industrial corporations, the people are overwhelmingly in favor of taking the profits out of war. Mr. VAN ZANDT said:

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H. R. 6258 on April 15, in a statement I mentioned that it was designed to take the profits out of war.

That was similar to my amendment which I sent to the desk a moment ago, which provides that anybody dealing under the program for which we are voting shall not make more than 10 percent profit. I submit that 10 percent profit is enough.

Mr. VAN ZANDT continued:

I also stated that the provisions of the bill were similar to a bill introduced by me in the Seventy-sixth Congress, and which was identical to a bill introduced at that time by 50 Members of the Senate and by 11 Members of the House.

Today, Mr. President, I am almost if not entirely alone. A short time ago the same bill was introduced by 50 Senators. It got exactly nowhere.

Mr. VAN ZANDT continued:

The sponsor of this legislation in the Seventy-sixth Congress was the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I am pleased to report that the VFW is supporting House Resolution 6258 in the Eightieth Congress, as evidenced by the following statement issued by the department of public relations of the VFW to all posts of that organization.

Before asking unanimous consent to have the statement placed in the RECORD, I shall read a few paragraphs. They show what the soldiers think about the way the Congress is running the Government. This is what they think of Senators who are receiving $15,000 a year. The statement is so good I believe I shall read it all, because it represents the feeling of hundreds of thousands of soldiers.

The soldier boys were asked to go out and sacrifice their lives. I went to Walter Reed Hospital, where I saw veterans, some without arms, some without legs, some without sight. Yet at that very time the corporations had taken in hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars. Listen to what the Veterans of Foreign Wars have to say:

Speaking in terms of money alone, World War II cost the American taxpayers in expenditures and pyramided debts, in excess of $330,000,000,000. This figure is five times the total national income during 1939, the year in which the war began in Europe.

During the period 1941 to 1943, inclusive, corporation net profits alone increased more than 100 percent over the preceding 3-year period during which there was little preparation for and no prosecution of a war. The vast bulk of this tremendous increase represents excessive war profits.

There was another kind of debt incurred during the war which cannot be repaid. That debt is owed to the one-third of a million Americans who gave their lives and to the million others who became casualties. The resultant grief of the survivors and disrupted lives of those who served cannot be compensated for in dollars.

Such figures as these tell a simple, yet highly indicative story. In their essence they mean that for some—a small minority we like to think—war is a highly profitable venture, and therefore a desirable one. For others it means sacrifices far above and beyond any monetary value.

Were I to advocate that taking the profits out of war is the sole remedy needed to abolish it I should defeat my purpose in talking to you today (tonight). Obviously it is not. Yet it is an irrefutable fact that most wars in recorded history have been fought purely for selfish, material gains. Whether openly mercenary or under the cloak of an ideology, the profit motive invariably exists to some extent in all wars. I repeat that taking profits out of war will not guarantee its abolition, but I emphasize strongly that it would be one of the greatest deterrents to war yet devised.

With these profits outlawed, any future war in which America might become engaged will truly be a war of purpose—a war fought solely for the preservation of the American way of life.

Constitutionally, the Federal Government cannot confiscate privately owned property to aid in the prosecution of a war in which it is involved. It may, however, appropriate human lives by use of the military draft and use them to the fullest extent if necessary to bring about a successful termination of a war.

Do we see, Mr. President, what these soldiers see, that under our Constitution we cannot confiscate property, but we can confiscate the lives of the young men? Oh, Mr. President, property is inviolate. But we can take the last son in a family of four or five or six and leave a farmer and his wife—I read the record on that question fully last year—with no one to help them. The Army took the last boy from a farmer who was 70 years of age and whose wife was approximately 67 years of age, and left them without any help on the farm. I called attention to another instance in which two sons had been killed, and I learned that the third boy was being sent across the water. It was only after getting in touch with the late Senator David I. Walsh that we were able to keep that boy from going overseas. He was finally stationed in California.

Under our Constitution we cannot confiscate property. We cannot say to some millionaire or some billionaire, "Now we will take all above five or six or twenty or twenty-five million dollars," but we can take the lives of young men, and do it constitutionally. These young men see the situation, Mr. President. They brought it to the attention of Representative VAN ZANDT of Pennsylvania.

Manifestly this is essential in times of emergency. But it is no less essential, no less democratic to appropriate excessive profits of war for the common defense. The most iniquitous quality invested in man during time of war is that he should profit from the blood of others. It is totally against the precepts of Christianity.

Maybe that is the reason why the 12 leading Protestant churches in America have come out against the bill which we are today considering.

The one democratic way of utilizing the full productivity of property in time of war without actual confiscation is through a steeply graduated personal and corporation war-profits tax. Thus would be abolished all monetary incentive for war; and those who foster it for its profits would be less belligerent knowing that they stood to lose by it. Those excessive profits which would otherwise go into the pockets of the individual or corporation would, under such an arrangement, revert to the United States Treasury to be used in defraying the expense of the war, with a postwar debt held at a minimum by an excess-profits tax operative during hostilities, there would be created a salubrious condition for a stabilized postwar economy. What war debts might be incurred could quickly be liquidated thus sparing a burden for succeeding generations to shoulder. Of no little consequence is that excess-profits taxes during war would do much to avert years of economic depression and widespread unemployment which follow in the wake of war and the disruption of world markets.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars continue in their statement as follows:

The drafting of excessive income of individuals and corporations during war would cause all Americans to realize that any future war would result not only in the loss of human life and misery to millions of citizens, but it would also mean the sacrifice of all profits above living expenses. The burdens of war would then be more equally distributed. To certain extents we would all be in it together—not just those who do the actual fighting. Potential profiteers of any possible future war, realizing that net profits, after payment of war taxes, would be less during time of war than during time of peace, would very probably be instilled with a strong desire for a policy by our country of doing all possible to stay out of war. With war profits gone, we should have to have an impeccably moral and worthy cause before entering another war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place the remainder of this statement in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For many years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has urged upon Congress the enact-

ment of legislation outlawing discriminatory war profits. Under its auspices such a bill was introduced into Congress on Americanization Day, April 27, 1938, along with the signed endorsement of 4,000,000 American citizens. Similar bills under VFW sponsorship were presented the following year under joint authorship of 50 Senators and 4 Representatives. These bills clearly had the backing of the American people. However, opposition and criticism of the bills by those who would be most affected by it prevailed, and shortly thereafter we entered World War II. As a result, fabulous personal and corporate fortunes were made just as they were made in World War I, and our war debt went up into astronomical figures. And so even after the war, the little man, the man who endured the rigors of war at $60 a month, the man who lost his son on Iwo Jima or at St. Lo, must keep on paying and paying. Those who stayed at home to reap the harvest will pay too—but how well they can afford it.

Today, hostile acts and aggressive tactics abroad are again threatening to embroil us in another and even more devastating global conflict. It is not my purpose today (tonight) to dwell upon the present international situation, or to offer solutions to the grave problems confronting us. I do wish to emphasize, however, the urgency of considering now a strong restraining influence on those who would compromise our national security by the greed for profits by which they are dominated—even at the expense of human life and abject misery.

To prevent, in the event of a future war, a repetition of the creation of war-made millionaires, the Veterans of Foreign Wars is again sponsoring a bill designed to eliminate those ill-gotten gains by steeply graduated income and other taxes during hostilities. This is House Resolution 6258 introduced on April 15, 1948. Its provisions will equalize the financial costs of war and provide for an effective defense at a time when it is most needed. It will do all possible to insure peace, but in case of attack by a foreign power, it will direct the entire resources of the Nation impartially toward the war's speedy and successful conclusion.

It must be understood clearly that H. R. 6258 is in strict conformance with our present tax laws and violates no constitutional provisions. It is applicable only in time of war and ceases when Congress declares war to be at an end. It makes no attempt to confiscate property nor does it violate the individual rights of any citizen. It bestows no unusual powers upon any one individual. It establishes no vast political machine, for it operates, when effective, with our existing tax-collecting agencies. Its provisions have been studied and approved by the country's leading tax experts. Its enactment would do more to prevent a world catastrophe than any other statute now in effect. It is written to aid the common man who is always the big loser in any war. It is the epitaph of the war profiteer.

One of the principal objections that has been voiced against this proposed measure (and you may be sure that those who stand to profit by war are the most vociferous against it) is that it is not in line with the principles of American democracy, and that it smacks of communism and socialism. I maintain that such an accusation is absurd in the face of those very principles upon which our democracy operates. If 100 percent of the bodies and minds of our finest young men are democratically drafted for national defense, it would be utter stupidity to assert that the wealth represented in the form of dollars which these same men helped to create is exempt from doing its part in the preservation of the system by which it came into being. In time of war our people fight, and often die for the continuation of the American form of government. Is it fitting then that huge individual and corporate war profits stand idle and later become a burden upon those who fight?

I do not maintain that H. R. 6258 would or could equalize all the sacrifices necessary to successfully wage a war if forced upon us. But it most assuredly will bring about a financial equalization, and will minimize to an extent hitherto unknown the sufferings that go with war. It would be a major factor in securing the earliest possible termination of war. Certainly it would spare the burden of huge war debts such as we now have. No—legislation alone cannot compensate those who bear the brunt of battle. They have ever been on the short end—their sacrifices cannot be equaled. H. R. 6258 is, however, the nearest thing yet devised to equally distribute the total costs of war. Under its provisions every person not in uniform, and every company and corporation would contribute any excess wartime profits to the financing of a war while it is still in progres. On the basis of actual income, every citizen and every business firm would pay their proportionate shares of the expense of war. With this bill made into law, there will be no more wartime profiteers in the United States.

It is generally accepted that America is a Nation that abhors war and holds to the tenets of peace. Our potential enemies today realize this fact and have, and will in the future, exploit it fully to gain their own ends. It is unfortunate and ignominious that we have in this country certain groups and individuals who play along with these adversaries of freedom. These peole would risk not only American security and human lives in another calamitous conflict, but even their own properties for an upsurge in profits from war. Such is their greed—such is their lack of foresight.

This Nation is now in one of the most crucial periods in its history. International tension will probably increase before it can abate. To resist the hue and cry of the forces leading to war will require a fortitude of the utmost degree. Let us not be misled by the wartime promises of a fool's gold which in the end can benefit only the few and bring but sorrow, privation, and despondency to the many. We must guard against propaganda for war by all those who would profit from it. But more than that, we must take all excess profit away from war—and then that propaganda will cease.

I call upon every person with a consicence to support H. R. 6258 and to make his support known to those who will be responsible for its enactment. Surely no person with a sincere belief in the justice of mankind can defend the wartime profiteer. No man with honor can conscientiously oppose a plan which guarantees equal division of the financial burdens of war. No American, worthy of the name, can condone the usury of the few imposed upon the blood of his fellow men.

I leave you with this thought: To help prevent war, let us have no fear of it and be ready for it should it come. If it must come—let it be untainted with the lust for profit. Let it be for the common cause of freedom.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a short time ago there was a very distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable Hugh B. Mitchell, former Senator of the United States, representing the State of Washington——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me how long he expects to speak?

Mr. LANGER. I do not think it will be very long; possibly an hour. I want to discuss the question of war profits.

Mr. LUCAS. Far be it from me to try to stop the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I will guarantee that my speech will require an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois that 1 hour, so far as the Senator from North Dakota is concerned, is normally a good hour.

Mr. LANGER. Let us call it a senatorial hour, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to know whether the Senator's hour is a daylight-saving hour, or just a normal hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot answer that question.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the suggestion has been made to me that the Senator from North Dakota might yield long enough for a vote on the pending amendment. I have no objection to the Senator from North Dakota keeping the floor. I think he has a message he desires to give to the Senate, and it would not help us particularly to have a vote on the pending amendment, if another one is to be presented. The Senator might as well continue his remarks at the present time, as far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Dakota how long he expects the Senate to remain in session today?

Mr. GURNEY. I am told by the acting majority leader that he would like to have the Senate continue in session until 10:30 or 11 o'clock, or later. He wants to get along with the bill tonight.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope it will not be much later than 11:30.

Mr. GURNEY. I share the hope of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, up until a short time ago there was included in the membership of this body one of the finest men in Washington, Mr. Hugh B. Mitchell. As Senator, he was a member of the Truman committee.

On Friday, August 2, 1946, Senator Mitchell had inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Investigation of War Profits." The article is so good, so clear, so concise, that I wish to read certain portions of it.

Senator Mitchell said:

Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 31, I made certain observations in the Senate with regard to the current investigation of war profits by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. It was my intention to evaluate the committee's findings in the broader context of wartime developments which point an ominous sign toward the future. In the few remaining hours of this session I do not wish to take up any more time, and accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have additional remarks on the same subject printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This is the statement of Senator Mitchell, as printed in the RECORD:

Mr. President, for the past several weeks the American people have heard and read the fantastic story of the Erie Basin case as developed in the hearings of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

The committee's investigation has laid bare in detail the efforts of persons associated with this munitions combine to secure special favors from the Government and to

extract unusual and illegitimate gains from the war. The responses of certain military and other Government officials to these solicitations indicate callous disregard or shocking ignorance of the standards of conduct implicit in public office.

WITNESSES DISAPPEAR

The committee has pursued the facts in this complex case despite difficulties and instances of noncooperation. Some witnesses have rendered themselves inaccessible or unwilling to give testimony. Prior to the hearings, shameful attempts at bribery were made in the vain hope that the committee would be dissuaded from continuing its investigation.

The present inquiry with regard to war profiteering is not unique in the committee's work. Its hearings and reports contain other cases, some less sensational and less involved, but no less indicative of the committee's purpose to insure the honest and efficient disbursement of public funds in behalf of the war effort and to promote the maximum of war production.

Throughout its many and varied investigations into the defense and war programs, the committee has shown a persistent and scrupulous desire to get at the facts. It has never indulged in witch hunts, indiscriminate criticism, and character assassination. It has held itself aloof from partisan considerations and has refused absolutely to lend itself to devious political pursuits. The committee's reports to the Senate record the unanimous judgment of its members.

UNDERLYING SIGNIFICANCE

Mr. President, speaking for myself, I wish to point out the underlying significance of the Erie Basin investigation which may have been obscured by the intense interest in the particulars of the case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of this article, on pages A4770 and A4771, volume 92, part 12, of the Appendix of the RECORD, be printed as a part of my remarks, down to the headline "Favoritism cost billions."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Certain persons associated with this dubious enterprise were lacking in tact and judgment, others were downright dishonest. But the startling thing about their combined efforts to obtain special favors from the Government is the success which attended these efforts. To my way of thinking, the facts disclosed in this case cannot be cut loose from the environment in which they transpired. They are but small ugly symptoms of a process of moral degeneration in the dealings of business and government.

Mr. President, the exertion of undue and improper business influence upon government is not something new in American history. There have been many times past when the existence of free, democratic government was threatened by the attempts of influential persons, backed up by the power of associated wealth, to subvert government to the purpose of a privileged few. And always at a critical stage, when political democracy was endangered by economic oligarchy, the people rose up in their wrath and repudiated the agents of special privilege.

SELF-SEEKING LOBBYISTS

America is in grave danger today. Greedy, self-seeking interests hold sway in the land. They send their agents to penetrate high places in Government and to haunt the Halls of Congress. We cannot legislate price control for a few short months without slacking their thirst for large and inordinate profits. We cannot promote housing for veterans and others desperately needing shelter without making special concessions to speculators and profiteers. We cannot legislate for the promotion of scientific research and the control of atomic energy while the fate of the world hangs in the balance, unless we defer to the wishes of giant corporations. Other legislation vital to the health and security and happiness of the American people dies aborning, because it does not fit into the program of the higher echelons in the business community. And while the hopes and aspirations of the American people for a better life in the aftermath of a terrible war lie still-born, the assorted lobbyists and representatives of greed howl gleefully.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that the line between private interest and public duty has become so jagged and confused? Shall we hold up our hands in horror when we find public officials trading small favors with outside business interests and yielding to their blandishments, without recognizing that the great principle of democratic government is at stake? The strivings of the Erie Basin interests for special treatment pale into insignificance beside the efforts of vested business interests to exploit the instrument of government and gain a stranglehold on the economic resources of this country.

TOO MUCH MONOPOLY POWER

The monopoly power of great corporations has been increased and extended during the war. Available studies show that economic concentration has been hastened by wartime production and the addition of the tremendous wartime plant capacity. Billions upon billions of public funds were channeled into the hands of a few giant corporations by the military procurement officers, and the war agencies directed the flow of manpower and materials to service these colossal procurement contracts.

Mr. President, the corporations that were favored in contract award did not come knocking on the doors of the war agencies to cultivate "contracts" and gain special favors with gifts and bribes. The representatives of these corporations were themselves on the "inside"; they sat high in the councils of the war agencies and marshaled the economic resources of this country for war in accordance with the business preferences of their employers.

TRUMAN DOLLAR-A-YEAR-MEN REPORT

I call the attention of the Senate to the committee's Report No. 480, part 5, which was submitted under Mr. Truman's direction in the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It is stated therein:

"The principal positions of the Office of Production Management were assigned to persons holding important positions with large companies who were willing and anxious to serve on a dollar per year, or without compensation (w. o. c.) basis. They usually did not sever their business connections, but instead obtained leave of absence. Their companies continued to pay their salaries. In some cases their compensation was even increased."

Of course, these men did not pass immediately upon contracts to their companies, but the advantages that accrued were substantial. The committee report continues:

"Although the contracts obtained by the companies loaning the services of dollar-a-year and without-compensation men are not passed upon by the men so loaned, such companies do obtain very substantial benefits from the practice. The dollar-a-year and without-compensation men so loaned spend a considerable portion of their time during office hours in familiarizing themselves with the defense program. They are, therefore, in a much better position than the ordinary man in the street to know what type of contracts the Government is about to let and how their companies may best proceed to obtain consideration. They also are in an excellent position to know what shortages are imminent and to advise their companies on how best to proceed, either to build up inventories against future shortages, or to apply for early consideration for priorities. They can even advise them as to how to phrase their requests for priorities. In addition, such men are frequently close personal friends and social intimates of the dollar-a-year and without-compensation men who do pass upon the contracts in which their companies are interested.

"These are only a few of the advantages which large companies have obtained from the practice and it should be especially noted that they are the very same ones which the small and intermediate businessmen attempt to obtain by hiring people who they believe have inside information and friends on the inside who could assist them in obtaining favorable consideration for contracts. Therefore, in a very real sense the dollar-a-year and without-compensation men can be termed lobbyists. This does not mean that either they or their companies are engaged in any illegal conduct, for lobbying as such is not illegal, but it does mean that human nature being what it is, there is a very real opportunity for the favoritism and other abuses which has led the public to condemn lobbying and the Congress to consider corrective legislation."

Other less tangible but perhaps more important benefits accruing to companies that sent dollar-a-year men into the Government were implicit in the fact that—

"All important procurement contracts must be approved by these dollar-a-year and without-compensation men, which means that contracts must conform to their theories of business. Since they represent the largest companies, this means that the defense program in all its ramifications must obtain the approval of the large companies."

The type of business thinking which directed the war program was described by the committee as follows:

"It is only natural that such men should believe that only companies of the size and type with which they were associated have the ability to perform defense contracts; that small and intermediate companies ought not to be given prime contracts; that the urgencies of the defense program are such that they have no time to consider small companies for defense contracts; that the large companies ought not to be required to subcontract items which they could profitably manufacture and as to which they express lack of confidence in the productive facilities of smaller concerns; that the producers of strategic materials should not be expected or required to increase their capacities, even at Government expense, where that might result in excess capacity after the war and adversely affect their postwar profits; and that large companies should not be expected or required to convert their facilities into defense plants where they prefer to use their plants to make the profits from their civilian business and, at the same time, to have additional plants directly or indirectly paid for by the Government, which they can operate profitably on terms dictated by themselves. The dollar-a-year and without-compensation men subconsciously reflect the opinions and conclusions which they formerly reached as managers of large interests with respect to Government competition, with respect to taxation and amortization, with respect to the financing of new plant expansion and with respect to the margin of profit which should be allowed on war contracts."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I read further from the statement of Senator Mitchell:

FAVORITISM COST BILLIONS

The Comptroller General of the United States recently appeared before the Mead committee and described how the huge war contracts were renegotiated and terminated. He testified that untold millions, if not billions, of dollars were irretrievably lost to the

Government through inefficiency, ineptitude, and favoritism displayed by contracting officers. Many of these officers were socially intimate with executives of interested companies, and in some cases landed high-paying jobs as a reward for their generous settlement of contracts. The chairman of the committee referred to this simultaneous process of terminating contracts and terminating Government employment as a sort of reconversion back to private industry of these so-called dollar-a-year men and others. Most of the procurement officers wore military uniforms.

Mr. President, we have heard our distinguished colleagues today tell about General Bradley and General Eisenhower and their testimony, but I submit that General Marshall's testimony is given as Secretary of State, not as a general. He was a general at the very time when the Mead committee made this report that billions of dollars were taken—by whom? By men wearing the military uniform. I do not criticize General Marshall for that. I mention it only for the purpose of making clear to the many Senators who are now upon the floor what I said yesterday, or the day before, with respect to who now runs the United States. I then quoted a military magazine, the Army and Navy Bulletin, which in its issue of the 18th of January asked, "Who is running the Government?" and answered its own question by saying, "Why, the Army."

NOMINATION OF THOMAS C. BUCHANAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for a short time in order that I may make a statement for the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut if I do not lose the floor by doing so. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Connecticut without losing the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, under date of June 3 I addressed a letter to our colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, considering the nomination of one Thomas C. Buchanan to be a member of the Federal Power Commission. I wrote to the Senator from Indiana as follows:

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I enclose herewith a transcript of newspaper stories carried in the Philadelphia Record under date of August 3 and 9, 1932, bearing upon the past activities of one A. B. Millar, secretary of the Pennsylvania Electric Association.

A preliminary check-up indicates that there is justification in fact for the stories. In view of the fact that Millar has testified against the nomination of Thomas C. Buchanan to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, it is of vital interest to the people of the United States to know all the facts and I therefore strongly urge that under the authority granted to the subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be a member, you immediately summon Millar to a meeting of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

BRIEN MCMAHON.

The story is from the Philadelphia Record of August 3, 1932. I read from it as follows:

HARRISBURG, August 2.—Chairman W. D. B. Ainey, center of Governor Pinchot's latest and heaviest attack on the Pennsylvania Public Service Commission, hoisted the white flag in surrender today. He resigned as the senate prepared to investigate charges of graft lodged against him. The resignation was accepted immediately by the senate and the commission was left with four working members, only two of whom have been confirmed by the senate.

I shall not read all of the story, but after skipping several paragraphs, I read as follows:

A senate investigating committee conducted an inquiry which developed the fact that Ainey and A. B. Millar, a former Mitten employee had gone to Europe on the same boat several years ago.

The investigation was about to be dropped when Governor Pinchot submitted additional sensational charges. These tended to show that Ainey went on the European trip as the guest of Millar and that a hospital bill in Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, was paid for him by the late A. W. Thompson, Pittsburgh utility magnate.

* * * * *

Chapman said money charged to legal expense was given to A. B. Millar, former PRT and Mitten management employee, by Mitten and that it was Chapman's understanding Millar took the money to Ainey at Harrisburg. Ainey denied this. Millar, an official of the Pennsylvania Electric Association with offices in Harrisburg, said he had either cashed these checks and returned the money to Mitten or endorsed the checks and returned the money to Mitten. He said that he did not get any of the money, denied ever giving any to Ainey and claimed ignorance regarding the ultimate destination or purpose of the money.

Millar admitted accompanying Ainey to Europe in 1927, but denied he had paid for Ainey's transportation. The Governor's new evidence included copies of the Cunard Steamship Co. books and records, showing that Millar purchased transportation for a party of five which included, in addition to himself, his wife, daughter, Ainey, and Ainey's attendant.

Mr. President, with one word I shall desist and permit the Senator from North Dakota to proceed. The nomination of Mr. Buchanan has been in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for about 2 months. In the hearings which were held we discovered that the utilities of Pennsylvania had a front man named Dunlap, whom they sent here to testify against Buchanan, which he did not do very successfully. On cross-examination of Dunlap we found that before he came here he talked to A. B. Millar, who is secretary of the Pennsylvania Association of Utilities. So Millar appeared and under cross-examination indicated that his sole duty was to promote the sale of electricity, and the general benefit of the electric-light companies in Pennsylvania; and, perish the thought that he ever engaged in any lobbying, or that he had indulged in any conspiracy with Dunlap in order to frustrate Buchanan's appointment.

In view of this story which appeared in the newspaper, which did not come into the possession of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], a member of the committee, until after the hearings closed, it seemed to some of us, more particularly the Senator from Pennsylvania and myself—although perhaps I should speak only for myself—it seemed to me that it would be a good thing if we called Brother Millar back again and give him another going over, because it looks to me as though the cat is out of the bag, that Millar has been engaged in this kind of business for a long while, and if Buchanan's appointment is going to be blocked by the power interests, I think the people of the United States should know it.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. I have talked with the Senator from North Dakota, and have asked him to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I promised the Senator from North Dakota that I would do my utmost to see that he is recognized after the conclusion of a vote on the pending amendment. It is my purpose at this time, therefore, to suggest the absence of a quorum, and I hope that the Senate will then proceed to a vote, and I further hope that when the vote has been taken the Senator from North Dakota will be recognized and may proceed with his remarks.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that after the vote on the pending amendment the Senator from North Dakota be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none. The request is granted.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Buck	Ives	Reed
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Capehart	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Langer	Smith
Cooper	Lodge	Sparkman
Cordon	Lucas	Stennis
Donnell	McCarthy	Stewart
Dworshak	McClellan	Taft
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McGrath	Thye
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Malone	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Watkins
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "G" offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer a modifying amendment, which would change the word "second" to the word "third" in line 2 of the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 2 of the so-called Morse amendment, after the word "thereof", it is proposed to strike out "second" and insert "third."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the way the bill stands at present is the way it is recommended by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. It is our firm conclusion that the best results in keeping the peace will come by showing a firm resolve that we mean to keep this country strong. We can mean to keep it strong for 6 months or for 1 year or for 2 years, 3 years, or 5 years.

When I presented the bill for the committee, I said that the bill is flexible. It can be made flexible within the 5-year period, as set forth in the bill, by having each subsequent Congress take a look at the world situation, determine what is best, and then fix the maximum number of men in each of the three branches of the armed services.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, what the Senator says about keeping the country strong in its armed forces appeals to everyone, not only for a 1-year period or for 2 years or 5 years, but always. But it seems to me that the people of this country have been told—and I know that the Members of the Senate have been told over and over again—that this peacetime draft is a temporary measure necessary to meet the temporary exigency which has arisen in the armed forces.

Now the plan as unfolded to us is that instead of being temporary, for the 2-year period for which the men will be drafted, it will continue; the bill visualizes the carrying on of this draft for a 5-year period.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield the floor to the Senator from West Virginia as soon as I have finished my remarks. If he has a question to put to me, I shall be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator believe that a 5-year period goes beyond the word "temporary," as stated?

Mr. GURNEY. No; I do not; and in the statement I have made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon I have given my reasons for taking that position. I have said that the bill is flexible. I have said that in the bill we have shown a firm resolve to keep the peace, and that the bill is flexible in that connection. If, a year or 2 years from now, we wish to reduce the maximum number of men, in light of world conditions or events at that time, we can do so as to each of the three branches of the armed services. If we do that, then undoubtedly volunteers will come into the armed services in sufficient numbers so that it will not be necessary to continue to draft anyone. In the meantime, we shall be building up the strength of the reserves and also the strength of the armed forces elsewhere, and therefore we shall provide another chance to cut down the strength of the armed forces—which will cost, for upkeep, close to $15,000,000,000 a year. That is another purpose of this bill.

Another purpose in having the bill provide for a term of 5 years is that when we come to the conclusion of that period, we can ask, "What can we expect in the near future? Can we expect that the United Nations will be strong enough to maintain world peace in a few years time? Can we expect in a few years to have conditions in Germany, Japan, and elsewhere such that we no longer shall be called upon to keep so many of our armed forces on duty in the occupation zones? Is it right for us to keep these men in the occupied zones, without having in the United States trained reserves to back them up?"

Mr. President, our committee has answered those questions by saying that it is the proper thing to build up the reserves. We say that if we are going to keep certain numbers of our men overseas, in vulnerable positions, we should be ready to back them up.

Therefore, I say the bill is flexible, and it is not necessary to provide a 2-year limitation. We wish to show a firm resolve, and we wish to do everything possible to maintain the peace.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that the sum and substance of the issue now before the Senate is that if the bill passes without this amendment, under the bill the Army will be authorized for a period of 5 years to draft at its own command.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if the Congress did not accept its responsibility each year to reevaluate the situation, then the answer to the Senator's question would be "Yes, absolutely." But I suspect that each subsequent Congress will be very much alive to the situation. Certainly if I am in the Congress, I shall want to reevaluate the situation, and I know the Senator from West Virginia will wish to do so, and I am sure there are about 94 other Senators who will also wish to be very sure that the Congress does not continuously, each year, authorize the armed services to have more than the correct number of men necessary to take care of the situation then confronting the country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To put it in another way, the Senator speaks of having the Congress reevaluate the situation under the draft each year. The Senator means, I assume, that Congress will have to repeal this law if it decides that it wants to discontinue the draft within the next 5 years.

Mr. GURNEY. No. I very sincerely tried to tell the Senator the way to proceed in that case. The way in which the bill is flexible—and if the Senator will read the provision on page 3, which is very short, he will see what we have provided—is that it provides a means of reducing the number of men authorized for each branch of the armed services. That point is very clear, I think. The Senator from West Virginia knows that if the world situations improved, and if we were able to cut down the number of men in the armed services to, let us say, 1,200,000, probably we could get along without drafting anyone.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would not it really be wiser and better to meet that situation as it confronts us, instead of today taking the unusual step of creating a draft, not only for this year but over a course of 5-years, although in order to prevent the enforcement of the draft next year and in the years to come for 5 years, the Senate must take action each year to prevent the armed services from continuing the draft?

So it seems to me the whole question is whether we shall act for a 2-year period or a 5-year period and shall authorize the continuation of the draft for 5 years.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the committee was of the firm belief that in order to get the best out of this bill we should show our firm resolve by passing a bill that will be in effect for a length of time sufficient to really take care of the present world situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In addition to what the Senator from South Dakota has said, the entire principle behind the bill is to provide inducements to men to volunteer into the services and to undertake training. Under the bill, the Army will have no discretion in the matter of drafting men, although the Senator from West Virginia has seemed to imply to the contrary. We wish to keep the armed forces up to the authorized strength, but we hope to do so by means of volunteers. If this bill is enacted and remains in force, unless Congress in its discretion repeals it, I believe that more and more volunteers will enter the armed services, and this bill will be used less and less.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am very anxious to reach a vote on this amendment. Certainly, a 3-year period is better than a 2-year period; but certainly a 5-year period is, by the same token, better than a 3-year period.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask the Senator to yield to me to permit me to reply very briefly to the statement of the able Senator from Massachusetts that the bill is one to induce volunteers.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts earnestly believe that if the Army has the power to draft men into enforced service it will pay any attention to volunteers or to advocating any volunteer system or to encouraging volunteering?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply say that under the bill as presently written 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds can volunteer. Today they are volunteering. Under the bill the inducements to enter the National Guard and the Reserves are such that I believe many men will volunteer. I hope a sufficient number will volunteer so as to make less and less necessary this draft provision.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that as I see this bill the only inducement to volunteering will be that a man must either volunteer or be drafted.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I have previously said, now that the Senate has spent almost all afternoon on this amendment, I am very anxious that it come to a vote. Regardless of whether the amendment is modified or is not modified, I hope it will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just a few words to say. However, before I make what will be not more than a 5-minute speech, I wish to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon requests the yeas and nays on his amendment lettered "G."

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to summarize my position on the amendment by briefly answering the major arguments used against my amendment this afternoon. They were rather interesting arguments, but if I were trying a case I would say most respectfully that most of them would fall under the objection of being irrelevant, immaterial, and inconsequential.

One of the arguments made earlier in the debate this afternoon was that 2 years from now might find us at the end of the session with such a congested calendar that we could not give careful consideration to the question of whether or not we should continue the draft. I think that is not a very sound argument, because I do not know how a bill could receive any more careful consideration or go through a longer hearing, or receive more hours of attention from committee members than we have given to this bill. I answer the argument that we may not have time 2 years hence to consider this problem, Mr. President, by offering a record of the Armed Services Committee over weeks and weeks of hearings on this bill in this crowded session of Congress as my exhibit A in complete rebuttal of that argument. We can take judicial notice that this issue will always receive thorough attention by Congress.

Second, I am privileged to say, because several Senators have said to me in the cloakroom they are inclined to go along with the committee report, that a good many members of the Armed Services Committee, of which I also am a member, have reconsidered very carefully the provision of the bill for a 5-year draft and have decided to vote for my amendment. I am privileged to say that at least five of us on the Armed Services Committee intend to vote for my amendment for a 2-year period instead of a 5-year period. I say that because I want the Members of this body to know that there has been a considerable amount of rethinking about the provision within the Armed Services Committee, and there is not on this provision, as there is on most sections of the bill, a unanimous report of the Armed Services Committee.

Then, it has been told me that one point of view I have expressed here this afternoon has raised some question in the minds of some Senators. I refer to my suggestion that at the end of 2 years this question would be an issue in the election and the people of the United States would have an opportunity to express themselves on it in choosing at the ballot box their representatives in one branch of the Congress, and a third of their representatives in the other branch. The feeling of some Senators seems to be that possibly this issue should not be invited into that campaign, as my amendment might tend to do.

My answer to that is, I know absolutely nothing of greater concern to the American people than the type of military establishment which shall be maintained in time of peace. If after 2 years it is the judgment of the American people that the draft should not be continued, then I think they should have an opportunity to make that perfectly clear to men running for office in the 1950 election. That is my conception of the good old American democratic process working in accordance with the ideal representative government. I think this issue should be referred to the American people in that election.

The third point I want to make is by way of answer to the argument which has been advanced here and which I think really lets the opponent's cat out of the bag. It was argued by one Senator that it would be easier to secure adoption of a resolution to end the draft than it would be to obtain agreement to a resolution to continue the draft. So far as I am concerned that argument proves the desirability of my amendment. I think we, the representatives of the people, must constantly keep our legislative process operating in a manner so affirmative action on our part will be taken in accordance with the dictates and will of the people. I do not think we should now pass a bill which will make it possible to continue the draft for 5 years when we have come to believe the people of the country might not approve such action. What I think we should do, if we are to keep faith with the democratic process, is to bind ourselves now by my amendment to take affirmative action in 2 years to decide whether we shall continue the draft. That will be carrying out representative government in a true sense.

The fourth point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that at the present time I am satisfied the whole question of the Military Establishment is being over-sold to the American people. There is an emergency. I have demonstrated by my acts on the Armed Services Committee and by the position I have taken on various issues on the floor of the Senate that I intend to do what in my judgment is necessary to build up the national defenses. But I think I would be failing in my duty to the Members of the Senate who are not members of the Armed Services Committee if I did not tell them it is my judgment, after listening to hearings for many weeks, that there are those in the armed services who are over-selling this emergency. In my judgment such drastic action as the armed services would have had us take early in our hearings is not required.

Let the Senate recall that some of the recommendations which came to us at one time would have totaled about $21,000,000,000 of annual expenditures for the Military Establishment, had we adopted their recommendation. We have it cut down now to $15,000,000,000 of annual cost, in round figures.

I want to see the obligation and responsibility placed upon the Congress to review at the end of 2 years the policy now being adopted, and at that time decide whether or not we want to continue the draft. I think it will be found that after 2 years our reserves will have been built up, and that we shall have done a pretty good job of educating the American people to an understanding of the need for supporting an adequate Military Establishment.

Let us not fool ourselves. Tonight in America it is touch and go on the whole question of military legislation. There is serious question whether on a referendum a majority of the American people would even vote for a draft on a 2-year basis. But I am convinced my amendment, if the American people had a chance to pass final judgment on it, would receive the approval of a majority.

The last point is, my amendment is in line with action already taken by the House. The House voted a 2-year provision. I think, Mr. President, we should follow in this instance the action taken by the House, and adopt my amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I merely want to point out that the distinguished Senator from Oregon and myself seem to be substantially in agreement on this proposal. I disagree, however, as to the length of time the pending measure should be in force. I feel it should be 3 years, not 2.

The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] earlier this afternoon very well covered the subject. I attempted later on to cover another aspect of it. At this particular time I desire to point out that later on it presumably will not be merely a question of discontinuing selective service. Presumably there will have to be a quid pro quo, a substitute for selective service when that time comes. It seems to me altogether inadvisable for the Congress in an election year to be considering a question of this nature. The very fact that we are confronted today with the problem now before us at a time when we find ourselves faced with an election, is indicative of what we would face 2 years hence.

I think a 3-year limitation is far sounder than would be the 2-year limitation proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. That is why I have placed before the Senate my proposed modification of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the

Senator from New York to the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	McCarthy	Taft
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Malone	Umstead
Eastland	Maybank	Watkins
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Flanders	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Hill	O'Conor	Young
Hoey	O'Daniel	

NAYS—33

Ball	Hawkes	Martin
Brewster	Hayden	Myers
Cain	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Capper	Holland	Reed
Cordon	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Donnell	Lodge	Saltonstall
Ecton	Lucas	Smith
Ellender	McFarland	Stennis
Feazel	McGrath	Thye
Green	McKellar	Tydings
Gurney	McMahon	Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin	Downey	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Hatch	Tobey
Bricker	Jenner	Wagner
Bridges	McCarran	White
Bushfield	Magnuson	
Connally	Taylor	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment lettered "G" was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2152) to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5770) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 15 and 34 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the present occupant of the chair please state the parliamentary situation, what is before the Senate, and who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that it was agreed prior to the vote that immediately after the vote had been taken the Senator from North Dakota would be recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill is the pending business, and open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is the unfinished business and open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask whether the distinguished Senator from Oregon has concluded with his amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not qualified to say.

Mr. MORSE. I have one further amendment. It is my desire, if the acting majority leader will permit the exercise of the desire, when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] shall have concluded, that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] be allowed to present his amendment, and then the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and that I follow them with my last amendment.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am really trying to expedite the procedure for the remainder of the session today, and I was endeavoring to ascertain how many amendments there were to be offered, and how long the session would have to run tonight. As I understand, then, there is the one amendment of the Senator from Oregon, there is the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. And the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and I take it there will be an amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Georgia has been endeavoring all day to secure an opportunity to offer an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly every Senator will have an opportunity to offer any amendment he desires to offer. Has the Senator from Texas an amendment to offer?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, in the face of those facts, it would seem almost conclusive that there will be quite a lengthy session tonight, that we will run until a reasonable hour, whatever hour pleases the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator will keep the Senate in session until I get an opportunity to present my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall certainly try to do so. The Senate was in session last night until 10:30, and will remain in session tonight, if it is agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will be agreeable to me. Most of yesterday and all of today I have been earnestly seeking an opportunity to offer an amendment. I should not like to have my amendment to the last amendment to be considered before the vote on the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will appreciate the Senator's stating his inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire as to who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent agreement, prior to the taking of the last vote, the Senator from North Dakota was granted permission to have the floor after the vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, just before I left the floor, a few minutes ago, I asked the Senator from North Dakota to yield to me that I might ask him one question. The question was as to how long he proposed to hold the floor. He advised the Senator from Illinois that he expected to speak for 1 hour. On the way to my office I heard the bells ringing for a quorum call.

I do not know what took place while I was going between the Senate Chamber and my office to sign my mail. Nevertheless, that is the situation, and I was a little bit disappointed as a result of the understanding I had before I left the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the present occupant of the chair remembers, the Senator from North Dakota said

that it was his intention to speak for another hour. Shortly after making that declaration he yielded the floor to another Senator, reserving his right to speak for that hour, and following the unanimous consent agreement which gave the Senator from North Dakota possession of the floor after the vote was taken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think in fairness to the distinguished Senator from Illinois——

Mr. LUCAS. I submit that such was a very peculiar arrangement, in view of the previous understanding the acting minority leader had before he left the floor. I think in all fairness the acting minority leader should have been notified of any different arrangement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair did not happen to be in the chair at the time of the colloquy to which the Senator from Illinois now refers.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope this will not be repeated if I should happen to leave the floor between now and the next 15 or 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state he has been informed that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] requested unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota might continue after the vote, in order to permit disposition of the amendment which has just been acted upon.

Mr. WHERRY. I was absent, and I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota. Was a quorum call had prior to the time the vote was taken?

Mr. LANGER. It was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call was had. There were a number of Senators in the Senate Chamber at the time the unanimous-consent request in favor of the Senator from North Dakota was made, and there was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the agreement made before the quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was made before the quorum call.

Mr. LUCAS. What good is a quorum call after a unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into?

Mr. WHERRY. A vote was had, was it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the quorum call was for a vote.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator from Illinois is interested in is keeping a certain agreement that was definitely made before the Senator from Illinois left. In the interest of keeping dignity and decorum in the United States Senate, it seems to me that agreement should have been kept, or at least the Senator from Illinois should have been notified if it was going to be nullified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair not having been aware of the tentative agreement, can only reflect that the agreement must be reconciled between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois, most respectfully, that I was in the chair of the acting majority leader at the time. As I remember, there was no agreement. The Senator from North Dakota said he expected to talk about another hour. Shortly after that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] asked for the opportunity to put something into the RECORD. It was granted him, and before the Senator from North Dakota resumed, under the agreement that he would have unanimous consent to resume, the Senator from South Dakota asked if the Senator from North Dakota objected to a vote being taken on the Morse amendment at that time. There was no agreement of any kind, as I remember.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand there was no agreement entered into by the Senate, but certainly there was a gentleman's understanding as to what would happen during the next hour.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The quorum call was had so as to notify Senators that there was going to be a vote. That was the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator from Massachusetts distinctly understood what I said, and the questions I propounded to the Senator from North Dakota and the answers I received. Certain Senators on this side of the aisle desired to leave for a short period of time on important business, and when the Senator from North Dakota said it would take him an hour at least to speak, we believed what he said.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a simple matter of courtesy, when the Senator asked me, I said casually, "I expect to talk an hour." After that, in fairness to the Senator from South Dakota, I permitted a vote on the Morse amendment. I resent the Senator saying I promised him I was going to speak an hour. I gave my best judgment at that time. I wish to say now that I am going to talk for an hour, so if he wants to go downtown, I guarantee I will be talking here an hour from now. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is greatly intrigued by the last statement of the Senator from North Dakota. He is usually a man of his word, and keeps his word. The only thing the Senator from Illinois is complaining about—and I think I have a right to complain—is that the Senator from North Dakota said, "You can go any place for the next hour, and eat, or anything you want to do, because I am going to speak an hour," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who was in the chair at that time, indicated that the length of the time of the hour of the Senator from North Dakota was usually more than that, and I had no hesitancy in leaving. The only point I am making is that had I left the Capitol for dinner I would have missed the important vote just taken, and I do not think that as the acting minority leader, and after having what seemed to be a fair and honest understanding, I should be ignored with respect to this particular roll call and the unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator from North Dakota may resent what I said; but, Mr. President, I sincerely resent this type of parliamentary procedure. I have a right to resent it, and I hope the Senator from North Dakota will keep his word this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to make it plain again that there was no agreement. I told the distinguished Senator I expected to talk for an hour. It was purely a matter of courtesy that I made that statement to him. The next time I am asked I will say I shall talk for a minute, so that Senator will not leave the Chamber.

Mr. President, as I was saying a while ago——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is now before the Senate? I have lost track of whether there is an amendment pending or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the fact that there is no amendment pending, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, in line 4, after the word "compensation", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in order thoroughly to inform the Senator from Maryland, I shall state the amendment. It is on page 65, line 4, to insert certain words after the word "compensation." I will read the subparagraph as it will read with my amendment included in it:

> (d) Fair and just compensation, but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital, shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

At the time I yielded, Mr. President, I was discussing the testimony of Henry A. Wallace. As I stated at that time, there were certain Senators on the floor who were not familiar with what had transpired just before I took the floor. One distinguished Senator had quoted General Bradley as saying that this country was in danger, and another Senator had quoted from General Marshall. I said I felt it only fair under those circumstances to quote from Henry A. Wallace. As I said at that time, it was only comparatively a short time ago that the Democrats, in a national convention held in 1940, I believe, looked all over the United States for a man with the capacity, the brains, the integrity, the experience, the qualifications, and the character to succeed Franklin Delano Roosevelt in case anything untoward should happen to him.

Mr. Roosevelt himself agreed, together with Mr. Pendergast, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Frank Hague, and other gentlemen who at that time were a component part of the Democratic Party, that by all odds the best man to succeed Franklin Delano Roosevelt in case anything untoward should happen was Henry A. Wallace. So Mr. Wallace, who had been Secretary of Agriculture, became the Democratic nominee for the office of Vice President. As I remember, one of the very distinguished Senators upon this floor nominated Mr. Wallace to be Vice President upon that occasion. I remember also that he received nearly a unanimous vote, with the exception of certain votes which went to Mr. Paul McNutt and some votes which went to the former Speaker of the House, Mr. Bankhead. In any event, the nomination of Henry A. Wallace for Vice President was finally made unanimous. So in due course of time Henry A. Wallace became the Vice President of the United States.

For 4 years he presided over this body, the overwhelming majority of whose membership were Democratic Senators, and apparently he did such a good job and was so respected and admired and beloved that a majority of the Democratic Members of the Senate decided that he would make a good Secretary of Commerce. I think nearly every Senator is familiar with the great fight which was put up by the, at that time, majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], in behalf of Henry A. Wallace, when his name was sent to the Senate, when nominated to be Secretary of Commerce. I am positive the RECORD will bear me out in saying that we were told by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that Mr. Henry A. Wallace would make a great Secretary of Commerce.

Of course, there was some objection to him. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] wanted to take away from the Department some of its powers, and the RFC, as I recollect, was removed from the Department, whereupon Henry A. Wallace was confirmed by a majority of the Senate. So, for a comparatively long period of time, Mr. Henry A. Wallace was the Secretary of Commerce.

Here we have a man, Mr. President, who, during all those years, was a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, a man who was chosen by the Democrats coming from every State of the Union, nearly 1,500 of them, meeting, as I recollect, in the city of Chicago, who, after looking over 143,000,000 Americans, finally nominated Mr. Wallace to be a candidate for the Vice Presidency, and then, as I recollect, 26,000,000 Democrats went to the polls and elected him to be Vice President of the United States. I maintain that a man with such a record, even if there is only one chance in a hundred that he is right, nevertheless is entitled to have his views on the pending bill presented to this body, and as apparently no Democrat is willing to present his views I have taken it upon myself to see to it that the views of the former Democratic Vice President of the United States were fairly and honestly presented to the Democratic and Republican Members of the Senate.

What did Mr. Wallace say? As I stated a while ago, he said that in his judgment the only danger to the country is from the administration itself. I read from his testimony in the record up to the time I was interrupted. I shall continue to read from Mr. Wallace's testimony, at page 545:

The current crisis—

Which calls for this bill we are now considering, Mr. Wallace says:

The current crisis was concocted by the administration not only to further the plans for private corporate expansion, but was also intended to forestall a domestic crisis threatened by their policies to date.

That is what Mr. Wallace said. He continued:

Instead of proposing measures for increasing purchasing power and curbing the profiteering of big business, President Truman offered compulsory military training, the draft, and a great increase in arms expenditures as the means of staving off a depression. The day after he read his message to Congress, the Journal of Commerce stated:

"As far as business is concerned, any sizable increase in military expenditures should provide the shot in the arm which, in the opinion of most economists, would be needed to offset the probability of a 1948 business slump."

Those are Mr. Wallace's words, not mine. Mr. Wallace said:

The armaments program, compulsory training, and the draft would be profitable to big business.

I wish to make it clear that those are not my words, but the words of the former Vice President of this country, who was elected on the Democratic ticket, with Democratic support, with practically every Senator supporting him.

Mr. Wallace continued:

For the common man, they mean harder work and lower living standards. He will make the sacrifices, while the corporations will add armament profits to inflation profits. Mr. Ira Mosher, chairman of the finance committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, admitted this in the following comment on the remobilization program:

"It is going to cost a lot of work—a lot of work building things and growing things—for which American workers and farmers are not going to receive one red cent in purchasing power for a long, long time, and maybe never."

That was said by Mr. Ira Mosher, chairman of the finance committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. He was quoted by Mr. Wallace.

Mr. Wallace, the same Mr. Wallace who testified before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, continued:

As I said earlier, when there is evidence that the big industrialists and financiers are willing to share equally with workers, farmers, and youth in the burden of national defense, I shall believe there is a legitimate crisis.

So according to Mr. Wallace there is no crisis at all. I maintain that that statement should be entitled to some weight in the minds of Democrats in the Senate. Here are the two leading Democrats of the United States, President Truman, on the one hand, and Henry A. Wallace, on the other. They disagree. One says there is a crisis, and the other says there is none. What are we poor Republicans on this side of the aisle to do? Mr. Truman says there is a crisis. Henry A. Wallace, who at one time had only one heartbeat between him and the Presidency, says that there is no crisis. So I conceive this statement to be very important. I believe that the Members of this body should at least give it a great deal of study, because, as I have said, if there is one chance in a hundred that Mr. Wallace is right, every Senator should have the patience to examine the record thoroughly to see what the probability is even of that one chance in a hundred.

There is much to what Mr. Wallace says. Earlier I read that Mr. Wallace stated that big business had been making a great deal of money out of World War II. He stated that—

The armaments program, compulsory training, and the draft would be profitable to big business.

An hour or so ago when I challenged any Member of this body on the other side of the aisle to prove that Mr. Wallace's statement was not true, even though I allowed an opportunity for a reply, no Democrat rose to defend the former Democratic Vice President of the United States. In view of the fact that no Democrat who was present rose to defend Mr. Wallace, I wish to defend him to some extent by reading what a former Democratic Representative from the State of Washington had to say. This was on January 22, 1946. This statement is found on page A166, volume 92, part 9, of the Appendix of the RECORD. The speech is captioned "Who Made the Money in This War?" Apparently that was what Mr. Wallace was talking about. I maintain that if money was made during the war the Democrats are to blame, because they had control of the House; they had control of the Senate, and they had control of the White House. So everything that was said by Mr. John M. Coffee, a Democratic Representative from the State of Washington, was said about the Democratic Administration. At that time the Republicans were not in control. So if all this money was made by what Mr. Wallace now calls big business, it was made while Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President and Henry A. Wallace was Vice President of the United States. When I speak of the record, I speak of the Democratic record. I quote from a Democrat, Mr. Coffee, who made this speech on the 22d day of January 1946——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I guaranteed that I would speak for an hour. I do not see why I should be interrupted.

I quote from the speech of Hon. John M. Coffee, a Representative in Congress

from the State of Washington, made on January 22, 1946:

Mr. Speaker, there are many citizens who are disturbed and perturbed by the spectacle of the vast fortunes made during this war by profiteers and racketeers.

This is a Democrat, John M. Coffee, of Washington, a Member of the House of Representatives, speaking about a Democratic administration. In a few weeks the Democrats will hold a convention in Philadelphia, where they will nominate a Democratic ticket. They will be calling upon the people of the country again to trust them and have confidence in them. So I think it is very important, in view of the amendment which I have offered, that we examine thoroughly the record of the Democratic Party, as exposed by a Democratic Representative.

I continue to quote from the speech of Mr. Coffee:

Many will recall that all veterans' organizations adopted resolutions at annual conventions each year, following the end of World War I, in which they proclaimed their relentless hostility to the making of profits out of wars.

According to this Democratic Representative, the Democratic administration was put on notice, because Mr. Coffee said:

Many will recall that all veterans' organizations adopted resolutions at annual conventions each year, following the end of World War I, in which they proclaimed their relentless hostility to the making of profits out of wars.

Year after year they told Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Henry A. Wallace of their relentless hostility to the making of profits out of wars.

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars suggested that we draft property as well as manpower in the next war. This was in the period of 1919 to 1940.

I now challenge any Democratic Senator to deny that before the war the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars suggested to President Roosevelt and to Henry A. Wallace, who now talks about taking the profits out of war, that that be done before we got into World War II.

But when 1940 came, somehow or other the Congress allowed the manufacturers to make the usual commercial killing out of war. With great reluctance and under terrific pressure the Congress finally was compelled to impose an excess-profits tax running up, in some cases, to 90 percent. Great Britain had, from the inception of the war, levied a 100-percent excess-profits tax in addition to granting to a national commission the power arbitrarily to disallow certain corporate expenses claimed against tax charges. Meanwhile we permitted numerous loopholes. Salaries were raised enormously at the beginning, although frozen later.

Again I say, Mr. President, that was under a Democratic national administration. The Republicans are not to blame for that.

I read further from the statement by Representative Coffee:

We proceeded to extend the draft, we raised from $30 to $50 a month the compensation paid the inductee. The question arises, Who made the money in this war? In an article in the January 1946 issue of This Month magazine I have discussed this subject. The article is as follows:

Mr. President, mind you, the article is by Representative John M. Coffee, writing about a Democratic administration, and a part of that administration was Henry A. Wallace, who testified just as I have read from the testimony which he himself gave before the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Here is what Representative Coffee wrote:

WHO MADE THE MONEY IN THIS WAR?

(By Representative John M. Coffee)

When the full bill for participation in the war is presented to the American people, it is expected to total $336,000,000,000. That is almost 11 times the cost of World War I. It is the equivalent of taking $2,551 from the pocket of every man, woman, and child in this country.

Mr. President, if $2,551 was taken out of the pockets of every man, woman, and child in this country, who is to blame? In the article from which I am now reading, we find a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives talking about the Democratic administration. I submit to you that is an issue Mr. Truman will have to face in the coming election. The Republicans were not in power at that time. The House of Representatives was controlled by the Democrats. The Senate was controlled by the Democrats. Yet if Democratic Representative John M. Coffee's statement is true—and I believe it is—the taking of $2,551 out of the pockets of every man, woman, and child in South Dakota and in every other State of the Union was permitted by a Democratic administration, because the Democrats had control of the lower House and the upper House and the White House.

I read further from the article by Representative Coffee:

That, in dollars and cents, is the price we have paid for victory. It does not take into account the cost in human lives; 259,637 killed, 35,328 missing, 651,934 wounded. It does not include the suffering, the sacrifice, the ultimate waste of war.

There is another side to the ledger, the credit side. For there are those in the United States, as in other countries, who have made an enormous profit from the war.

Mr. President, if an enormous profit was made out of the last World War, who is to blame? Oh, we heard a lot of beautiful phrases from the lips of the then President of the United States. He said many things that sounded very nice. One thing he said was, "We will not permit a single millionaire to be created out of this war." That is one thing he said. How was that promise kept? Why is it that today from one end of the United States to the other the veterans are pouring in to us petitions asking that the profits be taken out of war? I have used their protests as the basis of the amendment, which I now have at the desk, which provides that those profits shall be kept down to 10 percent.

Representative Coffee continued, as follows:

In the years that preceded World War II a series of congressional investigations uncovered startling evidence of World War I profiteering. Public opinion was shocked and outraged, even though only a meager trickle of the sordid details ever reached it.

That makes the record of the last Democratic administration so much the worse, because the article by Representative Coffee states that the Democratic administration unearthed evidence of graft and greed and war profiteering during World War I; so they were put on notice as to what might happen in World War II.

Mr. Coffee further states in this article:

Evidence was produced, for example, that—

British, French, German, and American industrialists made a profit from every soldier killed on either side.

Four years of war profits created 22,000 new millionaires in this country.

Mr. President, how does that jibe with what the late President Roosevelt told us? He said that not a single new millionaire would be created in this country as a result of the war. The Democrats then had control of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the White House. Then how does it happen that we have 22,000 new millionaires? Who is to blame but the Democratic Party which was in control all through that entire situation?

I read further from the article by Representative Coffee:

During the four war years—

The 4 years of World War I, when there was also a Democratic administration; that one was under Woodrow Wilson—

1915–18—United States industry made a profit, after taxes, of $28,500,000,000. Net earnings of United States corporations in those 4 years were as high as in the preceding 10 years.

By 1926, according to a Federal Trade Commission report, 59 percent of the Nation's material was in the hands of 1 percent of the population; 31 percent was owned by 12 persent of the people; the mast majority (87 percent) owned less than 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

About 30 percent of the national wealth was owned by corporations. Some 70 percent of all corporate stock was owned by only 1 percent of the stockholders.

Thus, as the Nation increased in wealth, its people as a whole became poorer. More economic power passed into the hands of fewer men. War had accelerated this process.

Just after Pearl Harbor the late President Roosevelt pledged that there would be no profiteering from this war.

Representative Coffee himself says that the President pledged that.

I read further from Representative Coffee's article:

It was precisely to prevent the excesses of World War I that Congress imposed heavy war taxes (in some cases four times the prewar level) and applied a surplus-profits tax to all corporate earnings.

The extent to which this noble purpose was fulfilled has just been revealed in separate studies made by Government and private agencies. Here are some of their conclusions:

Net profits (about $56,000,000,000) made by United States corporations during World War II far exceeded those recorded in any similar period in history.

Mr. President, that is the Democratic record. Democratic Representative John M. Coffee, of Washington, says so.

He says further in the article:

Net profits (about $56,000,000,000) made by United States corporations during World War II far exceeded those recorded in any similar period in history. During this war the number of billion-dollar companies in the United States increased by 11, making a total of 43.

Despite high war and excess-profits taxes, net profits after taxes of industry (1940–45) averaged 250 percent above prewar levels.

Since Pearl Harbor (1942–45) profits after taxes averaged 300 percent above prewar levels.

But even this picture is not complete, because it is an over-all picture. It includes all corporations, big and small alike, and many of the small ones went out of business during the war years or only just broke even. This means that if we consider only those corporations and industries which recorded a profit, the size of their earnings will stagger us even more.

I wish we could get this record into the hands of every Democrat in the country.

Take a look at the percentage increases in 1944 earnings, compiled by the OPA. Compare with average prewar (1936–39) earnings in the same industries. Motor-vehicle parts (increased) 896 percent.

While American boys were dying over there—boys whose comrades have protested in the testimony on the pending measure—while the boys over there were losing arms and legs and being made blind, motor-vehicle-parts profits increased 896 percent.

Iron, steel, and byproducts, 252 percent; lumber and timber byproducts, 1,064 percent.

An enormous increase, Mr. President, all at a time when the Democrats were in full control of the administration.

Electrical machinery, 434 percent.

That is more than four times as high as it was before. I am talking about the profits.

Communications equipment, 521 percent.

The profit became five times as great as it was before the war.

Industrial electrical equipment, 399 percent; other electrical products, 772 percent.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that some of the boys who lost their legs and arms feel that possibly after all there is something wrong with the Government?

Nonelectrical machinery, 360 percent; engines and turbines—

They were patriots, Mr. President, who said they would not go to work, they would not manufacture anything unless the Government guaranteed their profits. Those big corporations said that labor, when they went on strike, were unpatriotic and disloyal. Do you know, Mr. President, how much the profits were on the manufacture of engines and turbines? They show an increase of 2,431 percent. Where the manufacturers made $100 before the war, they made $24,310 during the war. Is it any wonder that Mr. Wallace came before the committee and said, "Before we pass this bill I want a guarantee that these big industrialists, these big manufacturers, are going to have their profits limited?" In the amendment I have offered I provide that a profit of 10 percent is enough—not 2,431 percent.

The manufacturers robbed and looted the families of the soldiers, their brothers and sisters and sweethearts and other relatives. They knew that engines and turbines were needed. The sky was the limit. I repeat, where they used to make $100 in profit, they made $24,310. Those are the people about whom Henry Wallace talked. That is why no member of the committee interrogated him about it. That is why Mr. Wallace said:

I am waiting for the industrialists and financiers who now profit from these war preparations to say:

"We are patriotic Americans. We are alarmed at threats to our country. For the duration of the crisis we are giving up all profits, all dividends, all huge salaries. Everything above normal living expenses belongs to the Treasury of the United States, and we want the Congress to put this into law until the emergency ends. We refuse to take a penny of profit for the defense of our country. We stand with the boys who are drafted in making sacrifices for freedom."

But, Mr. President, I have not noticed a single large corporation, a single large industrialist making such an offer as this. If the program goes over, the same men, who have made millions and millions—altogether 72 millionaires were created in World War I—or their sons or their successors—will be here, a new crop, robbing the American people of every single dollar they can, unless my amendment is adopted limiting profits to 10 percent.

Let us go back to the speech of the Honorable John Coffee. How about transportation equipment? We have heard a great deal about the railroads. The transportation equipment industry made a profit of 658 percent higher than before the war. What about aircraft and parts? They knew the armed services had to have aircraft.

Aircraft profits increased 1,686 percent; railroad equipment, 318 percent; food and kindred products, 150 percent; meat products, 271 percent; apparel, 280 percent; textile-mill products, 522 percent; petroleum and coal products, 159 percent; rubber products, 698 percent.

Mr. President, that was nearly seven times as much profit as was earned before the war.

Bituminous and other soft coal, 1,148 percent.

That is 11½ times as much profit as they earned before the war.

I read further:

And here is how the special Senate committee investigating the national defense program summed up the situation:

"The Planning Division of the War Production Board has estimated that net profits, after renegotiation and taxes, of the war industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, and rubber) for the four war years will be about $16,000,000,000."

The boys in Walter Reed Hospital, with one leg or both legs gone, or with one arm or both arms gone, or with one eye or both eyes gone, could reflect on how their Government had betrayed them. Mr. President, that was a Democratic administration. Henry A. Wallace was a part of it. He came before us and testified. He can say this much in his own favor, that, after all, he only presided over the Senate. He had no active part. Be that as it may, I give him credit for the fact that he is now protesting. That is more than many other Democrats are doing. He is now saying that he wants these excess war profits eliminated, or, if corporations make such enormous profits, he wants them taxed.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered limits those profits to 10 percent. That is more than the average man makes on his investment. Much is said about risk. How often we have heard upon the floor that a corporation will not expand, will not take any risk, unless it receives a profit. It is passing strange that we now find that most of the large new plants were built by the Government, built by taxpayers' money. There is a great plant in Utah which was sold for almost nothing on the dollar. Who bought it? The United States Steel Corp. So the great corporations came out of the war not only with huge profits, but owning some of the greatest plants in the world, which were built by the Government. We recently saw an example of what they did when the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] reported on the oil situation in the east, where our Government was promised delivery of oil at 40 cents a barrel. When the Navy wanted it for 40 cents a barrel it did not get it. No. It had to pay $1.10 a barrel. The Senator said in his report that the oil companies in the east were selling oil to other countries at from 45 to 55, or 60 cents a barrel.

I protest, Mr. President, against passing the kind of a bill we are about to pass, containing no limitation of 10 percent on profits. I hope I shall be able to get a yea-and-nay vote on the bill.

I read further:

The Senate committee also investigated the relative earnings of the 100 United States corporations which had the largest volume of war business. They discovered that, after all deductions for wartime taxes in 1942, 3 companies made more than 10 times their average prewar net profit; 19 earned more than three times prewar profits; 24 others between one and three times normal profits. Of the remainder, 12 companies which had shown average deficits during the prewar base period, earned in 1942 a net profit of between one and eighteen million dollars.

Mr. President, if a farmer in Montana, for instance, said, "I am not going to raise any crop unless I am guaranteed a profit," he would be called a Communist, just as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was called a Communist in more than a hundred letters, which I mentioned today, because he dared to be for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. If that farmer said, "I want to be guaranteed a profit for raising wheat or barley or rye," he would take his chances, Mr. President. The farmer is the biggest gambler in the world. He gambles, when he seeds his crop, that it may not rain. He gambles that the frost may not come and take it. He gambles that after it is up the drought may not come and take it. It may not rain during the growing season. He gambles that when the grain is about to head out a hot wind will not come and shrivel the grain. He gambles, Mr. President, that the grain may not be killed by hail or by chinch bugs, and he gambles that after he has threshed it and

after it is in the granary or elevator, the price may not be forced down to the point where the grain would be produced at a loss. He is not guaranteed anything; but these large corporations said, when the war broke out, "No; we are not going to build anything unless we are guaranteed a profit."

This man, John Coffee, Mr. President, is a smart man. He is a patriotic man. He says this:

> Many of us have criticized organized labor for striking in wartime, and believe even now that labor demands for increased wages are unreasonable. Unions have been accused of being unpatriotic. But let's look at their side of the picture.

Surely, Mr. President, we heard about John Lewis striking in the middle of the wartime. He was unpatriotic, he was everything that the big coal companies could lay their tongues to, everything that the controlled press could say about him that was untrue. John Lewis organized more than 400,000 men. They were working at starvation wages and he organized them and during wartime they produced more coal per capita than had ever been produced before in the history of this country.

When Mr. Lewis testified before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs he said to one distinguished Senator, "All we are asking is 6 days' work, 8 hours a day. We are protesting that in the summertime we can work only 2 or 3 days a week."

He gave the average figures, and showed that those men did not get calories enough to keep body and soul together, and of course they struck because of the high cost of living. The very fact that the big coal companies made a new contract with them and paid them more showed that those coal companies knew deep down in their hearts that John Lewis was right and they were wrong.

Mr. Coffee says:

> The cost of living, as every housewife knows, has gone up tremendously during the war years. A large part of the increased wages has gone simply to pay for that inflation. The unions, according to their own research bureaus and the evidence of Government agencies, know that the corporations have been making these fantastic profits.
>
> A study, called Five Years of War Profits, published by the Research Bureau of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO), reveals further facts on the earnings of big corporations. It may be assumed that the unions base their decisions to strike or not to strike on these revelations. The study claims that 200 great steel corporations earned more than $2,000,000,000 in open and concealed profits during the war.

Mr. President, these companies can conceal their profits, but a farmer cannot conceal anything if he has a crop. They even go out and measure the number of acres a poor farmer has. Senators will remember that under the soil-conservation program a farmer was allowed so many acres for wheat, and if he exceeded that he lost everything he was supposed to get.

I remember a poor farmer in North Dakota who was brave enough to go out among the hills and plow the ravines in the hills and put in a crop. Of course it was pretty hard to measure in the ravines and follow the gullies. The poor fellow planted half an acre in excess of what he was allowed, and it cost him $431. It is all right to soak the poor, defenseless farmers.

The record shows that in the Supreme Court appeals were made by some of the farmers which in every instance were turned down. In one decision a year ago the Supreme Court of the United States held by a vote of 5 to 4 that a farmer is presumed to read the Federal Register every day in order to find out what the last regulations of the department are. Imagine a farmer having time to read the Federal Register. The Government publishes thousands upon thousands of rules and regulations in that Register. It is an insult to the farmers to say that they should set aside their work and read the Federal Register.

Mr. Coffee continued:

> From 1940 to 1945 the industry averaged a profit, after taxes, of $245,000,000 per year. Total reported profits in the steel industry, after taxes, for comparative periods are:
>
1936–39	$576,000,000
1940–44	$1,225,000,000
Increase (percent)	113
>
> The United Auto Workers Union has released a study of 26 aircraft companies and their earnings during comparative years. The percentage increase in this industry is even more staggering:
>
1936–39	$20,554,274
1941–44	$173,598,422
Increase (percent)	745

Mr. President, is it any wonder that the veterans write to us saying there is something wrong in this country? There is something wrong. It was only a short time ago that 98 veterans were unable to get taxi licenses in the city of Philadelphia. They had gone forth and fought for their country, the majority of them were married, some had children, and all they wanted was to come back and drive taxis in Philadelphia. The board in that city would not let them do it. The taxicab companies and others got out an injunction. The boys offered to haul the passengers in Philadelphia and take their chances of making a living by taking tips, believe it or not. The opposition sued out an injunction to keep those 98 veterans from making a living. I appealed to the Public Service Commission over there. We had one of them down before the Committee on the Judicary, and we got exactly nowhere. They said they would give the veterans a hearing. Under State law they could give them a hearing, but they could hear one veteran at a time. They could take that one veteran's case and have it drag along 3 or 4 or 5 weeks, and that is what they did.

Mr. President, this article written by John M. Coffee is almost unbelievable. If I did not know him to be an honest, patriotic, God-fearing man, I would not believe the article, but he has the proof that word for word what he says is true.

Think of it, Mr. President, while our boys were dying, while old men went out and did the work on the farms all over the Northwest so that the boys could go to war, while all the women were scrimping to get enough to buy a $25 bond, the manufacturers of engines and turbines raised their profits so that their percentage of profit increased 2,431 percent, and not a single one of them was put in jail.

As I said earlier this afternoon, Mr. President, we have had no enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act, regardless of whether there was a Republican or a Democratic administration in power. Mark Hanna was once asked who he favored for President. He said, "I do not care who is President. Give me the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury, and you can take the President." Not a single man has been put in jail for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 57 years. Oh, but if a GI returns home and steals a loaf of bread to feed his hungry family, he is arrested, and I will tell you, Mr. President, he has an awful time to keep from being put in the calaboose. A man or a woman engaged in the grocery business, who sometime ago, sold bread at one-half a cent more than the price fixed by OPA, would find his place visited by a horde of inspectors and arrested and fined in triple damages. But the great trusts which were combining to raise the prices of bread and milk, and raised them time after time, were safe from prosecution.

Mr. President, some months ago the Senate confirmed the nomination of a certain individual to be an ambassador from this country. I read his record to the Senate. I objected to his confirmation. I showed that companies in which he was interested had bought up 300 dairies. Nobody went to jail for that. When my committee subpenaed one of the Assistant Attorneys General in charge of the Antitrust Division, who had been in charge of that division for years, he said they never arrested such persons; they simply sued them for $5,000. They did not arrest them, he said, because it might hurt their social standing. Imagine hurting the social standing of a man who was robbing and fleecing the people of this country. I have always been glad that after I got through with that gentleman he went back to the Office of the Attorney General and resigned his position as a Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. President, I read further from Mr. Coffee's article:

> According to a United Press survey, some of the giants and their assets are:
>
> Metropolitan Life, almost $7,000,000,000.
>
> Bell Telephone, more than $6,000,000,000.
>
> Prudential, more than $5,000,000,000.
>
> Chase National Bank, more than $5,000,000,000.
>
> Pennsylvania Railroad, almost $3,000,000,000.
>
> Standard Oil of New Jersey, $2,400,000,000.
>
> General Motors, $2,100,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article written by former Representative John M. Coffee printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

WHO MADE THE MONEY IN THIS WAR?

(By Representative John M. Coffee)

When the full bill for participation in the war is presented to the American people, it is expected to total $336,000,000,000. That is almost 11 times the cost of World War I. It is the equivalent of taking $2,551 from the pocket of every man, woman, and child in this country.

That, in dollars and cents, is the price we have paid for victory. It does not take into account the cost in human lives; 259,637 killed, 35,328 missing, 651,934 wounded. It does not include the suffering, the sacrifice, and ultimate waste of war.

There is another side to the ledger, the credit side. For there are those in the United States, as in other countries, who have made an enormous profit from the war.

In the years that preceded World War II a series of congressional investigations uncovered startling evidence of World War I profiteering. Public opinion was shocked and outraged, even though only a meager trickle of the sordid details ever reached it. Evidence was produced, for example, that—

British, French, German, and American industrialists made a profit from every soldier killed on either side.

Four years of war profits created 22,000 new millionaires in this country.

During the 4 war years—1915–18—United States industry made a profit, after taxes, of $28,500,000,000. Net earnings of United States corporations in those 4 years were as high as in the preceding 10 years.

By 1926, according to a Federal Trade Commission report, 59 percent of the Nation's material was in the hands of 1 percent of the population; 31 percent was owned by 12 percent of the people; the vast majority (87 percent) owned less than 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

About 30 percent of the national wealth was owned by corporations. Some 70 percent of all corporate stock was owned by only 1 percent of the stockholders.

Thus, as the Nation increased in wealth, its people as a whole became poorer. More economic power passed into the hands of fewer men. War had accelerated this process.

Just after Pearl Harbor the late President Roosevelt pledged that there would be no profiteering from this war. It was precisely to prevent the excesses of World War I that Congress imposed heavy war taxes (in some cases four times the prewar level) and applied a surplus-profits tax to all corporate earnings.

The extent to which this noble purpose was fulfilled has just been revealed in separate studies made by Government and private agencies. Here are some of their conclusions:

Net profits (about $56,000,000,000) made by United States corporations during World War II, far exceeded those recorded in any similar period in history.

During this war the number of billion-dollar companies in the United States increased by 11, making a total of 43.

Despite high war and excess-profits taxes, net profits after taxes of industry (1940–45) averaged 250 percent above prewar levels.

Since Pearl Harbor (1942–45) profits after taxes averaged 300 percent above prewar levels.

But even this picture is not complete, because it is an over-all picture. It includes all corporations, big and small alike, and many of the small ones went out of business during the war years or only just broke even. This means that if we consider only those corporations and industries which recorded a profit, the size of their earnings will stagger us even more.

Take a look at these percentage increases in 1944 earnings, compiled by the OPA. Compare with average prewar (1936–39) earnings in the same industries.

	Percent
Motor-vehicle parts	896
Iron, steel, and byproducts	252
Lumber and timber byproducts	1,064
Electrical machinery	434
Communications equipment	521
Industrial electrical equipment	399
Other electrical products	772
Nonelectrical machinery	360
Engines and turbines	2,431
Transportation equipment	658
Aircraft and parts	1,686
Railroad equipment	318
Food and kindred products	150
Meat products	271
Apparel	280
Textile-mill products	522
Petroleum and coal products	159
Rubber products	698
Bituminous and other soft coal	1,148

And here is how the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program summed up the situation:

"The Planning Division of the War Production Board has estimated that net profits, after renegotiation and taxes, of the war industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, and rubber) for the four war years will be about $16,000,000,000. Since the proportion of civilian business in these industries had been very small, almost all these profits may be regarded as coming from Government business. Such profits are about twice the prewar average of such industries."

The Senate committee also investigated the relative earnings of the 100 United States corporations which had the largest volume of war business. They discovered that, after all deductions for wartime taxes in 1942, 3 companies made more than 10 times their average prewar net profit; 19 earned more than three times prewar profits; 24 others between one and three times normal profits. Of the remainder, 12 companies which had shown average deficits during the prewar base period, earned in 1942 a net profit of between one and eighteen million dollars.

Many of us have criticized organized labor for striking in wartime and believe even now that labor demands for increased wages are unreasonable. Unions have been accused of being unpatriotic. But let's look at their side of the picture.

The cost of living, as every housewife knows, has gone up tremendously during the war years. A large part of the increased wages has gone simply to pay for that inflation. The unions, according to their own research bureaus and the evidence of Government agencies, know that the corporations have been making these fantastic profits.

A study, called Five Years of War Profits, published by the Research Bureau of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO), reveals further facts on the earnings of big corporations. It may be assumed that the unions base their decisions to strike or not to strike on these revelations. The study claims that 200 great steel corporations earned more than $2,000,000,000 in open and concealed profits during the war. From 1940 to 1945 the industry averaged a profit, after taxes, of $245,000,000 per year. Total reported profits in the steel industry, after taxes, for comparative periods are:

1936–39	$576,000,000
1940–44	$1,225,000,000
Increase (percent)	113

The United Auto Workers Union has released a study of 26 aircraft companies and their earnings during comparative years. The percentage increase in this industry is even more staggering.

1936–39	$20,554,274
1941–44	$173,598,422
Increase (percent)	745

If you have ever wondered how to make ends meet after you've paid your taxes, and how an extra few dollars a week would help that household budget, you'll be interested in these statistics on some of the aircraft industries. All these are profits after taxes and include postwar and contingency reserves.

	1936–39 average	1941–44 average	Percent increase
Bell Aircraft	$32,493	$3,845,404	11,743
Bellanca Aircraft	6,153	323,336	5,155
Bendix Aviation	2,480,661	17,883,326	621
Boeing Airplane	−840,038	7,294,040	
Consolidated Vultee	823,702	16,957,763	1,959
Curtiss-Wright	2,954,566	[1] 25,351,791	758
Glenn L. Martin	2,083,787	13,569,776	551
Wright Aeronautical	2,544,172	[1] 11,517,484	353

[1] Average for 3 years.

While making these profits, however, most companies were not generous with their stockholders. Dividend payments have by no means kept pace with the sharp advance in net profits. If they had, distribution of wealth would have been a little wider. The fact is that corporations paid out a much smaller proportion of their profits in dividends during the war than ever before. Prior to 1940, dividend payments were often two-thirds of net profits; since then they have averaged less than half. While the net income of incorporated business increased 134 percent between 1939 and 1944, dividends in the same period increased only 18 percent.

Reason? The conservative financial magazine Business Week of August 11, 1945, attributes it to the belief that high dividends at a time when war business alone was furnishing most corporate profits would invite public criticism.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that management had at its disposal a working capital 88 percent greater than in 1938. The figure in dollars had jumped from twenty-five billion in 1939 to forty-seven billion in 1945. One result was that corporations had to raise very little new capital for wartime expansion. At the same time, losses in enemy countries were written off or provided for through reserves. Investment in new plants was kept below depreciation charges, written off against taxes, charged to current operating expenses, or financed directly by the Federal Government.

And thus corporations have piled up $31,000,000,000 in undistributed profits and reserves during the war. They have also paid off a billion dollars in long-term debts.

A break-down of assets in the 200 great steel companies, as published by the United Steelworkers of America, further clarifies the situation.

	January 1940	January 1945	Increase
			Percent
Total assets	$4,860,000,000	$6,000,000,000	22
Dividend payments	419,000,000	765,000,000	82
Working capital	1,200,000,000	2,000,000,000	68
General reserves	103,000,000	395,000,000	288
Undistributed profits	585,000,000	1,000,000,000	81
Total financial resources	689,000,000	1,600,000,000	131
Funded debt	903,000,000	652,000,000	−28
Excess working capital over funded debt	308,000,000	1,393,000,000	363

The above figures give you a picture of the steel industry only. Others, of course, have fared as well. The 11 corporations that graduated into the billionaire class during the war make a total of 43 companies with assets of more than a billion dollars. Forty-third on this list is the Ford Motor Co., with total assets of a mere $1,021,325,159. But Ford is

exclusively a family holding, while the others are owned by numerous stockholders.

According to a United Press survey, some of the giants and their assets are:

Metropolitan Life, almost $7,000,000,000.

Bell Telephone, more than $6,000,000,000.

Prudential, more than $5,000,000,000.

Chase National Bank, more than $5,000,000,000.

Pennsylvania Railroad, almost $3,000,000,000.

Standard Oil of New Jersey, $2,400,000,000.

General Motors, $2,100,000,000.

American industry enters the postwar world with a greatly expanded plant and with tools and equipment far surpassing anything it had in the past. According to a report issued by the War Production Board, more than $25,000,000,000 worth of new plants and equipment were added to the industrial capacity in this country between 1940 and 1944. The Government contributed directly more than two-thirds of the total investment involved.

At the end of 1939 there were 934,000 machine tools in place in this country; by 1944 the number had risen to 1,400,000, an increase of nearly 50 percent. General Motors had 75,000 machine tools in 1940; in October 1943 it reported 143,774 machine tools in place.

Even after industry has financed its own transition to a peacetime production, equal at least to the prewar level of 1941, it will have on hand a fund, estimated by United States Department of Commerce economists in 1944 as between ten and twenty billion dollars left over for plant and other expansion.

It will also get from the Government a flat 10-percent rebate on wartime payments of excess-profits tax as a sort of severance pay to compensate it for the cessation of war contracts. This sum alone amounts to about $2,840,000,000, and is equal to more than half the total net corporate earnings in the banner year of 1937.

In addition, under the carry-back and carry-forward provisions of the excess-profits tax, United States corporations have accumulated with the Government a sort of unemployment insurance. Should the profits of any company in the next 10 years drop below its so-called normal profit level, it is entitled to a cash refund from the United States Treasury to make good these losses. That refund cannot be greater than the total income and excess-profits tax paid during the war. Theoretically, industry has thus a reserve fund of $62,000,000,000 to offset reconversion losses.

The steel companies, for example, face reconversion with savings (net working capital) of $2,000,000,000. Their flat 10-percent rebate from the Treasury will amount to about $200,000,000 more. If they fail to show a cent of profit in 1946, the Treasury must give them a rebate of $149,000,000. This last rebate guarantees them 29 percent more profits than they averaged during the years of peace.

Nowhere in the world, in any period of history, have comparable material gains been registered by industry. The war presumably has wiped out German and Japanese industry. Principal industries in Allied countries have suffered so heavily that it will take them a decade or more to regain even prewar production.

American business today is in the position of completely dominating world trade. It has become so strongly entrenched through its war profits that for many years it need fear no real competition anywhere on the globe.

Congress has not yet passed a comprehensive full-employment bill for the American people. But the tax-reduction bill has been rushed through in record time. Principal provision of this bill eliminates the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946. The total cut in taxes is almost $6,000,000,000, apportioned as follows between individuals and corporations:

Individuals	$2,784,000,000
Corporations	3,136,000,000

The reduction in individual income taxes is overwhelmingly in favor of the larger income groups. The little man gets $1 a year more to spend; the millionaire gets $44,218 more.

The 900 largest corporations in this country will get a tax reduction averaging $2,000,000 each in 1946. This amounts to a benefit twice that of the rest of the 18,000 corporations which have admitted excess profits. There is no gain whatever for the 261,000 smaller corporations that were never able to report excess profits.

At the same time it was revealed that the deficit in the national budget for 1946 is estimated at $30,000,000,000.

All this, then, must go into the balance in which we weigh our victory. On one side we have the total cost of war: $336,000,000,000 in cash, plus the dead, the wounded, the missing; on the other the outright profits made by large corporations—some $56,000,000,000 in cash, plus the power to dominate the lives of our people and the peoples of the world.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Coffee has considerable to say about reduction of income taxes. He presented his article on January 22, 1946. This is what he had to say about income taxes:

The steel companies, for example, face reconversion with savings (net working capital) of $2,000,000,000. Their flat 10-percent rebate from the Treasury will amount to about $200,000,000 more. If they fail to show a cent of profit in 1946, the Treasury must give them a rebate of $149,000,000. This last rebate guarantees them 29 percent more profits than they average during the years of peace.

Mr. President, suppose a farmer said to the Government, "I want a guaranty of 6 percent. I am going to get up at 4 o'clock in the morning, and I will work hard all day. I am going to put in a crop. I want a guaranty from you that I will receive 6 percent net." If a farmer made such a request seriously he would be sent to the insane asylum on the ground that he was crazy for ever making it. Yet the steel companies, because they have a monopoly, because they can hold our Government up for almost anything, receive a rebate of 29 percent. Mr. Coffee said further:

Nowhere in the world, in any period of history, have comparable material gains been registered by industry. The war presumably has wiped out German and Japanese industry. Principal industries in Allied countries have suffered so heavily that it will take them a decade or more to regain even prewar production.

American business today is in the position of completely dominating world trade. It has become so strongly entrenched through its war profits that for many years it need far no real competition anywhere on the globe.

Congress has not yet passed a comprehensive full employment bill for the American people. But the tax-reduction bill has been rushed through in record time.

Yet, Mr. President, as I said yesterday, the Republican Party rushed through the tax-reduction program. They said that was a promise made during the campaign which had to be kept; but they did not rush through bills to carry out the other pledges they had made in unequivocal language. They did not put through a bill providing for the establishment of the FEPC. They did not put through a bill to do away with the poll tax. They did not put through a single concrete piece of legislation against discrimination or segregation against Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, or the Negroes, not one.

Mr. Coffee, a former Representative in Congress, continues:

Congress has not yet passed a comprehensive full employment bill for the American people. But the tax-reduction bill has been rushed through in record time. Principal provision of this bill eliminates the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946. The total cut in taxes is almost $6,000,000,000, apportioned as follows between individuals and corporations:

Individuals	$2,784,000,000
Corporations	3,136,000,000

The reduction in individual income taxes is overwhelmingly in favor of the larger income groups. The little man get $1 a year more to spend; the millionaire gets $44,218 more.

The 900 largest corporations in this country will get a tax reduction averaging $2,000,000 each in 1946. This amounts to a benefit twice that of the rest of the 18,000 corporations which have admitted excess profits. There is no gain whatever for the 261,000 smaller corporations that were never able to report excess profits.

At the same time it was revealed that the deficit in the national budget for 1946 is estimated at $30,000,000,000.

All this, then, must go into the balance in which we weigh our victory. On one side we have the total cost of war: $336,000,000,000 in cash, plus the dead, the wounded, the missing; on the other, the outright profits made by large corporations—some $56,000,000,000 in cash, plus the power to dominate the lives of our people and the peoples of the world.

Someone may say that John M. Coffee may be wrong. Some may say that he is radical. Some may even claim that he was prejudiced. So I call upon other witnesses. I call upon the Comptroller General of the United States. Surely it will not be claimed that Lindsay Warren is an irresponsible public official. Let me read a few of the things that he said. This is from page A1664, volume 90, part 9, of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an extension of remarks of Hon. REID F. MURRAY, of Wisconsin. The following is from an article in the April 1, 1944, issue of Labor:

Warren insisted with great vehemence that every contract settlement should be audited. He cited huge payments already made by "officials who made the contracts sitting across the table from the contractors."

It was at this point that he declared that some of the officials were "just plain crooks, more interested in fattening the profits of contractors than in safeguarding the taxpayer."

"The tragedy is that no one seems disturbed about it," Warren said, explaining that when such matters are brought to public attention they are met with a "shrug of the shoulder and condoned under the specious plea that we have got a war to win."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, under the heading "We all know Lindsay Warren is a responsible public official," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ALL KNOW LINDSAY WARREN IS A RESPONSIBLE PUBLIC OFFICIAL

(Extension of remarks of Hon. REID F. MURRAY, of Wisconsin, in the House of Representatives, Friday, March 31, 1944)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the April 1 issue of Labor indicates what is taking place during this war. Certain agencies are continually calling the attention of the public to the profits of farmers when their total average income is only $3,000 to say nothing about the net income. The official study of Dr. Wylie Goodsell showed that a rather large percentage of the farmers of America made from 19 cents to 47 cents per hour in 1942.

Certain other groups and individuals that have accepted a 21.6 percent cost-of-living bonus on an overtime basis themselves on the first $2,900 of their $2,900 to $15,000 Federal salaries at the same time have insisted on freezing the below-average-income groups with 40 to 50 cents per hour wage. They even protested the 15-percent advance in wages provided by the Little Steel formula, for this below-average-income group.

The article follows:

"PROFITEERS ARE GETTING AWAY WITH MURDER, WARREN SAYS—AIDED BY 'CROOKS AND THIEVES' IN GOVERNMENT, COMPTROLLER CHARGES—BLASTS COST-PLUS CONTRACTS AS 'DAMNABLE'

"'A Government official wearing the uniform of his country was arrested in New York recently with $15,000 in marked bills in his pocket.'

"That startling instance was recited by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, in testimony before the House Naval Affairs Committee this week as proof of his contention that Congress must keep a sharp eye on administration if war profiteers are not to bleed the taxpayers white.

"'Some of these officials,' he charged, 'have been found to be just plain crooks and thieves. We have been assured that the bad and the inefficient have been weeded out, but that is just not so.'

"Warren's statement was one of the most sensational yet made before a congressional committee—and that is saying a mouthful. He declared that profiteers 'are on the loose' and are milking Uncle Sam for all he is worth. 'Worse still,' he added, 'many are getting away with it.'

"Warren, before taking over the Comptroller job, was a Member of the House from North Carolina and was respected as a hard-working, conscientious, and extremely able conservative. The General Accounting Office, which he heads, was set up before the sorry experiences of the last war had grown cold, to check disbursements and to see that the Government got something like an even break in ordinary business dealings.

"GAO OUT OF PICTURE

"As far as war contracts are concerned, however, the GAO is out of the picture, and will be kept out if bills now before Congress are approved. They provide for the settlement of the war claims virtually on the say-so of the contractors.

"Although billions of dollars are involved, the GAO is restricted to a mere comparison of the figures on vouchers and the amounts agreed upon by contractors and Government officials with whom settlements are made.

"It was to protest against this proposed set-up that Warren appeared before the committee, and he confronted a rather hostile audience. The committee seems to take the position that it is more important that contract settlements be made speedily than that the taxpayers shall be protected.

"BLASTS COST-PLUS PACTS

"'Ruthless gouging,' Warren declared, 'is going on under cost-plus contracts,' which were branded as 'the most extravagant, the most vicious, and the most damnable form of business skullduggery.'

"'Of course,' he conceded, 'war itself is wasteful and large expenditures are to be expected, but that,' he contended, 'is no reason why ordinary prudence should be thrown to the winds. Even on the battlefields,' he emphasized, 'Army generals try to spare their men.'

"'Like these generals,' he asserted, 'the contracting officers of the Government should make an effort to spare the public's money. Every dollar spent should show a dollar's worth in return.'

"JUST PLAIN CROOKS

"Warren insisted with great vehemence that every contract settlement should be audited. He cited huge payments already made by 'officials who made the contracts sitting across the table from the contractors.'

"It was at this point he declared that some of the officials were 'just plain crooks, more interested in fattening the profits of contractors than in safeguarding the taxpayer.'

"'The tragedy is that no one seems disturbed about it,' Warren said, explaining that when such matters are brought to public attention they are met with a 'shrug of the shoulder and condoned under the specious plea that we have got a war to win.'

"LIKE OLIVER TWIST

"Driving home the matter of laxity, Warren revealed that in cases where his office has had power to toss out illegal claims the contracts have been revised and the Government recovered large sums.

"'If somebody would come to us and say the Government shouldn't pay for something, we would be the most surprised people in the world,' Warren declared. 'However, with the audacity of Oliver Twist, they come and say, "Please, sir, we want more."'

"Warren hasn't concluded his presentation. When he again appears before the committee he promises to give chapter and verse details of how Uncle Sam is being hornswoggled on both sides of the bargaining table."

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me so that I may submit a conference report, which I think can be disposed of without controversy? It relates to the World Health Organization.

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the World Health Organization (hereinafter referred to as the Organization), the constitution of which was adopted in New York on July 22, 1946, by the International Health Conference for the establishment of an International Health Organization, and deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

"SEC. 2. The President shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the World Health Assembly of the Organization not to exceed three delegates of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the World Health Assembly. One of the delegates shall be designated as the chief delegate. Whenever the United States becomes entitled to designate a person to serve on the Executive Board of the Organization, under article 24 of the constitution of the Organization, the President shall designate a representative of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and may designate not to exceed one alternate to attend sessions of the Executive Board. Such representative must be a graduate of a recognized medical school and have spent not less than three years in active practice as a physician or surgeon. Such representative shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per annum for such period or periods as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is thus designated shall be entitled to receive such compensation: *Provided*, That no person shall serve as such representative, delegate, or alternate until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

"(a) such sums, not to exceed $1,920,000 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, including those incurred by the Interim Commission, as apportioned by the Health Assembly in accordance with Article 56 of the Constitution of the Organization; and

"(b) such additional sums, not to exceed $83,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

"(1) salaries of the representatives and alternate provided for in section 2 hereof, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

"(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

"SEC. 4. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the understanding that, in the absence of any provision in the World Health Organization Constitution for withdrawal from the Organization, the United States reserves its right to withdraw from the Organization on a one-year notice:

Provided, however, That the financial obligations of the United States to the Organization shall be met in full for the Organization's current fiscal year.

"SEC. 5. In adopting this joint resolution, the Congress does so with the understanding that nothing in the Constitution of the World Health Organization in any manner commits the United States to enact any specific legislative program regarding any matters referred to in said Constitution."

And the House agree to the same.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
WALTER H. JUDD,
WIRT COURTNEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think it is sufficient to say that the joint resolution is in the precise form in which it originally passed the Senate, except that certain precautions have been added, one of which is a ceiling upon any appropriations that can be made, and another requiring FBI inquiry into the qualifications of American employees. Otherwise, I think it is substantially the same as in the form passed by the Senate. I ask for approval of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am informed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that for 3 days he has been waiting to obtain the floor. I know that to be a fact because I have talked with him. I know that 3 days ago he was trying to obtain the floor. I am, therefore, yielding the floor so that he may be recognized, and I ask unanimous consent that the speech which I have made on my amendment shall not prejudice my speaking again on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I respectfully suggest that the able Senator from North Dakota continue and complete his remarks on this subject, so that we may proceed in some order. The hour is growing late. We have before us perhaps the most important bill which will be before this Congress. The Senator has had ample time, and under the rules of the Senate, he still has ample time to discuss the merits of the selective service bill. However, I respectfully suggest that he continue until he has completed his remarks. Then the Senator from Georgia may obtain the floor in his own right. I think I shall have to object to recognition of the Senator from Georgia with the unanimous consent understanding that the Senator from North Dakota may be recognized again.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the objection, I will say to my distinguished colleague from Georgia that I am very sorry. I did the best I could for him. He can now take a rest, because I intend to speak for a least an hour, or perhaps 2 hours more, in view of the objection. I tried to obtain unanimous consent, and was unable to get it.

My amendment is of great importance. I know that the Senator from Georgia has been waiting for 3 days for recognition. I am deeply sorry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. It is far from my purpose to prevent the Senator from North Dakota from fully covering the subject.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now call upon another great statesman who is no longer with us, a man who was formerly a Member of the Senate, David I. Walsh. Mr. Walsh was a distinguished Member of this body. On May 10, 1944, Mr. Walsh had a certain article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article had been printed in the University of Chicago Law Review. The article is entitled "War Profits and Legislative Policy." Mr. Walsh had been Governor of the great State of Massachusetts. He had been reelected Governor. Three different times he had been elected to the United States Senate from the State of Massachusetts. I almost forgot to mention that he was also lieutenant governor of that State for a while.

Here is what the great Senator Walsh of Massachusetts said in an article that was prepared by him for the University of Chicago Law Review:

WAR PROFITS AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY

(By David I. Walsh, United States Senator from Massachusetts)

Just as inveighing against sin is spasmodically a popular pastime, so, too, is inveighing against war profiteering. With the latter, considerable success has been experienced in the last 2 years, and it seems doubtful that, as a result of this success, postwar investigations will reveal anything like the scandals which shocked the public during the two decades following World War I.

Mr. President, I mention that to show that regardless of whether it is World War I or World War II, the pattern of robbing the common people is the same. Even during the Civil War, when Abraham Lincoln advertised for muskets and for horses, what the Army got was worn-out muskets and spavined horses. As a result, the Congress passed the Informers Act. That act provided that if there was a conspiracy to defraud the United States Government and if anyone in the conspiracy informed against his fellow conspirators, the men who were guilty would be fined double the amount they had stolen from the Government or had defrauded the Government; and of the money which the Government recovered, the informer would receive one-half and the Government the other half. The act also provided that in addition to putting the guilty persons in jail, the Government could also get $2,000 for every criminal offense. So even in the Civil War there were sharks and ghouls and war profiteers robbing the common people.

So as Senator David Walsh said in the article, there was war profiteering in World War I.

I read further from the article he wrote:

From its earliest days this country has been confronted with attempts on the part of merchants and vendors "to avail themselves of the difficulties of the times, and to amass fortunes on the public ruin." A condition which our people have faced in every one of their wars—and which other people have faced in their own wars—is perhaps best described by the Father of his Country in a letter dated March 31, 1779. It is worth quoting in extenso:

Mr. President, here we have the testimony of George Washington. If my amendment is adopted, it will limit the amount of profits to 10 percent, which I say is enough. Here is what George Washington said about this matter—and this letter was written by him on March 31, 1779:

Our conflict is not likely to cease so soon as every good man would wish. The measure of iniquity is not yet filled. * * *

Speculation, peculation, production, engrossing, forestalling * * * affording too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public virtue * * * and too glaring instances of its being the interest and desire of too many who wish to be thought friends, to continue the war.

Mr. President, Washington said those men were willing to continue the war in order to keep on making war profits—just as Henry Wallace said, when he was testifying before the Senate committee, that there were men trying to scare the Congress and trying to scare the people of the United States, when there was not one single substantial piece of evidence or proof that the national security of the country was in any danger at all.

Mr. President, I repeat, that I challenge any member of the committee who heard that testimony to show one scintilla of evidence that the national security is in danger. As Mr. Wallace says, these men go around scaring people. They are hypnotists who instill fear. I continue to read the statement by George Washington:

Cannot this common country America possess virtue enough to disappoint them? Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation, and of millions yet unborn?

Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure? And shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust for gain?

Forbid it, heaven! Forbid it, all and every State in the Union! By enacting and enforcing efficacious laws for checking the growth of these monstrous evils, and restoring matters, in some degree to the pristine

state they were in at the commencement of the war.

Our cause is noble; it is the cause of mankind. And the danger to it is to be apprehended from ourselves. (George Washington, in a letter to the President of Congress, dated August 16, 1777.)

Then the article by Senator Walsh continues:

The hopelessness of General Washington's position, his impotence to cure or even deal with "speculation, peculation, production, engrossing, forestalling," is akin to the difficulties which he had in maintaining his armed forces, whose personnel was wont to take off for home on the slightest whim.

This letter is worth quoting because it indicates the extent to which our groping for a solution to the problem of curbing war profiteering has advanced. In each of our wars adventurers have sought "to amass fortunes upon the public ruin." But in the present war such attempts are being dealt with effectively.

The problem is threefold—material, fiscal, and moral—with political overtones. Adequate appreciation of this triple nature of the problem is essential to an understanding of the history of attempts to meet it. For if attention is paid to the tone of only one or only two tines of the tuning fork, the results may be highly discordant.

PRICE OF ARMOR PLATE IN SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The most important of the threefold aspects of the problem is the material. For to an increasing extent wars have become matters of matériel. The point is illustrated by attempts by the Congress to control the price of just one item of matériel—armor plate—prior to and during the Spanish-American War. During the early nineties the Navy had paid from $574 to as high as $671 for armor plate. In the belief that such prices were unreasonable, the Congress took action, and on March 3, 1897, a statute limiting the price of armor plate to $300 a ton was approved. Fiscal and moral considerations may have motivated such action, but that material considerations were not amply weighed is indicated by the ineffectiveness of this legislation. Manufacturers simply refused to accept contracts at the lower price. To avoid its having dire results in the prosecution of the war, the Congress had to raise the ceiling to $400. Notwithstanding this experience, the Congress subsequently tempted fate by reducing the ceiling once more to $300, with the result that manufacturers again refused to bid. Finally despairing, the Congress gave the Secretary of the Navy authority to procure armor "at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable." Thus, the Congress finally succumbed to the material aspect of the problem—the most important of the three.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article entitled "War Profits and Legislative Policy," by the late David I. Walsh, former United States Senator from Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PROFITS AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY

(Extension of remarks of Hon. David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, May 10, (legislative day of Tuesday, May 9), 1944)

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me entitled "War Profits and Legislative Policy," from the University of Chicago Law Review for April 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PROFITS AND LEGISLATIVE POLICY

"(By David I. Walsh, United States Senator from Massachusetts)

"Just as inveighing against sin is spasmodically a popular pastime, so, too, is inveighing against war profiteering. With the latter, considerable success has been experienced in the last 2 years, and it seems doubtful that, as a result of this success, postwar investigations will reveal anything like the scandals which shocked the public during the two decades following World War No. 1.

"From its earliest days this country has been confronted with attempts on the part of merchants and vendors 'to avail themselves of the difficulties of the times, and to amass fortunes on the public ruin.'[1] A condition which our people have faced in every one of their wars—and which other people have faced in their own wars—is perhaps best described by the Father of his Country in a letter dated March 31, 1779. It is worth quoting in extenso:

" 'Our conflict is not likely to cease so soon as every good man would wish. The measure of iniquity is not yet filled. * * *

" 'Speculation, peculation, production, engrossing, forestalling * * * affording too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public virtue * * * and too glaring instances of its being the interest and desire of too many who wish to be thought friends, to continue the war. * * *

" 'Cannot this common country, America, possess virtue enough to disappoint them? Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation, and of millions yet unborn?

" 'Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure? And shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust for gain?

" 'Forbid it heaven! Forbid it all and every State in the Union! By enacting and enforcing efficacious laws for checking the growth of these monstrous evils, and restoring matters, in some degree to the pristine state they were in at the commencement of the war.

" 'Our cause is noble, it is the cause of mankind. And the danger to it is to be apprehended from ourselves.'

"The hopelessness of General Washington's position, his impotence to cure or even deal with 'speculation, peculation, production, engrossing, forestalling,' is akin to the difficulties which he had in maintaining his armed forces, whose personnel was wont to take off for home on the slightest whim.

"This letter is worth quoting because it indicates the extent to which our groping for a solution to the problem of curbing war profiteering has advanced. In each of our wars adventurers have sought 'to amass fortunes upon the public ruin.' But in the present war such attempts are being dealt with effectively.

"The problem is threefold—material, fiscal, and moral—with political overtones. Adequate appreciation of this triple nature of the problem is essential to an understanding of the history of attempts to meet it. For if attention is paid to the tone of only one or only two tines of the tuning fork, the results may be highly discordant.

"PRICE OF ARMOR PLATE IN SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

"The most important of the threefold aspects of the problem is the material. For to an increasing extent wars have become matters of matériel. The point is illustrated by attempts by the Congress to control the price of just one item of matériel—armor plate—prior to and during the Spanish-American War. During the early nineties the Navy had paid from $574 to as high as $671 for armor plate.[2] In the belief that such prices were unreasonable, the Congress took action, and on March 3, 1897, a statute limiting the price of armor plate to $300 a ton was approved. Fiscal and moral considerations may have motivated such action, but that material considerations were not amply weighed is indicated by the ineffectiveness of this legislation. Manufacturers simply refused to accept contracts at the lower price. To avoid its having dire results in the prosecution of the war, the Congress had to raise the ceiling to $400. Notwithstanding this experience, the Congress subsequently tempted fate by reducing the ceiling once more to $300, with the result that manufacturers again refused to bid.[3] Finally despairing, the Congress gave the Secretary of the Navy authority[4] to procure armor 'at a price which in his judgment is reasonable and equitable.' Thus, the Congress finally succumbed to the material aspect of the problem—the most important of the three.

"Price and profit control must be so finely governed that the material requirements of a war will be satisfied. This means that, under the capitalistic system to which we are committed, there must be incentive to produce and to produce quickly in large volume. In peacetime, competition provides this incentive, and as soon as competition kills it, production ceases. The fittest survive. But in wartime the production of the least fit may be just as essential as the production of the fittest, so that prices and profits must be such that both have an incentive to survive. If the material aspects of the problem are not given sufficient weight, the question of the moral and fiscal aspects may become academic through the loss of the war which is being fought.

"PRICE AND PROFIT CONTROLS IN WORLD WAR I

"Attempts to control prices and profits of war contracts in World War I proved futile. Indeed, as in the case of the Spanish-American War, they boomeranged—but for a different reason. The material aspect of the problem was overemphasized by the adoption of cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts. These were designed to underwrite the contractors, inducing him to turn to war production because by such underwriting he escaped risk, and at the same time inducing him to produce rapidly in large volume. But by the very nature of these contracts, he was actually induced to increase his costs, for the ratio between profits and costs remained constant and the higher the dollar costs the higher the dollar profits. Thus, a fiscal fallacy entered into the adoption of this kind of a contractual arrangement. It should have been evident at the outset, but in this as in so many aspects of pricing, hindsight is superior to foresight.

"Another fiscal error was made when attempts to limit war profits were supplemented by relatively high excess-profits taxes.[5]

---

[1] George Washington, in a letter to the President of Congress dated August 16, 1777.

[2] Hensel and McClung, Profit Limitation Controls Prior to the Present War, 10 Law and Contemporary Problems 187 at 191 (1943).

[3] Long, 1 The New American Navy 46 et seq. (1903).

[4] Act of June 7, 1900, 81 Stat. 684, 707; H. R. Doc. No. 95, 55th Cong., 2d sess.; 31 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 934 (1898), 32 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2190–2191 (1899); report of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, attached to report of the Secretary of Navy (1905), 45–47.

[5] Revenue Act of Sept. 8, 1916, 39 Stat. 756, 780; Revenue Act of Mar. 3, 1917, 39 Stat. 1000; and Revenue Act of 1918, 40 Stat. 1057.

"As Bernard Baruch has stated,[6] high excess-profits taxes standing alone aggravate war evils.

"However lofty may have been the motives of the country, the Congress, and the procurement agencies during World War I, however much they may have had their eyes on the material and moral prongs of the tuning fork, they failed to tune in with the third—the fiscal. While, unlike the experience of the Spanish-American War, legislation did not in itself hamper satisfaction of the material considerations or discourage production, while attempts to limit profits satisfied lofty moral concepts, these attempts were abortive because insufficient attention was given to the fiscal aspect of the problem. Not only did cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts fail to curb war profiteering; they aggravated it. Not only did high excess-profits taxes fail to prevent war profiteering; they made for inflation.

"Of the 168 bills and resolutions introduced into the Congress between the 1918 armistice and the fall of France for the purpose of coping with the problem of war profiteering, few were adopted and none recognized the threefold nature of the problem. Of those that were adopted, all were failures because they considered only the moral aspect of the problem. The only important piece of legislation of this nature was incorporated in the Vinson-Trammell Act, passed in 1934[7] and subsequently amended three times—in 1936,[8] 1939,[9] and 1940.[10] By limiting profits on naval vessels (subsequently extended to apply to military and naval aircraft) to a percentage of the contract price, the Vinson-Trammel Act prescribed what, in effect, was not very alien to the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts of World War No. 1. The main difference was that the contract price rather than the cost was the base. While superficially this difference might appear to be great, in actual practice, it could be almost meaningless. Thus, because it did not give sufficient cognizance to the material and fiscal aspects of price control and profit limitation on war contracts, the Vinson-Trammell Act was ineffectual. More than that, in some instances the act discouraged shipbuilders and aircraft manufacturers from entering into contracts, and thus delayed the defense program.[11]

"POLITICAL OVERTONES

"During the twenties, the question of regulation of prices of war contracts and limitation of profits thereon became increasingly important from the political standpoint.

"One of the most potent forces was the American Legion, whose political influence was growing rapidly. In 1920 it launched a campaign for what it termed 'Universal service.'[12]

"In 1924 the two major political parties each included a plank calling for the close control of the munitions industry in time of war.

"The Republican plank[13] read as follows:

" 'We believe that in time of war the Nation should draft for its defenses not only its citizens but also every resource which may contribute to success. The country demands that should the United States ever again be called upon to defend itself by arms, the President be empowered to draft such material resources and such services as may be required, and to stabilize prices of services and essential commodities, whether utilized in actual warfare or private activity.'

"The Democratic plank[14] read as follows:

" 'In the event of war in which the manpower of the Nation is drafted, all other resources should likewise be drafted. This will tend to discourage war by depriving it of its profits.'

"Apparently both major political parties felt that with the adoption of these two planks in 1924 the matter had been disposed of, for future party platforms ignored the subject. In view of the extensive newspaper publicity and general public preoccupation with the question of control of war profits that developed as the years went on, it seems strange that neither political party made an issue of the matter. Nor is it reasonable to explain this omission of the question from the party platforms by the fact that it was receiving so much attention in the Congress. The omission may be set down simply as a political phenomenon.

"During the 1930's, with World War II drawing nearer, agitation for a complete ban on war profits grew apace. Thus, a majority of the Senate Munitions Committee on June 18, 1936, recommended the nationalization of naval shipbuilding and manufacture of certain arms used by the Army and Navy.[15] The minority report of the committee expressed the belief that rigid and conclusive munitions control would be more effective than nationalization in promoting peace, defense, and economy. The majority recommendation was based on the conclusion, drawn from 2 years of investigation, that regulation of arms manufacture is easily evaded.[16]

"On June 22, 1936, the women's committee on suggestions for the Democratic platform recommended by unanimous adoption that the best way to preserve peace was by passing stronger neutrality legislation and taxing the profit out of war.[17]

"Three months earlier, in one of the first polls conducted by Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, the people of the country had gone on record as strongly favoring manufacture by the Government of its own war materials. In the Nation-wide poll the vote favoring this change was 82 to 18 out of every 100, with about the same proportion of members of both political parties favoring the change.[18]

"It was this agitation that, in part, led to the strengthening of the Vinson-Trammell Act of June 27, 1936.[19]

"The political crescendo reached in regard to war-profits control occurred in 1939 and 1940 and 25 bills were introduced in the Congress to deal with the subject more effectively than it had been dealt with theretofore. With war brewing and finally developing in Europe and with production of munitions mounting rapidly in this country, it was only natural that insistence upon adoption of some form of control should increase. None of these numerous bills, however, was adopted, for the Congress was tending more and more to the belief that the problem could be dealt with by a high excess-profits tax.

"Still clearly uncertain as to how to cope with the problem, the Congress side-stepped the issue in the Revenue Act of 1940. Finally, however, on July 1, 1940, shortly after approval of the Revenue Act of 1940, the President addressed a strong message to the Congress directing its attention to the national defense program and to the duty of the Congress to see that the burden of the program was equitably distributed according to ability to pay, and recommending the enactment of a steeply graduated excess-profits tax, to be applied to all individuals and all corporate organizations without discrimination.[20]

"As a result, both Houses finally adopted a highly complicated measure involving a combination of the theories of average earnings and invested capital which represented a not very happy compromise.[21] The provisions for excess-profits taxes were subsequently amended in 1941[22] and again in 1942.[23]

"SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT

"An uneasy feeling that the high excess-profits taxes did not wholly accomplish the purpose of controlling prices and profits on war production continued to prevail in the Congress. During discussion of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of April 1942, Congressman FRANCIS CASE, Republican, from South Dakota, introduced into the House a measure to limit the profits on war contracts to 6 percent.[24] While it was not specifically stated, it is to be presumed that this 6 percent was on a basis of before taxes, following the precedent established by the Vinson-Trammell Act. The measure passed the House by a vote of 70 to 8.[25]

"As it went to the Senate, however, the procurement agencies along with the War Production Board pointed out that this arrangement would place a profit strait-jacket on business and provide for the realization of excessive profits by companies which in the best of peacetimes were accustomed to making no more than 2 percent on sales, while at the same time it might force heavy industry companies into bankruptcy by not allowing them sufficient return. In other words, while the aim of the Case amendment was laudable, again the question of practicality was overlooked.

"Meanwhile, recognizing that unprecedented volume of production was leading to excessive profits already indicated by 1941 corporate reports, the War Department had conducted a number of price renegotiations with prominent war contractors. Therefore, when asked by the Congress to suggest an alternative to the Case amendment, Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Chief of the Army Service Forces, presented a substitute on behalf of the procurement agencies. It was based on

---

[6] American Industry and the War 415 (1921).

[7] 48 Stat. 505 (1934), 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 496.

[8] 49 Stat. 1926 (1936), 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 1155.

[9] 53 Stat. 555 (1939), par. 14, 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 496.

[10] 54 Stat. 676 (1940), 41 U. S. C. 1940 ed., note preceding paragraph 1.

[11] See debate on 1940 Excess Profits Tax, 87 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11,243, August 29, 1940.

[12] This was a 3-way program designed to: "(1) Promote peace, (2) take the profits out of war, and (3) strengthen the national defense." Note that the American Legion's second point was to "take the profits out of war"—not some of the profits, but by implication, all of the profits.

[13] See Republican Campaign Text Book of 1924 at 85.

[14] Sce Democratic Campaign Text Book of 1924 at 39.

[15] Baltimore Sun, June 20, 1936, Associated Press dispatch from Washington.

[16] Supra, note 15.

[17] Philadelphia Record, June 23, 1936.

[18] The National Weekly Poll of Public Opinion, March 7, 1936.

[19] 49 Stat. 1936, 34 U. S. C., 1940 ed., par. 296.

[20] H. Rept. No. 2697, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (June 30, 1940), a conference report on H. R. 10039. The bill was enacted into the Internal Revenue Code, 54 Stat. 516, 26 U. S. C., 1940 ed., pars 12 et seq.

[21] H. Rept. No. 3002, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (Sept. 30, 1940), a conference report on H. R. 10413, which was enacted into the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1940 (Oct. 8, 1940), 54 Stat. 974, 975 ff., 26 U. S .C., 1940 ed., pars. 710 ff.

[22] 55 Stat. 17 (1941), incorporated into Internal Revenue Code, 26 U. S. C., par. 710 (Supp. 1941).

[23] 56 Stat. 798, act of Oct. 21, 1942, Public Law 753, 77th Cong., 2d sess.

[24] 88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 28, 1942, p. 3230.

[25] Ibid. at 3231.

the theory that if every contract price could be reexamined by the parties in the light of actual experience under the contract, it should be possible to eliminate the bulk of excessive profits.[26]

"Appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, gave the following reasons for opposing a set profit limitation:

" '1. Effect of costs: In our view, the control of profits is an integral part of the problem of controlling costs and prices, and any method must be evaluated by its effects on all three aspects. From this point of view we feel that renegotiation is far superior to a fixed percentage limitation.

" '2. Uniformity: In the second place, a flat percentage limitation does not really achieve its prime objective of uniformity of treatment. Although it allows a fixed uniform percent of profit on gross sales, this will be most unfair as applied to the diverse types of business engaged in war work. It takes no account of the fact that in different lines of business the same volume of sales may require widely different amounts of capital, skill, and work, depending on the rate of turn-over.' [27]

"This can be regarded as a perfect summation of the practical aspects of control of prices on and profits from war contractors.

"As for political aspects, the startling revelations as to extraordinary salaries and bonuses paid by Jack & Heintz, Inc., as brought out in hearings before the Naval Affairs Investigating Committee,[28] crystallized in the public mind the extent to which war profiteering might lead. Public reaction, as reflected in newspaper comment and letters to the Congress, was immediate and intense. Under the leadership of Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democrat of Tennessee, the Senate Appropriations Committee adopted the principle of contract renegotiation in the form of section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act.[29] Thus, politically, this final approach to control of war profiteering had its active sponsorship from a Republican in the House and a Democrat in the Senate. The 1924 party platforms had been fulfilled.

"ANTIRENEGOTIATION CAMPAIGN

"But the matter had not been fully resolved with enactment of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act and its section 403. Perhaps because there had been no debate in the Senate or the House on this section, some contractors subject to it took the position that it had been ill-considered and that it was designed to ruin American business.

"In August of 1942 the campaign to repeal or emasculate renegotiation was launched by John B. Hawley, president and sole owner of the Northern Pump Co., of Minnesota, when he circularized the Congress and businessmen with a silver-covered 42-page brochure captioned 'Dictatorship over United States industry under Public Law 528' and subcaptioned 'Sabotage of production, development, and expansion—Towards losing the war.' This was only one of a series of mailings sent out by one of the relatively few aggressive opponents of renegotiation—an excellent producer, it must be said, as are most of the other vocal business opponents. At about the same time a financial magazine carried an article by a prominent writer condemning renegotiation and basing his argument almost wholly on a theoretical case coinciding interestingly with Northern Pump.[30] This article, displaying a wide misconception of what renegotiation is all about, was subsequently reprinted in condensed form in Reader's Digest. The battle was on.

"The departments engaged in renegotiation agreed with some of the more reasoned objections to the law which were voiced by businessmen of a less sensational stripe than Hawley, Jack, et al. Indeed, as the administrators began to work with the act, it became apparent that it did contain a number of minor flaws relating chiefly to mechanics. This was inevitable, since adoption and application of the principle of renegotiation represented pioneering. Certain recommendations for changes in renegotiation were adopted administratively by the departments and subsequently incorporated as amendments to section 403 in the Revenue Act of 1942,[31] jurisdiction for renegotiation having been transferred from the Appropriations Committee to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, where it has continued to remain.

"A summary of some of the other changes effected through the Revenue Act of 1942 will indicate the manner in which the practical aspects of profit control were now commanding an increasing degree of attention—the moral, fiscal, and political aspects having been satisfied by the adoption of the principle embodied in section 403.

"One amendment provided for final agreements. When a contractor or subcontractor renegotiated in good faith for a specified period and agreed to eliminate excessive profits for that period, it was clear that he should be entitled to assurance that the matter would not be reopened at a later date. The original statute did not provide expressly for any final clearance for liability for excessive profits. This amendment specifically authorized such final agreements for a specified past or future period.

"Another change was embodied in two provisions affecting a statute of limitations on renegotiation. The first of these prohibited renegotiation after 1 year from the close of the fiscal year in which the contract or subcontract was completed or terminated. The second authorized a contractor to file financial and cost statements for prior fiscal periods and obtain clearance under the statute, unless the Secretary should begin renegotiation within 1 year thereafter. Few contractors availed themselves of this privilege.

"Under the original law, when a contractor or subcontractor held a number of war contracts or subcontracts, the boards had found it desirable to renegotiate with him to eliminate excessive profits on these contracts or subcontracts as a group, or on an over-all basis, instead of individually. Section 403 authorized renegotiation of contracts individually. In view of the boards' practice of considering contracts as a group, the group renegotiation was formalized as part of the statute.

"By one of the amendments, too, the Treasury Department was brought into the field of renegotiation, while other changes were largely of a technical and relatively minor nature.

"CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

"Politically, the next important step affecting renegotiation was an investigation by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program (Truman committee) begun in the early part of 1943 under the direction of Senator CARL M. HATCH, chairman of a special subcommittee on renegotiation. A report [32] issued by this subcommittee under date of March 30, 1943, in general, endorsed the principle of renegotiation in no uncertain terms, praised its administration, and made a number of recommendations designed to lead to further improvement in both the act and the administration.

"Led by a small minority of businessmen, the attack on the principle of renegotiation became increasingly vocal as the year 1943 progressed. Thus it was that several score of industrialists thoroughly opposed to renegotiation appeared before the Naval Affairs investigation committee during its hearings on the subject in June 1943.[33] Also before this committee, on the other hand, appeared a number of contractors who favored the principle and the administration of the renegotiation statute. The transcript of these hearings is embodied in a 1,300-page document, which was supplemented on October 7, 1943, by a report of the committee itself.[34] The majority of this committee followed in the steps of the Truman committee by strongly endorsing both the principle and the administration of the statute. The minority endorsed the principle, praised the Government representatives in the price adjustment boards, but averred that renegotiation had served its purpose and should be repealed as to contracts made after December 31, 1943.

"With attacks by certain business groups rising to a higher pitch, the House Ways and Means Committee—as part of its job in preparing the revenue bill of 1943—began hearings on renegotiation in September 1943, which continued off and on during the month. This testimony ran 1,100 pages.[35] The committee's report [36] outlined provisions for a new renegotiation act based on section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act. To the amazement of business interests, the renegotiation provisions prescribed by the House Ways and Means Committee continued renegotiation in the main as it had been conducted for nearly a year and a half. Major changes—including provision for court review of unilateral determinations and exemption of contractors having renegotiable business less than $500,000 a year—had been either recommended or endorsed by the administrative departments.

"When the Senate Finance Committee had completed its hearings on renegotiation early in December of 1943, however, it soon became apparent that the majority of the committee was determined to make such changes in the House bill as would leave only an empty shell. The form would be preserved but the substance destroyed. All over the country newspapers reflected the public reaction to this attempted emasculation. Such a cham-

[26] Brig. Gen. Albert J. Browning, Price Control and Renegotiation, 29 Cornell L. Q. 149 at 165 (1943).

[27] See testimony of Under Secretary of War Patterson at hearings before Senate Finance Subcommittee on sec. 403 of Public Law No. 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess. (1942) 3.

[28] Hearings before House Naval Affairs Committee on H. Res. No. 162 (vol. I; Mar. 28, 1942) 77th Cong., 2d sess.

[29] Public Law No. 528, sec. 403, 56 Stat. 245, 50 U. S. C., par. 1191 (Supp. 1942).

[30] John T. Flynn in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly for Aug. 31, 1942, Cost Plus, a World War Evil Returns.

[31] Act of Oct. 21, 1942, Public Law No. 753, 56 Stat. 798.

[32] Additional report of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program pursuant to S. Res. 71 ((77th Cong.), a resolution authorizing and directing an investigation of the national defense program, renegotiation of war contracts, March 30 (legislative day, March 23), 1943.

[33] Investigation of the Progress of the War Effort; hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 1st sess. (Renegotiation of War Contracts, vol. 2, June 10 through June 30, 1943.)

[34] Investigation of the Progress of the War Effort, report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, Renegotiation of War Contracts, October 7, 1943.

[35] Renegotiation of war contracts, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015, revised, September 9 through 23, 1943.

[36] The revenue bill of 1943, November 18, 1943, 78th Cong., 1st sess., House of Representatives Report No. 871.

pion of private enterprise as David Lawrence at one extreme and such a leftist as PM at the other extreme, sprang to the defense of renegotiation. Said the former:

" 'Undoubtedly there have been some injustices, and these ought to be revised by the tax court, or even some special court. But when a man like James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, whose peacetime job is investment banking in Wall Street, cries out against the efforts to emasculate the renegotiation law, other businessmen will want to ask themselves whether their tactics may not lead to a reaction and another wave of radicalism and antibusiness legislation when the servicemen come back home and get all the facts about wartime profits.' [37]

"Another advocate of private enterprise, Mr. Arthur Krock, in commenting on the attempt to amend the renegotiation out of existence, said:

" 'If the Renegotiation Act is amended to the extent favored by the congressional committees, war corporate profits will reach levels that, when spotlighted after the war, as they are sure to be, may infuriate the country, produce a reckless and destructive backswing against industry and start all over again the cycle of pacifism and "merchants-of-death" propaganda that helped so profoundly to send this Nation unprepared into desperate war.' [38]

"The preservation of private enterprise is certainly one of my chief concerns. Any legislation that would destroy or hurt it would be inimical to such a concern. Believing that renegotiation was not only in the general public interest but was of specific benefit to industry itself and convinced that any emasculation of renegotiation would be a serious blow to both the country as a whole and industry as an important segment, I presented on behalf of myself and Senators La Follette, Connally, and Lucas a document called Minority Views.[39] The response to publication of these views, which attacked certain of the provisions of the Senate bill that seemed to me to emasculate renegotiation, was instantaneous and dramatic. Newspaper editorial writers and commentators throughout the country, presumably reflecting a good cross section of public sentiment, made it clear that the public would not stand for renegotiation emasculation. It became crystal-clear that the country would not tolerate a return to World War I profiteering and that it regarded renegotiation as the only sound preventive measure so far developed.

"As a consequence, the Senate and House conferees, composing their differences, presented to the Congress what the Washington Post described as 'a testimonial to the legislative process of study, discussion, and compromise. It is,' continued the Post, 'a sound, workable law, acceptable to the executive agencies which much administer it and responsive to the rights of the contractors who must submit to it.' [40]

"In short, after long trial and error, the fundamental trio of considerations, material, fiscal, and moral, had been satisfied by successful legislative processes for the reasonable control of wartime profiteering.

"No doubt, as time goes on, new flaws will appear in both the legislation and the administration. But as it now stands, the Renegotiation Act itself is the best solution of a difficult problem which human ingenuity and experience have been able to contrive."

[37] Washington Star, December 14, 1943.

[38] How Business Can Make Itself the Postwar Goat, Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, December 16, 1943.

[39] The revenue bill of 1943, Minority Views, January 6, 1944, 78th Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. 627, pt. 2.

[40] Washington Post, February 15, 1944, editorial page.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, dealing further with my amendment to limit war profits to 10 percent, I refer back to the fact that on the 9th day of May 1944 I made a speech upon the floor of the Senate on that very subject entitled "More Evidence of Huge Profiteering." It is one of many speeches I delivered on the subject. I read:

Few issues are of more vital importance than taxes. The fairness with which they are levied and the effectiveness with which they are collected may make or break a nation.

As everyone familiar with the situation knows, our tax laws are full of loopholes through which wealthy individuals and corporations are escaping their fair share of the cost of government.

As between Congress and the executive department, we do not attempt to assess responsibility for this situation. Both must share the blame. That is abundantly demonstrated by shocking disclosures in two official reports made public recently.

According to Randolph E. Paul, general counsel of the Treasury, the tax laws provide a postwar windfall for business that may reach the staggering figure of forty-five and one-half billion dollars, even if the war ends this week. The total will be larger if the conflicts extends beyond that period.

Before entering Government service Paul accumulated a good-sized fortune as tax adviser to business concerns. He can't be accused of radicalism or prejudice against business.

Tax legislation enacted in 1940, Paul pointed out in a speech before a gathering of businessmen at New York, permits business to obtain a refund of taxes paid during the war to meet the cost of conversion to peace—a subsidy in the guise of tax relief is the way he describes it.

For 2 years after the shooting stops—

Listen to this, Mr. President. Compare it with a farmer or a laboring man or a white-collar worker employed in a store on a salary. Compare what happens here with what happens to one of those men:

For 2 years after the shooting stops, if their factories do not turn a wheel, industrialists are assured of profits at least equal to their prewar earnings. Paul fears they may get more by inflating their costs and losses.

For all its generosity, this provision does not satisfy certain business groups. They insist that wartime taxes be returned to them now and retained in their own treasuries. They plead they can lay nothing aside for postwar readjustment. Paul exploded that statement.

He pointed out that, after paying taxes and all other charges, corporation profits during 1943 and 1944 alone will be three times average profits, after taxes, during the period from 1936 to 1939, inclusive. Furthermore, he emphasized, these corporations—after paying taxes and dividends and greatly increasing the salaries of their officials—have already accumulated from their war profits more than twelve billions of undistributed profits.

If we add the tax refunds to the undistributed profits, we will find these big concerns will have a postwar nest egg of $57,500,000,000—or 30 percent more than the entire national income during the last year of the Hoover administration.

That is what I said 4 years ago. Senators told us that a great many people had robbed the Government. What good does it do to talk about it after the Government has lost the money? I have an amendment which I have submitted providing that under the pending legislation no one dealing with the Government shall receive more than 10 percent profit.

On that same day I said:

Additional light on the fantastic profits of war contractors was furnished a few days ago by the Truman committee, which for 2 years has been investigating various phases of the war program.

Mr. President, we had the Truman committee in 1942. We have had investigation after investigation. Nobody ever seems to go to jail. The money of which the Government was robbed is gone. I repeat, no one seems to go to jail now any more than under the Sherman antitrust law, under which for 57 years not one single person has been sent to jail. When somebody robs the Government, we merely have another investigation. We find, somehow or other, that the action is outlawed, or else the criminal is dead and his descendants have the money.

I said at that time that the bulk of war business had been given to 100 corporations. Of these 100 the Truman committee asserted only 9 had been free of excess profits in 1942. As for the remainder, the profits ranged all the way from 25 to 600 times normal peacetime profits.

Mr. President, in order to give the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] an opportunity to speak, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the remainder of the speech which I delivered in May 1944 upon this subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the kindness of the Senator from North Dakota, but I prefer not to address the Senate until the pending amendment has been disposed of, unless unanimous consent be obtained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois made objection.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the objection of the distinguished acting minority leader, I shall continue speaking with reference to my amendment.

I want the RECORD to show, Mr. President, that I twice tried to conclude my remarks and give the Senator from Georgia an opportunity to deliver his speech, and twice I was prevented by objection. So I shall continue speaking with regard to my amendment.

In order that Senators who have come in late may know exactly what the amendment provides, I shall read it:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

On page 65, line 4, after the word "compensation", insert the following: "but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital."

That is, by anyone dealing with the United States Government.

In other words, if my amendment is adopted, no one will be able to make a

greater profit than 10 percent on a contract held with the United States Government.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that my request to insert in the RECORD the remainder of the speech which I made in May 1944 was not granted, I desire to read, first of all, the remainder of the speech which I made upon that occasion:

The Truman committee cited chapter and verse on the profits of various corporations. It tells of a New York aircraft corporation which had average peacetime profits of $32,493, but multiplied that figure 168 times in 1942 after paying taxes and dividends.

I am sorry the distinguished acting minority leader has gone, because that statement shows what kind of an administration the Democrats gave this country. At that time they had control of the White House, the House of Representatives, and the Senate. Yet under that kind of control a company raised its profits, according to the Truman committee report, 168 times.

The Truman report continues:

A small Pennsylvania airplane company which was reported to have an average deficit of more than $70,000—

Mind you, a deficit of more than $70,000 each year between 1936 and 1939—

had a profit of $11,400,000 in 1942.

I can only say, Mr. President, that it is my judgment if the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] had been in charge, someone would have gone to jail. The idea of a company having a loss of more than $70,000 year after year and then having a profit in 1942 of $11,400,000. That is the kind of a Government we had under Mr. Roosevelt with a Democratic House of Representatives and a Democratic Senate. That is the heritage which Mr. Truman had to assume.

The Truman committee report continues:

A concern in New York in 1942 increased its profits 25 times.

An Ohio locomotive plant increased its profits around 42 times.

They made $1,000 before, but they made $42,000 in 1942.

A Pennsylvania corporation increased its profits 10 times.

That is all quoted from the Truman committee report, Mr. President.

The story could be extended endlessly. The illustrations given are not exceptional. They happen to have been taken at random among the 100 corporations holding the largest volume of war contracts. For smaller companies the profit picture is equally as excessive. Only occasionally did a manufacturer bob up who placed his country's welfare above his pocket. One such is the United Aircraft Corporation of Connecticut, whose officials came to Washington and turned back $286,000,000 to the Government. They said they were ashamed to take the money. But after making the refund the committee observed the company still had left, after taxes, in the year 1942, $17,000,000 of net profit, which was a little more than three times its average profit of $5,000,000 a year during the prewar base period.

What became of President Roosevelt's promise that a new crop of millionaires would not come out of this war? What becomes of the plea of certain leaders in the House and Senate that we cannot increase the taxes of the rich, and that if we are to get additional revenue we must place new tax burdens on small incomes?

They surely put taxes on small incomes. Consider the school teachers, Mr. President. Oh, I remember so well when the tax bill was being considered. On the other side sat the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. He offered an amendment. He said to the Senators that when a banker or a merchant goes to a national convention, every single penny of the expense, all his entertainment expenses, can be taken off his income tax.

As I said before, the President of the National Teachers' Association appeared before our committee. He testified that in nearly every State in the Union a school teacher is required to attend summer school, and the average cost involved is $200. The teacher must attend summer school or lose her certificate. It is part of her business. So the Senator from Florida offered an amendment to the tax bill providing that the poor teacher should be on an equality with the banker or with the merchant who attends a convention. Mind you, Mr. President, the tax would amount to only $5 or $6. The Senator from Florida did not ask that the whole $200 come off, but merely that the tax be deducted from the gross.

The Senate refused to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, I believe, by a vote of 44 to 40. In effect, the Senate said go ahead and let the poor teachers, who today are and at that time were the most underpaid profession in the entire United States, go to summer school and get along the best way they possibly can.

Mr. President, I was discussing Henry Wallace's testimony before the committee. Again I say not a single word has been said on the floor of the Senate to refute his testimony. He said:

The armaments program, compulsory training, and the draft would be profitable to big business. For the common man, they mean harder work and lower living standards. He will make the sacrifices, while the corporations will add armament profits to inflation profits.

Further along, Mr. Wallace, testifying, said:

The armament boom will bring fantastic profits to the big corporation.

Under my amendment, Mr. President, that would not be possible, because they would be limited to 10 percent.

Even before receiving war orders, they were making double the profits they made during World War II. With their own men handling procurements, they will dictate their own terms on war contracts for the Truman-Forrestal doctrine. They will monopolize supplies of raw materials and freeze out independent businessmen. In a sellers' market, with increasing scarcities, they will push prices through the clouds.

Not a word is uttered here to refute his testimony.

The guns instead of butter formula is already evident. In 1947, the first year of the cold war, per capita civilian consumption declined by 2 percent, and food consumption by 1 percent. The Department of Agriculture predicts a further drop in food consumption this year, and this will become a sharp decline if the military are permitted to build up huge stocks to feed the Army they have in mind.

The Army will have 435,000 new men. The size of the present Army is 1,070,000, and according to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, they will draft 435,000 more.

Mr. President, Mr. Wallace's testimony dovetails right in with that. He said:

Housing will be the first victim of increasingly acute shortages of steel and lumber and building labor used for military projects.

Instead of building houses they will be building more military projects, says Mr. Wallace; and that makes sense to me. I do not know whether it did to the committee or not, but I remember when I tried during the war to get tractors and binders and farm machinery for the farmers in the Northwest, I was told there was a shortage of steel, that they could not manufacture the machinery, that the military authorities needed the steel for war purposes. So the farmers had to go without. The present Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], is familiar with western North Dakota, I know. In one county, the county of Hettinger, of which the county seat is Mott, N. Dak., I held a hearing. Four hundred farmers came to the hearing. I was particularly impressed with the testimony of the county agent, a Democrat. I shall never forget it. He said that the farmers could not get any new machinery. They had binders manufactured in 1927 and they could not get new parts for them. A farmer who had a tractor, a modern tractor at that, who broke a litle gadget, drove 800 miles, in spite of the shortage of gasoline and the shortage of rubber, and paid 75 cents, in the State of my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, so that he could repair his tractor and make it run. The testimony of the county agent was that because of their being unable to get new machinery, and because of the fact also that they could not get repairs for their old machinery, the loss in flax and wheat in that one county was a million dollars in 1943.

Mr. Wallace testified before the committee that if we pass the bill now before us one of the first effects will be a shortage in housing, the steel and building materials being used in the erection of military projects, while GI veterans who are trying to get little homes are unable to get any material.

Mr. Wallace said further:

Eventually with millions of workers forced to move again to new locations to produce war materials, a new and greater housing shortage will be piled onto the existing shortage.

These shortages will not plague big business firms—for they will make more profits than ever out of the shortage and out of orders for military goods.

The one cloud on the business horizon is the fear that the American people may rise and demand that Congress reject the remobilization proposals of the administration.

The only fear on the business horizon is the fear that the American people may

rise up against this iniquitous bill. That is the only thing they are afraid of.

Mr. President, I am not in any hurry about getting this bill through, a bill that is going to take 435,000 boys away from their homes.

I have here a letter which I received from the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, one of the great organizations of America. This organization, in my judgment, has done as much good for the youth of America as any organization within the history of the United States. This is what it wrote me under date of June 7:

DEAR SENATOR: The Senate draft bill, although it has been amended to make military training for 18-year-olds voluntary rather than compulsory, still contains a provision for training some 161,000 18-year-olds in regular armed services and along with the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

The President's Commission on Universal Training said:

"We must admit at once that a serious moral problem is presented by the very removal of a boy of 18 from the normal influences of his home, church, school, and local community, and his comparative isolation in a camp with large numbers of other men under an entirely new and different environment."

They recommended:

That is, Mr. Truman's committee recommended; not the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union—

They recommended:

"(7) limitation of the opportunities for the purchase by trainees of any alcoholic beverages, including beer, through (a) prohibiting the sale thereof to them on any military, naval, or other camp reservation, or in any post exchange, ship's store, or canteen, (b) declaring "off-limits" to trainees all taverns, taprooms, and similar facilities whose principal business is selling alcoholic beverages, (c) soliciting the assistance of local communities in this program, and (d) making it a Federal crime knowingly to sell such beverages to any person in training."

Furthermore, under this bill you are drafting 19- and 20-year-olds, boys whom their home communities would protect against the sale of alcoholic beverages. In the absence of Federal legislation, they were not protected in the Army in World War II, with the result that Dr. Harvey J. Tompkins, assistant chief of the psychoneurotic service, has estimated that 10 percent of all World War II patients discharged from veterans hospitals last year entered with a primary diagnosis of alcoholism. He gave the figure for all wars, including World War II, as 12.6 percent.

You will not benefit the defense of America by permitting these boys to be exploited by what General Marshall described as "sordid commercial interests." May we, on behalf of the many members of our own organization and the many parents of teenage boys, again urge you not to pass this bill without proper safeguards against alcohol and vice.

Very respectfully,

ELIZABETH A. SMART,
National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

That shows pretty well, Mr. President, that Mr. Wallace knew what he was talking about when he spoke of that situation, because, as I said before, it jibes quite well with what he said.

A story published in the Journal of Commerce—

Mr. Wallace said—

on March 22, 1948, interprets the business outlook in these terms:

"One official recalled * * * that 2 weeks ago he had predicted that only a worsening international situation could prevent a business adjustment.

"Now, he says, only an improved international situation can dim the business outlook."

Mr. Wallace said:

This is a cold statement that what is bad for the world is good for business.

Mr. Wallace said, and I repeat it:

This is a cold statement that what is bad for the world is good for business. But that is only true for big business and international financiers.

I repeat that Mr. Wallace was the great ideal of the Democrats. Some of the members of the Armed Services Committee were political friends of Mr. Wallace. At least one of them seconded his nomination at Chicago. Mr. Wallace was the great prophet in 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944. Mr. Wallace apparently was thought by some to be the best man in the whole world to be Secretary of Commerce, and he was confirmed with the advice and consent of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The Republicans, it will be remembered, opposed Mr. Wallace. The Democrats were in a majority, and they were for him. If he was such a great man only 2 or 3 years ago, why is not his testimony worthy of consideration now? But, Mr. President, have you heard one single Democrat, one Member on the other side of the aisle, read Mr. Wallace's testimony or give its contents upon this floor? Not one has done so. No; it remained for a Republican like myself to bring to the attention of the Senate the testimony of Mr. Wallace.

Mr. Wallace continues:

While the huge corporations tap the rich lode of armament profits, the common people will be increasingly subjected to the regimentation of a militarist economy. The administration asked for a military draft and universal military training. But this little draft will be followed by a labor draft. It will be needed to man the war factories as labor shortages follow increased conscription. But even more important, it will be required to regiment the people, to stifle criticism, to freeze wages and terrorize the unions.

The Journal of Commerce on March 18, 1948, reported that a stand-by manpower control plan would soon be initiated. It said:

"The situation is serious enough * * * to warrant a request for manpower control right now. But political expediency left no room for it. * * * Only by keeping the initial proposals relatively innocuous * * * was it possible to obtain congressional support."

Remobilization for war abroad involves intensified attacks against American labor.

So, Mr. President, we come right back to the speech made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] the day he opened the debate upon the bill. What did he say? He said that we want a force which we could send to every continent except Australia. The United States has grown up all right. We are not merely taking care of the United States any more, but we are taking care of all the continents except Australia. So we are going to send our boys all over the world, and the prophecy I made when the Senate adopted the United Nations Charter, that England was placing the burden upon the United States is coming true.

England used to send the money to keep Greece going. She no longer does so, but the taxpayers of the United States pay the bill. We are sending our hard-earned dollars all over the world. Now they are not satisfied with our money, but they want the blood of our boys in every continent except Australia, says my distinguished friend from South Dakota. The bill may be passed, but the senior Senator from North Dakota will not vote to send boys between the ages of 19 and 25 to every country on the globe except Australia.

How well I remember the speech of Winston Churchill, which came over the radio a few years ago. He said, in substance, "All we want is the material. Give us the guns. We do not want the men." But after England had the guns, she sent for the men. England now wants to turn Singapore over to us to take care of for her.

Mr. President, I repeat that not a single Democrat has referred to Mr. Wallace's testimony. This is the same Mr. Wallace who, when he went to any of the States in 1940 or 1941, was accompanied to the rostrum by my distinguished friends. They were glad to be seen with the Vice President of the United States. Today no one quotes him, and it remains for a Republican to get his views before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of Mr. Wallace's statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I want it clearly understood that I am not saying that I agree with him at all.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remobilization for war abroad involves intensified attacks against American labor. Employers are advised by the business press that remobilization will increase inflationary pressures—and that these must be offset by resolute opposition to demands for higher wages.

President Truman has given the workers a foretaste of what is being planned for them under the remobilization program. He has invoked the Taft-Hartley injunction against labor in the atomic energy industry. The head of the Atomic Energy Commission has warned that the Government cannot permit strikes on atomic projects and industries supplying them with critical materials. That will now be extended to cover all industry—since the whole economy will be required to service the remobilization program. Taft-Hartley has been invoked in the disputes in the coal and meat-packing industries, and with reference to the typographical union.

The labor draft and the outlawing of strikes will be accompanied by a wage freeze—already called for by President Truman and Bernard Baruch. Living standards must be driven down in a militarized economy—and this can be most effectively accomplished by a wage freeze. It is presented, of course, in the guise of combating the inflation fed by the war boom.

A longer working week will also be forced on the workers. Ever since the war ended, big business spokesmen have sought to cripple the Fair Labor Standards Act and abolish the 40-hour week. With millions of workers drafted into the Army and shifted to munitions factories, labor shortages will be used as the pretext to lengthen the working week and destroy the remaining safeguards of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Unlimited profits for the corporations and forced labor for workers will be the consequences of the remobilization program. The Forrestal plan will bring death and taxes for the many, and very handsome profits for the few.

The first effect, of course, is on those young men who are trained to kill. Not only do they learn to kill, senselessly, in a war in which there can be no victory, but they are deprived at the same time of the training necessary for purposeful, constructive, peaceful lives. For every 1,000,000 men who undergo 6 months of military training, we lose 500,000 man-years of study in the arts and crafts of peace and in the training in the sciences and humanities of civilization.

What may be less obvious is that this conditioning for war will not only affect the trainees themselves, it will be universal.

As stated in Ewald Banse, "philosopher" of nazism, a basic essential to war preparations is to "draft the minds of the whole people for war." The prime importance of doing this was stated long ago by Hitler's teacher, General Ludendorff, who pointed out that every war must be presented to the people as a fight for existence, and not an aggressive war. "To accomplish this," said Ludendorff, "one must reiterate to the people that there is an immediate danger of war."

The preparations and plans for compulsory military training and the draft do not differ from this concept.

Gen. Leonard Wood, initiator of citizens military training camps, admitted their futility as practical aspects of national defense and went on to reveal the real purpose when he said:

"We do not expect * * * to accomplish much in the way of detailed military instruction * * * but we do believe a great deal can be done in the implanting of sound military policy."

The same thing has been said many times by civilians, notably by educators.

Sir Norman Angell remarked:

"Conscription to be effective must be a conscription of minds as well as bodies * * * the state must take charge not only of the expression of opinion, but of the dissemination of facts which lead to the formation of opinion."

Brig. Gen. Henry J. Reilly, retired, described ideal training as follows:

"The Army is supposed to fight. Leave the morale to the Army and to hell with morals. Some people want to keep the young soldier from women and liquor. That's what he needs."

Major Hinman, of the Morale Division told a writer:

"It is not our job to teach the men in the Army what is right. It is simply to teach them to fight for what is right—as laid down by the Government."

Let us consider the impact of thinking like this, in the teaching of all our young people. In the current war psychosis, what is "right" as laid down by the Government? Current events teachers may be permitted to say that our Government's betrayal on Palestine was "unfortunate" but they will be compelled to add that it is "right." It will be "right" because it adds to the profits of the oil monopolists. They will have to teach that it is "right" to feed the power of Fascist Franco, Salazar, Peron, Chiang Kai-shek, and the Grand Mufti and the puppets of Greece and Turkey.

Civics teachers will be compelled to teach that only Reds are in favor of racial equality, for segregation at this time is a fixed part of military life. It will be their job to explain how "right" it is for the President of the United States to trail along behind the British Foreign Minister in slandering loyal Americans of Jewish faith who have helped to build a refuge for other Jews in Palestine.

UMT and the draft will not only affect the youth who sacrifice their schooling and their rights as citizens. It will be a draft and military training for the whole people. The military virus will infect every school, every college, every scientific institute; and the press, the radio, the magazine, the films—all media of mass communications will be reduced to gears in the war machine.

We have seen the bullying and blackmail of decent men and women who spoke the truth on the radio. We have seen the reign of terror instigated by the Thomas-Rankin committee sweeping away the livelihoods of writers, teachers, and scientists.

It is this aggressive military doctrine which constitutes the real threat to American security.

I share with Dr. Albert Einstein the conviction that UMT "would be harmful to the welfare and security of our Nation."

It is the special pleaders for universal military training, for the draft, for a huge air force, for more battleships, for more and bigger destructive atom bombs, who are endangering our American security.

A calm appraisal of our current military policy demonstrates that even on a purely military level it offers no security, and threatens us with disaster.

The administration's military policy is expensive, wasteful, unbalanced, and contradictory.

In 1947 we spent on our Military Establishment a sum equal to the total spent by six leading world powers in 1938. But our fighting forces are unbalanced, lopsided, and in a state of crisis.

Proposed new expenditures would make them more so. The Congressional Aviation Policy Board demands $10,000,000,000 a year to build our air strength. Proponents of UMT will ask an additional 2 to $5,000,000,000 a year for their military kindergarten. The armed services are already asking a military budget for the next fiscal year of some $14,000,000,000 but Washington reports indicate that the actual expenditures will be closer to $20,000,000,000, while additional billions may be spent for lend-lease to the western military bloc. A yearly military budget of 40 to $50,000,000,000 is already hinted at by journalistic spokesmen of the administration.

But there is no hint of a responsible military policy.

With expenditures of over $2,500,000,000 for land forces, we have been able to maintain two and a half combat divisions in the continental United States. General Eisenhower has admitted there is no program for reform for our land forces.

Our tremendously strong Navy—greater than the navies of all the rest of the world combined—is without strategic justification except for purposes of conquest.

The administration's military policy places its chief strategic reliance on the atom bomb. It is arming us, therefore, for a war without limits or inhibitions—a war as dangerous for ourselves as it is for others.

Army leaders and Air Force leaders hold contradictory conceptions about the functions and importance of land power. The Navy on the one hand, and the Army and the Air Force on the other, disagree on the functions of the Navy and the possibilities of its use in atomic war. There is a split between the advocates of blitz war and its adversaries. There are differences between those who believe the Air Force should use primarily atomic weapons and those who believe it should be prepared to fight with or without atomic bombs. There are many divergent conceptions of the functions of the Navy even among naval leaders themselves.

These contradictory conceptions reflect the fact that the administration has no sound military policy. This lack of an overall policy is an indication that it is not the security of our country which is the essential concern of the military.

The more closely we examine the administration's military policy the more clearly we can see that it is not designed for security. The administration's military policy has as its object the imposition of military control of every kind whether purposeful or not. This is not a program for security but a political program to control the American people.

This is most clearly demonstrated in the case of universal military training.

UMT is militarily valueless.

This is admitted by military experts, as for instance, John Henry Martin, former consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who wrote recently:

"Universal military training or, to call it by its older and more honest name, conscription, would be the most expensive military delusion this Nation could undertake. To adopt it would undermine our true strength, drain our public funds in wasteful activity, and leave us in ostrich-blind exposure."

UMT does not prepare trained reserves. It does not lay the ground for an American land force. If we need trained reserves, we now have 15,000,000 veterans of World War II who, as Mr. Martin has pointed out constitute a reserve of trained personnel that will be available for at least 10 more years.

The 6 months' training proposed by UMT can offer at the very best no more than a quarter of the knowledge and skill required for the education of the modern soldier. This is indeed no more than a military nursery school, corresponding roughly to the German labor service, instituted by the Nazis, as a preparation for Hitler's Wehrmacht.

UMT will be wholly wasted on more than 70 percent of the trainees since the experience of World War II showed that approximately 7 men are needed in essential noncombat duty for every soldier at the front.

UMT will waste fully 30 percent of our officer corps, who would have to be used to shepherd the trainees through elementary training routine.

UMT in sum can prepare only a police force on the home front, at high cost and without military value. Some of its advocates openly and cynically admit that it is no more than mass education for police purposes. A writer in the New York Herald Tribune declared March 7, 1948:

"We should have the military training of youth because we ought to have the product of it for police purposes whether it is of any military value or not."

The proposal for UMT is nothing but military irresponsibility. It was recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training along with other proposals to build up atomic weapons, increase our fighting forces, indoctrinate our citizens. In short, UMT was proposed as part of the universal militarization of America. The Commission's report threw in everything in outlining a reckless policy of expansion without limit and without knowledge of what is important or unimportant.

The Congress should realize that the policy recommended by the administration and its military spokesmen is only the beginning of a series of demands for higher and higher military expenditures without any ceiling. If Congress yields to present demands, thus opening the way for a policy of reckless militarism, every service will demand more and more billions. The appetites of the military chiefs will grow. They ask more arms not to protect America but because they want more power.

It is reported that Mr. Truman's request for additional military budget will total $4,000,000,000. However, the cat was let out of the bag in the testimony of the defense chiefs before this committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, last Thursday, March 24. W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, admitted that his service wanted a much bigger expansion than Mr. Forrestal had previously reported to the committee. The report in the New York Times of March 26 said that when Mr. Forrestal was recalled to the witness chair, he appeared to regret exceedingly that this issue had arisen. He conceded that it had been drawn out of Mr. Symington and General Spaatz by committee questioning. But he warned that such a program might call for additional expenditures of $15,000,000,000.

"Mr. Forrestal indicated that it was his conclusion that it would be futile to request Congress for such sums at this point."

Thus the strategy is plain—ask for only 3 or 4 billions extra now then after a few months and a new synthetic crisis, raise the ante to 15 billion, as planned all along.

The real potential military budget even for next year may prove to be as high as $25,000,000,000, quite apart from the foreign political adventures.

Militarily, this policy will lead nowhere or to world explosion since it is a policy based on the impossible conception of American military control of the globe. This is a geographical, political, and military impossibility. Even the United States cannot saturate the world with its bases and military power.

Only a few weeks ago, the Congress was asked to vote billions for what was called the economic reconstruction of Europe. Now it is being asked to vote even more billions for rearmament and still higher demands are being blueprinted. But we cannot have both rearmament and reconstruction. World recovery is incompatible with an unlimited investment in armament.

American security and the security of all peoples are threatened by the administration's military policy. American military needs cannot be based on the destruction of the major part of the European and Asiatic Continents from the air nor on the conquest of these continents.

American security must be based on the recognition that in the modern world real security can only be attained through universal peace and not a program of world conquest.

American security depends on the ability of American policy to help create the premises of peace. The best policy of national defense is a constructive peace policy. The problem of American security cannot be solved by rearmament. The War Department has itself realized this. It stated in a paper published April 8, 1947:

"The atomic bomb and the potential of aircraft and missiles has made the defense of the Nation more difficult, more expensive, and less certain of attainment. The need of eliminating war itself has never been so vitally necessary to the national security of the United States and to the survival of civilization throughout the world."

The building of a military machine even on the scale recommended by the administration will not prevent war; nor will it win a war—there can be no victory in another world war. Military power alone only intensifies rivalries and tensions which finally set off military conflict. David Lawrence in the March 26, 1948, issue of the United States News summed up this lesson of world experience in these words:

"For decades and decades military men have argued that military preparedness prevents war. This is an illusion. * * * to say that a standing military force ever prevented a war is to deceive oneself. For generations standing armies in Europe have been a factor in postponing wars only until another nation could build up a rival army or its equivalent in naval power."

The efforts of the administration to frighten the world with a show of force will not bring peace. It will only intensify the efforts of Soviet Russia and its allies to become equally strong.

Instead of taking a path which must inevitably lead to war, I urge the Congress to adopt a military policy which will not only insure the national security of the United States but promote world peace.

A sound military policy must be based on sound political objectives. If the United States were to reverse the Truman doctrine with its program of unlimited aggression, then it could develop and carry out a military policy that would truly safeguard national security at a small fraction of present military expenditures.

If the political objective is peace and not war, then the Military Establishment of the United States should fit the needs of the American people. This should be a modern, first-class defense force, based on scientific research and the latest developments in military technology.

With such a scientific Military Establishment, the United States could not be threatened anywhere in the world, since it would be backed up by the almost limitless war potential of our incomparable industrial power and the millions of trained reserves who fought in World War II. This would more than overbalance in military terms the power of any other nation or combination of nations on the globe.

No nation actually threatens our vital interests anywhere in the world. No power would dare attack the United States. Since the only thing we have to fear is the irrational fear whipped up by unfounded war hysteria, we can protect our national security while taking the lead in transforming the United Nations into a bulwark of peace and prosperity throughout the world.

The United States should lead from its real strength—its democratic traditions, its unmatched industrial capacity, its creative abilities which have made it the first Nation in the world. It can regain the leadership it had during the war by going back again down the road of good neighborliness, charted by Roosevelt.

In the spirit of cooperation, the American people must work for disarmament, the outlawing of unlimited weapons of destruction such as the atomic bomb, the promotion of international friendship, laying the foundations for universal peace through the instrumentality of the United Nations.

Peace will come if the American people and their Government really work for peace. If they have the will to peace, war can be prevented. Congress owes it to the fathers and mothers of America whose sons will be sacrificed on the altar of war to reject the Truman doctrine, turn down the proposals for remobilization which will commit the Nation irrevocably to Armageddon. Let Congress follow the hopes and wishes of the American people and declare its determination to stop the drift to war.

The CHAIRMAN. While you are waiting for the balance of your statement, is it not a fact that you, through your campaign manager, Mr. Anderson—Mr. B. Anderson—telephoned and asked——

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Baldwin—Mr. C. B. Baldwin—yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Baldwin, from your office on Park Avenue.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Baldwin asked for my appearance here; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. About the same time each Member of the Senate, I believe, at least I did, received a telegram from you dated March 17, I think that is correct, an Irish date; is that correct?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, the morning of March 17 it was sent to each Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. That telegram, I believe, had better go in the record at this point.

(The telegram is as follows:)

MARCH 17, 1948.

Hon. C. GURNEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your responsibility and that of the other Members of the Congress to quell the war hysteria which is being fanned by the military and cartelist members of the administration is brought into sharp focus by the President's convening of another emergency joint session. There is no evidence that any nation has threatened acts of aggression against us or threatens our national security. Yet the President and members of his Cabinet act as though a war crisis were imminent. The people look to the Congress for calmness and sanity. They expect you to guard them against dangerous and wholly unnecessary steps which will curtail their liberties and take us down the road to an economic and political life regimented by the military.

Twice before the President has convened the Congress in an atmosphere of artificially created crisis to cover up failures of his own policy. In May 1946, the President made an inflammatory attack on the railroad workers and called for repressive legislation which the Congress wisely rejected. Again, in March 1947, the President created another crisis to get military aid for Greece and Turkey. He embarked us on a course which has now proved bankrupt.

The crisis in international affairs results from the complete failure of the Truman doctrine throughout the world. The way out of this crisis is to renounce the doctrine as the basis of our foreign policy. We must stop finding excuses for ignoring the peacemaking machinery of the United Nations.

The American people cannot understand why a democratic election in Italy should be used to increase international hysteria merely because the administration fears the results may displease it. The Congress must give evidence that when we speak of democracy we mean democracy. The present administration is ruining the good name of the American people the world over. It rests with the Congress to quell the hysteria and set up a standard for the observance of democratic principles which will enable us to regain moral leadership in world affairs and in the cause of peace.

HENRY A. WALLACE.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you care to wait for the balance of your statement?

Mr. WALLACE. This is a sort of summing up or condensation.

President Truman first recommended UMT 2 months after VJ-day. That gave the American people time to look at it and decide that they did not want it. Even the new synthetic crisis, it appeared that Congress might not pass this measure.

So President Truman and Mr. Forrestal brought forward the other part of their program to militarize the American people—the draft. They would have asked for it sooner or later, anyhow, but the resistance to UMT caused them to advocate the draft, as something mild and temporary, in the hope that Congress would pass this, even if it rejected UMT.

Mr. Truman in his crisis speech asked for only a temporary draft, and Mr. Forrestal asked for the registration of 36,600,000—I think that is 3,600,000 men—but estimated that only 220,000 would be drafted. We are told that the draft is necessary only as an emergency measure to bring the armed forces up to authorized strength, because of the inadequate level of voluntary recruitment.

If the services really want to build up to authorized strength through voluntary enlistments, I will tell them an easy way to do it.

1. Stop the war propaganda. Resume a peaceful, cooperative foreign policy. Withdraw American troops from intervention in Greece, China, and other places.

2. Improve the pay and conditions of enlisted men. Improve relations between officers and men.

3. Abolish all forms of discrimination in the armed services, which keep out thousands of Negro recruits.

Mr. Forrestal, Mr. Royall, and their associates know these things as well as you and I. Their call for a limited draft is a screen for the much more sinister objective of militarizing America.

The real intention is to draft, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of men into the armed services. The real intention is to register not only young men, but all men of potential military value for service in the armed forces. The real intention is to draft all men and all women for militarized labor.

Congress is being asked to pass a limited draft on an emergency basis. But even this limited draft will give the powers to conscript several million men. And it is only an opening wedge for demanding the ultimate objective which I have stated. Once Congress grants the initial power, the conditions will be created for provoking new emergencies, for coming to Congress with even more urgent demands for the unlimited powers which are really wanted—or for declaring an emergency and putting them into effect without recourse to Congress. UMT and the draft are two sides of the same plan, and constitute a direct attack on the liberties of all Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Senator ROBERTSON?

Senator ROBERTSON. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator RUSSELL.

Senator RUSSELL. I have a question or two, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wallace, if you will indulge me a pleasantry, I might say that I have heard the statement all of my life, about the Devil quoting Scripture, but if the Devil had appeared here, horns, forked tail, and pitchforks, reading from the Holy Writ, I could not have been more surprised than to hear you rely upon the Wall Street Journal and the Journal of Commerce, and the spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. WALLACE. Are you inferring that the Wall Street Journal is the Bible, sir?

Senator RUSSELL. No, sir; but I noticed you quoted it. I noticed you adopted it as your Bible and quoted it very approvingly on more than one instance.

Mr. WALLACE. I did so because I felt that it might appeal to certain members of the committee as a Bible.

Senator RUSSELL. I am sure you exempt me from that, because I was the author of the revision of the first Draft Act of 1940, to provide for a draft of industry also, one that unfortunately the administration of which you were part of did not put into effect very often.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not have in mind, Senator, I may say, that you were afflicted with this tendency to look on the Wall Street Journal as your Bible.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not take these quotes.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator RUSSELL, Mr. Wallace comes from his office on Park Avenue in New York. Do not forget that.

Senator RUSSELL. I do not attach any significance to that.

Mr. Wallace, you have very definitely rejected any idea of universal military service, of any renewal of selective service. You have been very critical, if I understood your statement correctly, of any enlargement of the air forces of the country. You state that the Navy is much too large and should be greatly reduced.

If you were President of the United States at this time, what suggestions would you make to your Secretary of Defense as to the proper size of the Military Establishment to protect this country in today's world?

Mr. WALLACE. I think anyone who is Secretary of National Defense must think in terms of the possible next war, instead of in terms of the last war. I am talking now about the Secretary of National Defense, not the President.

Senator RUSSELL. Have the peace treaties been signed for this war, World War II?

Mr. WALLACE. Beg pardon, sir?

Senator RUSSELL. You said the last war. Have the peace treaties been signed for World War II?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, only in part, of course. It is not over, but that common terminology to look upon the war as essentially completed.

But to get back to the main point, I do feel that a military man, in order to be true to the security of this Nation, must think in terms of the next possible conflict, instead of in terms of the last conflict, and therefore a military man, in view of the various types of dangerous weapons which are now available, must think in terms of the science involved in those weapons.

Now, that is not a matter of training young boys for 6 months. That is a matter of having an exceedingly well-trained force, we will say, of perhaps a million men. I do not know the precise number that would be needed, but they must be full-time men, fully trained.

To some extent you misquoted precisely what I said with regard to the Air Force and Navy, but we will let that pass. You misquoted me.

Senator RUSSELL. Let us get it right. Here is the language that I have tried to mark, some of it, as I heard you read it. You state in here—

"Our tremendously strong Navy, greater than the navies of all of the rest of the world combined, is without strategic justification except for purposes of conquest."

So unless you as President would embark upon an imperialistic course of conquest, it would be too large, according to your own statement.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I agree that it would be too large.

Senator RUSSELL. About what do you think, if you were the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, would be the proper size for the Army and Navy and Air Force in today's troubled world? Do you think that a million men in all branches of the service would suffice?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I do not see how anyone could possibly make a statement without going into that in very great detail with the Chiefs of the Army and the Navy and Air Force.

Senator RUSSELL. But you are convinced that the present establishment is too large.

Mr. WALLACE. Granted that we have a proper foreign policy, I say unqualifiedly that the present establishment is too large.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes. Now, you state here that—

Mr. WALLACE. But with our present policy, it is not large enough, and cannot possibly be made large enough.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I am not altogether happy about our present foreign policy, but for entirely different reasons than you hold and express.

You have stated here that we are going to set off an armaments race. You are aware of the fact that Russia, which we may in all frankness say is the only potential enemy we have that could wage war on us, has 350 divisions under arms at the present time; are you not?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know of anyone who knows precisely the number. We all assume that it is a very large number of men under arms at the present time.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, I think I have seen, if not in the Wall Street Journal or the Commerce Journal, at least in the New York Times or the New York Herald Tribune that you also quote, that Russia did have 350 divisions under arms.

How are we setting off any armaments race in view of the fact that we have practically demobilized the greatest military force that the world ever saw, and are now just proposing to recapture a little of the security that we had at the end of World War II?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, undoubtedly as we seek to expand our armed forces, Russia again will proceed to go all out to expand her armed forces even further. I think there can be no question about that. Her chief reliance, of course, is on men. It is not on battleships or even on air power.

We can expect her to go even further. I certainly do not take Russia as a model for what we do.

Senator RUSSELL. No, sir. Well, we might differ about that.

You state here that you are very critical of the propaganda in this country, and you quoted, let me see if I can find this here, General Ludendorff saying that you had to have a policy of fear.

Would not that same statement have applied today to Russia if you had just stricken Ludendorff's name and substituted Stalin? Are they not constantly preaching they are being encircled, and are gravely endangered by the capitalistic imperialism of the United States?

Mr. WALLACE. Stalin stated so in his speech in February of 1946. I have not been following what has been said specifically since. I assume they are continuing to preach that. I would be surprised if they did not, because——

Senator RUSSELL. You think it is a fact.

Mr. WALLACE. If we were, if Russia happened to have bases within striking distance of our shores, a great many different bases in striking distance from our shores, and if the Russian air chief were boasting that he could fly their aircraft and strike any possible plant in the United States and return to those bases, I think that we might think that we were being encircled.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, do you mean——

Mr. WALLACE. I say the Russians do have, I would be surprised if they did not preach it; as I say I have not been aware of the specific statements, but I have not been reading the Russian press.

Senator RUSSELL. It is rather general knowledge in this country through the American press that the Russians have been preaching the doctrine of encirclement, and that they are in grave danger from capitalistic imperialism at the hands of the United States.

Do you, Mr. Wallace, advocate complete reversal of what you referred to as the Truman doctrine?

Mr. WALLACE. That is correct.

Senator RUSSELL. As I understand it——

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. You would have us pull out of Greece immediately?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. To stop any aid whatever to Turkey?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; that is correct.

Senator RUSSELL. Remove our fleet from the Mediterranean.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that from the standpoint of attaining world peace it might be essential before all of that were done to have a meeting with Stalin in order to have an over-all agreement. It might be a very wise thing to do. That certainly should be our objective as rapidly as it can be done with regard to all of the factors.

Senator RUSSELL. I thought you categorically advocated here withdraw American

troops from intervention in Greece, China, and other places. Would that not relate to the fleet in the Mediterranean?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; certainly.

Senator RUSSELL. And that would also, you would also annul the European relief plan as it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. WALLACE. If you want to get into that, I have stood continually, and still stand, for very comprehensive relief to the people of Europe on the basis of the damage done to them by the Axis during the war.

Senator RUSSELL. Yes, sir; I have been more diligent as a reader of the papers than you have. I am more familiar with your view. I was referring to the European relief plan, as such.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not in favor of furnishing relief on the basis of dividing Europe. I have not been at any time. I recognize that it might be necessary for an interim period in order to take care of hungry people in Italy and France in particular, it might be necessary for a certain number of months to make sure that certain quantities of food got to them, but as rapidly as could be done, we should get a new plan based on the United Nations and not based on help through the United States alone. Otherwise I know that we are going to be hated by the rank and file of all of the people of Europe.

I would like to have other nations bearing the burden of that obloquy. We are going to be feeling ourselves in the United States we have done a great many favors for millions of Europeans; at the same time those millions will hate us. I do not like it.

Senator RUSSELL. Do you know of any way whereby we could force Russia to join in this program short of war?

Mr. WALLACE. I think it can be done if Russia feels that we are not out to attack her.

Senator RUSSELL. And that would involve all of these military withdrawals that you have indicated you favor?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, as I say, I think that ought to be part of an over-all settlement with Stalin.

Senator RUSSELL. But leaving out the meeting with Stalin, you do not know of any great deal of difference in the program that you suggest here and that is being advocated by Mr. Stalin's mouthpieces, Pravda and Izvesta, and their propaganda?

Mr. WALLACE. You are more familiar with those publications than I am.

Senator RUSSELL. I try to keep up with them. I think it is a duty of every American to do so. I recommend it to you.

You refer here to the fact that the American security is threatened by the endeavors of backward countries everywhere to lift themselves from feudalism into the modern world of the twentieth century.

We are undertaking to help France, Britain, Belgium, Holland, and in the present European relief plan, have not those countries embarked upon a program more or less of state socialism? Would you not call that throwing off feudalism?

Mr. WALLACE. I would not say that any of those countries were in a state of feudalism. I say that Greece and Turkey are definitely in a state of feudalism. They never went through anything corresponding to the French or the American Revolutions. I would say that China also was definitely in that position.

Senator RUSSELL. You referred in your remarks to something about a strike in the atomic-energy plant. Do you believe that the Government of the United States should permit the atomic plant to be closed down by a strike by the people there in labor organizations walking about without exhausting all of the resources of the law?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not believe that the current trumped-up emergency is such as to warrant injunctions under the Taft-Hartley Act, to prevent labor from striking in order to obtain its just demands.

Senator RUSSELL. Even in the atomic energy plant?

Mr. WALLACE. Even in the atomic energy plant. As a matter of fact, you may know I have advocated steadily that we should build up a stock pile of atomic bombs, so I have felt that is one of the key things that is responsible for much of the present difficulty in the world.

Senator RUSSELL. That was the next question I wished to ask, that if you were the Commander in Chief at the present time, you would cease all operations looking to the construction of atomic bombs?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say, too, I would immediately use that as one of my bargaining points with Stalin, "See here, we are ready to stop construction of atomic bombs and ready to do this, we are ready to do other things, if you will do this, if you will do that, if you will do the other thing," and come to an agreement, an over-all agreement on the important points.

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Wallace, do you think there is any other man in the United States besides yourself who could reach an agreement on all of the details with Stalin?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I think that I could be very helpful in it.

Senator RUSSELL. "Barkis is willing."

In case of a war, would you favor or oppose the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon?

Mr. WALLACE. I will say first that if the United States dropped the atomic bomb in a preventive war, the United States would go down in history for more than a hundred years as a nation having made one of the most dastardly acts.

If it were done on a preventive basis, as a certain rather small group in Washington would like to see done, that would be destructive of United States prestige for probably many centuries.

Senator RUSSELL. Let us change——

Mr. WALLACE. If the war came.

Senator RUSSELL. Pardon me.

Mr. WALLACE. If the war came, and by the way, it is incredible to me that Russia would start an aggressive war for many years; she would be utterly foolish if she did, but granted that it would be many years in the future, I would assume that Russia really committed the act of aggression, in that case you would have to look at the situation as it existed at that time.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, to use a hypothetical case, of course, I assume that you include Trieste in your ideas on Greece, that we should pull our troops out of there, or do you; or should we leave the American troops in there?

Mr. WALLACE. Again I go back to the over-all conversation with Stalin.

Senator RUSSELL. To get back away from that for a moment, then, suppose tomorrow Tito were to swamp the small American forces stationed in Trieste, and either kill or capture all of our troops and the British there, and that Russia backed Tito up and attacked our troops in Berlin and in Vienna, and seized those two cities; do you think we would then be justified in dropping the atomic bombs over Russia?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that we would be very foolish so to do. I think your hypothetical question is altogether beyond the realms of reality, however.

Senator RUSSELL. I hope and pray that you are correct in that assumption, sir.

But you think even under those circumstances we would not be justified in using the atomic bomb.

Mr. WALLACE. I say it would be foolish for us to do it.

Senator RUSSELL. Why would it be foolish, Mr. Wallace, if Russia had 350 divisions in her land army and you state we only have 2½? What other hopes would we have of saving the American people that are over in Germany in the occupation at the present time?

Mr. WALLACE. Simply because that would not save them. That is why I made the statement. That is, Russia would promptly move in within a very few weeks on the way to the British Channel, and dropping bombs in Russia would make it more certain that she would move all the way across. She would do it out of purposes of defense, because she would feel that we would be deterred for a time at least in dropping bombs on the defenseless civilian population of western Europe.

Senator RUSSELL. Well, suppose we were to pull out of Europe tomorrow and follow this policy. Is there any doubt in your mind that Russia would move right in?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. I think Russia has too much good sense to move right in.

Senator RUSSELL. You do not think they would move into any of these troubled areas if we pulled out all of our forces and just said here it is, come and get it, in effect; I do not mean literally inviting them, but pull out all of our people.

Mr. WALLACE. I would not expect Russian troops to move into any of these areas.

Senator RUSSELL. You do not think even in western Germany?

Mr. WALLACE. No, not even western Germany. I think she would be foolish if she did.

Senator RUSSELL. I would like to ask what you think would have happened to any man in Russia who had occupied a high position in the Russian Government if he had expressed the opposition to the policy of the Politburo in Moscow in open meeting that you have expressed here in the United States to these proposals by this administration?

Mr. WALLACE. I have exactly the same views that you have on that subject, Senator.

Senator RUSSELL. You think he would be shot?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know whether he would be shot or sent to Siberia.

Senator RUSSELL. But at least we do have as American citizens that advantage over the people living in Russia.

Mr. WALLACE. We have for the time being. I do not know how long it will last.

Senator RUSSELL. Neither do I.

Those are about the only questions I have to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator WILSON.

Senator WILSON. Not for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BYRD.

Senator BYRD. No questions.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I would just like to ask Mr. Wallace about two questions.

Mr. Wallace, do you believe that our security in the United States depends in any way upon the peace, or lack of peace, if you will, in Europe? In other words, can we be secure in this country regardless of what goes on in Europe?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think any part of the world can ultimately be secure if some other part of the world is at war.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that we have certain responsibilities in Europe and Asia, your opinion being that the present policies concerning those responsibilities are conducted wrongly; is that it?

Mr. WALLACE. That is it.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But we do have certain responsibilities.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I believe that.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And our security does depend upon how those responsibilities are carried out?

Mr. WALLACE. That is correct.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that the difference of opinion between you and the present administration which is advocating these policies comes down to a question of means rather than a question of principles, so to speak?

Mr. WALLACE. In brief, I am not an isolationist.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, may I ask you one other question?

You made certain statements which I think are your assumptions rather than any statements of fact. On page 4, for instance, of your statement, you said in the seventh paragraph—

"Under the Forrestal plan still heavier taxes must be imposed, sales tax will be proposed to obtain revenue and cut down relief so that more output can be diverted into military channels."

Then on page 9 you said:

"Thus the strategy is plain—ask for 'only' 3 or 4 billion extra now, then after a few months and a new synthetic crisis, raise the ante to 15 billion, as planned all along."

Those are assumptions or conclusions of yours, rather than any present knowledge of the fact.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; that is correct. I think you are wise to bring that out.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, may I ask one other question, because we are primarily concerned with manpower in connection with our policies. I have not read, I do not think, I may have, I do not remember it, anyway, any of your views with relation to our policy in Japan and Korea. I bring that out because one of the arguments that were made to us is the shortage of manpower at the present time in Korea and Japan.

Do you as a whole approve of the way we have conducted our policy in Japan?

Mr. WALLACE. I regret to say, Senator, that I have not studied the details of our policy in Japan.

Senator SALTONSTALL. So that so far as you are concerned, the question of manpower with relation to our needs in Japan in that connection, you make no statement whatsoever.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not making any statement with regard to Japan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Or Korea?

Mr. WALLACE. Or Korea.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, for instance, today on the Senate calendar at this moment now being debated on the Senate floor is the question of our policies in China, and giving relief to Chinese, and also possibly making some funds available for the President to do what he pleases with there, which may mean added munitions, sending more armament to China.

Have you any suggestion concerning that, or any statement or views?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. From what I have seen in China myself, when I was there in 1944, I would say that money we sent to China will be money lost.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Money wasted, in other words.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, money wasted, that the rank and file of the people in China in the Kuomintang area are not for the present regime, and that there is no way in which the present dictatorship, no matter how much it may be strengthened by munitions from the United States, can indefinitely prevent the rank and file of the people from pushing forward to get out of the feudalistic regime.

When I was in China, I did not see any of the Communists. My duty and obligation on that occasion was to deal with the people of the government for specific objectives. I did see certain people in the middle of the road, certain of the professors at various institutions, men who had been trained at Princeton, Harvard, and other outstanding institutions, including my own alma mater.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I am glad you brought in mine, too.

Mr. WALLACE. Those men were very much disturbed at the violation of fundamental democratic freedoms.

Since I have been there, two of the professors were assassinated by the secret police of Chiang Kai-shek. One was first assassinated, and the second one was assassinated when or immediately after he delivered the funeral oration.

The ordinary people in China are mostly farm people. Our failure in dealing with the so-called backward economies is that most of our diplomats and makers of policy are not familiar with farm situations, and not familiar with the fact that under the set-up as it has existed in most of these areas, where the farms are small and the land is poor, and the interest rates are high and the rent is high, and our plan of labor will bring in a return of about 5 cents or even less, those people are just not satisfied, because they know it is possible to build up the productivity.

My eyes were first opened to the situation there by a representative of the National City Bank who had been in charge of the branch at Peiping, until the time of Pearl Harbor, and was unable to escape. He came in to see me immediately before I went over to China to give me certain information. He had to escape by way of the Communist territory and lived for some 6 months among the Communists there.

The statement he made to me at that time was that these people were essentially agrarian reformers. Personally I think that they are real Communists, but that was his impression at that time.

I think they are real Communists in their fundamental objectives, although I do not think they are Russian Communists. I think they are Chinese Communists. That is, I think they are patriotic in terms of China, which is not true in all countries, but I do believe it is true there from what I have been able to learn.

At any rate, they have divided up the estates. They have cut down interest rates. They have taught the people to read and write. I got most of this information from this gentleman in 1944, who was with the National City Bank. They have done all of those things.

The point I am making merely is that the Communists, in understanding the agricultural problem in China, have been wiser than we, who also should have understood the agricultural problems. We have greater capacities, as a matter of fact, if we only put our minds to it, to increase productivity, enrich the land, induce better types of machinery, and better types of seeds.

That is essentially the problem in all of these backward areas, and we have let that field be abandoned too largely to the Russians and to the Communists, and if we really wanted to do a job, we should step in and in terms of the needs of the ordinary people.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words, your point, to keep our nose to the grindstone of this bill, your feeling is that our need for additional manpower for purposes in China or our need for additional armament for purposes of selling to the Communists is unwarranted, or is it?

Mr. WALLACE. Our money will be wasted.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And it is going at the question in the wrong way, too.

Mr. WALLACE. It is going at it the wrong way, too.

Senator SALTONSTALL. There is just one more question regarding manpower. We have been talking about any possible conflicts between Russia and ourselves, and you have no feeling regarding the Russians and their methods, and their advances in the eastern part of Korea and Vladivostok and up through that territory. You have no worry about them there at all, so that need for manpower on our part over in those areas is also unnecessary and wrong, is that correct?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, I have not studied Korea and Vladivostok that we are worrying about. That is Russia's own territory.

Senator SALTONSTALL. I mean advancing from there, and so forth, the dangers of attack upon our west coast, put it that way.

Mr. WALLACE. We are talking about submarines.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, I am keeping it general. I do not know any more about submarines than you do.

Mr. WALLACE. I hope you know more about them than the Navy does, apparently.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Well, what I am trying to get at is, we have certain demands for manpower made on us. You have covered through Senator RUSSELL and Senator GURNEY very thoroughly the European side of it. I was trying to bring out your view on the other side of it.

Mr. WALLACE. Vladivostok is a long way from San Francisco. So far as I know there is no evidence that any Russian submarines have gotten within 5,000 miles of San Francisco. It is a long way from our territorial waters.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words, from our west coast and from the eastern side of the world, you are more of an isolationist than you are on the western side of the world. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I would not say so at all. It is just as important, I would say, for us to do our part in helping the Chinese toward a higher standard of living as it is the western Europe and Balkan states.

Senator SALSTONSTALL. That would take some manpower, though, would it not, to do our job correctly?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, to do the job as I would do it, I may say, I am outlining it in a book of mine called Toward World Peace, which is just off the press.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Have you given this summary of it here in your statement? Have you given us that?

Mr. WALLACE. I suggest in this book in the first instance until we get to better accord between the United States and Russia that the so-called backward nations should apply to the Economic and Social Council, and to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations for experts to help them in reorganizing, particularly their agriculture, but to some extent their small industries.

That would not cost an awful lot of money, and would not take an awful lot of manpower. It is the same kind of job to some extent that we did through the Farm Security Administration, and that has long been done through the Extension Service. I think it is vitally important for increasing the productivity of the world, and furnishing the fundamental basis for peace.

I do not think it takes tremendous sums of money to do that kind of thing.

Senator SALTONSTALL. In other words, do you think there would be need for some manpower over there, but less manpower used in a different way?

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wallace, I notice on page 1 of your statement that after 2½ years of reconstruction, its production, meaning Russia, has just regained the prewar level.

I am interested as to that. That is a definite statement. I had not heard from any other source that we had any information as to their production reaching the prewar level.

Mr. WALLACE. I suspect that the sources of information are no more accurate than the sources of information with regard to the 350 divisions; if you wish to have a memorandum on the subject, I will be glad to submit it.

The CHAIRMAN. I will be glad to have it.

Senator RUSSELL. I was also surprised, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Wallace could have such little knowledge of Russia's military strength and stated he knew nothing whatever about their propaganda, but could speak with such assurance that there had not been a submarine within 5,000 miles of our coast.

Mr. WALLACE. I am going merely by what Baldwin and Victor Bernstein report.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wallace, you are definitely in your statement here against selective service for building up the immediate manpower needs of the military as recommended by the Military Establishment. That is right, is it not?

Mr. WALLACE. Beg your pardon, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. You are definitely against selective service at this time?

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And also you are definitely against UMT for the long pull.

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But just as definitely on page 8 of your statement, you say:

"UMT does not prepare trained reserves. It does not lay the ground for an American land force. If we need trained reserves, we now have 15,000,000 veterans of World War II who, as Mr. MARTIN has pointed out, constitute a reserve of trained personnel that will be available for at least 10 more years."

Do you feel it is right, then, to lean on that group of veterans of World War II in case of any emergency?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not anticipate such an emergency, but I say we have them there as an insurance if the case of need should arise.

The CHAIRMAN. You are definitely against any program to build up any other reserve, so therefore you personally are relying on those reserves right there.

Mr. WALLACE. Standing on the statement I just made.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the statement, yes. I can understand how you as a nonveteran would make that statement.

Senator HILL.

Senator HILL. Mr. Wallace, in 1940 you were a member of our Government. You were in the President's Cabinet. You supported the defense program at that time, did you not?

Mr. WALLACE. I supported it very, very strongly, sir.

Senator HILL. Very strongly; and why?

Mr. WALLACE. Because I felt that we were in grave danger of having Hitler dominate this country.

Senator HILL. You see no danger at all from Russia and communistic Russia at this time?

Mr. WALLACE. I see no danger whatever to this country at this time from either Russia or communism.

Senator HILL. You entirely differentiate then between Hitler and nazism, and Stalin and communistic aggression.

Mr. WALLACE. I do completely, sir. I am in accord with the United States Army in that respect. I will give you this. It is a publication put out by the United States Army, entitled "Our Ally, Russia."

Senator HILL. What is the date of that?

Mr. WALLACE. That, I believe, was 1944.

Senator HILL. 1944. Well, things have changed quite a bit since 1944, have they not?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, but I would like to read this statement to you, Senator, because if the Army did not believe what it was saying then, it was just putting out this for propaganda purposes, for soft-soaping an ally that was serving our need temporarily. We ought to know it, I think.

Senator HILL. Read it.

Mr. WALLACE. So I think it would be well to read it into the record. The question asked in this publication, Our Ally, Russia, is: Are not Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union the same? Then it goes ahead and answers the question:

"Some people who talk faster than they think would say yes. After all, both are dictatorships. But there are many differences, and they happen to be important differences. The Nazi idea is that Germany and the whole world must be ruled by a little clique of greedy men for the benefit of a small group. This clique never intends to relinquish its power. It is not interested in improving the lot of the ordinary people. It is interested only in war, plunder, and world power. And the Soviet idea is that the dictatorship must serve the people. There is no master race idea in the Soviet Union. All people are considered equal. Working conditions were constantly being improved before the war, at a time when the Nazis were ruthlessly destroying the German labor unions and turning their own people into slave laborers. The Soviet Government raised the status of women to equality with men, while the Nazis considered women fit only to breed children. The Soviet Government increased the number of school children by 400 percent and of college students by 800 percent, while the Nazis cut the number of students in Germany by more than half. The Soviet Government has as its goal the building of a better, happier country for its people. The Nazi government has as its goal the building of a powerful war machine that will plunder the world to enrich Germany."

The Army put forth at that time a great many other statements of that general character, and apparently in the main, I would not say exclusively by any manner of means, because there were many people in the Army that did not hold those views, but in the main, as long as Roosevelt was alive, the Army had that kind of an attitude.

After Roosevelt died, the Army attitude changed completely.

Senator HILL. It was not the death of Roosevelt, but it was the acts, the subsequent acts of Russia that caused people to change their opinions.

Mr. WALLACE. I would not undertake to differentiate.

Senator HILL. You would not condemn Russian aggression. The close of the war changes your opinion no way whatever toward Russia?

Mr. WALLACE. Let us get right down to what we are concerned with. Suppose Russia is everything that you want to say she is. We will assume that you have said everything against Russia that is in your mind, and that is the record. I still say that we here in the United States at the present time, in view of the power realities of the next 10 years, are not warranted in taking this step to draft our boys.

Senator HILL. Well, then, you say that assume Russia is everything that some say she is, everything her actions would indicate she is, you still see no danger whatever between the United States and Russia.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I do not.

Senator HILL. No threat at all there.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not.

Senator HILL. If Russia took over all of Europe, it would be the same thing, would it?

Mr. WALLACE. No, sir; I do not say that.

Senator HILL. You would not say that. Well, you just would sit by and see whether she would take it.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say this. I do not know whether you read the speech I made on September 12, 1946, or not, but at that time I indicated a possible modus vivendi with Russia, and I may say that the President went over the speech at the time, and I think he was sold on my approach at the time he went over my speech with me.

Since then we have followed the get-tough policy, and as the result of the get-tough policy, Russia and communism have gotten stronger. I would say that the possibility, I would say that the methods we have used have served to strengthen Russia and communism in the whole world, not to weaken her, and that the more we use these methods, the more we will lose the sympathy of the rank and file of the ordinary people all over the world, and the more communism will be strengthened. I think human nature is made that way.

Senator HILL. We have changed our policy because we found that appeasement was not getting us anywhere with Russia; did we not? Did we not find that the more we gave, the more they demanded?

Mr. WALLACE. I would suggest, Senator, you ask your old friend Senator Byrnes; I may have been misinformed with regard to the last conversations he had with Molotov in December of 1946, but as I remember it, just before he ceased being Secretary of State he had great hopes for the next time when he met with Molotov, because he found Molotov being much more reasonable in December of 1946 than he expected.

Senator HILL. I do not think he said anything about that in his book, did he, speaking frankly?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, maybe he did not. Ask him about it personally off the record.

Senator HILL. Well, I think you will find that he found the more he gave, the more they demanded, and I am rather surprised that you would come here to defend your position today with a statement issued by the Army in 1944, in view of all that Russia has done, all of the many acts of aggression on her part since 1944.

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, if you will just reverse the situation, if you will just reverse it, put yourself in the other position, if you had seen the United States destroyed all the way from the Atlantic seaboard up to Gary, Ind., all the various factories, all of the various factories, I repeat, 10,000,000 of our people killed, all of the livestock driven off, practically all of the farm homes destroyed, and then if you had seen, if you had all of that happen, and a foreign power then came close to your very borders with bases, many bases, air bases, close to your borders, I think you would try to use whatever mechanisms you had, any possible mechanisms you had, to stop that kind of a situation.

Senator HILL. To reach out and take others.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that this method of answering tit for tat is leading irrevocably to war which Russia certainly cannot win, but neither can we.

Senator HILL. That justifies Russian aggression; is what you mean?

Mr. WALLACE. No, I would say that I am not justifying anybody. I am just simply explaining how people get that way.

Senator HILL. Do you not think that we went in the UN with an idea of working this peace out with Russia, as well as with all of the other nations, and that all we have gotten, practically all we have gotten from Russia has been a rebuff, and unwillingness to agree, and unwillingness to reach any mutual understanding?

Mr. WALLACE. I should say that we were headed toward eventual peaceful understanding as long as Roosevelt was alive. When Roosevelt died the whole thing changed. The military took control.

Senator HILL. Of course you have to realize that Mr. Roosevelt died before even VJ-day, do you not, before the war was over with, when Russia was still in danger, was still needing our help, was still getting help from us.

Mr. WALLACE. And we wanted her help very much, too.

Senator HILL. We wanted her to continue in the war. That is perhaps true. But the change came when Russia was no longer in danger, is that not true? The change came when the war ended.

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, I will not attempt to assess blame. All I am interested in is in the future and in peace. I do not think there is any possible good comes out of trying to assess blame or call people names.

Senator HILL. I agree with you thoroughly. Nothing comes out of that. But you have to look at past acts if we are to judge the future. And our portion for the future. If you adjudge the motives of men and the courses of men, the direction they are taking, of nations the same way, you can only

judge them by their acts, not by their sopious declarations, perhaps.

What I am judging Russia by, and the thing that interests me, is that you do not seem to consider at all her actions since the war, since VJ-day, her aggressions to other people.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that both nations have been taking actions which lead to war, and that we have got to reverse that policy.

Senator HILL. Would you put us in the same class with Russia?

Mr. WALLACE. I will not attempt to make exact measurements. I will say that both nations have been engaged in acts which lead to war.

Senator HILL. You spoke several times of the atomic bomb. Do you not think we made a very fine effort to reach an agreement on the bomb when we had the secret, and we were willing to turn it over to the world, provided we knew it would not be used against us?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I do not think so.

Senator HILL. You do not think so?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I did not think so, and judging from the recent statement by Mr. Bernard, he did not think so either, and neither did Mr. Lilienthal. If that statement that appeared in the press is correct, he thought it would lead to an inevitable destruction.

Senator HILL. You mean Mr. Baruch?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I am talking about Mr. Bernard, who recently became head of the Rockefeller Foundation, who was a member of the Commission at that time, with Mr. Baruch, Mr. Lilienthal, and I have forgotten the names of the other members at the moment.

Senator HILL. Then you think it is about as much our fault as it is Russia's fault?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that the blame is not all on one side, and the quicker we appreciate that, the more quickly we are to have peace.

Senator HILL. But you see no threat to us from Russian communism today?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I see no threat to us from Russian communism today.

Senator MORSE. I would like to ask two or three questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MORSE.

Senator MORSE. I want to say at the outset that the foundation of my questions is the first paragraph of your statement this afternoon, consisting of those three short sentences, with which I am in complete agreement.

I think you set out there objectives that we are striving for and the foundation of my question is based on those paragraphs.

"The American people want peace. They want lasting peace achieved through world cooperation in the United Nations. They want a strong and prosperous America."

Then I want to say most respectfully that following that statement I think we proceed in argument based upon a series of assumptions in regard to which I desire facts and my questions are related only to those assumptions because I am going to continue to insist, as far as my position on this legislation is concerned, that we get the facts.

On the first page you say, "but the security of the United States is not threatened." I assume by that you mean that as of now the territorial security of the United States is not threatened?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. Well, I also am concerned about the security of certain ideals, certain philosophical objectives upon which democracy either has to rest or is going to fall. So, my line of questioning is whether or not those ideals, sometimes referred to as those conceptions of liberty and freedom we think are essential so that men as individuals may remain free in this world, are threatened by Russian policy.

I think to paraphrase you a moment ago, let us get down to the brass tacks of the situation, the problem is a Russian-American problem. We are not going to have peace until the solution of that problem.

As I read through these assumptions I find that my questions can best be based on the periodical that you have seen fit to quote today, which I seldom quote. However, when there is something which I feel is right I do not fail to quote it. I refer to an article by Chamberlin in the Wall Street Journal of this morning, if the chairman will permit me, because I want to use these three paragraphs for the basis of my questioning.

I want to read them to you because I think that there is where we come to grips with the problems as to these philosophical concepts of democracy that are in danger as far as Russian policy is concerned.

Mr. WALLACE. Which Chamberlin do you have reference to?

Senator MORSE. William Henry Chamberlin, and the item is entitled, "Appeasement has not stopped Russian expansion which now takes in large areas in Europe and Asia."

I am interested only in the ideas expressed, irrespective of other ideas he may have.

"There are at least four such reasons which may be briefly summarized as follows:

"1. The fatalistic belief of Soviet statesmen; set down over and over again in the writings of Lenin and Stalin, that true peace and security can come only as a result of a triumphant world Communist revolution."

Do you think, Mr. Wallace, that that is an accurate statement of the political objectives and the teachings of both Lenin and Stalin?

Mr. WALLACE. I refuse to comment on any writings by William Henry Chamberlin.

Senator MORSE. Well, suppose that we eliminate his name?

Mr. WALLACE. That is, I do not wish to deal in ad hominem remarks of any kind, and I do not care to comment on anything he may say.

Senator MORSE. I know you do not, but suppose we take his name off and make them my statements? I will put the language in my langauge and ask the question as to whether or not in your opinion the writings of Lenin and Stalin as far as the political objectives of Soviet Russia are concerned lay down the program of world Communist revolution?

Mr. WALLACE. It is quite correct, sir, that back in the early twenties, both Lenin and Stalin made very extreme statements as to what they regarded as to the inevitable ultimate course of events and the desirable course of events.

In other words, in those days both Lenin and Stalin spoke for the eventual triumph of the dictatorship of the proletariat in all of the nations of the world. I think there is no gainsaying that.

Senator MORSE. Would you agree, Mr. Wallace, that the fact that that is historical background has caused tremendous fear in America among the American people or millions of them as to Russia's world political objectives?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that a very great disservice has been rendered the people of the United States by playing up those statements of Lenin and Stalin which were made under the stress of an extraordinary revolutionary situation, where there had been intervention by many countries in the internal affairs of Russia, millions of lives of the Russian people had been lost as a result of that intervention in the early twenties, the conniving had been of an extreme nature. You can read the history on that and discover just exactly the nature of the conniving as Britain drove for the oil fields of Baku, and various other people and Japan tried to make their objectives and, although the United States had a little cleaner bill of health than the rest, it was really pretty bad.

I would say that they had extreme provocation at that time and also they were probably moved by, you might say, a purely doctrinaire expression of what they approved to be true Marxism.

I do not think it contributes to the peace of the world to emphasize those statements at the present time because Stalin last year specifically took those statements back and came out for a modus vivendi with the United States when he gave interviews to Alexander Worth, a British newspaperman, to Harold Stassen and to Elliott Roosevelt. Moreover, it is also a part of history that after the death of Lenin, Trotsky was preaching the inevitable world revolution and Stalin, instead of preaching inevitable world revolution, came out for the strengthening of communism of Russia; that a Socialist state could be built in one country; that you did not have to have the whole world socialized in order to build it.

Trotsky felt that you had to have capital from other countries in order to get Russia off dead center and moving into the scheme of things. Stalin had a limited objective and in effect he took it out of the hide of the Russian people by very extraordinary measures.

I did not like those measures at the time at all, referring particularly to the liquidation of the Kulaks in 1932 and 1933, I did not like them at all. I remember when I was passing through Soviet Russia to China in 1934 and I discussed that particular matter with the man assigned to accompany me through Russian territory from the Russian foreign office and he made this point which in a way was a well-developed point.

I visited some of these collective farms in Siberia; that if Russia had not under Stalin's leadership moved decisively to get the farms on a more practical basis, that it would have been impossible to remove the labor to make that extraordinary development in Russia during the thirties and if that had not been done Russia would undoubtedly have been defeated. That is no excuse for the liquidation of the Kulaks where human values were sacrified in a way we do not like, but I do say that it saved the lives, undoubtedly, of many hundreds of thousands of American boys that Russia was able to withstand Germany and we did not have to fight by ourselves.

Senator MORSE. Would you say, Mr. Wallace, then, that you think it would be a correct statement of fact to give to the American people today that the present Soviet Government does not have as one of its world political objectives communistic revolutions in other countries.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is impossible to speak for all of the Russians in that respect. Stalin may have one view and other members of the Polit Bureau may have another. I doubt if there is a completely unified attitude such as we might be led to expect. We have many views in this country, goodness knows, in our top leadership.

Senator MORSE. I think you will agree with me, will you not, that fear itself can be a fact, one of the facts you have to deal with when you are dealing with relations between two countries; and I think it is an important fact trying to find a peaceful solution to present difficulties between the United States and Russia.

I am going to put my question this way because to me it is an important question. Do you agree with me that as long as many American people fear that Russia's world political objective is to communize at least some countries, if not the world, that that fear is a fact which must be tackled?

Mr. WALLACE. Let us put it this way: I was in Europe last spring a year ago and I was in Europe again last fall, and in a number of different countries. I would say that fear was very much in their minds and that their fear was of this nature. I think this applies to the large part of the people of the world.

The fear is of this nature, that the United States, believing in the inevitable and de-

sirable triumph of capitalism all over the world will come into conflict with a Russia that believes as you state and therefore these people who desperately desire peace more intensely even than the people of the United States, because they have had first-hand experience with occupying armies, they are very fearful that they will be ground between the upper and the nether millstone. The fear is one that goes both ways, both doctrines in the eyes of these people stand out and is tending to be dominating.

What I am pleading for is modus vivendi between the two and not a head-on conflict between the two.

Senator MORSE. Assume for the moment the existence of these two fears, the fears of our people and the fears of Europe. Referring to your statement in your testimony that our security is not threatened, would you deny that these principles of individual liberty, freedom of choice, and protection of the dignity of the individual which are basic to our American system, are not protected and to a large extent are not existent under a communistic society?

Mr. WALLACE. It is true with regard to Russia. I do not know to what extent it is true in the communistic area of north China; that is, I do not care to generalize.

Senator MORSE. It is true of Russian communism as it exists in Russia?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Senator MORSE. Which leads me to this question: As Russia expands her territorial jurisdiction as she has in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans——

Mr. WALLACE. I do not agree to that statement that she has expanded her territorial jurisdiction in those particular countries.

Senator MORSE. Let us pause on that one for a moment then because again I think we are dealing with a question of fact that again has created tremendous fears and misunderstandings; if it is not a fact and is also basic to trying to find the reasons for the demand now for universal military training and for the draft, because after all they are simply the products, it seems to me, of the fears that have been developed in this country, and I am trying to find the factual basis for the fear.

Is it your opinion that the policy which Russia has followed in Poland and Czechoslovakia and the satellite countries since VE-day is a policy that ought to be accepted by the United States as a policy not jeopardizing any of these democratic principles to which I have alluded?

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to get the full information with regard to just what has been done in those various countries. I think that ought to be entered into our record as to just what exactly has been done in those countries. I think you ought to get it from impartial sources.

For instance, some of you may have tuned in on the broadcast of Mr. Smith, who broadcast on Sunday, in which he said there were more Americans at the time of the coup in Czechoslovakia than there were Russians. There were more American soldiers, they were there on leave, but there were more American soldiers than Russian soldiers. There were apparently few Russian soldiers at the time according to Mr. Smith, and that is contrary to the opinion customarily expressed.

Then I would suggest you might read a statement made by Mr. Dick Crossman in the New Statesman and Nation, it is a British publication. Mr. Crossman is a member of Parliament who during the past 6 months has gone along with Ernest Bevin. He is alarmed on the whole about Russia but he apparently had just returned from Czechoslovakia and his statement I think you will find very illuminating. You will find it in the Congressional Library, undoubtedly.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Wallace, I certainly agree with you that we ought to find the facts and we have not the facts as yet.

Mr. WALLACE. Dick Crossman was a former Oxford man and he is something of a scholar and I believe he has taught the classics. While he is quite a rightist in the British labor politics, he is an objective observer on the whole.

Senator MORSE. I say we should weigh any facts that any of those men you mentioned can offer us but is it not true that the primary reason why you and I cannot sit here this afternoon and speak with absolute certainty as to what the absolute facts are is because of the Soviet's policy of making facts behind the iron curtain unaccessible to us?

Mr. WALLACE. I think the word "curtain" which was started by Mr. Winston Churchill at Fulton, Mo., has done an irreparable damage to the cause of world peace. The Czechoslovakians, for example, were continually joking about the iron curtain, asking the Americans to point out to them 3 months ago, just where the curtain was. I venture if you go there today you will find them joking and asking where the curtain is.

Senator BALDWIN. They know now.

Mr. WALLACE. I suggested that you go and find out.

Senator MORSE. We tried to get visas and passports into countries dominated by Russia.

Mr. WALLACE. Have you tried to get a visa into Czechoslovakia?

Senator MORSE. I have tried to get a visa into Czechoslovakia and you would be surprised the number of difficulties they are able to put in the way even after you get into Berlin to get into a satellite Russian country if they do not want you in there.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course, I have no doubt that if they are convinced that if you are going in there for a specific purpose they will interpose objections.

Senator MORSE. I think that just the purpose of observation is all the purpose they need; that has been my experience with them.

I have one other line of questioning. I want to leave that one with this statement. I think that if we intellectually honest men are going to try to get the facts to eliminate the cause of these fears we cannot escape one fact that the Russian policy—and I will eliminate the word "curtain"—the Russian policy of nonaccessibility, as far as free interchange of ideas and the people going into these countries is concerned, has created all of these fears.

Mr. WALLACE. I will agree with you wholeheartedly that it has created these fears with Russia herself. I think it is unfortunate that Russia has not seen fit to allow us to talk freely with her people.

I will not say it as an excuse for Russia but merely as an explanation that it does measure the very great depth of her fear of us, the fact that she will not allow her people to talk to any foreigner. I think that is a horrible reflection on the state of the world today.

Senator MORSE. I want to ask you a question on the second sentence in that first paragraph, "they want lasting peace achieved through world cooperation in the United Nations."

Is it your considered judgment that the Russian exercise of the veto power, her record that she has made, as far as cooperation and noncooperation with the United States is concerned, has not been a factor in creating the situation in this country which is causing us now to think of legislation for universal military training?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, an examination of Russia's use of the veto power would require a great deal of research. It is not the excessive thing that is indicated in the American press. If you conduct a careful scholarly, legal study without prejudice I think you will find that to be true.

Senator MORSE. You do not think that her exercise of the veto, the policy that she has followed in these other countries that I have mentioned, in any way placed in jeopardy the security of these ideals of democracy to which I have referred?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I think to some degree they have; I do not think there is any question about that. I am merely saying that the full truth has not been told about it.

Senator MORSE. Your constructive offer to the committee as to the first step we ought to take in lieu of any of this legislation is to seek a conference with the Russian leaders in an endeavor to reach some over-all agreement, I think your phrase was, in regard to world peace.

Now, what assurance can you give me on the basis of conferences of the past and the record of Stalin and the other members of his group that any successful negotiations could be carried on in developing such an over-all plan in the absence of getting this country in a military position powerful enough so that he would understand that we intended to enforce the peace?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think you can, by the military route, get the peace you are seeking for. If you have 10 times the force you have today, I say you still will not get the peace you are looking for.

As a matter of fact, I will say you are much less likely to have the peace you are looking for because people do not respond to force in that way; they never have and never will. You just cannot go at it in that manner.

Senator MORSE. Do you not think that because of the position that England and the United States and France were in at the time of Munich was an inducement to Hitler to continue with his march?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, that is a very complicated situation there.

Senator MORSE. I know; the whole thing is complicated.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course, in that case Hitler was very definitely the aggressor, there is no question about that.

Senator MORSE. You and I may disagree as to whether Stalin is the aggressor on the policy he has followed in the satellite countries, but it looks to me like another march and that is what I am afraid of.

Mr. WALLACE. I just disagree with you there.

Senator MORSE. I have no other question, Mr. Chairman, other than to say that I appreciate the witness facing the issue. As far as my interest is concerned, if I were concerned as to whether democratic ideals are endangered by Russian present policy, I think they are greatly in danger. It seems to me that we cannot avoid taking some steps, manpower steps, to keep ourselves sufficiently strong so that when we do negotiate with Russia, if we are able to negotiate, we will be able to enforce the peace.

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, I would like to make a further comment with regard to your approach, that if we attempt to bring Russia to terms in the manner you suggest, we shall find perhaps this year we have an over-all appropriation, this coming fiscal year for all purposes of containing Russia, of say, $25,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe Senator MAYBANK has a question.

Mr. WALLACE. Could I complete my comment?

The following year they will expend up to perhaps $40,000,000,000 and that will continually breed upon itself and it is quite conceivable that the Russian economists knowing the ultimate effectiveness on the economy in terms of inflation, in terms of unbalanced budget, would like to continue to needle us in this way, that way, and the other way into a position which ultimately will be a very weak position.

Remember, the Russians are chess players.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Wallace, if that assumption is true I do not think you are reconcile your statement to what you say in your prepared statement.

Senator MAYBANK. I just wanted to ask Mr. Wallace a question because he was talking

about Czechoslovakia. The other day I read in the paper that you said our Ambassador, Steinhardt, engineered the coup there. I wondered if you had any definite information that you base that on or is it a résumé of things such as you reviewed a while ago that you heard on the radio?

Mr. WALLACE. The statement there came up at a press conference and came up in a piecemeal fashion. The rightist ministers in the Czechoslovakian cabinet along about the middle of February raised certain issues, I have forgotten the details of the issues, with regard to I think the appointments by the police chiefs somewhere in a certain area, and said that if this particular issue of these appointments by a police chief in a certain area were not taken care of they would resign. The matter went along and Ambassador Steinhardt was in this country and got back, I think, on the 19th of February.

On the 20th of February he invited Czechoslovakia to come into the Marshall plan. With the crisis that existed in Czechoslovakia at that time a statement by the Ambassador, American Ambassador, inviting Czechoslovakia to come into the Marshall plan could not be looked on favorably by the Russians.

I realize many people have different opinions on this but this is my analysis of it and it could not have other than the effect of causing all the leftist groups in Czechoslovakia to feel that the United States was doing the same thing that she had done in Italy and in France in forcing the left-wing groups out of the government.

Therefore, when the rightists did resign on February 20, they immediately moved in. I said that Ambassador Steinhardt was responsible. I do not know whether I put in the words, "to some degree," but I should put them because this was a very hasty conference and it was not the main subject under consideration. He was to some degree responsible for the situation the way it finally resulted, I will put it this way.

The newspapermen brought back that we had hoped that the same objectives would be obtained in Czechoslovakia as had been obtained in Italy and France; that the Communist members would be kicked out of the Government. We can say that from our point of view that would be a highly desirable thing and we ought to get to do everything we can to get Communists out of the Government, but when you have a country where Communists have 38 percent of the votes in the preceding election, if we do believe in democracy at all, and at that time Czechoslovakia was a democracy in the western sense, if you do believe in democracy you do believe that they are entitled to some representation.

Senator MAYBANK. But the only specific thing that the ambassador did was to invite them to come in on the Marshall plan?

Mr. WALLACE. To come into the Marshall plan on that particular day; that is the point that I made.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BALDWIN.

Senator BALDWIN. Mr. Wallace, you were just discussing the term "democracy." Would it be, in your opinion, that if the people of Czechoslovakia were to choose a government and a Communist regime and thereafter be unable to change it would that be a democracy?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that if any country embarked on a regime which it never thereafter could change, that that could not be a democracy.

Senator BALDWIN. I am glad to hear you say that because that is my conception of it, too. In other words, if by the democratic process the people passing upon themselves a regime that they never can thereafter change by the democratic process, then they do not have a democracy.

Mr. WALLACE. That is my understanding, sir.

Senator BALDWIN. I remember that Abraham Lincoln once said that "if we knew where we were or where we were going, we would know better what to do."

I would want to preface with a statement to the effect that on this confused state of affairs many people have different views and you are entitled to yours as well as anybody else is entitled to his. That in turn is the working of the process of democracy.

I am wondering if a people, such as the people of the United States, see Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, the Balkan states, Poland, and Czechoslovakia taken into Communist regimes, if they are not entitled from that series of events to wonder whether or not their own institutions and the institutions of their former friends and allies are not being threatened.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not conclude that their institutions and their former friends and allies are being threatened.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, would you say that the acts of Russia to date, to judge from what has happened in these other countries, indicate that she has pursued a policy of aggression or that communism has pursued a policy of aggression?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I would not say that Russia had pursued a policy of aggression.

Senator BALDWIN. You do not think that Russia has pursued in any respect a policy of aggression?

Mr. WALLACE. I think that Russia has merely—mind you, it is not my objective to defend Russia.

Senator BALDWIN. I know, but what we have to do is to adopt policies and lay plans upon what we see, what we hear, and what we can fairly believe to be the facts; do we not?

Mr. WALLACE. I think we have to face this problem as realistically as we can. I think you have to realize this, that Russia having suffered in the way I previously described, and having been invaded century after century via those level plains on her western border, was certain to do everything possible to get friendly governments in all the nations that bordered her on the west.

Senator BALDWIN. But you would not think that in the process of doing that she had been aggressive in any way, shape, or manner?

Mr. WALLACE. When you say "any way, shape, or manner," possibly here or possibly there.

Senator BALDWIN. "Possibly here or possibly there," would you mind mentioning where?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, with regard to Czechoslovakia, I do not know of any proof that exists except the presence of Mr. Zorin, I believe, in Czechoslovakia. So far as I know he was the only Russian that was in Czechoslovakia actively at work at the time of the coup.

Dick Crossman, in his article in the New Statesman, mentioned that Mr. Zorin had a meeting with one particular person, a Mr. Lausman, I think it was. Mr. Crossman may not be completely informed, but that was the best information apparently that he could get while he was there. He makes the point that Russia was not active in the coup there except that there was this fact that there was in the background—Mr. Crossman's analysis—there was in the background the fact of this tremendous military power, which is Russia, that was close to the Czechoslovakian boundary.

Senator BALDWIN. In other words, your answer is that Russia did not do any more than she needed to do to accomplish her purpose?

Mr. WALLACE. Frankly, I think it is a question of geography; that the influence of both Russia and the United States varies almost inversely with the distance. While the United States probably did everything she could there, yet we were so far away from home that what we did there did not count for as much as Russia did.

In other words, it is a point that is made right along that Russia with one unit of energy along her borders can do 5 or 10 times as much as we can.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, she has geography on her side.

Mr. WALLACE. She has geography on her side.

Senator BALDWIN. That is what makes it easier.

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

Senator BALDWIN. But you want to be recorded as saying that you do not think Russia has followed a policy of aggression or that communism has followed that line?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know the full details there. I happened to read the statement of Crossman with regard to Czechoslovakia day before yesterday and have it in mind.

With regard to Poland, I do not know anything particularly; I do not know of anything aggressive that she has done in Poland.

With regard to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, they were a part of Russia before World War I and Russia apparently for security reasons deliberately took them back again. She was forced, apparently, to give them up after World War I because of an internal situation. You can say that that was aggressive and I will agree with you she took them over.

Senator BALDWIN. In other words, as an American citizen, you do not feel that Russian conduct and Communist conduct toward these countries that have gradually been drawn behind the iron curtain is anything that should cause apprehension?

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that it was a situation that was inevitable; that, frankly, was the point of my speech of September 12, 1946; that we should recognize the inevitability of the geographical situation and start with that. I think if we are going to fight for our type of democracy in the Balkans we will be fighting a long way from home, fighting to get something for people who have never enjoyed democracy in our sense of the term.

I will make the one exception for Czechoslovakia, which undoubtedly did enjoy democracy in our sense of the term.

Senator BALDWIN. As I understood it, what we were fighting this war for was aptly and perfectly expressed in the Atlantic Charter, to which I understood you subscribed?

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly.

Senator BALDWIN. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom from fear, and freedom to worship. Do you think we have that in any of these countries that have been drawn behind the curtain?

Mr. WALLACE. I think there is freedom to worship in practically all of these countries.

Senator BALDWIN. But there is not any freedom of speech and press and freedom from fear?

Mr. WALLACE. There is not freedom of speech or freedom of the press in Russia, certainly. As to how much there is in the other countries—and probably not in Yugoslavia—as to how much there is in the other countries, I think would take a detailed and careful survey to discover just how much there is.

Senator BALDWIN. You mentioned the possibilities of this survey, and you mentioned the possibilities of a meeting with Premier Stalin to work out a basis of agreement. Would you not think that one of the first things that we ought to insist upon is a free exchange of knowledge and ideas and news from our respective countries to one another? Would not that be a great help toward bringing about an understanding relationship?

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly it would be a great help; but I would say this—that you cannot do so with Russia in her present frame of mind and with her present very difficult economic situation and her very great fears, which are immensely more than ours; that you cannot hope, as long as she suspects

that we are trying to do to her what the western nations did try to do to her in 1919, 1920, and 1921—you cannot expect to get anything of this sort out of her until those fears are arrested and she has confidence that we do not have an aggressive objective for destroying her form of government.

She believes that we are out to destroy it, and she has every reason to, in view of the recent statements of President Truman.

Senator BALDWIN. What opportunities has she given us today to have us demonstrate to her beyond what we have already demonstrated that that is not our intention? Have we had the opportunity?

Mr. WALLACE. We certainly have not demonstrated it at the present time.

Senator BALDWIN. May I ask you this question: Mr. Wallace, a moment ago you drew an interesting parallel in which you said, "put us in their place."

Supposing the United States had been invaded by a hostile enemy and that the whole country to a line drawn from Gary, Ind., to Birmingham, Ala., had been laid waste. Then supposing Russia had given us $11,000,000,000 worth of equipment with which to fight; supposing Russia had withdrawn the greatest military force that had ever been assembled in history, that was right on her borders and ready if there were any militaristic purposes to strike, and had yet withdrawn that force; supposing Russia had continued to make overtures, as we have tried to do, tried to internationalize the use of atomic energy and lay bare the secrets of the atomic bomb upon certain commitments of international control. What do you think would have been the reaction of the American people toward Russia?

You think it would be the same as the Russian Government has indicated toward us?

Mr. WALLACE. I think if it had been done in the way that we did it, we would be very suspicious.

Senator BALDWIN. In other words, we have given away $11,000,000,000 and we have made all these overtures in the wrong manner?

Mr. WALLACE. No; let me say this: I happen to know something about the $11,000,000,000. We gave it under lend-lease to Russia, stating specifically to Russia—I do not know whether this is a matter of writing or not, but I know it was done this way—stating to Russia that we were doing it to save ourselves and not for the sake of Russia. We made that very clear to her at the time. We believed that it was saving the lives of our American boys.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, we did, and we were entitled to believe that. It also shortened the war as far as Russia was concerned, did it not?

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, as illustrated by these Army documents, all the time the war was on we were preaching the greatest friendship and understanding.

Senator BALDWIN. Do you not think we were sincere in it?

Mr. WALLACE. That is what I would like to know.

Senator BALDWIN. I would like to think we were. I think most Americans feel that way.

Mr. WALLACE. I think insofar as President Roosevelt had anything to do in determining these various pamphlets issued at that time to the Army, that he was sincere in it.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, I would like to read a statement in regard to former President Roosevelt that seems to be very apt right here: "Roosevelt believed in peace through preparedness, that preparedness was meant for peace."

It seems to me that that is pretty much our policy now, to try to get ready to meet any eventuality, is it not? Could it not be interpreted as such?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, you can lift statements of that sort out of context; but undoubtedly Roosevelt was, as the war drew toward a close, thinking more and more about attaining peace in other ways than through preparedness. Especially so, if he had known that the atomic bomb was coming, he would have felt that to a greater degree.

The atomic bomb means that the only safety, the only security for the United States, the only sound military policy, is that understanding between the United States and Russia which will give a strong United Nations with a police force for the United Nations stronger than that of any individual nation.

Senator BALDWIN. I think that is the thing we have to work for; but, going back to this reference to Mr. Roosevelt and the atomic bomb. As a member of that Commission, you do not mean to imply that President Roosevelt did not know that the atomic bomb was coming into existence?

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Senator BALDWIN. He did anticipate that it might have to be used as a weapon in war; that was the reason for the haste in getting it.

Mr. WALLACE. Of course, nobody knew until the bomb was dropped in New Mexico that it would work. I knew early in the game, and I was one of the few people that did know, about the efforts to obtain the atomic bomb, but I do not have any assurance whatsoever that Roosevelt would have used the atomic bomb in the way it was ultimately used.

Senator BALDWIN. Would you subscribe to this statement, thinking of it in terms of today?

"But we must face the fact that the dictators have definite designs against this hemisphere. Their tactics here, as in Europe, are to divide and conquer. They hope by propaganda and bartering agreements to set one nation against another. They hope to set each class against another class. They inspire a multitude of angry voices in every democratic nation. Out of the confusion which they have created they hope to build political power and eventually military power."

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly that is what Hitler was up to.

Senator BALDWIN. Would you subscribe to that statement?

Mr. WALLACE. Not with regard to the present situation. I would say that it could rapidly get into that position. I would say that it is dangerously close to that position now. I would say that as long as we are creating this fear in Russia that there is danger that Russia will do what you describe there.

Senator BALDWIN. You do not think Russians have any designs against this hemisphere?

Mr. WALLACE. I think as long as we are using our present methods they are going to create nuisance values wherever they can.

Senator BALDWIN. Do you think they have designs against this hemisphere?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know how anybody can answer what communism is any more than you can say what the Democratic Party is.

Senator BALDWIN. That is a hard thing to answer now, I will admit.

Mr. WALLACE. It is equally hard to say what the Republican Party is saying.

Senator BALDWIN. That has been true at times; I will admit that.

Mr. WALLACE. But communism, undoubtedly, is a different thing in China from what it is in some other places.

Senator BALDWIN. Taking it generally—this idea that Senator MORSE brought out so well about world revolution—do you think that there is any danger in the Western Hemisphere of any such thing happening?

Do you think there is any design to have it happen?

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, no; I would not think there could be a design, for the simple reason that Russia would be utterly foolish to move in as Russia did into western Europe. Now, enthusiastic local Communists may do their best to get control for communism, but Russia certainly has enough good sense to know that as a controlling power she cannot move farther west than she now is.

Senator BALDWIN. I certainly share that hope with you, but it does seem to me that we are lacking evidence.

Mr. WALLACE. She would be utterly and completely overplaying her hand; it would expose her to the same kind of weakness that I think we are exposing ourselves to.

Senator BALDWIN. That is a matter of opinion.

Here is another statement which I would like to quote, and it reads:

"Between now and November, I propose to do everything I can to arouse the American people to the need for peace through preparedness, to the importance of the solidarity of the Americas, and to the duty of businessmen, workers, and farmers to cooperate together for full employment and for the national defense."

Would you subscribe to that?

Mr. WALLACE. That sounds like something I said in 1940.

Senator BALDWIN. It certainly was something you said in 1940, and so was the other statement something you said in 1940, but you do not subscribe to them now?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think Russia is the same as Hitler; I just do not believe it.

Senator BALDWIN. I would like to read another statement to you which came from a very sincere witness before this committee, because of one of the questions that we have before us here is: Are we justified in going ahead? [Reading:]

"The whole aim and effort of the United States is to attain the objective of peace to prevent differences between nations developing into armed conflict until the United Nations has gained a maturity in both a moral and physical force with which to deal with any international act of aggression. In the meantime it must be made clear and manifest to the world that any nation which tries to copy the pattern of action which through Hitler brought so much disaster on mankind, must, like Hitler and Germany, face the determination and will of the United States that it shall not happen again."

Mr. WALLACE. Who was that?

Senator BALDWIN. Would you subscribe to that?

Mr. WALLACE. Who was that?

Senator BALDWIN. I am asking you. Your opinion, Mr. Wallace, as to principles should not be affected by who states them.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I would like to know who stated that.

Senator BALDWIN. You would subscribe to that?

I am asking you the flat, categorical question, would you or would you not subscribe to that?

Mr. WALLACE. I think I am entitled to know the author.

Senator BALDWIN. Is that going to affect your judgment?

Mr. WALLACE. I think I know the author, but I think you ought to furnish it to the audience.

Senator BALDWIN. I am asking you, irrespective of who the author was.

I will make it my statement, would you subscribe to it?

Mr. WALLACE. Will you read it again, sir?

Senator BALDWIN (reading):

"The whole aim and effort of the United States is to attain the objective of peace, to prevent differences between nations developing into armed conflict until the United Nations has gained a maturity in both moral and physical force with which to deal with any international act of aggression. In the meantime, it must be made clear and manifest to the world that any nation which tries to copy the pattern of action which through Hitler brought so much disaster on mankind, must, like Hitler and Germany, face

the determination and will of the United States."

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I will agree to that.

Senator BALDWIN. That statement is a statement that Mr. Forrestal made before this committee as to the reason why he thought we ought to bolster up our forces. I think it is interesting, because you had so much fault to find with Mr. Forrestal. That was the statement as to the policy of the armed forces; that is the statement that comes from the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. WALLACE. Where I disagree is in his likening Russia to Hitler.

Senator BALDWIN. Of course, that is, I am frank to admit, Mr. Wallace, the interpretation an American wants to put on what he has observed happening abroad. I am willing to admit that.

You certainly were not in favor of the appeasement of the Nazis, were you?

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Senator BALDWIN. And I know that you were against the aggressive actions of Hitler, but you claim that the actions of the Russians have not been aggressive.

Mr. WALLACE. I would say that they have been no more aggressive than the actions of the United States. I would not attempt to establish an exact balance, but I would say that there has been aggression on both sides.

Senator BALDWIN. Would you say that there is any difference in the manner in which Russia has handled the situation in taking over the satellite nations, any difference in her method to procedure from what Germany used?

Mr. WALLACE. Greatly.

Senator BALDWIN. What is the difference?

Mr. WALLACE. In the first place, what nation has Russia taken over?

Senator BALDWIN. You have your opinion on that, and I have mine. I think Russia has deliberately set out to dominate all of the Balkan states, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Latvian states, too.

Mr. WALLACE. You mean the Baltic states?

Senator BALDWIN. The Baltic states, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

Mr. WALLACE. I just disagree with you, and I would say that Russia had not taken over Yugoslavia, that she has not taken over Bulgaria, and not taken over Rumania, and has not taken over Hungary; that she has not taken over Czechoslovakia, that she has not taken over Poland. I would say, in other words, that the three countries which she has taken over and made a part of the USSR are Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Senator BALDWIN. Of course, if that is a fact, you and I are poles apart on that question—what Russia's action was with reference to these nations.

Would you think that Russia would be willing to submit to an international court the question of whether or not she had deliberately attempted to dominate and succeeded in dominating the political policies of these countries?

Mr. WALLACE. I would think that she would feel at the present time that any international court would be composed of men who would inevitably find against her.

Senator BALDWIN. Then if that is the case, it is impossible to carry out the things that you think should be carried out; and that is, the establishment of a United Nations in which there is real understanding. If Russia has the attitude that anything now done is designed to hurt her, then where are we at as long as Russia has that attitude?

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is very fine to approach the question in this way because you are getting at the very heart of the situation and it is a very fine thing indeed that you are approaching the situation in this way. It illustrates, however, if we really want peace, it illustrates again that we must have a settlement which will make it possible—an over-all settlement—which will make it possible for the United States and Russia to have confidence in each other.

At the present time Russia has absolutely no confidence in the United Nations because she feels it is completely dominated by the United States. I think that can be changed but I do not think it will be changed by present methods or by the present people in charge of our Government.

Senator BALDWIN. Then your proposal to change it would be to completely disarm ourselves, withdraw all our forces from our erstwhile friends and then trust that somehow or other Russia would understand us? She has not understood anything we have done, pouring out our wealth and withdrawing our armies, gesture after gesture that we have tried to make.

Mr. WALLACE. It is evident, Senator, that you were not here when I was talking to Senator RUSSELL. I think I made it abundantly clear what I thought.

Senator BALDWIN. I wish it was as clear to me as it appears to you but I am sorry, it is not.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not advocated the complete disarming of the United States at any time.

I, in talking with Senator RUSSELL, advocated that we have a very considerable force of full-time men, trained completely in terms of modern science which is the altogether important thing.

Senator BALDWIN. How big do you think that force should be?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator RUSSELL made that question and I finally made the statement that it was impossible for me without consulting real experts, to determine just how big it should be. I made the tentative statement it should be a million for the Army but I would say that I would prefer to withdraw that and say that I do not know exactly how big it should be, but it should be full time and should be in terms of training, in terms of modern scientific training.

Senator BALDWIN. That is what we are trying to accomplish with universal military training, a military force that would not be full time, that would offer a great variety of opportunities for scientific training; that would not militarize the Nation to the effect that we would have continuously a large standing army, which is militarism.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think any military man would think that you are going to get very effective a force out of universal military training.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, they have recommended it and they are the best authority that we have on military matters.

Mr. WALLACE. I know.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wallace, you said you would confer with the military. To be consistent then you would say that we should listen to the military, I mean this committee?

Mr. WALLACE. Naturally at the time I think the military is giving testimony in line with the over-all policy of the administration and in line with the present foreign policy which is based on complete containment of Russia which, as I said to Senator RUSSELL, would take an appropriation very very much larger than you now have and in my opinion an appropriation so large that it is impossible to carry it out.

The CHAIRMAN. If you were in charge of administration then you think that the military would give you advice in line with your views?

Mr. WALLACE. I think that is always essential in a democracy; that a civilian should be in charge of the military.

The CHAIRMAN. Then if that is so, and that is your belief, the military only reflect the policy of the administration then we should not listen to the military?

Mr. WALLACE. No, no; I think you ought to listen to the military to get the technical facts, but when it comes to over-all, you should use the civilian.

Senator BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BALDWIN.

Senator BALDWIN. You have stated categorically that you are not in favor of universal military training or the draft, and you have also said that we have presently from the armed forces of the last war a tremendous reserve, all that we need?

Mr. WALLACE. To carry us through the next 10 years.

Senator BALDWIN. To carry us through the next 10 years. In other words, whatever military requirement that there might be in the United States, you would be in favor of calling back into the service the veterans of World War II rather than going to a draft of new men or to universal military training?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, you and one other gentleman had attempted to put words in my mouth which I never intended to be there.

Senator BALDWIN. I do not intend to do that; that is an important question, and we do have to decide.

Mr. WALLACE. I know you do not, Senator, because I recognize in you a very earnest search for an outcome in terms of a peaceful world, I am sure.

With regard to the veterans of World War II, I would say that they are there as an ultimate insurance policy if we have to use it, but with any kind of a decent foreign policy we certainly will not have to use it. The point I am trying to make is this: Those men did have the actual experience, they did have the technical training that universal military training just cannot give to you.

Senator BALDWIN. In other words, if we wanted to make a real militaristic gesture threatening Russia, as you seem to think our present suggested program might be, all we would have to do is mobilize those forces and then we would do that?

Mr. WALLACE. You would have made a real gesture in that case.

Senator BALDWIN. But we have not done that. I think the question we have to decide is this: Shall we have universal military training, shall we have the draft, shall we have either or both, or shall we rely for the next 10 years upon calling back into the service to meet an emergency the men who fought the last war? Which way would you resolve that question, yes or no?

Mr. WALLACE. I would not take any one of those three alternatives. I would have the men who were in World War II as a reserve but I would have a foreign policy that would not make it necessary to call them. They are there in case of ultimate necessity, but I would say the chances are 100 to 1 against calling them if we have a decent foreign policy.

Senator BALDWIN. But supposing something goes wrong, we cannot guarantee, no matter how good our foreign policy may be, that some aggressor is not going to attack us. We cannot guarantee that no matter what we do Russia is not going to attack us. We are faced with the proposition of training a reserve and pulling our contribution to an international police force from some trained military men. Where are we to get them?

Mr. WALLACE. You are getting them in sufficient number by voluntary enlistments at the present time and as a matter of fact if you will lower the requirements for entry into the armed services, for enlistments into the armed services to the point where it was during the war, you certainly will get all you need.

Senator BALDWIN. That is the point that is under consideration by the committee but I would like very much to have your opinion as to whether or not we should count upon the present Reserve for the next 10 years; that is, the man that fought the last war, or whether we should attempt to build up a Reserve in some other way by universal military training or the draft?

Mr. WALLACE. It is not quite that straight, either-or proposition, because I always bring in the third proposition which is the decent foreign policy. I say you would not need either the draft or universal military training or calling on these men, but if you should, which God forbid, have an administration after next January 20 that will continue these present fatal policies——

Senator BALDWIN. I do not think we will. I do not think we will have the same administration but there are three different views on that.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not seen too much indication that the Republicans will carry on a policy which is much less fatal than the Democrats.

Senator BALDWIN. I said there were three different positions.

I think that is a fair question. Should we as a Nation count upon the Reserve that we have from the trained men of the last war or should we attempt by selective service or universal military training to build up a trained group of men?

Mr. WALLACE. Let us put this specifically and directly, we do not need universal military training and we do not need the draft.

Senator BALDWIN. That I am sorry to say does not answer my question.

Mr. WALLACE. I guess it is as close as you will get, Senator.

Senator BALDWIN. Apparently it is.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator SALTONSTALL.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Wallace, do I understand it that you want to leave it that there is no international tribunal today in front of which Russia will willingly go to arbitrate any differences with us?

Mr. WALLACE. I really do not know, but I assume that would be the case. I would be very much surprised if it were not the case.

Senator SALTONSTALL. That was the answer to Senator BALDWIN?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. If that is true, we have to be sufficiently prepared with what our military experts say is enough to be prepared to look after ourselves, have we not?

Mr. WALLACE. You see, in my discussion with Senator RUSSELL, I made the statement repeatedly that it is essential to have this over-all conference with Stalin on the pending points at issue so that we can get those pending points at issue settled in such a definite way that both Russia and the United States would be willing to go into a world federation where there is a world peace force stronger than the army of any nation or group of nations.

I was very much interested in the New York Times of March 4, in Cordell Hull's memoirs where he stated that the Russians were in favor, in the fall of 1944, of a world air force but that the United States was against it. That to me, when I read that in Cordell Hull's memoirs, that to me was a breath of hope that Russia eventually would be willing to enter with the United States into a world federation where the world police force would be stronger than the armed forces of any single nation.

Senator SALTONSTALL. But, until we reach that point, we have to be adequately prepared?

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes, of course; but I make this statement that now is the time to step in and to have that conference.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator GREEN, do you have a question?

Senator GREEN. Yes; I have.

Mr. Wallace, I listened to your statement with a great deal of interest and I hope that I find it in a statement of your political philosophy on which your conclusions were based.

It seems to me that I found the kernel of that philosophy in two short sentences which I would like to read to you:

"The peoples of the world are on the march toward a more abundant life."

A moment afterward you said:

"If we are to compete with communism we had better get on the side of the people."

Now, as I understand it, and I want to be quite sure that I am right in my understanding, when you said "we had better get on the side of the people," you mean on the march toward a more abundant life, do you not?

Mr. WALLACE. That is correct.

Senator GREEN. And then when you say, "Communism is on the march toward a more abundant life," is that true?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I am not—I certainly do not stand for the conclusion that you are about to make.

Senator GREEN. Let us answer one question at a time. You say if we are to compete with communism, we had better get on the side of the people and you say that means on their march toward a more abundant life?

Mr. WALLACE. That is correct.

Senator GREEN. That must necessarily mean that communism is on the side of the people in its march toward a more abundant life, does it not?

Mr. WALLACE. If you want to state my philosophy, Senator, you must include in it also my firm belief in the sacredness of the individual human soul.

Senator GREEN. Let us answer the question first.

Mr. WALLACE. You are asking for what is the kernel of my philosophy?

Senator GREEN. No, I am not. I am asking whether these two sentences taken together do not mean that you say, you speak of communism on the side of the people, on the march toward a more abundant life, is that not true?

Mr. WALLACE. And I ask for us to compete with communism?

Senator GREEN. Is that correct?

Mr. WALLACE. I refuse to be trapped by a syllogism; syllogisms, Senator, rarely give the whole truth.

Senator GREEN. That is not a syllogism.

Mr. WALLACE. That is a syllogism if I know what a syllogism is.

Senator GREEN. You are evidently afraid of it?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I refuse to say that I am for communism, if that is what you mean.

Senator GREEN. That is not what I am asking you to say. I am asking you whether by these words you did not mean, when you say, "If we are to compete with communism, we had better get on the side of the people," and you said that meant on the march toward a more abundant life.

In other words, if you are to put those two sentences together, "If we are to compete with communism, we had better get on the side of the people in its march toward a more abundant life"?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, that is not what I mean. I do not know what sentences you put together, but I certainly do not mean that.

Senator GREEN. You do not mean what?

Mr. WALLACE. That we are to get on the side of communism in order for the people to have a more abundant life.

Senator GREEN. What do you mean, then, if we are to compete with communism?

Mr. WALLACE. That is exactly what I do say that we must compete with communism in helping the people have a more abundant life.

Senator GREEN. If we compete, then communism must be for a more abundant life; is that not true?

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly the Communists are doing their best to bring a more abundant life to their people.

Senator GREEN. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. I am asking us in our way to contribute to a more abundant life.

Senator GREEN. You say "compete with communism."

Mr. WALLACE. That is exactly what I mean. I want to show that we can do a better job than communism in bringing an abundant life to the people.

Senator GREEN. I understand what you want to do, but in the meantime are you not stating in these words that we are not competing but we should compete with communism in providing a more abundant life? That we should compete with communism to provide a more abundant life for the people?

Is that not what you say?

Mr. WALLACE. No; not in the sense in which you word it, at any rate; it is not true.

What I am saying—and I believe that is at the very heart of our failure in foreign policy—is that we fail to recognize, especially in the backward areas of the world, that the people want more efficient methods so that they can produce more per hour of man labor so that they can have more of the good things of life.

I think we here in the United States have learned better than any people in the world that technology enables people to produce more, whether on the farm or in the factory.

I think we have a tremendous contribution to make and that we should endeavor to make that contribution not so much in money but in terms of know-how all over the world, in terms of helping the people, not to exploit the people with factories that will pay them miserable wages while they use the most up-to-date methods, as was done in Japan before the war—not in those terms, but in terms of helping the people to enjoy a better livelihood.

I think we can do a better job of that than the Communists can if we only address ourselves to the fundamental problem. But at the moment we are not addressing ourselves to the fundamental problem; on the other hand we are cooperating with the former exploiters of the people in these various backward areas of the world, whether China or Greece.

Senator GREEN. I think I understood you perfectly, Mr. Wallace. In the first place, you say we should compete with communism in a march toward a more abundant life; but now as you explain it, we are not doing it but should do it; but the Communists are doing it and we should and must compete with them in that effort and we should not be on their side but get on the side of the people where the Communists already are; that is what the English language means.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I think you are boring in rather superficially into it.

Senator GREEN. It is not superficial. I am trying to get the kernel of your philosophy and I think that your philosophy is this: That communism is doing a better job for the people in providing a more abundant life than American democracy and that is the reason that you do not fear it.

Mr. WALLACE. I say that American democracy is not doing the job for the people in the backward areas of the world which enables American democracy to compete with communism the way she should; that she can do a much better job, and I hope she does do a better job, but I see no hope under the present administration.

Senator GREEN. Do you or do you not say that communism is at present doing a better job in providing an abundant way of life?

Mr. WALLACE. Looking at it strictly from a materialistic point of view, it is necessary to examine each of the countries separately.

Senator GREEN. You speak of comparison yourself.

Mr. WALLACE. In north China apparently the Communists are making it possible for the Chinese peasants to do a better job than in the Kuomintang area.

I would like to see us back the ordinary folks in the Kuomintang area instead of the exploiters in the Kuomintang area.

You can go through each of the countries separately and you can draw each of the backward areas of the world separately and you will find that the Communists generally have gone directly to the people and have tried to help them directly and we have gone to the people at the top and I would like to see us get on the side of the people. I think that is the road of safety for the United States.

Senator GREEN. Then it seems to me, if I may conclude, that it is justifiable to draw the inferences that I drew which you perhaps unconsciously at the time expressed: That you believe that communism is doing a better job for the common people than American democracy and that would explain why you do not fear communism because if communism overran this country, the people would be better off?

Mr. WALLACE. Senator, you know me better than that. We have known each other a long time and I cannot understand why you would attempt to put words of that sort in my mouth.

Senator GREEN. I am taking words out of your mouth.

Mr. WALLACE. No, Senator; it is incredible.

Senator GREEN. I feel very much shocked.

Mr. WALLACE. I am even more shocked, Senator.

However, ad hominem never gets you anywhere. Let us get to the issues and surely you will accept my statement of belief, however you may put together words in your own way hitherto—you will accept my statement of belief that I want to see our American democracy in the so-called backward areas of the world do a better job than communism is attempting to do in these backward areas of the world for the people.

I want to see them do a better job. I do not think there is any danger whatsoever of communism in the United States, Senator.

Senator GREEN. I am not questioning what you hope and pray for; I am questioning your belief as to what the present situation is and I still do not see that you can deny that you believe that communism at present is doing a better job for the people on their march toward a more abundant life than our American democracy.

Mr. WALLACE. Would you mind showing me the particular sentence where I say that, Senator?

Senator GREEN. On page 3, the first sentence which is only a line long; it is the second line.

Mr. WALLACE. All right. Where is the other part?

Senator GREEN. The next sentence is in the paragraph just below—about half a dozen lines below—the first sentence there which is only a line long.

Mr. WALLACE. What is that one?

Senator GREEN (reading):

"If we are to compete with communism we had better get on the side of the people."

If you read those two together, and my first question, whether they should be read together, and you said "yes," I think the conclusion is inevitable which I have drawn.

Mr. WALLACE. I just deny your conclusion; I do not see it at all. It seems to me incredible that a man could reach such a conclusion.

Senator BALDWIN. If I understood, Mr. Wallace, you suggested that we did need an armed force for our own security of some kind and I think you said in answer to one of the questions that Senator HILL put that you thought an army of about a million well-trained men would be adequate.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I said later on that I felt that it would be essential—that is my first suggestion, I said it would be; I said later on it would be essential to consult technically with the people in the Army about that.

Senator BALDWIN. I understood you to say a million. Was that a figure that you used?

Mr. WALLACE. That is what I used in the first instance.

Senator BALDWIN. I thought just to keep the record straight you might be interested to know, because you had not heard Secretary Forrestal's request—I am reading from page 831 of the record:

"For the short-term part of the program, we need at once to increase the present actual strength of the Regular Establishment by 349,500 officers and men as follows:

"(a) The Army, by 240,000, from 542,000 to 782,000."

So that on that basis, Mr. Forrestal's own recommendations are nearly a quarter of a million under what you had suggested?

I wanted the record to be straight that we are not being urged to build a military force of tremendous proportion. Secretary Forrestal's figure over-all for the Army was 782,000, and I think you in answer to one of Senator HILL's questions mentioned that.

Mr. WALLACE. That was a figure that I pulled out of the air.

Senator BALDWIN. You would have to depend—you feel that we are justified in depending upon the opinion of experts as to what we need?

Mr. WALLACE. No; I say you ought to go to them for technical information. Then I say the policy ought to be determined by civilians on the basis of what our foreign policy may be.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Wallace, would it be a fair interpretation on my part from your colloquy with Senator GREEN to conclude that you believe one of the greatest superiorities of democracy over communism is that in democracy we do give primary importance to the dignity of the individual and to the freedom of the individual soul—I think was the phrase that you used—whereas in communism, materialism seems to be the primary idol or god of that political philosophy.

Mr. WALLACE. You find that discussed at some length in my book, Toward World Peace. That is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I have no questions to ask, but I would like to say that I feel that we have wandered very much from the object of the hearings here today. As I understand the hearings, they are to deal with universal military training and selective service, and I feel that Mr. Wallace has made himself very clear on the both of those. He is opposed to them. Instead he suggests, if the emergency calls for it, calling on the reserve of 15,000,000 veterans of World War II—veterans who probably are, the majority of them, over the age of 25, who are married and with families, rather than the selective service which would bring the young men from 19 into active service in a comparatively short time.

That, I think, is a very clear statement on page 9, paragraph 5, without any qualifications whatsoever, and I want to say that I am entirely opposed to any such suggestion of philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, thank you, Mr. Wallace.

Mr. WALLACE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. There are other witnesses this afternoon.

Dr. Cadbury, we will hear from you next.

Will you come forward, please? You may proceed, Dr. Cadbury. I understand you represent the Society of Friends.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Wallace has a right to have his views known by the people of the country. When a Senator quotes two lines from the statement of General Bradley, and three lines from a statement of General Eisenhower, now president of Columbia University, and does not quote the man who for many years was considered by the Democratic Party to be a great and wise man, I want to protect the man who for 4 years presided over this body.

Mr. President, I serve notice that I shall make a second speech in connection with my amendment before it is voted on.

I now yield the floor.

COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES IN DISASTER AREAS

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER's speech,

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. CORDON. I desire to introduce a bill.

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, and so forth.

I hope to have an opportunity of making a few remarks on it later in the session. I do not desire to interrupt my colleague from North Dakota for that purpose at this time.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2831) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stennis
Cooper	Lucas	Stewart
Cordon	McCarthy	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Feazel	Malone	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Young
Gurney	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the pending question, as I understand, is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to add, on page 65 of the bill, in line 4, after the word "compensation", the words "but not to exceed 10 percent on invested capital."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. As I see the matter, Mr. President—and I am sure the committee agrees with me—this amendment is not germane to this personnel bill. In the committee we decided to add the utilization of industry section for the reason that in calling men to the colors by means of selective service, we should at the same time guarantee that they will be equipped. We feel that an amendment regulating profit is not germane to this bill. It should be handled as a revenue measure before the Finance Committee. It should be handled by renegotiation, as the matter is presently being handled, because recently we adopted a renegotiation clause in the appropriation bill authorizing the purchase of airplanes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only do I associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said about this amendment, but in my opinion it renders an otherwise intelligible section of the bill utterly meaningless. It does not say whether the 10 percent shall apply for 1 day or 1 year or for some other period of time, and it would destroy the meaning of the provision which now is in the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia is correct.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, on page 65, in line 4.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a number of amendments are available. I am sure the Senator from Georgia is ready now to offer the amendment which he has lying on the desk.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I call up, and ask to have read, the amendment intended to be proposed by me for myself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. (a) Any person who registers as required by the terms of this act, and any person who hereafter voluntarily enlists in the armed forces of the United States, shall be afforded an opportunity to state in writing over his signature whether he was a preference to serve only in a unit all of the enlisted personnel of which are of his own race. Such opportunity shall be afforded at the time of registration in the case of those registering under the requirements of this act, or upon enlistment in the case of those who hereafter enlist in the armed forces of the United States. Any such person who expresses such preference shall thereafter be assigned only to units of a type consistent with his preference. The right to express and the effect of expressing any such preference shall be clearly explained to each person who hereafter registers under this act or enlists in the armed forces of the United States. As used in this section the term "unit" means a group of persons serving in the armed forces who (1) share the same housing, messing, or sanitary facilities, or (2) participate jointly in recreational or social activities. For the purposes of this subsection an individual's race shall be determined in accordance with the more detailed classification as to race used by the Bureau of the Census in connection with the taking and preparation of statistics of the Sixteenth Census of the United States. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the assignment of any individual who belongs to a race comprising less than 1 percent of the population of the United States to units containing enlisted personnel of the most numerous race in the United States, if the Secretary of the armed force concerned has determined that it is impracticable to organize units all of the enlisted personnel of which are of such individual's race.

(b) Any commissioned officer of the armed forces who knowingly and willfully denies to any person his right to express a preference upon enlistment as provided by subsection (a) or assigns any person after enlistment or induction to any unit in violation of the provisions of such subsection shall be guilty of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman and shall be subject to trial and punishment under the appropriate article of war or article for the government of the Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to make it perfectly clear that there is no real similarity between the proposition I now submit and the amendments proposed yesterday by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The confused impression has been created that one of these proposals was designed to serve as an antidote for the other, and that each is as revolutionary as the other in its effect. This is far from the truth.

The proposals offered by the Senator from North Dakota would have brought about drastic changes in the organization and operation of all of our armed services. His nonsegregation amendment would have completely transformed the tables of organization and the system employed by the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps from the time of their creation down to the present day. His other amendments went further afield and undertook to change the Constitution and laws of sovereign States, as well as long-established customs of life of our people. They could have only caused great confusion. They came from one who is opposed to the enactment of selective-service legislation.

On the contrary, the pending proposal in manner changes the system which has been applied in the armed forces of this country for 150 years. It merely recognizes by law a right of the individual American citizen which had never been questioned by anyone until 4 or 5 years ago. It prevents rather than creates confusion. It comes from those who are strongly supporting the principles of the pending legislation. We have no desire or purpose to hamper or delay its passage. We only seek to make it more effective by preventing threatened changes in long-tried methods which changes are sure to cause chaos and confusion and defeat the basic purposes of this legislation, even if it is enacted, by weakening the effectiveness of our entire national defense establishment.

The purpose and effect of the pending amendment is clear. It is simply worded, and may be applied and administered without any difficulty. It merely proposes to guarantee to any individual citizen brought into the services the right to serve in a military unit composed of members of his own race where such individual makes an affirmative declaration of his desire to do so. It does not deprive any other individual citizen of a single right, real or imaginary. If at the time of registration or induction any young man declares that he prefers to serve with his own kind, this proposal assures him of that privilege. The same identical right is allowed those of any and all races of our people, whether belonging to the majority or whether called a minority. It does not discriminate against any citizen or group of citizens. It does not take away anything from anyone. It cannot harm or injure anyone. It does not deny any individual the right to serve in units composed of mixed races if he so desires and is ordered to do so. It does not change the present policy of assignment used by the Army and Air Corps.

That is all that is involved. It is almost unbelievable that there can be opposition to such a fundamentally fair

and American proposal, particularly since there is no conflict between it and the system which has enabled us to emerge victoriously from every war in which this country has been engaged.

Unfortunately, it appears that this amendment cannot be considered in an atmosphere of calmness such as should characterize the legislative deliberations of the Senate of the United States. I urge Senators to open their minds and accord it a fair hearing on its merits. I realize that this is an election year. I know that we are afflicted with the political hysteria which besets us every 4 years when we elect our public officials from the Presidency on down. I know that perspectives are often blurred by the desire to capture the votes of a highly organized and very vocal minority. I know the truth of the old saw, "The squeaking wheel gets the grease."

It is our duty, however, to protect the rights of the individual citizen and to consider the desires of the unorganized and inarticulate majority of both parties, even though there be no immediate threat to translate those desires into votes. If we would but do that, I am convinced that this amendment would be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

The passage of selective service legislation when we are not engaged in a shooting war is an unprecedented step. We are proposing to interrupt each year the normal lives of nearly a million young Americans of all races. We declare that the dangers of today's troubled world are so grave that we must resort to the compulsions of law in order to obtain enough men for the armed services to secure the defense of our Nation.

I am one of those who believe that the conditions confronting us demand that we take this very drastic step. But, Mr. President, I insist that men who are required by law to forego the opportunities of civilian life for 2 years in order to serve their Nation as soldiers have rights as American citizens which we as their representatives are bound to respect, if we in good conscience represent them. They will be patriotic citizen soldiers of this great Republic, and should be honored as such. They are being drafted into the highest public service, and should not be treated as though they had been found guilty of the commission of a felonious offense. We should be exceedingly careful not to indicate by any word or act that they are to be treated as felons sentenced to the penitentiary, because we find it necessary to call them to the service of their country against their will. We should consider their wishes as fellow citizens of this Republic. It is appropriate to allow them any measure of autonomy or independence which is consistent with military discipline and general efficiency. I submit, Mr. President, it is not asking too much for them to insist that instead of making the conditions of their service intolerable or unpleasant the Congress should exercise great care to see that their surroundings should be as pleasant as possible and that the rights and wishes of every individual called are retained and respected, insofar as it is compatible with the maintenance of an efficient Military Establishment. That is all this amendment proposes to do.

I submit, Mr. President, that if there is any one fundamental and sacred right inherent in every individual in a free state it is the right of choosing the type of people with whom we will associate in our daily lives. This right is respected everywhere if there is a pretense of democracy. Everyone who truly believes in a democracy must respect and defend this right. Without it the individual is stripped of his essential dignity. The denial of this right is the hallmark of the police state. Even war cannot justify its temporary suspension unless the very existence of the land is endangered.

The vast majority of those who will be taken or forced into the services by this legislation each year will serve as enlisted men. There is no more intimate human relationship known to men than that of enlisted men serving together at the squad level. They eat and sleep together. They use the same sanitary facilities day after day. They are compelled to stay together in the closest association. Except for the members of their own squad or platoon they have no confidants with whom they may discuss their letters from home and with whom they may talk of their plans and hopes for the future when they shall have finished the service required by this law.

These things may sound trivial to Senators sitting in this Chamber. I can assure the Senate that they are not small in the minds and hearts of boys serving as soldiers a long way from home. This amendment merely recognizes that, though soldiers, these men are still citizens of the United States. To deny them this simple right because, forsooth, they are compelled to sacrifice 2 years for their country, is to treat them as automatons or animals whose preferences and happiness are of little concern.

I repeat, Mr. President, this amendment can harm no individual American citizen nor deprive a single one of any right, real or imaginary. It will only make secure a very modest privilege to men who are required to give a great deal that we may safely sit in this Hall enjoying the honors and emoluments of Senators.

Many of those who will serve have enjoyed greater opportunities than some of their fellow citizens and they will be permitted the rank of commissioned officers. Commissioned officers have some privileges enabling them to maintain their right of association. We will have a more democratic, as well as a more efficient service, if we make it possible for enlisted men who wish to take advantage of this provision to have the right to express themselves as to their associates.

I wish that the people of the United States could be permitted to understand and pass upon the principle involved in this amendment. If that could happen I am confident that it would meet with the approval of a majority of every one of the diverse races constituting our citizenship. It would appear that many Senators are of the opinion that their constituency, of whatever race, has no interest in the recognition of this right of those who express such a preference to serve with their own race and kind. I would not presume to speak for the people of any part of this Nation, other than my own section. I do, however, hazard the prediction that if this proposition is submitted to the young men of every race who will be called under the terms of this bill, a very large majority of each race and of every section will approve of it. I think the majority in its favor in North Dakota would be as substantial as that in the State of Georgia. I believe that the citizens of Maine or of California or of any other State would approve of it. It is plain Americanism. Even those who would prefer to have their sons serve in unsegregated units could scarcely be so narrow as to deny the right of any other young American to assert a preference to serve in a unit composed of members of his own race.

The people of this country recognize the great sacrifice which we are requiring of all of these men. It may seem to be good politics for the moment, in view of the opposition expressed in some quarters, to vote against this amendment. I assert, Mr. President, that if the events which I apprehend do come to pass, there will be ample opportunity in the future for all of us to reflect upon the political wisdom of voting against this amendment. Its fundamental fairness has never been challenged. In the discussion in the committee where it was defeated, as well as in the criticisms voiced by the press, I have seen no one deny the justice of this small measure of freedom to choose the type of people with whom one must associate merely because a man is compelled to make an unusual sacrifice for his country.

I realize that there are those who are determined to destroy any semblance of segregation, either voluntary or by law, not only in the armed services but in every phase and incident of our daily lives. Those people will find this amendment obnoxious. Let them point out where it does violence to the rights of any individual citizen to allow another individual the right to express this choice in his conditions of service.

Having been unable to oppose this proposal on its merits, the opposition has been compelled to resort to two specious arguments against it. One of them is the argument that there is no necessity for the amendment nor any reason to include it in the law. The other undertakes to raise the rather puerile bugaboo of difficulties in its administration.

Because, Mr. President, I am so strong in my belief that selective service or other legislation similar to this is necessary, I have earnestly and prayerfully sought solace in the argument that there was no necessity for placing any safeguard in the law to protect the rights of those who wish to express a choice as to the type of associates they will live with while in the service. My search has been in vain. I have been unable to find any justification for any confidence in the argument that there is no danger of the adoption by Executive order of the same theory contained in amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota. All that I

hear, as well as my knowledge of human nature, convinces me that if we are to show any regard for the preservation of the individual right which this amendment will protect it is most necessary that it be incorporated into the law.

It does not require any great understanding of our form of government or knowledge of the Constitution of the United States to be aware of the powers of the President and of Cabinet members appointed by him over our armed forces. Section 2 of article II of the supreme law, the Constitution, declares, "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States." The President of the United States has no difficulty in ridding his Cabinet of any member who does not respect his wishes. He has almost autocratic powers over those who serve in the armed forces of the United States unless his acts run counter to a law enacted by Congress under the constitutional powers of the Congress. We have not only the right but the duty to make such laws for the administration and direction of the armed service as we deem proper. Section 8 of article I of the Constitution makes it mandatory upon the Congress to "raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a Navy," and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." The President has the power to act where the Congress fails or refuses to exercise its primary responsibility for the proper guidance of those in command of those forces.

In this case we are confronted with the fact known to all Members of the Congress that the President has repeatedly, officially and formally, served notice on the Congress of the views he holds as to this issue. He had advised us of the action he proposes to take if the Congress does not have the courage to express itself on this issue, when we have under consideration a bill of this character. No one but the Congress can be blamed for any consequences of our failure to adopt this amendment. In the absence of legislation by the Congress on this subject there can be no question as to the constitutional power of the President to enforce his announced decision to eliminate segregation in the armed services, whether segregation has been dictated by military considerations or based on the expression of choice of individuals in the future.

The adoption of this proposal will not go as far as I would like, because it would permit unsegregated units where the individuals comprising units have expressed no choice as to service. It will, however, have the effect of enabling those belonging to either the majority or a minority race who wish to do so to serve with their own kind.

Referring to the position of the President, it is so clear and oft repeated that to hold the view that this amendment is not necessary would be to delude one's self. I have here the report of the President's committee on what he chooses to call civil rights. The committee making this report was appointed by the President for specific purposes. Through the entire report runs the same thread of condemning what it calls discrimination in the armed forces, and the report makes it abundantly clear that in the view of the committee any form of segregation amounts to discrimination. The President's committee adopts the comparatively new idea that the word "segregation" and the word "discrimination" are completely synonymous.

The President has endorsed this report without any qualification as to detail. I shall not read all the arguments of the report dealing with this subject, but I do wish to read briefly from its conclusions, wherein it makes its recommendations as to the proper organization of the armed forces. It says:

> Legislation and regulations should expressly ban discrimination and segregation in the recruitment, assignment, and training of all personnel in all types of military duty. Mess halls, quarters, recreational facilities, and post exchanges should be nonsegregated. The National Guard, Reserve units, and any universal military-training program should all be administered in accordance with these same standards.

That is the background of the President's message to the Congress on February 2, when he officially notified the Congress of the views he had previously expressed when the committee made its report. It was no snap judgment on his part. He had appointed a committee to advise him, the committee had held hearings and submitted its report, he had approved the report in a public statement, and called it officially to the attention of the Congress in these words:

> During the recent war and in the years since its close we have made much progress toward equality of opportunity in our armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.

This is the pertinent part:

> I have instructed the Secretary of Defense to take steps to have the remaining instances of discrimination in the armed services eliminated as rapidly as possible. The personnel policies and practices of all the services in this regard will be made consistent.

Lest one should attempt to console himself with the idea that the word "discrimination" as here used admits of the "separate but equal" theory, let him take counsel of his reason and consider the fact that the President's committee deals with the words "segregation" and "discrimination" as being synonymous, and the further fact that the Navy, prior to his statement that all the services would be made consistent, had officially abolished any form of segregation in the Navy.

Of course, Mr. President, this is not the most drastic recommendation of this misnamed civil-rights program, a program which, I may say, has caused considerable resentment in some sections of this country.

The report is replete with instances where it is recommended that new rights be created for those who are fortunate enough to belong to a minority race at the expense of rights, long cherished and never challenged, of individuals who belong to the majority race.

I shall not, of course, deal with the other phases of the report. I only observe in passing that about the only thing overlooked in the report of the President's committee in establishing these new rights for the members of minority races was to recommend a commission similar to the FEPC to fine and imprison any banker refusing a loan to a member of a minority race if there be any ground to suspect that the refusal was prompted by reason of the race or creed of the applicant. If any person in this country has a civil right to have another fined or imprisoned for refusing him a job, he should certainly have a similar right of action against a banker where an application for a bank loan rather than an application for a job is involved. I cannot understand how this Commission overlooked recommending the creation of a Fair Bank Loan Commission. I rather suspect that Mr. Wallace will beat the two old parties in espousing this idea.

It is unnecessary to go further into the details of the report. No person who reads it and the President's endorsement thereof, as well as his message to the Congress, could possibly delude himself with the idea that this amendment is mere surplusage and unnecessary, unless he deliberately wishes to do so.

Mr. President, I have here a copy of the New York Times dated Friday, May 28, within the past 2 weeks, which carries a headline on the front page that "President stands on antibias order to armed forces."

I shall read only the first paragraph.

> Injection of the segregation issue into the congressional fight over the stopgap selective draft has not caused any change in President Truman's instructions to the Secretary of Defense to eliminate racial discrimination within the armed forces, the Chief Executive told a news conference today.

The remainder of the article deals with the subject at great length, but it is abundantly clear that the President is firm in his determination to carry out the recommendations of what he calls his Civil Rights Committee.

Even if the danger were not so imminent, it is a complete answer to the argument that it is unnecessary to adopt the amendment to answer that the provision cannot hurt anything if it is inserted in the bill.

Not only do the President's oft-repeated views disclose the necessity for the amendment, but, as I have said, the policy of nonsegregation has been put into effect in the Navy. The action of the Navy in abolishing segregation is warmly applauded in this report. It has likewise been applauded by the lobbyists for the National Association for Advancement of Colored People and other organized minority groups.

Up until this time the abolition of segregation in the Navy has been more a matter of an order than an established fact. The Navy has had volunteers in sufficient numbers of the types desired by the recruiting service, and I understand that less than 5 percent of their total personnel are Negroes. In addition to this, all of those who are now in the Navy enlisted of their own free will and accord.

They took their chances with theoretical knowledge of the Navy's policy of enlistment and assignment to duty. This bill, however, will greatly increase the size of the Navy. It will either induce the enlistment or select for service in the Navy a total of 140,000 men a year. Once the policy of selection is applied we may be sure that at least 10 percent of these enlistees or draftees will be nonwhites.

The State I represent in part here has more Negro citizens than any other State of the Union. I would fight for equal treatment for Negroes drafted into the Navy, or any other branch of the service for that matter, just as vigorously as I oppose the compulsory establishment of unsegregated units. I would be the first to insist that where Negroes demonstrate capacity and ability they should be advanced to the grade to which they are entitled. They are of course entitled to the same treatment in clothing, rations, wages, and quarters as those issued or assigned to the white race, and I do not understand it has ever been complained that their quarters are not in every respect equal.

I also in the amendment demand for my Negro constituents the right to claim the privilege of serving in units composed of members of their own race. There is little doubt in my mind that a majority of them will affirmatively request service with their own race. They will find the 2 years they would be required by the proposed law to serve much pleasanter when serving with their own kind, and where they desire it they are entitled to be assigned to units of their own race. In cases where they or members of any other race express no choice the Navy will, of course, assign them to unsegregated units.

There are those who rely on the testimony of General Eisenhower as to the importance of assigning men to units composed of members of their own race and also rely upon statements attributed to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense that no immediate change is contemplated in the policies of the Army and Air Force. General Eisenhower's testimony before the Armed Services Committee on the subject of segregation strongly supports the principle of this amendment. He points out that it is to the advantage of the Negro to have him serve with members of his own race, and his argument on this point is unanswerable. General Eisenhower's testimony clearly proves that the Army is more efficient with separate units for the races, and that such a policy is to the advantage of both.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the portion of General Eisenhower's testimony on this subject bearing on the question I have just discussed.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I ask you one further question? There have been some very extreme statements made before this committee, and I think I have heard most of the evidence concerning the program of segregation in the Army, and in the possibilities of segregation of races or creeds or colors in this UMT program. You have been the Chief of Staff, a very distinguished general. I think it would be extremely helpful if you would elaborate briefly your views on that problem and what the Army is doing about it at the present time.

General EISENHOWER. It has been the problem, of course, that has been with the Army ever since it has been with the country. We must never forget that in a very definite way the Army is merely one of the mirrors that holds up to our faces the United States of America. It has never been easy to solve because you have certain incontrovertible facts that you must walk right up to.

One of them is that there is race prejudice in this country, and when you put in the same organization and make live together under the most intimate circumstances men of different races, we sometimes have trouble. Therefore, there has been a sort of a compromise made with this problem, right down through the years with the Army. When I first joined the Army there were two regiments of infantry that were Negro, two regiments of cavalry. We began to organize smaller units, and I believe at the present regulations allow us to build down to company strength, the company being the smallest administrative unit. It allows them to live together, mess together, sleep together, and so on.

* * * * *

I personally have always stood since that time for organizing the Negro down to include units no larger than platoons. It does create certain social problems on a post, because you always have men that do not like to mingle freely between the races, and therefore if you have a dance for your soldiers, you have a problem. But I believe those things can be handled. They are not too difficult; particularly since we are going to have large posts, the social problem can be met without difficulty. I personally see no reason why he should not be amalgamated to that extent.

Now, if you are going to go further, here is the problem you run into, Senator. In general, the Negro is less well educated than his brother citizen that is white, and if you make a complete amalgamation, what you are going to have is in every company the Negro is going to be relegated to the minor jobs, and he is never going to get his promotion to such grades as technical sergeant, master sergeant, and so on, because the competition is too tough.

If, on the other hand, he is in smaller units of his own, he can go up to that rate, and I believe he is entitled to the chance to show his own wares.

I do not mean to say that I have any final answer to the problem, and I believe that the human race may finally grow up to the point where it will not be a problem. It will disappear through education, through mutual respect, and so on. But I do believe that if we attempt merely by passing a lot of laws to force someone to like someone else, we are just going to get into trouble.

On the other hand, I do not by any means hold out for this extreme segregation as I said when I first joined the Army 38 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator RUSSELL has a question, General.

Senator RUSSELL. My question will not be the one I first had in mind, due to the question that Senator SALTONSTALL asked.

The question of segregation is one that is always painful for me to discuss, and particularly unpleasant for me to ask questions that I shall now, but due to the decided views I have on this issue, I must ask these questions. More is involved than racial prejudice, it goes directly to such vital factors as the morale, discipline, and health of the troops.

You are familiar, I am sure, with the ratio of crime among Negro troops as compared with white troops in the service, are you not?

General EISENHOWER. Well, certainly on a partial basis, within my own theater, I would say.

Senator RUSSELL. How did the ratio of crime among the Negro troops compare with that of the white troops?

General EISENHOWER. It was higher.

Senator RUSSELL. You are familiar with the reports that indicated the incidence of venereal diseases, were you not?

General EISENHOWER. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. How did those reports compare the colored troops as against the white troops.

General EISENHOWER. It was higher.

Senator RUSSELL. I am sure you are familiar with the figures that among the men examined for the draft, the incidence of venereal diseases, gonorrhea and syphilis, was 252 per thousand among the Negro race, as compared to 17 per thousand with the white race.

General EISENHOWER. I am not familiar with those particular records.

Senator RUSSELL. I would like to later offer those reports for the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say, Mr. President, that I have never heard of any other outstanding officer who has ever had actual experience in commanding large bodies of troops who took a contrary view to that expressed by General Eisenhower. If the amendment is not adopted we have no assurance whatever that the views of these outstanding military leaders will not be brushed aside. I have made some inquiry into the matter, and I cannot find that a single man of experience in military matters was called before the so-called Committee on Civil Rights to support their findings that Congress should by law or the President by Executive order do away with any form of segregation in the armed services.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder if the Senator is going to have any comments to make respecting the practice in the British Navy or Army on this matter, if there is any testimony on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. There was no such testimony taken before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, but so far as I know anything about the tables of organization of the various military forces of Canada and Great Britain they have never used absolutely unsegregated units in their armed forces.

Mr. President, as I stated, we do not know that the advice of these military leaders will be respected if we fail to put this common, ordinary horse-sense safeguard provision in the bill, which does not discriminate against any person in the United States.

We must not overlook the power of organized minorities in a Presidential year. I sometimes think, Mr. President, that if this great civilization we call the United States ever falls it will be because the Congress of the United States has not the courage to stand up against the organized minorities whose clamorous voice is always heard here. I do not base that solely upon the racial minorities but

upon other minorities who seek to obtain legislation which is detrimental to the great masses of the people because they are so insistent, because they repeat so often the threats of political reprisal.

We have a very peculiar situation in this country today. The leaders of the two old-line political parties, the Democratic and Republican, seem to be perfectly sure that each of them will receive the Negro vote. Both of them are relying upon the promises of persons who hold themselves out as being leaders of the Negro race who claim they can deliver the Negro vote. The idea that the Negro will vote as a group for either the Democratic or Republican nominee this year, whoever he may be, is utterly fantastic. If Henry A. Wallace stays in the race he will capture a large part of the Negro vote without regard to any promise or any act on the part of the Democrats or Republicans. The few Negro leaders who have heretofore had the ears of the leaders of the two old parties may stand hitched, but members of the rank and file will vote for Wallace as surely as he stays in the race, and there is nothing that either of the old parties can do about it. The same thing would happen if you enacted every suggestion in the report of the President's Commission, and in addition advocated intermarriage of the races and absorption of the Negro by the white race through the process of miscegenation.

However, the bidding for the support of Mr. Wallace's followers has already caused some queer turns. After the convention and when the campaign really gets under way this bidding will go much higher. This will be particularly true in the event there is no slackening on the part of the so-called Southern revolt.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the Senator object to being interrupted for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I prefer not to be interrupted, but I have no objection if the Senator desires to ask a question.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I would not want to interrupt the Senator if he does not desire to be interrupted. I did not know what the Senator's pleasure was in that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have expressed no pleasure.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator then yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask if the Senator has any information as to how the Navy policy is working out as a practical matter? Were the Negro members of the naval forces infiltrated into the general personnel, or were they grouped into groups each to its own color; and, if the Senator has ascertained the fact, how has the plan worked out?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to make some investigation into that subject, and I will say that the Navy policy has caused no confusion until now, because it has been merely a paper policy. I think the Army has been much more honest and straightforward in its approach to the problem than the Navy has been. The Navy has been more hypocritical in its approach, because it has said it has abolished all segregation, and yet when it comes to enlistment it has been well nigh impossible for any Negro to enlist except as a mess attendant. Of course, all mess attendants eat and sleep together. There has been no issue raised about that. For that reason I undertake to point out that it would be raising a real issue when we draft 140,000 men to fill the requirements of the Navy for each of the next 2 years under this bill.

At the present time a Negro has a greater opportunity to advance in his grades and ratings in the Army, which has in force a policy of segregated units, than in the Navy with its boasted policy of nonsegregation.

The situation would be very acute, because at least 10 percent of each of those groups would be Negroes and the other 90 percent would be white. The issue would arise unless we gave both whites and Negroes the right to declare whether they wished to serve with units composed of members of their own race.

There is another thing which causes me gravely to question the argument that this amendment is not necessary. We are confronted today with something that is without precedent, so far as I am advised. If this bill is passed, the President of the United States will be confronted with a real threat of mass civil disobedience. This threat has been raised. It was raised before the committee by one of the most radical and popular Negro leaders, one A. Phillips Randolph. Randolph was arrested in Cleveland during World War I for obstructing the draft. Since that time he has grown in stature as a Negro leader. He has great influence with his race outside the South, particularly in the cities of the East and West, where large numbers of them are concentrated. He is supported by a Negro official of the State of New York and other Negroes who claim to be leaders. On the eve of an election an administration would be subjected to great pressure if it were compelled, because of the failure to issue an Executive order to abolish segregation in the armed services, to face the threat of mass civil disobedience affecting three or four hundred thousand men and perhaps one million or more votes. It would certainly pose a great temptation to yield, rather than to have to go through with mass prosecutions all over the United States. How could a campaign of mass civil disobedience be carried on against this amendment, based as it is on individual choice? I submit that the adoption of this amendment, permitting the individual himself to choose whether he shall serve with the members of his own race, will eliminate the threat of civil disobedience. It could only be interpreted as a threat of 10 percent against permitting the 90 percent of the population a voluntary choice. The threat would be completely laughed out of existence. There could be no mass disobedience against a law which merely allowed the right to individual American citizens to choose the unit in which they should serve.

I do not know who will be elected President of the United States in November. The Governor of New York was the last nominee of his party, and is one of the leading contenders this year. One of his appointees, a member of his official family, Grant Reynolds, is among the leaders of the Negro race in New York. He is perhaps more vigorous in his leadership of the civil-disobedience movement than is Phillips Randolph. The Governor of New York is a great proponent of what is commonly called social equality. If nominated he will be subjected to great pressure in the campaign to declare himself on this issue. It is supposed to be very popular among the Negro voters outside the South. A recent edition of the magazine Newsweek carries some interesting statements in this connection.

I do not care to risk the effect of the influence that this man Reynolds and his followers in New York might bring to bear upon the present Governor of New York should he be elected President of the United States this fall or during a campaign if he is nominated.

To show how far the threat of a civil-disobedience campaign has gone, Newsweek magazine of June 7 carries a 2-page article on the subject. A poll has been conducted on college campuses. Two thousand, two hundred Negro undergraduates have been polled on 26 campuses; 71 percent reported that they favor A. Phillips Randolph's proposal for resisting the draft under present conditions. The poll results were as follows:

Are you inclined to favor the Randolph proposal? Yes, 71 percent; no, 15 percent; not sure, 13 percent.

Seventy-one percent stated that they favored the campaign of mass treason against the laws of the United States unless they had a right to impose their own will upon the Government of the United States, as well as upon 90 percent of the people of the country who happened to be white.

I ask that the remainder of this poll, as well as one paragraph from the article, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO SERVE OR NOT

Of 2,200 Negro college youth polled on 26 campuses by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1,619, or 71 percent, reported that they favor A. Philip Randolph's proposal for resisting a draft under present conditions. About 75 percent of those polled were veterans. The poll results were as follows:

Are you inclined to favor the Randolph proposal? Yes, 71 percent; no, 15 percent; not sure, 13 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

If called today to register for a draft into segregated armed forces, what would you do?

Register and serve, 24 percent.

Register but not serve if called, 23 percent.

Refuse to register, 14 percent.

Not sure, 39 percent.

In case of a real war emergency, would you be willing to serve?

Yes, whenever called, 31 percent.

Yes, but only if segregation is abolished, 51 percent.

No, not at all, 10 percent.

No answer, 8 percent.

These results have to be taken as 2,200 individual opinions since the balloting was done at random and cannot be regarded as tapping a scientifically selected sample.

Many Negro leaders avoided open repudiation of Randolph, hoping the threat would be enough to get concessions. Walter White, the careful and cautious secretary of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, said he "did not share Mr. Randolph's faith in the efficacy of a civil-disobedience campaign," but that the only way out would be "the immediate and total abolition of segregation." The NAACP said it would not advise young men to follow Randolph, but White told Newsweek NAACP would give legal aid to those who did.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Congress will yield to this sort of intimidation against reserving the simple right of selection, what can we expect of a man in either political party who is seeking the highest office in the gift of the people? On what issue can we go before the people if we reject this idea which, as I see it, would not only be fair and American, but would absolutely stop the threatened campaign of civil disobedience?

I have already referred to the weakness of the argument that there was any administrative difficulty in applying this choice-of-assignment amendment. I am utterly amazed that it would be advanced by any man who had even a smattering of knowledge of the military history of the United States. It is a purely imaginative difficulty, the falsity of which is disproved by the complete military history of the United States, and the success of the separate unit method of handling our troops in every war in which we have been engaged. Yet we are told that this amendment would cause administrative difficulty.

The War between the States saw the first Negro organizations. They were organized by regiments, and were subjected to real discrimination in that they were not paid as high a rate of pay as that received by the white troops. After the war, by an act of 1866, provision was made for the establishment of two Negro infantry regiments and two Negro cavalry regiments. Up to this time there have always been separate units in which the races of this country could serve their Nation, without any complaint whatever of administrative difficulty. There have always been separate units for the white race and the Negro race. This same condition existed through all of World War I. In World War II, when we mobilized the greatest number of men this country has ever had in the services, there were separate units for the whites and blacks, without any complaint of administrative difficulties.

If there is any one illustration to show the specious falsity of the argument that there is any difficulty in the administration of the amendment it is the record of the handling of the nisei combat teams. The word "nisei" of course means second-generation Japanese. They are native-born citizens of America of Japanese parentage. The entire Japanese-American population of the United States and Hawaii is estimated at 200,194. This is less than fourteen-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population of the United States and Territories as of 1940. The War Department organized these men into combat teams, and they proved to be among the most effective of all the troops in the American uniform. They all served in the Army. None of them were in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. In view of the record of these great fighting units in World War II, it is absolute folly to claim that any mild amendment such as this, preserving the right of those men who desire it to serve with members of their own race, can cause any administrative difficulties. The nisei combat teams wrote a glorious page in the history of American valor. With a racial pride that is unknown to some other minority groups they were not only satisfied but glad to serve with their own race and kind. Surely if any group ever had a right to complain about segregation it was these men. So far as I am advised there is no record of their entering any complaint that they were being discriminated against. Instead of complaining they showed that there were no better troops in the American Army. They looked at their equipment and saw that it was the equal of that issued to any other American troops. They realized that their mess and quarters were the equal of those of any other American Army organization. They saw other nisei by their sides and felt no inferiority. When brought into contact with the enemy they did not refuse to fight because a white man was not in front of them or another white man by their side. Instead of "fading away in the face of enemy action" they took every objective they were ordered to take; and few if any other outfits of comparable size, whether of the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, whether rangers or paratroopers, received more medals for heroism and achievement in action than did this segregated minority group. I have yet to hear the first soldier who served in Italy who was not loud in his praise of the courage and fighting efficiency of this minority group organization.

It is a great pity that other minority groups do not emulate their example instead of fading in the face of enemy action or refusing to serve at all in defense of their country unless they can dictate all of the terms of their service, even though such terms may be violative of the rights of other American citizens.

Among the most insidious of all the facets of Communist propaganda in this country is the subtle effort to disparage the sense of pride in our Nation which has caused us to grow great. The other day I read an article to the effect that pride in one's State is evidence of a small mind. It is vehemently argued that pride of race is evidence of Hitlerism. It is suggested that there is something unclean about a man who is proud of his country and of its history. Mr. President, if these forces ever succeed in killing the pride that the average American citizen feels in his community, in his State, in his race, and in his Nation, they will have killed patriotism, and these United States will be ready for burial. The competitive spirit between the small towns within the State, generated by community pride, has built great States. The belief that one's State is the greatest of the 48 and the determination to keep it so has built our great Nation. The faith that our American civilization is the greatest that the world has ever seen, and that our form of government is more desirable than any that mankind has ever enjoyed, has made us the greatest Nation of the earth. This pride of community, State, and Nation, and of race, has enabled the American fighting man to emerge victoriously from every war in which this country has engaged. It has been responsible for our great civilization.

The Continental Army won our independence in the war from 1776 to 1783 through the use of regiments that were assembled in the State of residence of the men in the ranks. Mr. President, some people scornfully refer to this as ancient history. Certainly if the day ever comes when we do not appreciate the sacrifices made by the Continental Army, if we take for granted the heritage we enjoy as the result of those sacrifices, we shall be approaching the end. Anyone who has read the record of that 7 years' struggle for the independence we enjoy today, can not fail to be impressed with the fact that it was the pride of men in their State organizations which finally enabled the untrained Americans to stand before the regiments of British regulars.

According to the concept that pride is a bad thing, I suppose that the historian of the future will be ostracized, and his books will be barred from use in the public schools of the Nation if he mentions the achievements of the Maryland line, the Blue Hen's Chicks from Delaware, Morgan's Virginia Riflemen, or the other fine Continental units which gained our freedom. Their great achievements were symbolic of their pride of State. The war with Mexico was largely fought by volunteer regiments which bore the names of the States from which they were enlisted, and who had a pride in their State which would not permit them to retreat in the face of overwhelming odds. In the tragic fratracidal strife of the '60's, with the exception of a few units of the Regular Army who retained their identity throughout the war, each regiment bore a number and the identity of the State from which its members came. There has never been bloodier fighting or a greater display of heroism than that manifested by the armies on both sides in that struggle. This was in part due to this fact that a regiment from Wisconsin would not yield ground for fear it would cause New Yorkers to laugh at them, while on the other side a soldier from North Carolina would die lest his regimental colors be planted behind those from other States in Pickett's charge at Gettysburg. I never saw a veteran of the War Between the States who did not think that his particular regiment was the best organization in either army, and I have no doubt that this pride of organization was responsible for the accomplishments of both armies, which caused foreign observers from the regular armies of Europe to constantly marvel. Mr. President, we could deal with this subject at great length, of course. There never has been bloodier fighting or greater heroism than

in the great battles in the War Between the States; and the pride of the men in their States, as well as in the Nation, was one of the things that made those men great. That sort of pride of organization is one of the important things upon which we must depend if we are to expect to continue the successes we have enjoyed in the past.

I now come to the argument which is directed at showing the detrimental effect that mandatory intermingling of the races and denial of any voluntary right of segregation in the armed services will have on the health, the morale, and the morals of the armed forces of the United States.

I should have preferred, Mr. President, to limit my argument solely to the high principle that it is our duty to preserve the right of a man to choose to serve in a unit composed of members of his own race. That of itself should be adequate in a free land which claims that its institutions of government are free and that we have a maximum of individual liberty compatible with organized society. But with the great pressure from one minority group to abolish all segregation in the armed services, accompanied as it is by threats of political reprisal and of mass civil disobedience, I fear that the rights of the inarticulate majority will not be very impressive in the minds of some Senators.

Mr. President, it can be demonstrated from statistics relating to the prevalence of communicable diseases and the crime rate of the United States that the adoption of this amendment will be wise. These are unpleasant subjects to discuss. One who has the temerity to deal with them is certain to have his position misrepresented by those who have an ax to grind. There are those who will deliberately misunderstand and distort any statements dealing with these touchy subjects. Facts are not always pleasant. However, I deem it to be a duty to bring these facts to the attention of the American people, and I shall not shirk it because it is not a pleasant duty. When General Eisenhower appeared before the Armed Services Committee, I asked him a simple question. I said, "General Eisenhower, how did the ratio of crime and venereal disease compare as between the white and colored units?" He said, "Of course they were higher among the colored groups." Later, to my amazement, I saw that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People the next day charged me with uttering a malicious and false attack on the heroic Negro soldiers of this country, merely because I asked that question of General Eisenhower. They did not attack the General who gave the answer, but they charged me with making a vicious attack merely because I asked the question of General Eisenhower when he appeared as a witness before the committee. I know that the bringing of these statistics to the attention of the Senate will bring in the Negro press lurid charges that I have indicted the entire Negro race. Mr. President, I wish to say in passing that if the Negro press would devote to attempts to inculcate a sense of racial pride in the Negroes, one-half of the time that it devotes in trying to tell the Negroes that they can force the Congress to pass laws declaring black to be white, white to be black, that press would serve a much more useful purpose to the members of their race.

I know them well. I am proud to claim many of them as my friends. I know many Negroes who are as law-abiding as any white man. Many of them are models of cleanliness. The moral and spiritual life of numbers of Negroes is above reproach.

But, Mr. President, the uncontrovertible fact remains that the Negro race as a whole, the masses of the Negroes of the Nation, have not yet reached the standards which I gladly attest to be held by individuals belonging to the race. Therefore, it is my unpleasant duty to discuss these facts as reflected by Government statistics, in an effort to persuade Senators who do not recognize the rights of the people of both Negro and white races to serve with units of their own choice, that the mandatory intermingling of the races throughout the services will be a terrific blow to the efficiency and fighting power of the armed services which we propose to augment through the draft system provided in this bill.

Mr. President, a failure to adopt this amendment and to allow this right of choice is sure to increase the numbers of men who will be disabled through communicable diseases. It will increase the rate of crime committed by servicemen. I submit in all earnestness that it will be most detrimental to the armed services to insist upon unsegregated units to such an extent that the right of choice is denied. It will have a most adverse effect on the morale of large numbers of the fighting units of the service, as well as upon the morals of the individuals comprising those units. Those who have no interest in the health or welfare of the individuals whom they propose to draft by the passage of this measure should have some concern as to the efficiency and effectiveness of the forces to be augmented and created if they are properly to defend their country.

Statistics can be quoted without number dealing with every phase of this question which will show that the incidence of syphilis, gonorrhea, chancre, and all other venereal diseases is appallingly higher among the members of the Negro race than among the members of the white race. The disparity is great between Negroes and whites in civilian life.

It is likewise great between the Negro units in the Army as compared with the white units, though both races have available identical systems of instruction and of hygiene to prevent venereal diseases. The incidence of tuberculosis among the Negro race as compared with the whites in the United States is almost unbelievable; and of course tuberculosis is a highly communicable disease. The mortality rate from tuberculosis in the age group 15 to 44, according to official documents published by the Public Health Service of the United States, which are upon my desk at this moment, is five times greater in the Negro race than in the white race. The crime ratio, particularly in the case of crimes of violence, on which statistics have been collected not only by the civilian crime reports issued by the FBI but by the Army of the United States in reporting crimes committed by those in the service, show that it is infinitely higher among the Negro race than among the white race. It is not confined to the South. As a matter of fact, the percentage of crime among the Negroes in the great cities outside the South is a great deal higher than among the southern Negroes.

Mr. President, I have here a publication issued by the United States Public Health Service. Figures and percentages are always tiresome, and I shall not undertake to quote all those appearing in this report. It is unnecessary to do so in order to establish the point I am making. They have to do with the physical examinations given the selectees in World War II. I read this brief paragraph from this report:

> In the first 2,000,000 selectees examined, the prevalence rate for syphilis based on serologic testing was 45.3 percent per thousand men tested; the rate for white males was 17.4 per thousand; for nonwhite males 252.3 per thousand.

Every Member of the Senate owes it to himself and to those he represents here to get this fact sheet and read those figures again and again before he votes to permit commingling of the races in the Army. I repeat them:

> The rate for white males was 17.4 per thousand; for nonwhite males 252.3 per thousand.

This bill proposes to draft the young men between the ages of 19 and 26. I wish to read the very next line in the report. It deals with the incidence of syphilis found in the age group between 20 and 25 years as disclosed in the physical examinations given under the selective-service law in the report of the Public Health Service. I ask Senators to listen as I read this one very brief statement——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. GURNEY. I have been talking with the majority leader. The Senator will remember the announcement made at the beginning of today's session, that we intended to go on into the evening. I am trying to answer the majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska, correctly, in an effort to analyze the situation we confront tonight. I told the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Georgia had about finished the presentation of his amendment. Would the Senator tell me if he could be through by 10 o'clock?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I could not guarantee it. I shall not exceed it by more than a very few minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Then could the Senator tell me how many other speeches there will be on the amendment? As

I understand, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are the only ones who are to speak, and the total time to be taken by their remarks on the amendment will probably not exceed 30 minutes. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can speak only for myself. I have no idea of the length of the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The length of my remarks, I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, will be about 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think mine will exceed more than 15 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Arkansas has just told me his remarks would take 5 or 10 minutes at the most.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. I am very hopeful, I may say to the majority leader, that we can conclude consideration of the amendment tonight.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to vote upon the amendment tonight.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to ask if any other Senators wish to speak on the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the majority leader, I also hope we may vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If I have added up the time correctly, and if Senators stay within the time, it would be about 10: 45 before we would have an opportunity to vote. I merely want to let the Members of the Senate know that that is about the hour when we shall reach a vote on the amendment. If it meets with the approval of the Senate, I have no objection to remaining in session until a vote on the amendment can be obtained.

Mr. GURNEY. I hope that is agreeable, because I am anxious to finish consideration of the amendment tonight in order to have the slate clean for another amendment in the morning.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida might wish 5 or 10 minutes. I did not want to be precluded, in case I desire to speak, by an understanding to the contrary.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest we proceed, Mr. President, and see how we get along.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, when interrupted I was reading from an official publication of an agency of the Government of the United States which analyzed the results of the examinations which were conducted of selectees in World War II. I was dealing with the age groups of the young men who will be taken from their homes by the pending measure and who will give 2 years in their country's service. I read from the official report, which states referring to the terrible disease of syphilis:

> In the age group 20–25 years the prevalence rate among nonwhite males was 19 times greater than among white males.

I hope that Senators from States which have comparatively few Negroes in their population will pay heed to these figures. When a boy is drafted only has 251 Negroes he will not serve from the State of North Dakota, which solely with North Dakotans or with Negroes from North Dakota. He will serve in an army which is gathered from every section of the United States. I submit that it is unfair to vote to compel a boy from North Dakota or any other State to serve against his will in an unsegregated unit where the chances for his innocently acquiring this dread disease of syphilis is 19 times greater than it would be if he were permitted to express a choice to serve only with members of his own race. It is not only unfair to the individual concerned to deny him this right, but it is almost a crime against the fighting power and the military efficiency of the very expensive military establishment which is provided for by the pending bill, to mix and intermingle all of the men together without regard for race when such action exposes 90 percent of the troops having a very low syphilitic incidence to 10 percent of them having a shockingly high syphilitic incidence.

I shall pass on from this venereal disease fact sheet, through it is replete with figures, after reading one more line which appears thereon. I read it and leave it for Senators to ponder:

> Gonorrhea incidence is estimated as approximately five times the syphilis incidence.

I have secured from a study made of the health reports of the War Department a statement showing the percentage of the command admitted to treatment for venereal disease during an average period. These figures reflect the percentages not only in the total Army but the percentages from the units of the armies stationed in Europe.

It may be said with respect to the examinations made of the selectees when they were taken into the Army that the Negroes had not had the same educational opportunities as the whites to protect themselves against venereal disease and to effect a cure. I willingly admit that there is some merit in that connection. However, Mr. President, the figures for the Army in the United States and for the Army in Europe, where both races had identical provisions for sanitation and hygiene and were subjected to the same educational course, show a great disparity. In 1942 the venereal-disease rate among the colored troops in the Army as a whole was 9½ times as great as it was among the white troops.

Among the troops stationed in Europe it was 7.6 times as great. For the years 1943 through and including 1947 the ratio runs from approximately 6 to 9 times as great among the colored troops in the Army, and averages around 5 times as great among the troops in Europe.

I ask, Mr. President, to have the table on venereal incidence in the Army of the United States printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percent of command admitted to treatment for venereal diseases[1] during the average week, in specified periods—total Army and Europe for total, white, and colored personnel and rates for the Ninety-second Division

Year	Venereal diseases	Total Army	Number of times greater per 1,000 troops	Army in Europe	Number of times greater per 1,000 troops
1942	Total	0.06		0.07	
	White	.04		.05	
	Colored	.38	9.5	.38	7.6
1943	Total	.05		.07	
	White	.03		.06	
	Colored	.27	9.0	.27	4.5
1944	Total	.07		.06	
	White	.05		.04	
	Colored	.29	5.8	.23	5.75
1945	Total	.13		.19	
	White	.09		.15	
	Colored	.55	6.11	.67	4.47
1946	Total	.23		.45	
	White	.14		.34	
	Colored	1.06	7.57	1.63	4.79
1947	Total	.17		.41	
	White	.12		.32	
	Colored	.65	5.42	1.29	4.03

[1] Includes cases acquired while in the service, not previously reported by an Army medical installation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, continuing this unpleasant duty, I also wish to give some figures which I have secured, showing the ratio of crime for 100,000 enlisted men in the Army, broken down into the white and colored races.

This report shows the nature of the offenses committed by general prisoners in confinement at rehabilitation centers, disciplinary barracks, and Federal institutions during the year 1945. They do not deal with such military offenses as desertion, cowardice in the face of the enemy, or absence without leave. They relate only to the crimes designated as civil offenses.

The table shows that the commitment rate of all civil offenses among the white enlisted men in the Army amounted to 78 per hundred thousand. The rate among Negro enlisted men was 229 per hundred thousand. The rate for the crime of murder among the Negro troops was 9 times the rate for the same offense among the white troops. As to the crime of rape the ratio was 13 times as great among the Negro troops per hundred thousand as it was in the case of the white troops. In the crime of assault with intent to rape the rate among the Negro troops was 5 times as great as among the white troops. In the crime of robbery the rate was almost 4 times as great per hundred thousand among the Negro troops as it was in the case of the same crime per hundred thousand among the white troops. In the crime of manslaughter the rate was 6 times as great among the Negro troops per hundred thousand as among the white troops. In the crime of assault the rate was practically 10 times as great among Negro troops as among the same number of white troops. In the crime of sodomy the rate was 2½ times as great per hundred thousand Negro troops as it was per hundred thousand white troops. In the crime of burglary and housebreaking the rate was nearly 4 times as high among the Negro troops as it was among the white troops.

I ask unanimous consent that this table of crimes per hundred thousand of enlisted men in the Army, by races,

for the year 1945, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rates per 100,000 enlisted men in the Army, by race (white and colored) and principal offense, of general prisoners in confinement at rehabilitation centers, disciplinary barracks, and Federal institutions during the year 1945

	Commitment rate [1]	
	Per 100,000 white	Per 100,000 Negro
A. w. o. l.	113	118
Desertion	75	105
Other military offenses	41	181
Civil offenses	78	229
Murder	—	9
Rape	—	13
Assault with intent to rape	2	10
Robbery	3	11
Assault with intent to rob	—	—
Manslaughter	2	12
Assault	7	69
Sodomy	2	5
Assault with intent to commit sodomy	—	—
Burglary, housebreaking	3	11
Larceny	29	38
Receiving stolen goods	—	—
Frauds against Government	6	13
Embezzlement	2	2
Forgery	10	8
Other offenses	11	28

[1] Rates based on an estimated enlisted personnel strength as of Dec. 31, 1944 of 6,353,807 white (89.14 percent) and 661,469 Negro (9.28 percent).

A rate of less than 1 person per 100,000 is indicated by "—".

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I also wish to have inserted in the RECORD a brief comment taken from a statistical study of 24,000 military prisoners made by a consultant to the Under Secretary of War in 1946.

Because of the lateness of the hour, I shall not read it, but any person who really wishes to do justice to all parties, even if they happen to be members of the majority race, in the matter of assignment units, should certainly read it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Race: The relative proportion of general prisoners representing minority groups was considerably higher among general prisoners than in the Army as a whole. The distribution by race for soldiers in the Army as a whole was approximately 89 percent white as compared with 9 percent Negro (a ratio of 10 to 1), and 1.5 percent for those of other races. This distribution closely corresponds to that of population figures for the United States. Among the 24,327 general prisoners studied, white prisoners constituted 80.6 percent of all commitments as compared with 17.3 percent Negro (ratio of nearly 5 to 1), and 2.1 percent of other races. In the cases covered by the study the commitment rates were 307 per 100,000 whites, 633 per 100,000 Negroes, 457 per 100,000 of other races, and 341 per 100,000 of all races. With respect to military offenses, it should be pointed out that proportionately more Negroes than whites come from environmental situations which greatly vary from experiences and relationships in the military environment, and that the Negro soldier will therefore find greater difficulty in making adjustments to the new conditions of the Army experience.

5. Bureau of the Census figures for male felony commitments during 1940 show 70.1 percent white, 29.1 percent Negro, and 0.9 percent other races.

6. Based on Bureau of the Census figures for male felony commitments during 1940 between the ages of 18 and 44, the ratio of white to Negro commitments was nearly 4 to 1, and the ratio of other races to white was about 3 to 1.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, be it said to the credit of the Negro serviceman that the ratio of crime among Negro troops, even though it is exceedingly high as compared with crimes among white troops, is somewhat lower than the ratio of crimes between the races in civil life in cities outside the South.

I have had a table prepared, taken from the Uniform Crime Reports made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of all crimes committed in the year 1947, broken down by races. I ask unanimous consent that the table from the reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statistics of arrests for the white and Negro races for selected offenses, 1946 and 1947 [1]

Offenses charged	Total white and Negro offenses	White offenses			Negro offenses			Number of times Negro rate is greater than white
		Total	Percent of white population	Rate per 1,000 white population	Total	Percent of Negro population [2]	Rate per 1,000 Negro population	
1947 total, all offenses [3]	724,476	536,695	0.422	4.22	187,781	1.316	13.16	3.12
Criminal homicide	6,514	3,555	.003	.03	2,959	.021	.21	7.00
Robbery	21,321	12,806	.010	.10	8,515	.060	.60	6.00
Assault	57,622	31,863	.025	.25	25,759	.181	1.81	7.24
Burglary—breaking or entering	37,867	26,415	.021	.21	11,452	.080	.80	3.81
Larceny	63,707	42,812	.034	.34	20,895	.146	1.46	4.29
Arson	1,023	782	.001	.01	241	.002	.02	2.00
Rape	9,648	6,731	.005	.05	2,917	.020	.20	4.00
Prostitution and commercialized vice	9,568	6,108	.005	.05	3,460	.024	.24	4.80
Disorderly conduct	50,244	36,015	.028	.28	14,229	.100	1.00	3.57
Drunkenness	170,869	143,350	.113	1.13	27,519	.193	1.93	1.71
Vagrancy	42,752	32,534	.026	.26	10,218	.072	.72	2.77
Gambling	15,809	8,087	.006	.06	7,722	.054	.54	9.00
1946 total, all offenses [1]	637,383	478,211	.382	3.82	159,172	1.140	11.40	2.98
Criminal homicide	6,430	3,559	.003	.03	2,871	.021	.21	7.00
Robbery	18,821	11,503	.009	.09	7,318	.052	.52	5.78
Assault	50,835	29,173	.023	.23	21,662	.155	1.55	6.74
Burglary—breaking or entering	34,732	24,936	.020	.20	9,796	.070	.70	3.50
Larceny	56,293	38,431	.031	.31	17,862	.128	1.28	4.13
Arson	696	533	.0004	.004	163	.001	.01	2.50
Rape	8,200	5,887	.005	.05	2,313	.017	.17	3.40
Prostitution and commercialized vice	10,120	6,401	.005	.05	3,719	.027	.27	5.40
Disorderly conduct	43,854	32,118	.026	.26	11,736	.084	.84	3.23
Drunkenness	147,596	126,147	.101	1.01	21,449	.154	1.54	1.52
Vagrancy	36,384	28,187	.023	.23	8,197	.059	.59	2.57
Gambling	12,662	6,017	.005	.05	6,645	.048	.48	9.60

[1] Population figures are estimates by the Bureau of the Census, July 1, 1946, and April 1947.

[2] No estimate has been made of Negro population since 1940 census. Figures used for Negro population are computed on basis of constituting 95 percent of total nonwhite population, as indicated by the 1940 census.

[3] Total offenses includes other offenses not shown in the table.

Source: Uniform Crime Reports for the United States and Its Possessions, Annual Bulletin, vol. XVII, No. 2, 1946, p. 124. Same for 1947, vol. XVII, No. 2, p. 122. Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Estimated Population of the United States, by Age, Color, and Sex: 1940 to 1946, Series P-47, No. 3, Apr. 3, 1947. U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 9, Jan. 19, 1948. U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not wish to use all the detailed statistical matter which I have in regard to this issue.

Figures are tiresome things, particularly when they stand by the side of logic and reason and in the way of a position which is determined by a desire to get votes. I do wish to say, however, that my study of this subject has revealed some amazing facts. I have been for many years, and still am, concerned about the very high crime rate among the members of the Negro race in the South. I knew, for example, that Atlanta, Ga., in my home State, had one of the highest murder rates per capita of any city of the United States. Approximately 34 percent of the population of the city of Atlanta are Negroes. In 1947, the appalling number of 91 murders were committed in the city of Atlanta. Though the Negro population was one-third of the total, they were responsible for practically 80 percent of the crime. However, in my investigation of the record of crimes committed in other cities I found,

to my amazement, that in such cities as Detroit, St. Louis, and Cincinnati the crime rate per capita among the colored citizens of those cities was much higher than the ratio of crime among the Negroes who live in the South. Too many crimes of violence are committed by Negroes in the southern cities, but I am glad to bear testimony to the fact that statistics clearly show that the southern Negro is much more law abiding and less addicted to crime than are the Negroes living outside the South.

I shall not go into all these tables, but I will illustrate my point from the one compiled on the crimes committed in the city of Detroit, in the State of Michigan. I should like to place it in the RECORD.

It shows, Mr. President, for the year 1947, that although the population of the city of Detroit is 88.6 percent white and only 11.4 percent colored, there were 21 murders committed by whites, who compose 88.6 percent of the population of that city, and 55 were committed by colored persons, who compose 11.4 percent of the population. The crime of murder was 20.4 percent greater among the colored population per thousand in the city of Detroit than among the white population.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this table may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Detroit

[Population: White, 1,580,800 (88.6 percent); colored, 204,200 (11.4 percent)]

	1946		1947		1946					1947				
					White		Colored			White		Colored		
	White	Colored	White	Colored	Percent	Per 1,000	Percent	Per 1,000	×	Percent	Per 1,000	Percent	Per 1,000	×
Murder	22	49	21	55	0.0013	0.0139	0.0240	0.2399	17.26	0.0013	0.0132	0.0269	0.2693	20.40
Manslaughter	39	7	22	3	.0024	.0247	.00342	.0342	1.38	.0013	.0139	.0015	.0146	1.05
Larceny	435	537	508	646	.0275	.2752	.2630	2.6297	9.56	.0321	.3213	.3164	3.1635	9.85
Burglary	257	235	305	205	.0163	.1626	.1151	1.1508	7.08	.0193	.1929	.1004	1.0039	5.20
Robbery	184	245	194	217	.0116	.1164	.1200	1.1998	10.31	.0123	.1227	.1063	1.0626	8.66
Rape	47	87	52	81	.0029	.0297	.0426	.4260	14.34	.0033	.0328	.0397	.3966	12.09
Aggravated assault	172	352	186	385	.0108	.1088	.1724	1.7238	15.84	.0118	.1176	.1885	1.8854	16.03
Auto theft	101	43	122	55	.0063	.0639	.0211	.2105	3.29	.0077	.0771	.0269	.2693	3.49

Total crimes: 1946—White, 1,257; colored, 1,555; 1947—White, 1,410; colored 1,647.
Rate per thousand: 1946—White, 0.00079; colored, 0.0076; 1947—White, 0.00089; colored, 0.008.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say in passing that the figures on crime as between the races are not available for the cities of New York and Chicago. Due to political pressure put upon the authorities of those cities, in which large numbers of Negroes reside, the police departments of those municipalities refused to release any figures showing the ratio of crime by races. We can secure only general figures for the Nation submitted by the FBI, and by making a study of the general figures in connection with the definite figures that can be secured from cities, it is very apparent that the Negro political leaders in New York and Chicago, who have intimidated the officials of those cities into suppressing the issuance of a break-down of crime figures, had a very sound reason for doing so.

Mr. President, I wish to say in conclusion that I do not think all the American people clearly understand this amendment. It has been said time and again that it was to compel the segregation of the two races in the armed services. It could only be done by voluntary action of American citizens. I heard one of the most distinguished commentators last night, while opposing this amendment, in explaining it say, "It will compel segregation in the armed services. Well," he said, "it practically compels it because it gives the people the right of choice and if they have that right you will have segregated forces."

Mr. President, what is unfair and what is un-American about that? If 90 percent of the people of this Nation who are white wish to express preference as individuals to serve with members of their own kind they should have the right to do so and they are taking away nothing from the 10 percent in this country who are nonwhites. The minority has the same right granted to whites.

Mr. President, I am not ashamed of my race. I am proud I am a white man. I care nothing for those who will say that feeling evidences a Hitlerian concept, because I know it does not. I would be ashamed to impose upon any other man because of his race. Every American citizen is entitled to fair treatment. I do resent any effort to deprive a member of the white race of a fundamental right that does not injure those of other races.

I would, Mr. President, that all minority groups had the same pride of race the Chinese have. One may go to the humblest peasant on a farm in China, living in utter poverty, and it will be found that he has a great pride of race. He thinks that his culture and his people are superior to those of any white man or of any other race.

Mr. President, I would that I could inspire the members of the Negro race in this Union with the same pride of race that I feel in mine. I would not take away from them their pride of race or any privilege of equality before the law, but I shall not surrender my pride of race on any specious argument that possession of such pride stamps me as being a follower of Adolf Hitler or anyone else.

Mr. President, I am appalled by the thought that pride of race in this country could be so dead that a simple proposition permitting people of my race to assert a voluntary preference to serve with their own kind when they are inducted into the service of the United States against their will, to give 2 years, with small recompense, to their country's colors, could be denied that privilege by a vote of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Florida, but the hour being late, I shall just go along with my remarks. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia and I offered the amendment now pending in the Armed Services Committee, and the amendment was defeated. As I remember, we received only 4 votes, which were made public to the press—the votes of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and myself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has been most cooperative, as have all other Senators, in the debate today, and called his attention to the fact that in 50 minutes we will have been in session 12 hours. We were in session practically 12 hours yesterday. In view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina stated that he would speak for possibly 20 or 25 minutes, and the Senator from Louisiana probably will want 20 or 25 minutes, and the Senator from Arkansas will want some time, I wonder if all the speeches could not be concluded within an hour, and if I might not suggest a unanimous consent agreement for a vote on the amendment tomorrow at 12 o'clock, the Senate to recess tonight to 11 a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there is no objection on my part, but my remarks will be rather brief, and I should prefer to make them before the recess is taken tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not press the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator would prefer to make his remarks tonight.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we may as well go ahead and try to reach a vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Whatever the distinguished Senator suggests is satisfactory to me. I should like to agree with him, but the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself, as the chairman of the committee well knows, proposed this amendment in the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I shall renew the unanimous-consent request at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina, if it will be agreeable at that time.

Mr. MAYBANK. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Florida, I shall not object.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me propose a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote on the Russell-Maybank amendment at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, the Senate to recess tonight until 11 a. m. tomorrow. It seems to me it would not be necessary to divide the time, but agree that a vote be had at 12 o'clock, and that the Senate remain in session tonight at least until the Senator from South Carolina shall conclude his speech.

Mr. MAYBANK. Twenty minutes will be all the time I shall need.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate will remain in session until the Senator concludes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no objection, if the Senator from Georgia does not object.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest that there be added to the request that no substitute for the pending amendment be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to include that no amendment shall be in order unless it is germane.

Mr. GURNEY. That the Senate vote on the Russell-Maybank amendment and any amendment thereto, and that the Senator from South Dakota may be given 3 minutes in order to make a statement before the vote is taken at 12 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me see if I can recapitulate what the request is, with the suggestions which have been made.

I ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken on the Russell-Maybank amendment, which is the pending question, and all amendments thereto, at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, only amendments to be considered which are germane to the subject matter; that the time be divided; that 55 minutes be allotted to the proponents of the amendment, to be controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; and 5 minutes be allotted to the Senator from South Dakota; and that the Senate recess tonight until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the understanding of the Chair that the request includes the taking of a recess tonight at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not include that in the unanimous-consent request, but I give the Senator from South Carolina my word that a recess will not be taken until he shall conclude his remarks tonight.

Mr. MAYBANK. And that no substitute shall be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is included in the suggested unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the Senator say that only 5 minutes would be reserved for opponents of the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and 55 minutes for the proponents, in charge of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I might desire to make some comment in opposition to the amendment, and I should like the reservation of as much as 10 minutes time in case I should desire to speak tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I amend the request then to include in it the proposal that 45 minutes of the time be in charge of the Senator from Georgia and 15 minutes in charge of the Senator from South Dakota, which will take care of the time for the Senator from Florida? Is that satisfactory?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is satisfactory.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I think the distinguished acting majority leader in making the request for unanimous-consent agreement has used the words "submitted" and "substituted." I take it—and I want it to be clearly understood for the RECORD—that he is referring solely to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have 15 minutes tomorrow. Will the Senator change his request so that the vote shall be taken at 12:30 tomorrow?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will have to appeal again to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. It is understood that the Senate will stay in session tonight until the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has concluded his address. That will leave only two Senators who have asked for time. If the Senator from Mississippi would like time certainly the time he requires can be covered in the 45 minutes time under the control of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. EASTLAND. I doubt whether there will be sufficient time left to me in view of the time which, I understand, will be required by the two Senators who have asked for time to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I will modify my unanimous-consent request once again by extending the time until the hour of 12:30, with 1 hour being allotted to the proponents of the amendment and 30 minutes to the opponents of the amendment. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I modify my unanimous request by asking that 1 hour be allotted to the proponents of the amendment, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and 30 minutes to be allotted to the opponents of the amendment, the time to be controlled by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. The other portion of the unanimous-consent request has previously been stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request, as I understand, includes the provision that after I shall have concluded speaking tonight the Senate will recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my purpose to submit another amendment which I shall ask to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska, which includes, as the Chair understands, a determination to vote on the pending amendment at 12:30 o'clock tomorrow, with an hour being given to the proponents and 30 minutes to the opponents.

Mr. WHERRY. The time on behalf of the proponents to be controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the time for the opponents to be controlled by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, June 9, 1948, at the hour of 12:30 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the amendment proposed by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) to Senate bill 2655, the Selective Service Act of 1948, and upon any amendment, if any, that may be proposed to the said amendment: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said amendment shall be received.

Ordered further, That of the intervening time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 12:30 o'clock on said day, 1 hour be allotted to those favoring the amendment, to be controlled by Mr. RUSSELL, and 30 minutes be allotted to those opposed to the amendment, to be controlled by Mr. GURNEY.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President and Members of the Senate. It has been my privilege to serve on the Senate Military Affairs Committee and more recently, the Armed Services Committee. My colleagues on these committees will bear witness to the fact that week in and week out, and session after session, I worked for and supported every measure which was in the interest of national defense. During the critical war years, I devoted most of my time to the work of the Military Affairs and Armed Services Committees and helped secure the necessary legislation to build an Army and Navy capable of crushing the Axis Powers.

During recent months when it became apparent that another totalitarian force was a threat to the peace of the world, I have worked with our Armed Services Committee to strengthen our national defense—to the end that we would not be

again unprepared for any emergency which might confront this Nation.

It grieves me beyond words that the question of segregation has been injected in our national-defense program which should always be above politics.

This is a campaign year and unfortunately, for the good of the country, and for the people of the world, there are some who are so determined to win an election that they will injure the national defense of the Nation in order to curry favor with groups of minority votes in doubtful States.

To protect our armed forces from pressure in high places, and to assure that our national-defense program shall not be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I have offered the so-called Russell-Maybank amendment. My colleague, the Senator from Georgia, has discussed that amendment and it is not necessary for me to repeat the unanswerable presentation he has made.

This matter of segregation—as it exists in the armed services at the present—was admirably revealed in the testimony of General Eisenhower before the Armed Services Committee. This great general declared that nonsegregation would slow the progress and development of colored boys who had been put into mixed units. Their advancement to the grades of sergeant, technical sergeant, and master sergeant, is almost prohibitive in the face of competition from the better-educated, better-trained, and more adaptable white boys of the same organizations.

This is a nation of many races but we must not forget that white people carved it out of the wilderness, white people conceived this Republic, white people fought the War of the Revolution, and in victory they gave to the world the greatest system of free construction of government ever known to mankind.

The decent, self-respecting people of this country, regardless of the section in which they live, are getting more than sick of all this kowtowing to a minority group which holds the balance of power in a few large doubtful States.

Senators, make no mistake about one thing. There is a political awakening taking place in this country. Some may think it is smart politics to placate these pressure minority blocs, but there is a time coming when any President or any Senator or any Representative who attempts to tamper with our national-defense structure, or any other laws, to win political support will be forever repudiated by the right-thinking and fair-minded people of this country.

As mayor of one of the Nation's oldest cities, as Governor of a State which had been one of the original Thirteen Colonies, and as a Senator representing the sovereign people of a sovereign State, no one can point to a single utterance or act of mine as being unfriendly to the Negro race. I have always fought, and will continue to fight, to improve his economic status and to assure him equal justice under the law. But I will resist, and the people of my State will resist, any break-down of our well-established segregation laws and customs which we know are for the benefit of both races.

We do not underestimate the present political power of these groups which are now demanding that our Army and our Navy abandon the ancient policy of segregation in our armed forces.

We realize that this is election year. The situation is bad, but we are going to oppose with every force at our command this cheap, miserable display of political maneuvering to win support from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and other similar organizations which seek to rule this country through the use of their minority block of votes, which votes as just so many sheep. The clean, self-respecting people of this country are going to see to it that a small block of votes under the absolute control of a few professional lobbyists shall not eliminate this Government to the detriment of the majority of the people.

In all seriousness, I ask the Members of the Senate why there is all this agitation for breaking down a segregation policy which has prevailed in our armed services since the Republic was established? Does any Senator seriously contemplate that the mixing up of the white and Negro races in combat units or having them sleep and eat together on our battleships and in our barracks strengthens our national defense?

The wars of this country have been won by white soldiers and I defy any Member of this body to challenge this statement. The Army and Navy have wisely attempted to utilize the Negro soldiers in the positions which they are capable of filling. Certainly there are some Negro soldiers and some Negro units which have demonstrated a certain degree of effectiveness on the battlefield; but by and large, Negro soldiers have rendered their greatest service as cooks, drivers, maintenance men, mechanics, and such positions, for which they are well qualified.

I believe that Negro soldiers should be educated and entitled to a higher level of service in our armed forces. However, racial pride alone should make them want to train and fight with a unit of their own people, and in distinguishing themselves reflect due credit to their race. They should not be content to hitchhike on the accomplishments of white soldiers.

We must not forget that the Negro race is only a few generations removed from slavery. We cannot expect them to distinguish themselves either on the battlefield or in private life to the extent that we expect the white man to distinguish himself. We must encourage, in every way possible, the Negro's attainment of a higher degree of mental stability, but we are not going to help him or his race by thinking this can be accomplished by forcing him into service along with white boys.

Already the Navy, acting under pressure from higher ups, has issued orders to wipe out the policy of segregation on battleships. This same pressure is now at work to abolish segregation in the Army. Unless this policy is reversed, we are going to create a fundamental weakness in our fighting forces.

A vast majority of the white soldiers and the white sailors of this country, especially in the South, will refuse to associate with Negroes in their barracks and mess halls; and, more important, no decent, self-respecting Negro would want to be forced into the company of people who do not want him. Our amendment gives these boys, both white and colored, an opportunity to serve in a segregated unit if they so desire.

Segregation in our armed forces is a sound policy and has proved to be the most effective in every war in which we have been engaged. This issue is one which should not be decided on political expediency; and I pray that it will not be.

We feel that those who are responsible for our national defense should be left absolutely free to administer the policies they think contribute most to effective fighting units, and should not be hamstrung by pressure from any source, whether from the President of the United States or the Congress of the United States.

In the amendment which the Senator from Georgia and I have offered, we have not undertaken to tell the Army or the Navy what it shall do about segregation, but we have determined that if the Federal Government is going into our States and draft our young men, then those young men shall at least have a choice of rejecting service in a nonsegregated unit. This amendment will not only benefit the white individual, but it will benefit the colored individual, because we feel that colored boys, especially those in the South, will prefer to serve in units made up of their own people.

In view of the plans for inductees to be sent to camps in the general vicinity of their homes, this amendment carries added weight. Many of the training camps will be located in the South.

If the Army adopts a policy of forcing our white boys to serve in such mongrelized units, it will stir up such racial strife as can never be overcome in a decade. The progress which has been made up until now will all go for naught. I predict that the Army will be faced with a deluge of courts martial such as has never been seen. I visualize a conscript army of bitter malcontents.

Those who are agitating the breaking down of our segregation laws may think they are playing smart politics, but they are destroying years of effort on our part to improve the economic and educational status of the Negro.

Time will not now permit me to tell the Senate what the South has done, and what it is doing, to make the Negro a more useful citizen. Our economic struggle in the South knows no color line. Since the War Between the States we have been up against economic disadvantages imposed upon us, which have weighed heavily upon both the white and colored people of the South. To some degree we are winning our fight for economic parity with other States, and as we do, the economic level of all of our people will rise. When this is accomplished we shall have new and better

educational facilities for all of our people.

Increased economic and educational advantages are what the Negroes in the South need, and that is what the forward-thinking people of the South are seeking to provide. Yet our efforts are set back constantly by misguided campaigns to abrogate our segregation laws and customs. It is easy to see that the Negro of the South is being made the victim of political by-play aimed at winning the Negro vote in doubtful States.

I appeal to my colleagues not to weaken our national defense program by giving encouragement to this scheme to put a compulsory end to segregation in our armed services. By adopting this amendment we shall give assurance to those who are drafted of some selection in the units in which they serve.

Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. If the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina becomes law, what effect will it have on the 50,000 foreign soldiers who are supposed to be taken care of under the Lodge amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that the Lodge amendment was never brought before the committee, and never discussed before the committee. I voted against it, as did the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I voted against it.

Mr. MAYBANK. That amendment was not contemplated when we drafted our amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Lodge amendment has already been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina has not yet been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct; but the amendment was considered and discussed by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Lodge amendment has been accepted by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is to prevent the Army of the United States from accepting those 25,000 soldiers and making them subject to the provisions of the amendment which the Senator has in mind, the one which was offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for himself and the Senator from South Carolina? What would be done with the 25,000 foreign soldiers?

Mr. MAYBANK. Frankly, the committee did not discuss that amendment in any detail. When we drew our amendment, that amendment was not in the bill. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] tried for some time to obtain the floor earlier today so that we could present our amendment; but it was not possible to do so. We tried yesterday. The amendment presented by the Senator from Massachusetts earlier in the day followed the drafting of our amendment and its consideration by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am seeking information. Suppose we get in the Army 10,000 Senegalese Negroes; French Negroes.

Mr. MAYBANK. This amendment applies only to those who are drafted. I do not presume that any Poles or Italians will be drafted. They will be volunteers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They will be volunteers.

Mr. MAYBANK. This amendment does not apply to volunteers. Our amendment applies only to the draft or selective service provisions. It does not apply to those affected by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like some assurance as to the sincerity of purpose of those who voted for the Lodge amendment. I should like to know whether or not they really meant it.

Mr. MAYBANK. That amendment applies entirely to a foreign group, not subject to the draft.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course it applies to a foreign group.

Mr. MAYBANK. It would have no effect on our amendment, which applies to those drafted by law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina affects only those who are drafted; but so far as segregation is concerned, it would affect those who volunteer as well as those who are drafted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, those affected by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts are not Americans. They would be segregated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that tomorrow, after the Senate convenes, it will carry out the unanimous-consent order, of course, to vote upon the Russell-Maybank amendment at 12:30.

After that amendment has been disposed of, there will be an amendment by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and an amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. Of course I am not stating the amendments in the order in which they will be considered.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the acting majority leader that I would rather not have him state the order in which the amendments will be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not doing so, of course.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure we can work out that matter during the day.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not mean that the amendments will be brought up in the order in which I am referring to them now. But I wish the Senate to know that in addition to the amendments I have already mentioned, there are also on file amendments by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I am not sure how long the consideration of those amendments will take.

However, I wish the Members of the Senate to know that it is our intention to conclude the action on all amendments to the bill and on the bill itself tomorrow or tomorrow night, even if we have to run quite late at night, and that may mean later than 10:30 p. m., if necessary. I think Senators have been most cooperative; but by tomorrow night we should get this bill out of the way. So I sincerely trust that all Senators will come prepared tomorrow to have the Senate vote finally on all amendments to the bill and on the bill itself.

RECORD OF RADIO STATION KLZ, OF DENVER, IN COMBATING HEART DISEASE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like at this time to invite the attention of Members of this body and have made a permanent part of the RECORD the work of a particular radio station in Colorado, KLZ, of Denver, for its job in combating the Nation's No. 1 killer, heart disease.

At a time when public information is needed on this subject as never before, KLZ, in discharging its public-service responsibility, sought the aid of the Colorado State Medical Society in providing its listeners an authoritative, interesting, and highly important series of broadcasts entitled "Knave of Hearts," dealing with diseases of the heart.

I am happy to say that on May 2 the plan reached its fruition with the first of these programs. KLZ's manager, Hugh B. Terry, and Dr. John S. Bouslog, highly respected president of the Colorado State Medical Society, worked out a detailed plan to bring knowledge of the heart and its diseases to every listener in the Rocky Mountain area. KLZ's staff prepared dramatic and accurate scripts. A three-man committee of heart specialists, appointed by Dr. Bouslog, checked each program for accuracy. Then, to assure complete public confidence, a doctor appears on every one of these vital Sunday night programs.

To make its contribution to the public all the greater, radio station KLZ not only provided valuable station time, writers, actors, and producers, but also spent considerable sums of money in many forms of paid advertising to call attention to this heart series and to insure its reaching the largest possible audience. Newspaper advertisements, a personalized letter to 1,250 business and civic leaders, transcribed announcements by prominent citizens, such as Colorado's chief executive, Gov. W. Lee Knous, transit and bus cards, outdoor billboards, motion-picture trailers, and many more—all were utilized to make the program more effective.

A luncheon was held for the State's Parent-Teacher Association and educational leaders at which time the complete plan for the series was laid before members of this group. The women who rear our children have now rallied round with their support, since they know all too well, for example, the danger of rheumatic fever, a phase of heart disease that

has become the number one crippler of children.

Dr. Bouslog and his group considered the series so significant that a letter was sent to every doctor in the region enlisting his cooperation. As Dr. Bouslog said in his letter:

This series is undoubtedly the finest production of this kind ever produced in cooperation with a State medical society.

The daily press, the weekly press, and the national industry press of radio itself, have singled out the series as a milestone of public consciousness and social responsibility.

Cognizant of the part a free press and radio must play in placing vital information before our people, I heartily endorse this display of civic awareness on the part of KLZ, Denver.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Dr. Bouslog, President of the Colorado State Medical Society, together with the letter from Mr. Hugh B. Terry, Manager of the KLZ Broadcasting Co., printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Denver, Colo., April 26, 1948.

DEAR DOCTOR: As doctors you and I are well aware of the toll taken by diseases of the heart and of the broad public interest in such illnesses. There is a real need for much more public education as well as for medical science to make every effort to reduce the ravages of diseases of the heart.

The Colorado State Medical Society is attempting to do something about better education of the public. Radio station KLZ of Denver in cooperation with our society is beginning a new series of Sunday night programs starting May 2 at 10:15 p. m. It is a dramatic health documentary entitled "Knave of Hearts," a 15-minute program designed for adults and dramatizing in an interesting and intelligent manner the causes of heart diseases and what can be done about them. The first two or three programs will be about rheumatic fever, which lends itself to dramatic treatment. All of the major heart diseases, however, will be covered.

Station KLZ and its entire staff is going "all out" on this series. The station has assigned seven actors, writers, and announcers. We are supplying the information and KLZ is doing the writing, production, and the broadcasting. A special State society committee is checking each script. KLZ has assigned this hour because it follows a popular newscast and also because it was desired to reach adults, not children, since the latter might not understand certain programs, especially those on rheumatic fever.

Knave of Hearts has our official backing. We assure you it merits your interest and support. Urge your patients to listen. Urge mothers and fathers to listen. Do all you can to call attention to this excellent heart series every Sunday evening at 10: 15 beginning May 2. It is undoubtedly the finest production of this kind ever produced in cooperation with a State medical society.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. BOUSLOG,
President, Colorado State Medical Society.

KLZ BROADCASTING CO.,
Denver, Colo., April 24, 1948.

The Honorable QUIGG NEWTON,
Mayor of the City of Denver,
Denver, Colo.

MY DEAR MAYOR NEWTON: I'm writing you about "murder."

Not murder in the sense of gangsterism or wanton killing, but the kind of murder that takes place whenever a vicious evil goes unchecked. This evil is heart disease—the Nation's No. 1 killer.

Serious? Take rheumatic fever for example. Forty thousand veterans of World War II are victims of it. Ninety percent of all heart disease in children is traceable to it. It's a disease that causes five times as many deaths as infantile paralysis, polio, scarlet fever, measles, spinal meningitis, diphtheria, and whooping cough combined.

Heart disease is so serious that the Colorado State Medical Society in cooperation with KLZ is presenting Knave of Hearts, a series of locally produced dramatic programs that will point out the major causes of diseases of the heart and how they can be recognized and prevented.

I hope you, your family, and your friends will listen to these vital programs. Tune in KLZ Sunday night, May 2, at 10:15, and every Sunday night thereafter. Your children's future, your own future is tied up with the heart—right where you live.

Very truly yours,

HUGH B. TERRY, *Manager.*

THE FLOOD IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a newspaper article, a letter, and various telegrams which I have received in regard to the flood in the Northwest. Tomorrow I shall speak at some length on the problem in that section of the country, because these communications make perfectly clear the importance of our taking early action in regard to the catastrophe which has afflicted some 30,000 persons in my section of the United States.

There being no objection, the article, letter, and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 6, 1948]

NATION LACKS A POLICY ON CONTROL OF FLOODS—TRAGEDY IN THE NORTHWEST SHOWS NEED FOR NEW APPROACH BY CONGRESS

(By Samuel A. Tower)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Devastating floods in the Columbia River Basin of the Pacific Northwest spurred congressional action this week on flood control.

President Truman asked Congress to provide $600,000 for emergency flood assistance for the inundated communities of the Northwest. Action was under way in the House to append the sum to a deficiency appropriation measure. There was every assurance that Congress would provide the supplemental funds for the worst flood on the Columbia River in the last 50 years.

At the same time, there was going on this week a series of conferences between Senators and Representatives over conflicting appropriations to be provided the Army engineers for flood-control work in the next fiscal year.

SENATE APPROPRIATION HIGHER

The Senate, over the protests of a Republican bloc that sought a $200,000,000 reduction, approved roughly $708,500,000, or about $102,000,000 more than was voted by the House. Even the Senate sum, however, was $29,000,000 less than the President in his budget had recommended as a rock-bottom figure.

While Congress was considering legislation, men in the Columbia River Basin were straining against new rains and floods, reinforcing levees and fills to combat the still rising river and the threat of still greater inundations.

Not all, but much of the funds carried in the War Department's civil-functions appropriation bill was for flood control. One or more projects, big or little, were listed for almost all of the 48 States, though the major target of flood defense was in the Mississippi Valley.

SECTIONAL APPROACH

While many of the appropriations carried forward long-range bulwarks against the devastation of floods, in a program of years—and there is a broad recognition on Capitol Hill that flood-control projects are essential to the national welfare—Congress has never been disposed to view the problem from overall policy and has consistently displayed a tendency to regard it with a parochial and sectional outlook.

In giving emphasis to the Mississippi River Basin, Congress followed President Truman's plea of a year ago. Its outlays, however, have been below the Presidential conception of a vast long-range program to cope with the tragic, recurrent blows to the national economy, a problem of prime importance in our national life, according to the Chief Executive.

On the other hand, a number of members have maintained that Congress has at no time before displayed such generosity with funds for flood control, with construction allocations marked by a huge increase over prewar levels.

Over and above flood control, however, Mr. Truman has urged on Congress consideration of such projects in terms of conservation of natural resources, branding as false economy feeble or inadequate measures while precious assets waste away.

The President hammered away at his belief in the desirability of regional authorities, similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority, which could combine with defense against floods such things as irrigation, hydroelectric power development and other water utilization projects that could build up and coordinate the resources of an area.

The TVA has demonstrated conclusively on a number of occasions that it could control floods and simultaneously produce beneficial power. Envisioned by the President was a Missouri Valley Authority or a Columbia Valley Authority. Only by such steps, it is argued, can a coordinated attack be made against the erosion and recurring devastation and death that come year after year.

In Congress, however, the concept of an MVA or other authorities has been dead as a dodo. The opposition has many reasons, including economy, ineffectiveness, bureaucracy, and regimentation by the Government. Furthermore, the present Congress has shown a disposition to chop away at the Tennessee Valley Authority.

OREGON STATE COUNCIL,
AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Portland, Oreg., June 2, 1948.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Portland Housing Authority this morning began consideration of various sites for 5,000 minimal family units (trailers, etc.) for immediate stop-gap relief of the victims of the Vanport disaster. We think this figure may be too low. There are about 19,000 homeless from Vanport alone and several thousand from adjacent areas. The total of homeless for this section of the Columbia Valley is reputed to be 65,000.

It was brought out during the meeting that the Authority has not yet begun to consider any permanent housing program, but may set up a committee next week to do so. Obviously there is danger, in this approach, that possible permanent sites may be blocked out by temporary construction.

When questioned as to their thinking on the subject of permanent housing relief, members of the Authority emitted some vague remarks about the possibility that

some of the victims might go home, and this may modify the need for a permanent program.

Regardless of the Portland Housing Authority's views of the matter, the residents of Vanport, the majority of whom are veterans of the last war, are citizens and constituents of this district and they are entitled to be treated as such. It is our feeling that the views of local real-estate interests are shared to a very great extent by the Portland Housing Authority, and this identity of viewpoint may result in policies reflecting great discredit upon the people of Portland and Oregon.

We ask therefore that you give close attention to this situation in the future. A number of organizations are setting up coordinating committees to maintain pressure on the Housing Authority, and AVC is working closely with the City Club, the League of Women Voters, the Urban League, and others toward that end. We will try to keep you supplied with accurate and reliable information as the situation develops.

Any help you can give us in securing a square deal for the veterans and other residents of Vanport will be greatly appreciated not only by us but by the vast majority of the people of the State.

Sincerely,

KENNETH KRAEMER,
Chairman, Portland Area Council,
American Veterans Committee.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 5, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

The League of Women Voters tonight called together a group of about 100 Portland citizens representing over 30 civic and professional groups whose members are determined to help find a decent and intelligent solution to the long-standing housing shortage now rendered disastrous by the Vanport tragedy. This group is on record against permanent reliance on temporary housing. After 4 years we want no more. The westward migration is permanent therefore the problem is permanent therefore we must have a permanent solution. We believe temporary stop-gap relief program is proceeding well as could be expected. Our major concern is with prompt establishment of permanent, low-cost housing designed for low-income groups available in 6 to 8 months and with buildings designed to last at least 25 years. No other approach can solve problem. Population experts predict problem will grow worse not better in next several years. The refugees are not going home. They are here to stay. We want to know whether legislation for permanent, low-cost housing is being prepared. If not we want you to prepare such legislation at once. Program should stress multiple rental units of good but inexpensive construction and lowest possible rents. If subsidy necessary it should go to tenant not to contractor or speculator. If such legislation or any similar legislation has been prepared we want a copy immediately by wire. If such legislation is prepared in future we want to be informed on all technical details. Further, we want to be kept continually informed of all developments relating to a permanent, low-cost housing policy or lack of such policy in this area. Toward this end we ask that you give this matter your closest attention until such time as a definite policy shall have been adopted and executed. Please forward all current information at once by wire.

HOWARD MORGAN,
Chairman, Special Housing Committee
of Portland Civic Groups.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 7, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Portland Federation of Women's Organizations urge immediate appropriation of $50,000,000 to meet emergency need for more permanent type housing in Multnomah County.

MRS. DOROTHY SANFORD WILSON,
President.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 4, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Supplementing our request for immediate stopgap housing it is recommended that Congress appropriate $50,000,000 for permanent housing for Portland flood disaster victims. Recommend this be made available to Public Housing Administration be disbursed to local bodies in loans and grants as may be necessary to enable flood victims to purchase or rent dwellings within their financial abilities. Also recommend appropriation of $5,000,000 to rehabilitate and reimburse flood victims for financial losses.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
HERBERT J. DAHLKE, *Chairman.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 4, 1948.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have contacted Field of FWA. He is leaving Portland Sunday and will contact you immediately upon return to Washington either Sunday night or first thing Monday morning. He will appear before Oregon delegation sometime Monday morning and return with Fleming to Portland Tuesday. We are all very much impressed with his findings and I feel sure that he has all the answers to the information you requested such as the number of dwellings needed, the damage etc., and more especially the question as to what legislation is required. I am in entire agreement with Field that the legislative program must be wrapped up in one bill. He will discuss this with you in detail. Tom Humphrey also contacted Field and he has I believe a complete picture of what is needed and I am sure that you will not go wrong in following his recommendations in which we all concur. Should you need additional information after talking with Field Monday wire or phone me and I will secure it for you.

PORTLAND LABOR MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE,
LEE STOLL, *Chairman.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 4, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C:

Sixty-five thousand persons estimated displaced in lower Columbia River flood area. Five thousand three hundred families involving approximately 18,500 people displaced in Vanport housing project flood. Sunday night, May 30, all Vanport evacuees mass sheltered in churches, schools, and community buildings. Many families taken into private homes. These people can exist in mass shelters and live with strangers for only a few days. Federal, State, and local authorities all agreed on three phases of housing flood victims. One. Emergency mass shelters. Two. Temporary emergency stopgap housing for from 3 to 7 months until permanent housing can be supplied. Three. Permanent long-range housing program. Emergency mass shelter problem no longer exists. Immediate problem is temporary emergency stopgap housing. Of 5,300 displaced Vanport families, 45 have been housed at University Homes housing project; 350 at Guilds Lake housing project, and 90 more in Guilds Lake when waters recede sufficiently to open sewers. It is estimated 700 more families can be absorbed in present private housing facilities in Portland or will leave the community temporarily. From housing realty board and city's experience only few families will leave community permanently. This leaves balance of 3,800 temporary emergency stopgap housing to be provided immediately. River estimated to require 30 days or more to recede sufficiently to allow persons to reenter their flooded houses still standing in other areas and another 30 to 60 days before they have sufficiently dried out to allow repairs and redecorating to make habitables. Many of these families will seek stopgap housing in Portland. Representative cross-section committee has determined 5,000 temporary emergency stopgap houses necessary, of which 1,200 have been or will be accounted for in other projects or private housing. Of 3,800 additional stopgap houses needed only have available 440 trailers in varying conditions of disrepair, belonging to PHA, FWA, or WAA. Portland housing authority has taken over 10 Swan Island barracks buildings suitable for hotel-type accommodation of 320 to 400 families. Will begin placing families from mass shelters in Swan Island June 5. When water recedes sufficiently that Portland Airport no longer endangered. Fifty to eighty two-story barracks buildings available for conversion into accommodations for 200 to 320 families as stopgap housing. When such stopgap housing is available Swan Island will be used as replacement center from mass shelters to stopgap housing. Have requested trailers be shipped immediately. Twelve quonset huts to accommodate two families each are on way. Federal, State, and local authorities agree trailers most satisfactory for stopgap housing because more could be realized on resale or could be moved to other locations where temporary or emergency housing may become necessary. PHA has requested Nation-wide survey of trailers available together with cost. Sufficient sites on land owned by Federal Government, city, county, and school districts in and on outskirts of Portland and in Vancouver, Wash., with sewers, water, and electricity immediately available to set up trailers. Must have money to purchase and install stop-gap housing and provide toilets, wash rooms, and laundry rooms. Ten million dollars should be made available through appropriations or net revenues from federally operated housing projects throughout Nation to public housing administration region one to provide temporary emergency stopgap housing. Fifty million dollars should be made immediately available for permanent housing for Portland flood disaster victims. Highest water this area has been Colon, Columbia, 30.2 feet. Willamette, 29.95 feet. Water has receded slightly. New freshet with higher flood crest now beginning. Predicted States: Willamette as follows: June 5, 29.1 feet, June 6, 29.2 feet, June 7, 30 feet, June 8, 30.5 feet. Columbia June 5, 29.4 feet; June 6, 29.5 feet; June 7, 30.3 feet; June 8, 30.8 feet. Dike situation in Columbia critical. Every effort being made to prevent additional breaks.

LESTER W. HUMPHREYS,
Attorney for Housing Authority
of Portland, Oreg.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 5, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Additional facts. Cost repairing Government trailers $200 to $500 each; cost new trailers $2,000 to $2,500 each. Cost installation water, sewerage, bath, and laundry facilities for trailers, $200 per trailer. Cost building temporary houses $4,000 to $4,500 each; temporary house cost more; salvage not so great in proportion to salvage for trailers. Survey PHA shows 5,000 to 7,000 trailers available on west coast for immediate purchase; trailers can be made ready for occupancy immediately, houses take 2 to 3 months to erect. No difficulty in obtaining land for trailers. Complications obtaining land for houses.

Greater difficulty in getting temporary houses removed which may if left create slum, shack, or substandard housing later.

LESTER W. HUMPHREYS,
Attorney, Housing Authority of Oregon.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. CORDON (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BALL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REED, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THYE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. YOUNG) introduced Senate bill 2831, to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears at the end of Mr. LANGER's speech.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2832. A bill to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2833. A bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to increase the security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. REVERCOMB) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAYBANK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2655, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1558) thereon.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to the consideraiton of various executive matters, including the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

William L. Alison, to be postmaster at Minter, Ala.; and

Loyd C. Olive, to be postmaster at Bartow, Fla.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Herbert A. Bergson, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Tracy S. Voorhees, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army; and

Lt. Gen. Lewis Hyde Brereton, and sundry other officers for appointment in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, as in executive session.

MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of NOBLE J. JOHNSON, of Indiana, to be associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Lynch, of Ohio, to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Austin J. Mahoney to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are various nominations of the military which we should like to have considered and confirmed tonight, and I shall ask the Senator from South Dakota to present them.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there are numerous nominations in the armed forces. Approximately three-quarters of them are in the Navy and possibly one-fourth of them are in the Army or the Air Force. These are largely junior nominations, although small numbers of them are nominations to the rank of lieutenant colonel or possibly the rank of colonel. All the nominations are routine, in accordance with the promotion bill.

I am informed by the executive clerk that it would cost approximately $450 to have this large number of nominations and promotions printed on the Executive Calendar, and would cost approximately $1,300 to reprint the 26 pages in the RECORD.

Therefore, I have the authority of the committee to ask that the nominations be presented as approved unanimously by the committee, and to ask for their immediate consideration and confirmation, without having them placed on the calendar and lie over one day. I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in this case I shall not object to the immediate consideration of the nominations, in view of the nature of the nominations and the fact that they are for the military establishment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as is our custom, we do not ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of nominations of general officers.

Therefore, I ask that the promotions and the nominations of general officers listed in Executive Report No. 314 and also the nomination of Tracy S. Voorhees, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, as listed in Executive Report No. 312, be offered for the calendar and appear on the Executive Calendar tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the request, the nominations of general officers and the nomination of the Assistant Secretary of the Army will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Is there objection to the request for present consideration of the nominations of officers other than those just mentioned? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate is now in legislative session, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the Senate is in legislative session.

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of June 1, 1948):

MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Andrew McCaughrin Hood to be an associate judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

NOBLE J. JOHNSON to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Skelly Wright to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Thomas J. Lynch to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Austin J. Mahoney to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Col. James Lendsey McKinnon et al., to be colonels in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, were confirmed today, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, June 3, 1948, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 7042 with the name of Col. James Lendsey McKinnon, and ending on page 7043 with the name of Brig. Gen. Paul Frailey Yount.

The nominations of Col. Leon Jacob Livingston et al., to be lieutenant colonels in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, were confirmed today, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, June 3, 1948, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 7043 with the name of Col. Leon Jacob Livingston, and ending on page 7060, with the name of Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John James Wood.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE AND CORPS SPECIFIED, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 AND TITLE II OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 365, 80TH CONG.)

To be lieutenant colonel

Howard W. K. Zellhoefer, MC, O233474.

To be majors

Charles T. Brown, MC, O301813.
Paul V. Davis, MC, O1685365.
Horace W. Doty, Jr., MC, O212407.
William W. Franklin, DC, O272330.
Vance H. Marchbanks, Jr., MC, O379380.
Harry Spitz, MC, O209984.
James C. Vanneter, MC, O247042.

To be captains

Jesse F. Brown, MC, O1747307.
Roy E. Clausen, Jr., MC, O1786358.
Oscar K. Diamond, MC, O402602.
George J. Hayes, MC, O1725182.
John J. Kavanagh, MC, O542867.
Julien C. Kennedy, MC, O392610.
James W. Lassiter, MC, O469672.
Charles S. Lueth, MC, O1725172.
Richard L. Martin, MC, O1747313.
Melvin T. Pennell, MC, O414939.
Earl S. Smith, DC, O1775014.
William C. Strong, DC, O1746019.
Henry Thompson, Jr., MC, O539345.
Norman A. Twigger, MC, O1725493.

To be first lieutenants

Charles F. Althaus, MC, O936899.
Francis E. Barry, MC, O1705683.
John R. Black, MC, O1786936.
Ralph W. Clemments, MC, O1718624.
Millard E. DeYoung, DC, O1756583.
Charles C. Dugan, MC, O490998.
Cloyce L. Duncan, MC, O935981.
William F. Enos, Jr., MC, O1705088.
James D. Green, MC, O1756385.
Harry M. Henderson, Jr., MC, O1776460.
Frank F. Marsh, MC, O1714764.
Marion E. McDowell, MC, O1765012.
William A. Moore, MC, O1786509.
Thomas M. O'Grady, MC, O1717760.
Edmond Scavone, MC, O1725570.
Martin J. Schumacher, MC, O1755987.
David G. Simons, MC, O1726132.
Harry F. Sproat, MC, O935706.
Richard J. Sullivan, DC, O1746777.
Clarence G. Sutherland, MC, O1735210.
George C. Walter, MC, O1786575.
Gordon T. Wannamaker, MC, O1736519.
William H. Westbrook, MC, O1776236.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Regular Army

Lonnie E. Harrington, Jr.	Wilmer C. Marvin
Walter N. Higgins	Graham A. Penniman, Jr.
John W. Hodnett, Jr.	Lynn L. Pesson
John C. Littlejohn	Walter Redd
Albert L. Loth, Jr.	Robert P. Reder
James W. Mann	Jack R. Sadler
Robert W. Martin	John R. Tilden

IN THE AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Regular Air Force

Stanley W. Ahrends	Thomas J. Mathews
James M. Burdette, Jr.	Robert F. Saydah
George W. Mathews, Jr.	Ofus L. Slayton, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following five groups of appointments in the Navy, which were received by the Senate on Thursday, June 3, 1948, and which were confirmed today, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, June 3, 1948, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on the pages indicated:

The nominations of Aaron G. Alexander et al., beginning on page 7060 with the name of Aaron G. Alexander;

The nominations of Samuel J. Abel et al., beginning on page 7061;

The nominations of George W. Absher, Jr., et al, beginning on page 7064;

The nominations of Kenneth Adams et al., beginning on page 7066; and

The nominations of Raymond B. Corob et al., beginning on page 7067.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Stuart M. Cohen	John B. Garrett, Jr.
Morris N. Jenkins	John F. Merritt
Donald A. McCartin	Edward E. Smith
Frederic L. McGiffin	Roy M. DuCharm
Frank G. Peterson	Lyle H. Worster

The following-named permanent warrant officers, now serving in temporary commissioned ranks, to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenants:

Reuben C. Collins
Charles B. Hirsch
Richard S. Hooker

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Austin R. Brunelli	Edward H. Forney
Richard C. Mangrum	Samuel G. Taxis
Wayne H. Adams	Harry G. Fortune
John H. Cook, Jr.	Walter T. Short

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Wade M. Jackson	William M. Gilliam
Frank J. Ervin	Hector R. Migneault

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Harry A. Waldorf
Nicholas A. Sisak
John W. Stevens II

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Frank R. Wilkinson, Jr.	James C. Short
	Howard M. Lee
Irving B. Hayes	Jules M. Rouse
Leslie A. Gilson, Jr.	Fritz Stampfli
Paul M. Smith	George J. Brookes, Jr.
Whitman S. Bartley	Robert E. Johnson
Bruce E. Keith	Gordon L. Allen
Robert S. Anderson	

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Wallace D. Blatt	Louis R. Daze
Carl E. Schmidt	John Finn, Jr.
Baxter R. Little	Donald S. Hopkins
Orlan R. Lodge	John R. Hyneman
George J. Edelmann, Jr.	John C. Shoden
	Richard B. Smith

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Donald E. Holben	Jack H. Butler
James E. Condra	Robert D. Winn
James M. Hayes	Donald E. Morin
Patrick J. Hagarty	

The following-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Roy L. Parker

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Father, unto this waiting assembly do Thou manifest to each Member and officer such knowledge and wisdom that will guide the present-day life of our country. If any be conscious of undue burden or care which cannot be well endured, O reveal unto him Thy guiding presence. Forgive every empty resolution and wasted opportunity and keep us mindful of our own omissions that we may be patient with the follies of others.

We pray for those conditions out of which come spiritual discipline and understanding that is beyond the analysis of man. Bless our whole land, that our homes may become nurseries of virtue and affection in which we find strength

to be brave in the hour of adversity. O Master, touch our hearts and minds and lead us in the way everlasting. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 253):

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

June 7 (legislative day, June 1), 1948.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. THOMAS L. OWENS, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BROOKS were appointed members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADVICE TO BATTERY COMMANDER FROM LEAD DRIVER

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, at Grand Island, Nebr., President Truman on his political or nonpolitical trip, as you will, was presented a pair of silver spurs which he promised to use on Congress.

In World War I, President Truman was an officer in a horse-drawn artillery regiment. I was a private, first class, in that same regiment—a driver of a lead pair. Captain Truman, One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Field Artillery, knew what President Truman, U. S. A., should not forget.

A lightly, judicially applied spur to a horse—lead, swing, or wheel—may be a good thing. But when the horse is "gigged" too sharply it can become a bucking, kicking, biting, stamping package of viciousness, capable of unseating its rider.

May a former lead driver respectfully advise the former battery commander to use those spurs lightly and judiciously?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I am informed by the Public Printer that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the Washington Star on the Mundt-Nixon bill.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial and a resolution.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by George S. Benson, president, Harding College, in reference to aid for education.

STANDARD OF LIFE

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, we will not make much real progress until we again put the standard of life ahead of the standard of living.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO WIDOWS AND OTHER DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 647, Rept. No. 2232), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3748) to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment, and no amendment shall be in order to the said bill. At the conclusion of general debate, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INCREASES OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 648, Rept. No. 2233), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5588), to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment, and no amendment shall be in order to the said bill. At the conclusion of general debate, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE PRESIDENT'S NONPOLITICAL TOUR

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it must have been humiliating, yet quite understandable, why the President had 8,000 empty seats before him in the auditorium at Omaha, Nebr. when he spoke the other night. I have been informed only 1,200 people were present. All of the people are getting tired of his double-talk. He accuses the other candidates of having farm programs only in the West and forgetting it when they are down East.

Mr. Truman has a farm program in the West and is campaigning for higher commodity prices while touring the West, but cries out loudly against the high cost of living when he gets back East. All this does not add up in my book, and the public is getting tired of it and he will realize it before he gets back home.

He talks of high parity and supported prices, as well as a long-range agricultural program. All of this carries with it acreage restrictions and marketing

quotas. Now, of course, farmers everywhere are willing that prices should remain high, but they want those prices to be made in the market place and not in Washington. Farmers are universal in their opposition to controls. Supported prices have cost the taxpayers billions of dollars and caused prices to spiral upward. In fact, it causes commodities to be priced off of the market. I am thinking of apples, potatoes, and peanuts.

The price of peanuts has been taken from $40 a ton to $240 a ton, with the result that the Commodity Credit Corporation has so many peanuts on hand that they recently sold several million dollars worth to a Philadelphia dealer on a contract that the CCC would buy them back unless the purchaser could make money.

Surely, even the peanut growers cannot subscribe to this kind of business.

Farmer reaction to the administration's agriculture policy is quite evident in a statement issued recently by John A. Smith, who is secretary of the Pennsylvania State committee of the Agriculture Department's production and marketing division. Smith is complaining in an Associated Press article that farmers are slow in accepting the Federal hand-outs this spring. Smith claims it is due to low-cash income on the farms. This is definitely a misstatement of fact. It is due to the general disgust of the agriculture policy that prevails. Smith laments the fact that 13,000 less farmers in Pennsylvania are participating in the program this year than did a year ago.

This is what Mr. Truman is finding out on his western jaunt. People generally are finally catching up with the New Deal.

I received a letter this morning from Lakeland, Fla., from a lady complaining about the high cost of living, who says her husband is a retired railroad worker and finds it difficult to make ends meet on his retirement. She says she wrote to Senator PEPPER explaining her problem, and he in turn sent her one of the new cook books with 150 recipes, telling her how to make ends meet.

Now, she says, "I have been a housekeeper for 52 years, but we just cannot eat grass along with soybeans and all the stuff the cook book says is so grand and nourishing. Sure the Agriculture Department is a crazy bunch," and I agree she is exactly right.

If that is all that the New Deal has to offer, after 16 years of planning, is there any wonder that there is such a wave of righteous indignation rising all over the land?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he delivered over Station WWJ, Detroit, Mich.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, about 30 years ago the Government of the United States acquired the Virgin Islands as a military base.

The Virgin Islands is an acquired possession of the United States. Our economic history since the purchase in 1917 reflects the absence of a stable colonial policy, a disregard—undoubtedly not intentional—for the basic economic development of the islands, a long chain of noncorrelated attempts of correcting the evils, and a condition today where the islands are faced with an economic catastrophe.

Let us briefly summarize the past 30 years' history:

First. The Virgin Islands were bought by the United States in 1917, during the First World War, for military reasons.

Second. Naval administration governed islands from 1917 to 1931.

Third. The main industries of St. Croix were sugar and rum. Prohibition was introduced in the United States, extended to the Virgin Islands, and the rum industry was killed.

Fourth. Private enterprise struggled on in the sugar industry, minus the rum business. Made money in 1921 for the last time, and went into bankruptcy in 1929.

Fifth. In 1931 civilian administration succeeded the Navy. The islands were placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Sixth. Economy of St. Croix at the time of introduction of civilian regime entirely collapsed. The Red Cross stepped in and fed the majority of the population. Large tracts of land were converted from cane fields to pasture—farmers went into cattle raising, requiring fewer hands.

Seventh. Young men and women by the hundreds left the islands for New York. They represented the best of the younger population, those with energy and knowledge and skills and who had saved enough to pay for the passage. Very few of these people have ever returned to the islands.

Eighth. NRA, PWA, and other emergency programs of the early Roosevelt administration were extended to the Virgin Islands. Considerable sums of money were spent, however, on projects dictated and planned from national headquarters of the programs, without proper planning and integration with actual local long-range needs. The beneficial results of these programs were simply feeding, for the time being, of those employed, but no assets or improvements of sizable proportion were left for the community on which to build up the future.

Ninth. In 1934 the Virgin Islands Company was formed as a Government corporation to resume the growing of cane and production of sugar and rum and to engage in other projects for the economic uplift of the islands. The Company has employed from 800 to 1,500 persons, depending upon the seasons of the year. During the years since its formation the Company has not succeeded financially, but it has constituted the balancing factor between a minimum standard of living and starvation for the majority of the population. The benefits from its operation have not extended only to those directly employed by the Company, but, of course, to the entire islands' economy in many direct and indirect ways.

Businessmen have not considered the management of the Virgin Islands Company as entirely efficient, or even prudent, and it is their belief that considerable improvements could be effected in the administration of the Company.

Tenth. After the lifting of prohibition, private industry also engaged in the production of rum, and this business became a good booster of the local economy culminating during the last war, but now entirely at a standstill.

Eleventh. In 1936 the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands was passed by Congress. Universal suffrage was introduced.

Twelfth. The islands were climbing up the ladder at the time the last war started. During this war limited military activities were extended to the Virgin Islands, mainly in St. Thomas, where large installations were built, while in St. Croix only an airport was built, Benedict Field. Before the close of the war the importance of the Virgin Islands for the conduct of the war had diminished, and military contingents were withdrawn. The expenditures made by the military authorities had been absorbed by the community in the form of pay rolls, and so forth, more or less in the same way as money distributed during the operation of emergency programs mentioned above. There were no war industries of any type established in the islands. The rum business boomed as a result of the war.

Thirteenth. The postwar period has brought about a momentarily very dark economic picture for the Virgin Islands. This same period has also brought excellent possibilities of a permanent solution of the economic problem. It is a very delicate period, and without proper planning and vision we might lose the advantages.

First the unfavorable factors:

(a) The war disrupted a normal development of a budding tourist industry, it created no new industries, it left a crippled rum industry, the meat export to Puerto Rico through the local abbatoir has been discontinued as noncompetitive with duty-free meat imports to Puerto Rico from the Dominican Republic. The inhabitants of the islands depend upon imported food, clothing, and so forth. The price of these items have skyrocketed in the United States proper, and the prices here have increased even more, because of increased cost of transportation. Consequently most cost-of-living commodities have increased over 100 percent in

cost, while the income of the inhabitants has decreased. This is probably the only area within the United States where the postwar economy has, so to speak, reversed. Only development of industry and export trade or direct subsidy from the United States' Congress can remedy the situation.

(b) The favorable factors are several. The Army left St. Croix with Benedict Field, one of the best airfields in the Caribbean. Efforts are presently being made to encourage direct flights from New York by Pan American World Airways, who are willing to use the field, provided the CAB approves their plans. Air transportation has placed St. Croix within 8 hours from New York. Our climate is wonderful, the beaches are excellent, there is plenty of land available for development for the tourist and vacation industry and for sites for winter homes. Our rainfall is scant, but it has been proved through experimentation last winter that we can grow tomatoes and ship at a profit to New York by air—or fast steamers during the midwinter months. A private company has been formed which will ship in quantities next winter season. Many continental Americans have bought land in the island with the intent of putting up winter homes, several small hotels and guest houses have been built or planned. It is felt that with the proper capitalization for development of a tourist industry, diversification of the present one-crop—sugar—system, and development of small industries, it should be possible to finally bring about a sound self-sufficient economy for these islands.

This cannot be done overnight. It will take considerable experimentation to develop a balanced diversified crop system, and some access to loans for development of the tourist industry will be necessary. In the proposed charter bill for the Virgin Islands Company have been included provisions which should take care of a proper development of our economy, and it is the opinion of this Chamber, which has already gone on record in favor of the rechartering, that the proposed new charter, as it now reads, would constitute no competition to established business and industry. Under the provisions of the new charter, the Virgin Islands Company would be in an excellent position to help the islands pass the next few and difficult years, and it seems reasonable to expect that if the Virgin Islands can use the next 5 years to build up their economy based upon the new opportunities, then the future need for Federal assistance should be negligible.

TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress is rushing and roaring blindly under the lash of the Republican leadership down the road to adjournment. Like all run-aways, it is oblivious to everything in its path. It sees not, nor hears not. There will be adjournment despite the failure of the Republican leadership to allow the Congress to consider some of the most crucial problems that have ever faced the Republic.

Committees that are handling the legislation affecting these problems are either being handcuffed by the leadership or by their own chairmen who in most instances even refuse to consider the plight of millions of our citizens.

As Pope Pius XII said but a few days ago, one of the two most vital problems in the world today is the question of proper housing. This is particularly true in these United States. Millions of our people, veterans and nonveterans, single and married, find themselves not only with inadequate housing, but with unsanitary, antiquated, disreputable dwellings. In Brooklyn, a community of 2,800,000 people, the problem has reached such proportions that it now borders on catastrophe. The head of our local government, the Honorable John Cashmore, is besieged morning, noon, and night by unfortunate human beings who are victims of the housing debacle. They represent almost every degree of our social scale—the poor, the middle class, and even the upper crust. We have had men and women with families sleep on the borough hall steps until succored by Mr. Cashmore. The borough president has held conferences with private builders, housing authorities, charitable, church, veteran, and fraternal groups in an effort to bring about some relief. He has made frequent visits to Washington to consult those in charge here. He has held a series of conferences with the nine Congressmen of Brooklyn in an effort to develop some workable plan. He has come to the conclusion, as have all the people who have studied this problem, that the only solution is the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Private builders have endeavored to fill the needs of the country, but have failed miserably. The problem is too vast for private enterprise to handle alone. While I recognize that the great majority of the builders are honest, decent Americans, yet there is scarcely a community in the United States today that is not having a scandal as a result of the acts of jerrybuilders. Veterans and nonveterans have lost their life savings in purchasing new homes which later developed to be nothing more than improperly erected packing boxes.

The problem is more than a political one. It is as Mr. Cashmore said in a recent meeting with the Brooklyn congressional delegation:

> One of the greatest moral issues of our day.

He said that—

> Families are being broken up, homes destroyed, and the friendly relationship between "in-laws" battered.

He further stated that—

> No architect, regardless of his degree of skill, has ever been able to design an apartment spacious enough for two families to live in in peace and happiness. It is one of the greatest contributing causes of juvenile delinquency in our community.

Gentlemen, these are the words of a man who has control of the civil destinies of close to 3,000,000 people. His situation is not unique. His words have been echoed by the civil heads of our local governments throughout the Nation. Gentlemen, the responsibility must rest somewhere, and it does. It rests fairly and squarely in the halls of this Congress. It rests particularly in the committee room of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has charge of housing legislation. If that committee, and if this House does not care to face this problem that is bringing ruination and moral degradation to millions of our people, then the answer must be made not only to the electorate but also to Almighty God. If we are contributing through nonfeasance to the increase of divorce, to the increase of juvenile delinquency, to the lowering of the national birth rate, to a lower standard of living, to the promotion of crime, and to the general discomfort of our people, we have failed in our trust and we are not worthy of sitting as the people's representatives in this body.

It is my sincere hope that every Member of this Congress will bring the utmost pressure to bear upon the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in an effort to bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to the floor. If we are not successful in this effort, then I ask that you follow my example and refuse to vote for adjournment until such time as the measure is brought before this House.

THE LATE SENATOR OVERTON

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago Senator John Overton, of Louisiana, died at the Bethesda Medical Center and speeches were made praising his magnificent work as a leader for flood control and rivers and harbors work. One of the last acts of the Senate prior to his death was to place in the civil functions appropriations bill an item to begin work on the Overton Red River canal—a project dedicated to his legislative work and his memory. Were Senator Overton alive today, he would be sitting beside the House and Senate conferees working on this bill with them.

The people of Louisiana are hopeful. They are very hopeful that this item will be retained in the bill. They are pleading that conferees will continue the recognition in death which this Congress has willingly given in life. The Overton Red River canal project should remain in the civil functions bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am asking for this time in order to make a unanimous-consent request that on Thursday next, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and all special orders granted for the day I may be granted 1 hour's time for the purpose of the delegation from California to place in the RECORD their opinions of the two retiring members of our delegation, the gentlemen from California [Mr. ELLIOTT and Mr. LEA] and for the convenience of any other Members who desire to participate.

Mr. LEA has served in this House for 32 years with an honorable and creditable record. Mr. ELLIOTT has served for 10 years. Both are retiring voluntarily, neither having sought reelection in the primaries. I think it is incumbent upon us to express our opinions in the RECORD to show our appreciation for the services these gentlemen have rendered to the Nation. I invite and would appreciate other Members of the House besides the California delegation to participate in these ceremonies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WORLD ASSEMBLY OF MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my great privilege to represent, though unofficially, the United States in the World Assembly of Moral Rearmament held in Los Angeles, Calif. In attendance were about 200 prominent leaders of industry, labor, and of governments of 21 countries, Britain, France, Burma, China, Greece, Germany, Japan, Italy, Sweden, India, and many others. The basic purposes as expressed by almost all of the foreign representatives was the preservation of Christian democracy throughout the world.

It was most inspiring to feel the warmth and friendship of all in one common cause, a better world understanding in social and spiritual needs of all the earth and also of the ultimate defeat of totalitarianism in any form.

You who saw the Good Road in Washington were inspired by the message of an ideological answer to totalitarianism and the preservation of our own Christian democracy.

The Good Road was presented by the same cast in the Hollywood Bowl last Thursday night to an audience of 20,000 people. That it was well received is putting it mildly.

Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, founder of Moral Rearmament, was honored on this occasion of the tenth anniversary of its birth. A delegation of nine from Japan were most deeply interested in the purposes of Christian democracies as well as prominent leaders from Germany, China, and many others. I might quote from many messages received by mail and cable to the World Assembly but I quote one from the Minister of Labor of India, the Honorable Jagjivan Ram:

> Am wholeheartedly in sympathy with the ideals of moral rearmament. Without a spiritual program neither economic rehabilitation nor military preparation will save the peoples of the world from disasters too terrible to contemplate.

The leaders and workers in moral rearmament are an inspired people, giving of their time and money generously for a most worthy cause, to live in a country where democracy lives, to enjoy the freedoms and the many privileges in a democracy instead of a totalitarian state where everyone becomes the slave of the dictator. It is my firm belief that moral rearmament is the greatest moving force in the world today for preservation of Christian democracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Cracked Voice," from the Wall Street Journal of June 4.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on the subject of reciprocal trade.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PAY RAISES FOR POSTAL AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am appearing this morning as a gentle reminder that we should not forget the pay raise for our good postal employees and the other Federal employees. Of course, Congress has many bills before it, and we are getting down to the last-minute rush when there are many worthy causes which should be heard, but we have had news that promises were made to the postal employees and the Federal employees that they would be considered for a pay raise before this Congress adjourns.

I think that not only the Republicans but the Democrats should put forward every effort to see that these worthy employees are given their just recognition. They have never struck, they have never held up the mails, they have never done anything but do their job efficiently and without complaint. When we find employees in industry getting raises year by year, the least we in Congress can do is to consider these people more than two or three times in a period of 25 years. I think the pay raise is overdue because of the admittedly great increase in the cost of living.

I hope Congress immediately passes an $800 cost-of-living increase in pay for these employees, in order to maintain the fine personnel we now have on a career basis. This increase should be made retroactive as there is no doubt that the present scale of compensation has been inadequate to support these families on a decent basis for some time. I urge immediate action by Congress.

COMMUNIST PERSECUTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, were it not for the fact that we are crowded for time I would rise to a question of personal privilege and discuss the persecution that is being carried on against me even in the courts of the District of Columbia—not by the courts but in the courts.

You saw in the morning paper about this lawsuit that has been inspired solely because of my activities on the Committee on Un-American Activities in trying to protect my country against those subversive elements that are plotting the overthrow of our Government and the destruction of our American way of life.

It is nothing in God's world but an attempt to embarrass me here and at home. This morning a friend of mine from Ohio sent me a newspaper clipping along the same line. It says:

> The Columbus Civil Rights Committee—

That means the Communist front, if you want to know—

> yesterday announced plans for an extensive drive in Columbus Sunday as a part of the observance of national Civil Rights Day.
>
> The group will seek contributions for the national fund to aid the civil rights program and will also seek signatures for petitions calling for the ouster of Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, and endorsing anti-lynching legislation and other civil-rights legislation.
>
> A goal of $1,000,000, the equivalent of $1 for each Negro who served in the armed forces during World War II, has been set nationally for the national radio goodwill fund drive.

Mr. Speaker, if they want to oust me because of my stand for Americanism

and my opposition to the communistic civil rights program, I am ready for the vote—I am ready for the vote now. They are raising money as they have done before—they say they are raising tens of thousands of dollars to send to my district to try to keep me from coming back to Congress.

But they cannot bluff me.

All I have to say to these Reds and their satellites is in the words of Shakespeare—

Lay on, Macduff, and damn'd be him that first cries, "Hold, enough!"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech.

SHORE PROTECTIVE WORKS AT NOME, ALASKA

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1025) to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska, to make the following correction, namely: In line 5 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert "Secretary of the Army."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITAKER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and editorial.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 565) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expense of conducting the investigation and study of the present condition of the Capitol Power Plant incurred by the House Building Commission, not to exceed $8,000, including expenditure for the employment of competent engineers, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such Commission, signed by the chairman of such Commission, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 636 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the period of any adjournment or recess of the House after the close of the second session of the Eightieth Congress until January 3, 1949, the Clerk of the House is authorized to pay out of the contingent fund of the House an amount equal to 6 months' salary of any deceased employee of the House at the rate such employee was receiving at the time of his or her death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of any such employee to whomever in the judgment of the Clerk is justly entitled thereto subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Public Lands on Investigation of National Resources on May 15, 16, and 20, 1947, be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOVER DAM POWER AND WATER CONTRACTS AND RELATED DATA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 391, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the publication entitled "The Hoover Dam Power and Water Contracts and Related Data," published in 1933 by the United States Department of the Interior, shall be brought up to date and printed with illustrations as a House document.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "printed" insert "with illustration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL POLICY, PARTS NOS. 1 AND 2

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 555, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 500 additional copies each of the hearings held before said committee during the Eightieth Congress entitled "Long Range Agricultural Policy, Parts No. 1 and No. 2."

The resolution was agreed to.

ECONOMIC FACTORS IN STATUTORY MINIMUM WAGES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 557, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 3,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 146, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Economic Factors in Statutory Minimum Wages" be printed, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 558, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 3,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 149, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance," be printed, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL POLICY—SELECTED TRENDS AND FACTORS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 588, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the study prepared for said committee during the Eightieth Congress entitled "Long-Range Agricultural Policy—A Study of Selected Trends and Factors Relating to the Long-Range Prospect for American Agriculture."

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 611, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved That there be printed as a House document and that there be printed 1,000 additional copies of supplement IV of the report of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism—Five Hundred Leading Communists (in the Eastern Hemi-

sphere, Excluding the U. S. S. R.)," for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

RECORDS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up House Resolution 601, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to transfer all records of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid created by House Resolution 296, Eightieth Congress, to the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation created by section 124 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.). Such transfer shall be upon condition that the joint committee will not commingle such records with any other records in its possession and will, when its need for such records ceases to exist, return them to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 204, authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof, in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before September 1, 1948.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding rooms at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives Establishment, Bureau of American Republics, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 10 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

Mr. LECOMPTE (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read. This is a long resolution, but a routine resolution which simply provides for cleaning up and disposing of surplus material in the folding room. It is in exactly the same form as previous resolutions on the same subject, except for the change of date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

TO AMEND THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2286) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4007) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF JUDICIAL CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 127) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the principal purpose of this bill is to relieve Federal employees from multiple State income taxes on their salaries and to permit, with certain exceptions, only the State in which such employee is domiciled to levy such tax.

It appears that many Federal employees who would normally be stationed in the District of Columbia, because of the abnormally crowded conditions in the District have been required to work in other taxing jurisdictions.

These conditions no doubt have accentuated the problem of multiple State income taxation. However, according to the advice of the Attorney General, since 1939 numerous cases have arisen in which a person employed by the United States and stationed in a State other than the State of his domicile, has been subjected to an income tax by each of the States involved. It is recognized also that there are probably numerous individuals other than Federal officers and employees who may be temporarily sojourning for business reasons in a State other than that of their domicile and who are, therefore, subjected to multiple taxation on their incomes.

The situation in which I am personally interested relates to the unjust and unfair Philadelphia wage tax. This tax is placed upon all who work in the city of Philadelphia, regardless of where they reside. The result is that thousands of employees living in the southern part of New Jersey are required to pay this tax. It is extremely unfair to them. They receive no benefits from the city of Philadelphia and generally they are required to pay their part of the expensive and inefficient administration that now exists in the city of Philadelphia.

Very recently, it has been divulged through the efforts of a Committee of Fifteen that thousands and even millions of dollars are alleged to have been misappropriated. This investigation is going on at the present time. It creates a situation that adds to the injustice that requires citizens of another State, and in fact all who live outside the city of Philadelphia, but who work therein, to pay tribute to a politically governed city. The payment of this tax by outsiders helps to keep drones on the pay roll of the city of Philadelphia. It is unfair; it cries out for adjustment, and it has been hoped that this bill would receive the approval of the House without the necessity of obtaining a rule to bring it before the House for action.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WAR DAMAGE COMPENSATION TO SWITZERLAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1605) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed

forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves entirely too much money to be considered by unanimous consent. I therefore ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3194) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 43, sec. 485h (e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In addition to entering into repayment contracts pursuant to the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, the Secretary may enter into short-term contracts to furnish water for irrigation purposes: *Provided*, That—

"(1) such contracts may be made with any water user or any group of water users within the area served by the project;

"(2) such contracts shall be made for a term of no longer than 5 years;

"(3) such contracts shall require payments annually in advance of delivery of water thereunder;

"(4) in making such contracts, the Secretary shall act in conformity with the provisions for repayment for irrigation as made by the Congress;

"(5) any and all amounts payable to the United States under such short-term contracts in excess of appropriate charges for operation and maintenance during the period of water deliveries thereunder shall be credited to the repayment of the construction costs allocated to irrigation and allocated for repayment by the water users."

SEC. 2. Section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 is amended by adding thereto subsection (f) reading as follows:

"SEC. 9. (f) As an alternative to any other contractual arrangement with the Secretary for the delivery of water for irrigation to any part of a project area authorized by law, including the construction of any distribution system necessary to such delivery, any organization empowered to engage in the distribution of water for the irrigation of any area or any part of an area for the irrigation of which a project has been authorized, has received an appropriation is under construction, or has been constructed and with which a repayment contract has not been executed, may, at its option, obtain from the Secretary, who is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate the same, a repayment contract, which said contract shall provide that—

"(1) annual payments, which need not be equal, by the organization over a period of not to exceed 50 years after the first delivery of water to such organization so calculated as to return to the United States, without interest, an appropriate and proportionate share of the reimbursable cost of the project allocated to irrigation to be repaid by the water users, together with any construction cost incurred exclusively for any distribution system of the contracting organization: *Provided*, That such payments shall not be greater than those provided under any alternative form of contractual arrangement with the Secretary available to the contracting organizations;

"(2) the quantities and classes of water to be delivered under such contract and the times and places agreed upon for such deliveries;

"(3) the vesting as appurtenant to the lands within the boundaries of the contracting organization of the perpetual right to use the water deliverable from such project to such organization: *Provided*, That all such rights shall vest in the manner and to the extent authorized by the laws of the State in which such irrigable lands are situated;

"(4) the time at which designated portions of the project facilities will be transferred to the contracting organization for the care, operation, and maintenance: *Provided*, That all organizations receiving water under the same project shall be accorded equality of treatment in the transfer to them of project facilities for care, operation, and maintenance: *And provided further*, That any such contracting organization upon the execution of a contract under this subsection, shall be entitled to take, for care, operation, and maintenance, all project facilities, including distribution systems, which serve it exclusively and shall be entitled, in conjunction with other organizations to take over all project facilities utilized jointly, for care, operation, and maintenance, as and when a suitable agency therefor has been created, all in accordance as nearly as may be, with the principles of subsection g of section 4 of the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1924 (43 Stat. 702)."

No organization shall be required in any such contract to assume any obligation other than those specifically authorized by this act and consistent with this subsection.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 43, sec. 485h (e)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) In lieu of entering into a repayment contract pursuant to the provisions of subsection (d) of this section to cover that part of the cost of the construction of works connected with water supply and allocated to irrigation, the Secretary, upon agreement with the water users, may enter into either short- or long-term contracts to deliver water for irrigation purposes. Each such contract shall be for such period, not to exceed 40 years, and at such rates as in the Secretary's judgment will produce revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost and an appropriate share of such fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper, due consideration being given to that part of the cost of construction of works connected with water supply and allocated to irrigation; and shall require payment of said rates each year in advance of delivery of water for said year. In the event such contracts are made for delivering water for irrigation purposes, the costs of any irrigation water distribution works constructed by the United States in connection with the new project, new division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, shall be covered by a repayment contract entered into pursuant to said subsection (d).

"'Contracts made under this subsection 9 (e) shall—

"'(1) be subject to section 8 of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388);

"'(2) include provisions for the right of renewal thereof under terms and conditions mutually agreeable to the parties and consistent with the provisions of this subsection, and subject to increase or decrease in rates, if such increase is required in the light of increased costs of construction, or of operation and maintenance and is not beyond the ability of the water users to pay, or such decrease is justified in the light of the reduced costs of construction, or of operation and maintenance, as the case may be: *Provided*, That such right of renewal shall be exercised within such reasonable time prior to the expiration of the contract as the parties shall have agreed upon: *Provided further*, That the aggregate of the periods covered by any such contract and renewals thereof shall not exceed 50 years;

"'(3) permit the execution of a contract under subsection 9 (d) upon terms mutually agreeable to the contracting parties: *Provided*, That such 9 (d) contract shall be subject to section 8 of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388); and

"'(4) provide that all amounts payable to the United States in excess of appropriate charges for operation, maintenance, and reasonable and necessary replacements during the period of water deliveries thereunder shall be credited to the repayment of the project construction costs allocated to irrigation, assigned for repayment by the water users under the project, and subject to repayment by the organization executing such contracts.

"'Contracts hereafter made under this subsection or under subsection (d) of this section shall, at the option of the organization concerned and subject to satisfactory and binding assurances that such works will be maintained in good operating condition, provide for the transfer to the contracting organization, for care, operation, and maintenance, of distribution works and project facilities designed to serve it exclusively: *Provided*, That the Secretary may enter into contracts for the transfer for care, operation, and maintenance of works which, in his judgment, may be utilized for serving more than one organization, only upon conditions which shall assure that such transfer will not be inconsistent with the utilization, present or prospective, of such works for authorized project purposes, with their efficient and integrated operation, and with due regard for the ultimate needs of the area affected.

"'SEC. 2. Contracts entered into under the terms of section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 prior to the effective date of this act may be amended to the extent agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the organization concerned and not inconsistent with the provisions of said section 9 (e) as amended by this act. Contracts heretofore entered into under the reclamation laws may, to the extent agreed upon by the parties, be amended in such a way as to afford to the organizations contracting thereunder the benefits of section 9 (e) as amended by this act.'"

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, the amendment to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 32 OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5960) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BECKWORTH, Mr. DEANE, and Mr. RAYBURN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was stricken from the calendar.

TRANSPORTATION SERVICES OF THE INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5318) to provide for the continuation of the transportation services of the Inland Waterways Corp., for the disposition of its property and other interests, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF CERTAIN LANDS AND MINERAL DEPOSITS FROM THE CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 363, providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems that a rule has been granted on this bill. I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can state that that is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COAST GUARD TO OPERATE AND MAINTAIN OCEAN STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist in providing adequate meteorological communication facilities and to provide adequate search and rescue facilities for safe, regular, and economic air services over such regions of the oceans as are regularly traversed by commercial or military aircraft of the United States, the Coast Guard is authorized to operate and maintain such floating ocean stations as may be necessary or desirable to serve the needs of the armed forces and of the commerce of the United States, or to fulfill the international obligations of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Coast Guard is authorized, subject to approval by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to operate, on floating ocean stations authorized by section 1 hereof, such air-navigation facilities as the Administrator may find necessary or desirable for the safe and efficient protection and control of air traffic. The Coast Guard, in establishing, maintaining, or operating any air navigation facilities herein provided, shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute therefor the following: "That the Coast Guard is authorized to operate and maintain floating ocean stations for the purpose of providing search and rescue, communication, and air navigation facilities, and meteorological services in such ocean areas as are regularly traversed by aircraft of the United States: *Provided*, That prior to the establishment of any station the Secretary of National Defense shall certify as to the need for such station."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING MILEAGE ALLOWANCE OF 7 CENTS PER MILE FOR UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 692) to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business.

There being no obligation, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That United States marshals and their deputies shall, under regulations prescribed by the Attorney General and whenever such mode of transportation is authorized or approved as more advantageous to the Government, be paid in lieu of actual expenses of transportation not to exceed 7 cents per mile for use of privately owned automobiles or airplanes when used on official business or when used in necessary travel on official trips. In addition to the mileage allowance prescribed in this act, there shall be allowed to United States marshals and their deputies reimbursement for the actual cost of ferry fares and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CREDITING OF SERVICE AS A CADET

The Clerk called the bill (S. 657) to amend the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CHANGE IN THE DUTY ON FIRE HOSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5608) to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FREE IMPORTATION OF EVERGREEN CHRISTMAS TREES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5612) to provide for the free importation of evergreen Christmas trees.

Messrs. SMITH of Wisconsin, MURRAY of Wisconsin, and H. CARL ANDERSEN objected.

AMENDING SECTION 624 OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4816) to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 624 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Each State for which a State plan has been approved prior to or during a fiscal year shall be entitled for such year to an allotment of a sum bearing the same ratio to the sums authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 621 for such year as the product of (a) the population of such State and (b) the square of its allotment percentage (as defined in section 631 (a)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all of the States: *Provided*, That no such allotment to any State shall be less than $250,000."

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary to provide increased allotments for the construction of hospitals pursuant to the first sentence of section 624 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by the first section of this act.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: On page 2, line 3, after "$250,000" and before the period insert "But for the purpose of this proviso the term 'State' shall not include the Virgin Islands."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE HOMES CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5509) to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING PROVISIONS OF TITLE VI OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5889) to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 631 of title VI of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after the term "Puerto Rico" appearing in subsection (a) thereof "and the Virgin Islands," and by changing subsection (d) thereof to read as follows: "the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) paragraph

(a) of section 631 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Puerto Rico' the following: 'and the Virgin Islands.'"

"(b) Paragraph (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia;'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6293) to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934, as amended (49 Stat. 1821), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "All such fees shall be paid into, administered, and expended as a part of the National Archives Trust Fund created by section 5 of the National Archives Trust Fund Board Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUEL PLANTS ACT OF 1948

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5475) to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5053) to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMEND LANHAM ACT TO PERMIT SALE OF CERTAIN HOUSING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2288) to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That whenever the Administrator disposes of any permanent house or structure containing not more than four family dwelling units under authority of this act by offering such house or structure for sale on an individual basis, he shall, when the purchaser is a veteran buying for his own occupancy, sell any such house or structure (1) at a purchase price not in excess of the apportioned cost of such house or structure and of the land and appurtenances allocated thereto, together with the apportioned share of the cost of all utilities and other facilities provided for and common to the project of which such house or structure is a part, or (2) at a purchase price not in excess of such considered full market value of such house or structure and the land, appurtenances, utilities and facilities allocated thereto, whichever purchase price is the less."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUILDINGS FOR OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BUREAU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3907) to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO GRANT COUNTY, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6127) to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, the Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby authorized and directed to allocate from any funds available, or that may become available for allocation to the State of Indiana the sum of $48,276 to the county of Grant, State of Indiana, in payment of one-half the cost of a bridge across the Mississinewa River in East Thirty-eighth Street in the city of Marion, Ind., constructed by the county of Grant: *Provided,* That the specifications and construction of said bridge shall meet the established requirements of the Public Roads Administration for such structures.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "available", insert "under the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1944, as amended."

At the end of the bill insert a comma and "and that said bridge is located on an approved secondary highway."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER JURISDICTION OVER SCHOOL BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5433) to transfer jurisdiction over certain school buildings in Vanport, Oreg., to the Federal Works Administrator and to authorize an appropriation to rebuild a school building in Vanport, Oreg., which was destroyed by fire.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the author of the bill that the purpose of it has now passed, and therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TIME CREDITABLE FOR PROMOTION IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1082) to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any employee of the postal service who is in a position for which salary grades are provided in the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, and who transfers or is transferred from such position to any other position in the postal service for which salary grades are provided by such act, shall, for purposes of establishing eligibility for promotion in the position to which he transfers or is transferred, (1) in the case of an employee in a position for which automatic promotions are provided, be credited with all satisfactory service since his last automatic promotion and (2) in the case of an employee in a position for which automatic promotions are not provided, be credited with all satisfactory service, not exceeding 1 year of such service, performed in such position.

SEC. 2. Any such employee shall be eligible for promotion within the salary grades of his new position after completing an amount of service in such position, which when added to the prior service for which credit is provided by the first section of this act, gives such employee sufficient service for promotion in his new position.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "employee" includes postmasters, officers, supervisors, special-delivery messengers in offices of the first class, and all other employees paid from field appropriations of the postal service for whom salary grades are provided in the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945.

SEC. 4. This act shall be applicable in determining eligibility for promotion of any employee who has been transferred from one position of the postal service to another prior to the date of enactment of this act and who has not received a promotion in his new position since such transfer, except that no employee shall be promoted because of

such application prior to the first day of the first quarter which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Any employee in the postal service whose services are utilized in a dual capacity shall be paid for service rendered in that capacity at the grade and rate of compensation authorized for the position to which he is temporarily assigned, and credit shall be allowed for all previous continuous service as a regular or substitute postal employee.

SEC. 6. The provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this act shall not apply to employees who transfer or are transferred to the position of post-office inspector or to the position of railway postal clerk.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 8, strike out lines 8 to 13, inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 5. The rate of compensation of any employee in the postal service whose services are utilized in a dual capacity shall not be reduced as a result of employment in such capacity: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the rural delivery service."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARE AND TREATMENT FOR VOLUNTARY ARMED SERVICE MEMBERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1470) to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserve, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes", approved June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1507), as amended (act July 15, 1939, 53 Stat. 1042; sec. 5, act October 14, 1940, 54 Stat. 1137; 32 U. S. C. 164d; 10 U. S. C. 455e), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term 'in time of peace' shall include that period after September 2, 1945 (the date of formal surrender by Japan), which is prior to the first day on which the United States is, by action of the Congress, or the President, or both, no longer engaged in any war in which the United States is engaged on the date of enactment of this section.

"SEC. 3. The foregoing amendment shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force to the same extent as if enacted prior to the passage of the National Security Act of 1947."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND ARMY-NAVY MEDICAL SERVICES CORPS ACT OF 1947

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5983) to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. During the period that appointments to the Regular Navy may be made pursuant to section 5 of the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), appointments to the Medical Service Corps may be made in accordance with the provisions of the said act, in addition to appointments authorized by section 203 of this title."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUE OF COMMODORE JOHN BARRY

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 297) to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution approved June 10, 1941, which authorized the President to present to Eire on behalf of the people of the United States a statue of Commodore John Barry, is hereby amended by striking out "$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$30,000."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT JUDGE FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5611) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

SEC. 2. No successor shall hereafter be appointed to succeed the person who shall be appointed to be such additional judge unless such vacancy shall occur within 2 years after such appointment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the period insert a colon and the words: "*Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in said district shall not be filled."

Page 1, line 8, strike out line 8 and the remainder of the page.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING EMPLOYEES TIME TO PARTICIPATE IN CERTAIN FUNERALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5964) to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That employees in the executive branch of the Government shall be excused from duty, without loss of pay or deduction from their annual leave, for such time as may be necessary, but not in excess of 6 hours in any one day, to enable them to participate in funeral ceremonies for members of the armed forces of the United States who lost their lives in World War II and whose remains are returned from abroad for final interment in the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3 after "Government", insert "who are veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, or World War II."

Line 5, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

Line 7, strike out "6" and insert "4."

Line 8, after "participate", insert "as active pallbearers or as members of firing squads or guards of honor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1493) to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the final period in section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), be changed to a semicolon and that the following be added thereto: "*Provided*, That any recommendation by the Civil Service Commission, submitted to any Federal agency, on the basis of the appeal of any preference eligible, employee or former employee, shall be complied with by such agency."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN VETERAN EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4917) to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 749; 5 U. S. C. sec. 645a), is hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"(c) Any person within the terms of this section, who, due to a disability incurred because of military service in World War II, is unable to perform the duties of the position designated by him at the time of taking the examination for appointment thereto, may upon written request at any time have his

name entered upon any list of eligibles for any position for which a like examination is required and such entry shall be made without any loss of seniority or other rights of eligibility conferred by this section: *Provided, however,* That this act shall not be construed to extend the period of eligibility which such person would have otherwise had."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this bill is in every respect deserving of favorable consideration. Sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, its terms are identical with those embraced in a measure which I introduced on June 23 last year, except that the applicability of my bill was limited to postal workers, whereas this covers any civil-service employee. I, of course, favor the broadening of its beneficial purposes.

My attention was drawn to a situation calling for remedial action by a case outlined to me by one of my constituents.

Back in 1941, he took the examination for a postal carrier and received a rating of 93 percent. Later, he enlisted in the Army and was badly wounded in Germany, with the result that he now has a 70-percent disability.

In March, 1946, he was given a probational appointment as a substitute carrier, but found that he was not physically able to do this work, which involved, of course, carrying heavy sacks of mail and a great deal of leg work. Consequently, in March of last year, he was reassigned to the position of substitute clerk.

The difficulty is, however, that despite his high rating on the examination, he has lost all of the important seniority rights which he would have had on the carrier list, since, under present law, his name was removed from that list when he received the clerk appointment. This, in the face of the fact that the original examination which this young man took was one given for either the position of carrier or clerk and was identical in all respects for both positions.

Accordingly, here was a case of a veteran who was badly wounded in the service of his country, who lay in an overseas hospital for many weary months, and who, upon returning to his country to take up his job after convalescence, found he would have to take his place far behind those who had received much lower marks in the same examination.

The measure, originally advocated by me and now before us, would amend the civil-service law to provide that any civil-service employee who, due to a disability incurred in military service, is unable to perform the duties of a position designated by him at the time of taking the examination may have his name entered on any list of eligibles for any position for which the same examination is required. It further provides that such action shall be taken without any loss of seniority or other rights of eligibility conferred by the civil-service law.

Good faith and fairness to those Federal employees whose bodies were broken in the service of their country requires favorable action on this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO JOHNSON CITY, TENN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6448) to direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby directed to convey to the city of Johnson City, a municipal corporation of the State of Tennessee, without consideration and on behalf of the United States, a tract of land located in the ninth civil district of Washington County, Tennessee, on the north side of United States Highway 11E approximately 1 mile west of the corporate boundary of Johnson City, Tenn., and more particularly described, as follows:

Beginning at the northwest corner of the property of the United States of America now under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, known as Veterans' Administration center, Mountain Home, Tennessee. This beginning point is also the northeast corner of property transferred from the Veterans' Administration to the Tennessee Valley Authority by Executive Order Numbered 9771, dated August 24, 1946; thence north eighty-six degrees fifty-six minutes east nine hundred and eight-tenths feet; thence south one degree thirty minutes west three hundred and seventy-two feet; thence south eighty-six degrees five minutes east five hundred and ninety-one feet; thence south four degrees, fifteen minutes west one hundred and forty-three and five-tenths feet to the north side of United States Highway 11E; thence with said highway south sixty-nine degrees forty minutes west one thousand six hundred and two feet to corner of said property transferred by Veterans' Administration to Tennessee Valley Authority by Executive Order 9771 aforesaid; thence north one degree thirty minutes east for a distance of one thousand and sixty-three and three-tenths feet to the beginning.

SEC. 2. It shall be made a condition of the deed of conveyance that the tract of land so conveyed shall be maintained by such municipal corporation only for fairground or other recreational purposes. If such municipal corporation ceases to maintain such tract for such purposes or attempts to alienate all or any part of such tract, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "directed" and insert "authorized."

Page 3, line 5, after "States.", insert "The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6130) for the relief of certain postal employees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all employees at first- and second-class post offices who were reduced from the position of regular clerk or regular carrier to the position of substitute clerk or substitute carrier prior to July 1, 1945, or who were formerly regular clerk or regular carrier and were reinstated as substitute clerk or substitute carrier prior to July 1, 1945, and whose compensation was converted to $1.24 per hour effective July 1, 1945, instead of $1.04 per hour as provided by sections 12 (a) and 24 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435, ch. 274), are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any amounts paid to them as a result of such overpayment of salaries from July 1, 1945, until the date their compensation was adjusted to conform to the provisions of the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435, ch. 274), as amended, and in the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster or other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service the amounts paid to such employees from July 1, 1945, as compensation shall be considered to have been authorized. Any amounts heretofore credited to such employees, or refunded to the United States by them on account of such overpayment of salaries shall be repaid to them out of any money available for the payment of salaries to city delivery carriers and clerks at first- and second-class offices: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITING OPERATION OF CERTAIN SECTIONS OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 378) to limit the operations of section 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in sections 361, 365, or 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of law imposing restrictions requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States shall apply with respect to counsel serving under the provisions of House Resolution 196, Eightieth Congress, first session, agreed to April 28, 1947, and House Resolution 479, Eightieth Congress, second session, agreed to March 9, 1948.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUR PRODUCTS LABELING BILL OF 1947

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3734) to protect consumers, retailers, distributors, manufacturers, dealers, and pro-

ducers from misnaming, misbranding, improper identification, and deceptive or misleading advertising of fur products and articles made in part or in whole from fur, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3934) to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid treatment centers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Venereal Disease Rapid Treatment Center Act."

SEC. 2. Section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 246), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) Funds appropriated under subsection (a) for a fiscal year, which are not determined by the Surgeon General to be available for allotment among the several States pursuant to subsection (d), may also be used by the Service to establish, operate, and maintain facilities for the diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted with venereal diseases, including transportation and subsistence of persons afflicted with veneral diseases, and their attendants, to and from the places of treatment, or allowances in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment, including emergency treatment for other illnesses, of such persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and other appropriate institutions; reasonable expenses of preparing remains, and of burial, of deceased patients; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel prescribed by the Surgeon General for use of employees in the performance of their official duties; recreational supplies and equipment; and repair and alteration of leased facilities. Such funds may also be used for grants of money, services, supplies, equipment, and facilities to States and, with the consent of the respective State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of facilities for the diagnosis, care, and treatment of persons afflicted with veneral diseases, including case finding and referral of voluntary patients to places of treatment. Such grants shall be in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine; and such grants may include all appropriate supplies and equipment available to the Public Health Service, however the supplies or equipment may have been acquired and whatever the source of the funds with which they were purchased."

SEC. 3. (a) The head of any executive department is authorized, without the transfer of funds, to transfer to the Federal Security Agency any of the supplies, equipment, or facilities which such department has made available to the Public Health Service for use in connection with venereal-disease-control work and which, on the date of enactment of this act, is still available for use in connection with such work. Any real or personal property so transferred to the Federal Security Agency, and any other real or personal property of the United States which is under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service (however it may have been acquired and whatever the source of the funds with which it was purchased) which the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service determines would be useful in connection with venereal-disease-control work, may be transferred, with or without reimbursement and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may prescribe, to any State and, with the consent of the State, to any county, health district, or other political subdivision of the State.

(b) As used in this section the term "executive department" means any executive department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States or any corporation wholly owned by the United States; and the term "State" means a State, or the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERADICATION OF CATTLE GRUBS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1043) authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], or the author of the bill, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], with regard to this bill? I notice the bill states:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

There is nothing in the report or the bill to indicate how much governmental expenditure that might require or how much of an appropriation, and your objectors are unable to determine from the contents of the bill whether or not it is one that should be passed on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. HOPE. The Department thought that an adequate program would cost about $300,000 per year. That is the laboratory program plus the field work that would be necessary to deal with this matter adequately.

It is estimated at the present time that the cattle grub is costing the livestock producers of this country something like $100,000,000 a year.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. There is no objection to the purposes of the bill, and since the gentleman has stated the cost will be about $300,000 a year, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1249) authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes, may be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to protect, promote, and conserve livestock and livestock products and to minimize losses, the Secretary of Agriculture, either independently or in cooperation with States or subdivisions thereof, farmers' associations, and other organizations and individuals, it is authorized to increase and intensify research and investigations into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs and to undertake measures to eradicate these parasites.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions of the United States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act. Funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be expended in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1043) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF WEED KILLER, 2,4–D

The Clerk called House Resolution 452 to request the Secretary of Agriculture to take action to prevent damage to valuable crops as a result of the use of the weed killer known as 2,4–D.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas a preparation known as 2,4–D (2, 4 dichlorophenoxyacetic acid) is being marketed and its use is being recommended as an economical method of killing weeds; and

Whereas this preparation, on the basis of such recommendations, is being used by farmers and others; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that valuable broad-leafed plants and crops as well as weeds may be injured or totally destroyed by 2,4–D unless the application of such preparation is carefully controlled; and

Whereas it has been reported that this powerful herbicide when applied in dust form by airplane has caused severe damage to cotton, vegetables, and other valuable crops located at considerable distances from the areas in which the herbicide was directly applied; and

Whereas the danger from the use of 2,4–D to cotton, vegetables, and other broad-leafed plants is so great, it is imperative that all appropriate measures be taken to provide adequate safeguards: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested—

(1) to ascertain the extent to which 2,4–D is being marketed in dust form;

(2) to determine whether the labels on preparations containing 2,4–D carry warning or caution statements which are adequate to warn against the improper use of the preparation and to prevent loss and injury to valuable crops;

(3) to continue any studies or investigations now being made and to institute such new studies and investigations as may be necessary to ascertain whether 2,4–D in any form may be used safely in areas where cotton, vegetables, and other broad-leafed plants are grown;

(4) to investigate the methods which are being employed in applying 2,4–D, including application by airplane, and to determine whether proper precautions are being taken to protect against injury to valuable crops;

(5) to cooperate with Federal and State agencies, farm groups, manufacturers, and others in the development of new and safer methods for the control and application of 2,4–D; and

(6) to us the information facilities of the Department of Agriculture to make known to the Nation the methods by which 2,4–D should be handled and applied to prevent injury to valuable crops.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF SAN FRANCISCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4531) for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the city and county of San Francisco, a municipal corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $9,728.81, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in rebuilding and restoring a power-transmission line and loss of power revenue in township 3 south, range 5 east, and township 3 south, range 6 east, San Joaquin County, Calif., south of Tracy and approximately 3 miles from the Navy Vernalis Airfield, which transmission line was demolished by the crashing of a United States Navy plane, type SB 2 C–2, bureau number 18772, on August 6, 1944, at 9:21 postmeridian, while the said plane was engaged in making a fight over the area indicated, and on August 30, 1944, at 1:14 antemeridian, by the crashing of a United States Navy plane, type TBM–1, bureau number 24994, while the said plane was likewise making a flight over the area indicated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATOCTIN RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION AREA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3807) to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Catoctin recreation demonstration area, near Thurmont, Md., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all lands which have been acquired by the War Department within the Catoctin Recreational Demonstration Area, comprising approximately 280 acres, are hereby made a part of that area.

SEC. 2. The lands comprising the Catoctin Recreational Demonstration Area shall be administered hereafter by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service as part of the park system of the National Capital and its environs, to be known as the Catoctin Park.

SEC. 3. The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized—

(a) to prescribe and collect fees and charges for such recreational and other facilities, conveniences, and services as may be furnished by the National Park Service for the accommodation of the public within the said park;

(b) to enter into a contract or contracts with any reliable person, organization, or corporation, without advertising and without securing competitive bids for the operation of performance of any such recreational or other facilities, conveniences, and services within the said park;

all revenue collected by the National Park Service, pursuant to the authority of this section, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. The powers and duties now exercised by the United States Park Police in National Capital Park areas and all rules and regulations applicable thereto, are hereby extended to the Catoctin Park, the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project, which was made a part of the park system of the National Capital by act of Congress of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 785), and that portion of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal located outside the boundaries of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to exercise and perform with respect to the said park all the powers and duties that are conferred and imposed upon him by law in relation to the construction, maintenance, care, custody, policing, upkeep, and repair of the public buildings and parks in the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESTON BENCH PROJECT, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5313) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1987) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate, pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, the Preston Bench project, Idaho, substantially in accordance with the report of the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, region IV, dated September 15, 1947, as concurred in by the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the total cost of the project shall be reimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws within repayment periods fixed by the Secretary of the Interior at not to exceed 78 years.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for the purposes of this act.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike out "78" and insert "74."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5313) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5189) to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to establish in the Post Office Department a research and development program which shall be administered by the Postmaster General through such officers and employees as he may designate.

(b) The investigations and studies under this program shall be for the purpose of improving existing equipment, supplies, methods, and procedures used in the postal service and of introducing new types of equipment, supplies, methods, and procedures for use in such service in order that the business of the Post Office Department may be more efficiently and economically operated.

SEC. 2. In carrying out its functions under this act, the Department is authorized to utilize the research and testing facilities of the National Bureau of Standards and to procure advice and assistance from any department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated annually not to exceed the sum of $100,000 to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "authorized", insert a comma "pursuant to the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1084), as amended (31 U. S. C., sec. 686), or other applicable law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6090) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if within 5 years after passage of this act it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that a tract or tracts of public land in Monroe County in the State of Michigan, not exceeding in the aggregate 160 acres, has or have been held in good faith and in peaceable, adverse possession by a citizen of the United States, his ancestors or grantors, for more than 20 years prior to the approval of this act under claim or color of title, and that improvements have been placed on such land or some part thereof has been reduced to cultivation, the Secretary shall, upon the payment of $1.25 per acre, cause a patent or patents to issue for such land to any such citizen: *Provided*, That the term "citizen," as used herein, shall be held to include a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State or Territory thereof: *Provided further*, That coal and all other minerals contained therein are hereby reserved to the United States; that said coal and other minerals shall be subject to sale or disposal by the

United States under applicable leasing and mineral land laws, and permittees, lessees, or grantees of the United States shall have the right to enter upon said lands for the purpose of prospecting for and mining such deposits.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the colon, and insert in lieu thereof a period, and strike out all thereafter through line 14.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6233) to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 2496, a similar bill, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described public lands in the State of Florida, to wit: Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 of section 5; lots 1 and 2 of section 6; lots 1, 2, and 3 of section 7; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 of section 8; lots 1 and 2 of section 9; lot 1 of section 17; and lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of section 18 in township 33 south, range 16 east, together with accretion thereto, shall be conveyed to Pinellas County, State of Florida, when it shall be determined that it is no longer necessary for the purpose for which it was reserved by Presidential orders of March 23, 1849, and November 17, 1882, or is not needed for the purposes as set forth in Executive Order No. 9151, April 28, 1942, and that the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell the said land, and to execute the proper conveyances to Pinellas County, State of Florida, with a reservation to the United States of all minerals in said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. The consideration for such conveyance shall be—

(a) with respect to that portion of said lands which was originally purchased by said county from the Treasury Department in 1938 and thereafter was reconveyed by it to the War Department in 1941, the sum received by said county from the War Department in consideration for such reconveyance; and

(b) with respect to the remainder of said lands, 50 percent of the reasonable appraised value thereof, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. The property acquired pursuant to section 1 shall be retained by the said Pinellas County and be used by it for such purposes as it shall deem to be in the public interest or be leased by it from time to time, in whole or in part or parts, to such persons and for such purposes as it shall deem to be in the public interest and upon such terms and conditions as it shall fix and always to be subject to regulation by said county whether leased or not leased but never to be otherwise disposed of or conveyed by it: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the said county from conveying said property back to the Federal Government or to the State of Florida or any agency thereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6233) was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6239) to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the Territory of Alaska, until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July 1949: *Provided*, That every claimant of any such mining claim in order to obtain the benefits of this act shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian of July 1, 1949, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6335) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill (S. 2479).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the United States, until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July, 1948: *Provided*, That every claimant of any such mining claim in order to obtain the benefits of this act shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian of July 1, 1948, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6335) was laid on the table.

AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6454) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation and apprehension of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies the duties of whose position are primarily the investigation or apprehension of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States (including any officer or employee engaged in such activity who has been transferred to a supervisory or administrative position) who is at least 50 years of age, and who has rendered 20 years of service or more in the performance of such duties (including the duties of a supervisory or administrative officer or employee) may, on his own application and upon the recommendation of the head of the department or agency in which he is serving, and with the approval of the Civil Service Commission, retire from the service; and the annuity of such officer or employee shall be equal to 2 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of service not exceeding 30 years. The Civil Service Commission shall, upon recommendation by the head of the department or agency involved, determine whether such officer or employee is entitled to retirement under this subsection. In making such determination, the Commission shall give full consideration to the degree of hazard to which such officer or employee is subjected in the performance of his duties, rather than the general duties of the class of the position held by such officer or employee."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "investigation or apprehension" and insert "investigation, apprehension or detention."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and a read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6502) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF PIERRE, S. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1925) to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Pierre, S. Dak., all of the rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described as all of blocks 1, 2, 3, and 4, Yaple's addition to the town, now city of Pierre, and lots 5 to 12 of block 23 and all of block 34, Ash's second addition to the town, now city of Pierre, S. Dak.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WYANDOTTE INDIAN PUBLIC BURIAL GROUND, KANSAS CITY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3685) authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is far too important to pass through the House by unanimous consent, inasmuch as it involves the abrogation of a treaty with the Wyandotte Nation of Indians which has stood for over a hundred years.

Further than that, the report does not state the facts, in that it states that this land has not been used for burial purposes for the past 30 or 40 years, when, as a matter of fact, it has been continuously used.

I have no objection, at next session, to using the same testimony and having this bill brought out and thoroughly discussed on the floor, so that every Member will know the import of it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]?

There was no objection.

RESTORING CERTAIN LANDS TO WADSWORTH, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1871) to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That those portions of the town site of Wadsworth, Washoe County, Nev., which were added to the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation by order of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, dated January 12, 1939, are hereby restored to and made a part of such town site. All proceeds from the disposition of lots within the lands restored to the town site of Wadsworth by this act, which shall be sold at a price of $25 per lot, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians of the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "which", strike out "shall be sold at a price of $25 per lot" and insert "may be sold at a price of not less than $25 per lot, provided such sale be approved by the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribal Council."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL DISTRICT 55, ROOSEVELT COUNTY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1933) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to school district 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey with the consent of the executive board of the Fort Peck Tribe by quitclaim deed to school district 55, Roosevelt County, Mont., the following-described lands located in Brockton, Roosevelt County, Mont.: Lots 3 through 14 of block 16; lots 1 through 4 of block 9; and lots 13 through 16 of block 9.

SEC. 2. The lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be used by the grantee for school purposes, including the use as a site for housing furnished to Indian families during the school term. The conveyance of such lands shall contain the express condition that if the grantee shall fail or cease to use such lands for such purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such lands, title thereto shall revert to the United States, in trust for the Fort Peck Tribe.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF LANDS OF THE CABAZON, AUGUSTINE, AND TORRES-MARTENEZ INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6457) to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martenez Indian Reservations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina why he asks that the bill be passed over? This bill has been worked out very carefully and has been agreed upon by all the people involved.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I observe that the Interior Department objects to the bill on several grounds.

Furthermore, I have been requested by attorneys representing the Indians involved that they have not had their day in court and request an opportunity to be heard.

Based upon that, I must insist on its being passed over.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is entirely mistaken, but under the circumstances I can do nothing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

CHANGING BASE PERIOD FOR THE DETERMINATION OF PARITY FOR MARYLAND TOBACCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5111) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to change the base period for the determination of parity for Maryland tobacco from August 1919 to July 1929 to the period from January 1936 to December 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the wool farmers of this country for the last 5 or 6 years have been trying to change their parity base but have been unable to do it.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this bill merely brings Maryland tobacco up with southern tobacco and to ask him to let the bill be considered. We are right in the midst of our market.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I did not hear what the gentleman said, but whatever it was it would not cause me to change my request. I voted against the bill in the committee and have heard no evidence since that has caused me to change my mind. We are going to have a regular agricultural adjustment bill next year and there is no reason why this bill cannot go over for a few months to take its place with the rest of American agriculture. I am against this special privilege readjustment that takes place from time to time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say, directing my remarks to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this is not special legislation. There are three types of tobacco. Two of the types have moved up, the southern types. Maryland tobacco has not moved up. It is just a drop in the bucket. We are right in the midst of our sales. This will not change the general price picture. This is not much but it is vital to this small section in Maryland. The over-all parity will undoubtedly be extended, but not this year, and we are selling tobacco a year old. It will not do us any good next year because we will sell before next year's market.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. McCORMACK. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SAFETY AND SANITATION STANDARDS FOR BAGGAGE CARS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6696) to amend part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to standards of safety and sanitation in the case of certain cars and equipment used in the movement of express traffic or baggage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding—and I ask the chairman of the committee, who is on his feet, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], if this bill was not reported unanimously from the committee, and if the purpose of this bill is not to protect employees in the discharge of their duties?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Long and extensive hearings were held. The conditions that were revealed were such as to require, in our judgment, legislation. The original bill had objectionable administrative features in it, but the committee took time with its staff to study the entire situation that called for a remedy. The result is this bill now before the House, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]. It has had the approval, as we understand, of all interested parties.

I am surprised that anyone would request that this worth-while bill be passed over. I think this worth-while and meritorious legislation should be passed by this House at the present time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, with such explanation of the bill by the able gentleman from New Jersey, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 25 thereof a new section as follows, and by renumbering the present section 26 as section 27:

"SEC. 26. (1) As used in this section—

"(a) The term 'carrier by railroad' means any carrier by railroad subject to this part, and any receiver, or other individual or body, judicial or otherwise, in possession of the business of any such carrier: *Provided,* That such term shall not include any street, interurban, or suburban electric railroad unless such railroad is operated as a part of a general railroad system of transportation.

"(b) The term 'express company' means any common carrier by express, subject to the provision of this part.

"(c) The term 'messenger service' means the movement by a carrier by railroad of express traffic or baggage in an express or baggage car which is accompanied en route by an express messenger or train baggageman.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to investigate, either upon complaint or upon its own motion, all cars and equipment used by any carrier by railroad in messenger service or furnished by such carrier to any express company for use in messenger service, and all cars and equipment owned by or leased to any express company for use in messenger service, and to make an examination of the construction, adaptability, design, and condition of all such cars and equipment, for the purpose of determining whether such cars and equipment are proper and suitable to provide adequate standards of safety and sanitation necessary to conform to basic requirements of safety and health for use in the service for which they are put so that the same may be so used without menace or peril to the lives, health, and safety of those employees who are required to work and travel in such cars: *Provided,* That no person who has any financial interest in any carrier by railroad or express company, or in any concern dealing in railway supplies, shall be employed for such purpose.

"(3) The Commission may, after investigation and after affording reasonable opportunity for hearing to interested persons, if found necessary in the public interest, order any carrier or carriers by railroad or any express company or express companies, or both, within such reasonable time as may be specified in the order, to alter, repair, reequip, or maintain any or all such cars to meet adequate standards of safety and sanitation necessary to conform to basic requirements of safety and health for the protection of those employees engaged in messenger service who are required to work and travel in such cars. In the establishment of any requirements with respect to sanitary facilities to be installed in cars furnished or used by any carrier by railroad or express company in messenger service, the Commission shall give due consideration, among other things, to the necessities of the situation as affected by (a) the safe accessibility of facilities in other cars in the same train, and (b) the length of time an employee is required to work in messenger service with no sanitary facilities available.

"(4) It shall be unlawful for any carrier by railroad or express company, to which any order issued under paragraph (3) applies, to use or permit to be used in messenger service, or for any such carrier by railroad to furnish for use by any express company in messenger service, any car or equipment which is not constructed, equipped, adapted, and in proper and suitable condition for use, in compliance with the applicable requirements imposed by such order of the Commission.

"(5) It shall be the duty of the Commission to see that the orders issued under paragraph (3) are observed by such carriers and the express companies, and all powers heretofore granted to the Commission are hereby extended to it for such purpose.

"(6) Each carrier by railroad and each express company shall file with the Commission such reports as the Commission may require for the purpose of enabling the Commission to determine whether such carrier or express company is complying with the orders issued under paragraph (3).

"(7) Any carrier by railroad or express company which fails or refuses to comply with any order issued under paragraph (3) shall be liable to a penalty of $100 for each such violation and $100 for each and every day such failure or refusal continues, to be recovered in a suit or suits to be brought by the United States attorney in the district court of the United States having jurisdiction in the locality where such failure or refusal occurs. It shall be the duty of such attorneys to bring such suits up on duly verified information being lodged with them showing that such failures or refusals have occurred; and it shall be the duty of the Commission to lodge with the proper United States attorneys information of any such failures or refusals coming to its knowledge."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 3 months after the date of its enactment.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 412, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill and the one following it, House Joint Resolution 413, were reported favorably by unanimous vote of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. These bills were introduced and reported in an effort to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine. We want a merchant marine that will not only protect our national security, but protect our leadership in maintaining the peace of the world.

These bills have the support of the shipping interests, shipbuilders, and Government agencies. The testimony before the committee leaves no doubt that they are vital and absolutely necessary if our merchant marine is to be built up to meet the demands not only of peace but of war. The testimony of Navy officials before the committee indicates in strong terms the need for an adequate merchant marine to maintain the national security. They favor these bills, as under them it will be possible to build and maintain an adequately balanced American merchant marine for our national security.

No special appropriation is required except as deemed advisable by the Committee on Appropriations. The legislation should have the unanimous approval of the House.

I am fearful that if this legislation is not passed it will dry up our shipyards and cause the loss of trained and skilled workers. I can further say that if this should happen and the New York Shipyard located at Camden, N. J., is denied the work for which it is now the low bidder because of failure to pass this legislation, it will prove disastrous in that community.

As an indication of the local interest in this important matter, I include, under the unanimous consent granted, a copy of an editorial appearing in the Courier-Post of Camden, N. J., June 7, 1948, as follows:

ALL-IMPORTANT DECISIONS ON SHIPBUILDING NEAR

Whether operations at the New York Shipbuilding Corp. are to come to a virtual halt this year or whether the yard is awarded contracts which will keep up to 6,000 men at work for a period of a year and a half or longer will be determined by events at Washington in the next few days.

Congressman WOLVERTON, President John Green, of the Industrial Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, Mayor Brunner, and others, have been engaged in a series of conferences aimed at bringing to the Camden yard contracts for several or all of the five proposed American President Lines cargo-passenger ships on which the yard is low bidder. The yard's bid was slightly in excess of $53,000,000.

Funds for the construction are available but will revert to the Treasury unless contracts are signed by June 30. Their release is held up by a conflict between the Maritime Commission and the American President Lines over the size of the construction subsidy to be granted, the operators seeking a 50-percent subsidy and the Commission reluctant to pay more than 33 percent.

President Truman told Brunner and Green last week that he favored construction of the ships, but referred the decision on letting the contracts to the Maritime Commission. The Commission and President George Killion of the President Lines are scheduled to discuss the contracts today and may reach an agreement which will permit them to be let without further delay before the June 30 deadline.

Should these negotiations fail, however, the sole hope for construction of the ships being started this year appears to rest with Congress. The House Merchant Marine Committee has favorably reported the Weichel bill, House Resolution 412, which would provide for the 50-percent subsidy as sought by the ship-operating companies.

Its fate is tied in with the legislative log-jam in Congress as it races to adjournment in 2 weeks.

Congressman WOLVERTON is doing his utmost to have the bill put on the House Consent Calendar, which would insure its speedy enactment and sending it to the Senate, where it is believed prompt approval could also be obtained, along with the President's signature.

The House leadership is slated to decide tomorrow whether to place this measure on the Consent Calendar. Unless the Maritime Commission-Killion conference produces an agreement which the two parties have been unable to reach heretofore, an early start on building the liners—which means continuation or suspension of work at New York Shipyard—depends on the decision the leadership makes tomorrow.

WOLVERTON hopes that decision will be favorable. So do the ship workers, the shipyard management, and all south Jersey.

I implore the House to pass this important legislation without requiring a rule for its discussion. It is too important to be lost in the closing days of this busy session.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, while this is a very meritorious piece of legislation, adequate time cannot be had on the Consent Calendar to consider a bill of this magnitude. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was nc objection.

AMENDING THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 413) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel the same way in reference to this bill as I did on the previous one and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL SERIES OF STAMPS COMMEMORATING ORGANIZATION OF THE ROUGH RIDERS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 305) authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer U. S. Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance, on as early a date as practicable, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer U. S. Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War. Such stamps shall be of an appropriate design, which shall include a picture of the equestrian statue standing in the city of Prescott, Ariz., of Capt. William Owen "Bucky" O'Neill, who commanded Troop A of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer U. S. Cavalry) who was killed in action while gallantly leading his men in the Battle of San Juan Hill, Cuba, on July 1, 1898.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURPLUS ATHLETIC EQUIPMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1302) to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a), notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, the War Assets Administrator is authorized to dispose of, without charge except for transportation and delivery, to States, their political subdivisions and instrumentalities; to public and governmental institutions; to nonprofit or tax-supported educational institutions and organizations; to charitable and eleemosynary institutions and organizations; to nonprofit associations, groups, institutions, and organizations designated to promote, support, sponsor, or encourage the participation of the youth of the country in athletics, sports, and games any surplus personal property which is suitable for use in athletics, sports, or games by the youth of the country.

(b) To aid in making surplus athletic equipment available to the youth of the country through associations, groups, organizations, and institutions sponsoring or promoting the participation of youth in athletics, sports, and games, any Government agency having a surplus of personal property which would be suitable for the purposes of this act shall declare such surplus to the War Assets Administrator who shall have authority to dispose of same in accordance with the provisions of this act.

(c) Any surplus property suitable for use by the youth of the country in athletics, sports, and games, or any property owned by any agency of the Government hereafter declared surplus which may be so used, shall not be disposed of in any manner other than as provided in this act unless the Administrator has given sufficient notice of such property available for disposal as herein provided and no request for such property has been received.

SEC. 2. (a) Any property so transferred shall be without restriction and without charge to the transferee except for disassembling, transporting, and delivering such property. The United States shall incur no obligation or liability in connection with the disassembling, transporting, or delivery of any property disposed of pursuant to this act.

(b) The War Assets Administrator is hereby authorized to prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(c) The War Assets Administrator is hereby authorized to determine the qualifications of the transferees under the provisions of this act and his decision shall be final.

(d) The War Assets Administrator is hereby authorized to effect transfers under the provisions of this act without regard to priority as between the transferees under this act or any other law, any law to the contrary notwithstanding.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "for", insert the word "disassembling."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE TIME LIMIT IN ADMIRALTY CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4873) to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Suits in Admiralty Act, approved March 9, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 46, sec. 745), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"And provided further*, That the limitations in this section contained for the commencement of suits hereunder shall not bar any suit against the United States or the United States Maritime Commission brought hereunder within 2 years after the date of enactment of this proviso, if such suit is on a cause of action arising out of the action or inaction of a general agent under a general agent service agreement with the War Shipping Administration and such cause of action arose after the date which preceded the date of enactment of this proviso by a period of time equal to the period within which suits on causes of action of the same type may be brought under applicable State law."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 5 of the Suits in Admiralty Act (41 Stat. 525, 46 U. S. C. 741–745), approved March 9, 1920, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 5. That suits as herein authorized may be brought only within 2 years after the cause of action arises: *Provided*, That where a remedy is provided by this act it shall hereafter be exclusive of any other action by reason of the same subject matter against

the agent or employee of the United States or of any incorporated or unincorporated agency thereof whose act or omission gave rise to the claim: *Provided further*, That the limitations contained in this section for the commencement of suits shall not bar any suit against the United States brought hereunder within 1 year after the enactment of this amendatory act if such suit is based upon a cause of action whereon a prior suit in admiralty or an action at law was timely commenced and was or may hereafter be dismissed solely because improperly brought against any person, partnership, association, or corporation engaged by the United States to manage and conduct the business of a vessel owned or bare boat chartered by the United States or against the master of any such vessel: *And provided further*, That after June 30, 1932, no interest shall be allowed on any claim prior to the time when suit on such claim is brought as authorized by section 2 of this act unless upon a contract expressly stipulating for the payment of interest.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING THE INTERESTS OF THE FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That those provisions of the order of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 6, 1948, which are based on certain recommendations contained in the Report on Conditions Found to Exist on the Fort Hall Irrigation Project and the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, dated February 26, 1941, and which are described in the said order as made pursuant to the authority contained in the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), are hereby approved pursuant to the provisions of such act.

SEC. 2. When water for the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is available in excess of the present maximum duty of 3 acre-feet per acre per annum, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to increase the water duty of those lands with respect to which such an increase is recommended in the report referred to in section 1 of this act in an amount not to exceed the actual needs of such lands as set out in said report.

SEC. 3. The Little Indian unit containing one thousand one hundred eighty-six and thirty-three one-hundredths acres of irrigable land in townships 2 and 3 south, ranges 36 and 37 east, Boise meridian, within the boundaries of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, is hereby made a part of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project and the lands therein shall have the benefit of, and be subject to, all existing legislation applicable to said project to the same extent as other lands of like ownership and character within the project. The Indian-owned irrigable land in the unit shall be charged with its proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this act. The non-Indian-owned irrigable land of the unit shall be entitled to receive only natural-flow water until a full project water right is acquired for said land through the execution by the owner of a contract, or contracts, providing for the repayment of the United States of like per acre costs as are charged against the Indian-owned land in the unit. Said charges, as to Indian and non-Indian lands, shall be a first lien against the lands, under the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210).

SEC. 4. The net irrigable area of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is hereby established as forty-seven thousand and forty-four and sixty-three one-hundredths acres of land, more or less. This area includes forty-six thousand eight hundred and three and seventy-two one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, shown as the irrigable area of the project by the maps and plats in the report referred to in section 1 of this act, and the two hundred and forty and ninety-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, included in eight additional tracts of land described as follows: (a) An irregular-shaped area in the northeast corner of the east half southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 36, township 5 south, range 33 east, Boise meridian, containing one and seventy one-hundredths acres; (b) an irregular-shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall main canal in the west half section 35, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty-eight and seventeen one-hundredths acres; (c) an irregular-shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall main canal in the south half of section 14, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing forty acres; (d) a portion of the northwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing thirty-three and forty-two one-hundredths acres; (e) Fairview Park in the east half southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter and west half southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres; (f) the east half northeast quarter northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty acres; (g) an irregular-shaped area lying along the east side of the Pocatello lateral in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ninety-seven and sixty-two one-hundredths acres; and (h) the southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres. The above-described tracts of land, together with such lands in the portion of the village of Alameda lying between the Pocatello lateral and the Oregon Short Line Railroad right-of-way in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, as (notwithstanding their inclusion in the irrigable acreage shown by the maps and plats hereinabove mentioned) have no water right at present, shall be entitled to receive, or to continue to receive, water through pumping operations or by gravity flow, provided the respective owners thereof, within 5 years from the date of the enactment of this act, enter into contracts whereby they agree (1) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project construction costs of $18.12 per acre, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this act, for such of their lands as do not now have a project water right, (2) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, for such of their lands as are not now covered by contracts for the repayment of such costs, and (3) to install, maintain, and operate, at their own expense, pumping machinery to lift the water from the project canals or laterals for the irrigation of such of their lands as cannot be supplied by gravity flow. The noninclusion of the Fort Hall town site within the net irrigable area of the project as hereby established shall not prevent the obtaining of water rights therefor in accordance with the act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1025).

SEC. 5. There is excluded from the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project by the designation of the project area in section 4 of this act the nine thousand six hundred and seventy acres of tribal, allotted, and non-Indian-owned lands located between Fort Hall and Gibson, Idaho, heretofore authorized to be included in the project by the act of March 3, 1927 (ch. 371, 44 Stat. 1398). The construction costs apportioned to the tribal lands so excluded are hereby canceled and the water rights are made available for project use. The water rights for the lands of the several allottees and non-Indian owners within the area so excluded shall not be impaired or affected by reason of such exclusion, but water shall be delivered only at the head of the laterals serving these lands. The respective owners of such lands may make their water rights available for project use, whereupon the construction costs assessed or assessable against their lands with respect to the water rights thus made available shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior. Allottees of lands within the excluded area, or their heirs or devisees, may donate or sell their lands to the tribe or may exchange their lands for assignments of tribal lands within the project area. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, $8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior, in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, of one hundred and eighty acres of non-Indian-owned land, with water rights and improvements appurtenant thereto, described as the north half southeast quarter southwest quarter section 13, township 4 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, and south half northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter section 7, township 4 south, range 35 east, Boise meridian, located within the area excluded from the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project by section 4 of this act.

SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,995 to compensate the following-named landowners, or their heirs, for work accomplished or for future work necessary in filling, leveling, and otherwise preparing for irrigation the abandoned portion of the old Fort Hall main canal within their holdings, in not to exceed the following amounts: Frank E. DeKay, $401; Henry Jensen, $633; Theodore H. Gathe, $654; A. E. Albert, $106; Ezra D. Wilson, $127; J. M. Bistline, $378; Ambrose H. McGuire, $424; Ellen Griffith, $412; C. M. Allen, $116; Olive A. Granden, $184; William Webster, $28; Hiram Faulkner, $114; Williamette Blakeslee, $298; Frank Parker, $99; and Henrietta C. Blakeslee, $21.

SEC. 7. Pending the construction of a siphon to provide gravity flow water to ninety-six and six-tenths acres of irrigable lands in the southwest quarter section 27, and east half section 28, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, which lands have been irrigated by pumping operations over a period of years, the Secretary of the Interior may accept the conveyance by the landowners of the pumping equipment for use of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project and may operate such equipment as a part of said project in order to provide water for the irrigation of such lands; the acceptance of such conveyance being subject to the owners of the lands executing releases to the United States of any and all claims

whatsoever due to the pumping operations carried on by such landowners.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to revise and reform, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in all the circumstances affecting the interests of the United States and the contractors, existing contracts between the United States and the Idaho Irrigation District, the Progressive Irrigation District, and the Snake River Valley Irrigation District in Idaho, which contracts provide for certain payments by the districts to the United States for the benefit of works of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project.

SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for refunds to Indians, or their heirs, the sum of $1,419.55, representing irrigation assessments of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project erroneously made and collected, as follows: Andrew F. Cutler, $153.80; Alice Sorrell Johns, $168.95; Nettie Stinson LaVatta, $146.62; Earl Edmund Cutler, $159.20; Charles Faulkner, $145.25; Josephine LaVatta Rumas, $155.20; May Phyllis LaVatta Brower, $29.90; Leonard I. Cutler, $135.85; Effie Diggie Houtz, $122.75; Lucy Yandell Spencer, $25; Charles Gerard Cutler, $121.53; and Hattie Sorrell Siler Tillotson, $55.50.

SEC. 10. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the relocating, rehabilitating, cleaning, and extending of irrigation systems serving the lands irrigated from Ross Fork, Bannock, and Lincoln Creeks, which lands are outside of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, including the construction of a storage reservoir on Bannock Creek. The costs of any work benefiting Indian lands performed pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned on a per acre basis and collected under laws applicable to Indian irrigable lands on the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project. Operation and maintenance charges against such lands shall likewise be subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations as apply to Indian lands on the Fort Hall project. Any unpaid charges against such lands shall be subject to a first lien as provided in the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210). No expenditure shall be made under this authorization which will benefit lands in non-Indian ownership unless the owners thereof execute contracts providing for the repayment of their proportionate per acre share of the costs of the work assessable against their lands.

SEC. 11. In order to prevent the accumulation of delinquent project assessments or other charges against the non-Indian-owned lands of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause liquidation of all delinquent assessments or charges by taking such action as may be necessary, including the foreclosure of the Government's lien covering any such delinquent charges or by initiating such other procedure as may be legally available, which action may be taken by him at any time when in his judgment the best interests of the project would be served thereby.

SEC. 12. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. During such periods as water for the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project may be available in excess of the present duty of 3 acre-feet per acre per annum, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the delivery of such excess water equally to the project lands in an amount not to exceed five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum, in addition to the present duty of 3 acre-feet per acre per annum: *Provided, however,* That any surplus water temporarily available in addition to the 3.5 acre-feet per acre per annum may be furnished for use on project lands on terms, conditions, and rates to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS ON CERTAIN PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6028) to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the author of the bill, whether he can give the committee any estimate as to the probable cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. CURTIS. I cannot give exact figures as to the cost. It applies to the construction period only of an irrigation project, and would permit them to reimburse certain school districts, just the same as the Army engineers do on flood-control construction.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. How many school districts are there?

Mr. CURTIS. That would be determined by the Committee on Appropriations and the extent of our construction program throughout the country.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it Nation-wide?

Mr. CURTIS. The reclamation program is restricted to 17 States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This would be applicable to any reclamation project in the 17 States?

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to other purposes for which appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation are authorized by law, appropriations for the Bureau are hereby authorized for payments to the public-school districts serving areas in which are located Federal reclamation projects, as reimbursement for the cost of instruction of dependents of persons employed on said projects while said projects are in construction status.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "instruction", insert "or transportation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL SERIES OF STAMPS IN HONOR OF MOINA MICHAEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6634) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare, for issuance at as early a date as practicable, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RATIFYING AMENDMENTS TO PETROLEUM CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4659) to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That contract amendments relating to Government prices to be paid for petroleum products, entered into by the Treasury Department in the calendar year 1946 following the removal of price controls on petroleum products, are hereby ratified and confirmed; and such amendments shall be treated as valid in the determination and adjustment of claims by or against the United States under such contracts.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That contract amendments relating to prices to be paid for petroleum products entered into by any department, agency, or establishment of the executive branch of the Government, in the calendar year 1946 following the removal of price controls on petroleum products, are hereby ratified and confirmed; and such amendments shall be treated as valid in the determination and adjustment of claims by or against the United States under such contracts.

"SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of accounts of accountable officers of the Government of the United States covering payments made under contract amendments which are, and to the extent that such payments are, ratified and confirmed by section 1 hereof.

"SEC. 3. Amounts which have been refunded or collected by set-off, or otherwise, from contractors on account of payments made under contract amendments herein ratified and confirmed, are authorized to be repaid to said contractors upon presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 411) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1948, a special 3-cent postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAMP FOR PALOMAR MOUNTAIN OBSERVATORY DEDICATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6368) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory, San Diego County, Calif., the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp of such denomination and design and for such period beginning not later than July 1, 1948, as he may determine.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "July" and insert "September."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF CARIBOU NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1037) to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest are hereby extended to include the following described lands and, subject to any valid existing claim or entry, all lands of the United States within the areas hereafter described are hereby added to and made part of the Caribou National Forest, State of Idaho, to be hereafter administered under the laws and regulations relating to the national forests, and the provisions of the act approved March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, are hereby extended and made applicable to all other lands within said described areas:

BOISE MERIDIAN

Township 10 south, range 35 east, section 34, south half south half; section 35, south half south half; section 36, south half south half;

Township 10 south, range 36 east, section 31, lot 2, southeast quarter southwest quarter, and south half southeast quarter; section 32, south half south half;

Township 11 south, range 35 east, section 1, lot 4; section 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4; section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, west half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 9, lot 1, southeast quarter northeast quarter, and east half southeast quarter; section 10; section 15; section 19, south half northeast quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 20, lots 2, 3, southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 21; section 22; section 23, west half; section 27; section 28, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 29, east half; section 32, northeast quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 33, north half, and north half south half; section 34, north half, southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter;

Township 11 south, range 36 east, section 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 8, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, west half northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, west half southeast quarter, and east half southwest quarter; section 17, east half, and east half northwest quarter; section 20, east half; section 21, west half; section 28, west half; section 29, east half; section 32, east half; and section 33;

Township 12 south, range 35 east, section 1, southwest quarter; section 2, south half; section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and south half; section 11, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, north half northeast quarter east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter; section 12, north half northwest quarter; section 14, north half northwest quarter; section 15, northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter, and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 21, east half northeast quarter, and east half southeast quarter; section 22, north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, and west half southwest quarter; section 28, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, east half northeast quarter, and northwest quarter southeast quarter; section 33, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter;

Township 12 south, range 36, east, section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and southwest quarter; section 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 9; section 10, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, west half northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, and west half; section 15; section 16, east half; section 21, east half; section 22; section 25; section 26, northeast quarter; section 28, east half; section 33, northeast quarter; section 34, southwest quarter; and section 36;

Township 12 south, range 37 east, section 23; section 24; section 25, east half northeast quarter, and northwest quarter northwest quarter; section 26; section 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, east half northwest quarter, northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 32, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, north half southeast quarter, and northeast quarter southwest quarter; section 33, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 34, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter;

Township 12 south, range 38, east, section 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter; and section 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter;

Township 13 south, range 35 east, section 4, lot 3, southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 9, east half northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 13, southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 14, south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, and south half; section 15, south half; section 16, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; and section 24, southeast quarter; and section 25, northeast quarter;

Township 13 south, range 36 east, section 1, lots 1, 2, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 3, lots 3, 4, 7; south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter, and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 10, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and west half northeast quarter; section 12, east half; section 13, north half northeast quarter; section 15, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, and west half northeast quarter; section 21, southeast quarter; section 22, lots 1, 2, and west half northeast quarter; section 28, northeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 29, south half; section 30, lots 3, 4, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 32, north half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter northeast quarter; and section 33, northwest quarter, and west half northeast quarter;

Township 13 south, range 37 east, section 7, lots 5, 6, 7, 8, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 18, lots 1, 2, east half northwest quarter, and east half; section 19, east half northeast quarter; section 20, southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 29, west half northwest quarter, and west half southwest quarter; section 32, north half, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 33, south half southwest quarter.

Township 13 south, range 38 east, section 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; and section 32;

Township 14 south, range 36 east, section 11, west half northeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 12, north half; section 14, west half, west half northeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 26, west half southwest quarter, and southwest quarter northwest quarter; section 35, east half;

Township 14 south, range 37 east, section 4, lots 3, 4; section 9, east half; section 10, west half; section 14, west half northwest quarter, and west half southwest quarter; section 15; section 16, northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter, and southeast quarter southeast quarter; section 20, west half, west half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 21, south half, and east half northeast quarter; section 22, northwest quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 26, south half, south half northwest quarter, and south half northeast quarter; section 34; and section 35.

Township 14 south, range 38 east, section 5; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 8; section 17; section 20; section 28, south half; section 29; section 32; and section 33;

Township 15 south, range 36 east, section 2, lots 1, 2, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 11, east half; section 14, east half; section 23, east half; section 24, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 25, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 26, east half; section 35, east half; section 36; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, east half northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter;

Township 15 south, range 37 east, section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and south half; section 9; section 10; section 14; section 15; section 16; section 21; section 22; section 23; section 25, west half, west half northeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 26; section 27; and section 35;

Township 15 south, range 38 east, section 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and south half; section 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and south half; section 8; section 9; section 16; section 17; section 18, east half southeast quarter; section 19, east half northeast quarter, east half southeast quarter, and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 20, north half, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; and section 21, north half;

Township 16 south, range 36 east, section 2, lots 1, 2, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 12; section 13; section 24, east half; and section 25, east half;

Township 16 south, range 37 east, section 2; section 11; section 14; section 15, south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, southeast quarter, and east half southwest quarter; section 22, east half, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter; section 23; section 26, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, north half, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; and section 27, lots 1, 2, 3, northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, after "section 2", strike out "lots 1, 2, 3, 4;" and insert in lieu thereof "lots 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9;."

Page 2, line 11, after "section 3", strike out "lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7," and insert in lieu thereof "lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10."

Page 2, line 13, strike out the words "west half" and insert in lieu thereof "east half."

Page 4, lines 6 and 7, after the words "section 21", strike out "east half;" and insert in lieu thereof "lots 1 and 2, northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter."

Page 7, line 11, after the words "section 5" insert a semicolon and strike out the remaining portion of line 11, all of lines 12 and 13, and the first word, i. e., "quarter;" of line 14.

Page 7, beginning line 23, after the words "east half;" insert the word "and." Change the comma after "36" to a period and strike out the remainder of page 7.

Page 8, line 18, after "2", strike out the words "south half northeast quarter."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND BANKRUPTCY ACT OF JULY 1, 1898

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5693) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64 and subdivision h of section 70 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to make inquiry of the author as to the meaning of section 30 (a) of this bill, which reads: "All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any provisions of this amendatory act are hereby repealed," the point of my inquiry being, How can anyone tell what acts are inconsistent with any provisions of this amendatory act? Are we not, in effect, imposing upon the judiciary and the bar the obligation of attempting to determine, whether rightly or wrongly, what acts are inconsistent with this pending measure?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I think that is just a repetition of the present law. This is an amendatory act. The entire act is noncontroversial. It merely simplifies the language of the present law.

Mr. KEOGH. Of course, it is noncontroversial until a controversy arises. I hesitate to say this, but it is my opinion that more confusion in attempting to interpret the acts of this body arises from the use of what might be described as a general indefinite repealer such as this than from anything else. However, if the committee is satisfied with it, I have no objection. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) paragraph (24) of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(24) 'Petition' shall mean a document filed in a court of bankruptcy or with a clerk thereof initiating a proceeding under this act;".

(b) Paragraph (30) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(30) 'Transfer' shall include the sale and every other and different mode, direct or indirect, of disposing of or of parting with property or with an interest therein or with the possession thereof or of fixing a lien upon property or upon an interest therein, absolutely or conditionally, voluntarily or involuntarily, by or without judicial proceedings, as a conveyance, sale, assignment, payment, pledge, mortgage, lien, encumbrance, gift, security, or otherwise; the retention of a security title to property delivered to a debtor shall be deemed a transfer suffered by such debtor;".

SEC. 2. Paragraph (21) of subdivision a of section 2 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(21) Require receivers or trustees appointed in proceedings not under this act, assignees for the benefit of creditors, and agents authorized to take possession of or to liquidate a person's property to deliver the property in their possession or under their control to the receiver or trustee appointed under this act or, where an arrangement or a plan under this act has been confirmed and such property has not prior thereto been delivered to a receiver or trustee appointed under this act, to deliver such property to the debtor or other person entitled to such property according to the provisions of the arrangement or plan, and in all such cases to account to the court for the disposition by them of the property of such bankrupt or debtor: *Provided, however*, That such delivery and accounting shall not be required, except in proceedings under section 77 and chapters X and XII of this act, if the receiver or trustee was appointed, the assignment was made, or the agent was authorized more than 4 months prior to the date of bankruptcy. Upon such accounting, the court shall reexamine and determine the propriety and reasonableness of all disbursements made out of such property by such receiver, trustee, assignee, or agent, either to himself or to others, for services and expenses under such receivership, trusteeship, assignment, or agency, and shall, unless such disbursements have been approved, upon notice to creditors and other parties in interest, by a court of competent jurisdiction prior to the proceeding under this act, surcharge such receiver, trustee, assignee, or agent the amount of any disbursement determined by the court to have been improper or excessive."

SEC. 3. Clause (8) of subdivision a of section 7 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) prepare, make oath to, and file in court within 5 days after adjudication, if an involuntary bankrupt, and with his petition, if a voluntary bankrupt, a schedule of his property, showing the amount and kind of property, the location thereof and its money value, in detail; and a list of all his creditors, including all persons asserting contingent, unliquidated, or disputed claims, showing their residences or places of business, if known, or if unknown that fact to be stated, the amount due to or claimed by each of them, the consideration thereof, the security held by them, if any, and what claims, if any, are contingent, unliquidated, or disputed; and a claim for such exemptions as he may be entitled to; all in triplicate, one copy for the clerk, one for the referee, and one for the trustee: *Provided, however*, That the court may for cause shown grant further time for the filing of such schedules if, with his petition in a voluntary proceeding or with his application to have such time extended in an involuntary proceeding, the bankrupt files a list of all such creditors and their addresses;".

SEC. 4. Subdivision a of section 11 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"a. A suit which is founded upon a claim from which a discharge would be a release, and which is pending against a person at the time of the filing of a petition by or against him, shall be stayed until an adjudication or the dismissal of the petition; if such person is adjudged a bankrupt, such action may be further stayed until the question of his discharge is determined by the court after a hearing, or by the bankrupt's filing a waiver of, or having lost, his right to a discharge, or, in the case of a corporation, by its failure to file an application for a discharge within the time prescribed under this act: *Provided, however*, That such stay shall be vacated by the court if, in a proceeding under the act commenced within 6 years prior to the date of the filing of the petition in bankruptcy, such person has been granted a discharge, or has had a composition confirmed, or has had an arrangement by way of composition confirmed, or has had a wage earner's plan by way of composition confirmed."

SEC. 5. (a) Clause (5) of subdivision c of section 14 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "or (5) in a proceeding under this act commenced within 6 years prior to bankruptcy been granted a discharge, or had a composition or an arrangement by way of composition or a wage earner plan by way of composition confirmed under this act;".

(b) Subdivision e of such section is amended to read as follows:

"e. If the bankrupt fails to appear at the hearing upon the objections to his application for a discharge, or having appeared refuses to submit himself to examination, or if the court finds after hearing upon notice that the bankrupt has failed without sufficient excuse to appear and submit himself to examination at the first meeting of creditors or at any meeting specially called for his examination, he shall be deemed to have waived his right to a discharge, and the court shall enter an order to that effect."

SEC. 6. Subdivision a of section 18 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"a. Upon the filing of a petition for involuntary bankruptcy, service thereof, with a writ of subpena, shall be made upon the person therein named as defendant. Upon the filing of a voluntary petition in behalf of a partnership by less than all of the general partners, service thereof, with a writ of subpena, shall be made upon the general partner or partners not parties to the filing of such petition. Such service shall be returnable within 10 days, unless the court shall, for cause shown, fix a longer time, and shall be made at least 5 days prior to the return day, and in other respects shall be made in the same manner that service of such process is had upon the commencement of a civil action in the courts of the United States; but in case personal service cannot be made within the time allowed, then notice shall be given by publication in the same manner as provided by law for notice by publication in suits to enforce a legal or equitable lien in courts of the United States, except that, unless the court shall otherwise direct, the order shall be published only once and the return day shall be 5 days after such publication."

SEC. 7. Subdivision k of section 21 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"k. In all proceedings under this act, the parties in interest shall be entitled to all rights and remedies granted by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States established from time to time by the Supreme Court pertaining to discovery, interrogatories, inspection and production of documents, and to the admission of execution and genuineness of instruments: *Provided, however,* That the limitations of time therein prescribed may be shortened by the court to expedite hearings."

SEC. 8. Subdivision d of section 29 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"d. A person shall not be prosecuted for any offense arising under this act unless the indictment is found or the information is filed in court within 3 years after the commission of the offense: *Provided, however,* That in the case of the offense of concealment of assets of a bankrupt the period of limitations herein shall not begin to run until the question of the bankrupt's discharge is determined by the court after a hearing, or by the bankrupt's filing a waiver of, or having lost, his right to a discharge."

SEC. 9. Clause (9) of subdivision a of section 39 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(9) transmit forthwith to the clerks all bonds filed with and approved by them, the originals of all orders made by them granting adjudications or dismissing the petitions as provided in this act, and certified copies of all orders made by them, granting, denying, or revoking discharges, confirming or refusing to confirm, or setting aside the confirmation of, arrangements or wage earner plans, and reinstating the proceedings or cases;".

SEC. 10. Subdivision a of section 42 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"a. The records of all proceedings in each case before a referee shall be kept in the manner as prescribed by the Supreme Court of the United States."

SEC. 11. (a) Subdivision j of section 57 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"j. (1) Debts owing to the United States or to any State or any subdivision thereof as a penalty or forfeiture shall not be allowed, except for the amount of the pecuniary loss sustained by the act, transaction, or proceeding out of which the penalty or forfeiture arose, with reasonable and actual costs occasioned thereby and such interest as may have accrued on the amount of such loss up to the date of bankruptcy.

"(2) Except where the estate of the bankrupt is solvent, interest accruing after the date of bankruptcy on taxes legally due and owing to the United States or to any State or any subdivision thereof shall not be allowed."

(b) Subdivision n of such section is amended to read as follows:

"n. Except as otherwise provided in this act, all claims provable under this act, including all claims of the United States and of any State or any subdivision thereof, shall be proved and filed in the manner provided in this section. Claims which are not filed within 6 months after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors shall not be allowed: *Provided, however,* That the court may, upon application before the expiration of such period and for cause shown, grant a reasonable fixed extension of time for the filing of claims by the United States or any State or any subdivision thereof: *Provided further,* That the right of infants and insane persons without guardians, without notice of the bankruptcy proceedings, may continue 6 months longer: *And provided further,* That a claim arising in favor of a person by reason of the recovery by the trustee from such person of money or property, or the avoidance by the trustee of a lien held by such person, may be filed within 30 days from the date of such recovery or avoidance, but if the recovery is by way of a proceeding in which a final judgment has been entered against such person, the claim shall not be allowed if the money is not paid or the property is not delivered to the trustee within 30 days from the date of the rendering of such final judgment, or within such further time as the court may allow. When in any case all claims which have been duly allowed have been paid in full, claims not filed within the time hereinabove prescribed may nevertheless be filed within such time as the court may fix or for cause shown extend and, if duly proved, shall be allowed against any surplus remaining in such case."

SEC. 12. Clause (8) of subdivision a of section 58 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) all applications by receivers, ancillary receivers, marshals, trustees, committees, and attorneys for compensation from the estate for services rendered, specifying the amount and by whom made: *Provided, however,* That where a creditor's committee has been appointed pursuant to this act, the notice required by clauses (1), (4), and (6) of this subdivision shall be sent only to such committee and to the creditors who have filed with the court a demand that all notices under this subdivision be mailed to them."

SEC. 13. Subdivision a of section 60 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"a. A preference is a transfer, as defined in this act, of any of the property of a debtor to or for the benefit of a creditor for or on account of an antecedent debt, made or suffered by such debtor while insolvent and within 4 months before the filing by or against him of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act, the effect of which transfer will be to enable such creditor to obtain a greater percentage of his debt than some other creditor of the same class. For the purposes of subdivisions a and b of this section, a transfer shall be deemed to have been made at the time when it became so far perfected that no bona fide purchaser from the debtor and no creditor could thereafter have acquired any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein, and, if such transfer is not so perfected prior to the filing of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before bankruptcy."

SEC. 14. Subdivision c of section 63 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"c. Notwithstanding any State law to the contrary, the rejection of an excutory contract or unexpired lease, as provided in this act, shall constitute a breach of such contract or lease as of the date of the filing of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act."

SEC. 15. (a) Clause (1) of subdivision a of section 64 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the actual and necessary costs and expenses of preserving the estate subsequent to filing the petition; the fees for the referees' salary fund and for the referees' expense fund; the filing fees paid by creditors in involuntary cases or by persons other than the bankrupt in voluntary cases; where property of the bankrupt, transferred or concealed by him either before or after the filing of the petition, shall have been recovered for the benefit of the estate of the bankrupt by the efforts and at the cost and expense of one or more creditors, the reasonable costs and expenses of such recovery; the costs and expenses of administration, including the trustee's expenses in opposing the bankrupt's discharge or in connection with the criminal prosecution of an offense punishable under this act or an offense concerning the business or property of the bankrupt punishable under other laws, Federal or State; the fees and mileage payable to witnesses as now or hereafter provided by the laws of the United States, and one reasonable attorney's fee, for the professional services actually rendered, irrespective of the number of attorneys employed, to the petitioning creditors in involuntary cases and to the bankrupt in voluntary and involuntary cases, as the court may allow: *Provided, however,* That where an order is entered in a proceeding under any chapter of this act directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with the costs and expenses of administration incurred in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding shall have priority in advance of payment of the unpaid costs and expenses of administration, including the allowances provided for in such chapter, incurred in the superseded proceeding and in the suspended bankruptcy proceeding, if any;".

(b) Subdivision b of such section is hereby repealed.

SEC. 16. (a) Paragraph (1) of subdivision a of section 67 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"a. (1) Every lien against the property of a person obtained by attachment, judgment, levy, or other legal or equitable process or proceedings within 4 months before the filing of a petition initiating a proceeding under this act by or against such person shall be deemed null and void (a) if at the time when such lien was obtained such person was insolvent or (b) if such lien was sought and permitted in fraud of the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That if such person is not finally adjudged a bankrupt in any proceeding under this act and if no arrangement or plan is proposed and confirmed, such lien shall be deemed reinstated with the same effect as if it had not been nullified and voided."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subdivision a of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) If any lien deemed null and void under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subdivision a, has been dissolved by the furnishing of a bond or other obligation, the surety on which has been indemnified directly or indirectly by the transfer of or the creation of a lien upon any of the nonexempt property of a person before the filing of a petition initiating a proceeding under this act by or against him, such indemnifying transfer or lien shall also be deemed null and void: *Provided, however,* That if such person is not finally adjudged a bankrupt in any proceeding under this act, and if no arrangement or plan is proposed and confirmed, such transfer or lien shall be deemed reinstated with the same effect as if it had not been nullified and voided."

(c) Subdivision b of such section is amended to read as follows:

"b. The provisions of section 60 of this act to the contrary notwithstanding, statutory liens in favor of employees, contractors, mechanics, landlords, or other classes of persons, and statutory liens for taxes and debts owing to the United States or to any State or any subdivision thereof, created or recognized by the laws of the United States or of any State, may be valid against the trustee, even though arising or perfected while the debtor is insolvent and within 4 months prior to the filing of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act, by or against him. Where by such laws such liens are required to be perfected and arise but are not perfected before bankruptcy, they may nevertheless be valid, if perfected within the time permitted by and in accordance with the requirements of such laws, except that if such laws require the liens to be perfected by the seizure of property, they shall instead be perfected by filing notice thereof with the court."

(d) Subdivision c of such section is amended to read as follows:

"c. Where not enforced by sale before the filing of a petition initiating a proceeding under this act, though valid under subdivision b of this section, statutory liens, including liens for taxes or debts owing to the United States or to any State or any subdivision thereof, on personal property not accompanied by possession of such property, and liens, whether statutory or not, of distress for rent shall be postponed in payment to the debts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of subdivision a of section 64 of this act and, except as against other liens, such liens for wages or for rent shall be restricted in the amount of their payment to the same extent as provided for wages and rent respectively in subdivision a of section 64 of this act."

(e) Paragraph (2) of subdivision d of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Every transfer made and every obligation incurred by a debtor within 1 year prior to the filing of a petition initiating a proceeding under this act by or against him is fraudulent (a) as to creditors existing at the time of such transfer or obligation, if made or incurred without fair consideration by a debtor who is or will be thereby rendered insolvent, without regard to his actual intent; or (b) as to then existing creditors and as to other persons who become creditors during the continuance of a business or transaction, if made or incurred without fair consideration by a debtor who is engaged or is about to engage in such business or transaction, for which the property remaining in his hands is an unreasonably small capital, without regard to his actual intent; or (c) as to then existing and future creditors, if made or incurred without fair consideration by a debtor who intends to incur or believes that he will incur debts beyond his ability to pay as they mature; or (d) as to then existing and future creditors, if made or incurred with actual intent as distinguished from intent presumed in law, to hinder, delay, or defraud either existing or future creditors."

(f) Paragraph (3) of subdivision d of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Every transfer made and every obligation incurred by a debtor within 4 months prior to the filing of a petition initiating a proceeding under this act by or against him is fraudulent, as to then existing and future creditors, if made or incurred with intent to use the consideration, obtained for the transfer or obligation, to effect a preference to a third person voidable under section 60 of this act. The remedies of the trustee for the avoidance of such transfer or obligation and of such preference shall be cumulative: *Provided, however,* That the trustee shall be entitled to only one satisfaction with respect thereto."

(g) Paragraph (4) of subdivision d of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Every transfer of partnership property and every partnership obligation incurred within 1 year prior to the filing of a petition initiating a petition under this act by or against the partnership, when the partnership is insolvent or will be thereby rendered insolvent, is fraudulent as to partnership creditors existing at the time of such transfer or obligation, without regard to actual intent if made or incurred (a) to a partner, whether with or without a promise by him to pay partnership debts, or (b) to a person not a partner without fair consideration to the partnership as distinguished from consideration to the individual partners."

(h) Paragraph (5) of subdivision d of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(5) For the purposes of this subdivision d, a transfer shall be deemed to have been made at the time when it became so far perfected that no bona fide purchaser from the debtor could thereafter have acquired any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein, but, if such transfer is not so perfected prior to the filing of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before the filing of such petition."

SEC. 17. Subdivision d of section 69 of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"d. Upon the filing of a petition under this act, a receiver or trustee, appointed in proceedings not under this act, of any of the property of a bankrupt, an assignee for the benefit of creditors of a bankrupt, or an agent authorized to take possession of or to liquidate any of the property of a bankrupt shall be accountable to the bankruptcy court, in which the proceeding under this act is pending, for any action taken by him subsequent to the filing of such bankruptcy petition, and shall file in such bankruptcy court a sworn schedule setting forth a summary of the property in his charge and of the liabilities of the estate, both as of the time of and since becoming receiver, trustee, assignee, or agent, and a sworn statement of his administration of the estate. Such receiver, trustee, assignee, or agent, with knowledge of the filing of such bankruptcy proceeding, shall not make any disbursements or take any action in the administration of such property without first obtaining authorization therefor from the bankruptcy court."

SEC. 18. (a) The introductory sentence of subdivision a of section 70 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"a. The trustee of the estate of a bankrupt and his successor or successors, if any, upon his or their appointment and qualification, shall in turn be vested by operation of law with the title of the bankrupt as of the date of the filing of the petition initiating a proceeding under this act, except insofar as it is to property which is held to be exempt, to all (1) * * *."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subdivision e of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) All property of the debtor affected by any such transfer shall be and remain a part of his assets and estate, discharged and released from such transfer and shall pass to, and every such transfer or obligation shall be avoided by, the trustee for the benefit of the estate: *Provided, however,* That the court may on due notice order such transfer or obligation to be preserved for the benefit of the estate and in such event the trustee may enforce the rights of such transferee or obligee. The trustee shall reclaim and recover such property or collect its value from and avoid such transfer or obligation against whomever may hold or have received it, except a person as to whom the transfer or obligation specified in paragraph (1) of this subdivision e is valid under applicable Federal or State laws."

(c) Subdivision h of such section is hereby repealed and subdivision "i" of such section is relettered to read subdivision "h."

SEC. 19. Section 221 of such Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "a" after "SEC. 221." and before "The judge * * *", and by inserting at the end of such section a new subdivision:

"b. The judge shall, in the order confirming the plan, fix the time when the trustee or debtor in possession shall cease to operate the business and manage the property of the debtor, after which time such business and property shall be operated and managed by the debtor or other corporation or corporations provided for by the plan. Notice of the time fixed shall be given, in such manner and to such persons as may be specified by order of the judge, at least 10 days before the expiration of such time. If such time is extended, like notice shall be given at least 10 days before the expiration of the period of extension."

SEC. 20. Section 222 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 222. A plan may be altered or modified, with the approval of the judge, after its submission for acceptance and before or after its confirmation, and before or after the final time fixed under section 221b of this act, if, in the opinion of the judge, the alteration or modification does not materially and adversely affect the interests of creditors or stockholders. If the judge finds that the proposed alteration or modification, filed with his approval, does materially and adversely affect the interests of creditors or stockholders, and if the proposed alteration or modification is filed before the final time fixed under section 221b of this act, he shall fix a hearing for the consideration, and a subsequent time for the acceptance or rejection, of such alteration or modification, and the requirements in regard to notice of hearing, to submission to the Securities and Exchange Commission, to acceptance, to filing and hearing of objections to confirmation and to the confirmation, as prescribed in article VII of this chapter in regard to the plan proposed to be altered or modified, shall be complied with."

SEC. 21. Paragraph (3) of section 238 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) only such claims as are provable under section 63 of this act shall be allowed, and claims not already filed may be filed prior to the expiration of 6 months after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors as provided in section 55 of this act, or, if such date has been previously set, then prior to the expiration of 3 months after the mailing of notices to creditors of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with."

SEC. 22. Chapter X of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end of article XI of such chapter the following new section:

"SEC. 239. Where, after the final time fixed under section 221 (b) of this act, the judge

shall enter an order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with—

"(1) the unsecured debts incurred by the debtor in the operation of its business and the management of its property after the time fixed in such order shall, unless and except as otherwise provided in the plan or in the order confirming the plan, share on a parity with the prior unsecured debts of the same classes, provable in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding, and for such purpose the prior unsecured debts shall be deemed to be reduced to the amounts respectively provided for them in the plan or in the order confirming the plan, less any payment made thereunder: *Provided, however,* That if the plan is grossly inequitable because of fraud, the extent to which such prior unsecured debts shall share in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding shall be adjusted to cure such inequity; and

"(2) the provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this section, apply to the rights, duties, and liabilities of the creditors holding debts so incurred after the time fixed under section 221b of this act, and, for the purposes of such application, the date of bankruptcy shall be taken to be the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with."

SEC. 23. Paragraph (11) of subdivision a of section 265 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(11) the orders directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, or adjudging the debtors bankrupt and directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with or dismissing proceedings;".

SEC. 24. Section 355 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 355. Upon the entry of an order under the provisions of this chapter directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, only such claims as are provable under section 63 of this act shall be allowed and, except as provided in section 354 of this act, claims not already filed may be filed within 6 months after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors, held pursuant to section 55 of this act, or, if such date has previously been set, then within 3 months after the mailing of notice to creditors of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with."

SEC. 25. Chapter XI of such act, as amended, is amended by renumbering "Sec. 379." to read "Sec. 380." and "Sec. 380." to read "Sec. 381.", and by inserting in its numerical order the following new section:

"SEC. 379. Where, after the confirmation of an arrangement, the court shall enter an order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with—

"(1) the trustee shall, upon his appointment and qualification, be vested with the title to all the property of the debtor as of the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with;

"(2) the unsecured debts incurred by the debtor after the confirmation of the arrangement and before the date of the entry of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with shall, unless and except as otherwise provided in the arrangement or in the order confirming the arrangement, share on a parity with the prior unsecured debts of the same classes, provable in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding, and for such purpose the prior unsecured debts shall be deemed to be reduced to the amounts respectively provided for them in the arrangement or in the order confirming the arrangement, less any payment made thereunder; and

"(3) the provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this section, apply to the rights, duties, and liabilities of the creditors holding debts incurred by the debtor after the confirmation of the arrangement and before the date of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, and of all persons with respect to the property of the debtor, and, for the purposes of such application, the date of bankruptcy shall be taken to be the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with."

SEC. 26. Section 459 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 459. Upon the entry of an order under the provisions of this chapter directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, only such claims as are provable under section 63 of this act shall be allowed, and claims not already filed may be filed within 6 months after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors, held pursuant to section 55 of this act."

SEC. 27. Chapter XII of such act, as amended, is amended by renumbering "Sec. 484." to read "Sec. 485." and "Sec. 485." to read "Sec. 486.", and by inserting in its numerical order the following new section:

"SEC. 484. Where, after the confirmation of an arrangement, the court shall enter an order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with—

"(1) the trustee shall, upon his appointment and qualification, be vested with the title to all the property of the debtor as of the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with;

"(2) the unsecured debts incurred by the debtor after the confirmation of the arrangement and before the date of the entry of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with shall, unless and except as otherwise provided in the arrangement or in the order confirming the arrangement, share on a parity with the prior unsecured debts of the same classes, provable in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding, and for such purpose the prior unsecured debts shall be deemed to be reduced to the amounts respectively provided for them in the arrangement or in the order confirming the arrangement, less any payment made thereunder; and

"(3) the provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this section, apply to the rights, duties, and liabilities of the creditors holding debts incurred by the debtor after the confirmation of the arrangement and before the date of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, and of all persons with respect to the property of the debtor, and, for the purposes of such application, the date of bankruptcy shall be taken to be the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with."

SEC. 28. Section 644 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 644. Upon the entry of an order under the provisions of this chapter directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, only such claims as are provable under section 63 of this act shall be allowed and, except as provided in section 643 of this act, claims not already filed may be filed within 6 months after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors, held pursuant to section 55 of this act, or, if such date has previously been set, then within 3 months after the mailing of notice to creditors of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with."

SEC. 29. Chapter XIII of such act, as amended, is amended by renumbering "Sec. 668." to read "Sec. 669." and by inserting in its numerical order the following new section:

"SEC. 668. Where after the confirmation of a plan, the court shall enter an order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with—

"(1) the trustee shall, upon his appointment and qualification, be vested with the title to all the property of the debtor as of the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with;

"(2) the unsecured debts incurred by the debtor after the confirmation of the plan and before the date of the entry of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with shall, unless and except as otherwise provided in the plan or in the order confirming the plan, share on a parity with the prior unsecured debts of the same classes, provable in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding, and for such purpose the prior unsecured debts shall be deemed to be reduced to the amounts respectively provided for them in the plan or in the order confirming the plan, less any payment made thereunder; and

"(3) the provisions of chapters I to VII, inclusive, of this act shall, insofar as they are not inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this section, apply to the rights, duties, and liabilities of the creditors holding debts incurred by the debtor after the confirmation of the plan and before the date of the final order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, and of all persons with respect to the property of the debtor, and, for the purposes of such application, the date of bankruptcy shall be taken to be the date of the entry of the order directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with."

SEC. 30. (a) All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with any provisions of this amendatory act are hereby repealed.

(b) If any provision of this amendatory act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this amendatory act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this amendatory act are declared to be severable.

SEC. 31. Effect of this amendatory act: (a) Nothing herein contained shall have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under any act or acts of which this act is amendatory.

(b) The provisions of this amendatory act shall govern proceedings so far as practicable and applicable in cases pending when it takes effect; but proceedings in cases then pending to which the provisions of this amendatory act are not applicable shall be disposed of conformably to the provisions of said act approved July 1, 1898, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

SEC. 32. This amendatory act shall take effect and be in force on and after three months from the date of its approval.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a corrective amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of Illinois: On page 22, line 15, strike out "XI" and insert "XII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REDUCTION OF SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6089) to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134), is amended by adding the following to section 8 (b): "*Provided,*

That incumbent postmasters in offices having receipts of $600,000 but less than $1,500,000 shall not have their salary reduced unless the receipts of their respective offices drop below $600,000 for any one calendar year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POST-OFFICE FACILITIES AT LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5750) to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in its present form the bill appropriates too much money to be on the Consent Calendar. However, the author has submitted to me an amendment which has cleared the Consent Calendar objectors, and at the proper time I shall offer that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, at a cost not to exceed $854,000, land situated in Los Angeles, Calif., for a site for a Federal building and additional post-office facilities which would comprise a tract bounded on the south side by the existing Terminal Annex Station, on the north side by Vignes Street, on the east side by the westerly line of Date Street, and on the west side by the easterly line of Alameda Street, or North Main Street (whichever is closer to the eastern boundary).

(b) The Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to enter into contracts, under plans and specifications to be approved by him and by the Postmaster General, for the construction of an additional story to the existing Terminal Annex Station. The cost of such additional story with plans and specifications to the Terminal Annex Station shall not exceed $850,000.

SEC. 2. (a) In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Federal Works Administrator, with the approval of the Postmaster General, is authorized to enter into agreements with the city of Los Angeles pursuant to which (1) such city shall vacate the use of streets and alleys situated within the land acquired under section 1 (a), and (2) the United States shall grant to the city of Los Angeles a portion of the land acquired under subsection 1 (a) for a street which will provide a suitable connection for Date Street with Vignes Street at grade level beyond the limits of any future underpass on Vignes Street.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Administrator, with the approval of the Postmaster General, is further authorized to make due provision for the methods of handling mail matter in metropolitan areas by air transport.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,704,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "facilities", strike out the comma and insert a period. Strike out the words "which would comprise a."

Page 1, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10.

Page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2.

Page 2, line 6, strike out "to" and insert in lieu thereof "and extension and remodeling of."

Page 2, line 8, after the word "story", insert "and extension and remodeling."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "$850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,850,000."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "$1,704,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,704,000."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM as a substitute for the committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the enacting clause, strike out all of line 3 to and including line 10 on page 1 and all of lines 1 and 2 on page 2; strike out (b) on line 3, page 2, and insert section 1 and (a); on line 10, page 2, strike out "$1,850,000" and insert "$1,000,000"; on page 2, line 11, strike out all of line 11 to and including line 21; and on page 3, line 4, strike out "$2,704,000" in line 4 and insert "$1,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa for the committee amendment.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUIT CLAIM DEEDS TO MINERALS IN OR UNDER CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5263) to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of certain real property quitclaim deeds to the minerals in or under such property.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be is enacted, etc., That for the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term "real property" means any lands (improved and unimproved) which (A) on the date of the enactment of this act are located in farms and (B) at any time were comprising or incident to those resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and other like enterprises heretofore initiated for similar purposes, which were financed in whole or in part with funds made available to the Secretary, War Food Administrator, Farm Security Administration, Resettlement Administration, or Federal Emergency Relief Administration.

(3) The term "reserved minerals" means any interest claimed or held by the United States in any coal, oil, gas, or other minerals in or under any real property.

(4) The term "nominal value" means any value not exceeding $5 per mineral acre.

(5) The term "present owner" means the owner or owners of any real property at the close of the day upon which this act is enacted.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to execute and deliver on behalf of the United States to a present owner a quitclaim deed to such reserved minerals in or under the real property of such present owner as have only a nominal value at the close of the day upon which this act is enacted. The consideration for the execution and delivery of any such quitclaim deed shall be a sum determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to the fair value of such reserved minerals.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary may by regulation prescribed methods for the identification of present owners. The cost of establishing the identity of the present owners shall be borne by such owners.

(b) A quitclaim deed executed by or on behalf of the Secretary purporting to transfer reserved minerals under this act shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this act insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers for value is concerned.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Agriculture be and he is hereby authorized and directed to execute and convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, the mineral rights heretofore reserved and now owned by the United States of America in connection with the sale of lands in Brown, Daviess, Decatur, Knox, Martin, Shelby, and Sullivan Counties, Ind., formerly known as the Wabash Farms project and officially designated in the records of the Department of Agriculture as project RR-IN-10, and the mineral rights heretofore reserved and conveyed to the United States of America by the Indiana Defense Relocation Corporation, to the respective persons who at the time of the enactment of this act are the owners of the lands in and under which such mineral rights were reserved.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary may require persons asserting a claim to such mineral rights pursuant to section 1 hereof to establish their claims to such mineral rights to the satisfaction of the Secretary, and at their own expense.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary may make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2455) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 973; U. S. C., title 49, sec. 401 and the following), is further amended by inserting, immediately following section 503 thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 504. No person having a security interest in, or security title to, any civil aircraft under a contract of conditional sale, equipment trust, chattel or corporate mortgage, or other instrument of similar nature, and no lessor of any such aircraft under a bona fide lease of 30 days or more, shall be liable by reason of such interest or title, or by reason of his interest as lessor or owner of the aircraft so leased, for any injury to or death of persons, or damage to or loss of property, on the surface of the earth

(whether on land or water) caused by such aircraft, or by the ascent, descent, or flight of such aircraft or by the dropping or falling of an object therefrom, unless such aircraft is in the actual possession or control of such person at the time of such injury, death, damage, or loss."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF JULY 30, 1947

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4690) to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to permit vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States," approved July 30, 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"That notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 883), vessels of foreign registry shall be permitted to transport products of, and supplies and equipment for, the Riverside Mine at Hyder, Alaska, between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "foreign" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Canadian."

Page 1, line 10, after the words "shall be permitted", insert the words "until June 30, 1949."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6618) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; May 27, 1908; and June 19, 1922 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the borough of Brooklyn, are hereby amended to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the twenty-six and nine hundred and sixty-nine thousandths miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile nor be less than $10,500 per mile: *Provided, however*, That the rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VURSELL: On page 1, line 10, after the word "exceed", strike out the words "$12,000 per mile nor be less than $10,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6618) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF DECEMBER 2, 1942, PROVIDING COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN CONTRACTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6045) amending the act approved December 2, 1942, which provides compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States and certain other persons or reimbursement therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 784, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby amended by striking out the proviso contained in section 102 (a).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6647) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $35 per week and compensation for disability shall not be less than $12 per week: *Provided, however*, That if the employee's average wages at the time of injury are less than $12 per week, he shall receive his average weekly wages."

SEC. 2. So much of subdivision (c) of section 8 of such act, as amended, as precedes paragraph (13) thereof and paragraph (22) thereof are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Permanent partial disability: In case of disability partial in character but permanent in quality the compensation shall be 66⅔ percent of the average weekly wages, and shall be paid to the employee, as follows:

"(1) Arm lost, 312 weeks' compensation.

"(2) Leg lost, 288 weeks' compensation.

"(3) Hand lost, 244 weeks' compensation.

"(4) Foot lost, 205 weeks' compensation.

"(5) Eye lost, 160 weeks' compensation.

"(6) Thumb lost, 75 weeks' compensation.

"(7) First finger lost, 46 weeks' compensation.

"(8) Great toe lost, 38 weeks' compensation.

"(9) Second finger lost, 30 weeks' compensation.

"(10) Third finger lost, 25 weeks' compensation.

"(11) Toe other than great toe lost, 16 weeks' compensation.

"(12) Fourth finger lost, 15 weeks compensation.

"(22) In case of temporary total disability and permanent partial disability, both resulting from the same injury, if the temporary total disability continues for a longer period than the number of weeks set forth in the following schedule, the period of temporary total disability in excess of such number of weeks shall be added to the compensation period, provided in subdivision (c) of this section: Arm, 32 weeks; leg, 40 weeks; hand, 32 weeks; foot, 32 weeks; eye, 20 weeks; thumb, 24 weeks; first finger, 18 weeks; great toe, 12 weeks; second finger, 12 weeks; third finger, 8 weeks; fourth finger, 8 weeks; toe other than great toe, 8 weeks.

"In any case resulting in loss or partial loss of use of arm, leg, hand, foot, eye, thumb, finger, or toe, where the temporary total disability does not extend beyond the periods above-mentioned for such injury, compensation shall be limited to the schedule contained in subdivision (c).

"In any case in which there shall be a loss of, or loss of use of, more than one member or parts of more than one member set forth in paragraphs (1) to (19) of this subdivision, not amounting to permanent total disability, the award of compensation shall be for the loss of, or loss of use of, each such member or part thereof, which awards shall run consecutively."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Reasonable funeral expenses not exceeding $400.

"(b) If there be a surviving wife or dependent husband and no child of the deceased, to such surviving wife or dependent husband 35 percent of the average wages of the deceased, during widowhood, or dependent widowerhood, with 2 years' compensation in one sum upon remarrage; and if there be a surviving child or children of the deceased, the additional amount of 15 percent of such wages for each such child; in case of the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or dependent husband, if there be one surviving child of the deceased employee, such child shall have his compensation increased to 35 percent of such wages, and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased employee, to such children, in equal parts, 35 percent of such wages increased by 15 percent of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided*, That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ percent of such wages. The deputy commissioner having jurisdiction over the claim may, in his discretion, require the appointment of a guardian for the purpose of receiving the compensation of a minor child. In the absence of such a requirement the appointment of a guardian for such purposes shall not be necessary.

"(c) If there be one surviving child of the deceased, but no surviving wife or dependent husband, then for the support of such child 35 percent of the wages of the deceased; and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased, but no widow or dependent husband, then for the support of such children, in equal parts 35 percent of such wages increased by 15 percent of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided*, That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ percent of such wages.

"(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than $52.50 nor less than $18, but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased."

SEC. 4. Subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 10 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) If the injured employee shall have worked in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, whether for the same or another employer, during substantially the whole of the year immediately preceding his injury, his average annual earnings shall consist of 300 times the average daily wage or salary for a 6-day worker and 260 times the average daily wage or salary for a 5-day worker, which he shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"(b) If the injured employee shall not have worked in such employment during substantially the whole of such year, his average annual earnings, if a 6-day worker, shall consist of 300 times the average daily wage or salary, and, if a 5-day worker, 260 times the average daily wage or salary, which an employee of the same class working substantially the whole of such immediately preceding year in the same or in similar employment in the same or a neighboring place shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"(c) If either of the foregoing methods of arriving at the annual average earnings of an injured employee cannot reasonably and fairly be applied, such annual earnings shall be such sums as shall reasonably represent the total annual earnings of such employee derived by him from the industry in which the employee was engaged and from any other industry or industries in which said employee may have been engaged during the year preceding such injury."

SEC. 5. Subsection (m) of section 14 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The total compensation payable under this act for injuries shall in no event exceed the sum of $11,000: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not apply to cases of permanent total disability or death: *And provided further,* That with respect to cases arising under paragraph 21 of subsection (c) of section 8 hereof the total compensation payable shall in no event exceed the sum of $9,000."

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act shall be applicable only to injuries or deaths occurring on or after the effective date hereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out lines 6 to 10, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $35 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $12 per week: *Provided, however,* That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $12 per week, he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages.'"

Page 2, line 2, strike out "and paragraph (22) thereof are" and insert in lieu thereof "is."

Page 2, line 6, after "wages", insert the following: "which shall be in addition to compensation for temporary total disability or temporary partial disability paid in accordance with subdivision (b) or subdivision (e) of this section, respectively."

Page 3, line 1, insert quotation marks after the period, and strike out lines 2 to 25, both inclusive.

Page 6, strike out lines 17 to 24, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(c) If either of the foregoing methods of arriving at the average annual earnings of the injured employee cannot reasonably and fairly be applied, such average annual earnings shall be such sum as, having regard to the previous earnings of the injured employee in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, and of other employees of the same or most similar class working in the same or most similar employment in the same or neighboring locality, or other employment of such employee, including the reasonable value of the services of the employee if engaged in self-employment, shall reasonably represent the annual earning capacity of the injured employee.'"

Page 7, line 3, insert after the quotation marks "(m)."

Page 7, line 6, strike out beginning with the colon down to the period in line 9.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $35 per week and compensation for disability shall not be less than $12 per week: *Provided, however,* That if the employee's average wages at the time of injury are less than $12 per week, he shall receive his average weekly wages."

SEC. 2. So much of subdivision (c) of section 8 of such act, as amended, as precedes paragraph (13) thereof and paragraph (22) thereof are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Permanent partial disability: In case of disability partial in character but permanent in quality the compensation shall be 66⅔ percent of the average weekly wages, and shall be paid to the employee, as follows:

"(1) Arm lost, 312 weeks' compensation.
"(2) Leg lost, 288 weeks' compensation.
"(3) Hand lost, 244 weeks' compensation.
"(4) Foot lost, 205 weeks' compensation.
"(5) Eye lost, 160 weeks' compensation.
"(6) Thumb lost, 75 weeks' compensation.
"(7) First finger lost, 46 weeks' compensation.
"(8) Great toe lost, 38 weeks' compensation.
"(9) Second finger lost, 30 weeks' compensation.
"(10) Third finger lost, 25 weeks' compensation.
"(11) Toe other than great toe lost, 16 weeks' compensation.
"(12) Fourth finger lost, 15 weeks' compensation.

"(22) In case of temporary total disability and permanent partial disability, both resulting from the same injury, if the temporary total disability continues for a longer period than the number of weeks set forth in the following schedule, the period of temporary total disability in excess of such number of weeks shall be added to the compensation period provided in subdivision (c) of this section: Arm, 32 weeks; leg, 40 weeks; hand, 32 weeks; foot, 32 weeks; eye, 20 weeks; thumb, 24 weeks; first finger, 18 weeks; great toe, 12 weeks; second finger, 12 weeks; third finger, 8 weeks; fourth finger, 8 weeks; toe other than great toe, 8 weeks.

"In any case resulting in loss or partial loss of use of arm, leg, hand, foot, eye, thumb, finger, or toe, where the temporary total disability does not extend beyond the periods above mentioned for such injury, compensation shall be limited to the schedule contained in subdivision (c).

"In any case in which there shall be a loss of, or loss of use of, more than one member or parts of more than one member set forth in paragraphs (1) to (19) of this subdivision, not amounting to permanent total disability, the award of compensation shall be for the loss of, or loss of use of, each such member or part thereof, which awards shall run consecutively."

SEC. 3. Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Reasonable funeral expenses not exceeding $400.

"(b) If there be a surviving wife or dependent husband and no child of the deceased, to such surviving wife or dependent husband 35 percent of the average wages of the deceased, during widowhood, or dependent widowerhood, with 2 years' compensation in one sum upon remarriage; and if there be a surviving child or children of the deceased, the additional amount of 15 percent of such wages for each such child; in case of the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or dependent husband, if there be one surviving child of the deceased employee, such child shall have his compensation increased to 35 percent of such wages, and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased employee, to such children, in equal parts, 35 percent of such wages increased by 15 percent of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided,* That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ percent of such wages. The deputy commissioner having jurisdiction over the claim may, in his discretion, require the appointment of a guardian for the purpose of receiving the compensation of a minor child. In the absence of such a requirement the appointment of a guardian for such purposes shall not be necessary.

"(c) If there be one surviving child of the deceased, but no surviving wife or dependent husband, then for the support of such child 35 percent of the wages of the deceased; and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased, but no widow or dependent husband, then for the support of such children, in equal parts 35 percent of such wages increased by 15 percent of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided,* That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ percent of such wages.

"(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than $52.50 nor less than $18, but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased."

SEC. 4. Subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 10 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) If the injured employee shall have worked in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, whether for the same or another employer, during substantially the whole of the year immediately preceding his injury, his average annual earnings shall consist of 300 times the average daily wage or salary for a 6-day worker and 260 times the average daily wage or salary for a 5-day worker, which he shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"(b) If the injured employee shall not have worked in such employment during substantially the whole of such year, his average annual earnings, if a 6-day worker, shall consist of 300 times the average daily wage or salary, and, if a 5-day worker, 260 times the average daily wage or salary, which an employee of the same class working substantially the whole of such immediately

preceding year in the same or in similar employment in the same or a neighboring place shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"(c) If either of the foregoing methods of arriving at the annual average earnings of an injured employee cannot reasonably and fairly be applied, such annual earnings shall be such sums as shall reasonably represent the total annual earnings of such employee derived by him from the industry in which the employee was engaged and from any other industry or industries in which said employee may have been engaged during the year preceding such injury."

SEC. 5. Subsection (m) of section 14 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The total compensation payable under this act for injuries shall in no event exceed the sum of $11,000: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to cases of permanent total disability or death: *And provided further*, That with respect to cases arising under paragraph 21 of subsection (c) of section 8 hereof the total compensation payable shall in no event exceed the sum of $9,000."

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act shall be applicable only to injuries or deaths occurring on or after the effective date hereof.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 6647 as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6647) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND ALONG MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5842) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, owing to the fact that this establishes an entirely new procedure for the transferring of property, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object. It was passed over 2 weeks ago, at the request of the gentleman from Ohio and further hearings were held and it was reported by the Committee on Public Works unanimously, with the exception of one vote. There is no reason why it should be passed over again at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING THE STATE OF MARYLAND TO CONSTRUCT AND MAINTAIN AND OPERATE CERTAIN BRIDGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2201) supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State Roads Commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, (1) a bridge across or a tunnel under the Chesapeake Bay, in the State of Maryland, from a point in Anne Arundel County at or near Sandy Point to a point approximately opposite on Kent Island, or a combined bridge and tunnel at such location, and approaches thereto, and (2) a bridge across or a tunnel under the Patapsco River, in the city of Baltimore, from a point at or near the mouth of North West Branch to a point approximately opposite at or near Fairfield, and approaches thereto.

SEC. 2. The State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland for the use of each of the structures and facilities the construction of which is hereby authorized and to use such tolls in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland for the purposes hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. The State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, may unite or group either or both of the bridges heretofore constructed in accordance with the provisions of the act approved April 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 205), across the Susquehanna River and the Potomac River with either or both of the structures and facilities the construction of which is hereby authorized into one or more projects for financing purposes. The rates of tolls charged for the use of each of the structures or facilities so included in any such project shall be so adjusted in accordance with the provisions of said act of April 7, 1938, as to provide in the aggregate a fund not to exceed an amount sufficient to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing, and operating all of the structures or facilities included in the project, and their approaches, under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the aggregate cost of the structures or facilities hereby authorized included in the project, and their approaches, including the principal and interest on revenue bonds issued for financing such costs, and such portion of the aggregate cost not yet amortized of the said bridges across the Susquehanna River and the Potomac River included in the project, and their approaches, including reasonable interest and financing costs, as soon as possible under reasonable charges but within a period not exceeding 40 years from the date of completion of the last completed structure or facility included in the project.

Within the aforementioned period of 40 years, tolls may be charged and continued to be charged for the use of any of the structures or facilities included in any such project and adjusted at such rates as may be necessary to provide a fund sufficient to pay any revenue bonds, with interest thereon and any lawful premium for the retirement thereof before maturity, heretofore or hereafter issued for the financing of such project or any of the structures or facilities included therein, or for the refunding from time to time of said bonds, or any of them, or of any such refunding bonds. Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing tolls to be charged for the use of any one or more of the hereinabove-named structures or facilities for the purpose of financing any structure or facility not authorized by this act and by said act of April 7, 1938.

SEC. 4. After a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the structures or facilities in any such project and sufficient to pay the principal and interest and any lawful retirement premium on revenue bonds issued as aforesaid with respect to such project shall have been so provided the structures or facilities included in such project shall be maintained and operated free of tolls.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act supplementing the act entitled 'An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State Roads Commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State,' approved April 7, 1938."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONVEY CERTAIN MINERAL RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5048) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to convey, without consideration and on behalf of the United States, all mineral rights heretofore conveyed to the United States by the Missouri Defense Relocation Association, Incorporated, a nonprofit association duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Missouri, to the respective persons who at the time of conveyance by the Secretary own the lands in which such mineral rights exist.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, on behalf of the United States, to execute and convey by quitclaim deed without consideration all the mineral rights heretofore reserved and conveyed to the United States by the Missouri Defense Relocation Association, Inc., a nonprofit association duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Missouri, to the respective persons who at the time of the enactment of this act are the owners of the lands in and under which such mineral rights exist.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary may require persons asserting a claim to such mineral rights pursuant to section 1 hereof to establish their claims to such mineral rights to the satisfaction of the Secretary, and at their own expense.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary may make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYSTIC RIVER BRIDGE AUTHORITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6300) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substiute S. 2553, a similar Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, without cost to said authority, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper, a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, repairs, and operation of approaches to a high level toll bridge crossing Mystic River over and across certain lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass., metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6300) was laid on the table.

RIGHT-OF-WAY CONVEYANCE TO COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA AT PUNGO, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2593) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia, without cost to the said Commonwealth, and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem proper, a perpetual easement for public-highway purposes in, over, and across a strip of land contiguous to the former naval auxiliary air station, Pungo, Va., being approximately 1,595 feet long and containing 1.58 acres, more or less, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY IN PUERTO RICO TO THE ORIGINAL OWNERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2592) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are individually authorized, in accordance with the express provisions of the conveyances to the United States Government or the final judgments in condemnation proceedings filed at the request of the Secretary of the Army in the Federal District Court for Puerto Rico, to convey all or any part of the land in Puerto Rico, which was acquired for national defense purposes, when such land or part thereof is no longer required for such purposes. The improvements constructed by the Departments of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, upon such property will be disposed of by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, or Air Force prior to the time such property is conveyed, in accordance with the best interests of the United States Government: *Provided*, That no such property shall be conveyed or otherwise disposed of without the prior joint approval thereof of the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES WITH CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6633) to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to convey to the city of San Diego without cost to said city, and upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by said Secretary the following lands and improvements and interests in land, metes and bounds description of said lands being on file in the Navy Department, to wit:

(1) Fee-simple title to an area containing approximately 244⅘ acres known as the Lindbergh Field extension of the United States Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego;

(2) Fee-simple title to an area comprising approximately 160 acres known as Rosedale Airport and being Pueblo lot 1231 of the Pueblo lands of San Diego;

(3) Fee-simple title to those structures and improvements constructed on land of the city of San Diego under naval contracts NOa–130 and NOa–1049, popularly known as the Ryan Aircraft Expansion, including, but not limited to, a frame stucco office building in two sections containing 37,000 square feet, a steel frame and corrugated-iron subassembly building of 122,000 square feet, and four miscellaneous smaller buildings, together with appurtenant utilities and parking-lot improvements;

(4) A perpetual easement for street purposes over and across a strip of land 200 feet in width traversing the United States Naval Training Station, San Diego, containing approximately 1⁴⁹⁄₁₀₀ acres:

(5) A perpetual easement for street purposes over and across four parcels of land comprising a strip along the east side of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot from Bean Street to Witherby Street, containing eight and eighty-five one-hundredths acres of land; a small strip along Pacific Highway and Barnett Avenue containing ten one-hundredths acre of land and an area south of Pacific Highway giving access to Lindbergh Field, containing three and seventy-six one-hundredths acres of land; and

(6) A perpetual easement for a right-of-way through the United States naval station for the extension of the Wabash Canyon Freeway between Main Street and the San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railroad right-of-way, containing approximately three and eighty-two one-hundredths acres: *Provided*, That if the establishment of such right-of-way should require the relocation of any existing naval structures, their removal and relocation shall be accomplished at the expense of the city and in a manner to be approved by the Commandant of the Eleventh Naval District; in consideration of the conveyance by the city of San Diego to the United States free from all incumbrances, the following lands, improvements, and interest in land situated in the city of San Diego, metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the Navy Department, to wit:

(1) A leasehold interest for 50 years with the right of renewal for 50 additional years in the area now used by the Navy for Fleet Sonar School near the westerly end of Harbor Drive containing thirty-two and thirty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less;

(2) A leasehold interest for 50 years with the right of renewal for 50 additional years in the Navy fleet landing area at the foot of G Street having a frontage of four hundred and sixty-four and five-tenths feet on Harbor Drive;

(3) A leasehold interest for 50 years with the right of renewal for 50 additional years in a triangular shaped tract of land bounded by Harbor Drive, the United States bulkhead line of San Diego Bay, and the projection southerly of the easterly line of Kettner Boulevard, comprising approximately three and three-tenths acres: *Provided*, That any lease covering this area may contain a clause to the effect that unless the United States shall construct on said area within a period of 5 years an officers' club, the lease shall be forthwith canceled and be of no further force and effect, and that the possession of the leased area shall be surrendered to the city: *And provided further*, That such lease may also provide that the city may continue in actual occupation and use of the leased area until such officers' club is actually constructed thereon;

(4) A leasehold interest for 50 years with the right of renewal for 50 additional years in the area now occupied by the Navy Public Works Building fronting four hundred and seventy-one and seventy-six one-hundredths feet on the westerly side of Pacific Highway at the foot of B Street, containing approximately three and two-tenths acres;

(5) A leasehold interest for 50 years with the right of renewal for 50 additional years in the area now used by the Navy for recreational purposes, known as Navy Field, fronting on the northerly side of Harbor Drive at the foot of First Avenue comprising approximately 28.13 acres;

(6) A leasehold interest for 50 years with the right of renewal for 50 additional years in the small-boat landing between Broadway Pier and Navy Pier having a frontage of 60 feet;

(7) A leasehold interest for 50 years with the right of renewal for 50 additional years in two loading-platform areas containing, respectively, 1,958 and 2,400 square feet of tideland, together with right-of-way for an overhead-bridge crossing to provide passage, exit, and entrance to Government buildings;

(8) A leasehold interest for 5 years or for such lesser period as the Secretary of the Navy may elect in one-half of the upper deck of that water-front facility commonly known as the Broadway Pier, situated at the foot

of Broadway, which space is now occupied by Navy offices: *Provided*, That any lease or leases to be executed by the city of San Diego to accomplish the exchange herein authorized may include a reservation clause in favor of said city reading as follows: "The term of said lease shall not actually begin until the said lands described in said lease shall be actually occupied and utilized for immediate Navy purposes such as are necessary in the maintenance of the United States Navy base within the Eleventh Naval District, and further in the event that if at any time the said premises so leased shall be abandoned by said Navy and not used and occupied, or if in the event that said Navy shall fail to occupy and actually use said lands for such Navy purposes as are necessary in the maintenance of said United States Navy base within said Eleventh Naval District, then and in that event said lease shall terminate, be canceled and be of no further effect, and the city shall have the right to immediately reoccupy the lands so abandoned or the use of which by said Navy has ceased: *Provided*, That if and when any water-front parcel covered by this lease shall no longer be required for naval purposes, its use by another branch of the armed services for purposes requiring water frontage shall be permissible hereunder."; and

(9) Fee-simple title to the old city jail site fronting 100 feet on the westerly side of Second Avenue between F and G Streets (including the building thereon) which is used by the Navy for shore-patrol headquarters, containing approximately 10,000 square feet.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is also authorized to accept from the city of San Diego, without cost to the United States, the conveyance of 90.2 acres of tidelands located between the United States bulkhead line and adjacent to and north of the southerly limits of the city of San Diego, now occupied by the United States under lease NOy (R)-1400 dated October 1, 1942, and being more fully described therein.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT TO POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR CERTAIN SHORTAGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1520) to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended (39 U. S. C., Supp. V, 135), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Every Navy mail clerk and assistant Navy mail clerk and every Coast Guard mail clerk and assistant Coast Guard mail clerk shall give bond to the United States in such penal sum as the Postmaster General may deem sufficient for the faithful performance of his duties as such clerk: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy may waive the giving of bond in the cases of Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks. Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks whose bonds are so waived shall not be entitled to the extra compensation otherwise authorized to be paid them by law. The Post Office Department shall be reimbursed annually by the Navy Department in an amount equal to funds embezzled by unbonded Navy mail clerks, assistant Navy mail clerks, and commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and funds expended in payment of claims arising from errors, losses, or defalcations by unbonded Navy mail clerks, assistant Navy mail clerks, and commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That 'commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps' as used in the foregoing provision shall be construed to mean only those commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who have been designated custodians of postal effects by the commanding officer."

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1795) to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874 (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CREDIT FOR LONGEVITY PAY PURPOSES OF CERTAIN SERVICE IN PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1790) to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first section of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946 (Public Law 309, 79th Cong.), is amended by inserting immediately following "Army," the words "Air Force."

(b) Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows: "The provisions of this act shall be effective from June 1, 1942."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4786) to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (1) of section 14 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Temporary employees in the custodial service paid on an annual basis shall be paid at the rates of pay of grade 1 of the position in which employed and shall, at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 1 year's satisfactory service in each pay status, be advanced successively to the rates of pay of the next higher grade of such position; and temporary employees in the custodial service paid on an hourly basis shall be paid at the rates of pay of grade 1 of the position in which employed and shall, at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 2,024 hours' satisfactory service in each pay status, be advanced successively to the rates of pay of the next higher grade of such position: *Provided*, That no temporary employee shall be paid at a rate higher than that provided herein for the highest automatic grade of the position in which he is employed: *And provided further*, That when a temporary employee is appointed to a regular position, such employee shall be assigned to a salary grade corresponding to the salary as a temporary. Any fractional part of a year's temporary service accumulated since the last compensation increase as a temporary shall be included with the regular service of a regular employee in determining eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade following appointment to a regular position."

SEC. 2. Any period of satisfactory service as a temporary employee in the custodial service performed by any such temporary employee prior to the effective date of this act shall be creditable for a promotion to the rates of pay of grade 2 of the position in which such temporary employee is employed.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective at the beginning of the quarter following the date of enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 13, strike out "two thousand and twenty-four hours' " and insert "twelve months'."

On page 2, line 20, after the word "position", insert "in the custodial service."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "the" and insert "his."

On page 2, line 21, after the word "temporary", insert "employee at the time of such appointment."

On page 3, line 3, after the word "of", insert "continuous."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PREPARATION OF REPLICA OF THE DADE MONUMENT FOR PRESENTATION TO STATE OF FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 153) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade

Monument for presentation to the State of Florida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon payment by the State of Florida to the Department of the Army of such sum as may be necessary to defray all expenses necessarily incident thereto, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause to be prepared an exact replica of the Dade Monument, located on the grounds of the United States military reservation at West Point, N. Y., and to present such replica to the State of Florida for erection in the Dade State Memorial Park.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO TEMPLE METHODIST CHURCH, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6332) to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas in 1929 the Temple Methodist Church completed the construction of the building now known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif.; and

Whereas certain space in said building was originally designed for, and previously occupied by, said Temple Methodist Church; and

Whereas in 1937, for reasons beyond its control, said Temple Methodist Church lost title to said building; and

Whereas the building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., is now owned in its entirety by the United States; and

Whereas in the event of a possible future sale of the building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., the value of said building would be materially increased by having certain space tenanted as originally intended; and

Whereas the return of certain space in the building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., to church uses would contribute to the civic, cultural, and spiritual well-being of the city of San Francisco and a major portion of the Pacific coast: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Buildings is hereby, authorized and directed to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, of San Francisco, Calif., for a period not in excess of 99 years and upon such terms as he may deem to be in the public interest, substantially that portion of the federally owned building now known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church.

SEC. 2. In the event that the Commissioner of Public Buildings and the Temple Methodist Church are unable to agree on the terms of the lease or on the portion of said building previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church, final decision thereon shall be made by the Federal Works Administrator.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment as a complete substitute for the bill. It has the unanimous consent and approval of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Public Works Committee as well as unanimous report from the Committee on Public Works.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: "Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'That the Commissioner of Public Buildings is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the Temple Methodist Church of San Francisco, Calif., for a consideration of $100,000, such portions of the federally owned building at 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., located generally in the west wing thereof, as he determines were formerly used for church purposes and can be conveyed without adversely affecting the use or disposal of the remainder of said building by the Government. The conveyance shall be upon such terms as the Commissioner of Public Buildings may deem to be in the public interest.

"'SEC. 2. In the event that the Commissioner of Public Buildings and the Temple Methodist Church are unable to agree on the terms of the conveyance, or on the portion of said building to be conveyed, final decision thereon shall be made by the Federal Works Administrator.

"'SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to lease to the Temple Methodist Church the two rooms on the second floor in the east wing of the building fronting on McAllister Street, for such period as the Government holds title to the property and for a consideration of $1 per year.

"'SEC. 4. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to lease to the Temple Methodist Church additional space on the third and fourth floors of the east wing of the building for such period as the Government holds title to the property and at rates charged for comparable commercial space.

"'SEC. 5. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to furnish utility services to the conveyed property at the cost thereof and upon such further terms as he may deem in the public interest.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN EXPENSES TO VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BENEFICIARIES AND THEIR ATTENDANTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved March 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 49), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, to pay the actual necessary expenses of travel, including lodging and subsistence, or in lieu thereof an allowance based upon the mileage traveled, of any person to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place in connection with vocational rehabilitation or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care: *Provided*, That payment of mileage in connection with vocational rehabilitation or upon termination of examination, treatment, or care may be made prior to completion of such travel: *And provided further*, That when any such person requires an attendant other than an employee of the Veterans' Administration for the performance of such travel, such attendant may be allowed expenses of travel upon a similar basis."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, before the words "Public Law", insert the following "section 1 of."

Page 1, line 4, before the words "is hereby amended", insert the following: "as amended."

Page 1, line 9, strike the word "subsistense" and insert in lieu thereof the word "subsistence."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5734) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., a parcel of land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., which is described as follows:

The north half of the northwest quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, the northeast quarter, and the southwest quarter less a strip of land 150 feet wide along the entire west side of the said quarter section, all in section 28, township 14 north, range 66 west, of the sixth principal meridian, in Laramie County, Wyo.

The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947, and shall provide for reversion of title to the United States should the city of Cheyenne fail to maintain a public park and golf course on the land: *Provided*, That a lease of any portion or portions of such land to a Federal agency shall not be deemed a failure to maintain a public park and golf course.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNSHIPS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6234) to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b), section 14, of the act of January 3, 1946 (59 Stat. 679; 38 U. S. C. 15m (b)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Administrator shall have authority to establish residences and internships; to appoint qualified persons to such positions without regard to civil-service or classification laws, rules, or regulations; and to prescribe the conditions of such employment including necessary training, and the customary amount and terms of pay during the period of such employment and training."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SUBSECTION 602 (F) OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6507) to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill would extend the GI national life term insurance for 5 years. An insured would have to pay an increased premium at his present age. The extension if carried out as provided in this act would further eliminate people who are now covered by national life insurance. The Veterans' Administration policy is to have no term insurance whatever. At one time we had 19,000,000 policies under national service life insurance. We now have 6,000,000. If this bill passes and the Veterans Commitee of this House helps the Veterans' Administration in this policy, we will wind up with possibly 3,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, this House has the opportunity to get from six to ten million additional people, young men under this insurance provision. It is an opportunity that we have never had in the history of our country. It would seem to me that to pass this bill, which is on the Consent Calendar, squeezing these veterans out of the possibility of insurance is against the best interests of this country.

For the reasons set forth above I object to the bill and ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman that the Congress is going to adjourn probably on the 18th of June and if this bill is not passed now these men will not be able to take out the 5-year level term insurance after it expires. They will lose their insurance if it lapses. If no other bill passes the House the veterans cannot reinstate after expiration. Therefore you will be placing a great hardship on the veterans.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McMAHON. As chairwoman of the Veterans' Committee and one who is very much interested and has proven her interest in veterans' affairs, this procedure just outlined has been adopted by her committee. That committee has elected to bring this bill out for consideration at a late date and having it put on the Consent Calendar. In effect it does the very opposite of what she seeks to do. We now have the 5-year level term with an extension of 3 years at the premium computed at the time the boys took out the insurance. This would force them to make the decision now to take it out at higher rates of premiums, or to convert, or to have no insurance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that if this bill does not pass, the veterans will have to convert or their insurance will lapse. You do not want to force them to convert. It works a great injustice on the veterans if we do not pass this bill. If we had another bill that might be another thing.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. May I point out to the gentleman who asked to have this bill passed over, that the committee has unanimously approved the bill. The Veterans of Foreign Wars assisted in the drafting of the bill and advises us that it cannot hurt anyone but, on the other hand, will give benefits and rights to veterans that they would not otherwise have.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CROW. I would like to point out that unless this bill is passed this type of insurance will be retarded very greatly and these insurance policies will be canceled to the injury of the veterans. It is a case of passing this bill and taking care of the veterans. If the bill is not passed today their insurance will be canceled.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentlewoman knows that today the veterans of World War II who hold 5-year-term National Life Insurance are receiving notices from the Veterans' Administration telling them that unless they convert their insurance by August 31 they will have no insurance after that date. This bill will simply renew the 5-year level term insurance and will permit its continuation for another 5 years.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Without physical examination. It is a good bill for the veterans.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. And it will not cost the United States of America one dime?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. This is for the protection of the veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCORMACK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McMAHON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER AT LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6716) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to transfer to the State of California for the use of the University of California as a research and medical center and allied purposes a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., said parcel being described by metes and bounds as follows:

Beginning at the southeasterly corner of said lot 1, said corner being at the intersection of the northeasterly line of said lot 1 and the northwesterly line of Wilshire Boulevard (formerly Sunset Boulevard); thence south seventy-two degrees nineteen minutes thirty seconds west a distance of six hundred and sixty-two and eighty-nine one-hundredths feet along said northwesterly line of Wilshire Boulevard to an intersection with the northeasterly line of Veteran Avenue (formerly Lookout Avenue); thence north thirty-three degrees eight minutes twenty-five seconds west a distance of seven hundred and thirty-three and eighty-five one-hundredths feet along said northeasterly line of Veteran Avenue to the southwesterly corner of that portion of said lot 2 deeded to the city of Los Angeles for fire-station purposes November 15, 1945, in accordance with Public Law 37, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved April 23, 1945; thence north fifty-six degrees fifty-one minutes thirty-five seconds east a distance of one hundred and fifty feet to the southeasterly corner of said portion of said lot 2; thence north thirty-three degrees eight minutes twenty-five seconds west a distance of one hundred feet to the northeasterly corner of said portion of said lot 2; thence south fifty-six degrees fifty-one minutes thirty-five seconds west a distance of one hundred and fifty feet to the northeasterly line of said Veteran Avenue; thence north thirty-three degrees eight minutes twenty-five seconds west a distance of four hundred and fifty-four and thirty-three one-hundredths feet along said northeasterly line to an intersection with the northwesterly line of said lot 2; thence north thirty-seven degrees fifty-seven minutes fifty-four seconds west a distance of one thousand two hundred and sixty-one and forty-eight one-hundredths feet along the northeasterly line of Veteran Avenue to a point; thence north seventy-two degrees fourteen minutes twenty-one seconds east a distance of one and sixty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point, said point being the southwesterly corner of lot 3, block 10, tract 9617, on file in map book 134, pages 78 to 82, inclusive, of the records of the city of Los Angeles; thence north seventy-two degrees nineteen minutes forty-one seconds east a

distance of six hundred and fifty-seven and thirty-six one-hundredths feet to the southeasterly corner of lot 11 of said block 10; thence south thirty-five degrees thirty-six minutes twenty-seven seconds east a distance of two thousand five hundred and forty-eight and fifty-four one-hundredths feet along the northeasterly line of lots 4, 3, 2, and 1 of said block 23 to the point of beginning; containing thirty-four and eight hundred and eighty one-thousandths acres, more or less.

The deed shall reserve to the United States all interest in and to any fissionable material in said land, and shall provide for reversion to the United States if the land ceases to be used as a medical and research center.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6730) to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (38 U. S. C. 693), is hereby amended by deleting "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "June 30, 1949."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL RESERVE OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6098) to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS AT CAMP PHILLIPS, KANS., TO ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1791) to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all land owned by the United States in section 7, township 15 south, range 3 west of the sixth principal base and meridian, containing approximately 640 acres, together with the buildings, improvements, and facilities located thereon, which comprised the hospital area at Camp Phillips, Kans., and now under the control and jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, is hereby transferred, without reimbursement of funds, to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2215) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a hasty study of this bill discloses that the cost may run somewhere in the neighborhood of $30,000,000. Further than that, it is proposed that there shall be about 30 persons whose pay will be raised up to the sum of $15,000 a year, and the impact upon the health program, which is objected to by the Army, and the expense involved, causes me to feel that this bill is far too important to be considered on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it surprises me greatly to hear the statements that are made by the gentleman from Kansas to justify his unanimous-consent request. The fact is that we have been appropriating money for this purpose, as may be attested to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], both of whom have taken a very great interest in this legislation. It is the purpose of this legislation to provide a program for the money that we are expending. There is no more worth-while expenditure of funds in this country than that which is being expended for the purpose of research with reference to heart disease. I am surprised, considering the type of legislation that this is, and that has had the consideration of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over a long period of time, with the most outstanding people in America having appeared before the committee in behalf of this legislation, and no opposition having been presented to the committee, that on the floor of this House at this late date in the session, when this legislation comes before the House, meritorious as it is, that objection should be made to its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to burden the already overtaxed House with a lengthy discussion on the pressing need for S. 2215 amended by insertion of H. R. 6729, after the enacting clause, a bill on diseases of the heart, similar to the National Cancer Institute Act passed by this body in 1938.

We in Congress seldom need to look beyond the members of our immediate family to appreciate that diseases of the heart and circulatory system cause more deaths than any other disease; over 600,000 a year.

The mass attack on cancer, due to the foresight of Congress is enacting the Cancer Act in 1938, and the efforts of the American Cancer Society, is today almost 10 years ahead of the attack on heart disease.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill proposes to amend the Public Health Service Act for the purpose of improving the health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the heart and circulation; assisting and fostering such researches and other activities by public and private agencies, and promoting the coordination of all such research and activities and the useful application of their results; providing training in matters relating to heart diseases, including refresher courses for physicians; and developing and assisting the States and other agencies in the use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart diseases.

In carrying out this objective the amendment provides for the establishment in the Public Health Service of a National Heart Institute, and makes appropriate amendments to various provisions of existing law.

The committee amendment is the same as the text of H. R. 6729 introduced on May 27, 1948. It is a consolidation and recasting, in the form of amendments to the Public Health Service Act of the substantive provisions, but with certain changes contained in various bills which were before the committee.

The committee held hearings in May of this year on the following bills related to diseases of the heart:

H. R. 3059, sponsored by our colleague Mr. KLEIN, of the State of New York;

H. R. 3464, sponsored by our colleague Mr. HAND, of the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6492, which I sponsored; and

H. R. 6547, sponsored by our colleague Mr. MCMAHON, of the State of New York.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, having before it a multiplicity of bills seeking to focus attention to the recognized need for a mass attack on heart diseases by means of applied and developmental research, and for scientifically trained manpower, has in the interests of legislative efficiency, combined these bills and recast them, in consultation with the USPH, as amendments to the Public Health Service Act.

In recasting and amending the heart bills in the House, and S. 2215 as passed by the Senate, the House has recognized the experience gained in the cancer field and embodied these changes in the legislation it recommends.

S. 2215 as passed by the Senate was drawn as an amendment to the Public Health Service Act to duplicate the language of the National Cancer Institute Act of 1938. Recent testimony in both Houses of Congress on heart disease and conferences with the United States Public Health officials including the Surgeon General, Dr. Leonard Scheele, former Director of the National Cancer Institute, and the Federal Security Administrator, Mr. Oscar Ewing, have indicated that 10 years' experience in conducting the Cancer Institute have brought to light the necessity of additional amendments

to S. 2215 and the National Cancer Institute Act. These amendments have been embodied in H. R. 6729.

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS IN H. R. 6729

The provisions of this bill, as reported by the committee are patterned for the most part after the current cancer program of the Public Health Service, with some modifications which experience under that program has indicated to be desirable. In broad outline this bill authorizes a well-balanced program of research, training, and control activities. While the Public Health Service will be the focal point in administering this program, it is by no means limited to intramural activities of the Service. On the contrary, the bill provides for the stimulation and assistance, in the form of grants-in-aid, of research, training, and control programs conducted by non-Federal agencies, including States and their political subdivisions, medical schools, hospitals, laboratories, and other institutions.

The bill, as reported by the committee, while substantially the same as S. 2215, differs from the Senate bill in several respects.

As passed by the Senate the bill provides for a National Advisory Heart Council composed of the Surgeon General, ex officio, and six appointed members, all of whom must be specialists in the field of cardiovascular diseases. The committee proposes to extend this membership to include three additional ex officio members (representing the Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration) and six additional appointed members, who need not have any technical or professional training in cardiovascular diseases or other fields of medical science. After a careful appraisal of testimony on this point, the committee is strongly of the opinion that the inclusion of some lay members on the Council would have a salutory effect on the entire program. Not only would it guard against any tendency toward overemphasis of technical considerations, but it would also bring to the program the fresh viewpoints and complementary talents of men and women who have achieved distinction in other fields of endeavor. The provision of additional ex officio members is designed to promote and facilitate closer coordination among the principal medical research agencies of the Federal Government. The committee also proposes to raise the compensation of members of this and other advisory councils in the Public Health Service from $25 to $50 per diem.

Another provision of the committee amendment makes a clear-cut authorization for grants-in-aid in support of programs of heart-disease detection, prevention, and related control activities. These control activities, in the committee's opinion, are as vital as are the provisions relating to research. For it is upon these so-called control activities that we must depend to bridge the gap between basic research discoveries and the application of these discoveries to the benefit of victims of heart disease.

In the control provisions of this bill the committee has followed the pattern of the current cancer program of the Public Health Service, under which grants are made to States to stimulate and support cancer-detection clinics, prevention and educational programs, and other control activities. As in the case of the present cancer program, heart-disease-control grants may also be made, under certain circumstances, to political subdivisions of States and to hospitals and other nonprofit institutions. In heart disease, as well as the degenerative diseases generally, particular emphasis must be given to the clinical or hospital care of the patient if we are to minimize their toll on death and disability. Therefore the committee believes that the facilities of private institutions now equipped to conduct such activities must not be overlooked in planning a comprehensive attack on heart disease. S. 2215 provides for traineeships for physicians and research fellowships in the National Heart Institute. The committee has expanded this provision to authorize traineeships and research fellowships in the institute "and elsewhere." So that these opportunities can be made available to other centers of learning throughout the Nation, the committee has further amended the bill to authorize the making of grants to institutions which in turn offer fellowships for study in the field of cardiovascular diseases.

Finally, the committee recommends a new provision authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to establish within the Public Health Service not more than 30 professional and scientific research positions at rates up to $15,000 per annum with the approval of the Civil Service Commission. The language is similar to that enacted for the Army and Navy last year. It is increasingly clear that the successful conduct of any medical research program, and particularly so with programs which must be clearly expanded such as cardiovascular research, depends upon attracting and holding in key positions those scientists who have the genius for planning, executing, and directing creative research of top national significance. The success of any clinical research program such as is needed to make any real advance in heart disease requires the appointment of a few outstanding clinicians to collaborate closely with medical scientists. Specialists of the caliber necessary to assure success of the program invested by this committee now command incomes well above even a $15,000 ceiling. The leadership of a relatively small number of outstanding men of science will insure more than any other factor the scientific competence of the rest of the professional staff in a research organization.

NEED FOR A HEART PROGRAM

Diseases of the heart and circulatory system are the principal cause of death and a major cause of disability in the United States today. Unless effective measures can be taken immediately, these diseases, which now account for more than one in every three deaths, will take an even greater toll as the average age of our national population rises. This is true because cardiovascular diseases, while ranking high as killers of all age groups above the infant category, count most of their victims among those who have reached or passed middle age.

An essential step toward reducing the ravages of these diseases is the stimulation of large-scale research into the causes, treatment, and methods of prevention of cardiovascular conditions. The current level of funds from all sources for cardiovascular research is far short of that available for other diseases of less significance as killers and disablers of man. Current research in cancer, which causes only one-third as many deaths as cardiovascular diseases, is now at an estimated annual level of $26,000,000, or more than 10 times that spent for heart research.

Research facilities, as well as funds, for cardiovascular diseases are pitifully inadequate. Less than 200 hospital beds in the United States are set aside for clinical research in diseases of the heart and circulation. There are only about 900 special hospital beds for convalescent cardiac patients in the entire United States. These beds are located in only 8 States, and 344 of them are in New York State alone.

The present picture with respect to personnel trained to carry out research in heart diseases and to apply advanced methods of prevention and control, is also dark. Out of a total of 135,000 effective physicians, only 199 limit their practice to diseases of the heart, another 439 give special attention to this field, making a total of only 638 doctors who specialize in cardiology. Aid must be given for the training of more physicians and technical personnel to carry out the research projects and to apply the special knowledge and methods acquired through research.

Heart disease community control programs under public auspices are practically nonexistent. In order to make the benefits of our newly acquired knowledge as widely available as possible, we must greatly strengthen and expand the clinical facilities and increase the trained personnel available in the various communities of our Nation to bring the benefits of this knowledge to the people. These community programs should be primarily the responsibility of State and local government bodies working with the Federal Government in a relationship similar to that which was proved so successful in the tuberculosis, venereal diseases, cancer, mental health, and other programs of the Public Health Service. These programs as they develop like the analogous cancer control programs, tuberculosis programs, and so forth, will support, and in turn enlist the support of, the voluntary health agencies mutually interested in the control of cardiovascular diseases.

Mr. Speaker, in my years of legislative experience I know of no legislation more widely supported and more seriously needed.

The cost in dollars will be small compared to the 600,000 who die from diseases of the heart each year in the Nation, and

the 9,000,000 others who suffer from the crippling attacks by the heart diseases. While there is no appropriation in the bill, the amount required is clearly dependent on the magnitude of the attack Congress is willing to make. The House approved estimate allows the Public Health Service $2,644,088 for its program in cardiovascular diseases. This is less than the $2,900,000 which the American Heart Association urged be appropriated a year ago.

Recent estimates of the need based on a mass attack using the available manpower trained in this field and the present facilities would be at least $5,000,000 in the first year. It is well known that no scientific or medical program can proceed any faster than the manpower and facilities available to undertake the task. To meet the forward program for a coordinated mass attack in diseases of the heart and circulatory system similar to the present cancer program the sum of $15,000,000 would be required.

Requirements for a National Heart Institute

1. Control grants to State [1]	$3,000,000
2. Special trainees in cardiovascular diseases [2]	1,000,000
3. Research fellowships [2]	1,000,000
4. Assistance to medical schools for teaching [1]	1,750,000
5. Construction of research facilities [3]	3,500,000
6. Research grants [4]	3,750,000
7. Information center and administration [5]	250,000
8. National Heart Institute (intramural research) [6b]	550,000
9. Preparation and distribution of antistreptococcus typing serum [6a]	100,800
10. Epidemiological studies [6a]	100,000
11. Demonstrations [6a]	119,110
12. Technical development	57,859
13. Survey of research and clinical facilities [6b]	125,000
Total	15,302,769

[1] Similar to grants under National Cancer Institute.

[2] 200 traineeships at $5,000 per annum; or 100 research fellowships at $5,000 per annum for a minimum period of 2 years.

[3] This sum to be kept available until spent.

[4] $1,875,000 to cover needs for 1 year, but amount is doubled so as to provide for some stability for research grants.

[5] Note that this is less than 2 percent of entire requested appropriation.

[6] Present 1949 allowance in U. S. Public Health Service budget, or the amount needed for 1949. (a) Present allowance. (b) Where additional amounts are requested.

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed from the study of this bill and the program proposed that it is essentially an operating agency designed to actively attack the diseases of the heart and circulatory system.

There is no conflict in this bill with the special commission on heart and cardiovascular disease in the proposed National Science Foundation bill, whose function is to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private in the heart field and to recommend an over-all research program in that field. The proposed commission is by its nature an ad hoc study group where public and private interests in the heart field can meet and plan an intelligent forward program for the mass attack on heart diseases. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6729 would create an operating agency to start at once an active program to combat the ravages of heart disease.

I thank my colleagues for the widespread interest they have indicated in this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this piece of legislation is designed to provide a program in connection with the study of the diseases of the circulation and the heart, that will utilize in a constructive manner the very funds we are now appropriating to the Public Health Service, and will bring together at one place under this law the expenditure of the money we are now spending. Bear in mind that the Congress has approved the construction of a great research center at Bethesda that will cost in the aggregate perhaps $40,000,000 to conduct research in the field of heart, cancer, and mental illness. You have taken care of the mental illness by passing the mental health bill. You have taken care of the cancer situation by passing the cancer bill. If we fail to pass this heart bill, and it has the unanimous approval of everyone familiar with the situation in this country, we shall be taking a great step backward and will not be following the people of America who are demanding that this program be put into effect in order to try to cope with this terrible, devastating heart disease that affects so many people in this country.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Can the gentleman give the House any estimate as to how much this bill will cost us?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, I can tell you how much this bill will cost.

Mr. SCRIVNER. How much?

Mr. KEEFE. It is going to cost this next year exactly the sum of money you have already appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. SCRIVNER. How much is that?

Mr. KEEFE. The amount we have already appropriated in all of the aspects of the situation is in the neighborhood of $3,500,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Does this legislation eradicate all of the objections which were raised by the Army to the previous bill relating to this subject? In the report on page 15 Secretary Royall sets out the objections; namely, that the War Department has been undertaking part of this program and helping, and they say that the initial appropriation is $5,000,000; and they object to the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. There can be no additional appropriation under this bill unless the Committee on Appropriations brings an appropriation to the Congress and the Congress approves the appropriation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let me make another inquiry of the gentleman, since he is conversant with the bill. What is the purpose of this amendment set out here hiking the salaries of these 30 persons, whoever they may be, from $10,000 to $15,000 a year? That has nothing to do with the heart situation.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman from New York desire to answer that?

Mr. JAVITS. May I just answer both points as to the objections of the Secretary of War?

My previous bill, H. R. 3762, which was the original bill introduced in June 1947 and supported by the American Heart Association, on which the bill before us was drafted, did provide that there should be appropriations, but the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], when he introduced this bill before us now as the committee amendment, eliminated all reference to appropriations. Hence there is no provision for appropriations in this bill, only a provision for establishing an organization and a plan to coordinate and go forward with the job of national heart-disease research.

As to the provisions with respect to additional assistance in the Public Health Service, the reason that was put in, I understand from the chairman of the committee, was that added responsibilities were given to the Surgeon General by this bill. The chairman of the committee informs me that he is ready to eliminate that from this bill so as not to complicate the immediate issue, which is to establish an institute for going after this heart-disease problem so critical to the country. If the gentleman from Kansas will withdraw his reservation of objection, I shall offer an amendment to that effect.

In the hearings held in May 1948, which are referred to in the remarks of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], there were also considered, pursuant to the notice of hearing, my bill H. R. 3762, introduced June 9, 1947, specifically providing for a program of research relating to diseases of the heart and circulation, and the bill of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], H. R. 5087, for the same specific purpose.

No action had been taken on that bill which was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce because last year the chairman of that committee, Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, provided for a Special Commission for Heart Diseases in the National Science Foundation bill, H. R. 4102, which was passed by both the House and Senate but vetoed by the President. The urgent necessity for taking prompt and constructive action to deal with the problem of heart disease is well known to everyone, and that is why there has been such great interest both in and out of Congress as to the best way to attack the Nation's No. 1 killer—heart disease.

In 1947, when testifying before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in behalf of H. R. 3762, I said:

My bill, H. R. 3762, provides for such a broad-scale attack on the problem of heart diseases in the same way as we are attacking the problems of cancer and of mental health. It initiates a program immediately, though vesting its administration in the Surgeon General's office by setting up a Heart Disease Institute in the National Institute of Health; it also provides for a National Heart Disease Council, composed of leading medical and

scientific authorities and other citizens which is given full control over research and research projects. In this way, administrative efficiency is obtained, but initiative and scientific resources are not sacrificed. The bill is endorsed by the American Heart Association, the leading professional association in this field.

Action to provide for research relating to diseases of the heart and circulation, etc., is called for without delay.

I deferred to the judgment of the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last year and to my other colleagues that the job could be started at least within the framework of the National Science Foundation, after introducing an amendment to the National Science Foundation bill which set an outside time limit of 1 year within which the Special Commission for Heart Disease must formulate and recommend to the National Science Foundation an over-all research program in the field of heart and cardiovascular diseases. That amendment was adopted by the Congress and I said last July 16 on the floor that I hoped in this way to call attention to the problem dealt with by my bill, but that I was convinced that a broad-scale attack on the problem of heart disease was essential in order to cut down on the ghastly death toll caused by heart diseases. I believe that what I said at that time is even more pertinent today. The President vetoed the National Science Foundation bill and another year has gone by with its sorry story in terms of deaths caused by heart disease without anything constructive having been done.

There is no longer any reason to put off facing the issue squarely and courageously. Although an appropriation for over $14,000,000 has been provided for cancer research during the fiscal year 1948 aside from the $25,000,000 for cancer research in the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission, and although research in infantile paralysis has had enormous support, there is only $3,500,000 per annum being currently spent for research in diseases of the heart and arteries by the Federal Government and something over $1,000,000 by private agencies.

It seems hardly possible that a disease which caused the death of more than 587,000 men, women, and children in 1945, a number twice as large as that of the Americans who lost their lives in battle in World War II can be overlooked by the Congress. Deaths from heart disease ran three times as high as cancer, six times as high as from accidents, and 11 times as high as from TB. Only a broad-scale attack on heart diseases can accomplish anything. To economize on the health of our people is to undermine and jeopardize the welfare and security of our Nation. The true picture of the disastrous effect of heart disease on the health, economic productivity and social well being of the Nation cannot be measured alone by the number of deaths it produces. Diseases of the heart and blood vessels cause a greater number of permanent disabilities than any other single disease. They are responsible for a loss of more than 150,000,000 work days annually. Heart disease strikes at the very heart of our citizenry. It takes its toll among youngsters as well as among those who are growing old and who are expected to show the wear and tear of the years. One out of every 10 rejected for military duty by selective service was turned down because of cardiovascular diseases and more than 40,000 men developed rheumatic fever during their military service. Heart disease causes more deaths among children of 10–15 years of age than any other disease. It causes nearly one out of every two deaths after the age of 45. These are statistics which should cause us to take heed and to take action. In the light of these facts it is difficult to understand why something was not done about the situation long before this. Constructive action must be delayed no longer than it takes to consider and pass the legislation before us.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JAVITS: Please accept our heartfelt thanks for the effort you are expending toward creation of a heart-disease institute.

We have a little 5-year-old girl who has a type of heart disease for which so far there is no correction perfected.

The creation of a central office within our health service will, we are sure, hasten many discoveries in the field of heart diseases, and be of inestimable aid to many thousands of sufferers.

Is there anything we might be able to do to be of assistance?

Again, with many sincere thanks,

Respectfully,

RUTH D. GOLDBERG
(Mrs. Edwin L. Goldberg).

It is interesting to note that small countries such as France, Czechoslovakia, and several Latin-American countries lead the world in official steps toward the study and aid to victims of heart diseases. The United States, mainly through an oversight, lags behind in taking action on this very challenging front. It is very gratifying, however, to see that the Congress is taking action on this question.

It is very gratifying to me also to see that the principle for which the American Heart Association and I have fought, that the National Heart Disease Council should have the responsibility for certifying to the Surgeon General its approval for grants-in-aid rather than just recommending, which provision to certify was contained in my bill, H. R. 3762, is contained in the bill to be acted on by the House today. I specifically provided for certification by the Council after thorough consideration of the matter with the American Heart Association which is convinced that such provision is necessary in order to attract the services of the most outstanding men in the field of heart disease research and treatment to the institute. In this way distinguished scientists and doctors will play a vital role in the work of the institute and will not think themselves figureheads, without in any way giving them the power to supersede the authority and functions of the Surgeon General. This idea of certification and how it will work as against the recommendation practice will deserve the careful study of all who are interested in the field of medical research.

One other point should be made and that is that the creation of a National Heart Institute should encourage greatly contributions from private sources for the same purposes. It will enormously stimulate interest in this field and will mobilize support of the same character which has joined so generously in the campaigns to remove the blights of cancer and infantile paralysis. Especially has it been shown that leadership by the Federal Government increases rather than decreases the support of private individuals and private agencies for such projects.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House is the result of long and careful consideration in hearings by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The objections which have been raised with reference to the matter spoken of by the gentleman from Kansas were objections to previous bills. After the hearings, the committee gave this matter further consideration, and a new bill was drawn which sought to eliminate the objections to which the gentleman has referred. The bill as finally passed had the approval of the Departments and Agencies of Government and of the American Heart Association and of all who are interested in this type of legislation. The bill which is now before the House is not the same bill to which the objections that the gentleman has voiced were based.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman asked me a moment ago what the cost was going to be. I stated that it would be about $3,500,000. I was talking from memory. I now have before me the actual figures submitted by the clerk of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling these appropriations. I was only off $7,000. The actual appropriation this year for the purposes outlined in the bill is $3,507,000. But in addition to that, you have provided, as I have indicated, the expenditure necessary to construct this great research center at Bethesda for which there must be funds in addition. The whole idea of this program is to coordinate research in diseases of the heart and circulatory system, so as to have the proper utilization of the funds that we are now appropriating and which we have already appropriated.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am glad to have the satisfaction of knowing that the objections raised by the Department of War have been eliminated in this legislation. What is the status of legislation with reference to the building of the new building that you have just mentioned? Has that been passed yet?

Mr. KEEFE. That has been passed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What is the status of the appropriation for it?

Mr. KEEFE. The status of the appropriation is that it has been passed by both the House and the other Body.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Having those replies and the assurance that the provision providing for the increase from ten to fifteen thousand dollars for these

persons will be stricken by an amendment, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell me whether or not there is another bill on the Consent Calendar introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON], that goes into this a little bit further than merely covering the subject of heart diseases? That bill, for example, goes into poliomyelitis. I have a bill which goes a little further than merely into heart research. While I am strongly in favor of this bill, I hope we will eventually reach the point where we will go a little further.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, there is another bill on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Heart Act."

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this act is to improve the health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the heart and circulation; assist and foster such researches and other activities by public and private agencies, and promote the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results; provide training in matters relating to heart diseases, including refresher courses for physicians; and develop, and assist States and other agencies in the use of, the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart diseases.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

SEC. 3. (a) The title of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6a) is amended to read "Title IV—National Cancer and Heart Institutes."

(b) Title IV of such acts is further amended by inserting "Part A—National Cancer Institute" between the title of such title IV and the heading of section 401, and by adding at the end of section 406 the following new part:

"PART B—NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

"ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTE

"SEC. 411. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Heart Institute (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Institute').

"HEART DISEASE RESEARCH AND TRAINING

"SEC. 412. In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to heart diseases the Surgeon General, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Heart Council, shall—

"(a) conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of heart diseases;

"(b) promote the coordination of researches conducted by the Institute and similar researches conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"(c) provide training and instruction in technical matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases, and provide for such training and instruction through grants to public and other nonprofit agencies and institutions;

"(d) provide fellowships in the Institute from funds appropriated or donated for such purpose;

"(e) secure for the Institute consultation services and advice of heart disease experts from the United States or abroad;

"(f) cooperate with State health agencies in the prevention, control, and eradication of heart diseases;

"(g) make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private agencies and institutions, and to individuals for such research projects relating to heart diseases as are recommended by the National Advisory Heart Council, including grants to such agencies and institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, equipment, and maintenance of such hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, and for the care of such patients therein, as are necessary for such research.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 413. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 412 all appropriate provisions of section 301 shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General, and he is authorized to provide the necessary facilities where training and instruction may be given in all technical matters relating to diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases to persons found by the Surgeon General to have proper technical qualifications and designated by him for such training or instruction, and to fix and pay them a per diem allowance during such training or instruction of not to exceed $10.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Administrator acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501 of the Public Health Service Act, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this part may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

"(c) In carrying out the purposes of section 412 grants-in-aid for heart disease research or training projects shall be made only after review and recommendation of the National Advisory Heart Council made pursuant to section 414.

"FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL

"SEC. 414. The Council is authorized—

"(a) to review research and training projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of heart diseases, and certify approval to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under section 412, of any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of heart diseases;

"(b) to collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of heart diseases, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through the appropriate publications for the benefit of health agencies and organizations (public or private), physicians, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

"(c) to review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research or training projects relating to heart diseases, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases;

"(d) to recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 501 of this act; and

"(e) to make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this part.

"OTHER AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO HEART DISEASES

"SEC. 415. This part shall not be construed as superseding or limiting (a) the functions or authority of the Surgeon General or the Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to the study of the causes, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases; or (b) the expenditure of money therefor."

NATIONAL ADVISORY HEART COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) Section 217 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The National Advisory Heart Council shall consist of the Surgeon General ex officio, who shall be chairman, and of six members to be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator. The six appointed members shall be selected from leading medical or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of heart diseases. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. An appointed member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than 3 years but shall be eligible for reappointment if he has not served immediately preceding his reappointment."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 217 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The National Advisory Health Council shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the Surgeon General on matters relating to health activities and functions of the Service. The Surgeon General is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council and, where appropriate, any member or members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or the National Advisory Heart Council, in connection with matters related to the work of the Service, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine."

(c) The title of section 217 of such act is amended to read "National Advisory Health, Cancer, Heart, and Mental Health Council."

(d) Subsection (c) of section 209 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Members of the National Advisory Health Council, members of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, and members of the National Advisory Heart Council, other than ex officio members, while attending conferences or meetings of their respective Councils or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $25 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence."

(e) Paragraph (d) of section 301 of such act is amended to read:

"(d) Make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private institutions, and to individuals for such research projects as are recommended by the National Advisory Health Council, or, with respect to cancer, recommended by the National Advisory Cancer Council, or, with respect to mental health, recommended by the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or, with respect to heart diseases,

recommended by the National Advisory Heart Council;".

(f) Paragraph (g) of such section is amended to read:

"(g) Adopt, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council, or, with respect to cancer, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, or, with respect to mental health, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or, with respect to heart diseases, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Heart Council, such additional means as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section."

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 2 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (l), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and ", and by inserting after paragraph (m) the following new paragraph:

"(n) The term 'heart diseases' means diseases of the heart and circulation."

(b) The term "National Institute of Health", wherever appearing in the Public Health Service Act, shall be changed to "National Institutes of Health".

(c) The word "title", wherever appearing in sections 403, 404, and 406 of the Public Health Service Act, shall be changed to "part."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'National Heart Act.'

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. The purpose of this act is to improve the health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the heart and circulation; assist and foster such researches and other activities by public and private agencies, and promote the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results; provide training in matters relating to heart diseases, including refresher courses for physicians; and develop, and assist States and other agencies in the use of, the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart diseases.

"RESEARCH AND TRAINING

"SEC. 3. (a) The heading of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) is amended to read 'Title IV—National Cancer and Heart Institutes.'

"(b) Title IV of such act is further amended by inserting 'Part A—National Cancer Institute' between the heading of such title IV and the heading of section 401, and by adding immediately after section 406 the following new part:

"'PART B—NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

"'ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTE

"'SEC. 411. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Heart Institute (hereafter in this part referred to as the "Institute").

"'HEART DISEASE RESEARCH AND TRAINING

"'SEC. 412. In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to heart diseases the Surgeon General, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Heart Council (hereinafter in this part referred to as the "Council"), shall—

"'(a) conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of heart diseases;

"'(b) promote the coordination of research and control programs conducted by the Institute, and similar programs conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"'(c) make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities, and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this part;

"'(d) make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private agencies and institutions, and to individuals for such research projects relating to heart diseases as are recommended by the Council, including grants to such agencies and institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, equipment, and maintenance of such hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, and for the care of such patients therein, as are necessary for such research;

"'(e) establish an information center on research, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart diseases, and collect and make available, through publications and other appriate means, information as to, and the practical application of, research and other activities carried on pursuant to this part;

"'(f) secure from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad who are experts in the field of heart diseases;

"'(g) in accordance with regulations and from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose (1) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Institute and elsewhere with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train research workers and procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States and abroad, and, in addition, provide for such fellowships through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions; and (2) provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships, in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees as he may deem necessary, the number of persons receiving such training and instruction, and the number of persons holding such traineeships, to be fixed by the Council, and, in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeships through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions.

"'ADMINISTRATION

"'SEC. 413. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 412 all appropriate provisions of section 301 shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General, and grants-in-aid for heart disease research and training projects shall be made only after review and recommendation of the Council made pursuant to section 414.

"'(b) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Administrator acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this part may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

"'FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL

"'SEC. 414. The Council is authorized to—

"'(a) review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, and certify approval to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under section 412, any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases;

"'(b) review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution or agency, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-on-aid for research projects relating to heart diseases, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases;

"'(c) review applications from any public or other nonprofit institution for grants-in-aid for training, instruction, and traineeships in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of such applications for grants-in-aid as it determines will best carry out the purposes of this act;

"'(d) collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through appropriate publications for the benefit of health and welfare agencies and organizations (public or private), physicians, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

"'(e) recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 501 for carrying out the purposes of this part; and

"'(f) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this part.

"'OTHER AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO HEART DISEASES

"'SEC. 415. This part shall not be construed as superseding or limiting (a) the functions or authority of the Surgeon General or the Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to the study of the causes, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases; or (b) the expenditure of money therefor.'

"NATIONAL ADVISORY HEART COUNCIL

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 217 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) The National Advisory Heart Council shall consist of the Surgeon General or his representative, the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Army or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Navy or his representative, who shall be ex officio members, and 12 members appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator. The 12 appointed members shall be leaders in the fields of fundamental sciences, medical sciences, education, or public affairs, and 6 of such 12 shall be selected from leading medical or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of heart diseases. Each apopinted member of the Council shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the members first appointed, shall hold office for a term of 3 years, 3 shall hold office for a term of 2 years, and 3 shall hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment. None of such 12 members shall be eligible for reappointment until

a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. Every 2 years the Council shall elect 1 member to act as chairman for the succeeding, 2-year period.'"

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 217 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The National Advisory Health Council shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters relating to health activities and functions of the Service. The Surgeon General is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council and, where appropriate, any member or members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or the National Advisory Heart Council, in connection with matters related to the work of the Service, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.'"

"(c) The heading of section 217 of such act is amended to read as follows: 'National Advisory Health, Cancer, Heart, and Mental Health Councils.'"

"(d) Subsection (e) of section 208 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Members of the National Advisory Health Council, members of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, and members of the National Advisory Heart Council other than ex officio members, while attending conferences or meetings of their respective Councils or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.'"

"(e) Paragraph (d) of section 301 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private institutions, and to individuals for such research projects as are recommended by the National Advisory Health Council, or, with respect to cancer, recommended by the National Advisory Cancer Council, or, with respect to mental health, recommended by the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or, with respect to heart diseases, recommended by the National Advisory Heart Council;'".

"(f) Paragraph (g) of such section 301 is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) Adopt, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council, or, with respect to cancer, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, or, with respect to mental health, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or, with respect to heart diseases, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Heart Council, such additional means as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.'

"CONTROL GRANTS

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 314 of such act is amended by redesignating subsection (e) to (j), inclusive, as subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"'(e) To enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of part B of title IV and to assist, through grants, States, counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the State, and public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, and other organizations, in establishing and maintaining organized community programs of heart disease control, including grants for demonstrations and the training of personnel, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for such purposes. For each fiscal year the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, shall determine the total sum from the appropriation under this subsection which shall be available for allotment among the several States, and shall, in accordance with regulations, from time to time make allotments from such sum to the several States on the basis of (1) the population and (2) the financial need of the respective States. Upon making such allotments the Surgeon General shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts thereof.'

"(b) The subsection of such section 314 herein redesignated as subsection (f) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided,* That in the case of amounts to be paid from allotments to any State under subsection (e), the Surgeon General may determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury amounts to be paid to a county, health district, other political subdivision of the State or to any public or nonprofit agency, institution, or other organization in the State, if he finds that payment to such subdivision or other organization has been recommended by the State health authority of the State, and (1) that the State health authority has not, prior to August 1 of the fiscal year for which the allotment is made, presented and had approved a plan in accordance with subsection (g), or (2) that the State health authority is not authorized by law to make payments to such other organization.'

"(c) The subsection of such section 314 herein redesignated as subsection (g) is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) The moneys so paid to any State, or to any political subdivision or other organization, shall be expended solely in carrying out the purposes specified in subsection (a), or subsection (b), or subsection (c), or subsection (e), as the case may be, and in accordance with plans, approved by the Surgeon General, which have been presented by the health authority of such State, or, under the circumstances specified in subsection (f) (1), by the political subdivision, or the agency, institution, or other organization to whom the payment is made, and, to the extent that any such plan contains provisions relating to mental health, by the mental health authority of such State.'

"(d) The subsection of such section 314 herein redesignated as subsection (h) is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) Money so paid from allotments under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e), shall be paid upon the condition that there shall be spent in such State for the same general purpose from funds of such State and its political subdivisions (or in the case of payments to a political subdivision or to an agency, institution, or other organization under circumstances specified in subsection (f) (1), from funds of such political subdivision or organization), an amount determined in accordance with regulations.'

"(e) The subsection of such section 314 herein redesignated as subsection (i) is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the health authority or, where appropriate, the mental health authority of the State (or, in the case of payments to any political subdivision or any agency, institution, or other organization under the circumstances specified in subsection (f) (1), such subdivision or organization) finds that, with respect to money paid to the State, subdivision, or organization out of appropriations under subsection (a), or subsection (b), or subsection (c), or subsection (e), as the case may be, there is a failure to comply substantially with either—

"'(1) the provisions of this section;

"'(2) the plan submitted under subsection (g); or

"'(3) the regulations;

"the Surgeon General shall notify such State health authority or mental health authority, political subdivision, or organization that further payments will not be made to the State subdivision, or organization, from appropriations under such subsection (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, subdivision, or organization from such appropriations for activities in which there is such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Surgeon General shall make no further certification for payment to such State, subdivision, or organization from appropriations under such subsection, or shall limit payment to activities in which there is no such failure.'"

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 2 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word 'and' at the end of paragraph (l), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (m) and inserting in lieu thereof ';and', and by inserting after paragraph (m) the following new paragraph:

"'(n) The term "heart diseases" means diseases of the heart and circulation.'

"(b) The term 'National Institute of Health', wherever appearing in the Public Health Service Act, is hereby changed to 'National Institutes of Health.'

"(c) The word 'title', wherever appearing in sections 403, 404, and 406 of the Public Health Service Act, is hereby changed to 'part.'

"(d) Section 209 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) The Administrator is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within the Public Health Service, not more than 30 positions, in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development activities of the Public Health Service which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel: *Provided,* That the rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this subsection shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum, and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission. Positions created pursuant to this subsection shall be included in the classified civil service of the United States, but appointments to such positions shall be made without competitive examination upon approval of the proposed appointee's qualifications by the Civil Service Commission or such officers or agents as it may designate for this purpose.'

"(e) Section 633 (b) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out '$25' and by inserting in lieu thereof '$50.'"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 10, strike out all of lines 1 to 22, inclusive.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, S. 2215. I do not know of any legislation which will do more to improve the general welfare

than this measure. At the beginning of this session I introduced a bill very similar to this one. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] also had bills similar to this one pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I join with them in urging the Members of the Congress to pass the bill now before the House, as it represents the best features of each of our bills.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has so ably stated, this legislation will require no new appropriation at this session of Congress. The money has already been appropriated, and this legislation makes it possible for that money to be used in a sensible and practical fashion to combat the most prevalent and deadly of all diseases—heart disease.

Only yesterday the House of Representatives recessed for the purpose of paying tribute to one of our distinguished Members who was suddenly and without warning taken from us by this insidious disease. We all have friends and relatives who are today suffering from some form of cardiovascular disease. We know that it incapacitates more people than all other diseases combined. During World War II eight times as many people died of heart disease as were killed in action in the armed forces. It has been estimated that between nine and ten million people are today suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation, and yet, despite all this destruction and waste of human life that is being wrought by diseases of the heart, very little is being done to learn new methods of preventing the diseases or bringing about its cure once a person is stricken.

This bill will fill the void. It channels brains, energy and money into a direct assault on heart disease, its cause, prevention, and cure. It provides a defense against humanity's most implacable enemy.

The bill was passed unanimously by the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It comes before the House on the recommendation of the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. It has had the full and complete consideration and approval of officials of the Public Health Service, as well as of the outstanding doctors of the United States. Certainly it merits the wholehearted and unanimous approval of Congress, and I am confident that every member will be everlastingly proud of his vote for this bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KEEFE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KEEFE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency and related independent agencies, for printing in the RECORD.

CONSENT CALENDAR

OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6707) to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to make a very short statement on the bill and to offer an amendment which I think will be acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, reported by the Armed Services Committee, has a good purpose. It does clarify as to when five-star officers in the military, shall retire, if and when they retire, and also clarifies certain privileges that they may have if they do retire.

I think the Armed Services Committee has done a fine job in helping to clear up a rather difficult situation. You will recall that several weeks ago I made some remarks relative to General Eisenhower, when placed on inactive service. He took three enlisted personnel of the services with him. They were assigned for an indefinite time. I understand that was an Executive order, and went far beyond the intent of Congress. The bill that is before us clarifies that situation, but I feel will go a little too far, in that they give these five-star generals and admirals, two military personnel for 3 years. I propose to offer an amendment to make it 1 year.

I do not want to be stingy or ungrateful in granting privileges to these men who have rendered outstanding services to their country. Neither do I think that Congress has been ungrateful or stingy, because you will recall that when these generals and admirals retire they get a pension of some $15,500 for the rest of their lives, and I understand it is tax-free. A great many people in this country would be glad to hire their own secretary to carry on their correspondence.

I do realize there is considerable correspondence that they must answer for perhaps a year after they retire. This mail and service after 1 year could well be paid out of the generous pension received for the rest of their lives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer appointed under the provisions of the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), who is on the active list of his respective service, and who is not serving as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, Chief of Staff of the Army or Air Force, Chief of Naval Operations, Theater Commander, or Task Force Commander, shall be transferred to the retired list not later than July 1, 1948. Any officer appointed under the provisions of the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), who is now or hereafter retired may at any time be called to active duty by the President, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, as appropriate, for such period of service and for such purposes as may be specified. Whenever any such officer heretofore or hereafter called to active duty is serving as Chief of Staff of the Army or Air Force, Chief of Naval Operations, Theater Commander, or Task Force Commander, he shall be counted within the number of officers authorized in grades of general and admiral in their respective services, but whenever serving in any other capacity he shall not be charged against the number of officers authorized in any grade or grades.

(b) Not to exceed two persons in the military or naval service may be assigned to assist such officers, when not serving on active duty, in the discharge of their continuing military responsibilities.

SEC. 2. The numerical ceilings on the number of officers in the grade of General of the Army and Admiral in the United States Navy specified in the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), shall not become applicable until January 1, 1950.

SEC. 3. Section 504 (b) of Public law 381, Eightieth Congress, is hereby amended (1) by striking out the number "forty-four" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the number "forty-five", (2) by striking out the number "nine" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the number "ten," (3) by striking out the number "seven" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "eight", (4) by striking out the number "three" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "four", and (5) by striking out the number "seventeen" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "eighteen."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 14, strike out all of lines 14, 15, 16, and 17, and insert:

"(b) Until July 1, 1951, not to exceed two persons on active duty in the Army, Navy, or Air Force may be assigned to assist such officers, when not serving on active duty, in the discharge of their continuing military responsibilities."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 2, line 18, after "July 1" strike out "1951" and insert "1949."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] for his cooperative spirit, which has assisted us in the preparation of this bill, which is relatively important in fixing the exact status of certain high officers, and it is thus of importance to this committee. For a period of a year or two we have struggled with the proposition of reducing high rank. I have, I suppose, been the leader in that movement. With the end of the war came the discontinuance of the five-star rank. It has been our effort to put a premium on the four-star rank for the future by reducing the number of officers who can become four-star officers. But connected with the entire proposition in the consideration of this bill is the fact that the committee is not desirous of disrupting the careers in rank of men like Gen.

Mark Clark in the Army or Admiral Spruance in the Navy, who might very easily have been five-star men. We allow them through this bill to continue their four-star rank until the date of their retirement.

The gentleman from Nebraska is a very conscientious Member of the House and has assisted in the working out of this important question on what assistants should be allowed these officers when they have retired. I might say that the Committee and the Subcommittee gave great consideration to his views.

But there are notably heavy loads at the present time in the case of some of the retired officers.

The first is the case of Admiral Nimitz who, we understand reliably, is receiving an average of 3,000 letters a month. Then there is the case of General Arnold of the Air Force, who is receiving about that number of letters himself. In the case of General Eisenhower, his mail load will average seven, eight, or ten thousand letters a month.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman from New York agree that in the case of the present retired generals and admirals the situation is the same as that with retiring Congressmen, that when they get out of the limelight their mail is not going to be so heavy, and perhaps these officers can get along with two assistants for the period of a year to help them take care of this correspondence? Then with their pension of $15,600, they could carry on without using military personnel paid for by the taxpayer?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The committee carefully considered this question and even went to the extent of having conferences with members of the Senate committee, and they sought more enlightenment from members of the military service. There is a certain environment and atmosphere which surrounds men such as General Eisenhower, Generald Arnold, General Marshall, or Admirals Nimitz and King, men who have performed such outstanding service in the war and who are now in what might be considered a continuing military position under which heavy mail load is imposed upon them, plus other demands on their time and responsibilities of a public nature. For this reason the committee felt that this should be put on a 3-year basis. Then at the end of 3 years the question could be reconsidered and if the situation then showed that these assistants should be continued for a greater length of time Congress could then act to extend it. The main difference between the gentleman from Nebraska and the committee is the difference of the period of time, he wanting it to be for 1 year, and the committee for three.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would it not be just as easy to reconsider the matter at the end of 1 year instead of 3 years? If we find at the end of 1 year that this assistance should be continued for these officers, the Congress could then extend the act. I understood that the gentleman from New York was not seriously objecting, that 1 year would be all right.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I agree that 1 year would be all right, but as chairman of the committee I am obliged to take the position the committee took unanimously that 3 years was the proper time for now.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman from New York is agreeable to 1 year. I think the time should be made 1 year. That will be sufficient time to see how it is working out and whether further extension needs to be made. The 1 year seems generous to me, and I trust my colleagues agree.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. But it just means further consideration of the same factors.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of New York) there were—ayes 66, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY: On page 3, line 2, strike out "January" and substitute "July."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the committee unanimously reported this bill and that was the intent of the committee when it so reported. I therefore accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no obpection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, through some inadvertence, not on the part of the Committee on Armed Services, I believe an error has crept into this bill which would prevent the accomplishment of the full purpose for which it is intended. Admiral Thomas Kinkaid, one of our most distinguished four-star officers, retires for age on May 1, 1950, 4 months after the limiting date now set forth in the bill. Changing the date from January 1, 1950, to July 1, 1950, as suggested by this amendment, will permit Admiral Kinkaid to retain his rank for the rest of his time on the active list. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, does not object to this amendment, and so I hope it will be adopted.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (S. 2215) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the page and line reference of the amendment submitted, which was adopted, be corrected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is simply to correct an erroneous designation in the amendment offered relative to the $15,000 salary.

Mr. JAVITS. It is exactly the same amendment. We had two drafts of the bill which caused the confusion.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the corrected amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 24, line 20, strike out all of lines 20 down to and including line 14 on page 25.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION OF BOARDS OF VISITORS TO MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3657) to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as near as I have been able to tell by a hurried examination of this bill and the report, it appears that the bill proposes to change the composition of the Board of Visitors, which in the case of the Military Academy at the present time has a total of 19 members all from the Congress, and in the case of the Naval Academy 18 members, the majority of whom are from the Congress, with 7 appointed by the President. It is proposed that these be changed to a board where there will be 9 members appointed by the President on a board of 18 members. In other words, in the case of the Military Academy a wholly congressional board would be reduced to a board which has 50 percent congressional representation and 50 percent Presidential representation. I personally have no objection to a reduction of the number of members from the Appropriations Committee of the House, but I do not see any reason why we should create a Board of Visitors which has a 50 percent Presidential representation to take the place of a board where it was entirely a congressional board. I would like to have some justification for this.

Mr. TOWE. Does the gentleman know how many members who have been appointed in the past have visited these institutions?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know that not very many Members have. I

have been up there a time or two, but not as often as I would have liked to have gone; at the same time I think that the Congress should not substitute a Presidential board for a congressional board.

Mr. TOWE. If the gentleman will examine the bill, he will find that the purpose of this measure is to try to create a board that will function more or less continuously. The appointments are made in a little different fashion than at the present time, so that there will always be on the board men who have been there before. The object is to improve the work of the Board of Visitors and to interest people who may deal with educators and so forth who might make a real contribution in their work.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would have no objection to the consideration of the bill if the gentleman would offer an amendment reducing from nine to six the number to be named by the President. That would make the board consist of 15 rather than 18 members and leave the majority with the Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what this bill does is to see to it that members of the Committee on Appropriations are on both boards, whereas they are not necessarily now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But you do make it two from the Committee on Appropriations where at the present time there are five. That is all right with me and I am not objecting to it, but I think to change a wholly congressional board in the case of West Point to a board where nine represent the President and nine the Congress requires an explanation at least. The writers of the Constitution thought it important to put in the keeping of Congress the power of the purse and the sword.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. And there is the necessity of having scientists and educators on that board.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, and you could have that with six members appointed by the President. But I certainly object to destroying the balance of a board which is primarily a congressional responsibility and giving it over to the President. Therefore I object, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL APPOINTMENT FOR NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6494) to provide that personnel of the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve Corps shall have a common Federal appointment or enlistment as reserves of the Army of the United States, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have given this bill some study. It seems to be a complete departure from our present defense system of a separate National Guard and a separate Reserve, and in order that some of us who are interested in the preservation of the National Guard may have an opportunity to study the measure and its eventual significance, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SENDING OF MILITARY PERSONNEL TO CIVILIAN SCHOOLS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 295) to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C., Supp. V, 535), is further amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to detail personnel of the Army of the United States, without regard to component, as students at such technical, professional, and other civilian educational institutions, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants, hospitals, and other places as shall be best suited to enable such personnel to acquire knowledge or experience in the specialties in which it is deemed necessary that such personnel shall perfect themselves, and any officer or warrant officer who receives such instruction shall, immediately upon termination thereof, be ordered to active duty for a period at least equal to the duration of his period of instruction but not greater than 4 years, except that where the duration of such training is 90 days or less, such subsequent active duty may be at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army and only with the consent of the individual concerned: *Provided,* That no member of the National Guard or the Organized Reserve Corps shall be detailed as a student, observer, or investigator pursuant to the provisions of this act nor be ordered to active duty as herein provided except with his own consent, and, in the case of a member of the National Guard of the United States, with the approval of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Army may require that an enlisted man, prior to his detail pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph, shall be discharged and reenlisted in his component for a period of not less than 3 years; and the total length of detail of an enlisted man pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent of his enlistment period: *And provided further,* That at no time shall more than 8 percent of the authorized commissioned officer strength, 8 percent of the authorized warrant officer strength, or 2 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Army, or more than 8 percent of the actual commissioned officer strength, 8 percent of the actual warrant officer strength, or 2 percent of the actual enlisted strength of all reserve components of the Army (including in the computation of the actual strength of each such class of reserve personnel persons in active or inactive duty status), be detailed as students pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph."

SEC. 2. All expenditures incident to the detail of personnel as students at such technical, professional, and other civilian educational institutions, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants, hospitals, and other places, as provided herein, shall be paid from any appropriated Department of the Army funds.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the foregoing section shall be equally applicable to the Department of the Air Force: *Provided,* That all reference therein to the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Regular Army, the National Guard of the United States, and the Army of the United States shall, insofar as they apply to the Department of the Air Force, be construed for the purpose of this section as referring to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "Army", insert "and only with the consent of the individual concerned."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS TO THE HOLLOWAY PLAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1214) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) In clause (b) of section 2 after the word "Navy" insert the following: ", or his designated representative."

(b) Amend the first sentence of the first proviso of section 4 to read as follows: *"Provided,* That such benefits and retainer pay shall commence to accrue on the day each midshipman or apprentice seaman commences his first term of college work under the provisions of this act and that such benefits and retainer pay may be received by midshipmen appointed pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3 for a period not exceeding four academic years."

(c) Amend section 8 to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Navy shall during the second quarter of each calendar year cause to be examined (a) the records of all ensigns of the line of the Navy and second lieutenants of the Marine Corps commissioned pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6 who apply prior to April 1 of that calendar year or prior to the first anniversary of the acceptance of their commissions, whichever is earlier, for retention in the Regular service as permanent officers and who in the then current calendar year will reach the first anniversary of the date of acceptance of their appointment as ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, selecting from among such officers the number he may determine necessary for retention, and (b) the records of all other officers appointed pursuant to this act who apply prior to April 1 of the third calendar year following that in which they accepted their commissions or prior to the third anniversary of the acceptance of their commissions, whichever is earlier, for retention in the Regular service as permanent officers and who in the then current calendar year will reach the third anniversary of the date of acceptance of their appointment as ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, selecting from among such officers the number that he may determine necessary for retention."

(d) Amend section 9 to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) The commission of each officer commissioned pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6 who, prior to April 1 of the calendar year following that in which he accepted his commission or

prior to the first anniversary of the acceptance of his commission, whichever is earlier, shall not have applied for retention in the Regular service, shall be terminated not later than the first anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, and the commission of each such officer who applies for retention as a permanent officer within the time limits prescribed by this subsection, but who is not selected for retention under clause (a) of section 8 shall be terminated not later than June 30 of the appropriate calendar year or the first anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, whichever is the later date. Upon termination of commission, each such officer who thereupon accepts appointment to commissioned rank in the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve may apply for and receive retainer pay at the rate of $100 for each calendar month or part thereof during which, while an officer of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve, he pursues full-time instruction in an accredited college or university but not to exceed a total of $2,000, such instruction to commence not later than a date to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy; in addition, each such officer shall be entitled to the benefits provided for him by section 10 of this act.

"(b) The commission of each officer commissioned pursuant to paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6 and pursuant to subsection (b) of section 6 who, prior to April 1 of the third calendar year following that in which he accepted his commission or prior to the third anniversary of the acceptance of his commission, whichever is earlier, shall not have applied for retention in the Regular service, shall be terminated not later than the third anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, and the commission of each such officer who applies for retention as a permanent officer within the time limits prescribed by this subsection, but who is not selected for retention under clause (b) of section 8 shall be terminated not later than June 30 of the appropriate calendar year or the third anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, whichever is the later date. Upon termination of commission, each such officer may be commissioned in the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) or first lieutenant, as the case may be (if in a staff corps, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the grade appropriate to that rank), and to rank from a date 3 years after the date of rank stated in his original commission in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS BAND AT ASSEMBLY OF MARINE CORPS LEAGUE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5036) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., from September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such assembly, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $8,901, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided,* That in addition to transportation and pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Marine Band be allowed not to exceed $6 per day each for additional living expenses while on duty, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which they would be entitled while serving at their permanent station.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEDURES FOR CONTROL OF THE USE OF PENALTY MAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6406) providing procedures for the control of the use of penalty mail by Government departments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles, bearing the indicia prescribed by law for matter mailed free of postage under the penalty privilege by all executive departments and agencies, all independent establishments of the Government, and all other organizations and persons authorized by law to use the penalty privilege, shall be procured or accounted for through the Postmaster General under such regulations as he shall prescribe. The head of each such department, agency, establishment, or other organization, or each such person, shall submit to the Postmaster General within 60 days after the close of each fiscal year a statement showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing such indicia on hand at the close of such fiscal year.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General shall report to the Congress and to the Bureau of the Budget within 90 days after the close of each fiscal year the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing such penalty indicia procured or accounted for through him during such fiscal year by each executive department and agency, by each independent establishment, and by each organization and person authorized by law to use the penalty privilege.

SEC. 3. No article or package of official matter, or number of articles or packages of official matter constituting in fact a single shipment, exceeding 4 pounds in weight shall be admitted to the mails under the penalty privilege, except (1) stamped paper and supplies sold or used by the postal service; and (2) books and documents published or circulated by order of Congress when mailed by the Superintendent of Public Documents or under the franking privilege.

SEC. 4. (a) Official matter not within the provisions of section 3 which is over 4 pounds in weight, if otherwise mailable, whether sealed or unsealed, including written matter, shall, if such matter does not exceed the limit of weight or size prescribed for fourth-class matter, be accepted for mailing upon the payment of postage at fourth-class rates.

(b) Shipments of official matter shall be sent by the most economical means of transportation practicable, and the Postmaster General may refuse to accept any such matter for shipment by mail when in his judgment it is in the public interest that it be forwarded by other means at less expense.

SEC. 5. All executive departments and agencies, all independent establishments of the Government, and all other organizations and persons authorized by law to use the penalty privilege, are directed to supply as soon as practicable, all necessary information requested by the Post Office Department to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. No executive department or independent establishment of the Government shall transmit through the mail, free of postage, any book, report, periodical, bulletin, pamphlet, list, or other article document (except official letter correspondence, including such enclosures as are reasonably related to the subject matter of the correspondence; informational releases in connection with the decennial census of the United States, mail concerning the sale of Government securities, and all forms and blanks and copies of statutes, rules, regulations, and instructions and administrative orders and interpretations necessary in the administration of such departments and establishments), unless a request therefor has been previously received by such department or independent establishment; or such transmission is required by law; or such document is transmitted to inform the recipient thereof of the adoption, amendment, or interpretation of a statute, rule, regulation, or order to which he is subject. The head of each independent establishment and executive department (other than the Post Office Department) shall certify to the Postmaster General at the end of each quarter that nothing was transmitted through the mail free of postage by the independent establishment or department in violation of the provisions of this section: *Provided,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the mailing free of postage of lists of agricultural bulletins, lists of public documents which are offered for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, or of announcements of publication of maps, atlases, statistical, and other reports offered for sale by the Federal Power Commission as authorized by section 825k of title 16: *Provided further,* That this prohibition shall not apply to the transmission of such books, reports, periodicals, bulletins, pamphlets, lists, articles, or documents to educational institutions or public libraries, or to Federal, State, or other public authorities.

SEC. 7. Section 321b of title 39 United States Code and Public Law 364 approved June 28, 1944, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. This act shall take effect July 1, 1948.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 24, strike out "is" and insert "if."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Massachusetts inform me what this bill does? As a member of the committee handling the Maritime Commission appropriation I would like to know why this was sent to the Maritime Commission.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am not the gentleman from Massachusetts, nevertheless, this was a recommendation of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board. It was

recommended by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board that as this type of lighter-than-air aircraft was of particular use and appropriate to the Maritime service, and as the Navy Department has heretofore, in recent years, not engaged in such development, the Maritime Commission would be the only other place for its consideration.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Does the gentleman know how much money is involved?

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. In the absence of the gentleman from Massachusetts, may I say to the gentleman from California that this bill will not cost any money under its present terms. It merely authorizes an investigation of the lighter-than-air aircraft program by the Maritime Commission. As the gentleman from California has said, it has been recommended by the Aviation Policy Board and by every other agency that has studied the program.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the interest of national defense and of the commerce of the United States and for the development, promotion, and improvement of the commercial and civil aeronautics of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out a program of development, experimentation, procurement, and operation of lighter-than-air aircraft, and is authorized in connection therewith to make such purchases and to execute such contracts as it deems necessary or advisable. The effecting of such program shall be in addition to the other functions of the United States Maritime Commission authorized or required by law, and for the purposes hereof the Commission is authorized to make use of its regular personnel, facilities, and, to such extent as shall be appropriate for the purpose of the program hereby authorized, its powers under the shipping laws of the United States. The Commission shall include in its annual report to Congress a summary of its operations hereunder.

SEC. 2. The United States Maritime Commission is authorized to confer with other departments and agencies of the Government and any such departments or agencies are authorized to make available to the Maritime Commission such of their personnel, property, and facilities as may be desirable for carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "its" and insert "necessary."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4365) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries—marine, shell, and anadromous—of the Gulf Coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6766) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill is supposed to come up under a motion to suspend the rules later; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be pased over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. This bill will come up under suspension later. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1052) to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

TAX COURT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5687) relating to the jurisdiction of the circuit court of appeals to review decisions of the Tax Court.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1141 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) In general: Except as provided in paragraph 2, such decisions may be reviewed by the circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which is located the collector's office to which was made the return of the tax in respect of which the liability arises or, at the election of the petitioner, by the circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which is located the principal place of business or principal office of the taxpayer. If no return was made, the decision may be reviewed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable with respect to decisions rendered by the Tax Court of the United States after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after "or", insert "in cases of appeals from income or excess profits tax decisions."

Line 11, strike out "petitioner" and insert "taxpayer."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "in which is located" and insert "in which either the taxpayer resides or."

Line 3, after "taxpayer", insert "is located."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOANS MADE UNDER SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

RESEARCH RELATING TO DENTAL DISEASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6726) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Dental Research Act."

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this act is to improve the dental health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; assist and foster such researches and other activities by public and private agencies; provide training in matters relating to dental diseases and conditions; and promote the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results, with a view to the development and prompt widespread use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

SEC. 3. (a) The heading of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A), as amended, is amended to read "Title IV—National Cancer and Dental Institutes."

(b) Title IV of such act is further amended by inserting "Part A—National Cancer Institute" between the heading of such title IV and the heading of section 401, and by adding immediately after section 406 the following new part:

"PART B—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

"ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTE

"SEC. 411. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Institute of Dental Research (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Institute').

"DENTAL DISEASE RESEARCH AND TRAINING

"SEC. 412. In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to dental diseases and conditions the Surgeon General, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Dental Research Council (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Council'), shall—

"(a) conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

"(b) promote the coordination of researches conducted by the Institute, and similar researches conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"(c) provide fellowships in the Institute from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose;

"(d) secure for the Institute consultation services and advice of persons from the United States or abroad who are experts in the field of dental diseases and conditions;

"(e) cooperate with State health agencies in the prevention and control of dental diseases and conditions; and

"(f) provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships, in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees as he may deem necessary, the number of persons receiving such training and instruction, and the number of persons holding such traineeships, to be fixed by the Council, and, in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeships through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 413. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 412 all appropriate provisions of section 301 shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General, and grants-in-aid for dental research and training projects shall be made only after review and recommendation of the Council made pursuant to section 414.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Administrator acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501 of the Public Health Service Act, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of dental diseases and conditions, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this part may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

"FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL

"SEC. 414. The Council is authorized to—

"(a) review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, and certify approval to the Surgeon General for prosecution under section 412 (a) hereof, of any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

"(b) collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of dental diseases and conditions, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through appropriate publications for the benefit of health agencies and organizations (public or private), physicians, dentists, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

"(c) review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research projects relating to dental diseases and conditions, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

"(d) recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 413 (b);

"(e) make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this part; and

"(f) review applications from any public or other nonprofit institution for grants-in-aid for training, instruction, and traineeships in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of such applications for grants-in-aid as it determines will best carry out the purposes of this act.

"OTHER AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO DENTAL DISEASES AND CONDITIONS

"SEC. 415. This part shall not be construed as superseding or limiting (a) the functions or authority of the Surgeon General or the Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to the study of the causes, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of dental diseases and conditions; or (b) the expenditure of money therefor.

"SEC. 416. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $750,000 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part."

NATIONAL ADVISORY DENTAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) Section 217 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The National Advisory Dental Research Council shall consist of the Surgeon General or his representative, the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Army or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Navy or his representative, who shall be ex officio members, and 12 members appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator. The 12 appointed members shall be leaders in the fields of fundamental sciences, medical sciences, education, or public affairs; 6 of such 12 shall be selected from leading dental, medical, or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of dental diseases and conditions, and at least 4 of such 6 shall be dentists. Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of 4 years except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the members first appointed, 3 shall hold office for a term of 3 years, 3 shall hold office for a term of 2 years, and 3 shall hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment. None of such 12 members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. Every 2 years the Council shall elect one member to act as chairman for the succeeding 2-year period."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 217 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The National Advisory Health Council shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the Surgeon General on matters relating to health activities and functions of the Service. The Surgeon General is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council, and where appropriate, any member or members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or the National Advisory Dental Research Council, in connection with matters related to the work of the Service, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine."

(c) The heading of section 217 of such act is amended to read "National Advisory Health, Cancer, Mental Health, and Dental Research Councils."

(d) Subsection (e) of section 209 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Members of the National Advisory Health Council, members of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, and members of the National Advisory Dental Research Council, other than ex officio members, while attending conferences or meetings of their respective Councils or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence."

(e) Paragraph (d) of section 301 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private institutions, and to individuals for such research projects as are recommended by the National Advisory Health Council, or, with respect to cancer, recommended by the National Advisory Cancer Council, or, with respect to mental health, recommended by the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or, with respect to dental diseases and conditions, recommended by the National Advisory Dental Research Council;".

(f) Paragraph (g) of such section 301 is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Adopt, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council, or, with respect to cancer, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, or, with respect to mental health, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or, with respect to dental diseases and conditions, upon recommendations of the National Advisory Dental Research Council, such additional means as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section."

RESEARCH FACILITIES

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $2,000,000 for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable and adequate site or sites, selected on the advice of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, in or near the District of Columbia for such buildings and facilities, and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities. The amount authorized to be appropriated in this section shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, supervision of construction, and other administrative expenses incident to the work: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Agency shall prepare the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts, and supervise construction.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Section 2 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (l), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by inserting after paragraph (m) the following new paragraph:

"(n) The term 'dental diseases and conditions' means diseases and conditions affecting teeth and their supporting structures, and other related diseases of the mouth."

(b) The term "National Institute of Health", wherever appearing in such act, is hereby changed to "National Institutes of Health."

(c) The word "title", wherever appearing in sections 403, 404, and 406 of such act, is hereby changed to "part."

(d) Section 633 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "$25" and by inserting in lieu thereof "$50."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 9, line 6, strike out "209" and insert "208."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BREHM:
On page 10, line 17, strike out the title in line 17 and all of section 5, and renumber the remaining sections accordingly.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I need not stress the necessity for the Nation to undertake a dental program, as outlined in the bill introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]. In my opinion it is preferable to S. 176 introduced by Senator MURRAY and passed in the Senate, since it has been drawn as an amendment to the Public Health Service Act and in conformity with the National Cancer Institute Act passed in 1938.

It is essential that all the special health programs, dental, heart, cancer, polio, and so forth, follow a uniform pattern, drawn as amendments to the Public Health Service Act with such additional language as we have found, after consultation with the USPH, to have been the experience gained in the 10 years operation of the Cancer Act.

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill proposes to amend the Public Health Service Act by establishing in the Public Health Service a National Institute of Dental Research, for the purpose of furthering the purposes of the legislation, to improve the dental health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; to assist and foster such researches and other activities by public and private agencies; to provide training in matters relating to dental diseases and conditions; and to promote the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results, with a view to the development and prompt widespread use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions.

H. R. 6726 is designed to lay a sound legislative basis for a dental research program. The establishment of a National Institute of Dental Research in the Public Health Service would provide a focal center for basic and applied research in dental diseases. The new Institute would occupy a position comparable to that of the Cancer and Mental Health Institutes in the fields of cancer and mental health. It would be empowered not only to conduct basic and applied research but to make grants-in-aid to public and private institutions for research projects which are found by the Surgeon General and the National Advisory Dental Research Council to show promise of making valuable contributions to knowledge of dental diseases and conditions.

In establishing an institute and an advisory council on the basis for administering the provisions of this bill, H. R. 6726 follows the pattern already tested by experience in the fields of cancer and mental hygiene. This pattern is modified in one significant respect, namely, in the size and composition of the Council. In the opinion of the committee a council composed of both experts and laymen is superior for the purposes of this legislation than one confined to expert or technical membership. H. R. 6726, therefore, provides for a Council of 4 ex-officio members and 12 appointed members, and only 6 of the appointed members need have technical or professional training. In addition, the bill increases the maximum compensation of members of this and similar councils in the Public Health Service from $25 to $50 per diem.

H. R. 6726 recognizes the need to support training of potential researchers both within the Institute and in the various institutions where dental research will be conducted. The establishment of a National Institute of Dental Research, coupled with a training program as provided by this bill, would constitute a clear demonstration that dental research was on a sound basis and would encourage qualified candidates to prepare themselves for research.

The bill here represents the best thought of the committee on this subject after having given careful consideration to various bills having the same purpose. These included H. R. 574 and its companion bill, S. 176, passed by the Senate, and H. R. 4200, on which hearings were held in March, and H. R. 6470.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will act favorably and promptly on this measure.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 6726, is of great importance to the health and welfare of the people of this country.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress an effort was made to establish a National Institute of Dental Research. It was not enacted by the Congress at that time.

At the beginning of the Eightieth Congress, and in fact, January 7, 1947, I introduced H. R. 574, which was similar to the bill that passed the Senate in the previous Congress but failed to have the approval of the House. H. R. 574 was a companion bill to S. 176, passed by the Senate in the last session of Congress. These bills have the approval of and strong support of the American Dental Association.

This bill, H. R. 6726, contains the same provisions and has for its purpose the same objectives. The committee decided that it would probably be more appropriate to amend the Public Health Service Act to make the dental-research program a part of that act.

In establishing a National Institute of Dental Research, the Surgeon General, in cooperation with the National Advisory Dental Research Council is authorized to carry out the program to improve the dental health of the people of the United States, through the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the causes, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions. It provides for such activities to be conducted by public and private agencies and for the training in matters relating to dental diseases and conditions.

In addition, this authorizes $2,000,000 to be appropriated for the erectment of buildings and facilities for the use of dental research institute. This would provide a centralized institution for basic and appropriate research in dentistry.

I am advised by Dr. Carl O. Flagstad, who appeared before our committee in support of this program, that this new bill "has the full endorsement of the American Dental Association as it incorporates our objectives for Federal support and desirable facilities for dental research." This is another step by the Congress in providing a sound legislative program for the health and welfare of our people. It deserves the most careful consideration by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN POLIOMYELITIS AND OTHER DISEASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6732) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in poliomyelitis and other diseases, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, no report has been available to the objectors on this bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5154) to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, title 16, sec. 590h (a)) is amended (a) by striking out "January 1, 1949" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1953"; and (b) striking out

"December 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1952."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the year "1953" and insert in lieu thereof the year "1950."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the year "1952" and insert in lieu thereof the year "1949."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 77 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6657) to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF COSTS OF JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 945) relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act fixing the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts, including the District Court of Hawaii, the District Court of Porto Rico (now 'Puerto Rico'), and the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia (now 'District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia')," approved April 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 323), as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 600), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Jurors in the United States courts, except in the United States district courts of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and the Canal Zone, and except in the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and including the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, shall receive the following and no other compensation, except in cases otherwise expressly provided by law: For actual attendance at the place of trial or hearing of any court or courts, and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from such place of trial or hearing, either at the beginning and end of service or at any time during the same, $4 per day during such attendance: *Provided*, That whenever a juror is required to attend court 30 or more days in hearing a single case, he may be paid, in the discretion and upon the certification of the trial judge, a per diem of up to and not exceeding $10 for each and every day in excess of 30 days he is required to hear such case.

"For the distance necessarily traveled by the shortest practicable route from their place of residence in going to and returning from the place of trial or hearing at the beginning and at the end of the term of service, 5 cents per mile: *Provided*, That for additional necessary daily transportation expenses, the cost of travel by common carrier shall be allowed not to exceed $2 per day, or if it is not practicable to travel by common carrier a rate of 5 cents per mile shall be allowed but not to exceed $2 per day, or if daily travel appears impracticable subsistence of $2 per day shall be allowed: *Provided further*, That whenever in any case the jury is ordered to be kept together and not to separate, the cost of subsistence during such period shall be paid by the marshal upon the order of the court in lieu of the foregoing allowance for subsistence, and such sum may, in the discretion of the court, be taxed as costs."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike out the words "except in", and on page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2, and through the word "and" in line 3, and insert after the comma following "Columbia" in line 4 the following: "the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, and the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, and excluding the United States District Courts of Alaska and the Canal Zone and the District Court of the Virgin Islands."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "$4" and insert in lieu thereof "$5."

Page 3, lines 6 and 7, change the comma after the word "subsistence" to a period, and strike out the words "and such sum may, in the discretion of the court, be taxed as costs."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIR PARCEL-POST SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this is a highly important and controversial bill concerning several industries in my district. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] has seen fit to cause this bill not to be considered at this time. In my opinion, with the end of the session so near this bill should be approved now to assure that this new service to the public is authorized and directed.

The objection apparently is premised upon a question as to how the railroads feel about this particular legislation. As I stated to the gentleman, the railroads were given an opportunity to testify and did not object to this legislation. Specifically the railroads were represented by Mr. Roland Rice, assistant general counsel of the Association of American Railroads. This association represents 95 percent of the class 1 railroad mileage in this country. In his statement to the committee at hearings on air parcel post, Mr. Rice said:

Let it be clear that we are not opposing the institution of air parcel post as such. If it be a development in the course of progress in this country it is something that ought to come. However, we do feel that if it is provided as a service to the public it should be on a compensatory basis, it should pay its own way.

H. R. 6773 provides rates of American railroads. These rates were submitted to the committee by the Post Office Department with the assurance they would bring in sufficient revenue to meet the expenditures for this new service. We have written into the bill an additional safeguard assuring that there will be no loss to the Post Office Department in air parcel post. This safeguard appears in section 1 (11) which I quote:

The Postmaster General is further authorized and directed for the period of 2 years, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (9), inclusive, of this section, to adjust from time to time the weight limit, size, rate of postage, zone or zones or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public and assure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

I would like to point out that at the present time the Post Office Department under rates established by the Civil Aeronautics Board is required to pay for in excess of 20,000,000 ton-miles of space annually on the air lines. This is because the Civil Aeronautics Board has directed that the Post Office Department pay some air lines on a plane-mile basis and others based upon a minimum-load guaranty. Since there is not sufficient mail to use up this space, it is being paid for by the Department and represents a large part of the subsidy to the air lines. By authorizing this air parcel-post service most of this space will be used by the additional mail sent by air.

It is also pointed out that under the recent ruling of the Civil Aeronautics Board which granted more than $5,000,000 in increased mail pay to the big-five carriers, the ton-mile rate decreases as the volume increases. Taking into consideration present volume, the average ton-mile payments to these carriers is 60 cents. After this air-parcel-post program is placed into operation the additional volume will bring the ton-mile rate down to less than 40 cents.

The net effect of the increase in volume of mail which will be produced as a result of this new service will be a reduction in the present Post Office Department deficit of over $10,000,000 annually. Taking into consideration this large savings, and in view of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee's efforts to reduce the Post Office Department's deficit, you can understand my concern for any delay in establishing the air-parcel-post service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1470) to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE JUDICIAL CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2271) to incorporate into the Judicial Code the provisions of certain statutes relating to

the three-judge district courts, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this three-judge court review—H. R. 2271—might not be adopted. It is a very important matter, and as the gentleman knows, does not conflict with any of the interests of the ones who are involved.

Mr. KEATING. I might say to the gentleman from Alabama that this bill contains the same provision giving to the Attorney General complete control over the litigation of independent agencies, the same as the other two bills, with which the gentleman is concerned. If he would be willing to amend the bill to withdraw that provision, I am sure those who filed the minority report would be willing to go along with that suggestion.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, that is not within my power because the full Committee on the Judiciary adopted it. But the point I want to make is wholly without regard to that, because that does not affect the Interstate Commerce Commission nearly to the same extent that the other does, this is asking for complete and excellent revision of provisions for review of decision of three-judge courts, which involves several hundred sections of the code. I do hope we may have this legislation passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT, 1938

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2454) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Civil Aeronautices Act of 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 973; U. S. C., title 49, sec. 401), is amended by changing the number of paragraph (31) to (32), and by inserting, immediately following paragraph (30), the following new paragraph (31):

"(31) 'Spare parts' means parts, appurtenances, and accessories of aircraft (other than aircraft engines and propellers), of aircraft engines (other than propellers), of propellers and of appliances, maintained for installation or use in an aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, or appliance, but which at the time are not installed therein or attached thereto."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (17) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(17) 'Conditional sale' means (a) any contract for the sale of an aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, or spare part under which possession is delivered to the buyer and the property is to vest in the buyer at a subsequent time, upon the payment of part or all of the price, or upon the performance of any other condition or the happening of any contingency; or (b) any contract for the bailment or leasing of an aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, or spare part, by which the bailee or lessee contracts to pay as compensation a sum substantially equivalent to the value thereof, and by which it is agreed that the bailee or lessee is bound to become, or has the option of becoming, the owner thereof upon full compliance with the terms of the contract. The buyer, bailee, or lessee shall be deemed to be the person by whom any such contract is made or given."

SEC. 3. Section 503 of such act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 523), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 503. (a) The Administrator shall establish and maintain a system for the recording of each and all of the following:

"(1) Any conveyance which affects the title to, or any interest in, any civil aircraft of the United States;

"(2) Any lease, and any mortgage, equipment trust, contract of conditional sale, or other instrument executed for security purposes, which lease or other instrument affects the title to, or any interest in, any specifically identified aircraft engine or engines of 750 or more rated take-off horsepower for each such engine or the equivalent of such horsepower, and also any assignment or amendment thereof or supplement thereto;

"(3) Any lease, and any mortgage, equipment trust, contract of conditional sale, or other instrument executed for security purposes, which lease or other instrument affects the title to, or any interest in, any aircraft engines, propellers, or appliances maintained by or on behalf of an air carrier certificated under section 604 (b) of this act for installation or use in aircraft, aircraft engines, or propellers, or any spare parts maintained by or on behalf of such an air carrier, which instrument need only describe generally by types the engines, propellers, appliances, and spare parts covered thereby and designate the location or locations thereof; and also any assignment or amendment thereof or supplement thereto.

"(b) The Administrator shall also record under the system provided for in subsection (a) of this section any release, cancellation, discharge, or satisfaction relating to any conveyance or other instrument recorded under said system.

"(c) No conveyance the recording of which is provided for by section 503 (a) (1) made on or after August 22, 1938, and no instrument the recording of which is provided for by section 503 (a) (2) or section 503 (a) (3) made on or after the effective date of this section, shall be valid in respect of such aircraft, aircraft engine or engines, propellers, appliances, or spare parts against any person other than the person by whom the conveyance or other instrument is made or given, his heir or devisee, or any person having actual notice thereof, until such conveyance or other instrument is filed for recordation in the office of the Administrator. For the purposes of this subsection (c), such conveyance or other instrument shall take effect from the time and date of its filing for recordation, and not from the time and date of its execution.

"(d) Each conveyance or other instrument recorded by means of or under the system provided for in subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall from the time of its filing for recordation be valid as to all persons without further or other recordation, except that an instrument recorded pursuant to section 503 (a) (3) shall be effective only with respect to those of such items which may from time to time be situated at the designated location or locations and only while so situated: *Provided*, That an instrument recorded under section 503 (a) (2) shall not be affected as to the engine or engines specifically identified therein, by any instrument theretofore or thereafter recorded pursuant to section 503 (a) (3).

"(e) No conveyance or other instrument shall be recorded unless it shall have been acknowledged before a notary public or other officer authorized by the law of the United States, or of a State, Territory, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, to take acknowledgment of deeds.

"(f) The Administrator shall keep a record of the time and date of the filing of conveyances and other instruments with him and of the time and date of recordation thereof. He shall record conveyances and other instruments filed with him in the order of their reception, in files to be kept for that purpose, and indexed according to—

"(1) the identifying description of the aircraft or aircraft engine, or in the case of an instrument referred to in section 503 (a) (3), the location or locations specified therein; and

"(2) the names of the parties to the conveyance or other instrument.

"(g) The Administrator is authorized to provide by regulation for the endorsement upon certificates of registration, or aircraft certificates, of information with respect to the ownership of the aircraft for which each certificate is issued, the recording of discharges and satisfactions of recorded instruments, and other transactions affecting title to or interest in aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, or parts, and for such other records, proceedings, and details as may be necessary to facilitate the determination of the rights of parties dealing with civil aircraft of the United States, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, or parts.

"(h) The person applying for the issuance or renewal of an airworthiness certificate for an aircraft with respect to which there has been no recordation of ownership as provided in this section shall present with his application such information with respect to the ownership of the aircraft as the Administrator shall deem necessary to show the persons who are holders of property interests in such aircraft and the nature and extent of such interests."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE FOR EMPLOYEES OF MARITIME SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6728) to authorize medical and hospital service for those employed in the maritime service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to ask an explanation of this bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. For the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I am pleased to say that this bill which was introduced by the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was for the purpose of giving statutory authority for appropriations which, in the past, have been made with legislative language on an appropriation bill.

The purpose of this bill as presently drawn, different from the bill as originally drawn, is merely to confirm by statute the right of the Public Health Service to carry on this very worth-while activity, which it has been doing for many years.

Mr. FENTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. Just how far does the bill go? Does it authorize treatment on the outside, or is it purely within the Bureau?

Mr. WOLVERTON. It is purely within the Public Health Service at their hospitals where such exist, but I think the gentleman will readily understand that it is impossible to have the Public Health Service hospital at every port in the United States, so that the Public Health at times does enter into contractual relations with hospitals and others for medical service in different ports of the United States.

We must ever bear in mind that the nations of the world recognize a responsibility toward their seafaring men. This country for many, many years has recognized its obligation and has sought to fulfill its duty to them. The services provided in this bill are a part of our general program to promote the welfare of our seamen. The whole basic thought of caring for them arises from the fact that in many instances, these men have no permanent home or place of abode to go to when sick and disabled; hence the desire to provide for them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (h) of the Public Health Service Act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. IV, title 42, sec. 201 (h)), is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The term 'seamen' includes (1) any person employed on board in the care, preservation, or navigation of any vessel, or in the service, on board, of those engaged in such care, preservation, or navigation, and (2) any person who (A) has been so employed for at least 60 days of substantially continuous service, (B) applies for treatment under this act within 6 months of the last day of such service, and (C) has not changed his occupation;".

SEC. 2. Section 322 (a) of the Public Health Service Act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. IV, title 42, sec. 249 (a)) is amended by inserting after the word "Seamen" in paragraphs (1) and (2) the words "who are or have been," by inserting before the word "employed" in paragraph (3) the words "or have been", and by inserting after the word "Seamen" in paragraph (5) the words "who are or have been employed."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPOSITION OF THE AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6247) to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course, we are all much in favor of the 70-group air force, but placing a bill which has to do with $7,000,000,000 on the Consent Calendar seems ridiculous. May I ask the gentleman from New York, Does this bill do anything more than authorize what has already been appropriated.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. This provides authorization for the 70-group air force.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force was created as a separate military service under the National Security Act of 1947. Both the Navy and the Army have legislation which determines the composition of those two services. No legislation has ever been brought forward for the purpose of determining the composition of the Air Force. So this bill has been brought forward for that purpose, to lay a foundation.

There is no money involved in this bill. It is not an authorization bill in the sense of asking for any planes or any men or anything of that sort. It provides for ceilings; for example, a ceiling for the number of officers and men as contained in the Selective Service Act which is before the House. The ceiling as to planes, squadrons, and groups is the ceiling which was placed on the appropriation bill which has already become law. Other provisions in the bill are solely for the purpose of determining the composition of the Air Force so that it can have something for guidance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Do the Navy and the Army Air Force approve of this bill?

Mr. CLASON. As far as our committee is concerned, I would say it met with the approval of everybody.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are all satisfied?

Mr. CLASON. Yes, they are both satisfied. No objection was ever raised to it. It simply lays the basis on which the Air Force shall be guided in its work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as chairman of the Armed Services Committe, I would like to say this: This is the only plank that is a 70-group air force that the Republicans have got so far to put in their platform in Philadelphia on the subject of preparedness. Up to now, with their refusal to act on universal military training, and no consideration having been given as yet to selective service, this issue of a 70-group air force is going to have to be spread pretty thin. I do not think there is 1 man in 50 in this House that knows what is in the 70-group air force. I want to remind the House that the 70 groups contain 10 whole groups of many squadrons and many planes in the 70-group air force, which passed this House almost unanimously, and these 10 groups are for airborne troops, engineers, and air-borne infantry. These are men we have not now got and will not have unless we have selective service and a larger Army.

There are only 10 days left presumably, and I am banking on the word of the Speaker of this House and the majority leader that the selective service will come up before we adjourn; otherwise what might be said in the Republican platform will be mockery and claptrap.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not ask that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is no one in this House I think who is any stronger for the 70-group air force than I am. In fact, I did all that I could to have the appropriation bill passed that made that possible.

I would suggest to the gentleman from New York, however, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Forces, that he has given evidence of the fact that this bill ought to have some general consideration. He has just said that there were not 50 Members of this House who knew what was in the 70-group air force.

It is said that the bill now before us proposes a program involving $7,500,000,000 annually. Under all precedents in our procedure, it should be put over until we can give it specific and direct consideration which is not possible on the Consent Calendar.

The bill may be perfect in every particular, but it should be explained. For example, I note that it proposes to make inapplicable to the Air Force certain limitations on numbers of the civilian employees as established by law for other branches of the armed services—the Army and Navy. It is not clear how this ties in with the action which the House took in the appropriation bill the other day on civilian employees.

So, because of the very far-reaching importance of the bill, and because I think the House should be acquainted with the details of the bill I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when does the gentleman think the House will find time to take it up?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it is as important as the gentleman from New York says it is there will be no question but that it will have attention before we adjourn.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman from South Dakota voted for the 70-group air force.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly; and the gentleman from South Dakota as much as any member of the Committee on Deficiencies, was responsible for the appropriation and the language which was worked out, which made it possible for the larger air force to be a reality. But as that law is already in being, and the appropriation has already been made, we should at least devote a few minutes to considering the bill that seeks to spell out basic air-force law.

The bill should be considered before we adjourn, of course, but the House ought to know what is in it and not pass the bill on the Consent Calendar without explanation or debate.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is the position of the Air Force and the witnesses who came before our committee that they would like to have a basic law on which to base the composition of their work in the

future. They have to have a guide. Now we are going to go into a recess or into an adjournment which will last for possibly 6 months. The Air Force should have this basic legislation now.

The pending bill does not call for anything that they have not already been granted; as a matter of fact, it places a ceiling on the amount they can spend for civilian employees, as it is already established by an appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What does it do to the ceiling on civilian employees?

Mr. CLASON. It limits them to 50,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the ceiling on civilian employees even though we establish a different ceiling in the bill that was reported last week. In the matter of civilian employees whereas they requested $325,000,000, the bill as it passed the House called for only $300,000,000. They are now limited to those figures.

Mr. CLASON. The Air Force under the adjustment of January 2, 1948, was allotted 50,000 of the employees which we gave to the Army. They have asked for the right of the Air Force to employ civilian personnel though it may be in addition to what the civil-service law provides at the present time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I must insist upon this because the matter obviously has too many ramifications to be considered on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

CAUSES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THUNDERSTORMS AND OTHER ATMOSPHERIC DISTURBANCES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2456) to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of the Weather Bureau is authorized and directed to study fully and thoroughly the internal structure of thunderstorms, hurricanes, cyclones, and other severe atmospheric disturbances, particularly the degree of turbulence within such storms and the development, maintenance, and magnitude of updrafts and downdrafts with a view to establishing methods by which the characteristics of particular thunderstorms may be forecast and methods by which the characteristics of such storms may be determined on visual observation from outside of the immediate thunderstorm area. Such study shall be concluded at the earliest practicable date and a final report submitted to Congress. The Chief of the Weather Bureau shall make interim reports to Congress at least annually during the course of the study.

SEC. 2. The Chief of the Weather Bureau is empowered to make such expenditures at the seat of government and elsewhere as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act and as from time to time may be appropriated for by Congress, including expenditures for the development and purchase of special meteorological instruments and other equipment (including motor vehicles and aircraft), without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Any executive department or independent establishment is hereby authorized to cooperate with the Chief of the Weather Bureau in carrying out the purposes of this act, and for such purposes may lend or transfer to the Chief of the Weather Bureau any officer or employee of such department or establishment and any property, equipment, lands, or buildings under its control.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETENTION IN THE SERVICE OF CERTAIN DISABLED ARMY AND AIR FORCE PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1783) to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized and directed to retain in service disabled officers, warrant officers, and flight officers of the Army and the Air Force of the United States until their treatment for physical reconstruction has reached a point where they will not be further benefited by retention in a military hospital or in the military service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL SERIES OF STAMPS COMMEMORATING FOUNDER OF GIRL SCOUTING IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue during 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of Juliette Low, the founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "during 1948 a" and insert "at the earliest practicable date."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION TO HEAR AND DETERMINE THE CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1260) to create a commission to hear the claims of certain motor carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SAFEGUARDING AND CONSOLIDATING CERTAIN AREAS WITHIN THE SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1090) to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to protect and administer more effectively the publicly owned lands within certain parts of the area described in section 1 of the act approved July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020), and to accomplish certain public purposes explicit and implicit in sections 2 and 3 of said act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to acquire any lands or interest in lands, and appurtenances thereto, situated within the area described in section 2 of this act, where in his opinion development or exploitation, or the potentialities for development of exploitation, impair or threaten to impair the unique qualities and natural features of the remaining wilderness canoe country: *Provided, however*, That under the authority of this act no continguous tract of land in one ownership, not exceeding 500 acres in the aggregate, shall be condemned if at the time of the approval of this act it is encumbered with a structure or structures of a permanent type suitable for human occupancy and if the owner thereof files written objections before expiration of the time for answering the petition in the proceedings.

SEC. 2. That the authority granted in section 1 of this act shall be supplemental to the authority granted by existing acts relating to the acquisition of lands for national-forest purposes and shall not be deemed as repealing any portions of those acts; and said supplemental authority granted by section 1 of this act, but not the authority granted by existing acts, shall be confined to the following described areas in Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis Counties, State of Minnesota:

Township 63 north, range 2 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 5 to 8, inclusive.

Township 63 north, range 3 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 12, inclusive.

Township 63 north, ranges 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 west, fourth principal meridian, entire townships.

Township 63 north, range 9 west, fourth principal meridian, south half section 19 and sections 20 to 36, inclusive.

Township 63 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian, section 6.

Township 63 north, range 14 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 12, inclusive, and 14 to 22, inclusive.

Township 63 north, range 15 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 24, inclusive.

Township 63 north, range 16 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 3, inclusive, 10 to 15, inclusive, and 22 to 24, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 3 east, fourth principal meridian, south half section 7.

Township 64 north, range 2 east, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 12, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 1 east, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 4, inclusive, south half section 7, sections 8 to 12, inclusive, 15 to 17, inclusive, and east half section 18.

Township 64 north, range 1 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 17 to 20, inclusive, and 29 to 32, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 2 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 7 to 11, inclusive, and 13 to 36, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 3 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 7 to 36, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 4 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 6, 7, and 10 to 36, inclusive.

Township 64 north, ranges 5, 6, 7, and 8 west, fourth principal meridian, entire townships.

Township 64 north, range 9 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 24, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 10 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 18, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 11 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 4, inclusive, and 9 to 16, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 5 to 8, inclusive, 15 to 22, inclusive, and 28 to 32, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 14 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 6 to 36, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 15 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 3, inclusive, and 10 to 36, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 16 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 22 to 27, inclusive, and 34 to 36, inclusive.

Township 65 north, range 2 east, fourth principal meridian, entire township.

Township 65 north, range 1 east, fourth principal meridian, sections 19 to 30, inclusive, and 33 to 36, inclusive.

Township 65 north, range 1 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 19 to 30 inclusive.

Township 65 north, range 4 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 3 inclusive, 10 to 14, inclusive, and 31.

Township 65 north, range 5 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 6, 7, and 18 to 36, inclusive.

Township 65 north, ranges 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 west, fourth principal meridian, entire townships.

Township 65 north, range 12 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 17, inclusive, 20 to 27, inclusive, and 34 to 36, inclusive.

Township 65 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 3, inclusive, and 10 to 12, inclusive.

Township 65 north, range 14 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 18, 19, 30, and 31.

Township 65 north, range 15 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 13, 14, 23 to 26, inclusive, 35 and 36.

Township 66 north, range 4 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 3, 9, 16, 21, 22, 26 to 28, inclusive, and 33 to 36, inclusive.

Township 66 north, range 5 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 2, 8, 9, 16 to 20, inclusive, 30 and 31.

Township 66 north, range 6 west, fourth principal meridian, entire township.

Township 66 north, ranges 11, 12, and 13 west, fourth principal meridian, entire townships.

Township 66 north, range 14 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 28, inclusive, and 33 to 36, inclusive.

Township 66 north, range 15 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 17, inclusive, and 20 to 24, inclusive.

Township 66 north, range 16 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 1 to 5, inclusive, and 9 to 12, inclusive.

Township 67 north, ranges 13, 14, and 15 west, fourth principal meridian, entire townships.

Township 67 north, range 16 west, fourth principal meridian, sections 6 to 8, inclusive, 16 to 18, inclusive, 20, 21, 28, 29, and 32 to 34, inclusive.

Township 67 north, range 17 west, fourth principal meridian, those portions of sections 1, 12, and 13 east of Crane Lake.

Township 68 north, ranges 13, 14, 15, and 16 west, fourth principal meridian, entire townships.

Township 68 north, range 17 west, fourth principal meridian, that portion of section 36 east of Crane Lake.

SEC. 3. That lands shall be acquired by purchase or condemnation under the supplemental authority granted in section 1 of this act only with prior approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission created by section 4 of the act approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, and lands so acquired shall become parts of the Superior National Forest and be subject to the provisions of said act (36 Stat. 961), as amended, and of such other laws as apply to land acquired under the provisions of said act (36 Stat. 961), as amended, except as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 4. That upon finding and determination by the Secretary of Agriculture that the public purposes and objectives explicit and implicit in the act approved July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020), more effectively can be accomplished by exchanging lands of the United States situated within the boundaries described in said act for other lands in State, county, or private ownership situated within the said boundaries which are more suitable for public ownership, management, and use, for the purposes contemplated by said act, such lands of the United States shall be subject to exchange under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, or the provisions of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1215).

SEC. 5. That in addition to the payment to the State of Minnesota under the provisions of the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260), and of section 13 of the act of March 1, 1911, as amended (36 Stat. 961; 38 Stat. 441), there shall be paid at the end of each fiscal year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State of Minnesota the amount, if any, by which the payment made under the above cited acts for such year is less than the sum certified to him by the Secretary of Agriculture as equaling, as of the first day of such year, the number of acres of national forest land situated within the areas described in section 2 of this act multiplied by 7½ cents per acre; and such amount shall be expended for the benefit of the counties in which said national-forest lands are situated in the manner prescribed by State law for the expenditure of payments made under the acts cited above or in such other manner as the State legislature may hereafter prescribe: *Provided, however,* That the first payment to the State of Minnesota under the provisions of this section shall not be due until the close of the first full fiscal year after approval of this act.

SEC. 6. That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That the total appropriations under the authority of this act shall not exceed $500,000 for the purchase and condemnation of land.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

Page 8, line 1, strike out all of section 5 and insert in lieu thereof a new section 5 as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall pay to the State of Minnesota, at the close of each fiscal year, from any national-forest receipts not otherwise appropriated, a sum of money equivalent to three-quarters of 1 percent of the fair appraised value of such national-forest lands as may be situated within the area described in section 2 of this act at the end of each fiscal year; and the payments made hereunder shall be distributed to each of the three aforesaid counties in conformity with the fair appraised value of such national-forest lands in each county: *Provided,* That the fair appraised value of the lands shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at 10-year intervals and his determination shall be conclusive and final: *Provided further,* That the first payment to the State of Minnesota under the provisions of this section shall not be due until the close of the first full fiscal year after approval of this act: *And provided further,* That the provisions of the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260), and of section 13 of the act of March 1, 1911, as amended (36 Stat. 961; 38 Stat. 441), shall not be applicable to the national-forest lands to which this section applies."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOFF: Page 2, line 16, after the word "acts" insert "except as provided hereinafter."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF POTATO AND TOMATO PRODUCTION FROM THE GOLDEN NEMATODE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2137) to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read thte bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to protect potato and tomato production in the United States from the destructive pest known as the golden nematode which subsists on the roots of patatoes and tomatoes, causes marked reduction in yield, persists in the soil for many years in an inactive state in the absence of preferred hosts, and becomes active and destructive when potatoes or tomatoes are again planted, it is the policy of the Government of the United States, independently or in cooperation with the State and local governmental agencies, and other public and private organizations, associations, and individuals, to eradicate, suppress, control, and prevent the spread of, this pest.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture either independently or in cooperation with public or private agencies is authorized to carry out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or prevent the spread of, the golden nematode.

SEC. 3. The activities contemplated by this act include cooperation with States and other agencies in making inspections, applying suppressive measures, enforcing quarantines, enforcing restrictions on the planting of potatoes and tomatoes, destroying potatoes and tomatoes growing in soil found infested or exposed to infestation with the golden nematode, and compensating growers in areas infected, or exposed to infestation, with the golden nematode for not planting potatoes or tomatoes or for losses resulting from destruction for the purposes of this act of potatoes or tomatoes.

SEC. 4. In the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture no part of any sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act shall be expended with respect to any area infested with the golden nematode or exposed to such infestation until the appropriate cooperating agency or agencies have presented evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture that they will provide funds, materials, means, and State and local authority necessary for the cooperating agency or agencies to carry out effectively that part of the cooperative program the Secretary of Agriculture may require from the cooperating agency or agencies.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not undertake any program involving mandatory restrictions on the planting of potatoes or tomatoes, or mandatory destruction

of potatoes or tomatoes unless the State concerned shall have enacted legislation authorizing such restrictions or destruction.

SEC. 6. The amount of compensation to be paid by the Federal Government and any cooperating agency, and the method of computation thereof, shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture or the agent or agents designated by him, in cooperation with the responsible officials of the agency concerned and in a manner to assure that necessary records are preserved to show full compliance with the provisions of this act and regulations promulgated in accordance therewith. No payment shall be made to any grower except after compliance in good faith with regulations concerning the golden nematode promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture and the responsible official of the cooperating agency. The determination by the Secretary of Agriculture, or his authorized agent, of the amount of compensation to be provided by the Federal Government for any grower shall be final.

SEC. 7. To carry out the purposes of this act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to incur all necessary expenses, including the employment of persons in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act are intended to supplement, and shall not be construed as limiting or repealing existing legislation.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Golden Nematode Act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6794) to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, this is a very worthy piece of legislation. It is designed to take care of many veterans of World War II, especially prisoners of war, who returned to their homes and neglected to file certain claims because they did not know it was necessary to file a claim for the value of personal effects lost in the military service. I also wish to take this opportunity to commend the House Committee on the Judiciary, and especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], for initiating this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War, and such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay any claim against the United States, including claims not heretofore satisfied arising on or after December 7, 1939, of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, when such claim is substantiated, and the property determined to be reasonable, useful, necessary, or proper under the attendant circumstances, in such manner as the Secretary of War may by regulation prescribe, for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, or to replace such personal property in kind: *Provided*, That the damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and shall not have occurred at quarters occupied by the claimant within continental United States (excluding Alaska) which are not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the Government. No claim shall be settled under this act unless presented in writing within 1 year after the accident or incident out of which such claim arises shall have occurred: *Provided further*, That if such accident or incident occurs in time of war, or if war intervenes within 2 years after its occurrence, any claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within 5 years after peace is established. Any such settlement made by the Secretary of War, or his designee, under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 2. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act are hereby authorized. Appropriations available to the War Department for the settlement of claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 350), as amended, shall be available for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Sections 3483–3488 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 209–214), and the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 350), as amended by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 880), and by the act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1436; 31 U. S. C. 218–222), and by section 6 of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 374; 31 U. S. C. 222a, 222b), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. That portion of section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), reading as follows: "The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to claims arising in foreign countries or possessions thereof which are cognizable under the provisions of the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, or to claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property of military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, or for personal injury or death of such persons, if such damage, loss, destruction, injury, or death occurs incident to their service." is hereby amended, effective as of the date of approval of said act, to read as follows: "The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to claims arising in foreign countries or possessions thereof which are cognizable under the provisions of the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, or to claims for personal injury or death of military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army if such injury or death occurs incident to their service."

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "Military Personnel Claims Act of 1948."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 2, line 14, after the word "within" strike out "1 year" and insert "5 years."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this is merely a conforming amendment because in the statutes there were two limitations within which the claim had to be filed. The committee overlooked one and this merely makes it perfectly plain that it is the intention of the Congress to give to the men the right to file their claims within 5 years from the enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

RECLASSIFYING THE SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for the immediate consideration to Calendar No. 703, the bill (H. R. 4786) to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1861, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (1) of section 14 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Temporary employees in the custodial service paid on an annual basis shall be paid at the rates of pay of grade 1 of the position in which employed and shall, at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 1 year's satisfactory service in each pay status, be advanced successively to the rates of pay of the next higher grade of such position; and temporary employees in the custodial service paid on an hourly basis shall be paid at the rates of pay of grade 1 of the position which employed and shall, at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 12 months' satisfactory service in each pay status, be advanced successively to the rates of pay of the next higher grade of such position: *Provided*, That no temporary employee shall be paid at a rate higher than that provided herein for the highest automatic grade of the position in which he is employed: *Provided further*, That when a temporary employee is appointed to a regular position in the custodial service, the employee shall be assigned to a salary grade corresponding to his salary as a temporary employee at the time of such appointment. Any fractional part of a year's temporary service accumulated since the last compensation increase as a temporary shall be included with the regular service of a regular employee in determining eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade following appointment to a regular position."

SEC. 2. Any period of continuous satisfactory service as a temporary employee in the

custodial service performed by any such temporary employee prior to the effective date of this act shall be creditable for a promotion to the rates of pay of grade 2 of the position in which such temporary employee is employed.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective at the beginning of the quarter following the date of enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 4786, was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for the immediate consideration to Calendar No. 709, the bill (H. R. 6507) to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentlewoman whether she has cleared this with the objector?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have cleared it with the gentleman who objected, and he has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How many times has this extension been granted?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. None for World War II veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (f) of section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Such insurance may be issued on the following plans: Five-year level premium term, ordinary life, 20-payment life, 30-payment life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65. Level premium term insurance may be converted as of the date when any premium becomes or has become due, or exchanged as of the date of the original policy, upon payment of the difference in reserve, at any time while such insurance is in force and within the term period to any of the foregoing permanent plans of insurance, except that conversion to an endowment plan may not be made while the insured is totally disabled. All level premium term policies, except as provided below, shall cease and terminate at the expiration of the term period: *Provided*, That at the expiration of the term period any national service life insurance policy which was issued on a 5-year level premium term plan before January 1, 1948, and which has not been exchanged or converted to a permanent plan of insurance, may be renewed as level premium term insurance for an additional period of 5 years at the premium rate for the then attained age without medical examination, provided, the required premiums are tendered prior to the expiration of the first term period: *Provided further*, That in any case in which the insured is shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to be totally disabled at the expiration of the level premium term period of his insurance under conditions which would entitle him to continued insurance protection but for such expiration, such insurance, if subject to renewal under this provision, shall be automatically renewed for an additional period of 5 years at the premium rate for the then attained age, unless the insured has elected insurance on some other available plan. Provisions for cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values, dividends from gains and savings refund of unearned premiums, and such other provisions as may be found to be reasonable and practicable may be provided for in the policy of insurance from time to time by regulations promulgated by the Administrator."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, we have but a few legislative days remaining in this session of Congress, and we are faced with the problem here now as to whether or not we can extend the 5-year level premium term insurance under the National Life Insurance Act. Mr. Speaker, the most fundamental observation that can be made regarding this insurance of our former GI's is that at the peak period we had in this country 19,000,000 policys, and today we have less than 6,000,000.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that I would not be alone in this fight to restore some of the 13,000,000 policies that we have lost because of the vacillation in administration and the forcing of these boys to abandon their life insurance because their budgets could not meet the threat of increased premiums in the years to come.

Think what a golden opportunity we have here in this country today here in this Congress to set in motion the machinery which would ultimately bring under insurance some 10,000,000 or more of our young men. Surely this would cost a little money, but nothing in comparison with the terrific impact it would have on social legislation. Any procedure which has resulted in the loss of two-thirds of the policyholders—13,000,000—is indeed one in which this House must sit up, take notice, and seek to have remedial action. Is it the policy of this House and the Veterans' Administration to lose 3,000,000 of the remaining 6 they have?

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that in this fight for the veteran that my bill, H. R. 6171, which provides that the 5-year level term insurance be extended for an additional 5 years upon written application at the same premium that they are now paying, would be the bill accepted by the House here today.

This present bill, coming as it does so late in the session and which would increase the premiums by two or three dollars a month, is not the answer to our problem. We must adopt a strong, forceful campaign to insist that we lose not even one more of the remaining 6,000,000 policyholders, and that we set our sights on getting back at least 50 percent of the 13,000,000 policyholders that we have lost.

Is the Congress going to miss this golden opportunity of establishing a rock-bound insured people to stable future generations?

Since this appears to be a hopeless fight, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position, because of the legislative jam, to use a mere legislative technicality to prevent the passage of this wholly inadequate bill for the extension of level-term policies that a good many of our boys now hold.

Therefore, because of these legislative restrictions, I am withdrawing my objections at this time, but I will continue to fight to regain these 13,000,000 policyholders that we have lost by poor administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. McMAHON] may extend his remarks in the RECORD previous to the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING PARAGRAPH 1007 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for the immediate consideration to Calendar No. 600, the bill (H. R. 5608) to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts who objected now has no further objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by striking out "19½ cents per pound and 15 percent ad valorem" and inserting in lieu thereof "40 percent ad valorem."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD at the points where the bill H. R. 127 and House Joint Resolution 412 were considered, and in the latter extension to include an editorial from the Camden Courier.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee (at the request of Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks at the point in the RECORD where the bill H. R. 6448 was passed.

EXEMPTING HOSPITALIZED SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS FROM ADMISSIONS TAX

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5065) to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, strike out all after "follows:" down to and including "furlough.' " in line 10 and insert: " 'Subject to such regulations as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Sec-

retary, shall prescribe, no tax shall be imposed in the case of admission free of charge of a hospitalized member of the military, naval, or air forces of the United States or of a person hospitalized as a veteran by the Federal Government in a Federal, State, municipal, private, or other hospital or institution, except when such member or veteran is on leave or furlough.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

METHOD OF ISSUING PATENTS FOR PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3628) to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert: "That all patents for public lands shall be issued and signed by the Secretary of the Interior in the name of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary may delegate his authority under this act to officers or employees of the Department of the Interior, but notice of any such delegation shall be given by publication in the Federal Register."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2245), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HENDRICKS reserved all points of order on the bill.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

BUNGE NORTH-AMERICAN GRAIN CORP. AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of the Bunge North-American Grain Corp., the Corporation Argentina de Productores de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal & Ore Corp.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JAMES B. WALSH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1281) for the relief of James B. Walsh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $21,899.67, to James B. Walsh, an individual doing business as M. J. Walsh & Sons, of Holyoke, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for work performed in connection with the construction of defense housing project Mass-19023, at Springfield, Mass., in January and February 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$21,899.67" and insert "$7,500"

Line 5, strike out "B." and insert "R."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of James R. Walsh."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARCELLA KOSTERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1573) for the relief of Marcella Kosterman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marcella Kosterman, the sum of $3,422, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, William P. Kosterman, on February 25, 1924, as a result of illness contracted by the said William P. Kosterman in the Philippine Islands while a member of Company F, Signal Corps, United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. L. McCANDLESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 915) for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $113,655 to the executors of the will of L. L. McCandless, late of Honolulu, T. H., deceased, in full settlement of all claims against the United States sustained as a result of activities of the armed forces of the United States on and following the 7th day of December 1941, upon lands owned in fee simple or held under lease by the trustees under said will, and for the use and occupation of said lands from December 7, 1941, to December 29, 1946, in the districts of Waianae and Waialua, Island of Oahu, T. H.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection therewith, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the enacting clause, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interest may appear, against the United States of America for damages, if any, but not exceeding the sum of $46,155, for the loss of personal property, including the loss of livestock, alleged to have been caused by military personnel of the United States, and for damages, if any, but not exceeding the sum of $67,500, for the alleged withdrawal of the Government lands covered by general leases Nos. 1740 and 1741 of the Territory of Hawaii, each dated December 25, 1925, from the operation of those leases for use by the United States Army for war purposes: *Provided*, That judgment shall not be rendered against the United States with respect to any part of the alleged damages for the loss of personal property, including livestock, which arose out of the combat activities of military personnel of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Proceedings for the determination of these claims shall be had in the same manner as in cases against the United States of which the district courts of the United States have jurisdiction under the provisions of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 1 year after the enactment of this act; *And provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States and to confer jurisdiction upon said court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, described in section 1 hereof, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims

of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interest may appear, against the United States of America."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE H. WHIKE CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1902) for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $14,483.45, to George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained on Jackson Park homes project contract No. OH 33037, Canton, Ohio, as the result of Executive Order 9301 changing the workweek from 40 hours to 48 hours on same date (February 11, 1943) that contract was signed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GLADYS JANOW ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2431) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Gladys Janow, the widow of David Jefferson Janow, for herself and seven minor children, namely, Vernon Janow, James Jefferson Janow, Virginia Janow, Hazel Janow, William Janow, Patsy Janow, and Jefferson Janow, said claim growing out of the death of said David Jefferson Janow, who was killed on or about the 25th day of January 1944 while working at the Enid Army Air field at Enid, Okla., when he was struck by a United States Army airplane being driven by Army student pilots at said Army airfield base.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court of the Western District of the State of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Gladys Janow, the widow of David Jefferson Janow, for herself and seven minor children, namely, Vernon Janow, James Jefferson Janow, Virginia Janow, Hazel Janow, William Janow, Patsy Janow, and Jefferson Janow, said claim growing out of the death of said David Jefferson Janow, who was killed on or about the 25th day of January 1944 while he was working at the Enid Army Air Field at Enid, Okla., when he was struck by a United States Army airplane being driven by Army student pilots at said Army airfield base.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the passage and approval of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased, late of Woodward, Okla., the sum of $7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said David Jefferson Janow as the result of being struck by a United States Army airplane on January 25, 1944, at the Enid Army Air Field, Enid, Okla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAWAIIAN DREDGING CO., LTD.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6186) for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, out of funds heretofore appropriated for Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, is hereby authorized to pay to the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd., as one of the contractors under contract NOy 3550, an amount not to exceed $25,120 as reimbursement for, and in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of, the loss of its dump scow No. 14, which scow, due to military exigencies arising out of the attack on Pearl Harbor, was abandoned and lost without negligence or fault on December 7, 1941, while in transit upon the open sea for the purposes of the contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount authorized in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$25,120" and insert "$14,610.21."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 329) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., a corporation, of Juneau, Alaska, the sum of $250,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for crushed rock, building materials, and services furnished the United States for use in urgently needed defense projects, including construction of the subport of embarkation, air landing fields, and so forth, at Juneau, Alaska, and in the vicinity during the period from June 1, 1942, to February 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$80,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. RUTH CAMERON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 1501) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cameron.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ruth Cameron, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $54,722.37, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for missing and damaged equipment which she had stored at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds at the time it was occupied by the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$54,722.37" and insert "$34,704.49."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: On page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "Mrs. Wesley Berk, formerly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

D. C. HALL MOTOR TRANSPORTATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1795) for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to D. C. Hall Motor Transportation, Fort Worth, Tex., the sum of $7,551.17. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said D. C. Hall Motor Transportation against the United States arising out of the collision near Leland, Miss., on December 11, 1945, of a United States Army truck (which was being operated in a negligent manner by an Army enlisted man who was using the vehicle without authority) with a truck and trailer belonging to the said D. C. Hall Motor Transportation and being operated with due care: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,551.17" and insert "$7,107.17."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LORAINE THOMSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4590) for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to extend to Mrs. Loraine Thomsen, Lincoln, Nebr., the benefits of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, ch. 15; Supp. III, title 5, ch. 15), as if such Commission had found that the death of her husband, Immanual H. Thomsen, on December 5, 1946, had been the result of a personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty as an employee of the Navy Department.

SEC. 2. Any amounts payable pursuant to this act with respect to any period prior to the date of enactment of this act (including funeral and burial expenses) shall be paid in a lump sum within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "United States Employees' Compensation Commission" and insert "Federal Security Administrator."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Commission" and insert "Administrator."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARY T. MALONEY PREECE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5943) for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time limitation for execution of applications for retirement under section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece, of Newport, R. I., formerly employed at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., and her application for retirement on account of disability under such section 6 shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such application with the Civil Service Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WARREN H. McKENNEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 873) for the relief of Warren H. McKenney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Warren H. McKenney, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $8,660, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States (1) for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred on November 22, 1945, near Antwerp, Belgium, when the automobile in which he was a passenger was struck by a United States Army vehicle, and (2) for compensation for the death of his wife, Anita R. McKenney, as a result of such accident, and (3) for reimbursement for medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE J. BEARMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 355) for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eugene J. Bearman, of Memphis, Tenn., the sum of $642.60. The payment of such sum constitutes a refund of payments heretofore made by the said Eugene J. Bearman to the United States on account of the loss by theft of a United States Army vehicle on August 10, 1944, in Rome, Italy, while said vehicle was in his custody and control as an officer in the United States Army, and the said Eugene J. Bearman is hereby relieved of all liability to the United States by reason of the loss of said vehicle by theft: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT (JACK) NORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1782) for the relief of Albert (Jack) Norman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert (Jack) Norman, of Culleoka, Tenn., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and injuries sustained by the said Albert (Jack) Norman when a motorcycle being driven by him was struck by a United States Army truck, on 70–N, just outside the city limits of Lebanon, Tenn., on August 28, 1943.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Page 2, line 1, after "1943", insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. J. HOUZE CONVEX GLASS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1783) for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co., of Point Marion, Fayette County, Pa., the sum of $7,868.38, for flood damages to their gas well field property located in Monongalia County, W. Va. Such damage caused to their property by the construction by the Government of lock and dam No. 8 on the Monongahela River. The construction of such new lock and dam No. 8 has caused the permanent overflow and submergence of the land adjacent to the gas well leased by the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co., thereby causing damage in the above-named sum to their company.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "company:", insert: *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ROBERT LEE THREATT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1910) for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor, of Danville, Ark., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of severe personal injuries sustained by the said Robert Lee Threatt on or about October 17, 1943, on the Camp Chaffee Military Reservation about 4 miles east of Greenwood, Ark., when an unexploded shell which he had picked up suddenly exploded, causing the loss of his right hand and severe injuries to his right leg: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GERTRUDE WOOTEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2349) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Wooten.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Gertrude Wooten, of Detroit, in Red River County, Tex., the sum of $267. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Gertrude Wooten against the United States on account of personal injuries, including hospital and medical expenses, and loss of earnings, sustained as a result of a collision between a passenger car of the Texas Electric Railway Co., of Dallas and Denison, Tex., on which claimant was a passenger, and an Army vehicle, near Denison, Tex., on August 19, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in this connection, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CYPRESS CREEK DRAINAGE DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2395) for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas, the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Cypress Creek Drainage District against the United States on account of damage to its drainage system as the result of the activities of the War Relocation Authority: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR G. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2435) for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Arthur G. Robinson, of Keansburg, N. J. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical services, loss of earnings, and future loss of earnings sustained when the bakery truck driven by Mr. Robinson was involved in a collision with an Army truck on Route 35, in Middletown Township, N. J., on August 18, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICHOLAS G. NIEDERMILLER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2531) for the relief of Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $79,199.54 to Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States on account of services rendered by the said Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev and all other officers and employees of the Russian Volunteer Fleet represented by them in connection with the preservation of the property of the said Russian Volunteer Fleet.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "Fleet", insert: *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARION T. SCHWARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3727) for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz, Oakland, Calif., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Leo Schwartz, as the result of injuries sustained by him on September 1, 1944, at Camp Knight, Calif., when he was struck and crushed against a building by a United States Army vehicle: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out "$5,000" and the balance of line 6, all of lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 down to and includ-

ing the word "vehicle", in line 1, on page 2 and insert: "$4,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages on account of the personal injuries sustained by her late husband, Leo Schwartz as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle at the Oakland Army Base, Oakland, Calif., on September 1, 1944.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL E. ROCKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4179) for the relief of Paul E. Rocke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul E. Rocke, Warren, Ohio, the sum of $373. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul E. Rocke against the United States for property damage sustained by him on May 3, 1946, when an Army reconnaissance car, driven by a soldier who was using such car without authority, ran into the automobile of the said Paul E. Rocke which was properly parked on Market Street, Warren, Ohio: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY W. SHARPLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4292) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Harry W. Sharpley, of Greenbackville, Va., his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States for alleged damages caused by the sewage emanating from the naval auxiliary air station, at Chincoteague, Va., and the flow of such sewage over and across certain oyster grounds located in Mosquito Creek, Va., which grounds had been leased by the said Harry W. Sharpley.

SEC. 2. Proceedings for the determination of said claim shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of said Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. RICHARD E. DEANE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4458) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane the aggregate sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injury, the medical expenses, pain and suffering, loss of earnings, and property damage incurred by reason of the injuries and the property damage sustained by them as a result of being struck by an Army vehicle operated by Army personnel on Route 25, near the intersection with Lawrence Street, near Rahway, N. J., August 15, 1944, and said injuries and damage having been caused by the negligent operation of said Army vehicle so as to cause it to turn into the vehicle in which said Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane were riding: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,341.85."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. BREVARD WALKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4644) for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. Brevard Walker, Mobile, Ala., trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co. (hereinafter referred to as the "shipper"), the sum of $674.70. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the shipper against the United States for the loss sustained by reason of nonpayment of the balance of the price of a shipment of southern yellow pine lumber sent by the shipper on August 3, 1944, upon the telephonic order of the Birmingham, Ala., office of the Central Procurement Agency, office of the Chief of Engineers, Army Service Forces, to the Campagna Construction Co., Easthampton, Mass., for use by such company in the execution of a contract with the United States Government. The Central Procurement Agency had stipulated that such shipment be made by sight draft with bill of lading attached because of the unsound financial condition of the Campagna Construction Co., but the telephonic order of the Birmingham office of such Agency indicated that such shipment be made an open account in accordance with wartime procurement practices, and the shipper received only a part of the price of the lumber as a result of the subsequent bankrupty of the Campagna Construction Co.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. REBECCA LEVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5484) for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Rebecca Levy, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $30,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Rebecca Levy against the United States arising out of the death of her husband, Isaac Levy, which resulted from his being struck by a United States Army vehicle in Seattle, Wash., on September 26, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SALE OF LAND ADJACENT TO ANCHORAGE HOUSING PROJECT, MIDDLETOWN, R. I., TO ANTHONY P. MILLER, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1551) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., for not less than its fair market value and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, an unimproved parcel of land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I., containing 20 acres more or less.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES D. SIGLER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1220) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of Maryland to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsang 3d.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court of Maryland to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsang 3d, both of Baltimore County, Md., for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by them as the result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and an Autocar tractor and trailer, U. S. N. 71430, U. S. N. 63839, owned by the United States of America and operated by its agent and servant, Herbert E. Anderson, in Baltimore County, Md., on the 4th day of March 1944 at about 12:20 p. m.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to James D. Sigler, and to pay the sum of $1,000 to Frederick P. Vogelsang 3d, both of Baltimore County, Md., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and property damage sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy vehicle in Baltimore County, Md., on March 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsang 3d."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN W. MITCHELL, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5113) for the relief of the estate of John W. Mitchell, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithsanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Administrator, War Assets Administration, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reconvey to the estate of John W. Mitchell, deceased, all of the real estate and improvements thereon situated in the county of Sonoma, State of California, and more particularly described as hereinafter stated, which was conveyed to the United States of America by John W. Mitchell and his wife, Anna A. Mitchell, by a certain deed under date of November 6, 1942, wherein the real estate is described as follows, to wit:

Parcel 1: Being the fractional part of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 30, township 8 north, range 8 west, Mount Diablo meridian, and commencing about the center of said section at a point in the center of the county road from Mark West Station to Redwood and about one-eighth mile west from the railroad at a point from which a white oak tree four feet in diameter is south sixty-eight degrees thirty-one minutes east, one hundred and thirty-seven links distant and the west chimney of Mrs. Kidds' house is north thirty-eight degrees west; thence west along the center of said road twenty rods; thence south sixteen rods; thence east twenty rods; thence north sixteen rods to place of beginning, containing two acres of land and being bounded on the east by the Lone Redwood District School property and lands of the Kruse estate.

Parcel 2: Being the fractional part of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 30, township 8 north, range 8 west, Mount Diablo meridian, and commencing at the southwest corner of land of John W. Mitchell; thence south to land of Charles Reverman; thence west twenty rods; thence north to southwest corner of land of John W. Mitchell; thence east twenty rods to point of beginning, containing about two acres of land.

SEC. 2. Said reconveyance of said real estate and improvements thereon shall be in consideration of the payment to the United States from the estate of John W. Mitchell, deceased, or any one of the legal heirs of said John W. Mitchell, deceased, of a sum not more than the sum paid for said land to John W. Mitchell, deceased, by the United States on November 6, 1942; less such sum as may be determined by the Administrator and the Secretary of the Army, jointly, as the benefit which has accrued to the United States for the use of such real estate and improvements thereon by the agencies of the United States from November 6, 1942, to current date. The net amount to be paid upon said reconveyance shall be adjusted by the Administrator to reflect any increase or decrease in value of said property resulting from action by the United States since November 6, 1942, or a price equal to market value at time of said reconveyance of said property, whichever is the lower. The decision by the Administrator as to net amount to be paid the United States under the provisions of this act shall be final.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "estate" and insert in lieu thereof the word "heirs."

Page 3, line 5, strike out the word "estate" and insert in lieu thereof the word "heirs."

Page 3, line 6, after the word "deceased", strike out all down to and including the word "deceased" on line 7 thereof.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of the heirs of John W. Mitchell."

LOUISE PETERS LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 403) for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the German special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, created by section 4 (a) of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, as amended, to Louise Peters Lewis, of East Lynn, Mass., a native-born citizen of the United States, the sum of $10,000. Such sum represents the actual amount of the loss (without interest thereon) sustained by the said Louise Peters Lewis on account of the depreciation in value of certain pre-World War German securities owned by her and described in her claim (list No. 5242, docket No. 7172) heretofore filed with, and dismissed by, the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "pay", strike out "out of the German special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, created by section 4 (a) of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, as amended", and insert in lieu thereof: "out of any funds or property of the Government of Germany or of nationals of Germany in the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States or which may hereafter come into the possession or under the control of the United States."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "pre", insert "First."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM R. BLAIR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6216) to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of existing law, the application for United States Letters Patent of William R. Blair, serial number 598,167, filed June 7, 1945, for Object Locating System, shall not be rejected nor shall any patent granted on said application be held invalid by reason of the fact that the invention disclosed in said application was patented or described in a printed publication in this or any foreign country, or was in public use or on sale in this country, unless the effective date of such patent, publication, public use, or sale, is prior to the date of said invention by the said William R. Blair.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. HIGGINS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 424) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States

District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the following-named persons, all of Saunders County, Nebr., against the United States for loss of or damage to their corn crops as a result of the flooding in April, May, and June, 1944, of the properties owned or rented by such persons as a result of an excessive flow of water in Silver Creek which followed the construction by the War Department of a drainage ditch from the Nebraska Ordinance Plant to such creek: John J. Higgins, Frank Higgins, Mrs. Agnes Kelly, Leonard G. Cameron, Dr. Daniel Dieter, Frank J. Dieter, Kenneth Rogers, Amanda Scheuneman Coderre, and Joseph Trpisovsky.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person in accordance with the law of the place where the acts or omissions occurred.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any statute of limitation or lapse of time, suit upon such claims may be instituted by the claimants within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHRISTINE AND MRS JESSE WEST

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1062) for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Mrs. Christine West, of Poplar, Mont., the sum of $1,000 representing compensation for her outstanding right, title, and interest in 340 acres of land and all improvements thereon, tract 215B, Roosevelt County, State of Montana, adverse to the title of the United States under deed from Christ Christofferson dated on December 2, 1936, recorded in the land records of the said county on December 12, 1936, in volume 62 on page 190, and for any and all damages to a dwelling formerly located thereon, which was destroyed by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1939, upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the Attorney General of a right, title, or interest adverse to the record title of the United States, and, upon delivery of a quitclaim deed conveying such right, title, or interest to the United States, together with a release to the United States of any and all claims for damages resulting from the possession or use of the land by the United States prior to the transfer of title; and

(2) to Mrs. Jesse West, of Wolf Point, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $250, representing the fair value of certain buildings owned by her late deceased husband, upon proof of title, right, or interest by Christine West to the lands on which they were situated when seized and destroyed in 1939 by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LORRAINE BURNS MULLEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1703) for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lorraine Burns Mullen, of West Haven, Conn., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for (1) compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by her and reimbursement for medical expenses incurred by her as the result of an accident which occurred on October 20, 1944, when a United States Coast Guard vehicle in which she was riding and which was operated by Edward Kiselewski, then a member of the United States Coast Guard, collided with a trolley car in West Haven, Conn.; the said Lorraine Burns Mullen having obtained a judgment for $7,000 against the said Edward Kiselewski in the Superior Court at New Haven, Conn., on account of such injuries; and (2) the costs and expenses incidental to the obtaining of such judgment: *Provided*, That the said Lorraine Burns Mullen furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury satisfactory evidence of the relief of the said Edward Kiselewski from liability for the payment of such judgment: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY DANIELS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1835) for the relief of Harry Daniels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry Daniels, of 1426 Twenty-first Street NW., Washington, D. C., the sum of $894.25, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for salary not paid while under suspension and separation from service in the National War Labor Board, from November 9, 1944, to August 6, 1945, inclusive, while serving in the position of mail clerk of the communications unit of the National War Labor Board, Washington, D. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNICE GREEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1170) for the relief of Bernice Green.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bernice Green, the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses, and losses sustained by her as a result of an Army truck striking the automobile in which she was riding at the intersection of Pico and Sepulveda Boulevard in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., on January 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not to exceed $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATES OF ARTHUR F. SALADINO, JOSEPH SPIVAK, AND IRVING WEINBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3848) for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivak, and Irving Weinberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Arthur F. Saladino, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $10,000; to the estate of Joseph Spivak, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $10,000; and to the estate of Irving Weinberg, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $10,000; in full satisfaction of the claims of each estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg as a result of personal injuries sustained by them when the taxicab in which they were passengers was struck by a United States Army vehicle on route 5, near Clinton, St. Georges County, Md., on February 21, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,700."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,700."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,790."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: Page 1, line 9, strike out "$4,790" and insert "$4,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESLIE A. HARBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4133) for the relief of Leslie A. Harber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Leslie A. Harber, of 4303 Thirteenth Place NE., Washington, D. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident in the city of Port of Spain, Trinidad, British West Indies, on March 12, 1942. Said accident occurred while on official duty with the War Department as a civilian employee: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,800."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES I. MATHEWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2508) for the relief of James I. Mathews.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James I. Mathews, New York, N. Y., the sum of $2,812.65. Such sum represents the amount (exclusive of the amount which would have been deducted for subsistence) which the said James I. Mathews would have received for the period February 6, 1946, to October 19, 1946, both dates inclusive, if he had been continued during such period in an active-duty status as a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve. The said James I. Mathews was admitted to the United States Naval Hospital, St. Albans, N. Y., on January 29, 1946, while on terminal leave which expired on February 5, 1946, and was discharged from such hospital on October 20, 1946. A dispatch of the Secretary of the Navy known as Alstacon 222258, dated March 18, 1946, provided for the continuance on active duty of naval officers hospitalized while on terminal leave, but such dispatch was not made retroactive and, therefore, did not include the said James I. Mathews.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 13, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: Wherever the surname "Mathews" appears the same is hereby amended so that it is spelled "Matthews."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUAN BERRAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5655) confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of Saint Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing 139.62 acres.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of Juan Berrar, listed as claim No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners for the western land district of the State of Louisiana, dated June 1811, reported in volume II, page 686, American State Papers, Public Lands, Duff Green Edition, 1934, be, and it is hereby, confirmed in favor of said claimant and his heirs, assigns, and legal representatives, as including among other lands, all of section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing one hundred and thirty-nine and sixty-two one-hundredths acres: *Provided*, That this act shall be construed to operate merely as a confirmation of said claim so as to include the above-mentioned section, and as a relinquishment of title on the part of the United States, and shall not prejudice any right, title, or interest of any person or body corporate, who, except for lack of confirmation of the claim, as to said section, would be the true and lawful owners of said lands or any portion thereof under the laws of the State of Louisiana, by virtue of either legal title or possession.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TITLE TO THE SALINE LANDS IN JACKSON COUNTY (ILL.)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1504) to amend the act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others, approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others", approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036), is further amended by striking out so much thereof as reads as follows: "To Stephen Holliday, southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section thirty-one, township eight, of range two;", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "To Stephen Holliday, the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section thirty-one, township eight, of range two;".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall be effective as of March 2, 1861.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF EASTERN AVENUE (DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2040) to permit certain property owners to file objections and exceptions to awards of damages and assessments of benefits growing out of condemnation proceedings for the extension of Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to provide relief for the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia, which properties were involved in condemnation case No. 2611 in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, wherein the owners of such properties were awarded damages as a result of the bringing to grade of the proposed Eastern Avenue, which damages have become inadequate because of increased construction costs during the war period, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia, upon certification by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of the amounts payable, to the owner of each parcel of real property enumerated in section 2 of this act, an amount equal to the actual cost of constructing a retaining wall and steps in front of such parcel, not exceeding, however, the amount set forth in section 2 after the number of such parcel. Upon completion of the construction, by private contractors, of the retaining wall and steps for each parcel, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall certify to the Secretary the amount payable to the owner of such parcel under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The parcels of real property referred to in the first section and the maximum amount payable to the owner of each parcel are as follows:

Parcel number at condemnation	*Parcel number at present time*	*Maximum amount to be paid to property owner*
127/25	127/42	$3,961.00
127/27	127/40	3,600.00
127/23	127/38	3,020.00
127/7	127/60	2,620.00
116/21	116/46	4,083.60
116/28	116/42	2,103.86
116/27	116/40	2,067.86
116/22	116/38	2,741.01
116/23	116/47	2,443.00
116/25	116/34	2,487.00
116/26	116/32	400.00
Total		29,527.33

SEC. 3. All walls and steps, payment for which is authorized by this act, shall be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable regulations in force in the District of Columbia, and all construction shall be performed under permit or permits issued by the appropriate officials of the government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. The authority to pay the sums authorized by this act shall expire 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 17, strike out "$3,961" and insert "$5,105"; strike out "$3,600" and insert "$5,064"; strike out "$3,020" and insert "$4,932"; strike out "$2,620" and insert "$3,120."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL O. BURDETTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6327) for the relief of Samuel O. Burdette.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, that bill is not on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further call of bills on the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a Senate hearing.

OMNIBUS PRIVATE CLAIMS BILLS

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first omnibus bill on the Private Calendar.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6482) for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes.

NORTHWEST MISSOURI FAIR ASSOCIATION, OF BETHANY, HARRISON, COUNTY, MO.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

Title I—(H. R. 3983. For the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.) By Mr. COLE of Missouri

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage and destruction by fire of certain buildings, while occupied by and under the exclusive control of the Seventeenth Field Artillery, Third Battalion, of the United States Army, on September 13, 1931: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: Beginning on page 1, strike out all of title I.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I reiterate what I said here a few weeks ago on the occasion of the consideration of first omnibus bill of this session. Being an objector is not the way to make friends or influence people.

However, I feel it incumbent, as do my colleagues the objectors, to bring to the attention of the House certain bills which appeal to them as having some doubt which the House should consider and pass upon.

This bill makes payment of $25,000 to the Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Mo., in full settlement of all claims gainst the United States for damages and destruction by fire of certain buildings on the fairgrounds while said fairgrounds was occupied by a United States Army battalion on September 14, 1931.

While en route from Fort Leavenworth to Des Moines, the Army obtained oral permission for the battalion to encamp at the fairgrounds from September 12 to September 14, 1931. A nominal rental of $10, plus $2.50 for water, was paid. The Army did not occupy any of the buildings. A State fair held on September 11, 1931, ended that day.

On Sunday, September 13, the Army held a baseball game, for which it obtained permission. The grandstand was used by spectators, both military and civlian. At about 4 p. m. a fire started. It spread and the Liberal Arts Building was destroyed.

The War Department opposes the bill. Its Board of Investigation found that the Army had assumed no responsibility for the buildings, that no one claims that any member of the military force caused the fire, and that the only basis for the claim is that if the troops had not been there, there would not have been a ball game, and if there had not been a ball game, there would not have been a fire.

The association claims that the building would not have been destroyed if the Army vehicles had not driven over the hose that had been put down by the fire department to combat the fire, thereby damaging it so that it would not withstand sufficient pressure. The Army board claims that this claim is not based on fact, but rather there was not sufcient pressure in the first instance.

Now, there are two questions I raise to this bill for the consideration of the House. The first one is the remoteness of the claim. This loss occurred nearly 17 years ago, in 1931.

The second part to which I call the attention of the House as a valid reason for your consideration is the liability of the Army or the United States Government in any respect for this fire. It is true that a fire did occur, but actually the armed forces of the United States were not in occupation of any of the buildings. There is no showing by any of the witnesses that the Army was in any way responsible for the unfortunate fire which occurred. Of course, this House may vote this $25,000 to an undoubtedly very deserving County Fair Association in Missouri. You have the right to do that, and perhaps you will do that, but it occurs to me that there is no liability here which would attach to the Government of the United States for this unfortunate loss which occurred, as I say, nearly 17 years ago, and which now at long last has come to the attention of this House.

I think it might be well to call your attention to the fact that this bill was introduced in the Seventy-second and Seventy-third Congresses, but no action was taken by the House in either of those instances. It was reported out by the Committee on Claims at that time. I understand that the reason why no action was taken, perhaps, was because no private bills were considered during those two Congresses. I was not here then and I do not know what the answer to that question is.

But, bear in mind as you cast your vote that this is $25,000 for a claim which occurred in 1931, nearly 17 years ago. It is on a proposition where, as far as I can discover from anything in the record, there is no showing that the United States Government caused this fire or that there was anything which would attach liability to the Government.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who is my good friend, no doubt thinks that he is doing his duty in moving to strike this title from the omnibus bill. Evidently he has overlooked the fact that he is pitting his judgment against two former Members of this House, one of whom is now a Federal judge. He is pitting his judgment against the entire membership of the Claims Committee in the Seventy-second Congress. He is pitting his judgment against the entire membership of the Claims Committee in the Seventy-third Congress. He is pitting his judgment against the entire membership of the House Committee on the Judiciary, which is composed of some of the best lawyers in the House.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not an undisputed fact that this property was owned by this county, and that at the time it was destroyed it was under the control and under the auspices of the Army, and that in addition, after the fire was started, the Army trucks came along and cut the hose and cut the water off so that these buildings were all destroyed?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

May I point out that this bill has been twice considered by the present House Committee on the Judiciary, because when it was first objected to, when first called on the Private Calendar, it was sent back to the Committee on the Judiciary and was reconsidered by that committee.

Now let me read from the original report on this claim by the Claims Committee of the Seventy-third Congress to prove the Army was exercising complete jurisdiction and control over this fairgrounds and over the buildings thereof

at the time this loss occurred. This is what the report says:

During the 2 days the grounds were entirely in charge of the battalion, not even the caretaker of the fair association having any control over the grounds during the period. When the people were gathering for the ball game the Army patrol directed traffic to and from the grandstand, policing the grounds and at points turning back the people and requiring them to move along certain lines. Even the officers of the fair association were ordered and directed by the Army patrol where they could and could not go.

The grounds were policed and patrolled by members of this Army battalion. The ball game was arranged by the Army officers in charge for the amusement and entertainment of the soldiers and visiting citizens. When the fire started it first caught in the grandstand. The Bethany Fire Department was called and soon had their fire hose out in an effort to save the grandstand. A strong wind fanned the fire, and it was soon realized that this building could not be saved. In the meantime, the wind was blowing sparks over to the roof of the Liberal Arts Building. Some of the soldiers had climbed to the roof of that building and were tearing off the shingles that had caught fire, trying to check the spread of the fire, but the Army officers ordered them down. While the fire department was attempting to change their hose so that they could play the stream on the Liberal Arts Building, the Army officers ordered the soldiers and their equipment out of the fairgrounds.

Tractors, trucks, and other equipment were recklessly driven over the fire hose which had been attached to a hydrant near the Liberal Arts Building, cutting it to pieces. As a result, no water could be thrown on the roof of this building, so it was completely destroyed.

I will now read from the conclusions of the Committee on the Judiciary, beginning on page 3 of the report on this bill:

CONCLUSIONS

(a) The evidence justifies the conclusion that the Liberal Arts Building could have been saved had it not been for the action of the troops in recklessly driving their tractors, trucks, and other equipment over the fire hose which the Bethany Fire Department had attached to a nearly hydrant to throw water on the roof of the Liberal Arts Building. These trucks, tractors, and other equipment driven over the fire hose injured it to such an extent that it would not stand the pressure and water could not be carried to the roof of the Liberal Arts Building. The loss of this building is directly attributable to the action of the troops in injuring the fire hose.

(b) The origin of the fire will probably never be known; however, the United States troops were in complete possession and control of the grounds and buildings. If the fire was the result of the negligent act of one of the soldiers the Government should respond in damages. If, on the other hand, the fire originated from some wrongful act of a civilian invited or permitted to be on the grounds, this would not purge the Government of liability. It was the duty of the officers of this battalion to police these grounds and buildings during the presence of their invited guests and to exercise reasonable care and caution to avoid damage and injury. The officers must have known that underneath the grandstand was a quantity of rubbish which could be easily ignited by the dropping of a burning match or a lighted cigar or cigarette. Under these circumstances, it was the duty of the officers of the battalion to police the grandstand and prevent the visitors from going or loafing thereunder and committing any careless act that might result in a fire and destruction of the building. The injury was suffered and the loss sustained while the Government troops and their invited visitors were in possession of the fairgrounds, and in my opinion the Government should reimburse the fair association in an amount representing the fair and reasonable value of the buildings destroyed on September 13, 1931, and that the buildings on that date were to the reasonable value of $25,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this amendment be voted down, and H. R. 3983 passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOLLIVER) there were—ayes 6, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title II—(H. R. 5546. For the relief of Harry Tansey.) By Mr. GORSKI

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $39,105 to Harry Tansey, of Chicago, Ill., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for personal property, which was illegally seized and disposed of by the United States marshal, on October 18, 1926, in Chicago, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POTTS moves to strike out all of title II.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, this bill in the same form except for amount was before the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and on a roll call vote, the House rejected the bill. We are doing the same thing over again in the Eightieth Congress. In view of the fact that action has been taken in the previous Congress, I think that what was said in the Seventy-ninth Congress merits attention. Mr. MCGREGOR had the bill at that time and he pointed out that the bill was for the relief of Mr. Harry Tansey, and at that time it repreesnted the third bill which had been before the House. This is now the fourth bill. It originally was introduced as a claim for payment of $81,000 to Harry Tansey for alleged payment of taxes and interest, taxes paid on liquor stored in Chicago, Ill. during the bootleg era of 1923. Then a new bill was introduced and presented for $49,500. Mr. MCGREGOR said in the Seventy-ninth Congress:

Now we have another for $39,500, all relative to the same case.

Gentlemen, I say that now we have a fourth bill, this time reduced to $34,272. So if this bill comes in many more times, it will gradually peter out. I cannot go into the details in so short a time, but I briefly say that originally it involved a corporate set-up. The firm of Grommes & Ulirich, Inc., at a meeting of the board of directors back in 1923, elected Mr. Harry Tansey president and director and by special resolution authorized a distribution of the liquor to certain stockholders. On or about April 23, 1923, Roscoe Andrews, prohibition director for the State of Illinois, was suspended for the reason of having issued a permit for the distribution of the assets of this corporation. In November 1923 the Government seized certain liquor in a barn located on West Monroe Street in Chicago. On January 5, 1925, in the case of the United States of America against Albert Mulcahy and Romain Blakesly, Harry Tansey intervened with the claim that the liquor seized from Mulcahy belonged to him and asked that the same be returned to him. His appeal was denied, and on October 18, 1926, the liquor was destroyed. There was involved about 17,000 cases of liquor. The Government filed in the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois Equity No. 3798, seeking to have the premises where the liquor was stored declared a nuisance under the National Prohibition Act. Harry S. Tansey filed an intervening petition, and after numerous hearings United States District Judge, James H. Wilkerson, issued a final decree on January 6, 1926.

On October 2, 1928, the United States circuit court of appeals, upon motion of counsel for appellant, that is, Tansey, dismissed the appeal.

I said Mr. Tansey wants some $34,000. Last year it was $39,500. A couple of years before it was $49,500, and before that it was $81,000.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTS. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is there any showing in the record that Mr. Tansey paid this amount, or any amount, to the Federal Government for taxes?

Mr. POTTS. There is no testimony whatsoever. Acting Secretary of the Treasury John T. Sullivan said:

Available reports and files do not show when or from whom the liquor was purchased by Grommes & Ulirich, or what, if any, commodity tax thereon was paid by the company or by Mr. Tansey.

Mr. DOLLIVER. So actually there is no showing in this record that Tansey or anybody else ever paid any amount of taxes, and by paying this money to him it would be just a windfall or a gracious gift to him from this Congress.

Mr. POTTS. That is my opinion. Mr. Tansey had his day in court in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS] has expired.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS], said that the Seventy-ninth Congress voted down this bill, but he failed to tell you that the Seventy-eighth Congress passed the bill and it reached the Senate, but because it did not reach it before adjournment, no action was taken.

This bill has been considered by three different committees on claims. Each committee allowed the bill. Mr. Tansey obtained this liquor legitimately. The report says he was the only one singled out. Everybody else got their assets out of this corporation except Mr. Tansey. True, while he took an appeal from the district court judge in Chicago, and while that appeal was pending in the appellate court, the liquor was destroyed. All that Mr. Tansey gets out of this claim is the amount of money that was paid in taxes on the liquor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORSKI. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. To identify this claim, is not Mr. Tansey the man who at one time was Doorkeeper out here?

Mr. GORSKI. Yes; I think he was.

Now, the Claims Committee went into this very, very carefully, and they allowed this claim. Let me read to you from page 2 of the report:

> A great many bills are automatically rejected under the committee rules, and a great many rejected after exhaustive consideration by the whole committee. It is therefore felt that those bills which do reach the floor of the House, especially in an omnibus bill, should be met with the realization that they have already been given consideration similar to that given by a jury in a court of law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not attend the hearings, but I presume that those three different committees which have considered this claim have gone into every phase of it. While the gentleman from New York said there is no evidence that Tansey paid the money for these taxes, I believe there is evidence, and I have been so informed, that there was $175,000 paid by the people who took over the assets of this corporation. I believe those statements to be true. All that Tansey gets is the amount that was paid in taxes on this liquor.

Mr. POTTS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GORSKI. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. Is it not a fact that Mr. Tansey had sold his interest in the corporation and taken back a promissory note?

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Tansey took back a promissory note from Mr. Mulcahy.

Mr. POTTS. Was not this liquor put up as collateral to that note?

Mr. GORSKI. Yes; I believe it was, I may say to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POTTS. Then, does not this liquor belong to the one who made the note and not to Mr. Tansey?

Mr. GORSKI. Let me answer in this way, that the committee said after exhaustive hearings and going into the matter very fully, as I said—I have not attended the hearings, but they have considered it very fully and they found that Tansey is the owner, that he did pay some money in here and I believe that as a legitimate transaction he is entitled to this money.

The report also says, Mr. Speaker, that Andrew Mellon came into possession of some distilleries. Now, no one would accuse him of doing anything illegal and unlawful, yet he disposed of his assets legitimately. I believe that Mr. Tansey could have done the very same thing if he had been given an opportunity.

The money he is seeking is only money that was paid as taxes on this liquor.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORSKI. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is what I wanted to bring out. I was going to ask the gentleman to yield to bring out that point. They are just returning to him his own money that they collected illegally.

Mr. GORSKI. That is the point. This is money that was paid for taxes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORSKI. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. There is no evidence here at all to show that Mr. Tansey ever paid a nickel in here. Will the gentleman point out what evidence there is to show that in the hearings?

Mr. GORSKI. Yes. There is evidence that Tansey paid money. I was told there was $175,000 paid for the assets of this corporation.

Mr. McGREGOR. If that be so, why does Tansey ask for only $39,000?

Mr. GORSKI. That is what the committee decided to give him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to strike out title II.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORSKI) there were—ayes 37, noes 39.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 173, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—192

Abernethy	Carson	Gavin
Allen, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Gearhart
Allen, Ill.	Chadwick	Gillette
Allen, La.	Chenoweth	Gillie
Andersen, H. Carl	Chiperfield	Goff
Andrews, N. Y.	Church	Goodwin
Angell	Clason	Graham
Arends	Clevenger	Grant, Ind.
Arnold	Coffin	Gross
Auchincloss	Cole, Kans.	Gwinn, N. Y.
Banta	Cole, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa
Barrett	Colmer	Hale
Beall	Cooley	Halleck
Beckworth	Corbett	Hand
Bennett, Mich.	Cotton	Harness, Ind.
Bennett, Mo.	Crawford	Harris
Bishop	Crow	Harvey
Blackney	Dague	Herter
Bolton	Davis, Wis.	Heselton
Bramblett	Dawson, Utah	Hess
Brehm	D'Ewart	Hill
Brooks	Dolliver	Hinshaw
Brophy	Dondero	Hoeven
Brown, Ohio	Ellis	Hoffman
Bryson	Ellsworth	Holmes
Buck	Engel, Mich.	Hope
Buffett	Fenton	Horan
Burke	Fletcher	Hull
Busbey	Foote	Jenison
Byrnes, Wis.	Fuller	Jenkins, Ohio
	Gamble	Jenkins, Pa.
Jensen	Merrow	Scoblick
Johnson, Ill.	Meyer	Scott, Hardie
Jones, Wash.	Michener	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Jonkman	Miller, Conn.	Scrivner
Judd	Miller, Md.	Seely-Brown
Kean	Miller, Nebr.	Shafer
Kearney	Mitchell	Simpson, Pa.
Kearns	Muhlenberg	Smith, Kans.
Keating	Nixon	Smith, Ohio
Keefe	Nodar	Smith, Wis.
Kersten, Wis.	Norblad	Snyder
Kilburn	Norrell	Stefan
Kunkel	Patterson	Stevenson
Latham	Phillips, Calif.	Sundstrom
LeCompte	Potter	Taber
LeFevre	Potts	Talle
Lemke	Poulson	Taylor
Lichtenwalter	Ramey	Tibbott
Love	Rankin	Tollefson
McConnell	Redden	Van Zandt
McCowen	Reed, N. Y.	Vorys
McCulloch	Rees	Vursell
McDonough	Riehlman	Wadsworth
McDowell	Rizley	Welch
McGarvey	Rockwell	Whitten
McGregor	Rogers, Fla.	Wigglesworth
McMahon	Rogers, Mass.	Williams
McMillen, Ill.	Rohrbough	Wilson, Ind.
Mack	Ross	Winstead
Macy	Russell	Wolverton
Mahon	Sadlack	Woodruff
Maloney	Sanborn	Worley
Mason	Schwabe, Mo.	
Mathews	Schwabe, Okla.	

NAYS—173

Abbitt	Garmatz	Morris
Albert	Gary	Morrison
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Multer
Andresen, August H.	Gore	Mundt
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	Murdock
Bakewell	Gossett	Murray, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	Norton
Battle	Griffiths	O'Brien
Bland	Hagen	O'Hara
Blatnik	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Boggs, Del.	Hardy	O'Toole
Boggs, La.	Harrison	Pace
Bonner	Hart	Passman
Boykin	Havenner	Peterson
Bradley	Hays	Pfeifer
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Philbin
Buchanan	Hedrick	Pickett
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Poage
Burleson	Hendricks	Powell
Butler	Hobbs	Preston
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Price, Fla.
Camp	Huber	Price, Ill.
Canfield	Isacson	Priest
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Rains
Carroll	Jarman	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Javits	Reeves
Chelf	Jennings	Regan
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Combs	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Cooper	Jones, N. C.	Rivers
Cravens	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Crosser	Kelley	Sabath
Cunningham	Kennedy	Sadowski
Curtis	Kilday	Sarbacher
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Sasscer
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Sikes
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Smathers
Deane	Landis	Smith, Va.
Delaney	Lanham	Somers
Devitt	Lea	Spence
Dingell	Lesinski	Stanley
Dirksen	Lewis, Ohio	Stratton
Domengeaux	Lucas	Teague
Donohue	Lyle	Thomas, Tex.
Durham	Lynch	Thompson
Eaton	McCormack	Towe
Elsaesser	McMillan, S. C.	Trimble
Elston	MacKinnon	Twyman
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Vail
Evins	Manasco	Vinson
Feighan	Mansfield	Walter
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Weichel
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Wheeler
Flannagan	Meade, Md.	Whitaker
Forand	Mills	Wolcott
Fulton	Monroney	Wood
Gallagher	Morgan	

NOT VOTING—65

Barden	Coudert	Fellows
Bell	Courtney	Fogarty
Bender	Cox	Folger
Bloom	Dorn	Gathings
Buckley	Doughton	Granger
Case, N. J.	Douglas	Hall, Leonard W.
Chapman	Eberharter	Harless, Ariz.
Clark	Elliott	Hartley
Clippinger	Fallon	

Jackson, Calif.	Ludlow	Robertson
Johnson, Calif.	Lusk	St. George
Johnson, Okla.	Meade, Ky.	Sheppard
Johnson, Tex.	Miller, Calif.	Short
Kee	Morton	Simpson, Ill.
Kefauver	Nicholson	Smith, Maine
Keogh	Patman	Stigler
Kerr	Peden	Stockman
King	Phillips, Tenn.	Thomas, N. J.
Lane	Ploeser	West
Larcade	Plumley	Whittington
Lewis, Ky.	Rayburn	Wilson, Tex.
Lodge	Rich	Youngblood

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rayburn for, with Mr. Keogh against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Leonard W. Hall with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Peden.
Mrs. St. George with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Plumley with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Youngblood with Mr. King.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Gathings.
Mr. Short with Mr. Fogarty.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Folger.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Nicholson with Mr. Eberharter.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Simpson of Illinois with Mrs. Douglas.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. REDDEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GRIFFITHS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TIBBOTT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. KNUTSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STRATTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. Ross changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. POLK changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROLL OF THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. D'EWART submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein (Rept. No. 2248).

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, millions of our children will be unable to attend school this next year because no facilities will be available. Why? Because Congress has failed to pass the Federal aid to education bill.

I admit that this is not the way education should be financially assisted—by the Federal Government. But when the various States cannot, or will not provide the necessary facilities, then the Federal Government remains the sole benefactor for these children by offering grants to the several States on a matching basis.

Illiteracy is increasing at an alarming rate in the country. Obviously this cannot, or must not, be permitted to continue. Illiteracy is a national weakness, and if we are to continue to be a strong virile people, this trend must be reversed.

Congress must do something soon. It cannot escape its duty here. This problem of education has become a national issue. Congress should have taken some action before this. Another year will only intensify the problem, and every year of postponement will intensify it further. It would not take long until we would become the most illiterate nation among the so-called civilized nations of the earth. Do we wish to be labeled thus?

Many States and sections of States are far in arrears on proper school buildings, equipment, and teachers. All backward States should be brought up to the average of the best States. This will take time and the longer we defer aid the longer will be the road to a satisfactory status.

There is the great problem of national subsidy with the necessary taxes but there is no alternative if we are to avoid a high rate of illiteracy. Every child has a right to an education, and it has now, distasteful as it is, become the duty of our National Government to assist by grants to States.

The grave danger of the Federal Government assuming some control of education in the States must be avoided. This situation cannot be tolerated.

The question is: How long must we wait before Congress acts to correct a bad situation?

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon, notwithstanding that the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech and copy of a bill.

AMENDMENT TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6766) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing "2" to "2.40", "1½" to "1.80", and "1" to "1.20." Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing "$3" to "$3.60" and "$50" to "$60."

SEC. 2. Subsection (f) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting "(1)" before "Upon", by striking out "this subsection" wherever it occurrs and inserting in lieu thereof "this paragraph", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph.

"(2) Whenever it shall appear, with respect to the death of an employee on or after January 1, 1947, that no benefits, or no further benefits, other than benefits payable to a widow or parent upon attaining age 65 at a future date, will be payable under this section or, pursuant to subsection (k) of this section, under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended, there shall be paid to such persons or persons as the deceased employee may have designated by a writing filed with the Board prior to his death, or if there be no designation, to the person or persons in the order provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection or, in the absence of such person or persons, to his estate, a lump sum in an amount equal to the sum of 4 percent of his compensation paid after December 31, 1936, and prior to January 1, 1947, and 7 percent of his compensation after December 31, 1946 (exclusive in both cases of compensation in excess of $300 for any month), minus the sum of all benefits paid to him, or to others by reason of his death, under this act and, pursuant to subsection (k) of this section, under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended: *Provided, however*, That if the employee is survived by a widow or parent who may upon attaining age 65 be entitled to further benefits under this section, or pursuant to subsection (k) of this section, under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such lump sum shall not be paid unless such widow or parent makes and files with the Board an irrevocable election, in such form as the Board may prescribe, to have such lump sum paid in lieu of all benefits to which such widow or parent might otherwise become entitled under this section or, pursuant to subsection (k) of this section, under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended. Such election shall be legally effective according to its terms. Nothing in this section shall operate to deprive a widow or parent making such election of any insurance benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended, to which such widow or parent would have been entitled had this section not been enacted. The term 'benefits' as used in this paragraph includes all annuities payable under this act, lump sums payable under paragraph (1) of this subsection, and insurance benefits and lump-sum payments under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended, pursuant to subsection (k) of this section."

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 1 hereof shall apply to all annuities under section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, accruing during calendar months following the month of enactment hereof other than joint and survivor annuities heretofore awarded and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities heretofore awarded; and the provisions of section 2 hereof shall be effective as of January 1, 1947. All annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 and all joint and survivor annuities heretofore awarded and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities heretofore awarded, accruing during the calendar months following the month of enactment hereof, and all pensions due in months following the first calendar month after the enactment hereof,

shall be increased by 20 percent. All recertifications required by reason of the provisions of this act shall be made by the Railroad Retirement Board without application therefor.

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 8 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by substituting the following for so much of said subsection as precedes the proviso:

"(a) Every employer shall pay a contribution, with respect to having employees in his service, equal to the percentage determined as set forth below of so much of the compensation as is not in excess of $300 for any calendar month paid by him to any employee for services rendered to him after June 30, 1939:".

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 8 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is further amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following:

"1. With respect to compensation paid prior to January 1, 1948, the rate shall be 3 percent.

"2. With respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1947, the rate shall be as follows:

"If the balance to the credit of the railroad unemployment insurance account as of the close of business on September 30 of any year, as determined by the Board, is:	The rate with respect to compensation paid during the next succeeding calendar year shall be:
$450,000,000 or more	½ percent.
$400,000,000 or more but less than $450,000,000.	1 percent.
$350,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000.	1½ percent.
$300,000,000 or more but less than $350,000,000.	2 percent.
$250,000,000 or more but less than $300,000,000.	2½ percent.
Less than $250,000,000	3 percent.

"As soon as practicable following the enactment of this act, the Board shall determine and proclaim the balance to the credit of the account as of the close of business on September 30, 1947, and on or before December 31 of 1948 and of each succeeding year, the Board shall determine and proclaim the balance to the credit of the account as of the close of business on September 30 of such year."

(b) Contributions paid under subsection (a) of section 8 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, prior to the enactment of the foregoing amendment thereof which are in excess of those required by said subsection as so amended shall be subject to adjustment or refund in accordance with the provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of said section 8.

SEC. 6. Subsection (f) of section 8 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended, to read as follows:

"(f) The contributions required by this act shall be collected by the Board and shall be deposited by it with the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, such part thereof as equals 0.2 percent of the total compensation on which such contributions are based to be deposited to the credit of the fund and the balance to be deposited to the credit of the account."

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 10 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by substituting the following for subdivision (i) of the second sentence of said subsection: "(i) such part of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act as is in excess of 0.2 percent of the total compensation on which such contributions are based, together with all interest collected pursuant to section 8 (g) of this act;".

SEC. 8. Subsection (a) of section 11 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by substituting the following for subdivision (i) of the second sentence of said subsection: "(i) such part of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act as equals 0.2 percent of the total compensation on which such contributions are based;".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the limited time available for consideration of H. R. 6766, which amends the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, I shall make my remarks as brief as possible. However, I urge all of you, if you have not already done so, to read the committee report, which is not much more than a page in length but contains all of the essential details.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had jurisdiction over railroad retirement since its inception and it was a pleasure for me when our party was in the minority to support activities of the gentleman from California, Congressman LEA, then chairman, and my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman CROSSER, who has taken such an active part in this legislation. I am pleased now as a member of the majority to give assurance, by the action of the committee on H. R. 6766 and as its chairman, to the railroad workers that this committee hopes to establish a fine record similar to that already established.

As I stated when I introduced this bill, H. R. 6766, it is the product of an agreement between railroad labor and railroad management. Their action in this instance is indeed a continuation of the spirit of mutual agreement upon which the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 was based. It will be recalled that the basic railroad retirement system was the result of agreement between labor and railroad management. I compliment both the representatives of labor and the representatives of management for the manner in which they have cooperated to present to the Congress a bill which they both can wholeheartedly support.

I am giving my full-hearted support to H. R. 6766. I do this even though I had introduced a previous measure—H. R. 6704—which, in my opinion, was on the whole a good bill. I recognize, however, the value of the compromise arrangement worked out in H. R. 6766, which is before the House today. I, therefore, am giving my full support to this measure sponsored by the railroad workers and management. I am delighted that the same attitude is being taken by other Members of Congress who have introduced bills.

So far as the Railroad Retirement Act is concerned, the bill provides in sections 1 and 3 for a 20-percent increase in pensions and annuities. This 20-percent increase applies to those who are now retired and to those who will retire in the future. And the increase is effective in the month following enactment of the law without the necessity of any application therefor on the part of those affected. This 20-percent increase represents the best increase in pension benefits which can safely be made. In the words of counsel for the railway labor executives:

> We are very much concerned that what changes are made shall be made with due consideration for maintaining the soundness of the railroad retirement account * * * and we have gone as far in the direction of increasing benefits as we feel it is prudent to go.

In this connection it is important to note that the Railroad Retirement Board, which administers the act, wholeheartedly approves this bill, and stated in its report to the committee that it will not in any way destroy the soundness of the fund.

In section 2 the bill restores on an optional basis the provision for lump-sum death benefit payments that was in effect before the act was amended in 1946. In substance this provision guarantees that every employee who has contributed to the system will receive in benefits, either to himself or to survivors or a designated beneficiary, an amount equal to the amount he paid in pay-roll taxes, plus an allowance for interest.

With respect to the Unemployment Insurance Act, the bill substitutes for the present flat 3-percent tax, a sliding scale under which the tax is automatically adjusted in accordance with the amount of reserves in the railroad unemployment insurance account as of September 30 of each year. The rate of tax provided ranges from a minimum of one-half of 1 percent when the balance in the fund, as determined by the Board, is $450,000,000 or more, to a maximum tax of 3 percent when the balance is less than $250,000,000. So long as the reserve is $450,000,000 or more, the rate of tax would remain at one-half percent; and the rate then is increased by graduated steps of one-half percent for each $50,000,000 by which the reserve is less than that amount, again reaching the full 3-percent rate if the fund should fall below $250,000,000.

The present tax rate of 3 percent has been paid by the railroads since the Unemployment Insurance Act became effective in 1939, and has resulted in a huge and unnecessary surplus—at the present time over $900,000,000.

It should be borne in mind that this merit-rating or sliding scale of tax merely extends to the railroad industry substantially the same treatment accorded every other employer in the country with respect to unemployment under the various State and Federal social-security systems. Merit or experience rating is now in effect in all of the 48 States and in the three territorial funds with respect to unemployment insurance, the actual minimum tax rate applied varying from

complete forgiveness to 1½ percent. Where Congress itself has established an unemployment insurance system—in the District of Columbia—the minimum rate provided is one-tenth of 1 percent.

The graduated scale of tax provided in this bill is adequate to assure against depletion of the reserves, and at the same time, it will relieve the railroads of continued unnecessary payments of money which could be used in providing and improving service to the public.

The representatives of railway labor have always been on guard, and justifiably so, to see that nothing be done which would jeopardize their unemployment insurance system. The fact that they have agreed to this bill is an assurance that they are satisfied that the rates and balances required in the fund will be sufficient at all times to provide an ample margin of security.

In changing from a flat 3 percent tax to a sliding scale, it becomes necessary to change the formula by which the amount necessary for administration of the fund is fixed. Sections 6, 7, and 8 of the bill provide for the administrative expenses by allocating from the taxes collected an amount equal to two-tenths of 1 percent of the total compensation upon which collections are based. From past experience this will produce an adequate amount for administrative purposes.

And now a further word as to the underlying purpose for increasing by 20 percent the present and future retirement benefits. It is based upon the fact that there has been a considerable increase in the cost of living. This is so clear to all of us that it needs no proof.

The annuity formula in the Railroad Retirement Act was originally fixed in the early 1930's and was based on living costs and wages at that time. Amounts which were considered adequate in 1937 and the next few following years have not been increased (except for some increase in the minimum amount payable) since that time.

It is clear that the annuities which retired persons are now receiving are inadequate to cope with the higher living costs. The same situation, moreover, will exist as to those annuities of employees who will retire in the future. This fact comes about because under the present benefit formula annuities are based on the average wages for the entire period of railroad work up to 30 years. It would require many years of work at the current higher wage levels to raise these averages very much and in turn to show an appreciable effect on benefits.

Accordingly, even though railroad wages on the average in 1948 are up approximately 75 percent over those in 1937, these increases in wage rates, as the Railroad Retirement Board says, have had no effect on benefits awarded before the increases, very little effect on those awarded since, and will have an appreciable effect only on those which will be granted many years in the future.

I long have supported and followed closely the operation of the railroad retirement system. I have always been in full accord with its purposes. I am firmly convinced, however, that annuities and benefits, which the retirement system provides, must be adequate to permit the retired or disabled employee to maintain himself in reasonable comfort and decency.

At the same time I am firmly of the opinion, as I know all of us are, that the amount of benefits promised by the retirement system must in nowise jeopardize the soundness of the fund.

The Railroad Retirement Board has informed and assured the committee that increased benefits now might be paid without jeopardizing the fund and without necessitating any increase in tax rates. It states that this possibility arises from the fact that present rates of collection from the employees and the railroads were based on a lower total pay roll than that now being paid. With the current higher total pay roll, collections on the present tax schedule from employees and railroads could allow greater benefits without impairing the soundness of the fund.

While it may be true that this bill will not go all the way to meet today's higher cost of living, yet it will provide substantial relief consistent with maintaining the soundness of the retirement fund.

The bill also has merit in that it reestablishes what has been called lump-sum death-benefit payments. As previously stated, this was in the original act until abolished by the amendments of 1946. This should never have been done. The injustice of it has become more and more apparent. By the provisions of this bill this benefit payment is restored on any optional basis. It will guarantee to every employee who has contributed to the retirement fund, or to survivors or a designated beneficiary in the event of the existence of no survivors named under the act, an amount equal to the amount the employee has paid in payroll taxes, plus interest. Thus, every employee, his survivors or named beneficiary will receive the full amount he has paid into the fund, plus interest. This provision is fair and just and will eliminate one of the loudest complaints that has come since the amendments of 1946. From past experience this will produce an adequate amount for administrative purposes.

Summarizing, the bill gives to employees who are presently retired and to those who will retire in the future a 20-percent increase in their pensions, and restores to them the guarantee of a lump-sum death-benefit payment equal to the amount they have contributed plus an allowance for interest. To the railroads, who alone pay the tax for unemployment, it gives a reduction in the tax rate so long as an ample balance is maintained in the fund. These changes are urgently needed, and do not involve any other changes in the rights of employees, either with respect to retirement or unemployment rights which are now in effect. Neither do these changes involve any cost to the Federal Government.

In short, the bill represents a desirable improvement in the present acts, and since both management and employees, as well as the Railroad Retirement Board, are in agreement on its terms as a whole, it should receive the unanimous support of the House as a fair and sound solution to the problems with which it deals.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I congratulate the gentleman on handling very efficiently a very serious problem.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New York. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on both the majority and minority sides, have worked hard, intelligently, sincerely, and sympathetically in the preparation of this bill, and it is unanimously supported by the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman's statement that the committee has worked very hard on this bill, and that the bill comes from the committee with a unanimous report.

Mr. WOLVERTON. It was a unanimous report. I am happy to make that statement before this House because it assures the House that the members of the committee were actuated not by partisan motives but by a sincere desire to be helpful to the railroad employees of this Nation.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I congratulate the committee on the promptness with which they have handled this legislation and the fine benefits that will accrue to the workers of the railroads in the years to come.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think it is a fine piece of legislation. The committee is to be congratulated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I congratulate the committee and the chairman for bringing in this bill, as one who 2 years ago opposed the bill that was passed because I did not think it would do the thing that it was intended to do. I am glad to support this bill, which I believe will do it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLASON. I also wish to congratulate the chairman for the fine work that he and his committee have done in bringing in this bill. I believe at this time that all social-security benefits ought to be checked over on the basis of present high prices. I certainly think that your committee acted promptly in this matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am in full accord with what the gentleman has said about increasing social security. I am strongly of the opinion that under present conditions, they should be increased.

I am hopeful that what the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has done for railroad employees will set the pattern for what should be done for social security beneficiaries in general.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the chairman of our committee if he thinks this is a correct statement, that every individual in every group and any organization that was interested in legislation of this kind was in agreement on it. There was no opposition to this bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is true. Of course, there are some individuals and some organizations who would prefer something greater to be done, but at least they are in favor of what we have done and recognize the necessity of keeping the fund stable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, as a man nears the sunset of life I believe that he desires two things: First, that he be permitted to look back on a well-spent life and, second, that he find ample reward in the form of adequate social security for having contributed to the betterment of his fellow men.

No one can successfully argue that retired railroaders have failed in contributing to the welfare and betterment of our Nation, as well as to the happiness and contentment of mankind in general.

H. R. 6766 is intended as a partial repayment to those "old rails" not only as a reward for a well-spent and industrious life, but also as a partial recompense for their years of courageous and loyal service.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has done a splendid job in analyzing this bill so I will not repeat in this particular. However, I could not let this opportunity go by without expressing my joy and happiness in seeing this legislation pass the House.

A grand group of fellows will benefit from our action and my heart rejoices with them.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary to discuss the merits of the pending bill. This bill is substantially the same as the bill H. R. 5993, which I introduced on March 24, 1948. The only difference between the two bills, as they provided for amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, is this:

The bill which I introduced on March 24, 1948, provided for an increase in retirement annuities ranging from 20 to 25 percent and averaging 20.4 percent, while this substitute bill provides a uniform increase of 20 percent in retirement annuities.

The pending bill provides also for a reduction in the contributions payable under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

This bill represents an agreement between the Association of the American Railroads, representing the great majority of the railroads in the country, and the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing the overwhelming majority of railroad employees. It is supported also by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

We might say in a paraphrase of the old hymn: "This is the thing I long have sought, and mourned because I found it not."

In view of the fact that the railroad workers and the railroad companies have agreed upon the bill, there is no opposition to bother anyone; in fact, there is eagerness to sponsor such measures. It has now become popular to speak in behalf of this kind of a bill. It is not so many years ago, however, when there was general reluctance, if not dread, on the part of legislators about speaking in behalf of this kind of measure. Generally it was hard even to secure a hearing, and the person who undertook to champion such a cause was not too popular, and was likely to be the victim of sneers, if not of something even worse.

It is pleasant to recall, however, that in the great struggle to improve the condition of railway workers, the legislative representatives of the railway labor organizations, the general and local chairmen, their journalists, and other railroad men, by their earnest efforts, their courtesy, their sincerity, and tact, did very much, indeed, to assure the success of their measures. Their conscientious efforts did much to inspire and encourage those of us who officially presented the measures to Congress in behalf of the workers. Their good cheer and energy helped greatly to counteract any effect of the harassing tactics of the opposition. While, however, the early spokesmen for the victims of injustice received sneers and scorn from those in the seats of the mighty, such supporters were, on the other hand, greatly heartened by men of vision, like the poet, James Russell Lowell, who, in expressing his approval of the early workers for justice for the oppressed, wrote as follows:

Then to side with Truth is noble when we
share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit, and 'tis
prosperous to be just;
Then it is the brave man chooses, while the
coward stands aside,
Doubting in his abject spirit, till his Lord is
crucified.

Lowell was always vigorous in his support of those who, defying the displeasure of the powerful, and who early in the struggle, in behalf of the victims of special privilege, joined the workers for the cause of the oppressed, and who, without brag, bravado, or ostentation, and without proclaiming themselves inveterate champions of the obscure and humble, nevertheless plodded ahead in the struggle to improve the condition of mankind.

Yes; Lowell and all other great thinkers have realized that the service of the cause of the oppressed, rather than the wearing the uniform of the cause is what is most important. It is true also that the consciousness of serving, rather than other peoples' opinions of our service, is what truly satisfies the sense of duty.

The great political economist, Henry George, in one of his books writes as follows:

He who sees the truth let him proclaim it without asking who is for it or who is against it.

That certainly is sound principle. A little over 50 years ago, when Henry George, who wrote the most fundamental and unanswerable work on the subject of political economy ever published in this country, made a speech, on the last night of his life, in Turner Hall at College Point, in New York City. He was introduced as a special friend of labor. He rose to his feet and immediately said:

I have never claimed to be a special friend of labor. Labor does not want special privileges. * * * I stand for the equal rights of all men.

This last sentence has been shortened by a cigar manufacturer, and with the picture of Henry George was printed on the lids of cigar boxes. The statement so printed is:

I am for men.

Yes; Henry George, in the last speech of his life, scorning the martyr pose, shouted:

I am for equal rights for all men.

At the time of the occurrence of which I have just spoken I had just graduated from Kenyon College in Ohio and was in New York City to enter law school if I could find an opportunity to earn the means to pay my way.

I was particularly interested in the campaign for the first election for mayor of greater New York, as I had cast my first vote in the election of the year before, 1896.

Mr. George died suddenly in the middle of the night of October 29, on which he made the speech from which I have just quoted. His physicians had warned him that the campaign would probably cause his death. His answer to them was:

How can I die better than serving humanity?

Mr. George's brave action and courageous refusal to pander for the support of any special group made a profound impression on my young mind, an impression that has lasted to this day. Mr. George influenced me so greatly that during the many years which have followed his last speech I have never in any speech or at any time said, "I am a friend of labor. I have always been a friend of labor."

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, there is no difficulty for anyone in voting for this legislation. The railroad workers and the companies have agreed and there is, therefore, little need for much talk about the merits of this particular measure.

This bill and similar measures I regard as in the nature of temporary helps for the beneficiaries while there goes on the great struggle for the adoption of measures establishing fundamental economic justice and freedom. It is not enough to merely declare that all men are equal before the law. No, my friends, we must not rest until, as the fundamental principle of civilization, of social life, the

equal rights of all men in the Creator's bounty to mankind will have been established. Then will men surely receive the full value of their toil, whether it be mental or physical effort. No longer then would there be dependence on temporary aids, palliatives, or the exercise of arbitrary official power in order to save a large part of the population from disaster and physical suffering. Then men will no longer be haunted by want and the fear of want, then will they be free to obey their inspirations, their highest intuitions, and develop the real, the harmonious life, and be free to unfold in their individual experiences the eternal verities of being. The essence and law of the true life would then be realized. In order to be worthy of the commission, entitling him to speak in this House for the people, every Member should devote himself wholeheartedly to the task of assuring all men their equal rights in the bounty supplied by the Creator. When that task will have been finished we shall then welcome the dawn of a new day. No longer then shall we witness the unsecurity, strife, and struggle by men for the enjoyment of what they will have produced. Then shall we have the real brotherhood of man. The constant serious effort which all must make to carry out this purpose, to realize this high ideal will be well repaid by a vivid consciousness of happiness assured to our fellow men by our part in making it possible to enjoy the beneficence of the manifestation of the infinite ideal. Let there be no talk, however, about dying for one's faith. Rather should all be inspired to live for their convictions, as so nobly urged by Ernest Crosby, one of the faithful disciples of the great Henry George.

Let me here quote the poem by Ernest Crosby entitled "Life and Death," which is in the following language:

So he died for his faith. That's fine,
More than most of us do,
But, say, can you add to that line
That he lived for it, too?

In his death he bore witness at last
As a martyr to the truth.
Did his life do the same in the past,
From the days of his youth?

It is easy to die. Men have died
For a wish or a whim—
From bravado or passion or pride,
Was it harder for him?

But to live—every day to live out
All the truth that he dreamt,
While his friends met his conduct with doubt
And the world with contempt.

Was it thus that he plodded ahead,
Never turning aside?
Then we'll talk of the life that he lived.
Never mind how he died.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman and scholar from Ohio if there is anything in this bill which necessitates raising the revenues of the railroads.

Mr. CROSSER. Not one single thing. The assessments are not increased 1 cent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the consumer has no particular interest in this bill.

Mr. CROSSER. This increase of 20 percent in the annuities will be paid for out of the excess in the reserve fund of the retirement system. Contrary to the dire predictions of the opponents of the Crosser amendments, 2 years ago, the reserve fund is not only adequate but has a surplus sufficient to pay 20 percent more to annuitants.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That was my understanding, but I wanted the gentleman to get that into the RECORD.

Mr. CROSSER. That is entirely right.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What does the bill finally provide with reference to unemployment compensation?

Mr CROSSER. It provides the same as was already provided, as far as benefits are concerned. It does not increase the unemployment benefits at all. I would have liked to have had the benefits increased. The men and the railroad companies, the official representatives of the two groups are, however, together, in agreement on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN.]

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see this legislation brought up for consideration before the adjournment of Congress.

I have given this type of legislation my energetic support all along. Two years ago when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] proposed his bill, I strongly supported it. When the gentleman introduced his two bills a few weeks back, H. R. 5875 and H. R. 5993, I gave them my hearty endorsement. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the splendid gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. He is loved by everybody in this House. I am happy that I can count him among my very close friends. He has consistently fought for the workingman. He deserves great credit for the legislation for railroad men. He has always been in the forefront of the fight for them.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 6766, which we are considering today is not all that I had hoped we could get at this session. While I am delighted that we have this bill before us, I wish very much that we could have a bill here embodying greater benefits. But it is gratifying that railroad management and railroad labor have agreed, so we are told, upon this legislation. It means a lot when these two great interests can sit down and work out a great problem like this. The bill therefore represents a great achievement. We are told that this bill represented the very best that can be worked out at this session of Congress. That being true, I am giving the legislation my hearty approval and support, even though it does fall short of what I would like to achieve for the railroad men. I hope to see the time in the not too distant future when a program providing a far more substantial retirement plan can be worked out for the railroad people. I appreciate the fact that it takes time to do that, but I would like to see the great committee of this House handling this legislation give attention in the next Congress to this very problem.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, everybody wants to keep this retirement fund on a very firm foundation. It is very important to the railroad men to know that their fund will be sound from an actuarial standpoint right on in the future. I believe all the railroad men themselves are anxious to preserve the soundness of this fund. We are advised by those in a position to know that the passage of this bill will not impair this fund. All Members of the Congress, it seems to me, can therefore give this bill their full support. And, while I am gratified at the accomplishment of this legislation, I do want to serve notice that it will be my purpose to work for a retirement program for these people that will give them better protection than is even afforded by this bill.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, we have waited a long time for this occasion. I have thought for several years that an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 was proper and in order. During the current year I have worked very diligently in an effort to obtain an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act, which amendment would increase the amount of the retirement benefits due the individual persons receiving these benefits. This increase has long since been due. The present bill will grant an increase of these benefits by approximately 20 percent; and this increase can be given without impairing the retirement fund upon which so many faithful persons must depend. The figures show that the present balance in the railroad retirement fund is well over $1,000,000,000 and that a fund of $450,000,000 will be ample for the purposes of the Retirement Act. In the event the fund is reduced below $450,000,000, the contributions to the fund automatically increase so as to guarantee it shall not sink beneath $250,000,000. I am therefore heartily in favor of this legislation. In fact, I would have supported legislation increasing benefits beyond the 20 percent indicated by this bill but for the fact that persons in whose judgment I have utter confidence felt that we should not test the soundness of the railroad retirement fund at the present time. I am therefore complying with the judgment of those who feel that the present bill is a proper one at this time.

The cost of living has greatly increased during the last few years. It has reached the point where some increase in retirement benefits to the railroad people is imperative if they are to live in decency and self-respect. My earnest hope is that this increase will go far to alleviating some of the suffering which these people have sustained during these inflationary years and will give them some degree of comfort and satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will pass both Houses and become the law of

the land prior to the time when this Congress adjourns and we Members return to our respective homes and our districts.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ.]

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H. R. 6766.

During this Eightieth Congress, a number of bills have been introduced to amend the Railroad Retirement Act so as to increase retirement benefits; to restore the lump-sum death-benefit pensions that were removed in 1946, and to make these pensions available to railroad men who are already retired, as well as those who will retire.

I understand that it was difficult to get agreement from labor and management on most of the recommended changes and therefore no bills were reported out by the committee. However, a bill has been introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], which includes many of the desired changes and which I understand is agreeable to both labor and management.

There are a large number of railroad men living in my congressional district and I am personally acquainted with many of them. These railroad men have long been the backbone of our Nation. They are solid, highly respected, loyal citizens. Through their labor they have made a tremendous contribution to the successful operation of our great transportation system and the economy of the Nation, which depends on this transportation system.

When the present Railroad Retirement Act was adopted, it gave the railroad men a fair pension upon the completion of their life's work. However, at today's high cost of living, this pension is woefully inadequate. It will buy about half of what it bought prior to 1940. This is certainly not a fair return to the railroad man for his years of faithful service to the American public. These men are not receiving the benefits which Congress intended them to have when it passed the Railroad Retirement Act.

H. R. 6766, which is scheduled to come before the House today is an attempt to correct this condition. It does not grant as much of an increase in retirement benefits as the railroad men deserve, but it is a step in the right direction, and I believe the best legislation that can be gotten before the adjournment of this Congress. Therefore, I strongly urge the Members of the House to approve this bill by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee for bringing out this legislation for consideration by the House today. With time running out on this session of Congress, I had become fearful that all of the much needed amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act might be caught in the last minute jam and fail of passage.

The meager annuities now being received by retired railroad workers are in most cases insufficient to meet minimum subsistence requirements. The bill before us provides a 20 percent increase in these annuities which still leaves much to be desired but will nevertheless make a great deal of difference to retired railroad people.

It is gratifying also that this bill has restored to the Railroad Retirement System provision for lump sum settlement to the survivors of an employee in case of death. The absence of such a provision has been particularly onerous to many employees who made contributions to the fund but who were never able to participate in its benefits.

During the past year I have had numerous communications from railroad employees in my district, pointing out inadequacies in existing retirement legislation. There has at times been evidence of disagreement among the employees themselves, and I am glad to learn from the remarks made here on the floor that this bill has been approved by the representatives of the great majority of railroad employees. My recent correspondence indicates that many of the railroad employees in my district feel the need for other amendments to the present act which are not embodied in the bill under consideration. Although it may be desirable to provide additional benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, I am grateful that we are today considering this measure and am confident that it will receive the overwhelming support of the membership of the House.

I believe that within the limitations imposed by the necessity for keeping the retirement fund actuarially sound, we should as promptly as possible broaden the benefits available to railroad employees to enable these people to maintain the highest possible standard of living after retirement.

Again let me congratulate the committee for this constructive step forward and let me urge a continued study of this problem so that further improvements may be made at the earliest practicable date. There should not be a single vote against this measure. I hope it will pass unanimously.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. For many weeks I have been corresponding with railroad employees in my district regarding legislation to provide increases in the annuities of retired railroad employees. I have received several hundred letters calling attention to the fact that living costs have increased and that these increased costs are felt by the retired railroad employee as much, if not actually more, than the active worker who is still on the job and drawing a pay check each and every pay day.

It is, of course, important that no law shall be passed which will tear down the retirement fund. It is important to preserve the soundness of the retirement fund. I have made careful inquiry into the question as to whether this bill will affect the soundness of the railroad retirement fund, and I am reliably informed that it will not adversely affect it, but that the soundness of the retirement fund will be preserved, if this law is enacted.

There are three objectives which legislation of this kind should accomplish, namely, to increase the amount of the annuities, to avoid increasing taxes, and to preserve the soundness of the retirement fund. This bill will accomplish these three objectives. It will give much needed relief to retired railroad employees, who must depend upon their pensions for a living. It will hold out hope to those who are now working, and who have not yet reached retirement age, that when their day of retirement does come, they may look forward to a pension which will more adequately provide for their needs.

I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and to the members of that committee, for working diligently and hard upon this legislation, and my appreciation to them for bringing this bill to the floor today for consideration by the whole House.

A word of appreciation is most certainly in order for Representative ROBERT CROSSER for his untiring work in behalf of railroad-retirement legislation, not only this year, but in years gone by.

I support this bill with pleasure, and sincerely hope that there will not be a vote against it.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I heartily support this meritorious measure. It is significant that it comes to us with the support of both labor and management. Equally significant is the splendid backing given the measure from the committee and from both sides of the aisle. There should be no politics in our efforts to insure good working conditions, good pay, and adequate retirement programs for the Nation's workers.

Unquestionably a more liberal retirement program is needed by railroad workers. The provisions of this bill will help to alleviate their condition. I feel that more could and should be provided, but this is a step in the right direction. And step by step I hope that the Congress will rewrite in more liberal terms all of the measures which now affect aged or retired personnel. Altogether too many of these have been too long neglected.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the consideration of legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees I feel I can almost on faith follow the lead of my good friend from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], who has championed their cause throughout the many years of my service in this Chamber; yea, even long before I came to Congress BOB CROSSER fought for and won many a battle in their behalf. I shall therefore vote for H. R. 6766 without further discussion of its merit. The only thing that could be offered to improve the bill would be an amendment to sweeten or

liberalize the benefits, but inasmuch as time before adjournment grows short this worthy bill might be jeopardized by lengthy debate. Let us pass it now as is and improve the law further in the next session.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this legislation. It gives me great pleasure to be afforded the opportunity of supporting H. R. 6766, the purpose of which is to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 as amended and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

In the face of the current high cost of living this legislation is long overdue. There is no gainsaying the fact that thousands of people in this country are in dire need of the additional benefits provided by the bill which we now have under consideration. I take this opportunity to commend the committee which brought this legislation to the floor for action and to pay my respects to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], who is greatly responsible for the liberal provisions embodied in this bill.

I would much prefer to have been given the chance to support Mr. CROSSER's original bill on the subject at hand but since H. R. 6766 grants at least part of the benefits proposed by Mr. CROSSER, I am happy to support it as being much better than no legislation at all on the subject. The fact of the matter is that the bill under consideration grants much more liberal benefits than had been anticipated during this session of Congress.

I feel sure that there will be few voices raised against H. R. 6766 since the need for this legislation has been so clearly shown and since its immediate passage is justified.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on this bill in general at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for its foresight in unanimously reporting out H. R. 6766. The fact that it has the support of both management and labor is most significant. In my judgment it is legislation long overdue. The legislation has my wholehearted support and I am sure the enactment of this bill will please the loyal railroad workers of the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been a real pleasure and honor to work and support the railroad employees' retirement bill and I thank the committee.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting H. R. 6766, amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended. I am assured by the sponsors of the bill that this measure has the approval of all of the representatives of the railway employees and that it also has the approval of the employees themselves.

The bill in substance provides that all retirement annuities and pensions that are paid under the Railroad Retirement Act are increased by 20 percent. The measure further provides a guarantee that every employee who contributes to the system will obtain in benefits either for himself or his survivors or a designated beneficiary an amount equal to the contribution he makes together with an allowance in lieu of interest.

The amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act substitute for the present flat 3-percent contribution rate a sliding scale under which the tax rate is automatically adjusted in accordance with the amount of reserves in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

I am informed that so long as the reserve is $450,000,000 or more that the rate will be one-half of 1 percent and that the rate increases one-half of 1 percent for each $50,000,000 by which the reserve is less than the sum of $450,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in view of the increased cost of living and considering that many railroad employees have retired when their salaries were not as high as they are at the present time, that an increase in retirement pay is necessary.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has recently approved liberal increases for those who have retired from employment in the Government service. It is only fair that those faithful employees in the railway service should be entitled to similar consideration.

Mr. Speaker, there is another important matter with respect to this problem of retirement in which I have always been deeply interested and that is to see to it that those employees who have rendered long and faithful service and through no fault of their own become totally disabled before they reach the required age of service for retirement, be given proper protection. We ought, so far as we can, make sure that men disabled in service are not pushed aside because of technical or other reasons when they ought, as a matter of right, be allowed fair compensation. We forget too often that many of these employees are engaged in hazardous work and by reason thereof ought to be amply protected. We should deal with this problem of retirement and unemployment insurance in a realistic manner and try so far as we can to do the thing that is right for the thousands of deserving people employed in the railroad service of this country.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, upon the introduction of his bill, H. R. 6766, which grants to former railroad workers who are presently retired on pensions, and to railroad workers who will retire in the future, an increase in their retirement annuities of 20 percent. It also, among other things, restores the provision for lump-sum death benefit payments which was in effect before the 1946 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

Several cases have been brought to my attention of the inadequacies of the present benefits compared to present living costs. These cases are real, difficult hardship cases and involve aged and retired employees of the railroad industry. Existing funds, I understand, are ample to support the proposed increases. This bill does not involve an increase in taxation. I am advised that this bill will not endanger the financial stability of the railroad retirement system. From various angles which I have endeavored to study the proposal, it appears to be sound and meritorious.

Since the inception of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, there has been established and maintained a fine nonpartisan approach to this very important matter.

There have been many bills introduced which affect railroad retirement alone. I have endeavored to give a great amount of time and study to these bills and have urged the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to take up these bills for hearings and consideration. I am glad, therefore, that the distinguished and able chairman of the committee has introduced his own bill, which contains many of the features of the various other bills. I am also glad to learn that there is general agreement in the committee on this bill and that both the railroad industry and the railroad labor organizations are in favor of the measure.

In view of the above, I wish to express here the hope that this measure may receive speedy and favorable action by this Congress and that it will be passed by the House today.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this bill (H. R. 6766) for the reason that it will provide a substantial increase in the pensions of retired railroad employees. While it may be inadequate to meet the high cost of living of today it will afford these annuitants some measure of assistance which they are entitled to and so richly deserve.

The bill provides a flat 20-percent increase in pensions and annuities, and this increase applies to those who are now retired as well as to those who will retire in the future. The increase will become effective in the month following the enactment of the law without the necessity of any application therefor being made on the part of those affected. In addition, the bill before the House restores to the railroad retirement system a feature which was omitted by the 1946 amendments whereby railroad employees are guaranteed benefits, either to themselves or to survivors or designated beneficiaries, at least equal to the amount they have contributed, plus an allowance for interest.

The railroads, who alone pay the tax for unemployment insurance, are permitted to reduce the tax rate on a graduated scale so long as an ample balance

is maintained in the fund. This extends to the railroads substantially the same treatment accorded every other employer with respect to unemployment insurance under the several State and Federal social-security systems.

The pending bill, therefore, accomplishes a fourfold purpose. It increases the amount of the annuities; it avoids increasing taxes; it preserves the soundness of the retirement fund; and restores on an optional basis the provision for lump-sum death-benefit payments that was in effect before the present law was amended in 1946.

Numerous bills have been introduced during the present session to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts. Many of the measures sought by different means and in varying degrees to increase the benefits paid, while others provided adjustments of various kinds in the taxes and contributions collected. As an example, the Crosser bill (H. R. 5993), which was introduced at the request of the employees, provided a graduated increase in retirement annuities, ranging from 20 to 25 percent and averaging 20.4 percent, whereas the measure under consideration provides for a uniform increase in retirement benefits of 20 percent. I do not believe that this slight difference will be considered significant by any of the parties concerned in the bill. The Railroad Retirement Board has reported that its actuarial studies show that the enactment of this measure will not in its judgment jeopardize the soundness of the financing of the railroad retirement system.

The proposed legislation is the result of an agreement between railroad labor and railroad management. Some provisions, standing alone, management would not recommend; while others, standing alone, the employees would not approve. However, considering all of the provisions as a whole, the bill represents a fair solution of the problem, and embodies changes in the existing law that are urgently needed. It does not involve any other changes in the rights of employees, either with respect to retirement or unemployment rights which are now in effect.

The steady increase in the cost of living has diminished the living standards of all retired railroad employees and has inflicted severe hardships on many. These conditions will not be entirely remedied by the pending legislation, but there will be substantial relief. It is fortunate that labor and management were able to reach an agreement because it is doubtful whether otherwise it would have been possible to secure the enactment of any legislation in the short time that remains before adjournment of the Congress.

I shall vote for this bill with very great pleasure, and I trust that it will receive overwhelming approval.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Ohio, 10.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to support H. R. 6766, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

It is my privilege to represent a district with a large railroad population principally because at Altoona, Pa., is located the Pennsylvania Railroad shops, the largest railroad shops in the world. In addition, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad at DuBoise and the New York Central Railroad at Clearfield employ thousands of men. It is estimated that current railroad employment in my congressional district totals 32,698, with an estimated total potential retirement coverage of 81,745.

As a result, there are thousands of retired railroad employees who will benefit directly by this legislation. At the present time these thousands of retired employees are living under conditions, due to the high cost of living, that make it impossible for them to receive the bare necessities of life.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, for the fiscal year of 1947 there were 240,026 persons on the retirement rolls whose average monthly benefits were $61.10. Widows 65 years and over on the retirement rolls received a monthly payment of $23.34, while dependent children averaged $15.70 monthly, and dependent parents $16.84 monthly.

These recipients of railroad-retirement benefits are faced with the high cost of living, which has practically doubled since the Railroad Retirement Act became effective in 1937. This increase in the cost of living is no fault of this particular group of retired railroad employees. There is hardly a day in the week that I do not receive pathetic letters from retired railroad employees or their survivors informing me of their dire circumstances.

Let me quote a few excerpts from some of these letters I have been receiving:

We find it hard to live on our small pension of $50 monthly since the prices are so high. We do not like to ask our children for help because they have a hard time making ends meet. But we do want to live the few years we have left without worry and anxiety.

A wife 73 years of age, whose husband is 76 years of age and permanently disabled, writes me as follows:

The $50 monthly pension is all we have in the way of income. My husband has been bedfast since April 1946 and in need of medicine and medical attention. We are existing on one meal a day, which is very scanty, since $50 monthly is all we have to depend upon to keep body and soul together.

Another retired employee writes:

I am 67 years old and worked 2 years over my time. Now I receive $55 a month. How can I keep three people and buy coal, clothing, and food on $55. We are hungry many times and have to accept food from our neighbors.

No doubt there are many of you who have received similar letters from retired railroad employees, emphasizing the need for an increase in present benefits.

H. R. 6766 provides that these retired employees will receive a 20-percent increase in benefits. In the case of a person receiving $60 monthly the increase will mean an additional $12 monthly. While it is true that this increase is a modest one, it will, at least, convey to these retired employees that Congress is conscious of their plight.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, the total cost of the 20-percent increase provided in this bill for the fiscal year 1949 will be approximately $48,000,000, with the cost increasing to about $66,000,000 in 1952, with a gradual increase thereafter due to the increasing number of employees expected to retire.

It must be kept in mind that the funds necessary to pay railroad retirement benefits are raised through employer-employee contributions and that no money is appropriated for this purpose by the Government.

Over a period of years the cumulative balance in the Railroad Retirement Account has increased considerably. For an illustration, in 1941 and 1942 the balance was approximately $95,000,000. By 1947 the fund had increased to approximately $811,000,000 and as of March 1, 1948, it was approximately $1,300,000,000.

This balance, in the opinion of the majority of the members of the Railroad Retirement Board, is adequate to support a 20-percent increase in present benefits and will not endanger the soundness of the fund, nor will it be necessary to increase pay-roll taxes.

At this point, I want to call attention to the following table of receipts and expenditures of the Railroad Retirement Account for the fiscal years 1942 to 1947, inclusive. The table is as follows:

Fiscal year	Receipts	Expenditures	Balance	Cumulative balance
1941–42	$143,993,059	$126,656,781	$17,336,278	$94,139,717
1942–43	220,577,849	130,863,977	89,713,872	183,853,589
1943–44	272,557,049	135,215,326	137,341,723	321,195,313
1944–45	324,057,493	142,527,642	181,529,851	502,725,164
1945–46	312,024,329	153,815,252	158,209,077	660,934,240
1946–47	322,420,274	173,101,153	149,319,121	810,253,361

NOTE.—Receipts consist of appropriations and interest.

You will observe that in the year 1941–42 the net balance which accrued to the fund was about $17,500,000. In the period of 1944–45 the balance reached a peak of $182,000,000, while in 1946–47 it dropped to $150,000,000.

The fluctuation in the yearly net balance is due to the fluctuation in railroad employment. At the present time the cumulative balance, as previously mentioned, is $1,300,000,000. Indications are that railroad employment will continue

at a moderately high level, which is assurance that the Railroad Retirement Fund will be kept in a healthy condition.

It is encouraging to me to know that this legislation has the endorsement of railway labor and railway management and I wish, at this time, to commend the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for taking favorable action in reporting this bill. Many of us who introduced similar bills made constant demands upon the committee for action and, at times, may have appeared too zealous.

However, the plight of the retired railroad employees motivated us and I am glad that our pleas have been heard and that the present legislation will receive the approval of Congress.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill is necessary, and I believe certain.

It is a satisfaction for me to say I represent a district in which reside hundreds of railroad men. They have been my friends ever since I first ran for Congress.

Unlike some groups in organized labor, the railway brotherhoods do not make it a practice of crucifying Congressmen who do not always agree with them. They are generally fair and considerate to men who vote their convictions.

I have usually gone along with what the railroad employees in my section want. They are hard-working, honest citizens, and, in my opinion, deserve the best this Congress can give them.

Today we are voting to raise their retirement pensions 20 percent. Many people back home who have been writing me on this subject for years will be glad indeed of the action we are taking.

Retired railroad workers are faced with higher living costs just like the rest of us. Their families are in need, and we are fulfilling promises made in the past by approving their pension increase today.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that so many Members have indicated their support of this legislation. I remember that it was not always that this was the case. Two years ago we had a very long and hard fight over this kind of legislation. I at that time did all I could in favor of the Crosser bill and the Crosser amendments. I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee when the railroad retirement bill was first passed. I had a very active part in the writing of the first Railroad Retirement Act. I have helped to strengthen it and have supported any amendment in that direction.

In this present session of Congress I took a very active part in holding in the Ways and Means Committee a bill which would have reduced the fund out of which benefits would be paid to the railroad men when they became unemployed. The railroad employees were opposed to that legislation because they wanted this fund held intact so as to guarantee that there would be a sufficient fund to meet the demands that might come should we find ourselves again in the midst of another serious depression. Those who were advised with reference to what we did in holding back that legislation appreciated our efforts very much. I am glad to support this pending measure.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, one of the best friends to the railway employees of this country in Congress. I favor its enactment. These amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act accomplish two fundamental purposes. By the provisions of section 1, together with the provisions of section 3, all retirement annuities and pensions payable under the Railroad Retirement Act are increased by 20 percent. In the second place, by the provisions of section 2 of the bill, there is restored to the railroad retirement system a provision which was in the act prior to the 1946 amendments, and which in effect, is a guaranty that each employee who contributes to the system will obtain in benefits, either for himself or to his survivors or to a designated beneficiary an amount at least equal to the contribution he makes, plus an allowance in the place of interest.

The amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act substitute for the present flat 3-percent contribution rate, a sliding scale under which the tax rate is automatically adjusted in accordance with the amount of reserve in the railroad unemployment insurance account at the close of business on September 30 of each year. If the reserve is $450,000,000 or more, the rate will be one-half percent; the rate thereafter increases one-half percent for each $50,000,000 by which the reserve is less than that amount, and the rate will reach a 3-percent rate if the reserve should fall below $250,000,000.

THERE IS A NECESSITY FOR THIS LEGISLATION

Various bills were introduced to accomplish the purpose reached by these amendments. In a conference between the railroad managements represented in the Association of American Railroads and the employees represented in the Railway Labor Executives Association, an agreement was reached by the representatives of the great majority of railroads and the representatives of the great majority of the employees on the provisions which are contained in this bill. The representatives of the railroads and the representatives of the railway employees were heard at length by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. At these hearings it appeared that this bill had the support of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, who are not members of the Railway Labor Executives Association.

In order to secure the enactment of this measure it was necessary that the terms of the measure be agreed upon by the railroads on the one hand, and the railway employees on the other. Taking the provisions as a whole, the bill is a fair solution of the problems sought to be settled by this measure. The bill contains provisions that will maintain the solvency of the fund from which the increased benefits provided by the act are to be paid.

I am happy to cast my vote in favor of the enactment of this measure.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 6766, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

I believe this is a meritorious and worth-while bill which deserves immediate passage. Its provisions have been reached after careful consideration of the facts and conditions as presented by both management and labor. Moreover, the human factors involved received the serious attention they deserved.

This bill will provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in the retirement benefits to our railroad employees and their survivors. We are all cognizant of the tremendous contribution the railroad workers have made to our national welfare.

I particularly like the changes which have been written into this bill over some of the other measures. The features providing for either a lump-sum payment or annuity upon retirement to these employees or their families are good. This increase has been sorely needed to meet the high cost of living which has pinched these folks the hardest who are living on a fixed income or pension.

I am glad to vote for this bill and urge its immediate passage.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I believe the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is due a hearty vote of thanks on the part of all the Members of the House for his assistance in bringing out this splendid measure. We are all in favor of the bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, having lived close to the railroad men who did such a magnificent job in handling the commerce of the Nation, regardless of the time and effort during the recent war, and who are continuing to help give us the best system of transportation in the world, it is indeed a pleasure for me today to lift my voice in the support of H. R. 6766 which amends the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act which will be of great benefit to the railroad employees generally.

I am very glad to note that real conference-table bargaining in the finest traditions of collective bargaining between railroad management and the officials of the employees has brought

about a unanimous agreement written into this act which will not only be of great benefit to the employees, but at the same time will be beneficial and fair to the management. It is a fine demonstration of mutual trust in helping to make free enterprise really work in the Nation. I compliment both the representatives of labor and the representatives of management for the manner in which they have handled this most complex problem.

So far as the Railroad Retirement Act is concerned, the bill provides in sections 1 and 3 for a 20-percent increase in pension and annuities. This 20-percent increase applies to those who are now retired, and to those who will retire in the future. The increase is effective in the month following the enactment of this law without the necessity of any application on the part of those affected. It is thought the increase in pension benefits is all that can safely be made at this time in order to make certain that the pension fund is kept in sound condition.

It is important to note that the Railroad Retirement Board which administers the act approves this bill and states in its report to the committee that it will not jeopardize or destroy the soundness of the fund.

In section 2 the bill restores on an optional basis the provision for lump-sum benefit payments that was in effect before the act was amended in 1946. This means that every employee who has contributed to the system will receive the benefits either to himself or to survivors, or his beneficiary, an amount equal to the amount paid in pay-roll taxes plus an allowance for interest. Mr. Speaker, as to the Unemployment Insurance Act, the bill substitutes for the present flat 3-percent tax, a sliding scale under which the tax is automatically adjusted in accordance with the amount of reserves in the railroad unemployment insurance account as of September 30 of each year. The rate of tax will range from a minimum of one-half to 1 percent when the balance in the fund is $450,000,000 or more, to a maximum tax of 3 percent when the balance is less than $250,000,000. As long as the reserve remains at $450,000,000,000 or more the rate of tax would remain at one-half percent and the rate is then increased by graduated steps at one-half percent for each $50,000,000 by which the reserve is less than that amount, again reaching the full 3-percent rate if the fund should fall below $250,000,000.

The graduated scale of tax provided in this bill is adequate to insure against depletion of reserve and at the same time it will relieve the railroad of continued unnecessary payments of money which could be used in providing and improving service to the public. The fact that the representatives of railway labor have agreed to this bill is assurance that they are satisfied that the rates and payments required in the fund will be sufficient at all times to provide an ample margin of security.

Mr. Speaker, in this act we have arranged to increase by 20 percent the present and future retirement benefits due to the fact there has been a considerable increase in the cost of living. It is clear that annuities which retired persons are now receiving are inadequate to cope with the higher cost of living. The same situation will doubtless exist as to the annuities of those employees who will retire in the future. This bill will benefit all of those coming under the act, not only for the present, but for the long-range future. We must keep the fund sound and we must increase benefits to compensate for the higher cost of living. That is what we are doing in this legislation. While it may not go all the way in meeting this additional cost, it goes a considerable distance and as far as the representatives of the railroad men and management think it is prudent to go at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it reestablishes the lump-sum death-benefit payment which was in the original act and was abolished by the amendments of 1946. This should never have been done. It will guarantee on an optional basis to every employee who has contributed to the retirement fund, or to survivors or a beneficiary in the event of no existing survivor, an amount equal to the amount the employee has paid in pay-roll taxes plus interest. This is a good provision and answers many complaints that have come since the amendments in 1946.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to support this legislation and I hope it may pass the House by unanimous vote.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 6766, favorably reported to the House by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member.

This bill provides an immediate 20-percent increase in all railroad retirement pensions and annuities and a lump-sum payment provision guaranteeing that every railroad worker, his widow or other survivors, will get back all that he paid into the fund, plus interest. This bill increases benefits without any increase in cost to the worker or to the railroads. At present, the retirement fund has a reserve of almost a billion dollars. We are here providing a sliding tax scale, requested by the carriers, but with modifications designed to assure that the fund will remain ample to pay the promised benefits to railroad workers who are unemployed or laid up by illness or injury.

This bill is supported by the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing some 20 rail unions and, in addition, by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, who are not members of the Railway Labor Executives Association. It is also supported by the American Association of American Railroads. I regard this as a real legislative achievement, that we can bring out a bill supported by all concerned. It was not an easy thing to do. Twenty-four bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act were introduced in the Eightieth Congress and referred to my committee. It was only after careful study of all of these measures, and hearings which we conducted, that we were able to report the pending measure, which I know will be adopted and become law this month. The bill contains some provisions which, standing alone, management would not recommend and others which, standing alone, the employees would not recommend. Nevertheless, by considering all the provisions as a unit, both management and employees are in agreement that the bill represents a fair solution to the immediate problems concerning this legislation and recommend that the bill be enacted.

It is clear that the annuities which retired persons are now receiving are inadequate to cope with the higher living costs. I have long supported and followed the operation of the railroad retirement system. I have always been in full accord with its purposes. But I am convinced that its benefits must be adequate to permit the retired or disabled employee to maintain himself in reasonable comfort and decency. In accomplishing such a purpose we must be careful that the amount of benefits promised by the retirement system must in nowise jeopardize the soundness of the fund, which is built up by the contributions of the workers and the railroads. The Railroad Retirement Board informs my committee that the increased benefits we seek to grant in this bill today will not hurt the fund or require an increase of tax rates.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to repeat that this is not the first time I have taken an interest in the problems of the railroad employees. I have done so for years. The general shops of three great railroads are in my congressional district. The Frisco shops are at Springfield and the M. K. & T. and Missouri Pacific shops are at Sedalia, Mo. In addition, there are hundreds of rail employees in my district not employed in the shops. As a member of the committee of Congress which handles all rail-labor legislation, I have made it a particular point to fight for their interests. When the Taft-Hartley Act was being considered by another committee, I was one of those who insisted, with success, that all rail labor be specifically exempted from provisions of that law. Also, I voted against the slave-labor draft bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress when the administration sought to force workers into the Army to break a strike. My friends in the rail unions know of that record. One of the evidences of their friendship and support I received in 1946 when the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 20 railway-labor unions, supported me for Congress. This group speaks for one and a half million railroad workers. Following is a copy of the letter I received on August 1, 1946, from A. E. Lyon, executive secretary of the association:

Hon. MARION T. BENNETT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This letter is to again express our thanks for your support

of the Crosser bill amending and liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

You were particularly helpful in signing the discharge petition and also supported the bill and voted against destructive amendments on July 3. We have noted with much appreciation that you again voted for the bill when it was considered on the floor of the House on July 27.

Your continuous aid during the long period when this bill was pending before the Congress warrants the gratitude of all railway workers. As you know, the bill has now been approved by the President, with the result that great numbers of railway workers and members of their families will obtain benefits to which they have long been entitled.

Respectfully yours,

A. E. LYON,
Executive Secretary.

Earlier today this House passed my bill, H. R. 6696, which I sponsored for the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. This measure was favorably and unanimously reported by my committee after 3 days of hearings. I hope that it, too, will soon become law. If it does it will correct many of the deplorable conditions, the hazards, and lack of sanitation which impair the working conditions in these cars.

On June 5, 1948, Labor, the official weekly newspaper of 15 of the recognized standard railroad labor organizations, carried an article on its first page, with my picture, commenting on this measure. The article said, in part:

Credit for securing favorable action by the committee was given BENNETT by Hartman Barber, general representative of the clerks. "Once again, Congressman MARION T. BENNETT has shown his sympathy toward problems affecting railway workers, and in this instance he has been a sturdy advocate of correcting the unsafe and unsanitary conditions existing in express and baggage cars in which express messengers and train baggagemen have to work," Barber said.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support this legislation. I have many of the beneficiaries of it in my district.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing indeed to have this kind of legislation come to the floor with a unanimous report of the committee. It is a very creditable accomplishment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and its leadership, to bring before the House of Representatives H. R. 6766, the Wolverton bill.

Briefly, the bill increases retirement benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by 20 percent. This is the most important provision of the bill and will be of considerable help to retired railroad workers. It also sets up a sliding scale of payments to the retirement fund, based upon the amount of money in the reserve of the retirement fund. The Railroad Retirement Board joined with the labor and management of the railroads in endorsing the bill.

This legislation represents very considerable effort and complete success in reaching agreement between railroad labor and management and the board. It is refreshing to have such agreement consummated by legislative action.

The staff of the committee also deserves much credit for this work. The men who compose the committee staff worked arduously to bring about complete accord between those interested.

Its unanimous passage by the House of Representatives is a tribute to the wisdom of the bill. I have had many communications from people in the Sixth District of Iowa concerning this type of legislation. It is sincerely hoped that this bill is a step in the right direction to meet the needs of our railroad workers and to make the Railroad Retirement Act a more adequate law to meet the needs of a great industry.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.]

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, it is a great tribute to management and to labor that they were able to get together on so effective and so important a piece of legislation as this is. I would like to pay high compliment to the distinguished chairman of this committee whose patient efforts contributed so greatly toward a constructive solution of a very difficult problem and resulted in such complete satisfaction to both labor and management. Past Congresses have tried and failed to come up with a solution. This Congress has shown the way to be progressive, but this is not enough in itself unless the legislative product is also effective. This piece of legislation is hailed as a success, thanks largely to the persuasiveness and effectiveness of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the action soon to be taken on this resolution will be an overwhelming, if not unanimous approval of the recommendation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That committee has made consistent efforts all this session to develop legislation which could result in such approval by all the Members of the House as being in the common interest of the railroad employees, the railroad industry, and the public. The committee report explains concisely and clearly the purposes of, and the necessity for this legislation. As stated in the report, it is noncontroversial, is urgently needed, and should be enacted at the earliest possible moment. That moment will be within the next few minutes, and I hope that the result here will have the immediate effect of clearly indicating the wisdom of prompt and favorable action elsewhere.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to give my full support to this bill H. R. 6766. It is a deserved recognition of the rights of railroad labor. I commend the chairman of the committee the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and his associates on the committee for bringing in the bill and giving us an opportunity to enact it into law before we adjourn. It is fortunate that both railroad management and labor are in agreement on the measure.

The amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act are designed to accomplish two basic purposes. First, by the provisions of section 1, together with the provisions of section 3, all retirement annuities and pensions payable under the Railroad Retirement Act are increased by 20 percent. Secondly, by the provisions of section 2 of the bill, there is restored to the railroad retirement system a feature which was in the act prior to the 1946 amendments, and which in effect, is a guaranty that every employee who contributes to the system will obtain in benefits, either to himself or to survivors or a designated beneficiary, an amount at least equal to the contribution he makes, plus an allowance in lieu of interest.

The amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act substitute for the present flat 3 percent contribution rate, a sliding scale under which the tax rate is automatically adjusted in accordance with the amount of reserves in the railroad unemployment insurance account as of the close of business of September 30 of each year. So long as the reserve is $450,000,000 or more, the rate would be one-half percent; the rate then increases one-half percent for each $50,000,000 by which the reserve is less than that amount, again reaching a 3-percent rate if the reserve should fall below $250,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I want particularly to commend our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] for the gallant fight he has carried on through the years for the rights of railroad labor and I am proud to have associated myself with him in support of this and the so-called Crosser bill of the last session. I hope this bill will receive unanimous support.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this bill which corrects two of the injustices in the act of 2 years ago. First, it actually does something for the retired railroaders by increasing their pensions. Nothing was done for this group 2 years ago. Second, it puts the unemployment-insurance payments on a merit basis approximating the system applied to other employers, instead of singling out the railroads for discriminatory treatment.

As far as I can see, this bill not only satisfies the railroads and their employees, but is also in the public interest. Now and in the future we must remember that legislation and other Federal action affecting railroads must not only be satisfactory to the railroads and their workers, but must benefit the general public. Whatever we do to or for the railroads, or their employees, affects everybody. Whatever the railroads do to or

for their employees, and whatever the brotherhoods do to or for the railroads, affects everybody. We want the principal effect on the public, from any of these actions, to be beneficial.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee for bringing out this very excellent piece of legislation.

It seems to me imperative because of the inadequacy of present benefits compared to present living costs that this measure should become law before this session closes. The bill does not involve any increase in taxes or contributions. The amount of money existing in the retirement fund is ample to support the proposed increases. The need is undeniable and there can be no justifiable reason for failure to pass this legislation immediately. While I would have preferred to see my bill acted upon and passed because it comes closer to meeting the needs of the recipients, yet, inasmuch as time is of the essence and this particular bill has the united support of all factions, I trust the House will vote favorably upon it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the welfare of the railroad worker. I have recognized the need for improvement in the Railroad Retirement Act and have always supported legislation which would be beneficial to these workers. The annuities paid the retired railroad workers are based on living costs and wages which prevailed in the early thirties and certainly are not in line with the cost of living today. Under the provisions of H. R. 6766 not only the retired railroad workers but the widows, orphans, and aged parents of those who have died will definitely be benefited. Since being a Member of Congress I have worked to help this deserving group and I hope this legislation will be enacted into law.

While H. R. 6766 does not go as far in helping the retired railroad worker and his dependents as I would like, I do think it is a step in the right direction. I urge the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to continue this work in order that the railroader may eventually receive the retirement compensation he has earned and so richly deserves.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCMILLEN].

Mr. MCMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I heartily approve of this legislation.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to appear before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of H. R. 6766.

As I understand it, the amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act are designed for two basic purposes. The first is that all retirement annuities and pensions payable under the Railroad Retirement Act are increased by 20 percent.

While all of us agree that this increase is not an abundance, it will certainly be helpful in view of the present cost of living.

The amendments further provide for the restoration to the railroad system a feature which was in the act prior to the 1946 amendments, and which in effect, is a guarantee that every employee who contributes to the system will obtain in benefits, either to himself or to survivors or a designated beneficiary, an amount at least equal to the contribution he makes, plus an allowance in lieu of interest, which is a very desirable improvement.

I again congratulate the committee for its approach to this problem. While it is not all that some of us had hoped for, it is probably the best that could be worked out at this time and is a step in the right direction.

This action on the part of the committee, and I hope on the part of the Congress, indicates that we are ready and willing to correct existing inequities.

I shall support the measure.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is really a refreshing experience to sit here today and see such unanimity of opinion among Members on both sides of the aisle in support of the pending legislation, which indicates to me that men with fighting hearts like BOB CROSSER, ultimately bring results. As I noted this splendid exhibition of unanimity of thought and action in support of this bill my mind went back to 2 years ago when in the closing days of a session of the Congress a progressive measure of that time to help the employees of railroads was bitterly opposed and when it came back from the Senate the effort was made to prevent it coming up for further consideration.

My mind also went back to 1935 when the original bill was passed and to 1937 when certain amendments thereto were adopted.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, with this attitude of unanimous manifestation on legislation that in bygone Congresses should have received the same unanimous support. To the chairman of the committee and the other members I want to extend my congratulations, although unanimous action is many years delayed. We Democrats are very glad to welcome you Republicans into the fold so far as this bill is concerned, because it is Democratic legislation. It originated with the Democratic Party and has always been fought for on this side of the House. We have always fought for improvements in the laws relating to railroad employees. We are glad to see and receive converts.

While I congratulate the chairman and the members of the committee, I want to pay especial tribute to one of the greatest men I ever served with, a man who has suffered every minute for years, but who has performed his duty with courage and determination. To me he is at all times an inspiration. The railroad employees of America owe a debt of gratitude which they can never repay, and should never forget, to one of the greatest and most courageous men I have ever known, the father of this legislation, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has given a most comprehensive and accurate description of this legislation. I agree with him in support of it. I believe this bill deserves to be supported from the standpoint of the public interest.

We cannot afford to close our eyes to the great problem that Social Security presents to this country. That is true from the standpoint of benefit to employees; from the standpoint of the effect upon the employer; and primarily from the standpoint of the public who must pay the bill. That public is representative of the great masses of our people. The millions who may become beneficiaries of our social security programs are a part of that public to which I refer. That public also includes our whole population. The rights of the beneficiaries of social security must be, or should be granted consistently with the rights of that public. The benefits of one man must be the burden of others. There must be a proper balance running through our whole social security program.

As I look forward to the future, and the obligation of Congress to deal with this question, I regard it as one of the most important responsibilities Congress now faces. The proper performance of that trust calls for a very high degree of ability, patience, fairness, and courage. I trust that the future Congresses may deal with this problem with that high courage and ability and fidelity that the problem demands, not only in justice to the employees and the employer, but to the American people who after all are primarily concerned.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill have been adequately explained by the Chairman, and also the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Early this year it was clearly apparent to those who were familiar with the circumstances that legislation amending the Railroad Retirement Act to provide for additional benefits to retired railroad employees was in order.

To that end perhaps 25 bills were introduced by Members of the House. I introduced one myself. Out of all of this legislation has come this bill on which all parties agree. I think it is a tribute to those who have developed this agreed program and a tribute to other Members of the House who introduced bills on their own that they have so willingly cooperated, in this effort, even though it necessarily meant the merging of their own bills in favor of a bill that could be reported and passed here in the closing days of this session.

This is meritorious legislation. I hope there will not be a vote against it on passage. Certainly the 20-percent increase in retirement benefits is fully justified by the increase in the cost of living.

Restoration of the lump-sum death benefit provision will correct a mistake that never should have been made in the amendments adopted in 1946.

The sliding-scale tax formula as it applies to the Unemployment Insurance Act appears fully justified by the facts.

While this bill cannot be considered as the final word insofar as amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act is concerned, it does in a rather large measure meet a situation that requires the attention of the Congress. It should receive unanimous support.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, not only am I in favor of this legislation, but I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and the chairman of this committee and the Members for bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

Further, I endorse what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has said about that great American, Henry George. In my opinion, his book, Progress and Poverty, should be required reading for every man in public life in America.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as has already been said, this bill was unanimously reported from our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and so far as I know has the full support of everyone interested.

It is easy to support legislation when everyone is in agreement. It is commendable that both railroad management and railroad employees will resolve their differences and reach full agreement on a matter of this kind, which is of so much importance to not only those directly affected but to the general public. This is reminiscent of the days when full accord was reached on railroad retirement and benefit for employees after some time in legislative channels and judicial proceedings.

No legislation can be expected to meet the needs of any given problem for all time to come. Conditions change from time to time, making it necessary to adjust any legislation to existing conditions. It is as true with railroad retirement and insurance legislation as it is with any other problems.

Some 3 years ago it became evident that some adjustments needed to be made, in matters of retirement and insurance of railroad employees. It was in 1945 when we first began consideration of the Crosser amendments to the Retirement and Insurance Act. Extensive hearings were held, and long and sometimes very controversial consideration was given to those amendments.

I supported the Crosser amendments and it was unfortunate that the differences at that time were so keen that prevented mutual agreement and understanding. The bills were passed in 1946. The cost of living has continuously increased and experience has shown that this adjustment is not only desirable but necessary and justified.

This is another example, Mr. Speaker, that in consideration of problems that mean so much to so many equity and justice will finally prevail. This is another example that your Congress will continue to consider these problems from time to time making such adjustments to meet the conditions that arise.

Our committee has worked diligently in endeavoring to alleviate the conditions that exist among retired railroad employees.

This bill, H. R. 6766, amends the Railroad Retirement Act in two important ways.

In the first place, it provides a 20-percent increase for all retirement annuities and pensions payable under the Railroad Retirement Act.

In the second place, this bill restores to the railroad retirement system the provision that every employee who contributes to the program will obtain in benefits either to himself or to survivors or to a designated beneficiary an amount at least equal to the contribution he makes plus an allowance in lieu of interest. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this restores the lump sum payment to the beneficiary or survivors of the employee at death.

This bill also amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. It substitutes for the present flat 3-percent contribution rate, a sliding scale under which the tax rate is automatically adjusted in accordance with the amount of reserves in the railroad employment insurance account as of the close of business of September 30 of each year. So long as the reserve is $450,000,000 or more, the rate would be one-half percent; the rate then increases one-half percent for each $50,000,000 by which the reserve is less than that amount, again reaching a 3-percent rate if the reserve should fall below $250,000,000.

There is a real necessity for this legislation. It is imperative that there be an increase in benefits to be paid to railroad annuitants. Everyone recognizes that the cost of living has continuously increased, diminishing the living standard of retired railroad employees and making it difficult for many of them to maintain an adequate livelihood. I am indeed happy to see the unaniminity manifested here on this floor as it was in the committee after obtaining an agreement between the groups affected. It is my pleasure to have contributed what little I could to this problem as it was when the Crosser amendments were before the Congress 2 years ago. I feel that this meritorious legislation will receive the unanimous approval of this Congress and this contribution to these people affected will be received with the deepest of appreciation and gratitude.

I should like to pay tribute to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] in his efforts to bring this matter to a successful conclusion. Certainly I should like to pay my tribute and respect to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. Everyone knows that this lovable character who has a long record in this Congress is the father of social legislation and benefits for railroad employees. Mr. Crosser introduced legislation several months ago to provide the adjustments for retired employees as carried in this bill, H. R. 6766. He introduced an identical bill, 6768, at the same time this bill was introduced after full agreement had been reached by the parties concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also pay tribute to our distinguished and lovable friend from California [Mr. LEA], for the long and faithful service and fine leadership he has provided for our committee. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] has been in the Congress for more than 30 years, and served as chairman of our committee for many years. He is familiar with legislation affecting our transportation problems as well as other problems of vital importance to the public and our general welfare. He is leaving Congress at the end of this session. We will miss him. We wish him Godspeed and many more years of health and happiness. The pages of history will reveal that no finer or greater man, no harder worker, no one with greater sincerity and a nobler heart has ever served in the Congress.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, in all the time I have been a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it has never dealt in a partisan sense with any legislation of this character. True, there may have been differences of opinion, but I think the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] in the many years he has served, as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], exemplify the feelings of that committee in its concern for railroad employees.

This bill is a needed improvement on present railroad retirement legislation. It is not all of the answer that I, individually, would like to have seen, but it is the best we can do at this time. I know I express the hope of all the members of the committee as well as my own hope that from time to time we shall review this and other legislation pertaining to railroad retirement. I hope that in the near future, further needed consideration will be given to this subject.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill be passed?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 381, nays 0, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—381

Abbitt	Allen, Calif.	Andersen, H. Carl
Abernethy	Allen, Ill.	Anderson, Calif.
Albert	Allen, La.	

Andresen, August H.	Evins	Kunkel
Andrews, Ala.	Feighan	Landis
Andrews, N. Y.	Fellows	Lanham
Angell	Fenton	Latham
Arends	Fernandez	Lea
Arnold	Fisher	LeCompte
Auchincloss	Flannagan	LeFevre
Bakewell	Fletcher	Lemke
Banta	Fogarty	Lesinski
Barrett	Folger	Lewis, Ky.
Bates, Ky.	Foote	Lewis, Ohio
Bates, Mass.	Forand	Lichtenwalter
Battle	Fuller	Lodge
Beall	Fulton	Love
Beckworth	Gallagher	Lucas
Bender	Gamble	Lyle
Bennett, Mich.	Garmatz	Lynch
Bennett, Mo.	Gary	McConnell
Bishop	Gathings	McCormack
Blackney	Gavin	McCowen
Bland	Gearhart	McCulloch
Blatnik	Gillette	McDonough
Boggs, Del.	Gillie	McDowell
Boggs, La.	Goff	McGarvey
Bolton	Goodwin	McGregor
Bonner	Gordon	McMahon
Boykin	Gore	McMillan, S. C.
Bradley	Gorski	McMillen, Ill.
Bramblett	Gossett	Mack
Brehm	Graham	MacKinnon
Brooks	Granger	Macy
Brophy	Grant, Ala.	Madden
Brown, Ga.	Grant, Ind.	Mahon
Brown, Ohio	Gregory	Maloney
Bryson	Griffiths	Manasco
Buchanan	Gross	Mansfield
Buck	Gwinn, N. Y.	Marcantonio
Buffett	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Bulwinkle	Hagen	Mason
Burke	Hale	Mathews
Burleson	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meade, Md.
Busbey	Hall, Leonard W.	Merrow
Butler	Halleck	Meyer
Byrne, N. Y.	Hand	Michener
Byrnes, Wis.	Hardy	Miller, Conn.
Camp	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Md.
Canfield	Harris	Miller, Nebr.
Cannon	Harrison	Mills
Carroll	Hart	Mitchell
Carson	Harvey	Monroney
Case, N. J.	Havenner	Morgan
Case, S. Dak.	Hays	Morris
Chadwick	Hébert	Morrison
Chelf	Hedrick	Morton
Chenoweth	Heffernan	Muhlenberg
Chiperfield	Hendricks	Multer
Church	Herter	Mundt
Clason	Heselton	Murdock
Clevenger	Hess	Murray, Tenn.
Coffin	Hill	Murray, Wis.
Cole, Kans.	Hinshaw	Nicholson
Cole, Mo.	Hobbs	Nixon
Cole, N. Y.	Hoeven	Nodar
Colmer	Hoffman	Norblad
Combs	Holmes	Norrell
Cooley	Hope	Norton
Cooper	Horan	O'Brien
Corbett	Huber	O'Hara
Cotton	Hull	O'Konski
Cox	Isacson	Pace
Cravens	Jackson, Wash.	Passman
Crawford	Jarman	Patman
Crosser	Javits	Patterson
Crow	Jenison	Peterson
Cunningham	Jenkins, Ohio	Pfeifer
Curtis	Jenkins, Pa.	Philbin
Dague	Jennings	Phillips, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Jensen	Pickett
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Ill.	Plumley
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Ind.	Poage
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Potter
Dawson, Utah	Jones, N. C.	Potts
Deane	Jones, Wash.	Poulson
Delaney	Jonkman	Preston
Devitt	Judd	Price, Fla.
D'Ewart	Karsten, Mo.	Price, Ill.
Dingell	Kean	Priest
Dirksen	Kearney	Rains
Dolliver	Kearns	Ramey
Domengeaux	Keating	Rankin
Dondero	Keefe	Rayburn
Donohue	Kelley	Redden
Doughton	Kennedy	Reed, Ill.
Douglas	Keogh	Reed, N. Y.
Durham	Kerr	Rees
Eaton	Kersten, Wis.	Reeves
Ellis	Kilburn	Richards
Ellsworth	Kilday	Riehlman
Elsaesser	Kirwan	Riley
Elston	Klein	Rivers
Engel, Mich.	Knutson	Rizley
Engle, Calif.	Kunkel	Rockwell
Rogers, Mass.	Smathers	Rogers, Fla.
Rohrbough	Smith, Kans.	Vail
Rooney	Smith, Va.	Van Zandt
Russell	Smith, Wis.	Vinson
Sabath	Snyder	Vorys
Sadlak	Somers	Vursell
Sadowski	Spence	Wadsworth
Sanborn	Stanley	Walter
Sarbacher	Stefan	Weichel
Sasscer	Stevenson	Welch
Schwabe, Mo.	Stratton	Wheeler
Schwabe, Okla.	Sundstrom	Whitaker
Scoblick	Taber	Whitten
Scott, Hardie	Talle	Wigglesworth
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Taylor	Williams
Scrivner	Teague	Wilson, Ind.
Seely-Brown	Thomas, Tex.	Wilson, Tex.
Shafer	Thompson	Winstead
Short	Tibbott	Wolcott
Sikes	Tollefson	Wolverton
Simpson, Ill.	Towe	Wood
Simpson, Pa.	Trimble	Woodruff
	Twyman	Worley

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—49

Barden	Jackson, Calif.	Powell
Bell	Johnson, Calif.	Regan
Bloom	Johnson, Okla.	Rich
Buckley	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Celler	Kee	Ross
Chapman	Kefauver	St. George
Clark	King	Sheppard
Clippinger	Lane	Smith, Maine
Coudert	Larcade	Smith, Ohio
Courtney	Ludlow	Stigler
Dorn	Lusk	Stockman
Eberharter	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	West
Fallon	O'Toole	Whittington
Harless, Ariz.	Peden	Youngblood
Hartley	Phillips, Tenn.	
Holifield	Ploeser	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Buckley.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. King.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Ross with Mr. Larcade.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Eberharter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 651, Rept. No. 2249), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived, and it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations.

ESTABLISHING THE FRANCIS SCOTT KEY NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 652, Rept. No. 2250), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 150, to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Monument, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the World Health Organization (hereinafter referred to as the Organization), the constitution of which was adopted in New York on July 22, 1946, by the International Health Conference for the establishment of an International Health Organization, and deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

"SEC. 2. The President shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the World Health Assembly of the Organization not to exceed three delegates of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the World Health Assembly. One of the delegates shall be designated as the chief delegate. Whenever the United States becomes entitled to designate a person to serve on the Executive Board of the Organization, under article 24 of the constitution of the Organization, the President shall designate a representative of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and may designate not to exceed one alternate to attend sessions of the Executive Board. Such representative must be a graduate of a recognized medical school and have spent not less than three years in active practice as a physician or surgeon. Such representative shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per annum for such period or periods as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is thus designated shall be entitled to receive such compensation: *Provided*, That no person shall serve as such representative, delegate, or alternate until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

"(a) such sums, not to exceed $1,920,000 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, including those incurred by the Interim Commission, as apportioned by the Health Assembly in accordance with Article 56 of the Constitution of the Organization; and

"(b) such additional sums, not to exceed $83,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

"(1) salaries of the representative and alternate provided for in section 2 hereof, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

"(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

"SEC. 4. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the understanding that, in the absence of any provision in the World Health Organization Constitution for withdrawal from the Organization, the United States reserves its right to withdraw from the Organization on a one-year notice: *Provided, however*, That the financial obligations of the United States to the Organization shall be met in full for the Organization's current fiscal year.

"SEC. 5. In adopting this joint resolution, the Congress does so with the understanding that nothing in the Constitution of the World Health Organization in any manner commits the United States to enact any specific legislative program regarding any matters referred to in said Constitution."

And the House agree to the same.

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
WALTER H. JUDD,
WIRT COURTNEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate joint resolution after the resolving clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute for both the Senate joint resolution and the House amendment. The substitute agreed to substantially follows the House amendment. Except for clarifying, clerical, and minor changes, the differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are explained below.

The House amendment provided that the representative of the United States on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization must be a graduate of a recognized medical school and have spent not less than 10 years in active practice as a physician or surgeon. There was no corresponding provision in the Senate joint resolution. The conference substitute retains the House provision, with the 10-year requirement reduced to 3 years. In this connection it will be noted that the Senate conferees accepted the House provision requiring the representative to be designated by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The House amendment provided that no citizen of or resident in the United States shall participate in any session, conference, or meeting, or other work of the World Health Organization or of any subordinate committee or organization thereof, without the consent of the Secretary of State. The conference substitute omits this provision. However, the House provision requiring investigation as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been retained.

The Senate joint resolution authorized the appropriation annually of such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization and such additional sums as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization. The House amendment authorized an annual appropriation of not to exceed $1,920,000 for expenses of the Organization and further provided that "the annual United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the Organization shall not be greater in proportion than the United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the United Nations" and authorized additional sums for United States participation in the activities of the Organization. The conference substitute retains the House provision putting a ceiling of $1,920,000 per annum on the United States share of the expenses and all other provisions of section 3 authorizing appropriations, except the requirement quoted above as to quota of contribution.

The Senate conferees also agreed to the House provision (sec. 5) making clear that nothing in the constitution of the World Health Organization "in any manner commits the United States to enact any specific legislative program regarding any matters referred to in said constitution."

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
WALTER H. JUDD,
WIRT COURTNEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the June 7 issue of Steel Magazine.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House entered on yesterday, it is in order to consider today bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CERTAIN PROPERTIES ABUTTING EASTERN AVENUE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the Private Calendar that was called today there appeared the bill (S. 2040) for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia. The amounts that were stated in the bill were correct but the total is not correct. I ask unanimous consent that the total in that bill be corrected to correspond with the amounts set opposite the names of the claimants.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the amount in the engrossment of the bill.

There was no objection.

REGULATING LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 612) to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain addi-

tional investments, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 36 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, is hereby repealed, and that section 35 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Investments of funds of domestic companies: A domestic company shall invest its funds only in—

"(1) Bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness of the United States, any State, Territory or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Dominion of Canada, any province of the Dominion of Canada, or of any administration, agency, authority, or instrumentality of any of the political units enumerated.

"(2) Bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness guaranteed or insured as to principal and interest by the United States, any State, Territory or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Dominion of Canada, any Province of the Dominion of Canada, or by an administration, agency, authority, or instrumentality of any of the political units enumerated.

"(3) Bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued, guaranteed, or insured as to principal and interest by a city, county, drainage district, road district, school district, tax district, town, township, village or other civil administration, agency, authority, instrumentality or subdivision of a State, Territory or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, or of the Dominion of Canada, or any province thereof, provided such obligations are authorized by law and are (a) direct and general obligations of the issuing, guaranteeing, or insuring governmental unit, administration, agency, authority, district, subdivision, or instrumentality; or (b) payable from designated revenues pledged to the payment of the principal and interest thereof.

"(4) Legally authorized bonds, debentures, notes, collateral trust certificates, and other such evidences of indebtedness, and share certificates, which have been or may be issued by (a) the Federal home-loan bank; (b) the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; (c) any Federal savings and loan association; (d) the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; (e) the Federal Farm Loan Board; (f) any Federal land bank; (g) the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank; (h) any housing authority organized under the public housing laws of the District of Columbia or any State of the United States, or in notes, bonds, or loans secured by mortgage or deed of trust insured under the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or guaranteed or insured pursuant to the provisions of title III of an act of Congress of the United States of June 22, 1944, cited as the 'Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944,' as heretofore or hereafter amended, or by any entity, corporation, or agency which has been or which may be created by or authorized by any act which has been enacted, or which may hereafter be enacted by the Congress of the United States, or any amendment thereto, which has for its purpose the relief of, refinancing of, or assistance to owners of mortgaged or encumbered homes, farms, or other real estate.

"(5) (a) Bonds, notes, or loans secured by first lien on real estate in the United States or Dominion of Canada worth at least 40 percent more than the amount loaned thereon: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to any of the classes of securities mentioned in subsection (4) of this section, if guaranteed or insured in whole or in part as therein provided; but nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit a company from renewing or extending a loan for the original amount where there has been a shrinkage in the value of such real estate nor to prohibit a company from accepting, as part payment for real estate sold by it, a lien thereon for more than the percentage herein specified of the purchase price of such real estate. For the purpose of this section real estate shall not be deemed to be encumbered by reason of the existence of taxes or assessments that are not delinquent, instruments creating or reserving mineral, oil, water, or timber rights, rights-of-way, joint driveways, sewer rights, rights of walls, nor by reason of building restrictions or other restrictive covenants, nor when such real estate is subject to lease in whole or in part whereby rents or profits are reserved to the owner.

"(b) Bonds, notes, or loans secured by first lien on leasehold estates in improved real property located in the United States or Dominion of Canada, where such real property is unencumbered except by rentals to accrue therefrom to the owner of the fee, and where there is no condition or right of reentry or forfeiture under which such lien can be cut off, subordinated or otherwise disturbed, so long as the lessee is not in default, provided the value of such leasehold, with improvements thereon shall be at least 50 percent more than the amount loaned thereon: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to any of the classes of securities mentioned in subsection (4) of this section, if guaranteed or insured in whole or in part as therein provided. Such loan shall be completely amortized during the unexpired portion of the lease or leasehold estate securing its payment.

"(c) Loans or advances by a company for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, additions, or improvements to homes or other buildings on improved real estate upon which real estate or upon a leasehold estate in said real estate such company then holds a first lien to secure a loan previously made: *Provided,* That no such loan or advance shall be made in a sum in excess of $2,000: *And provided further,* That the amount of such loan or advance when added to the balance due on the original indebtedness shall not exceed the amount originally secured by the first lien.

"(d) Ground rents in the District of Columbia or any State of the United States: *Provided,* That in the case of unexpired redeemable ground rents the premiums paid, if any, shall be amortized over the period between the date of acquisition and earliest redemption date, or charged off at any time prior to redemption date; and in the case of expired redeemable ground rents the premiums paid, if any, shall be charged off at the time of acquisition. Redeemable ground rents purchased at a discount shall be carried at an amount not greater than the cost of acquisition.

"(6) Notes, bonds, or trust certificates secured by any transportation equipment leased or sold to a common carrier, domiciled within the United States or the Dominion of Canada, with gross revenues exceeding $1,000,000 in the fiscal year immediately preceding purchase, which notes, bonds, or trust certificates provide a right to receive determined rental, purchase, or other fixed obligatory payments adequate to retire the obligations within 20 years from date of issue and also provide (a) for the vesting of title to such equipment, free from encumbrance in a corporate trustee or (b) for the creation of a first lien on such equipment, provided at the date of purchase such notes, bonds, or trust certificates are not in default as to principal or interest.

"(7) Bonds and other evidences of indebtedness of any solvent corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada, or any province thereof: *Provided,* That (1) no company shall invest an amount in excess of 2 percent of its admitted assets in any one issue of such obligations of any one corporation; (2) the net earnings of the issuing corporation available for its fixed charges for a period of five fiscal years next preceding the date of acquisition by such insurance company shall have averaged yearly, and during the last year of said 5-year period shall have been not less than one and one-half times its annual fixed charges at the time of the investment, or, if a new issue, as shown by the pro forma statement of the corporation; and (3) there shall have been no defaults in interest thereon, or on any such obligations of such corporation which are of equal or higher priority with those purchased, during the period of 5 years next preceding the date of acquisition, or, if outstanding for less than 5 years, at any time since said obligations were issued. The term 'net earnings available for fixed charges', as used herein, shall mean the net income after deducting all operating and maintenance expenses and taxes other than Federal, State, and District of Columbia income taxes, but nonrecurring items of income and expense may be eliminated. The term 'fixed charges' as used herein shall include interest on all of the fixed interest-bearing debt of the corporation outstanding and maturing in more than 1 year, as of the date of acquisition, and in case of investment in contingent interest obligations, said term shall also include maximum annual contingent interest as of said date. The earnings of all predecessor, merged, consolidated, or purchased companies may be included through the use of consolidated or pro forma statements provided the fixed charges of all such companies are also included.

"(8) Bank certificates of deposit and bankers' acceptances, and other bills of exchange of the kind and maturities made eligible by law for purchase in the open market by Federal Reserve banks.

"(9) Preferred stock of any solvent corporation (other than its own) created under the laws of the United States, or of any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada, or any Province thereof, where such corporation has not failed in any one of the three fiscal years next preceding such investment, to have earned a sum applicable to dividends on such preferred stock equal at least to three times the amount of dividends due in that year, or where in case of issuance of new preferred stock such earnings applicable to dividends are equal to at least three times the amount of pro forma annual dividend requirements after giving effect to such new financing, and where the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness, if any, of such corporation are eligible as investments under the provisions of subsection (7) of this section, and where the total investment in any one issue of such preferred stock of any one corporation does not exceed 1 percent of the investing company's admitted assets.

"(10) Common stocks of any solvent corporation (other than its own) created under the laws of the United States, or of any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada, or any Province thereof, which shall have paid common dividends in cash for not less than 5 years next preceding the purchase of such stocks, and where the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness, if any, and the preferred stock, if any, of such corporation are eligible as investments under the provisions of subsections (7) and (9), respectively, of this section, and where the total investment in the common stock of any one corporation does not exceed 1 percent of the investing company's admitted assets.

"(11) Loans upon the pledge of any of the securities aforesaid.

"(12) A life-insurance company may also purchase for its own benefit any policy of life insurance or other obligation of the company and claims of the holders thereof, and may lend to the holders of its life-insurance policies sums not exceeding in any case the reserve value of the policy at the time the loan is made, and for the payment of any such loan the policy and all amounts payable thereunder shall be pledged.

"(13) A company doing business in a foreign country may invest the funds required to meet its obligations in such country and in conformity to the laws thereof in the same kind of securities in such foreign country that such company is allowed by law to invest in the United States.

"(14) A life-insurance company may also acquire, hold, and convey real estate for the purposes and in the manner following:

"(a) the building in which it has its principal office and the land on which it stands;

"(b) such as shall be requisite for its convenient accommodation in the transaction of its business;

"(c) such as shall have been acquired for the accommodation of its business;

"(d) such as shall have been conveyed to it in satisfaction of debts, previously contracted, in the course of its dealings;

"(e) such as it shall have purchased at trustee sale or sales on judgments, decrees, or mortgages obtained or made for such debts; and

"(f) such as it may purchase or hold for the production of income. It may improve or otherwise develop in any manner such real estate and the improvements thereon, and may own, maintain, manage, collect, and receive income from, and sell or convey the same. No company may, in any period of 12 consecutive months, invest in or agree to pay for real estate, including improvements thereon, under the authority of this item (f) an aggregate amount in excess of 2 percent of its admitted assets as shown in its most recent annual statement; nor shall the total value of real estate and improvements thereon acquired or held by a company for the production of income under the provisions of this item (f) at any time exceed 5 percent of its said admitted assets. No investment shall be made by any company pursuant to this item (f) if such company then owns real estate having a total value in excess of 10 percent of its said admitted assets or if such investment will cause such company's aggregate investments in real estate owned by it to exceed 10 percent of its said admitted assets: *Provided*, That for the purpose of applying said 10 percent limitation real estate shall include all real estate then owned by the company and such real estate as it may have owned and sold on contract, to the extent of the balance unpaid on such contract of sale; or if the balance unpaid on account of real estate owned and sold by a company is secured by mortgage or other instrument, there shall be included as real estate the amount, if any, by which the balance unpaid exceeds 75 percent of the value of such real estate. A company may, subject to the limitations and conditions of this item (f), elect to consider property acquired as specified in items (c), (d), and (e) as real estate for the production of income as defined in this item (f). Such election shall be duly authorized and recorded by the board of directors or by a committee thereof charged with the duty of supervising loans or investments.

"All such real estate specified in items (c), (d), and (e) of this subsection (14), which shall not be necessary for its accommodation in the convenient transaction of its business, and which it has not elected to hold for the production of income, shall be sold by the company and disposed of within 5 years after it shall have acquired the title to the same, or within 5 years after the same shall have ceased to be necessary for the accommodation of its business, unless the company file with the Superintendent an application for extension of time, supported by such evidence as may be required by the Superintendent, establishing to his satisfaction that an extension would be to the advantage of the company and that the interests of the company would be affected adversely by a forced sale thereof, in which event the time for the sale may be extended to such time as the Superintendent shall direct.

"No loan or investment, except loans on the security of life-insurance policies, shall be made by any such company, unless the same shall have been authorized or be approved by the board of directors or by a committee thereof charged with the duty of supervising loans or investments.

"No such company shall subscribe to or participate in any underwriting of the purchase or sale of securities or property, jointly with any other corporation, firm, or person, or enter into any agreement to withhold from sale any of its securities or property; but the disposition of its assets shall at all times be within the control of the company.

"Nothing in this act shall prohibit a company from accepting in good faith, to protect its interests, securities or property, other than herein referred to, in repayment of or to secure debts due or to become due the company."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, line 10, after the word "or", insert "equipment."

Line 15, after the word "or", insert "equipment."

Page 11, line 3, strike out "may" and insert "shall."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATING BARBERS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4635) to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved June 7, 1938 (sec. 2–1111 D. C. Code, 1940 edition), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. All fees and charges payable under the provisions of this act shall be paid to the secretary-treasurer of the Board. The Board is hereby authorized to collect the following fees and charges and to refund any such fee or charge or portion thereof erroneously paid or collected under this act:

"(a) For the examination of an applicant for a certificate as a registered barber, $20.

"(b) For the issuance of a certificate as a registered barber, $5.

"(c) For the issuance of a renewal of a certificate as a registered barber, $10.

"(d) For the restoration of an expired certificate as a registered barber, $15.

"(e) For the examination of an applicant for a certificate as a registered barber apprentice, $15.

"(f) For the issuance of a certificate as a registered barber apprentice, $5.

"(g) For the issuance of a renewal of a certificate as a registered barber apprentice, $5.

"(h) For the restoration of an expired certificate as a registered barber apprentice, $10.

"(i) For registration of a private barber school or college, $50.

"(j) For annual renewal of registration of a private barber school or college, $25.

"(k) All students in a private barber school or college shall register with the Board and shall pay a fee of $2 for a certificate of registration as a student.

"(l) Any registered barber or apprentice whose certificate has been lost or destroyed shall, upon satisfying the Board of such loss or destruction and upon payment of a fee of $2, be given a duplicate certificate."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to increase the fee for inspection of barber shops so as to make that wholly special service self-sustaining. The necessity for this arises by reason of the acts of 1945 and 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSPITAL LIENS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6297) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for service rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2643) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens", approved June 30, 1939, is amended by inserting after the word "institution" a comma and the following: "and any agency of the United States or the District of Columbia,".

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act is amended by inserting after the word "institution" a comma and the following: "and any agency of the United States or the District of Columbia,".

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act is amended by inserting after the word "body" a comma and the following: "and of any agency of the United States or the District of Columbia,".

SEC. 4. Section 5 of such act is amended by inserting after the word "institution" the words "or agency."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make possible the imposition of a lien against any claim or against moneys recovered by a patient in a tort claim owed to a hospital where hospital services have been rendered, and there is no other way to secure the payment for such service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL O. BURDETTE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6327) to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropratic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any limitation relating to the time within which an application for a license must be filed, the Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia is authorized and directed to issue a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, and on condition that the said Samuel O. Burdette shall be found by said Commission to be otherwise qualified to practice under the provisions of said act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to make possible the issuance of a license to a qualified practitioner of the chiropractic art who was outside of the District of Columbia at the time the time limit was set for such qualification. This is in line with the practice of the Committee on the District of Columbia in permitting those who were absent for good cause or reason to receive a license after qualifying to practice their specialty.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF THE HEALING ART IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6524) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 25 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as reads: "An applicant who desires to obtain a license without examination, by virtue of a license issued to him by a State, Territory, or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States, or by a foreign country, shall submit proof, satisfactory to the Commission, that he is not less than 21 years of age and is of good moral character;" is amended so as to read: "An applicant who desires to obtain a license without examination, by virtue of a license issued to him by a State, Territory, or other jurisdiction forming a part of the United States, or by a foreign country, or by virtue of a certificate or diploma issued by a national examining board, shall submit proof, satisfactory to the Commission, that he is not less than 21 years of age, of good moral character, and a citizen of the United States;".

SEC. 2. So much of section 26 of said act as reads: "Each applicant for a license to practice the healing art, to be issued after examination, shall submit with his application proof satisfactory to the Commission that he is not less than 21 years of age; that he is of good moral character;" is amended so as to read: "Each applicant for a license to practice the healing art, to be issued after examination, shall submit with his application proof satisfactory to the Commission that he is not less than 21 years of age; that he is of good moral character; a citizen of the United States;".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, heretofore the applicant could qualify for a professional license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia without being a citizen of the United States. Most of the jurisdictions of the country today require, among other things, that the applicant be a citizen. This brings it in line with other jurisdictions and merely adds to existing law by requiring citizenship as a qualification.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSANITY PROCEEDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6598) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939, and I ask unanimous consent for its consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939, is amended to read:

"SEC. 2. Upon the filing with the court of a verified petition as hereinabove provided, accompanied by the affidavits of two or more responsible residents of the District of Columbia setting forth that they believe the person therein named to be insane or of unsound mind, the length of time they have known such person, that they believe such person to be incapable of managing his own affairs, and that such person is not fit to be at large or go unrestrained, and that if such person be permitted to remain at liberty the rights of persons and property will be jeopardized or the preservation of public peace imperiled or the commission of crime rendered probable, and that such person is a fit subject for treatment by reason of his or her mental condition, the court, or any judge thereof in vacation, may, in its or his discretion, issue an attachment for the immediate apprehension and detention, for preliminary examination, of such person in St. Elizabeths Hospital and, unless found by the staff of St. Elizabeths Hospital to be of sound mind, therein for a period not exceeding 30 days. Any person so apprehended and detained shall be given an examination within 5 days of his admission into St. Elizabeths Hospital by the staff of St. Elizabeths Hospital. The superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital is hereby authorized to receive and detain such persons, at the expense of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The fourth paragraph of section 2 of said act is hereby amended to read:

"If as a result of examination, the staff of Gallinger Municipal Hospital or St. Elizabeths Hospital shall find that any person detained in Gallinger Municipal Hospital or St. Elizabeths Hospital pursuant to the provisions of this section is of sound mind, he shall be discharged forthwith by said Gallinger Municipal Hospital or St. Elizabeths Hospital, and the petition, if any, shall be dismissed."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely permits transfer directly to St. Elizabeths Hospital of those psychopathic cases who now must go through Gallinger. It helps to bypass Gallinger Hospital. I think it is better for the patients; it is cheaper for the District of Columbia, and in the interest of the District of Columbia and of the patient who must eventually go to St. Elizabeths Hospital.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, WHITE HOUSE POLICE, AND FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5047) to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Commttee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the annual basic salary of (1) any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, whose rate of compensation was increased by the act entitled "An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia", approved July 14, 1945, as amended; and (2) any pilot or marine engineer of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia whose rate of compensation was increased by the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An Act

to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia' ", approved July 3, 1945, is hereby increased by $800.

(b) The additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential provided for in section 2 of such act of July 14, 1945, shall be computed as though this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of January 1, 194°.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "$800" and insert "$500."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "January" and insert "July."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to increase the salaries of police, firemen, and members of the Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments in the District of Columbia by $500 from July 1948. However, there is an understanding in the committee that in the event that the amount that may be provided by way of salary increase for Federal employees should be larger or smaller, or there should be no increase at all, then, of course, this bill would be modified in accordance with that understanding. Since no action has been taken in the Senate, there will be opportunity to adjust it in line with whatever action is taken.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF DECEASED MEMBERS AND RETIRED MEMBERS OF POLICE DEPARTMENT AND FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6295) to provide increased pensions for widows and chilldren of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; and I ask for its consideration in the House in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as amended, is amended by striking out from the fourth paragraph the following language:

"In case of the death of any member of the Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, before or after retirement from the service thereof, leaving a widow, or a child or children under 16 years of age, the widow shall be entitled to receive relief from the said policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia, in an amount not exceeding $60 per month, and each child under the age of 16 years in an amount not exceeding $10 per month:"

and substituting in lieu thereof the following language:

"If any member of the Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall die as the sole and exclusive result of injury sustained through violence or external force within 1 year from the time such injury was sustained, and such injury was sustained, in the case of a member of the Police Department, while actually performing his duty as such member in making or attempting to make an arrest, or in the prevention of the commission of a crime about to be committed in his presence, or in the rescue of persons, or in responding to an emergency call, or in doing any other act which exposes such member to extraordinary hazard and which must be performed without regard to his personal safety, or, in the case of a member of the Fire Department, while actually performing his duty as such member in fighting a fire, or in the rescue of persons, or in going to a fire or in responding to an emergency call, or in doing any other act which exposes such member to extraordinary hazard and which must be performed without regard to his personal safety, and such member leaves a widow, or child or children under 16 years of age, the widow shall be entitled to receive relief in an amount not exceeding $125 per month, and each child under the age of 16 years shall be entitled to receive relief in an amount not exceeding $25 per month; and when any other member of the Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall die, before or after retirement from the service thereof, leaving a widow, or a child or children under 16 years of age, the widow shall be entitled to receive relief in an amount not exceeding $100 per month, and each child under the age of 16 years shall be entitled to receive relief in an amount not exceeding $25 per month."

SEC. 2. All widows and children of deceased members of the Police Department or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia receiving relief under the provisions of section 12 of the act of Congress, approved September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as amended, shall be entitled to receive relief to the same extent and in the same manner as is provided by the fourth paragraph of said section as amended by the first section of this act: *Provided*, That no relief shall be increased under the authority of this section for any period prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 5 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved July 1, 1930 (39 Stat. 839), be, and the same hereby is, amended by striking out therefrom the figures "3½" and substituting in lieu thereof the figure "5."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second month following the date of approval of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "amended", strike out the balance of the line and all of line 9, and insert "as follows the first sentence thereof is hereby amended to read as follows."

Page 2, line 3, strike out all of lines 3 to 12, both inclusive.

Page 3, line 7, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert "eighteen."

Page 3, line 10, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert "eighteen."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "sixteen" and insert the word "eighteen."

Page 3, line 18, strike out the word "sixteen" and insert the word "eighteen."

Page 3, line 19, after the word "month", insert "*Provided*, That upon the remarriage of any widow granted relief under the provisions of this act such relief shall cease, and relief granted to or for any child or children under the age of 18 years shall cease upon their reaching that age: *Provided further*, That no widow, child, or children of any deceased member of the said Police Department or Fire Department resulting from any marriage contracted subsequent to the date of retirement of such member shall be entitled to any relief under the provisions of this act."

Page 4, line 14, after the word "act", insert "*Provided*, That no relief shall be increased under the authority of this section for any period prior to the effective date of this act. Any child or children of a deceased member of the Police Department or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which child or children had attained the age of 16 years but had not attained the age of 18 years on the effective date of this act shall be entitled to receive relief as provided by the fourth paragraph of said section 12, as amended by the first section of this act, until the attainment of the age of 18 years: *Provided*, That no relief shall be granted under the authority of this section for any period prior to the effective date of this act."

Page 5, line 2, strike out "39" and insert "46."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who is a member of the House District of Columbia Committee. Under existing law, the retirement amount that is available would be $60 a month and $10 per month for each child under the age of 16. That is quite out of line with the general retirement scale that prevails both in and out of the Federal Government.

This bill is designed to bring it more nearly into line with what is paid under the general retirement system. The employees' contribution is raised from 3½ percent to 5 percent. The added benefits will increase the cost to the District by about $10,000 a year. At the present time there is a deficit of $140,000. This bill is designed to bring this system more nearly in line with the general system.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HORAN, STEFAN, CHURCH, STOCKMAN, ANDREWS of Alabama, BATES of Kentucky, and FOGARTY.

COST OF POLICE AND FIRE DETAILS AT THEATERS, ETC.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6452) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making

appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 20 (a) of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, be amended by adding thereto an additional paragraph to read as follows:

"When, in the opinion of the Chief Engineer of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, it is necessary to post firemen at, on, and about the licensed premises for the protection of the public safety, in addition to the license fee provided for above, such owners or managers shall pay a further monthly permit fee, to be determined monthly by the said Chief Engineer, based upon a reasonable estimate of the number of hours to be spent by firemen at, on, and about the licensed premises, such fee to be payable in advance on the first day of the month for which the permit is sought. The firemen so assigned shall be charged for by the hour at the wage rate of the firemen so assigned in effect on the first day of the month for which the permit is sought."

SEC. 2. That paragraph 20 (c) of section 7 of said act be amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and adding the following words: "*Provided further*, That when, in the opinion of the Major and Superintendent of Police and the Chief Engineer of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, or either of them, it is necessary to post policemen or firemen, or both, at, on, and about the licensed premises for the protection of the public safety, in addition to the license fee provided for above, such owners or managers shall pay a further monthly permit fee, to be determined monthly by the said Major and Superintendent and Chief Engineer, or either of them, based upon a reasonable estimate of the number of hours to be spent by policemen and firemen at, on, and about the licensed premises, this fee to be payable in advance on the first day of the month for which the permit is sought. Policemen and firemen so assigned shall be charged for by the hour at the basic daily wage rate of the policemen and firemen so assigned in effect the first day of the month for which the permit is sought."

SEC. 3. That paragraph 23 (a) of section 7 of said act be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph to read as follows:

"When, in the opinion of the Major and Superintendent of Police and Chief Engineer of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, or either of them, it is necessary to post policemen or firemen, or both, at, on, and about the licensed premises for the protection of the public safety, in addition to the license fee provided for above, such owners or managers shall pay a further monthly permit fee, to be determined monthly by the said Major and Superintendent and Chief Engineer, or either of them, based upon a reasonable estimate of the number of hours to be spent by policemen and firemen, or either of them, at, on, and about the licensed premises, such fee to be payable in advance on the first day of the month for which the permit is sought. Policemen and firemen so assigned shall be charged for by the hour at the basic hourly wage rate of the policemen and firemen so assigned in effect on the first day of the month for which the permit is sought."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under existing law in the District of Columbia, the fees imposed for safety purposes and for the assignment of police and firemen are inequitable in the sense that they bear no real relationship to the amount of space that is involved and the hazards that exist. So this bill is designed to correct existing law so as to make those fees more nearly commensurate with the kind of service that is rendered by the police and firemen of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIABILITY FOR CAUSING DEATH BY WRONGFUL ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1265) to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1301 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1301. Liability: Whenever by an injury done or happening within the limits of the District of Columbia the death of a person shall be caused by the wrongful act, neglect, or default, of any person or corporation, and the act, neglect, or default is such as would, if death had not ensued, have entitled the party injured, or if the person injured be a married woman, have entitled her husband, either separately or by joining with the wife, to maintain an action and recover damages, the person who or corporation, which would have been liable if death had not ensued shall be liable to an action for damages for such death, notwithstanding the death of the person injured, even though the death shall have been caused under circumstances which constitute a felony; and such damages shall be assessed with reference to the injury resulting from such act, neglect, or default causing such death, to the spouse and next of kin of such deceased person, and shall also include the reasonable expenses of last illness and burial: *Provided*, That if there be a surviving spouse the jury shall allocate the portion of its verdict payable to the spouse and next of kin, respectively, according to the finding of damage to said spouse and next of kin: *Provided further*, That if in a particular case the verdict is deemed excessive the trial justice or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, on appeal of the cause, may order a reduction of the verdict: *And provided further*, That no action shall be maintained under this chapter in any case when the party injured by such wrongful act, neglect, or default has recovered damages therefor during the life of such party."

SEC. 2. Section 1303 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1303. Distribution of damages: The damages recovered in such action, except the amount specified by the verdict or judgment covering the reasonable expenses of last illness and burial, shall not be appropriated to the payment of the debts or liabilities of such deceased person, but shall inure to the benefit of his or her family and be distributed to the spouse and next of kin according to the allocation made by the verdict or judgment, or in the absence of such allocation, according to the provisions of the statute of distribution in force in said District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this act changes existing law in that it removes the limitation for recovery for death by wrongful act what is known as the old common law Lord Campbell Act, and the existing limitation of $10,000. The limit has been taken off. There is now no limit upon it. It also gives the right of both the trial and the appellate court to reduce the amount of damages awarded by jury and also leaves it up to the jury instead of the probate court to make the allocations of damages awarded by the jury.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSIBILITY OF CERTAIN TESTIMONY

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1266) to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1964. Testimony of surviving party: In any civil action against a person who, from any cause, is legally incapable of testifying, or against the committee, trustee, executor, administrator, heir, legatee, devisee, assignee, or other representative of a deceased person or of the person so incapable of testifying, no judgment or decree shall be rendered in favor of the plaintiff founded on the uncorroborated testimony of the plaintiff or of the agent, servant, or employee of the plaintiff as to any transaction with or action, declaration or admission of the deceased or incapable person; and in any such action, if the plaintiff or any agent, servant, or employee of the plaintiff testifies as to any transaction with or action, declaration, or admission of the deceased or incapable person, no entry, memorandum, or declaration, oral or written, by the deceased or incapable person, made while he was capable and upon his personal knowledge, shall be excluded as hearsay."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill designed merely for the preservation of testimony.

An amendment will be offered due to the incorrect designation of the section and I ask that this be considered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "1964" and insert in lieu thereof "1064."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL INJURY ACTIONS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1442) to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 235 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 235. On the death of any person in whose favor or against whom a right of action may have accrued for any cause prior to his death, said right of action shall survive in favor of or against the legal representative of the deceased: *Provided, however,* That in tort actions, the said right of action shall be limited to damages for physical injury and pain and suffering resulting therefrom."

SEC. 2. Section 327 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 327. Executors and administrators shall have full power and authority to commence and prosecute any personal action at law or in equity which the testator or intestate might have commenced and prosecuted: *Provided, however,* That in tort actions, the said right of action shall be limited to damages for personal injury and pain and suffering resulting therefrom; and they shall also be liable to be sued in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in any action at law or in equity, except as aforesaid, which might have been maintained against the deceased; and they shall be entitled to or answerable for costs in the same manner as the deceased would have been and shall be allowed for the same in their accounts, unless it shall appear that there were not probable grounds for instituting or defending the suits in which judgments or decrees shall have been given against them."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this provides for the survivorship of tort action. Originally the act as passed by the Senate included the right to recover for pain and suffering. The committee struck out and eliminated the right of recovery for pain and suffering.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "and" and insert "except for."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "and" and insert "except for."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDING AND RELEASING OF LIENS ON CERTIFICATES OF TITLE FOR MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAILERS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2406) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes" approved July 2, 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 739), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. The fee for recording liens or assignments of liens upon a certificate shall be the sum of $1 for each lien or assignment of lien on each motor vehicle or trailer contained in the instrument, which fee shall include the charge for recording the release of such lien."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended by the first section of this act, there shall be a fee of 50 cents for recording the release of a lien which is recorded under the provisions of such act of July 2, 1940, as amended, prior to the date of enactment of this act and no assignment of which is recorded under the provisions of such act of July 2, 1940, as amended, after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this act provides for the payment of $1 for the filing of liens, which also includes payment for the release. Heretofore, under existing law, there was a payment of 50 cents for the recording of liens and 50 cents for the recording of the release. The Commissioners have recommended passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE WITHOUT EXAMINATION OF LICENSES TO CERTAIN PERSONS TO ENGAGE IN BUSINESS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6106) to amend the act of December 20, 1914, to provide for the issuance, without examination, of licenses to certain persons to engage in business, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sixth paragraph of section 1 (b) of the Act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That any person engaged in any of the businesses herein enumerated during the 5-year period immediately preceding the date of enactment of this proviso shall be entitled to a license therefor without examination, upon application therefor."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 8 to 11 and lines 1 and 2 on page 2 and insert the following: "following: '*Provided further,* That any person (1) who throughout the 5-year period immediately preceding July 1, 1946, was engaged in the business of installing, maintaining, or repairing apparatus, equipment, fixtures, appliances, or wiring, using or conducting electric current, and (2) who devoted at least one-half of the time he engaged in such business during such period to work performed in the District of Columbia shall, upon application therefor made within 6 months after the date of enactment of this proviso, be entitled, without examination, to a license to continue to engage in substantially the same character of work as he carried on during such period: *And provided further,* That any person (1) who, during the 10-year period immediately preceding July 1, 1946, was engaged for an aggregate period of at least 5 years in the business of installing, maintaining, or repairing apparatus, equipment, fixtures, appliances, or wiring, using or conducting electric current; (2) who devoted at least one-half of the time he was engaged in such business during such aggregate period to work performed in the District of Columbia; (3) who left such business to serve on active duty in the armed forces of the United States; and (4) who has been released from such active duty under honorable conditions, shall, upon application therefor made within 6 months after the date of enactment of this proviso or within 6 months after the date of such release from active duty, whichever date is the later, be entitled, without examination, to a license to continue to engage in substantially the same character of work as he carried on during such aggregate period'."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA to the committee amendment: On page 3, at the end of line 6, strike the period, insert a colon and add the following: *"And, provided further,* That any person (1) who is licensed in any other jurisdiction to engage in the business of installing, maintaining, or repairing apparatus, fixtures, appliances, or wiring, used in conducting electric current, and (2) who has engaged in such business in such other jurisdiction for not less than 5 years immediately preceding his application for license in the District of Columbia, shall, upon application therefor, be entitled without examination to a license to engage in work of substantially the same character as that in which he is licensed to engage in such other jurisdiction, if such other jurisdiction through reciprocity accords equal rights to persons licensed in the District of Columbia who wish to engage in such work in such other jurisdictions."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I may say this is necessary because of the passage of the act of 1944 affecting electricians and because of the fact so many of them were in the service. Consideration had not been give to that fact. The passage of this act is therefore necessary to protect the rights of those who had prac-

ticed as electricians in the District prior to the war.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6451) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill to the House? I have been trying to get a report on the bill and am unable to get one. I am informed that there are no reports available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is correct. I think it was probably filed too late to have the report come from the Government Printing Office.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman withdraw it temporarily.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withdraw it temporarily, Mr. Speaker.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6759) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman whether those of us who oppose the bill will have an opportunity to speak in opposition to it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman could be recognized notwithstanding the fact that it is being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, but if the gentleman prefers an allocation of time, I could move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and then have limited debate on the bill.

Mr. KLEIN. I think that that might be better, Mr. Speaker. I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6759) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could not have 30 minutes on each side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is done in the expedition of time. I just conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] who labored so long on this matter. Suppose we agree on 40 minutes, 20 minutes on a side. That will give everybody an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I recognize there are several who want to speak on the bill, and in expediting the business before the House today it seems to me that those who want to speak should get time under the 5-minute rule, as well as in general debate, as the gentleman from Illinois suggests.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, there will be opportunity in Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule for all Members to express themselves on this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman suggests 40 minutes, with 20 minutes on a side?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am wondering whether the gentleman in charge of the bill will agree not to move to close the debate at the end of one speaker using 5 minutes. This is very important legislation. I do not think we should be confined to 20 minutes, that is, those opposing the measure and those favoring it

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say that the gentleman from Illinois will endeavor to be rather generous in the matter. This is imperative legislation, incidentally, and it must be passed by this Congress, because it involves the balancing of the budget for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6759, with Mr. CRAWFORD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. Incidentally, may I say that almost since the first of the year he has worked most diligently in connection with the sessions of the joint committee of the House and Senate in preparing a revenue bill for the District of Columbia. It has indeed been a labor of love, and he has done a masterful piece of work. I now pay great testimony to the work he has done for the District and his interest in the pending bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today carries the so-called combination sales tax, compensating use tax, excise tax, and revision of the income and franchise taxes in the District of Columbia.

May I say at the outset that I realize full well the controversial features of this legislation. I realize also the importance of it from the standpoint of meeting the revenue requirements of the District of Columbia. For 12 years I have been a member of the Fiscal Affairs Committee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and for the past 2 years chairman of the committee. Over a period of many months last year we went very thoroughly into a complete analysis of the entire financial structure of the District of Columbia.

May I say without any feeling of vanity on my part that for 30 years I have given a great deal of my time and effort to the problems of municipal finance, administration, and taxation. I realize full well the problems confronting the District of Columbia, as I have the problems confronting the cities in other parts of the country in which I have been interested down through that period of time. May I say that during that period I have never been so concerned with a problem confronting any community as I am at the present time with the problem confronting the District of Columbia.

We have in mind, of course, the tremendous increase in the cost of Government in the District, going from $42,000,000 in 1937 to a budget this year of over $100,000,000. We know that the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia recently approved a bill for a little over $99,000,000, which is $3,000,000 more even than the last year. We know that as a result of the pay-as-you-go policy here in the District, where we do not owe any money from the standpoint of municipal debt, tremendous sums of money are being expended for capital outlay projects from the current revenues of the year.

We have not borrowed any money for a long period of time. We have now reached the point in our municipal requirements that we must find some way to develop revenue so that these obligations can be met, and all necessary improvements carried forward. Today we are recommending a sales tax provision. For 30 years I have been opposed to a sales tax. For 10 years I have been one who has spearheaded the opposition to a sales tax in the District of Columbia. I opposed it last year, the year before, and every year before that, and along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] back in 1939 when the income tax and the sales tax was proposed, we recommended the income tax instead of the sales tax. Down through this period of years, because we have been unable to develop what might well be called an equitable income-tax system for the District of Columbia, we are forced to the position that we are now in. Let me give you a typical illustration of what we are

up against here. Last year when conditions got so bad that we had to find additional revenue, the question before us then was whether or not we were going to comply with the recommendations of the District Commissioners and adopt a sales tax. They were in oposition to any increase in the real estate tax. I took the position then, and I still think that position is correct today, that the real estate tax at that time was extremely low from the standpoint of comparable rates in other cities of the country. The result was that we inaugurated for the first time in 11 or 12 years an increase in the tax rate from $1.75 a thousand dollars to $2 per thousand dollars. In addition, the Board of Assessors here in the District revalued the District and put a 20 percent increase on the assessed valuation of the properties here, so that the net increase in the tax bill within the District of Columbia last year was approximately 30 percent over and above what it was the year before.

In other words, let us assume that a man was paying a thousand dollars in taxes a year ago. Under the bill that passed a year ago he is paying approximately $1,333. We are up against a situation with the possibilities of a Federal increase in salary which will reflect itself automatically in the District in the wages of all municipal employees; we are up against the possibility of adding seven or eight million dollars or more to our already heavy tax burden in the District of Columbia. In addition to that, we are utilizing all available funds from the sales of securities, as well as funds available in cash that will not be used during the fiscal year 1949, as a basis for adjusting the whole tax structure so that there will be no increase necessary in any sort of revenue to balance the 1949 budget if the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate is adopted. I see no reason why it should not be adopted. We are up against the situation this year that if the salary increases go through for the Federal Government, and as I say that will reflect itself in the cost of the District government, we will have to find at least seven or eight million dollars by some means to meet those obligations. For this reason, unless you want another substantial increase in the tax bill on property over and above the 30 percent that we gave them last year, we see no other way in which we can raise this money other than through a sales tax and a compensating use tax, which we are suggesting today.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand that there was an increase in the real-estate tax in the last year?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. For the first time in 11 years, I might say to the gentleman from Colorado, I recommended to the committee, and the committee adopted the recommendation, which was approved by the House and Senate and signed by the President, a bill to increase the tax rate from $1.75 a thousand dollars to $2 per thousand dollars. In addition to that, the Board of Assessors revalued the whole city, placing an increased value in the assessed valuation of 20 percent on residential and commercial property in the District.

Mr. CARROLL. Can the gentleman tell me how much revenue that tax increase yielded to the District?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Altogether, about $5,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL. In addition to that increase, do we need this sales tax also?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In order to balance the budget this year, which is $3,000,000 more than a year ago, according to the bill that has been approved by the Senate District Committee on Appropriations, we are utilizing funds which are now free cash to the amount of $1,600,000, plus the sale of securities of $4,300,000. In other words, we will balance the budget if the Federal salary increase does not go through. In that event as the committee report shows the effective date the bill will become law will be July 1, 1949. We have an understanding within the committee and the Senate committee on that matter.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HAND. To what extent do we now assess property in the District of Columbia? That is, about what proportion of its full and true value is it assessed?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In an examination we made a year ago, I had a spot-check made by Assessor Dent of a few hundred sales in the District of Columbia between 1945 and 1947, the selling price and the assessed value on each of those properties. The result of that was that the myth that has always existed that property was assessed far in excess of its real value was completely exploded. According to the figures given to me by the chairman of the Board of Assessors, in regard to apartment houses they were assessed at 79 percent of their sales value; in the case of business property, about 76 percent; and residence property about 62 percent.

Mr. HAND. In view of the fact that that runs between 65 and 75 percent of the true value, is the gentleman not of the opinion that the $2 rate is still a reasonable rate compared to most tax rates?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I wonder if the gentleman would tell the committee the difficulties of the limitation of taxable real estate in the District of Columbia, which renders rather difficult the hope of raising sufficient revenues from the real estate in the District of Columbia proper.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, we can well understand the large amount of property owned in the District of Columbia by the Federal Government. On the other hand, perhaps with the exception of New York City and Chicago, we have the highest per capita value in the District of Columbia of any city in the country. Nevertheless, I do not want it to be understood that the District of Columbia is in any financial distress. It is in one of the most favorable financial conditions of any city in the country. But we cannot meet the additional costs in the District of Columbia which will add approximately, together with the deficiencies which we will run across next year, $15,000,000 or $16,000,000. If we add that to the tax burden on real and personal property, in addition to the 30 percent we added last year, it will mean that in 2 years we will just increase the tax burden on the property owners of the District of Columbia 100 percent. I am not willing to become a party to that proposition.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Would the gentleman say that the tax levy and the assessment of property in the District of Columbia is comparable to other cities in the country?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I just answered that question. I think, relatively speaking, that the tax levy is relatively low in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRANGER. And what about the assessed valuation?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I just said a moment ago that it represents from 62 to 79 percent of the actual value, an average of about 70 percent.

Mr. GRANGER. How does that compare with other cities?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Generally speaking, I believe the comparison is fair with most large cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Is it not a fact that the tax rate in the District of Columbia or the city of Washington has the lowest tax rate of any large city in the United States?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The only exception is the city of Los Angeles. That city has an adjusted rate lower than the District. One other is the city of Milwaukee.

Mr. WELCH. Oh, no. We cannot accept the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Those are the only ones that have a lower adjusted tax rate.

Mr. WELCH. The city of Los Angeles tax rate is over $5 on the hundred. In San Francisco, the city in which I reside, the tax rate is $5.50 per $100. Washington is absolutely the lowest taxed city in the United States.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I disagree with the gentleman on the adjusted rate. According to my records San Francisco and Los Angeles have a higher rate but a 50-percent assessment to full value.

Mr. BRADLEY. How does the tax apply to hotel accommodations?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. There is no relationship to hotel accommodations.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish to say that the tax paid in Washington is commensurate to similar taxes in my home territory.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find that is so although in his State they have the sales tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has finally yielded to the pressure and influence of the tax evaders here in the District of Columbia after all these years. I know the pressure was great. He states that there has been an increase in the real-estate tax of 25 percent. Meanwhile, property values have gone up from 100 to 500 percent and revenues from business property as well as residential have increased from 100 to 300 and 400 percent.

I feel that the sales-tax provision in this bill is manifestly unfair, unjust, and unwarranted. It is another effort to place the burden upon those who can least afford to bear it. If the committee had familiarized themselves with the real facts they would not have permitted themselves to be bludgeoned and influenced by the real-estate lobbyists and big tax evaders in the District of Columbia. They would easily find that the real-estate tax could be increased not only the 25 percent it has been in the last 11 years, but by an additional 25 or 50 percent. That would give the District the revenue it needs.

How about the personal-property tax? We have in this District thousands of people who because they can evade the tax at home in the various States, come down here to the District of Columbia. If the personal-property-tax law here were rigidly and decently enforced and an additional fair increase in the real-estate tax were imposed, the District would derive all the money it requires, and a sales tax would not be necessary.

I have communications from many many many consumers and other organizations representing the people of this city who, I think, are entitled to our consideration in preference to the real property owners of the District.

I am of the opinion that the sales tax is unjustifiable, as I stated; and I hope that we will not deviate from the position we have taken and considered many times when we have refused to be influenced by the tax evaders here.

The consumer today is paying tremendous prices for everything outside of the exceptions that are in this bill, clothing, shoes, everything they are obliged to buy, especially those with large families; and these big property owners, these rich, wealthy people who own this property here naturally do not consume very much because their families are small, but to the wage earners, the workers, whose families as a rule are much larger, four, five, and six to a family, it will mean hundreds of dollars a year to them in this additional tax because under the provisions of the bill instead of a 2 percent tax it will be 4 percent. Consequently, I hope the House will refuse to vote favorably on this, will vote down section 2 in this bill and stop imposing additional burdens on those who can least afford them. That is my position. I have lived in the city of Washington for many years and I know some of the properties that could be acquired for three, four, and five thousand dollars that today are worth $25,000 and $50,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know when the property in the District was revalued?

Mr. SABATH. It was revalued last year, as I understand, and they added 25 percent on the so-called revaluation; but I know that the tax on real estate in the city is lower than in any other large city in the United States. I know the figures will bear me out.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's remarks indicate that the District does not have a personal property tax. Is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. Yes there is, but very little tax is collected.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, of course they have a personal property tax in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SABATH. I repeat they have it but they do not collect it. They should be able to collect enough personal property taxes so that this unfair, burdensome tax on persons of low income would not be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I arise in opposition to the proposal to impose a sales tax on the residents of the District of Columbia. I do this because the sales tax means that the low-income groups are the ones which will be forced to pay the most under this sort of revenue raising measure. A 2 percent retail sales tax would consume more than 1 percent of the total income of the poorest families and less than one-third of 1 percent of the total income of the richest families.

The result of the sales tax would be to drive the low-income families further into debt and to impose it would literally take food out of the mouths of such families and make their means of livelihood that much harder to achieve. This tax will hit larger families much harder than the small families because the larger units will have to spend more of their incomes on items which would be liable under this measure. Furthermore, the burden on the low income levels is increased by the relative importance of a-fraction-of-a-cent tax on small purchases. There is no arguing the fact that the imposition of a sales tax would impose a real burden on the groups who can least afford it.

In 1944, one-fourth of our urban families spent for living expenses more than they received in income. It is easy to imagine what the effect of a sales tax would be on the families in the District of Columbia when one considers the cost of living in the District is the highest in the country. Furthermore, in every low-income family virtually all expenses are for necessities so that a sales tax, even though it exempts food and medicine, would be a tax on necessities. The sales tax is unsound economically and unjust socially and places too much of the burden of taxation on the people who need help the most.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has repeatedly refused to do anything about passing legislation which would help to control the high cost of living and bring to a halt the spiral of inflation. I think that it is high time for this Congress to consider the facts of life as they affect the people of this country. Instead of imposing a sales tax, they should enact legislation which would halt the upward spiral of prices.

If this body passes a sales tax today, it is my belief that at the next session, it will try to impose a sales tax on the country because of the fact that this year and the next, we will have to pay the cost of the Government by means of deficit spending. I am opposed to this type of spending because I feel that we should be able to maintain our expenses in line with our income. The country must realize that because of the Republican majority in this Congress refusing to do anything about the high cost of living, while at the same time imposing a tax-reduction measure and bringing into being a sales tax on the District of Columbia, it is failing in its duty to take care of the real needs of the people of our country as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I want to register as emphatically as I know how my opposition to a sales tax now being considered for the reasons stated above. It will place the greatest burden on the low-income families and it will also create a situation which will be very difficult for merchants to administer and which will allow the possibility of graft and corruption to take place in the compiling, assessment, and collection of this iniquitous tax.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, there are several tenets which apply and determine as to the justice of any tax. It should be levied according to ability to pay. Many people stop there. It should also be levied according to the benefits received or damages done. Benefits to be received cause the need for taxes. It should take no more out of the common persons than is necessary to run the Government.

After listening to the last two speakers I feel there is another tenet that applies here; namely, it should always be levied against the other fellow.

Mr. Chairman, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which considers the District of Columbia appropriations, and I want you to know that we labor long and hard to see that we get 100 cents out of the taxpayers' dollar. We appropriate for a municipality and a State all in one.

We need a guiding standard for the levying of taxes around the Nation.

In the first place, in the income-tax field the Federal Government already usurps the total possibilities to such a great extent that this House was persuaded not more than 2 months ago to pass a reduction in the income tax over the President's veto. I feel that sales taxes should be reserved for State governments. Twenty-eight States wisely use this revenue possibility. The District of Columbia is at once a State as well as the city of Washington, the Nation's Capital. Property taxes are and should be a local matter, because only the people living in the locality can judge and gage the effect of property taxes upon the security of the taxpayers and the property owners of a district. Quite properly that is the situation here in the District. Here in the District of Columbia—and get this—only one person in eight pays any taxes. There are about 150,000 parcels of land, many of those parcels owned by one person, and so we figure there are about 100,000 people who own property here. There are about 88,000 who pay an income tax in the District, and they are the same people who own the property. So, it is easy to see that only one person in eight pays any taxes in the District. If this America of ours is so fine, it is certainly fine enough to be supported by every individual privileged to live here. Taxes will never be popular, but if you want justice in government, if you want those who derive the benefits of our great democracy to be protected, and benefit from its privileges, do not deny them the right of paying their full and just portion of that cost.

I happen to be against the income-tax provision in this bill, although I am not opposed to the bill. Why? Because the people that it is proposed to tax here are already taxed to a full extent for the Federal Government. They can move out of the District. I submit that the high hopes held for this source of revenue are rather apt to become abortive. On the other hand, the only way we can protect the District of Columbia from the great burdens placed upon our Fire Department, our Police Department, upon St. Elizabeths, and our other hospitals here in the District from the great hordes of people who come here to see their Nation's Capital, and sometimes become stranded, is by the imposition of a sales tax so that they may pay a part of the cost of supporting the Nation's Capital. If we do not do this, if we do not pass a sales tax, we will have to resort to other sources of revenue, and I submit the property taxes will not prove sufficient, because the area that is taxable is decreasing every year as we increase the Federal holdings, and I submit that the income tax is abortive, because we already have used up all the possibilities there.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the Committee on the necessity of a sales tax and increased income taxes for the District of Columbia. The only justification for these increased taxes would be if all other legitimate methods of financing had been exhausted and I submit that this has not been done.

By what process of reasoning is the payment of capital projects out of current income justified? When capital outlays for projects which will have a useful life of 20 to 25 years, or even less, are involved they should be paid out of borrowed funds, the loan to be amortized over a reasonable period of time. Thus those who enjoy the use of these improvements will participate in their payment and the burden will not be borne in toto by the taxpayer of today.

A study of the current District budget reveals that there is a total of $17,909,583 devoted to the payment of capital expenditures. Of this amount $5,023,283 is for schools, $5,250,000 for streets and bridges; $5,858,000 for sewer and water improvements; these capital items total $16,131,283 which should be raised by the sale of school and utility bonds. It has long been an accepted principle of public finance to pay operating expenses out of current revenues and to finance capital outlays by borrowing. Of course, the amount of the public debt must be limited and kept within the ability of the city to pay but the borrowing of money by a municipality should not be condemned per se.

In the home-rule bill under the consideration of the House, the District of Columbia would be permitted to borrow up to 3 percent of the assessed valuation of the land in the District—exclusive of Federal-owned property—for the purpose of capital improvements. This would amount to about $48,000,000 under present circumstances. I should say, however, that the act would not permit any borrowings without the authority of Congress and the consent of the people of the District. In this way much needed capital improvements could be undertaken without in any way increasing the taxpayers' burden.

Bonds and evidences of indebtedness of the District of Columbia would find a very ready market among the investors of the country and I venture the opinion that the demand would be so great that the securities would sell at a low interest rate and undoubtedly command a premium. Under all these circumstances it is difficult for me to understand why the committee, which has worked so hard on this budget problem, did not come up with its obvious solution.

I am not proposing an amendment to the bill to provide for the sale of bonds because it involves a number of different considerations such as a description of the property, the life of the improvement, the authority for the issue, and other legal and technical matters which cannot be handled in a hasty manner. I do urge the Congress, however, to approve home rule for the District in order that such matters, and many others affecting the lives of the people who live here, may be cleared by an elected District city council and then submitted to the Congress for its approval. No one can dispute the right of taxpayers to have a voice in how their money is spent, but that is the sad and un-American state of affairs in our Nation's Capital today.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the unfortunate position of arguing against this bill which would provide a means of increasing tax revenue for the District of Columbia and at the same time arguing for increased salaries for Federal employees. Normally it would be an untenable position, but I believe I can justify such a stand in this particular case.

I cannot support a revenue bill, be it for the District of Columbia or for the United States as a whole, which is based upon a sales tax. It is not a good system of taxation. It is especially repulsive when it is wrapped into a bill which virtually eliminates income-tax payments for the bulk of District of Columbia residents. The entire system of taxation in this country has been based upon the time-tested theory of "ability to pay." I recognize full well that the "ability to pay" plan has at times been stretched to the breaking point and that, if it falls into unscrupulous hands, it could be turned into a totalitarian weapon in this country.

I do not understand how we can justify a District of Columbia tax system different from the rest of the Federal tax program. We have a few excise taxes which are in effect sales taxes, but it is generally known that we permitted most of these because of the war emergency. The District of Columbia must work out a different tax program to meet its requirements.

Just as serious a problem in the District of Columbia today is what this Congress intends to do about pay increases for Federal workers. It is for that cause that I earnestly request the leadership of my party to take immediate action—to make an immediate decision.

I have supported previously introduced bills which would raise Federal employees $800 annually. Since that time two bills have been approved by the House committee and now await action by the Rules Committee of this body. H. R. 5667 would raise postal workers $585 a year. It affects 479,850 employees and would cost $268,000,000. H. R. 5472 would increase the pay for 900,000 other Federal workers by $468 a year. It will cost the Government $421,000,000. They are sound and just compromises. I believe we will be neglecting our duty as Representatives of the people of this Nation if we go home without assuring an adequate pay adjustment for the servants of the people.

We sit in the Halls of Congress and criticize labor and business for not bargaining properly across the table. Some of us sharply criticize labor for its methods. Some of us condemn business. Both views are often expressed in this body, especially when a national emergency faces the country because of a breakdown in negotiations.

But here we are in the role of representing the employers and we sit by without giving careful and proper consideration to the most vital problem affecting the men and women who work for the American people. Private business has found it necessary to freely grant several major pay adjustments in the past 2 years. The Federal Government has not granted a pay increase to its workers during that period. Private business has made an adjustment to offset the rising cost of living. The Federal Government has not. I cannot emphasize too vigorously my belief that we cannot pass by these two compromise bills which would help the Federal worker over the rough spots in the next few years.

We who condemn representatives of private employers for inaction had better remember that we are the employers in this instance. We who condemn labor unions for demanding too much and using ruthless methods had better remember that we forbid the Federal employees to even consider such tactics or pressure in order to bring about consideration of their case. We have a moral responsibility which we cannot escape nor should we want to.

The sales tax proposed in this bill will force the average workingman to pay more in taxes for the operation of his Government. I cannot approve such legislation especially at the same time that we neglect to offset the loss in income which has been suffered by that some workingman because of a 23-percent cost-of-living increase since he was granted his last pay raise.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

SALES TAX NOT NECESSARY

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] who has labored so well and so long on this problem. I served with him on the subcommittee on fiscal affairs and I know the job, and I know there is no doubt that he is convinced that the only way we can get the income necessary for the District of Columbia government is through a sales tax.

However, I respectfully differ with him.

I think we all agree that the District needs additional revenue, but it seems to me we have not exhausted every means of getting additional revenue. There are other ways. I think the best way is to have a real income tax, which we do not have in the District at the present time. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts would agree with me. Unfortunately, the Congress took that question up last year, and in the rush to adjourn it was defeated. However, I believe that if the Members really had an opportunity to give it full thought they would probably agree with me that the best way, the fairest way to raise any revenue anywhere is by means of an income tax based on the income of the individual and his ability to pay. The firmest policy of good taxation is based on that. The man who makes more money should pay more taxes, and the fellow who makes only a little should not pay much.

SALES TAX IS NOT FAIR

The sales tax falls on the people least able to pay. From the figures we have seen, it takes over $3,600 to support a man, his wife, and two children in the District of Columbia. The cost of living here is one of the highest in the country. Why should we want to have a sales tax here which would fall so heavily on the people who can barely make ends meet now?

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 6711, which would provide, in my opinion, an adequate public income through an equitable income tax. It is too easy at the present time for the people of Washington to evade an income tax. That is why only about $2,500,000 to $3,000,000 is obtained by the District from income taxes. All a person living here has to do to evade the payment of an income tax in the District is simply to make a statement that he is not domiciled here, that he is domiciled somewhere else, in his home State.

BROADEN BASE, RAISE RATES

I have obtained figures from New York State, my own State, and we find that very few of the New Yorkers who live here in Washington and work for the Government pay income taxes in New York. They evade paying taxes in New York because they claim they pay them here, and they evade paying taxes here because they claim they pay them in New York. The same thing applies in regard to many, many other States. Therefore, if we had a good income-tax law such as I have proposed, broadening the base and increasing the rates, we would get more than enough to take care of this need.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I appreciate all the gentleman has said, and I am thoroughly in accord with him. The gentleman knows, as a member of the committee, that last year we did try to get such a tax through the Congress, but we failed. This year we eliminated all the brackets under the income-tax law below $8,000, and we retained the higher brackets, even though there was a great deal of influence brought to bear on the committee to wipe out the income tax altogether. The Commissioners, as the gentleman recalls, a few weeks ago recommended the elimination of the income tax. I did not see fit to recommend that, and neither did the committee. So we are eliminating all the brackets under $8,000, because we know that under the sales-tax provision the people in the lower-income brackets have to pay the bill.

Mr. KLEIN. May I also point out that the Federal contribution should be higher? There are many other ways to raise the needed revenue.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that this Congress would not be enacting legislation of this type in an election year for their own district. Because of that, I see no reason why we should impose this vicious sales-tax measure on the voteless and defenseless DP's of the District, who are without a vote.

It has been said that the tourists of the country who come into Washington would pay a great share of this expense. The tourists may pay some of it, those who are financially able, but there are thousands of school children throughout the country who save their pennies in anticipation of visiting Washington each year. There is no reason why they should be gouged.

We recently reduced taxes for citizens throughout the country, and we have not yet enacted a pay-raise bill for Federal employees. The supporters of this bill are preparing to take away a great percentage of the earnings of the small-income workers who are living in the District of Columbia.

My State of Ohio in 1932 enacted a sales tax solely as an emergency measure. But it is still on the books. I think you will find that is true of most of the other States that have a sales tax. Why enact a sales tax? Now, during this most prosperous period of our existence, if we have gotten along all the years that the District of Columbia has existed without a sales tax, I see no reason why other methods cannot be devised that will not call on the low-income worker to pay an unreasonable share of the taxes. There is no question about it—it is the person in the low-income bracket percentagewise who will be paying the District's bills more than anybody else.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 6759, but I do so with this reservation.

There are Members of Congress, while appreciating the urgent need for needed and additional revenue for the District of Columbia, who are hesitant to support a sales tax here in the District of Columbia for two reasons.

First. That their vote might be looked upon as a precedent for supporting next year some type of sales tax for the Nation.

Second. They come from States that do not have a sales tax.

In supporting this legislation, I want it understood that even though I consider the Nation's financial condition in a deplorable condition, and can be expected to grow worse in view of what I consider an unwise tax cut, I would not support a national sales tax.

It is difficult to discuss any budget or method of taxation for the District of Columbia without taking into consideration the budget requirements of this Nation. You are familiar with our own housekeeping problems.

The Congress started out with the determination to cut the President's budget by $2,500,000,000, yet as of June 1, it increased budget estimates more than it reduced them.

The House and Senate have completed action on only one regular appropriation bill for fiscal 1949, but the House Appropriations Committee has reported 11 bills. While reductions have been made, not all of which have stood up in subsequent action, totaling $575,000,000.

The Congress has also acted on four deficiency and supplemental bills. All of these have cleared conference; the result shows there has been a net increase of $1,218,000,000. This means an actual net increase on all appropriations of $643,000,000 over the President's budget estimate.

This 1949 budget, coupled up with a national public debt of around $253,000,000,000, the Congress without any question must come to grips with new tax laws next year or else we become a "receivership" Congress.

My reason for inserting these views on the national budget requirements is to emphasize the position felt by many that a vote for a District of Columbia sales tax is not a vote for a national sales tax.

We have ample precedent for supporting this measure.

The following States have a sales tax and certain States have both a sales tax and a use tax. The use tax, as you understand, represents a tax designed to prevent the evasion of a sales tax by levying a tax on the use and consumption of commodities purchased outside the State and brought into the State for use and consumption:

State	Rate	Sales tax	Use tax
Alabama	2 percent	X	X
Arizona	do	X	
Arkansas	do	X	
California	2½ percent	X	X
Colorado	2 percent	X	X
Connecticut	1 percent	X	X
Illinois	2 percent	X	
Indiana	½ percent	X	
Iowa	2 percent	X	X
Kansas	do	X	X
Louisiana	1 percent	X	X
Maryland	2 percent	X	X
Michigan	3 percent	X	X
Mississippi	2 percent	X	X
Missouri	do	X	
New Mexico	do	X	X
North Carolina	3 percent	X	X
North Dakota	2 percent	X	X
Ohio	3 percent	X	X
Oklahoma	2 percent	X	X
Rhode Island	1 percent	X	X
South Dakota	2 percent	X	X
Tennessee	do	X	X
Utah	do	X	X
Washington	3 percent plus ¼ of 1 percent.	X	
	3 percent		X
West Virginia	2 percent plus ½ of 1 percent.	X	
Wyoming	2 percent	X	X

States which have had but do not now have sales tax: Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont.

States which have not continuously used sales tax but are now levying sales tax: Maryland, New York, Louisiana.

Comparing the District of Columbia with other States in population, there are today 13 States with a total population less than the District of Columbia. These States are: Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

NEEDS OF THE DISTRICT

New school buildings, athletic facilities, equipment; institutional needs, hospitals and health centers; child day-care centers.

Available income

Total assessed valuation	$1,572,527,504
Rate	$2 per $100
Producing	31,450,585
Personal income: Other sources	72,389,000
Federal contribution	12,000,000
Total revenue (approximately)	98,136,800

DISCUSSION OF SALES TAX

The two principal reasons for opposing the sales tax are:

First. The tax is a regressive one and falls heaviest upon the little man.

Second. It is burdensome upon the merchants who must collect the tax for the State.

I grant that a sales tax alone would bear heavier upon those of lower income. In fact the use of a sales tax without an income tax would be a tragic injustice in taxation, but the distribution of the tax burden depends upon the whole tax structure and not upon one tax alone.

When a sales tax is used in connection with a fair progressive income tax with reasonable exemptions, the arguments against the sales tax lose their force.

The various exemptions provided for in the legislation before us are placed there because the committee is interested in our low-income groups. Conservatively speaking, I would judge that 35 to 45 percent of all retail sales are exempt. For the low-income groups a larger percent of purchases than the above figure is exempt.

What will the impact be upon a family with an income of only $2,000? A reasonable assumption would be that they would spend approximately $60 for coal, $300 for clothing, and $240 for household equipment and supplies. The sales tax on this budget would not be more than $15. This I contend is not a heavy tax.

The second argument is that the tax is burdensome upon the merchants. It is true that merchants have some clerical expense in connection with the sales tax; however, many items that are exempted in this legislation certainly will reduce the work load upon any merchant. In addition, merchants under this legislation are given a special discount for acting as collectors of the sales tax. I submit this virtually will cover any cost actually involved in the collection process.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The main arguments for and against a sales tax advocated prior to the adoption of this tax in our various States essentially were not the two arguments which I have just submitted.

The major question facing these States and today the District of Columbia is: Can our State units of the Government maintain the same standard of service in Government without a sales tax and at the same time maintain a tax program that will not retard the over-all progress of any State? The choice facing the people of the District of Columbia and the Congress must be made, in my opinion, between the use of a sales tax or a reduction in the amount of Government services.

After making a careful study of the income derived by the District of Columbia, I am satisfied myself that the District cannot maintain its present standard of service, not to mention the urgent needed capital improvements, without the use of a sales or use tax.

OPERATION OF SALES TAX IN MY STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina first enacted the sales tax in 1933. The rate is 3 percent. North Carolina has a population of approximately 3,718,000 as compared with 861,000 in Washington. For the year 1945–46 North Carolina collected from sales taxes $26,554,843. The State has received $15,766,088 as an average for the 13-year period which included the depression years.

From the standpoint of spending money, Washington enjoys a most liquid position both for good and in depression years. It is my belief that the income derived from a sales tax in the District of Columbia would produce some eight to ten million dollars, almost the equivalent of the Federal contribution.

The District of Columbia today, in my opinion, compares with my own State back in 1933. In 1933 North Carolina had a general fund deficit of $14,000,000. This deficit and the general fund indebtedness totaled $51,000,000. Today that deficit and indebtedness have been paid off fully and the State has set aside $50,000,000 for capital outlay expenditures, has $30,000,000 in a postwar fund and a current surplus of around $40,000,000.

North Carolina has made tremendous progress in its educational program and it has been due to the fact that it had the money to pay for the job to be done. Today, with approximately $50,000,000 available for capital expenditures, with $30,000,000 in a postwar fund and with a surplus of about forty million, we are in a position to move forward not only in education but other governmental services.

What I would desire for North Carolina, I likewise desire not only for the other States within our Union, but the District of Columbia, the orphan child of the National Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in opposition to the committee's sales tax, even though I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I take it that this chart fairly proves that the sales tax would put the main burden on the people who cannot afford to pay it.

I say further that Washington is in much better shape than most cities of its size and that it can afford to increase the income tax in place of a sales tax, which is an act of desperation.

If we take the 3-percent sales tax, that means that a person with less than $1,000 income will have to pay 4.5 percent of his income. As this goes on up, it means that a man with $15,000 will pay less than five-tenths of 1 percent of their income in this sales tax. If you put on a 2-percent sales tax, exclusive of food, it means that people with less than $5,000 income will pay more than 1 percent of their income in this tax, but people with incomes of $15,000 will pay less than five-tenths of 1 percent. With the present income tax, you will find that people with $2,000 incomes do not have to pay anything, while people with $15,000 incomes have to pay slightly over 1 percent of their income.

We suggest in Mr. KLEIN's bill that we increase the income tax and exclude the sales tax. So that means that with Mr. Klein's bill an increase in the income tax will take place, which will mean that people with $2,000 income would not pay anything, and people with $15,000 income would pay slightly over 3 percent of their income—the people most able to pay.

It seems to me this is an admirable compromise and that this will bring in plenty of income, and it will place the burden on the people most able to pay and yet not much of a burden.

So I hope the bill offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] will be the bill that is passed by this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act divided into titles sections may be cited as the "District of Columbia Sales and Compensating Use Tax Act of 1948."

TITLE I—SALES TAX

SEC. 1. Definitions: When used in this title the following terms shall mean or include:

(a) "Person": Includes an individual, partnership, society, association, joint-stock company, corporation, estate, receiver, trustee, assignee, referee, or any other person acting in a fiduciary or representative capacity, whether appointed by a court or otherwise, and any combination of individuals.

(b) "Vendor": Includes a person selling property or rendering services upon the receipts from which a tax is imposed under section 2 of this title.

(c) "Purchaser": Includes a person who purchases property or to whom are rendered services, receipts from which are taxable under section 2 of this title.

(d) "Receipt": The amount of the sale price of any property or the charge for any service specified in section 2 of this title, valued in money, whether received in money or otherwise, including all receipts, cash, credits, and property of any kind or nature, and also any amount for which credit is allowed by the vendor to the purchaser, without any deduction therefrom on account of the cost of the property sold, the cost of materials used, labor, transportation or service cost, interest or discount paid, taxes paid, or any other expense whatsoever.

(e) "Sale" or "selling": Any transfer of title or possession or both, exchange or barter, license to use, license to consume, conditional or otherwise, in any manner or by any means whatsoever for a consideration, or any agreement therefor, and shall include the rendering of any service specified in section 2 of this title.

(f) "Tangible personal property": Corporeal personal property of any nature.

(g) "Retail sale" or "sale at retail": A sale to any person for any purpose other than for resale in the form of tangible personal property. A "sale or purchase at retail of tangible personal property" shall also be deemed to include the sale of the services of producing, fabricating, processing, printing, or imprinting tangible personal property, to a person who directly or indirectly furnishes the tangible personal property, not purchased by him for resale, upon which such services are performed; other than the rendering of services in connection with the repair, alteration, or reconditioning of tangible personal property on behalf of the owner thereof to refit it for the use for which it was originally produced.

(h) "Semipublic institution": Those charitable, educational, and religious institutions which are supported principally by public subscriptions or endowment or by appropriation made by the Congress of the United States and are not organized or operated for private gain.

(i) "Return": Includes any return filed or required to be filed as herein provided.

(j) "District": The District of Columbia.

(k) "Commissioners": The Commissioners of the District or their duly authorized representatives.

(l) "Assessor": The Assessor of the District or his duly authorized representatives.

(m) "Collector": The Collector of Taxes of the District or his duly authorized representatives.

(n) "Food": Cereals and cereal products; milk and milk products; candy and confectionery; ice cream and ice-cream products; meat and meat products; fish and fish products; eggs and egg products; vegetables and vegetable products; fruits, fruit products, and fruit juices; flavoring extracts, condiments, spices and salt; sugar and sugar products; coffee and coffee substitutes; tea; cocoa and cocoa products; and ice when used for household consumption. "Food" shall not include spirituous or malt liquors; beer, soft drinks; and sodas and beverages such as are ordinarily dispensed at bars and soda fountains or in connection therewith, other than coffee, coffee substitutes, tea, and cocoa.

SEC. 2. Imposition of tax: Beginning 60 days after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, for the privilege of selling certain tangible personal property at retail as defined in this title and for the privilege of dispensing certain services as defined in this title, there is hereby imposed and there shall be paid a tax upon the amount of receipts from every sale of tangible personal property sold at retail in the District, including services rendered in connection therewith, computed as follows:

(a) On each sale where the price is from 14 cents to 50 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent;

(b) On each sale where the price is from 51 cents to $1, both inclusive, 2 cents;

(c) On each 50 cents of price or fraction thereof in excess of $1, 1 cent.

The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the purchaser.

SEC. 3. Exemptions: Receipts from sales of the following and services rendered in connection therewith shall be exempt from the taxes imposed by this title:

(a) Sales to the United States or the District or any instrumentality thereof.

(b) Sales to a State or any of its political subdivisions if such State grants a similar exemption to the District. As used in this subsection, the term "State" means the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(c) Sales to a semipublic institution.

(d) Sales of food for human consumption in the home or residence. It is not intended by this subsection to exempt from the tax sales of food for human consumption in restaurants, cafes, hotel dining rooms, taverns, night clubs, and similar establishments.

(e) Sales of drugs and medicines.

(f) Sales of motor-vehicle fuels upon the sale of which a tax is imposed by the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended or as may be hereafter amended.

(g) Sales of tickets for admission to places of amusements and sports.

(h) Sales of gas and electricity and services rendered incident thereto: *Provided*, That the receipts from such sales and services are subject to a gross-receipt tax in force in the District during or for the period of time covered by any return required to be filed by the provisions of this title.

(i) Sales of transportation and telephone and telegraph service.

(j) Sales of property purchased by a utility or public-service company for use or consumption in furnishing a commodity or service: *Provided*, That the receipts from furnishing such commodity or service are subject to a gross-receipts tax in force in the District during or for the period of time covered by any return required to be filed by the provisions of this title.

(k) Sales of newspapers and magazines.

(l) Casual and isolated sales by a vendor who is not regularly engaged in the business of selling tangible personal property.

(m) Sales of livestock, poultry, seeds, feeds for livestock, poultry, fertilizers, lime, and land plaster used for agricultural purposes.

(n) Sales of advertising space and sales of radio advertising.

(o) Sales of food or beverages of any nature if made in any car composing a part of any train or in any aircraft or boat operating within the District in the course of interstate commerce.

(p) Sales of goods made pursuant to bona fide contracts entered into before the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That there is a contract in writing signed by the buyer and seller which imposes an unconditional liability on the part of the buyer to purchase goods covered thereby, and an unconditional liability on the part of the seller to deliver a definite quantity of such goods at the contract price.

(q) Sales of natural or artificial gas, oil, electricity, solid fuel, or steam, to any purchaser for use in manufacturing, assembling, processing, or refining.

(r) Sales which the States would be without power to tax under the limitations of the Constitution of the United States.

(s) Sales of motor vehicles and trailers.

SEC. 4. Upon each taxable sale or service the tax to be collected shall be stated and charged separately from the sale price or charge for service and shown separately on any record thereof, at the time when the sale is made or evidence of sale issued or employed by the vendor and shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor as trustee for and on account of the District, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection thereof and for the tax. The vendor shall be personally liable for the tax collected or required to be collected under this title, and the vendor shall have the same right in respect to collecting the tax from the purchaser, or in respect to nonpayment of the tax by the purchaser, as if the tax were a part of the purchase price of the property or service and payable at the time of the sale: *Provided, however*, That the Collector shall be joined as a party plaintiff in any action or proceeding brought by the vendor to collect the tax.

SEC. 5. The tax imposed by this title shall be paid upon all sales made and services rendered beginning 60 days after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, although made or rendered under a contract dated prior thereto. Where a service is billed on either a monthly or other term basis, the payment of such bill for such month or other period of time shall be a receipt subject to the tax herein imposed. The Commissioners may provide by regulation that the tax upon receipts from sales on the installment plan may be paid in full at the time the agreement therefor is made or on the account of each installment and upon the date when such installment is due. The Commissioners may provide by regulation for the exclusion of amounts representing sales where the contract of sales has been canceled, or the property returned, or the receipt has been ascertained to be worthless or, in case the tax has been paid upon such receipt, for a credit or refund of the amount of the tax upon such receipt upon application therefor as provided in section 13 of this title.

SEC. 6. Presumptions: For the purpose of the proper administration of this title and to prevent evasion of the tax hereby imposed, it shall be presumed that all receipts for property and services mentioned in this title are subject to tax until the contrary is established, and the burden of proving that a receipt is not taxable hereunder shall be upon the vendor or the purchaser. Unless the vendor shall have taken from the purchaser a certificate signed by and bearing the name and address of the purchaser and the number of his registration certificate to the effect that the property or service was purchased for resale, the sale shall be deemed to be a taxable sale at retail.

SEC. 7. No person engaged in the business of selling property or services the receipts from which are subject to tax under this title shall advertise or hold out to the public in any manner directly or indirectly that the tax imposed by this title is not considered as an element in the price to the purchaser.

SEC. 8. Collection of tax from purchaser; The tax shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor as trustee for and on account of the District, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection thereof for and on account of the District.

SEC. 9. Every vendor shall keep records of receipts and of the tax payable thereon in such form as the Commissioners may by regulation require. Such records shall be offered for inspection and examination at any time upon demand by the Assessor and shall be preserved for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 10. Returns: (a) Every vendor shall file with the Assessor a return of his receipts and of the taxes payable thereon for monthly, quarterly, or other periods as the Commissioners may by regulation prescribe, or as the Assessor may require as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Such returns shall be filed within 20 days from the expiration of the period covered thereby. The assessor may permit or require returns to be made by other periods and upon such dates as he may specify: *Provided*, That the receipts during any year shall be included in returns covering such year and no other. If the Assessor deems it necessary in order to insure the payment of the tax imposed by this title, he may require returns to be made for shorter periods than those prescribed pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section, and upon such dates as he may specify.

(c) The form of returns shall be prescribed by the Assessor and shall contain such information as he may deem necessary for the proper administration of this title. The Assessor may require amended returns to be filed within 20 days after notice and to contain the information specified in the notice.

SEC. 11. Payment of tax: (a) At the time of filing a return of receipts each vendor shall pay to the Collector the taxes imposed by this title upon the receipts required to be included in such return, as well as all other moneys collected by the vendor acting or purporting to act under the provisions of this title even though it be judicially determined that the tax collected is invalidly imposed. All the taxes for the period for which a return is required to be filed shall be due from the vendor and payable to the Collector on the date limited for the filing of the return for such period, without regard to whether a return is filed or whether the return which is filed shows correctly the amount of receipts and the taxes due thereon.

(b) The vendor shall be entitled to apply and credit against the amount of tax payable by him an amount equal to 3 percent of the gross tax to be remitted by him to the Collector in payment for the vendor's expense in the collection and remittance of said tax: *Provided, however*, That the credit allowed by this subsection shall be denied to any vendor who shall fail or refuse to file his return within the time prescribed by regulation or as required by the Assessor as provided in section 10 of this title.

SEC. 12. Determination of tax: If a return required by this title is not filed, or if a return when filed is incorrect or insufficient, the amount of tax due shall be determined by the Assessor from such information as may be obtainable. Notice of such determination shall be given to the person liable for the collection of the tax from the purchaser and payment thereof to the Collector. Such determination shall finally and irrevocably fix the tax unless the person against whom it is assessed, within 30 days after the giving of notice of such determination, shall apply in writing to the Assessor for a hearing, or unless the Assessor of his own motion shall redetermine the same. After such hearing or redetermination the Assessor shall give notice of his final determination to the person against whom the tax is assessed.

SEC. 13. Refunds: (a) Except as to any tax finally determined as provided in section 12, where any tax has been erroneously or illegally collected the tax shall be refunded if application is filed with the Assessor for such refund within 1 year from the payment thereof. For like cause and within the same period a refund may be made upon the certificates of the Assessor and the Collector. Whenever a refund is made upon the certificates of the Assessor and the Collector, the Assessor and Collector shall state their reasons therefor in writing. Such application may be made by the person upon whom such tax was imposed and who has actually paid the tax. Such application may also be made by a vendor who has collected and paid such tax to the Collector: *Provided*, That the application is made within 1 year of the payment by the purchaser to the vendor, but no actual refund of moneys shall be made to such vendor until he shall first establish to the satisfaction of the Assessor, under such regulations as the Commissioners may prescribe, that the vendor has repaid to the purchaser the amount for which the application for refund is made. In lieu of any refund required to be made, a credit may be allowed therefor on payment due from the applicant.

(b) Application for a refund or credit made as herein provided shall be deemed an application for a revision of any tax, penalty, or interest complained of and the Assessor may receive evidence with respect thereto. After making his determination of whether any refund shall be made, the Assessor shall give notice thereof to the applicant.

SEC. 14. Any person aggrieved by a final determination of tax as provided in section 12 or denial of an application for refund of any tax under section 13 may, within 90 days from the date of the final determination of the tax or from the date of the denial of an application for refund, as the case may be, appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of title IX of the act entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes", approved May 16, 1938, as amended, and as the same may hereafter be amended. The remedy provided in this section shall not be deemed to take away from the taxpayer any remedy which he might have under any other provision of law, but no suit by the taxpayer for the recovery of any part of any tax shall be instituted in any court if the taxpayer has elected to file an appeal with respect to such tax with the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 15. The taxes imposed by this title and penalties and interest thereon may be collected by the Collector in the manner provided by law for the collection of taxes due the District on personal property in force at the time of such collection; and liens for the taxes imposed by this title and penalties thereon may be acquired in the same manner that liens for personal property taxes are required. If the Assessor believes that the collection of any tax imposed by this act will be jeopardized by delay, he shall, whether or not the time otherwise prescribed by law for making return and paying such tax has expired, immediately assess such tax (together with all interest and penalties, the assessment of which is provided for by law). Such tax, penalties, and interest shall thereupon become immediately due and payable, and immediate notice and demand shall be made by the Collector for the payment thereof. Upon failure or refusal to pay such tax, penalty, and interest, collection thereof by distraint shall be lawful.

SEC. 16. Whenever there is made a sale, transfer, or assignment in bulk of any part or the whole of a stock of merchandise or of fixtures, or of merchandise and of fixtures, pertaining to the conducting of the business of the seller, transferor, or assignor, otherwise than in the ordinary course of trade and in the regular prosecution of said business, the purchaser, transferee, or assignee shall at least 5 days before taking possession of such merchandise, fixtures, or merchandise and fixtures, or paying therefor, notify the Assessor by registered mail of the proposed sale and of the price terms, and conditions thereof, whether or not the seller, transferor, or assignor has represented to or informed the purchaser, transferee, or assignee that he owes any tax pursuant to this title or whether he has complied with section 1 of the act entitled "An Act to Prevent the Fraudulent Sale of Merchandise in the District of Columbia", approved April 28, 1904, or whether or not he has knowledge that such taxes are owing, or whether any such taxes are in fact owing.

SEC. 17. Whenever the purchaser, transferee, or assignee shall fail to give the notice to the Assessor as required by the preceding section, or whenever the Assessor shall inform the purchaser, transferee, or assignee that a possible claim for such tax or taxes exists, any sums of money, property, or choses in action, or other consideration, which the purchaser, transferee, or assignee is required to transfer over to the seller, transferor, or assignor shall be subject to a first priority right and lien for any such taxes theretofore or thereafter determined to be due from the seller, transferor, or assignor to the District, and the purchaser, transferee, or assignee is forbidden to transfer to the seller, transferor, or assignor any such sums of money, property or choses in action to the extent of the amount of the District's claim. For failure to comply with the provisions of this subdivision, the purchaser, transferee, or assignee shall be personally liable for the payment to the District of any such taxes theretofore or thereafter deter-

mined to be due to the District from the seller, transferor, or assignor, and such liability may be assessed and enforced in the same manner as the liability for tax under this title.

SEC. 18. Regulations: In addition to the powers granted to the Commissioners in this title, they are hereby authorized and empowered to make, adopt, and amend rules and regulations appropriate to the carrying out of this title and the purposes thereof.

SEC. 19. In addition to the powers granted to the Assessor in this title, he is hereby authorized and empowered—

(a) To extend for cause shown the time of filing any return for a period not exceeding 30 days; and for cause shown, to remit penalties and interest in whole or in part except as provided in section 22 of this title; and to compromise disputed claims in connection with the taxes hereby imposed.

(b) To request information from the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department of the United States relative to any person for the purpose of assessing taxes imposed by this title; and said Bureau of Internal Revenue is authorized and required to supply such information as may be requested by the Assessor relative to any person for the purpose herein provided.

(c) To prescribe methods for determining the receipts from sales made or services rendered and for the allocation of such receipts into taxable and nontaxable receipts.

(d) To require any vendor selling to persons within the District to keep detailed records of the nature and value of personal property sold for use within the District, and to furnish such information upon request to the Assessor.

(e) To assess, determine, revise, and readjust the taxes imposed under this title.

SEC. 20. The Assessor, for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any return filed as required by this title, or for the purpose of making a return where none has been made, is authorized to examine any books, papers, records, or memoranda, of any person bearing upon the matters required to be included in the return and may summon any person to appear before him and produce books, records, papers, or memoranda bearing upon the matters required to be included in the return and to give testimony or answer interrogatories under oath respecting the same, and the Assessor, or his duly authorized representative, shall have power to administer oaths to such person or persons. Such summons may be served by any member of the Metropolitan Police Department. If any person, having been personally summoned, shall neglect or refuse to obey the summons issued as herein provided, then in that event the Assessor, or the Deputy Assessor, may report that fact to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, or one of the justices thereof, and said court or any justice thereof hereby is empowered to compel obedience to said summons to the same extent as witnesses may be compelled to obey the subpenas of that court. Any person in custody or control of any books, papers, records, or memoranda bearing upon the matters required to be included in such returns, who shall refuse to permit the examination by the Assessor or any person designated by him of any such books, papers, records, or memoranda, or who shall obstruct or hinder the Assessor or any person designated by him in the examination of any books, papers, records, or memoranda, shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $500.

SEC. 21. Registration: (a) On or before the sixtieth day after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, or in the case of vendors commencing business after July 1, 1948, or opening new places of business after such date, within 10 days after such commencement or opening, every vendor and every person purchasing tangible personal property for resale shall file with the Assessor a certificate of registration in a form prescribed by the Assessor. The Assessor shall within 5 days after such registration issue without charge to each vendor or person who purchases for resale a certificate of authority empowering such vendor to collect the tax from the purchaser. Duplicates of such certificate shall be obtained from the Assessor for each additional place of business of such vendor. Each certificate or duplicate shall state the place of business to which it is applicable. Such certificates of authority shall be prominently displayed to the public in the places of business of the vendor. A vendor who has no regular place of doing business shall attach such certificate to his cart, stand, truck, or other merchandising device. Such certificates shall be nonassignable and nontransferable and shall be surrendered, within 3 days to the Assessor upon the vendor's ceasing to do business at the place named.

(b) A vendor shall refuse to accept a certificate that any property or service upon which a tax is imposed by this title is purchased for resale and shall collect the tax imposed by this title unless the purchaser shall have filed a certificate of registration and received a certificate of authority to collect the tax imposed by this title: *Provided, however,* That the payment of the tax by such purchaser shall not relieve the purchaser of the duty herein imposed upon such purchaser to collect the tax upon any resale made by him; but such purchaser who shall file a certificate of registration and receive a certificate of authority to collect the tax may, upon application therefor, receive a refund of the taxes paid by him upon property and services thereafter resold by him and upon the receipts from which he shall have collected and paid over to the Collector the tax herein imposed.

SEC. 22. Penalties and interest: (a) Any person failing to file a return or to pay or pay over any tax to the Collector within the time required by this title shall be subject to a penalty of 5 percent of the amount of tax due, plus interest at the rate of 1 percent of such tax for each month of delay excepting the first month after such return was required to be filed or such tax became due; but the Assessor, if satisfied that the delay was excusable, may waive all or any part of such penalty in excess of interest at the rate of 6 percent per year. Such penalties and interest shall be paid and disposed of in the same manner as other revenues from this title. Unpaid penalties and interest may be collected in the same manner as the tax imposed by this title.

(b) The certificate of the Collector or Assessor, as the case may be, to the effect that a tax has not been paid, that a return or registration certificate has not been filed, or that information has not been supplied pursuant to the provisions of this title, shall be presumptive evidence thereof: *Provided,* That the presumptions created by this subsection shall not be applicable in criminal prosecutions.

SEC. 23. Returns to be secret: (a) Except to any official of the District, having a right thereto in his official capacity, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the District to divulge or make known in any manner the amount of receipts or any particulars relating thereto or the computation thereof set forth or disclosed in any return required to be filed under this title, and neither the original nor a copy of any such return desired for use in litigation in court shall be furnished where neither the District nor the United States is interested in the result of such litigation, whether or not the request is contained in an order of the court: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the furnishing to a taxpayer a copy of his return upon the payment of a fee of $2.

(b) Nothing contained in section 23 (a) of this title shall be construed to prohibit the publication of notices authorized in section 27 of this title, or the publication of statistics so classified as to prevent the identification of particular returns or reports and the items thereof, or the publication of delinquent lists showing the names of persons, vendors, or purchasers who have failed to pay the taxes imposed by this title within the time prescribed herein, together with any relevant information which in the opinion of the Assessor may assist in the collection of such delinquent taxes.

(c) Nothing contained in section 23 (a) of this title shall be construed to prohibit the Assessor, in his discretion, from divulging or making known any information contained in any report, application, or return required under the provisions of this title other than such information as may be contained therein relating to the amount of receipts or tax thereon or any particulars relating thereto or the computation thereof.

(d) Any violation of the provisions of this section shall be a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both, in the dicsretion of the court.

(e) All reports, applications, and returns received by the Assessor under the provisions of this act shall be preserved for 3 years, and thereafter until the Assessor orders them to be destroyed.

SEC. 24. Penalty for failure to file returns, and so forth: (a) Any person required to file a return or report or perform any act under the provisions of this title who shall fail or neglect to file such return or report or perform such act within the time required shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $300 for each and every failure or neglect, and each and every day that such failure or neglect continues shall constitute a separate and distinct offense. The penalty provided herein shall be in addition to the other penalties provided in this title.

(b) Any person required to file a return or report or perform any act under the provisions of this title who willfully fails or refuses to file such return or report or perform such act within the time required shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every failure or refusal. The penalty provided herein shall be in addition to the other penalties provided in this title.

SEC. 25. Assessment, reassessment, false and incorrect returns: The Assessor shall determine, redetermine, assess, or reassess, any tax imposed by this title, except in cases where the tax is correct as computed in any return filed with the Assessor, within 3 years after the filing of any return, except as follows:

(a) In the case of a false return, or a failure to file a return, or failure to include taxable receipts in any return filed, whether in good faith or otherwise, the tax may be assessed at any time.

(b) In the case of an incorrect return which has not been prepared as required by this title and by the return and instructions, rules, or regulations applicable thereto, the receipts reported shall be assessed or reassessed within 5 years after the filing of such return.

SEC. 26. Prosecutions: All prosecutions under this title shall be brought in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia on information by the Corporation Counsel of the District in the name of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 27. Notices: Any notice authorized or required under the provisions of this title may be given by mailing the same to the person for whom it is intended in an envelope, postage prepaid, addressed to such person at the address given in the last return filed by him pursuant to the provisions of this title or, if no return has been filed, then to the last address of such person. If the address of any person is unknown, such

notice may be published in one or more of the daily newspapers in the District of Columbia for three successive days. The cost of any such advertisement in newspapers shall be added to the tax. The proof of mailing of any notice required or authorized in this title shall be presumptive evidence of the receipt of such notice by the person to whom addressed. The proof of publishing any notice required in this title in one or more of the daily newspapers in the District shall be conclusive notice to the person for whom such notice is intended.

SEC. 28. Extensions of time: Where, before the expiration of the period prescribed herein for the assessment or redetermination of an additional tax, a taxpayer has consented in writing that such period be extended, the amount of such tax due may be determined at any time within such extended period. The period so extended may be further extended by subsequent consents in writing made before the expiration of the extended period.

SEC. 29. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this title, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE II—COMPENSATING USE TAX

SECTION 1. Definitions: (a) When used in this title the following terms shall mean or include:

(1) "Use": The exercise of any right or power over tangible personal property by the purchaser thereof and includes but is not limited to the receipt, storage, or any keeping or retention for any length of time, withdrawal from storage, any installation, any affixation to real or personal property, or any consumption of such property.

(2) "Sale" or "purchase": Any transfer of title or possession or both, exchange or barter, rental, lease, or license to use or consume, conditional or otherwise, in any manner or by any means whatsoever for a consideration, or any agreement therefor.

(3) "Vendor": Every person making sales of tangible personal property in the District: *Provided, however,* That when in the opinion of the Assessor it is necessary for the efficient administration of this title to regard any salesman, representative, peddler, or canvasser as the agent of the dealer, distributor, supervisor, or employer under whom he operates or from whom he obtains the tangible personal property sold by him, the Assessor may, in his discretion, treat and regard such agent as the vendor jointly responsible with his principal, employer, or supervisor for the collection and payment over of the tax.

(4) "Purchase at retail": A purchase by any person for any purpose other than for resale in the form of tangible personal property.

(5) "Tangible personal property": Corporate personal property of any nature.

(b) The definitions of "person," "'retail sale' or 'sale at retail'", "return", "District", "Commissioners", "Assessor", and "Collector", as defined in section 1 or title I of this act, are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title.

SEC. 2. Imposition of tax: Beginning 60 days after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, there is hereby imposed and there shall be paid by every person a tax on the use within the District of any tangible personal property purchased at retail. The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the purchaser and shall be computed as follows:

(a) On each sale where the price is from 14 cents to 50 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent;

(b) On each sale where the price is from 51 cents to $1, both inclusive, 2 cents;

(c) On each 50 cents of price or fraction thereof in excess of $1, 1 cent.

SEC. 3. Exemptions: The provisions of this title shall not apply—

(a) In respect to the use of property used by the purchaser in the District prior to the date on which the tax is imposed by this act.

(b) In respect to property which is in transit through the District, or which is stored and not used in the District but is so stored solely for the purpose of awaiting further transit through the District.

(c) In respect to the use of property if the sale thereof has already been or will be subject to tax under title I of this act.

(d) In respect of the use of property purchased at retail, upon the sale of which the purchaser would be exempt from the taxes imposed under title I of this act.

(e) In respect to the use by any one person of property purchased from a vendor not maintaining a place of business in the District where the aggregate value of such property subject to the tax imposed by this title is less than $25 in value during any quarterly period.

(f) In respect to the use of property which is converted into or becomes an ingredient or constituent part of, or is transformed or wrought into, attached to or sold with, a product or commodity produced or manufactured for sale by the purchaser.

(g) In respect to the use of property by any person who comes into the District on or after the date on which the tax is imposed by this act and establishes a temporary or permanent residence in the District, or engages in any trade or business or commercial activity in the District, if such property was purchased at retail by such person not less than 1 year prior thereto.

(h) In respect to the use of property if the sale or purchase thereof has been taxed by a taxing jurisdiction other than the District, and if such tax was paid by the person who brings such property into the District: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to any sales or excise tax imposed or paid for Federal revenue purposes: *And provided further,* That if a tax on the sale or purchase of property is imposed by and paid to any taxing jurisdiction other than the District is less than the tax imposed by this title, the difference between such taxes shall not be exempted under this section.

SEC. 4. Vendor to collect tax from purchaser; unlawful to advertise tax will be assumed or absorbed: (a) Every vendor maintaining a place of business in the District and making sales of tangible personal property the use of which is taxable under this title, and every other vendor who, upon application to the Assessor, has been expressly authorized to collect the tax, shall at the time of making such sales, or if the use is not then taxable hereunder, at the time such use becomes taxable hereunder, collect the tax from the purchaser. The tax to be collected shall be stated and charged separately from the sale price and shown separately on any record thereof, at the time when the sale is made or evidence of sale issued or employed by the vendor, and shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor as trustee for and on account of the District, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection thereof and for the tax. The vendor shall be personally liable for the tax collected or required to be collected under this title, and the vendor shall have the same right in respect to collecting the tax from the purchaser, or in respect to nonpayment of the tax by the purchaser, as if the tax were a part of the purchase price of the property and payable at the time of the sale: *Provided,* That the Collector shall be joined as a party in an action or proceeding to collect the tax. No vendor shall advertise or hold out to the public in any manner, directly or indirectly, that the tax imposed by this title is not considered an element in the price to the purchaser.

(b) Where the vendor has not collected a tax imposed by this title, such tax shall be payable by the purchaser directly to the Collector, and it shall be the duty of the purchaser to file a return thereof and pay the tax imposed thereon as provided in sections 7 and 8 of this title.

(c) For the purpose of the proper administration of this title and to prevent evasion of the tax hereby imposed, it shall be presumed that the use of tangible personal property is subject to tax until the contrary is established, and the burden of proving that the use is not taxable shall be upon the vendor or the purchaser. Unless the vendor shall have taken from the purchaser a certificate signed by and bearing the name and address of the purchaser and the number of his registration certificate to the effect that the property was purchased for resale, the sale shall be deemed a retail sale.

SEC. 5. Collection of Tax From Purchaser: The Commissioners shall by regulation prescribe a method or methods of collecting from purchasers the tax in respect to any property the use of which is subject to tax under this title.

SEC. 6. Records To Be Kept: Every person shall keep records of sales and of the tax payable in connection therewith and also records of purchases in such form as the Commissioners may by regulation require. Such records shall be offered for inspection and examination at any time upon demand by the Assessor, and shall be preserved for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 7. Returns: (a) Every vendor engaged in a trade or business, or commercial activity, in the District who is required or authorized to collect the tax imposed by this title shall file with the Assessor a return within the time prescribed by regulation or as required by the Assessor as provided in section 10 of title I of this act.

(b) Every person purchasing tangible personal property, the use of which is subject to the tax imposed by this title, and who has not paid the tax due hereunder to a vendor required or authorized to collect the tax, shall file with the Assessor a return within the time prescribed by regulation or as required by the Assessor as provided in section 10 of title I of this act, showing the value of the tangible personal property purchased by such person, the use of which became subject to the tax imposed by this title during the respective periods and with respect to which the tax was not paid to a vendor required or authorized hereunder to collect the tax.

(c) The provisions of section 10 (b) and (c) of title I are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title.

SEC. 8. Payment of tax: At the time of filing the return the vendor or purchaser, as the case may be, shall pay to the Collector the taxes imposed by this title as well as all other moneys collected by the vendor acting or purporting to act under the provisions of this title even though it be judicially determined that the tax collected is invalidly imposed. All the taxes for the period for which a return is required to be filed shall be due from the vendor or purchaser, as the case may be, and payable to the Collector on the date limited for the filing of the return for such period, without regard to whether a return is filed or whether the return which is filed correctly shows the amount of receipts and the taxes due thereon.

SEC. 9. Registration: (a) On or before the sixtieth day after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, or in the case of vendors commencing business or opening new places of business after such date, within 10 days after such commencement or opening, every vendor selling tangible personal property for use within the District and maintaining a place of business in the District shall file with the Assessor a certificate of registra-

tion in a form prescribed by the Assessor. A vendor selling tangible personal property for use within the District who is engaged in a trade or business, or commercial activity, in the District but who does not maintain a place of business in the District shall likewise file a certificate of registration with the Assessor. The Assessor shall within 5 days after such registration issue without charge to each such vendor a certificate of authority empowering such vendor to collect the tax from the purchaser and duplicates thereof for each additional place of business of such vendor. Each certificate or duplicate shall state the place of business to which it is applicable. Such certificates of authority shall be prominently displayed in the places of business of the vendor. A vendor who has no regular place of doing business shall attach such certificate to his cart, stand, truck, or other merchandising device. Such certificates shall be nonassignable and nontransferable and shall be surrendered within 3 days to the Assessor upon the vendor's ceasing to do business at the place therein named. Vendors and persons who have filed certificates of registration pursuant to, and have complied with, the provisions of section 21 (a) of title I shall not be required to comply with this subsection.

(b) The provisions of section 21 (b) of title I are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title.

SEC. 10. The provisions of sections 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 of title I of this act are hereby incorporated in and made applicable to this title.

SEC. 11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, not to exceed the sum of $20,000 for the employment of persons specially qualified in the field of sales-tax law in connection with the administration of this act. Such sum shall be available for expenditure for personal services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and to the civil-service laws and to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

TITLE III—EXCISE TAX UPON ISSUANCE OF TITLES TO MOTOR VEHICLES

An act known as the "District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925," approved March 3, 1925, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding to section 6 thereof the following subsection:

"(j) In addition to the fees and charges levied under other provisions of this act, there is hereby levied and imposed an excise tax for the issuance of every certificate of title for a motor vehicle in the District at the rate of 2 percent of the fair market value of such motor vehicle at the time such certificate is issued. The tax so levied and imposed shall constitute a lien upon each such certificate of title until paid; and no certificate of title so issued shall be delivered or furnished to the person entitled thereto until the tax has been paid in full. The Director of Vehicles and Traffic may require every applicant for a certificate of title to supply such information as he deems necessary as to the time of purchase, the purchase price, and other information relative to the determination of the fair market value of any motor vehicle for which a certificate of title is required and issued. The issuance of certificates of title for motor vehicles owned by the United States and the government of the District of Columbia shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this subsection.

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE I OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947

Article I of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, approved July 16, 1947, as amended, is further amended as follows:

SEC. 1. Paragraph lettered (s) of section 4 of title I of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(s) The word 'resident' means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word 'resident' shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year."

SEC. 2. Paragraph lettered (u) of section 4 of title I of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subparagraph:

"(9) The spouse of the taxpayer, if living with the taxpayer on the last day of the taxable year."

SEC. 3. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of title V of article I of said act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Residents and nonresidents: Every nonresident of the District receiving income subject to tax under this article and every resident of the District, except fiduciaries, when—

"(1) his gross income for the taxable year exceeds $8,000; or

"(2) his gross sales or gross receipts from any trade or business, other than an unincorporated business subject to tax under title VIII of this article, exceeds $8,000, regardless of the amount of his gross income; or

"(3) the combined gross income for the taxable year of husband and wife livng together exceeds $8,000 and each spouse has a gross income in excess of $500, or the gross sales or gross receipts received or accrued by such husband and wife from any trade or business, other than an unincorporated business subject to tax under title VIII of this article, in the aggregate exceeds $8,000. In such cases a separate return shall be filed by each spouse showing his respective portion of such gross income, gross sales or gross receipts, as the case may be, and no joint return of income or computation thereof by them shall be required or permitted under this article except such returns as are required under section 2 (c), 2 (f), and 2 (g) of this title."

"(b) Fiduciaries: Every fiduciary (except a receiver appointed by authority of law in possession of part only of the property of an individual) for—

"(1) every individual for whom he acts having a gross income for the taxable year of $8,000 or over, regardless of the amount of the individual's net income;

"(2) every estate for which he acts, the gross income of which for the taxable year is $8,000 or over, regardless of the amount of the net income of the estate; and

"(3) every trust for which he acts, the net income of which for the taxable year is $100 or over."

SEC. 4. Section 2 of title VI of article I of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Personal exemptions and credit for dependents: There shall be allowed to residents the following credits against net income:

"(a) An exemption of $8,000 for the taxpayer.

"(b) An exemption of $500 for each dependent, as defined in this article, whose gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins is less than $500.

"(c) Beginning with the first taxable year to which this article is applicable and in succeeding taxable years, the amount allowed under subsection (a) of this section shall be prorated to the day of death in the final return of a decedent dying before the end of the taxable year, and as of the date of death the personal exemption is terminated and not extended over the remainder of the taxable year.

"(d) In the case of a return made for a fractional part of a year, the personal exemption and credits for dependents shall be reduced, respectively, to amounts which bear the same ratio to the full credits provided as the number of months in the period for which the return is made bears to 12 months."

SEC. 5. Section 3 of title VI of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Imposition and rate of tax: There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every resident a tax at the following rates:

"Two percent on the first $7,000 of taxable income.

"Two and one-half percent on the next $5,000 of taxable income.

"Three percent on the taxable income in excess of $12,000."

SEC. 6. Section 4 of title VI of article I of said act is repealed.

SEC. 7. Section 5 of title IX of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsections:

"(d) There shall be allowed to an estate the same exemption as is allowed residents under the provisions of section 2 (a) of title VI of this article.

"(e) There shall be allowed to a trust a credit against net income of $100."

SEC. 8. The amendments made by this title shall apply to taxable years beginning after the 31st day of December 1948.

TITLE V—FURTHER AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE I OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947

Article I of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, approved July 16, 1947, as amended, is further amended as follows:

SEC. 1. Section 2 of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(c) Adjusted gross income: The words 'adjusted gross income' as used in this article mean gross income less deductions allowed under section 3 (a) of this title: *Provided, however,* That such deductions were directly incurred in carrying on a trade or business: *And provided further,* That in determining adjusted gross income, no deductions shall be allowed for charitable contributions, alimony payments, medical and dental expenses, an optional standard deduction, losses of property not connected with trade or business, or for an allowance for salaries or compensation for personal services of the person or persons liable for the tax."

SEC. 2. Section 3 (a) (1) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Expenses: All the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business, traveling expenses (including the entire amount expended for meals and lodging) while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business; and rentals or other payments required to be made as a condition to the continued use or possession, for purposes of the trade or business, of property to which the taxpayer has not taken or is not taking title or in which he has no equity."

SEC. 3. Section 3 (a) (4) (C) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(C) of property not connected with a trade or business, if such losses arise from fires, storms, shipwrecks, thefts, or other casualty: *Provided, however,* That no such loss shall be allowed as a deduction under this subsection if such loss is claimed as a deduction for inheritance—or estate—tax purposes: *And provided further,* That this subsection shall not be construed to permit the deduction of a loss of any capital asset as defined in this article."

SEC. 4. Section 3 (a) (8) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(8) Charitable contributions.—Contributions or gifts, actually paid within the taxable year to or for the use of any religious, charitable, scientific, literary, military, or educational institution, the activities of which are carried on to a substantial extent in the District, and no part of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual: *Provided,* That such deduction shall be allowed only in an amount which in the aggregate of all such deductions does not exceed 15 percent of the adjusted gross income."

SEC. 5. Section 3 (a) (9) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(9) Medical, dental, and so forth, expenses of individuals—Expenses in the case of residents, paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year, not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, for the medical care of the taxpayer, his spouse, or dependents as defined in this article. The term 'medical care,' as used in this subseection, shall include amounts paid for the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of diseases, or for the purpose of effecting healthier function of the body (including amounts paid for accident or health insurance); *Provided, however,* That a taxpayer may deduct only such expenses as exceed 5 percent of his adjusted gross income: *And provided further,* That the maximum deduction for the taxable year shall not exceed $1,250."

SEC. 6. Section 3 (a) (13) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(13) In lieu of the foregoing deductions, any resident may irrevocably elect to deduct for the taxable year an optional standard deduction of $500: *Provided, however,* That the option provided in this subsection shall not be permitted on any return filed for any period less than a full calendar or fiscal year."

SEC. 7. Section 3 (a) of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto a new subsection to read as follows:

"(15) Reasonable Allowance for Salaries.—A reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered: *Provided, however,* That in the case of an unincorporated business the aggregate deduction for services rendered by the individual owners or members actively engaged in the conduct of the unincorporated business shall in no event exceed 20 percent of the net income of such business computed without benefit of this deduction: *Provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to exempt any salary or other compensation for personal services from taxation as a part of the taxable income of the person receiving the same."

SEC. 8. Section 4 of title IV of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Installment sales: If a person reports any portion of his income from installment sales for Federal income-tax purposes under section 44 of the Federal Internal Revenue Code and as the same may hereafter be amended, and if such income is subject to tax under this article, he may report such income under this article in the same manner and upon the same basis as the same was reported by him for Federal income-tax purposes, if such method of reporting is accepted and approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue."

SEC. 9. Section 10 (a) (4) of title III of article I of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) For the purposes of subsections (a) (1), (a) (2), and (a) (3), a return filed before the last day prescribed by law for the filing thereof shall be considered as filed on such last day."

SEC. 10. The proviso to section 11 of title XII of article I of said act is amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That if it shall be determined by the Assessor, the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia, or any court that any part of any tax which was assessed as a deficiency under the provisions of section 5 of this title was an overpayment, interest shall be allowed and paid upon such overpayment of tax at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date such overpayment was paid until the date of refund, and in addition thereto any interest upon such overpayment which was paid by the taxpayer shall be refunded."

SEC. 11. Section 1 of title XIV of article I of said act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and the following: *Provided, however,* That any unincorporated business having a gross income for the taxable year of $10,000 or less shall not be required to obtain the license provided for in this title."

SEC. 12. The provisions of this title shall be effective with respect to taxable years or portions thereof beginning after December 31, 1947.

TITLE VI—SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to the other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. DIRKSEN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina whether or not I might ask unanimous consent to consider the bill as read and that it be open for amendment at any point.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is agreeable to to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, let me remind the members of the Committee of the Whole this afternoon that what is envisioned here is not only a bill or a tax program designed to meet the needs at present, but to meet future needs. We must have a tax fabric that is elastic, that is expansive, that will take care of the growing needs of the District of Columbia.

When I came to Congress, I think the population of the District of Columbia was, roughly, about 500,000. It has grown nearly 400,000. It has nearly doubled its population in that time.

There have been ever so many demands for all sorts of services and municipal functions in that time. Of course, they cost money. I have seen the District budget, in that tenure here, go from somewhere around $50,000,000 to $100,000,000. The budget for fiscal 1949 is $100,000,000. So the question is, Where do you get the money? Obviously, we must follow a good fiscal pattern and keep the District budget in balance, for if we fail to do that we would certainly be poor fiscal stewards of the affairs of the United States Capital.

So, here is a $100,000,000 budget confronting us. What do you do for revenue? Well, we have a gasoline tax. We have an intangible personal-property tax. We have a real-estate tax, we have an income tax. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and I, back in 1938, sponsored the income tax, and we fought on the floor of this House hour after hour and hour after hour to get the thing on the books. We sought, you remember, not so long ago to exclude some of the provisos so that more people would be covered by the Income Tax Act. The House said no. When our good friend and associate from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] offered his amendment on domicile, that was the end of the effort. So there are thousands of people whom we could not blanket under the Income Tax Act. Many of you Members sitting here in this Chamber at the present moment said that to us. Now you come here and attack the proposal before us because it is regressive and it places the greatest burden upon a certain group. You say: "Increase the real-estate tax." As a matter of fact when you increase the real-estate tax what do you do to every Government worker, to every poor family who buys a house under a first mortgage and a second trust who must pay the insurance and must pay the taxes? Every time you do it you are making it harder for the very people you seek to benefit.

Here is a tax that is easy of administration. It is a tax that yields well. They have it in 28 States of the Union and there has been no great fuss about it. Long ago I fought the sales tax. You remember long ago when the balanced-tax program came in recommended by the Pond committee some 8 or 10 years ago. Delegation after delegation came to my office. I said: "No; I will not stand for a sales tax." But it was a balanced-tax program. You cannot put the entire burden upon real estate. Let me say with respect to the observation that is made here that you should increase the burden on real estate, that whenever you undertake to compare the tax burden of a family here with the tax burden of a family in any other of the States, whether it be California, Illinois, or New Jersey, do not pick out just one of the taxes, but pick out all of the taxes that they must pay. When you do that you will find that the District of Columbia is about No. 30 on a list of 60 municipalities in the United States. So it is about halfway up from the bottom and halfway below the top. You must take all the taxes. No matter what the tax is, it constitutes a burden upon the individual or upon the family; and you cannot disassociate one tax from the whole pattern and then make comparisons with it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is well informed. Can he inform me how much is being collected annually in the District of Columbia from the personal-property tax?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not that figure in mind. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is about $5,000,000 a year.

Mr. SABATH. Is that all it is?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is a nice little sum of money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have a very diligent assessor here.

Mr. WELCH., Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman from Illinois has emphasized the increase in the cost of government in the city government of the District of Columbia. Does not that apply equally to every other large city in the United States?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think to a considerable extent it does.

Mr. WELCH. How do other cities meet it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Other cities increase their taxes.

Mr. WELCH. Has this city increased its taxes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are trying to do it right now.

Mr. WELCH. The District of Columbia has absolutely the lowest tax rate of any large city in the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not quite agree. But right now we are trying to devise a balanced tax program here. You cannot exclude this element and that element and finally get a program that will stand up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I desire to ask whether or not Maryland and Virginia, States that surround the District of Columbia, have a sales tax?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, they have. Maryland put on a sales tax last year; likewise Virginia.

Mr. DONDERO. I might say that the State of Michigan has a sales tax. When it was first established there was great opposition but now it is one of the chief sources of revenue.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I remember all the furore and fervor with which we approached the sales tax in the State of Illinois. It now yields about $130,000,000 a year, and the money is used for a variety of purposes, including the retirement fund for teachers, policemen, firemen, and that sort of thing, insofar as they share in the benefits of the State.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The tax rate on property is lower in Montgomery County, Md., adjoining the District of Columbia than it is in the District. The tax rate there is $1.75.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I think it would be interesting to the House to have the gentleman explain to these Members who are pleading for the poor that foodstuffs and medicines and other articles of that kind are exempt from this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I noticed with interest the presentation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and how the lines crossed at about the middle. The fact of the matter is that all food, all medicines, and all drugs, which are the substance of the average family budget, are completely excluded from incidence of this tax; so I am confident if that were recast in terms as we experience it in the District of Columbia that graph would not apply at all.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If a workingman bought a suit of clothes for $35, how much sales tax he would pay on it? He would pay six or seven dollars.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman can figure that out from the table in the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You do not exempt clothing and a workingman has to buy overalls, a pair of shoes, and things like that once in a while.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, the bulk of all is, first, rent, then food, then drugs and that sort of thing, so that the main expenditure in the average family budget is not reached by this tax at all. The fact is this makes for a balanced aspect of the matter and should be approved by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman said that food is exempt. Is it not a fact this does not apply to restaurants or hotels where more than 50 percent of the people in the District of Columbia eat because they cannot keep up their own homes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, now, let me say to the gentleman in all kindness that if a person can go to a fashionable restaurant and pay $4 or $6 for a meal, surely he is not going to kick about this tax. The people the gentleman is referring to are transients and they are not the people he is trying to defend here at all.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is it not a fact that as far as real-estate taxes in Washington are concerned they are the lowest of all the States?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, that is not correct.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is that tax not about a mill and a half while in the large industrial cities the tax is about 3½ mills?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If you take tangibles, the real-estate tax and all the other tax burdens, the District of Columbia is about in the middle of 60 large metropolitan centers of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, line 6, add the words "and trailers" between the word "vehicles" and the period.

On page 36, insert after the word "vehicle" in lines 10, 11, and 20, the words "or trailer."

On page 36, lines 21 to 24, inclusive, strike out all of the sentence beginning with the words "The issuance" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The issuance of certificates of title for the following motor vehicles and trailers shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this subsection:

"(1) Motor vehicles and trailers owned by the United States or the District.

"(2) Motor vehicles and trailers ownership of which are transferred by gift made or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment after the death of the donor if such motor vehicles and trailers were titled in the District at the time of the death of the donor.

"(3) Motor vehicles and trailers ownership of which are transferred by will, or by right of survivorship, or under the law of descent and distribution in force in the District if such motor vehicles and trailers were titled in the District at the time of the death of the decedent."

On page 45, line 22, change the numeral "III" to the numeral "XII."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Page 47, line 13, after the word "title", add the following new section:

"SEC. 12. Section 2 (b) of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new paragraph:

"'(14) Dues and initiation fees in the case of any club organized and operated exclusively for pleasure and recreation, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private individual or shareholder. As used in this subsection, the word "dues" means only sums paid or incurred by members on a monthly, quarterly, annual, or other periodic basis for the privilege of being members of such club and any pro rata assessment made against the members as such; the word "dues" does not include any sums paid or incurred by members or their guests for food, beverages, or other tangible personal property purchased or for the use of the club's social, athletic, sporting, and other facilities; and the term "initiation fees" includes any payment, contribution, or loan, required as a condition precedent to membership, whether or not

any such payment, contribution, or loan is evidenced by a certificate of interest or indebtedness.'"

Page 47, line 14, after the word "Sec.", strike out the numeral "12" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "13."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to exempt from taxation the dues that are paid by the members of the various organizations of the District which, under an interpretation of law we passed last year, are taxable. This meets with the approval of the corporation counsel. It does not exempt, of course, sales of food or liquor or any other commercial activities within the club itself.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This exempts dues that a member might pay to a country club in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes; on the dues, but not on the activities. It always has been exempt under the income-tax law in the District up to last year and also exempt under Federal income-tax statutes.

We appreciated, Mr. Chairman, before we brought this bill to the floor of the House, that there would be a good deal of opposition to it. In this bill we are exempting food, cereals and cereal products, milk and milk products, candy and confectionery, ice cream and ice cream products, meat and meat products, fish and fish products, eggs and egg products, vegetables and vegetable products, fruit, fruit products and fruit juices, and various other items. This bill attempts to modify a bill that was recommended to the committee. I want to reiterate what I have already said, that 9 years ago, to be exact, 1939, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, rose on the floor of the House as members of the Committee on the District of Columbia and opposed the so-called Pond report, which was a combination sales and income tax. We were able at that time to defeat the so-called sales tax and we were able to have adopted into law an amendment which is now the income-tax law of the District. Down during that period of time we have consistently kept out of the District the so-called sales-tax provision. But we have reached the point where we must obtain further revenues, and I want to say to the Members of the Committee that unless we find some way of raising sufficient revenues to finance the affairs of the District, the time is short, if we pass a salary increase bill for the District employes, within a year you will have a budget that will call for $15,000,000 or more in additional revenue. What will that mean? It will mean that either a sharp drop in major projects will take place or borrow money to finance the projects or we will have to jack up the tax rate from $2 to nearly $3, and that will mean that within a period of 2 years. Take the case of a man that paid $1,000 in taxes last year. We increased his taxes this year 30 percent. If we have to levy on property taxes to the amount that this bill will yield in revenue he will have to pay $2,000, or an increase in his realty tax of 100 percent in a period of 2 years. Now, that is what you are up against, gentlemen, and we are trying to find some way by which we can get the revenue. This is a fair bill. While the bill does provide for a sales tax, under the revised income-tax provisions of this bill incomes of less than $8,000 are exempted.

We have exempted food of every character for home consumption, as well as drugs and other things of necessity. We think it is a good bill that will yield the necessary revenue, and we firmly believe it ought to become law.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I notice on page 6 that you exempt the sales of drugs and medicines, and drugs and medicines are not defined in this bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I suppose there is a legal interpretation as to what drugs and medicines actually are, and I cannot interpret it here on the floor of the House this afternoon, but what drugs and medicines are is pretty well understood.

Mr. FOGARTY. One thing I have in mind is the sale of cod-liver oil, used for young children.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I should think that would be medicine in every sense of the word.

Mr. FOGARTY. Some people say it is not.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman has mentioned the fact that foodstuffs are exempted, as well as drugs. Is it not a fact that household articles such as soap flakes, cleansers, wax, toilet tissues, and all other paper products, brooms, mops, disinfectants, household necessities, and other products of the kind, are not exempted?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right, but food is.

Mr. KLEIN. But these articles are almost as essential to the average housewife as food is, therefore it would add to the cost of living of these people.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from New York well knows as a member of the committee last year how we really did try to get through an income-tax bill in the lower brackets as well as the higher, but were unable to do so because of the feeling on the floor of the House. The House rejected our bill at that time.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to own a home here, so I am a homeowner and a taxpayer in the District. I have figured out my tax bill here in the District and compared it with the tax bill on my home in Detroit. I feel that I pay about 40 percent less in real-estate taxes in the city of Washington than I do on similar property in the city of Detroit.

You say, "This is a tax on the District of Columbia," and I say that this is a tax on the city of Washington. It is a 2-percent sales tax upon a city, upon a city population. Where have you a city in the whole United States of America where you are taking a 2-percent sales tax to run a city government? You are not running the State of Maryland, or the State of Michigan or the State of Massachusetts or the State of Ohio. The District is not a State. We have no State government to support. This is a little city, the city of Washington.

In the city of Detroit we get our revenue as you do in other cities, from real estate taxes, personal property taxes, and from intangibles, but certainly we operate our great city of Detroit without going into the pockets of the poor people and taking a 2-percent sales tax out of them.

Who is going to pay this tax? It is a tax on poor people. You go to Murphy's, to any 5-and-10 store, or a dime-to-a-dollar store, or Kresge's 5 and 10, Hahn's or Lansburgh's, go to any of these stores, and stand there and look at the people coming in to buy things. They are predominently wage earners, Government clerks and low-income folks. On all the articles that are sold in the stores those customers are going to pay this sales tax. Just take a look at those people and see who is buying these things and who is going to pay this tax. It is the poor people. This is a tax on children. This is a tax on babies. This is a tax on those families that have the greatest number of children. They will pay the greatest part of this tax burden of running the city of Washington. Is that fair? Is that equity? I do not think it is. I just looked over the exemptions under the bill. It provides as follows:

Exemption (k): Sales of newspapers and magazines exempted.

Exemption (n): Sales of advertising space and sales of radio advertising is exempted.

Why should they be exempted? Is it to squelch newspaper opposition to it? There might have been opposition on the part of the big advertisers to this bill, and the committee could not get it through the House. So they have exempted the big boys and exempted all those who have control of publicity so that there would not be too much publicity against this bill. That is why they put these exemptions in. But it is an unfair bill. A sales tax is not necessary in the District of Columbia or the city of Washington. They can raise their revenues here the same as they raise them to run our city of Detroit and in the same way as they raise funds to run the cities in your own States. Do not let them kid you that they have to have this additional means of raising taxes which certain States have been forced to resort to, because this is not a State Government. It is only a city government, and it only needs taxes to run a city government.

The apartment-house owners receive higher rents than they do in Detroit or other large cities and they pay only 50 percent as much in taxes as they would

in other cities. Why cannot they pay their full share of the taxes?

This is a continuation of the Republican tax policy to shift the burden of taxation onto the backs of the poor people, the wage earners and upon those in the lowest income groups.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the line and page references of the amendment be corrected to read on page 47, after line 13, and at the bottom, page 47, line 14, so that it is in consonance with the bill that is now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 4, line 11, after the word "products", insert "soft drinks," and on line 15, page 4, after the word "beer" strike out the words "soft drinks," and on line 18, page 4, after the word "cocoa", insert the words "soft drinks."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I assume even those who oppose the idea of a sales tax will concur with the thought behind this amendment because it recognizes soft drinks as a food. I have in mind such soft drinks as soda pop and Coca-Cola and all of the drinks that the children buy. I think they ought to be encouraged to have their soft drinks and not have to worry about paying the tax. I think it helps develop temperance. I can remember as a boy how important it was to me to be able to go down to the soda fountain and buy that little bottle of pop. If I had to pay a tax on it, I am afraid that I would not have had it to buy. I am sure there is no opposition particularly to this amendment. It is included with the other items of food and juices and other mild drinks. So far as those who want to drink liquor or who want to drink soda with their liquor, I think it is perfectly proper for them to pay a tax on such drinks. But in consideration of the little people who want to buy their soft drinks, I do not believe they should be included so as to have to pay a tax under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We have already agreed to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. O'HARA. That is my understanding.

May I ask the ranking minority member if he has any objection to the amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. No. I agree to the amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. An ice cream soda in most drug-stores costs 15 cents. The children would have to pay a cent tax on that.

Mr. O'HARA. I did not know that they did. I hope not.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes, they do.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman is a member of the committee, is he not?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; I am.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wonder if the gentleman does not think that coffins and caskets ought to be exempted.

Mr. O'HARA. I had not thought of it. Does the gentleman wish to offer such an amendment?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am asking the gentleman. I would rather the committee took action.

Mr. O'HARA. I am frank to say I had not thought of it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; but you have accepted that. That has already been agreed to.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. How about bubble gum? Is that exempt?

Mr. O'HARA. I assume that is exempt under the limitations of the bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. I do not think the gentleman wants to think of caskets and coffins.

Mr. O'HARA. No. I want to live a while.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we are witnessing something very unusual this afternoon. The two chief advocates of this bill, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has just told us that for over 30 years he has fought against the imposition of a sales tax. Finally, he has become convinced, as a matter of expediency, to levy a sales tax on the citizens of the District of Columbia. If it was wrong in principle in his mind in Massachusetts for 30 years, I think it is the wrong place to change his opinion about the principle of levying a sales tax here in this District of Columbia.

The other gentleman who is supporting this measure and advocating it strongly, the gentleman from Illinois, admits also that it is wrong in principle to impose a sales tax. He does not believe in it. Those are the only two gentlemen who have strongly advocated the passage of this measure this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I have not heard anybody on the floor since this measure was called up say a good word about the sales tax, yet we want to inflict it upon the people of the District of Columbia. I do not think we are giving fair consideration to the good citizens of this city and to the people from all over the country who come here to see our national shrines and monuments and historical features in this city, when we seek to levy a sales tax on them. At the same time, the people who live in this city have the opportunity, at Government expense, more than any other American citizens, of enjoying more public parks, enjoying visits to shrines and monuments and historical places. And remember, as was so well said by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], the owners of homes in the District of Columbia pay approximately 40 percent less in real-estate taxes.

I understand it is the intention of the majority to report from the House Committee on Banking and Currency a bill which has killed the public housing feature, which has killed the redevelopment of urban territories, thus showing in bold relief the strength of the real estate operators of the country. It seems to me that this bill has also some relevancy to the power of the real estate operators in this city, because in my opinion real estate taxes ought to be raised. We should not think of inflicting a tax on sales on all the visitors from your district and my district and from all over the world. The real estate power is great, but I hope it is not able to carry this afternoon. This proposed sales tax is an opening wedge for the imposition of a manufacturer's sales tax on every article manufactured in the United States, because in our committee we hear more and more all the time about broadening the sales tax, broadening the manufacturer's tax, and putting the burden more and more on people least able to pay.

This measure should be defeated. I sincerely hope it will be.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is it not a fact that we in Congress appropriate a certain amount of funds that are used to pay for the Park Police? We maintain the parks and all other things which in other cities are paid for by the regular taxes on the citizens.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely right. The people who live in the District of Columbia live in the finest city in the world at the lowest comparable real estate tax in existence, the finest city without question in the entire world.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I wish to point out to the gentleman this one fact, that the apartment house owners in this city of Washington get more rent for their apartments than is charged in my city of Detroit and in many of the other big cities of the country, yet here in the city of Washington these same apartment house owners are paying only from 40 to 50 percent of the tax that apartment house owners in other cities throughout the country are having to pay.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk to subsection (n) of section I of this bill, which is identical with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], with the exception that my amendment adds the words "soft drinks" in line 11

after the words "fruit juices", whereas his amendment adds the words "soft drinks" after the words "fruit products."

The effect of both amendments is to place soft drinks in the category of food, and to exempt soft drinks from this sales tax.

Subsection (n), which is the subsection defining "food", as you will note, includes milk and milk products; candy and confectionery; ice cream and ice-cream products; fruit, fruit products, and fruit juices; coffee and coffee substitutes; tea; cocoa and cocoa products. Certainly soft drinks should be included in this list of food items. Bottled soft drinks cannot be classed as a luxury. There is no reason to exempt a pound of candy costing $1.50 from this sales tax, and at the same time refuse to exempt a carton of six bottles of soft drinks, retailing for 25 or 30 cents, as the case may be, and I feel sure that the Members will see the justice of including bottled soft drinks in the list of food items to be exempt from this sales tax.

I call your attention to a pamphlet prepared and released by the United States Department of Commerce from the sixteenth census of the United States in 1940, which shows that the value of nonalcoholic, carbonated, and still beverages, manufactured in the District of Columbia in 1939 totaled $2,905,160. Accurate estimates of the proportion of these beverages sold in cartons or cases amounting to more than 14 cents each in value, show the total of such sales to be approximately $871,000 retail value. The tax on that sum would be inconsequential, amounting at the 2-percent rate to $17,420. This exemption therefore will have no serious effect upon the revenue to be produced by the act. Soft drinks constitute a common grocery-food item. They logically should be placed in the food classification, and I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a limitation of time. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there are many Members who want to get away and we have a great deal of business yet to transact.

I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE: On page 8, line 7, insert "coffins and caskets."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that of all the detestable taxes man puts on anything it is on the family in time of their bereavement.

This amendment is easily understood by everyone and they know that the amount of money that would be collected under this tax would merely add to the cost of the funeral.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that the committee would have no objection to that particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to announce that there are three amendments at the desk. The Chair would like to recognize the authors of these amendments.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEIN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: That section 3 (s) of title I, article I, is amended to read as follows:

"'(s) The word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year.'

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of title III is amended by striking out all of the paragraph numbered (b) (10) and renumbering the succeeding paragraphs as (10) and (11), respectively.

"SEC. 3. Section 3 of title III is amended by striking out all of the paragraph numbered 3 (b) (5) and renumbering the succeeding paragraph as (5).

"SEC. 4. Section 3 of title VI is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. Imposition and rates of tax: There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every resident a tax at the following rates:

"'Two percent on the first $2,000 of taxable income.

"'Three percent on the next $3,000 of taxable income.

"'Four percent on the next $5,000 of taxable income.

"'Five percent on the taxable income in excess of $10,000.'

"SEC. 5. Article I is further amended by striking out all of title VIII and renumbering the succeeding titles as VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, and XV, respectively."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I must reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I withhold it.

NO NEED FOR SALES TAX

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I have offered is a substitute for the pending bill. This is my bill to provide for an adequate income tax in the District.

If the point of order should be sustained, I ask the members of the committee to vote down the bill in the hope that if it is defeated then this bill of mine will get consideration by the committee. As I stated a little while ago, there is no need for a sales tax, although, having served on the Fiscal Affairs Committee of this committee, I admit that the District does need additional revenue. But there are other ways of getting it. It is not necessary to use the sales tax, the most unfair of all taxes, because it falls heaviest on those least able to pay.

SALES TAX IS HIDDEN

Of course, it is an easy tax to put over on the people. We have had it in New York for many years. It was originally passed as a temporary measure, but like all of them it has become permanent. It is a hidden form of taxation. It is an easy, but costly, tax to collect; it is easy to lull the people into believing it is a sort of luxury matter. They just feel that the cost of living has gone up, that is all.

There are other ways of raising revenue. How about an additional Federal contribution? The Federal Government, as we know, owns most of the buildings in the District of Columbia. It pays no taxes at all to the District government except for a small annual contribution. This is unfair because the District government loses all that means of revenue. If private individuals or corporations maintained those buildings they would have to pay a tax to the District of Columbia.

I thank the gentleman for withholding his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

The question was taken; and on a division demanded by Mr. KLEIN) there were—ayes 16, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 5, strike out all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and insert "(a) On each sale where the price is at least $1, 1 cent, and of every dollar of price from then 1 cent."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will in effect reduce the sales tax of 2 percent to 1 percent on every dollar and every dollar of purchase thereafter. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is expected to do away with the tax on soft drinks, but even though they say it is a 2-percent sales tax, the people could very easily be forced to pay a sales tax of 4 or 5 percent, because on every purchase from 14 cents to 50 cents there is a tax of 1 cent. To the housewife going from store to store downtown, making small purchases here and there, this tax could very easily add up to a 4- or 5-percent sales tax. The amendment that I have offered would simply mean that it would be a 1-percent sales tax, and there would be no tax on any articles that did not cost at least $1. That would help to take care of the children that we, I think, are interested in taking care of in the District on all these things that have been mentioned this afternoon, like soft drinks, gum, and candy and everything else. I do not think a 1-percent sales tax would

be too much. The present bill in some cases would add up to a 4- or 5-percent sales tax because of the way the committee has written the bill. It is entirely too much and goes much further than the committee intended it to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR FARM PRODUCTS MUST BE CONTINUED AT A HIGH LEVEL

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this Congress for several years. For a considerable part of that time I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture, a place where I have had the opportunity to study the agriculture of the Nation, to seek ways and means of advancing the welfare of those engaged in farming, as well as those who may not be directly engaged in such but who are dependent upon the welfare and well being of agriculture.

During the years when my party was in power the Congress believed that farmers were entitled to the same consideration, to the same necessities, and to the same opportunity of providing for themselves the things which make life enjoyable as are individuals in other occupations. The Congress set up the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I am proud to have some part in continuing it. The Congress has heretofore guaranteed our farmers 90 percent of parity for basic commodities and administered the same through the Commodity Credit Corporation. We have provided rural electrification so that life on the farm can be just as comfortable as in the cities. I long to see the day when electric lines will reach to every farm home, and believe we are on the way toward that objective. We have provided adequate farm credit, for further research in the use of farm products, and many other valuable farm programs.

During the war we called on the American farmer to produce as he has never produced before. This he did, notwithstanding the fact that he was short of labor, of fertilizer, of farm machinery, and had many other problems. The farmer accomplished this at the cost of a deterioration of his plant and with a depletion of his soil. We have recognized these facts and have developed a wonderful program of soil conservation.

Personally, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I have devoted myself to trying to relieve some of the farmers' problems. I am glad to say that the future looks a little brighter. I believe that by the next crop season the fertilizer and farm-equipment situation will be much improved. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to forget the other things that are so essential to the farmers' welfare.

For a number of years we have guaranteed the farmer 90 percent of parity, and further provided that such guarantee should continue for 2 years after the war. We did this in an effort to prevent any sharp break in farm prices and in the farmers' well-being. Yet, January 1, 1949, these 2 years will come to an end. I believe we should have long since made the support-price program permanent, with possibly some changes to correct inequities which exist in the present law.

For the past 2 years we have heard much of a new long-range farm program. The Senate and House Committees on Agriculture have conducted days and days of hearings. We have heard representatives of various farm organizations and hundreds of farmers from more than 40 States on the new long-range program. They have submitted their views on farm credit, research, parity, price supports, soil conservation, and many related subjects. Sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of the present program, particularly with regard to soil conservation and price supports, with a few suggested improvements here and there. There was an almost unanimity of agreement that the program should be given a long-range status and anchored to a state of permanency.

After all these months of lengthy hearings and study, what is the situation? At this late date the long-range program is being carried over until next year. In the meantime two most important phases of the present program, which were considered in the hearings on the new long-range program, will expire unless speedy action is taken by the Congress.

The Republican leadership has announced that it intends to adjourn the Congress June 19. That is only 11 days away. The time is very limited. Bills which my committee has reported and which would continue these very important phases of the program are pending and awaiting action of the Congress. You must permit the Congress to pass these measures before adjournment.

Everyone is entitled to a fair return for his labor and merchandise. Certainly the farmer is no exception. The law which guarantees to the farmer a support price of 90 percent for basic commodities will expire on December 31, 1948. Unless that law is continued the only authority for support of basic commodities will be that found in the Agricultural Adjustment Act; and it provides for supports ranging only from 50 to 75 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The supports so authorized in the Triple-A Act are not only inadequate, but most indefinite. The farmer is given little assurance of what he may expect in the way of price supports.

The Secretary of Agriculture has set production goals for 1948 at a figure which will require 9,000,000 more acres of cropland than were utilized in 1947. He has asked our farmers to help feed the world through higher production. It is reasonable to assume that similar production goals will be imposed for 1949. High production goals create the risk of price-breaking surpluses. It is wrong, therefore, for the Government to insist on increased farm production and not at the same time guarantee a reasonable price through the means of price supports. On this the farmers are entitled to a definite commitment from the Government. I, for one, favor fixing the support at not less than 90 percent of parity.

Several weeks ago the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, reported a bill which would continue supports for basic commodities produced through 1949 at 90 percent of parity. It was the view of the committee that before the expiration of 1949 a new long-range program would be enacted, but in the meantime the present laws should be continued. The bill also has for its purpose the continuation of supports at present levels for the so-called Steagall commodities.

Mr. Chairman, as yet no action has been taken on this bill. It is most important and imperative that the same be called up by the Republican leadership for immediate consideration. Time is running out. I respectfully urge the Republican leadership to submit the bill to the House for prompt consideration.

Of equal importance is the bill which would continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. The authority under which the Corporation functions will expire on June 30 next. It is through this agency that the support program is administered. Various differences apparently exist between the members of the Senate and House committees as to the authority which should be conferred upon the Corporation and the manner and form in which the Corporation should be continued. Bills for continuance of the Corporation are pending before both Houses. They should likewise be called up for immediate consideration. Unless the Commodity Credit Corporation Act be continued the support program for 1948 will be endangered. I doubt seriously that it could be carried on at all.

Mr. Chairman, I join with other members of the Committee on Agriculture in imploring the Republican leadership to bring up these bills, continue the present farm program for another year so that the farmers will be protected until the long-range program is enacted. We must see to it that the farmers of our Nation are given the same consideration that is accorded all others. We on the Agricultural Committee feel that certainly no less could be done than to continue the present program. We hope then to pass an adequate long-range measure guaranteeing the farmer fair and equal treatment for years to come.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 8, line 6, after "trailers", insert a new subsection: "Sales of all clothing."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] when they were talking about the substance of a sales tax on the poor, and the reference to food,

drugs, and medicines. I think the gentleman knows that the articles of clothing that are bought for children today amount to almost as much as food and medicine combined amount to, because whereas once the parents of 2 and 3-year-old children were paying a dollar for a pair of shoes for them, they now are paying five and six dollars for a pair of shoes. Every other article of clothing that is bought for a child or for those going through school, through high school, or through college, has gone up to at least 5 or 10 times what it was 10 years ago. I think if you want to be sincere about this matter, if you want to take care of the poor class of people, this is one amendment that you can accept in good grace.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: One page 3, line 20, after "gain", strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "or that are not organized or operated for gain."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I assume the committee intends to accomplish what my amendment will bring about, but if so the use of the language here in paragraph (h) on page 3 did not accomplish that purpose. My amendment, for example, might apply to a hospital like Providence Hospital or some other private institution that is operated by the Sisters or those of some other religion, which institutions are not supported principally by public subscriptions or endowment or by appropriations from the Congress, and yet are not operated for profit or gain. My amendment is designed to meet that particular situation, if it exists, in the District.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has discussed that matter with the chairman of the committee and with me, and we are certainly in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here with a very practical proposition, and it is very reminiscent now of just what happened here last year when we were trying to pass a tax bill to raise the necessary revenue for the District of Columbia. It is much easier to object and to criticize something that a committee has worked over for months and months than it is to do something constructive about it yourself. That has been our experience in trying to bring about proper tax legislation for the District. Last year we did just what these gentlemen have been suggesting. We tried to get away from the sales tax. We had to balance the budget in the District of Columbia by raising revenue from other sources. We brought in an income-tax bill. The House adopted it. It was feared that that bill might tax somebody that somebody did not want to tax around here, so we were defeated. We went out and left an unbalanced budget. This joint committee has worked over this matter. We have invited everybody in Washington and every Member of Congress who wanted to be heard to come before the committee. We heard them. The committee is practically unanimous on it, and if we are going to write a tax bill, you have to just accept the bill devised by the committee. That is the experience we have had in bills which come from the Committee on Ways and Means. As a matter of fact, all bills coming from the Committee on Ways and Means with reference to taxation come before us under a closed rule, because we all realize the impracticability of writing any kind of tax bill on the floor of the House. This matter of legislating for the District of Columbia is not an easy task. It is not a task that men get very much thanks for. Something has to be done to raise the necessary revenues to operate the Capital of the Government of the United States. This is the only method we have been able to devise as yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my opening remarks against this outrageous sales tax I called attention to the fact that every one of the gentlemen who reported the bill stated that for years they had been opposed to the sales tax. Consequently, I cannot understand the underlying reasons why they changed their positions since the businessmen and real-estate owners in the District of Columbia are making more money and obtaining greater returns on their investments than ever before. Those very men are behind the movement to force this tax on the backs of the vast majority of consumers of low incomes and invariably larger families, who will be gouged not only 2 percent but up to 3 and 4 percent on small purchases under the provisions of this bill.

I realize that foods and medicines have been exempted from the tax, with the exception of foods served in restaurants and hotels. Naturally, I do not have in mind the Mayflower, as my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated. I agree that transients and those people living at the Mayflower or the best hotels can easily afford to pay the tax. What I have in mind is the several thousand smaller and cheaper restaurants who cater to the working class of people. Most of the patrons of these restaurants are Government workers and people privately employed who cannot keep house and prepare their meals at home because housekeeping quarters are impossible to obtain.

It has been stated that a powerful lobby has been working on some of the gentlemen and it appears, unfortunately, they have succumbed to their influence and their prestige.

Yes, in many cities a sales tax was imposed on the people during the Hoover days. After the crash when municipalities and States were actually in desperate need, people were unable to pay their real-estate taxes, which reduced by over 50 percent the revenue of the municipalities and States. So, in desperation, a sales tax was adopted to relieve them of their distressing financial conditions, and to enable them to pay the salaries of the municipal and State employees, including policemen and firemen, and even the unfortunate school teacher.

However, these conditions do not exist today because, as I said before, business is making greater profits; property is bringing in greater revenues; and personal property such as stocks and bonds is paying larger dividends to the wealthy owners.

Consequently, if the personal property of those thousands of people living in the District of Columbia was properly assessed and collections rigidly enforced, it would bring in greater revenues than this proposed sales tax.

Yes, we have a sales tax in Illinois and it brings to the State about $160,000,000 annually, but because of laxity and inefficiency in collections only about 60 percent of the tax is collected. I have heard of many instances where businessmen have settled their sales tax with the collectors, which unfortunately has never reached the State treasury. In connection with the collecting of these taxes there has been a great deal of scandal involved and, of course, this is under the Republican administration.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Last year we increased the real-estate tax by 30 percent. If we are to take care of the increased Federal wages and salaries, we will have to make the tax 100 percent above what it was last year. That is the danger of this situation.

Mr. SABATH. I cannot agree with the gentleman. You stated that last year, for the first time in 11 years, real-estate taxes were increased 25 percent. I then stated and restate now that real-estate taxes can be increased an additional 25 percent and the total tax would still be lower than in most of the large cities in the United States, because the value of real estate and the increase in rentals on business property in the last 7 years have gone up 100 percent and, in many instances, 200 percent.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. You would agree if you had the facts.

Mr. SABATH. We can easily increase the taxes on real estate another 10 or 20 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, what I want to say this afternoon cannot be said in 2 minutes, so I will merely announce that I have reserved time to speak after the business of the day is concluded, at which time I shall speak about the Navajo rehabilitation bill, which is now coming before us. I will be complimented by those of you who remain and hope that those who have business in their offices will read my speech tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRAWFORD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6759) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them engross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Not a sufficient number have arisen.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 116, noes 71.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present; a quorum.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 7, 1948.

Mr. F. EDWARD HÉBERT requests, pursuant to rule XXXVIII, leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of H. R. 3639, for the relief of Alexander D. Irwin and Archibald O. Leighton, Seventy-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been filed thereon.

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absense was granted to Mr. PEDEN (at the request of Mr. MORRIS), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in regard to social security.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein excerpts from the committee's report on the bill; and to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, to include in each extraneous matter, and in one a radio address by Jack Bell.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5770) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5770) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19, 25, 29 and 30, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$4,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$52,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$174,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$19,584,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$193,584,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$12,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$505,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$172,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$2,114,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$12,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$2,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$17,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$23,042,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$7,658,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$12,653,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$14,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$42,457,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 12, 15, and 34.

GORDON CANFIELD,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOE B. BATES,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GUY CORDON,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5770) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommend in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I. TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 1 appropriates $125,000 for the Division of Tax Research, instead of $110,000 as proposed by the House and $141,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 appropriates $250,000 for the Office of the General Counsel, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 authorizes $4,250,000 for promoting the sale of savings bonds, instead of $3,750,000 as proposed by the House and $4,658,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates $52,000,000 for administering the public debt, instead of $51,500,000 as proposed by the House and $52,408,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 appropriates $174,000,000 for personal services in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, instead of $168,736,000 as proposed by the House and $179,266,000 as proposed by the Senate. In approving for the Bureau of Internal Revenue funds additional to the amount requested in the original Budget for 1949, it is the intention of the managers on the part of the two Houses that the Secretary of the Treasury apply these additional funds for upgrading essential positions in field enforcement activities and for the employment of additional qualified enforcement personnel. The Secretary of the Treasury should report to the Congress at the beginning of the next session as to the progress made, including detailed information as to the success of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in recruiting competent persons in order that this program may be reviewed at the earliest moment in the 81st Congress, 1st session, and a decision reached as to whether and the extent to which the program should be enlarged.

Amendment No. 6 authorizes expenditure of not to exceed $16,530,000 for personal services at the seat of Government in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 appropriates $19,584,000 for objects of expenditure other than personal services in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, instead of $18,000,000 as proposed by the House and $21,166,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 authorizes not to exceed $2,576,500 for stationery for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 authorizes not to exceed $1,500,000 for ammunition for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 authorizes not to exceed $500,000 for rewards for bringing to trial violators of internal revenue laws, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 provides for a total appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in amount of $193,584,000, instead of $186,736,000, as proposed by the House and $200,432,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates $12,500,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,830,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,275,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Supply, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,310,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 16: Inserts the amendment of the Senate providing funds to increase the general supply fund established by the Act approved February 27, 1929, as amended, with an amendment providing $1,500,000 for such purpose, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $170,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House, for printing and binding for the Bureau of Federal Supply.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $968,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $928,000, as proposed by the House, for salaries, Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $823,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $752,000, as proposed by the House, for salaries, Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $505,000 for salaries, Bureau of Accounts, instead of $485,000, as proposed by the House, and $525,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $172,150 for contingent expenses, instead of $160,000, as proposed by the House, and $184,300, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,114,000 for printing and binding, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,228,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $12,600,000 for compensation to assistant postmasters, instead of $12,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $12,700,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $2,900,000 for carfare and bicycle allowance, instead of $2,800,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Strikes out the provision of the House to appropriate $23,842,000 for foreign mail transportation, including not to exceed $79,200 to cover cost for maintaining sea post service on ocean steamships conveying mails to and from the United States, and inserts $23,762,800 for such foreign mail transportation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $17,500 for indemnities, international mail, instead of $15,000, as proposed by the House, and $20,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $23,042,000 for foreign air mail service, instead of $19,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $26,583,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 28, 29 and 30, relating to Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, miscellaneous supplies and equipment: Appropriates $7,658,000, instead of $7,158,000, as proposed by the House, and $8,158,000, as proposed by the Senate; makes available $50,000 for mechanizing devices for separation of mails, and $50,000 for research, design, manufacture, and installation of pilot mail-sorting equipment, and for the necessary supervision of the installation and operation of such equipment, as proposed by the Senate, it being of the highest importance that the Postmaster General cooperate to the fullest extent with the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the progressive program to be implemented by funds provided in this amendment, since many millions of dollars of public funds may be saved by this program; and strikes out the words "or blueprints", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $12,853,625 for equipment shops, instead of $12,800,000, as proposed by the House, and $12,907,250, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $14,750,000 for rent, fuel, and utility services, instead of $14,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $15,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $42,457,000 for vehicle service, instead of $42,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $42,914,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

Amendment No. 12, relating to management and operational studies of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 15, relating to the purchase of typewriters by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Supply. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 34, relating to the transfer of funds, Field Service, Post Office Department. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

GORDON CANFIELD,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOE B. BATES,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANFIELD (interrupting the reading of the statement of the managers). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12. Page 11, line 3, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $150,000 of the amount appropriated under this head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for expenses by contract or otherwise, of such management and opera-

tional studies as are necessary in the Bureau of Internal Revenue."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 and agree to the same.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 22, line 11, strike out all of lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "In the event the Director of the Bureau of Federal Supply is unable to furnish any such agency with suitable typewriters out of stock on hand, he may purchase, out of funds specifically appropriated for that purpose, such machines at the lowest published retail list price for any such typewriters offered for sale to the Federal Government less 30 percent, plus the amount of Federal excise tax applicable to the lowest published retail list price."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing paragraphs, in the event the Director of the Bureau of Federal Supply is unable to furnish any such agency with suitable typewriters out of stock on hand, he may purchase typewriters for the account of such agency: *Provided*, That the price paid during any quarter of the fiscal year for such typewriters shall not exceed 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most favored customer (other than the Government of the United States, or any agency thereof, and purchasers of typewriters for educational instruction purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6 months' period immediately preceding such quarter."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: On page 40, after line 10, insert the following: "Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation for the Field Service, Post Office Department, may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other appropriation or appropriations under the same Service, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent by such transfers."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of said amendment, strike out the word "same", and insert "said."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a poem.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition signed by a large number of citizens of Tennessee.

INCREASING TRAVEL ALLOWANCE FOR RAILWAY POSTAL CLERKS AND SUBSTITUTE RAILWAY POSTAL CLERKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this morning when the Consent Calendar was called, the bill S. 2152, appeared thereon, but had not been on the calendar long enough to be considered today. I asked unanimous consent at that time for its consideration, and the Speaker informed me that if I would interview the objectors perhaps it could be called up later. I have spoken to the objectors, both Republicans and Democrats, I have taken the matter up with the majority leader and the minority leader, I have also talked to the senior and minority members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and they have no objection to the consideration of this bill at the present time. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2152) to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (m) and (r) of section 16 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, are amended by striking out "$4 per day" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6 per day."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NAVAJO INDIAN LEGISLATION

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I heartily commend the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], chairman of the Public Lands Committee, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, as well as the Republican steering committee, for their decision Friday to push enactment of the Navajo Indian legislation before Congress adjourns. Following their action Friday, it was my understanding that the Navajo bill would be called up today under unanimous consent or by a suspension of the rules. Though the primary election is in progress in New Mexico today, I flew back to Washington yesterday, only to find this morning that the Indian Office has filed an adverse report to the D'Ewart bill.

I have heretofore restrained myself because of my affection for Secretary Krug and Under Secretary Warne, who are sincere men, but this action on the part of the Indian Office shocks me beyond further restraint. I must speak out. Is it possible that the Indian Office is more interested in putting this Congress on the spot so that it can be blamed for failure to act? I do not believe in playing politics at the expense of hungry and destitute people.

The bill reported out by the committee is right in line with Secretary Krug's recommendations. It authorizes the full $25,000,000 requested for the construction of schools, school dormitories, and other educational facilities. It authorizes $100,000 per year to promote employment of Navajo Indians off the reservation; it authorizes $250,000 per year for the relief of disabled and dependent Navajo Indians; it authorizes $228,000 for health improvement, and $1,000,000 per year for the construction of roads. All of this is right in line with the recommendations of Secretary Krug.

True, this does not at one stroke authorize the entire 10-year $90,000,000 program, and because it does not do so the Indian Office objects to the enactment of this bill. This arbitrary and dilatory attitude is unreasonable and likely to result in no action at all.

Heretofore in the summer of 1946, nearly $1,000,000 was appropriated for the building of two Navajo schools. To this date, not a handful of dirt has been turned and not a nail has been driven in the construction of those two schools. Chicago architects were hired, as if there were none competent in New Mexico and Arizona, and the whole matter is still tangled up by the red tape and dilatory attitude of the Washington Indian Office. Under the circumstances, objection to the House bill on the grounds that it does not authorize the entire program, including airports and modern coal bins and all, comes with poor grace.

The D'Ewart bill should be taken up as promptly as possible. I hope this is done before this week ends, and that it is passed and enacted into law before the adjournment of Congress. I go further and say that either Acting Commissioner Zimmerman and Educational Director Beatty should be discharged for their delay in carrying out the mandate of Congress as expressed in the appropriation bill in 1946, or else the Navajo Reservation should be taken from under their jurisdiction and their inaction. The Congress is not in position to discharge the men responsible for the neglect of this tribe, but it can and should emancipate the Navajo from the lethargy of this Bureau. Congress can pass legislation whereby a man of vigor and action can be selected to administer the long-delayed rehabilitation and education of these people. A bill to do that very thing is now pending in the Senate and I sincerely hope that Mr. D'EWART's bill and the Senate bill are combined and are enacted into law before we adjourn.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this observation. The gentleman from New Mexico had some very complimentary things to say about the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and also about the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And I say they deserve it, too.

Mr. MURDOCK. They do deserve it, and for that reason I wanted to second what the gentleman said in that respect. I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New Mexico himself has been untiring in his efforts to get the kind of legislation for which he now pleads. That was shown quite eloquently last November when we had temporary legislation before us, and at that time the gentleman from New Mexico time after time stressed the need of a permanent piece of legislation that would rehabilitate this great Navajo Indion Tribe. I am in accord with the gentleman in wanting a proper long-range plan.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman. I have also been very patient. I have not spoken out, although I did tell the committee what I knew about the details regarding the building of those two schoolhouses. Now they come in here with this report. If they had criticized our committee for not giving them the full amount requested, I would not have anything to say, but when they come in and say, "Do not enact this bill," when they know full well or ought to know full well that if we are not going to enact this bill we will not at this late date get anything, that is the last stroke.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to commend the gentleman for his courageous statement on this matter. We are all very deeply interested in the welfare of the Indians of the country, and the gentleman from New Mexico has always fought valiantly for the Indians of his State.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. In my opinion, our Committee on Public Lands has not had the proper cooperation from the Indian Bureau. I hope that some way may be arrived at whereby we can secure more adequate information and better reports and more active cooperation from the Indian Bureau.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As far as getting information about the Navajo Reservation is concerned, I do not think we will ever get it until we have a man responsible at the head of that reservation, instead of trying to channel everything through the Indian Office in Washington.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I in turn want to compliment the gentleman from New Mexico on bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress. Certainly the situation on the Navajo and the Hopi Reservations is something that is a disgrace to the Nation. We have made treaties with these people under which we are supposed to do certain things. We have fallen down in the carrying out of those treaties. During this session we have held extensive hearings on the situation in the Navajo Reservation. As a result of those hearings, various bills were introduced. The one to which the gentleman from New Mexico refers is the one that is being pressed for enactment at this time and has been voted out unanimously by our House Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman will agree with me, I am sure, that it is the beginning of the very program Secretary Krug has recommended.

Mr. D'EWART. That is right. It is not the intention of the committee that this shall be the final word on this problem, but it is a step in the right direction. I think this goes along and is in accord with the recommendations of the Bureau. I regret very much that they have seen fit to send up an adverse report on this necessary legislation. I hope we may not pay too much attention to that report, but can get favorable action in this session on this bill, which will be a step in taking care of this very, very bad situation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am sure Congress will do what is right, regardless of the report.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. As I recall, when this bill was brought before the full Committee on Public Lands, this very statement was made, that this was the first step in the general over-all program and approach to settling this very delicate and serious problem as far as the Indians are concerned.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes. I think the committee is very properly putting first things first in this bill. If we authorize the whole $90,000,000, what assurance have we that they will handle that any better than the $1,000,000 we gave them 2 years ago, with which they have done nothing up to date?

Mr. POULSON. I do not believe there is a single committee in the House that works any harder than the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, of which the gentleman is one of the very able members.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am sorry to say that in this particular matter we have not accomplished very much so far because of the lack of a cooperative attitude on the part of the Indian Office in Washington. What has been done is due to the untiring efforts of men like the gentleman from California, and the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. PHILBIN. I desire today, Mr. Speaker, to devote some time to a summary of the life, works, service, and principles of a very great American whom I was privileged to call my warm and close friend for many years. Last June the 11th, just about a year ago, in the bloom of a beautiful New England spring, our former distinguished Senator David I. Walsh, whose name was synonymous with Massachusetts and high achievement for a full generation, laid down the heavy burden of service to the people which he had borne so nobly during a very large part of his life and passed to his eternal reward. It was significant that the end should come suddenly, that he was spared a protracted period of suffering, that he should appear before his Maker with the same spirit of Christian humility that he had demonstrated throughout his lifetime. At his untimely passing the State and Nation were plunged into deepest sorrow and all Massachusetts, stricken by grief, conscious of the passing of a great public servant and a matchless friend of the common people, paused to pay tribute to one of her greatest and noblest sons and one of our Nation's most illustrious patriots.

I had known Senator Walsh all my life. He was a close intimate friend of my father and my family. I lived in the same community with him and from earliest youth had scrupulously followed his career and had admired the fine American principles which he stood and fought for. Apart from his own family there was probably no one more profoundly moved by his death, or who misses him more than I do.

We had been together in friendship and political life for many years. Since I was a boy in college I was privileged to enjoy the closest association with him. At various times I served him as secretary, as his assistant in working out public problems and questions, as his representative in handling political matters, and on some occasions as his campaign manager. In recent time, since I came to Congress, I saw him more frequently and spent a great deal of time with him when our respective days' work was finished. For these reasons, and because I had probably as good an opportunity as anyone to recognize and to admire the character, the principles, the high motives, and the steadfast ideals of this great American, I am in a position where I can evaluate not only his personal qualities, but the worth and significance of his public contributions.

One would have to understand his origin and background to appreciate fully the political principles and activities of Senator Walsh. Born in humblest cir-

cumstances, sprung from rugged, honest hard-working Irish-immigrant stock, brought up in an environment typified by hard struggle and frugality, Senator Walsh never forgot the common people. He could not forget them because he was one of them himself. From the beginning to the end of his public life, the welfare of the great masses of the American people was his profound and never-ceasing concern. It was a curious coincidence that he should have commenced his public life in the general court of Massachusetts with a program which he ultimately carried to a successful conclusion to alleviate conditions of the poor and the laboring classes and that he should virtually end his great service in the august, deliberative United States Senate, with one of the strongest and most eloquent appeals in behalf of the workers and the people that has ever been heard in an American legislative body.

At the outset I think that I should briefly sketch something of his background. Born in Leominster, Mass., November 11, 1872, David Ignatius Walsh was the second youngest of 10 children of James and Brigit (Donnelly) Walsh. His father, an Irish immigrant, strong of body and character, was a comb maker in one of the local factories who worked long hours daily in the hot oppressive atmosphere of the comb factory where the horns of cattle were fashioned and molded into the materials for combs and other articles and ornaments of the day. There were many mouths to feed in the Walsh family and James Walsh's wages were trivial indeed as compared with our standards of today or even with some of the standards of his time.

Through a succession of hardships and misfortunes culminating with the foreclosure of the modest family home to satisfy a judgment obtained by a neighbor who had been bitten by the family dog, the Walshes lost their home, the father was stricken by sickness and died, and the family moved to live in nearby Clinton where the Senator's sisters, somewhat older than he, secured employment in the local textile factories. In this dawn of early American industrialism, long hours and hard work were the almost invariable rule, and the sisters of the future Governor and Senator of the State trudged to their work in the early morning hours through the dark streets of Clinton and back home again when their day's work was finished through twilight and darkness depending on the season. The Senator had several brothers and his courageous sisters, imbued with the determination of their race and conscious of the great opportunities of America, were resolved that any of their brothers who desired it should secure education and training for a profession. Three of the brothers who showed early promise and who were especially anxious to train for advancement in life responded to their pleadings and offers. The first and oldest was John, a young man, like the Senator, of brilliant talents, magnetic personality, and studious habits. After a few years he became a lawyer and soon distinguished himself before the bar of Worcester County. Sad to relate, however, his career was destined to be short-lived, for he was stricken by the dreaded white plague that was rampant in the industrial areas of New England at the time and he passed away when he was only 27 or 28 years of age.

While the family was overcome by his loss, its members were not to be deterred from carrying out their plans to secure appropriate education for as many of its members as possible. Two of the sisters and David and his brother Thomas, in rapid succession, attended higher institutions of learning, secured their certificates, diplomas, and degrees, and launched upon successful and impressive careers—the girls in the teaching profession where they achieved high standing and success, and the boys in the practice of the law.

David early distinguished himself and showed great promise. While he was attending high school, by his industriousness, his studious habits, his brilliant mind, his diligence and perseverance, he attracted the attention not only of his teachers but of his fellow citizens and townspeople. Easily one of the best students in his class though he spent much of his spare time selling papers or doing errands and chores in the neighborhood to supplement the hard-earned family income, he achieved high rank and went on to Holy Cross College where he was graduated with high honors as valedictorian and president of his class.

Next came Boston University Law School where his qualities of leadership, ability, and brilliance as a student and future achievements were to stamp him as one of the most successful and illustrious alumni of that outstanding Massachusetts institution which has furnished so many conspicuous and able men to the bar, the practice of the law, and the public service. He was also valedictorian and president of his class at law school and started practicing law in his home town of Clinton and the neighboring city of Fitchburg.

It is amazing that one family starting so humbly and, as the Senator himself so often said, "eating the bitter bread of poverty" should have made such steady and rapid progress in educating its members and establishing them in secure, respected, and remunerative positions in life. Undoubtedly, the quality of their courageous Irish stock had much to do with this phenomenon. Undoubtedly, the environment and example of the rugged, Yankee New Englanders with whom they lived contributed due share to this progress and development. Unquestionably the character of the Senator and his family were the chief factors which permitted him and his brothers and sisters to climb up the ladder of success. Too much cannot be said for the sensible devoted Irish mother who led this family after her husband's untimely death, and too much cannot be said for the devoted sisters who labored and struggled and saved and planned so prudently to furnish the means for educating their family.

By this time, Thomas, also a young man of great promise and ability had come forward, completed his legal education at Boston University and was admitted to the bar. He and David joined in partnership for the practice of the law in Clinton, Fitchburg, and afterward in Boston which achieved marked success. Let me state, however, that Senator Walsh detached himself completely from the law business when he was elected Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, and after that time never handled a case in court and never took an active part in practice. This was not understandable to some of his friends who urged upon him many times that he should supplement his income from public position by accepting the proffers of munificent legal business that were offered to him. He felt, like some other public men feel, that there should never be any question of conflict betwen his public position and his private interest. To all intents and purposes he became completely divorced from the law practice he had conducted with his brother Thomas, but the latter whose full name was Thomas L. Walsh, and who had been named major on the staff of former Governor Foss, a man of marked ability, energy and popularity, carried on the law business successfully for many years in the city of Boston until his untimely death in 1931 at the relatively early age of 57.

There was the closest bond of affection and mutual understanding between the members of the Walsh family. Characteristic of the New England Yankee among whom they had all been brought up, the Walshes were not demonstrative. Except for the brothers who were in public life, they remained very much in the background and lived quiet, dignified but useful lives. The eldest sister, Mary, who is now the sole surviving member of the family and is entering her ninetieth year, had long since assumed the role as head of the family. Nothing in the large, stately mid-Victorian white house in Clinton where the distinguished Senator and his sisters made their home ever escaped her attention. She had worked all her life and was determined to work to the end. She presided over the development of the whole family, sharing its joys and tribulations with calmness and equanimity and never losing her firm grasp on the details of her household or the personal problems of its occupants. She saw her brothers and sisters grow from childhood to maturity and she saw each one of the family assume a definite and useful place in life. She saw her brother rise to high public station. By the same token in her advanced and declining years she saw each one of her loved ones gathered in by the Grim Reaper and she is now alone in her great white house in Clinton, still vigorous despite her years and accepting the verdict of the Almighty and the loss of her loved ones with that typical, unperturbable calmness which comes from a firm and unflinching Christian faith.

There may be some room in this more or less brief recital of the life of Senator Walsh to acknowledge the encouragement and assistance he received from

loyal friends but foremost among these must be the contributions of his sisters, led and inspired by the saintly Mary who, whether in fortune or adversity, gave such sustaining strength to his aspirations. I wish I could but find appropriate words to laud the devotion, loyalty, and love and unfailing help that these quiet, modest self-effacing and self-respecting women lavished upon the senior Senator.

David could not be limited by the practice of law because destiny had marked him for a greater service. Almost immediately upon graduation from law school he responded to the instinctive inner promptings to enter politics by joining the Democratic forces in his home town as Register of Voters—an indefatigable party worker. At this time he came under the influence and guidance of one P. H. Morrison, a native-born Irishman with natural talents who was a leader in the business, civic, and political life of the community, and the Honorable John W. Corcoran, his own blood cousin, a man of great parts, who was one of the leading political and judicial figures of his time and a neighbor of the Walshes in Clinton. It was not long before the efforts of this resourceful trio in combining the material assets and militancy of Morrison, the sound judgments and persistency of Corcoran, and the ability, energy, and diplomacy of Walsh, brought definite results. Cousin Corcoran, his great ability recognized by party leaders, became the first man of his race and creed to run for high public office in Massachusetts and he failed of election as lieutenant governor by just a few thousand votes. Later he was appointed superior court judge but cloistered life upon the bench was too tame for his vigorous spirit and he soon resigned to take up the practice of law in Boston in company with ex-Mayor Patrick A. Collins, another great figure of the era. Together these men were not only very successful but furnished intelligent, honest, and forceful leadership to their party and group.

Guided by such wise counsel and unquestionably inspired in very large measure by the advice and example of Corcoran, Walsh started to carve out his own political career. The great Wachusett Dam and Reservoir, an extensive engineering project which now furnishes metropolitan Boston with water was under construction at the time. Thousands of laborers were employed on the project and many of them were recent immigrants of Irish, Italian, and German stock who had been put to work under a form of the "padrone" system. They lived in barracks and shacks situated on or close to the project and worked at various tasks ranging from ordinary pick-and-shovel work to granite setting or mechanics. They worked long hours for relatively low pay. They were forced to patronize the commissary set up by the contractors for all their necessaries, in fact, for practically everything they used. Their charge accounts were set off against their weekly pay wage and it was generally believed at the time that they were exploited by high prices and low wages and at the end of the week after the charges for purchases were deducted they had little or nothing left.

Young Walsh had observed these conditions and became very much aroused about them. He ran for the general court in a district which was strongly Republican, but that did not deter this young champion of the worker who came boldly onto the political stage. He waged an extremely active campaign and traveled into every part of the district; in fact, it is said that he interviewed about all the voters. The unexpected happened, and a great upset occurred. Young Walsh was elected to the general court, where in due course he pressed and secured legislation which ended the padrone system and the other abuses to which workers had been subjected in his district. Because of his commanding personality, marked ability, and skill and ingenuity in debate, and aptitude for developing issues that attracted to his standard large numbers of independent voters, Walsh rose steadily in the ranks of his party. Though he was later defeated for the State senate in a Republican district by a very small vote and also defeated for lieutenant governor in 1911, he was not dismayed or disappointed. He was renominated for lieutenant governor by his party in 1912 and was swept into office. Each year increased his stature and added to his achievement. By this time he had acquired an impressive personal following, comprised not only of his own party but Republicans and independents as well. It was not surprising, therefore, that he should be elected governor the following year. By virtue of his unquestioned integrity and his clear-cut, decisive mastery of the progressive side of public questions, his adherence to the cause of the oppressed and underprivileged, he came to command the confidence of the Massachusetts electorate like few men in the history of the Commonwealth. As governor he launched upon a program of social reform that shook the historic old statehouse to its foundations. In rapid succession and with unerring support of a hesitant, reluctant, and oft-times hostile legislature, he drove through reforms in education, labor-management relations, health, social welfare, banking, and factory protection which commanded the admiration of the entire country.

He established a State university for the enlargement of educational opportunities for all citizens; he enacted one of the first and most liberal workmen's compensation laws, adopted the principle of the minimum wage for the first time in any American commonwealth, passed innumerable laws regulating the wages and hours of workers, restricting the hours of labor for women and children, and requiring protective devices and safety conditions in factories.

He reorganized and implemented the State department of health and extended its functions to furnish greater service to the people. He checked the machinations of the money trusts joining with Judge Brandeis and Dr. Berle in eliminating financial racketeering and manipulation which had caused serious losses to depositors and stockholders of savings banks and other financial institutions. As one nationally known political commentator said at the time:

> Gov. David I. Walsh during his regime showed more conception of constructive government than any Massachusetts executive for many a day.

All told, his administration was phenominally successful and one of its great achievements was breaking the power of what Walsh called "invisible government by special interests and lobbyists and other groups impeding social progress through corruption or improper influence."

Governor Walsh could never be "reached" because his first concept was absolute honesty in public affairs. Selfish interests could not change his course on public issues which he deemed beneficial to the State, nor could they use this vigorous young governor to secure important public appointments for those who would do their bidding. This tenacity for rectitude and integrity cost him dearly in terms of personal success because after he had served two terms as governor he was defeated for the third by a very small margin because he refused to appoint a State excise commissioner demanded by the liquor interests.

Here again the future Senator did not lose faith in the people, he did not lose faith in the strength of his own integrity and the rightness of the principles he had followed. After his defeat in 1916, he took an extended trip to the Orient and it was in the Philippines that he first met and brought to this country young Isidro Carino, a native Filipino, who became and remained until the time of his death his faithful personal friend and servant. Of more than passing interest is the story of this young Filipino. Observing the backward conditions under which some of the young boys lived in the Philippines at the time, Governor Walsh decided that he would try to help some by bringing them to the United States. With the assistance of Government officials he picked out three boys anxious to come of which "Cidro," as he came to be known, was one. During the long voyage across the Pacific and the country the Governor instructed these boys in the value and advantages of American citizenship and pointed out to them the opportunities which were theirs of pursuing some chosen career. Two of them chose to further their education and with Governor Walsh's valued aid and advice subsequently became college graduates and returned to the Philippines as leaders of their people. "Cidro," however, desired to remain with the Governor and in time because of his devoted interest and unselfish service practically became a member of the family. He, too, saw the great advancement and the ultimate passing of the senior Senator and his brothers and sisters. Faithful to the very end, like Elizabeth Cooper, a fine colored girl, another valued member of the household, he still attends the venerable Mary.

It is said that in public life there is no standing still and there may be some truth to this saying. In our own experience we have observed many highly qualified men who for some reason, either because they did not get the "breaks," or because they were content with their status, or because they were defeated and gave up public life, never reached the top. But this was not to be the destiny of David I. Walsh. World War I came and with it as leader, the great President Woodrow Wilson. David I. Walsh had steadfastly stood with the war President during the fighting of the war until victory was secured. He had made weighty contributions to the strategy of the party and the outcome of the elections. He had served on resolutions committees at Democratic conventions and had given strong leadership to the party and its candidates. In 1918 just as the war was terminating, he stood for the Senate against the incumbent, one of the most powerful and eminent national figures that Massachusetts has ever given the Nation, Hon. John W. Weeks, subsequently a member of President Harding's Cabinet and the father of the distinguished and able Sinclair Weeks, who later served our Commonwealth as United States Senator, and is presently an outstanding businessman and Republican leader of the State and Nation. Because of the issues involved—special privilege versus progressive government—and the strength of his adversary, the campaign was fiercely contested. Governor Walsh made a tremendous campaign in which he covered the entire State bringing his fight to the people. He was sucessful and was elected to the United States Senate by a majority of something like 18,000 votes, the first Democrat to be elected to the Senate from Massachusetts since Robert Rantoule who went to Washington for a brief term in 1851 even before the Republican Party was born.

From that time on Senator Walsh steadily increased in stature, esteem, and popularity. Time and again he rode back into office by tremendous majorities, frequently in the face of Republican landslides. When he left the Senate in 1946 he had completed 26 years of service in that body, a record exceeded only by Senator Hoar, who served a few months longer than Senator Walsh, and Senator Lodge, who served about 30 years. A glowing example of Walsh's strength was the 1924 election, when President Calvin Coolidge, favorite New England native son, in a Republican landslide, swept the State by approximately 500,000 votes and Walsh was defeated by only about 18,000 votes. In that election he ran 400,000 votes ahead of the rest of the Democratic ticket. He was out of the Senate for 2 years, but in 1926 he came back and defeated Senator William Butler, who was serving out Senator Lodge's unexpired term by virtue of appointment from the Governor.

Again in 1928 Walsh recorded a smashing victory. In that year the colorful and popular Al Smith was the candidate for President. At the convention and during the campaign Walsh had enthusiastically supported him and toured the country in his behalf, and served as a member of his inner board of strategy. It was unquestionably because of Walsh's vigorous campaigning in Massachusetts that Smith was able to carry that State by a small margin while Walsh himself was carried easily back into office. On many occasions he was groomed for Vice President, but always discouraged his supporters because he believed his candidacy might give rise to internal factional controversies which would be harmful to the party's success. Although he had again enthusiastically supported Smith in the 1932 convention, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was nominated, he threw his great strength behind his candidacy and stumped throughout country and State and also advised concerning strategy and tactics.

In 1934 at the peak of President Roosevelt's popularity and at a time when hundreds of thousands were unemployed in the State as a result of a Nation-wide depression of great magnitude Senator Walsh was again swept into office, this time by almost 400,000 votes. It was my privilege to serve as campaign manager in this particular contest and in my opinion Senator Walsh made one of his finest campaigns. Sweeping aside differences of opinion with the national administration on basic economic and social questions, Walsh called for a united front to fight the depression, and to secure the people against the twin spectres of unemployment and insecure old age.

While boondogglers and overzealous social reformers were busy spinning their web of supercontrol and superregulation over the financial and economic system, Walsh turned his attention to concrete remedial measures. As chairman of the important Senate Committee on Education and Labor, he inaugurated definite action on the social-security bill. After months of intensive work under his management in the Senate, it was enacted into law. Next he turned to labor-management relations which were then in a state of utmost confusion. Because of widespread unemployment, radical doctrines were prevalent and class feeling was running high. Demand for radical social reform was at its peak. After months of study and painstaking work holding hearings and conferring with business and labor leaders, Walsh reported from his committee what has been referred to since as labor's Magna Carta. The original measure—its objectives and purposes—have been, it is true, grossly perverted by ensuing regulations and administrative decisions. But the original bill as sponsored and proposed by Senator Walsh unquestionably laid down a sound basis for harmonious relations between labor and management, maximum use of collective bargaining and the recognition of the fundamental rights of those who toil to join together by concerted action to carry on negotiations with their employers. In every prolabor measure of the period, Senator Walsh took a leading part. The Walsh-Healey Act, which bears his name, set up decent standards for the Government to follow which secured labor and enabled management to know definitely just what was expected of it. The regulation of hours, the establishment of decent wage scales, the adoption of satisfactory working conditions, and the health and security, welfare and education of workers and their families in turn received the careful attention of this great advocate and practitioner of social justice for the masses of the people.

Fighting for liberal causes Walsh never asumed the role of demagog. He was always dignified and statesmanlike in his approach to public questions and was always able to see the point of view of those who disagreed with him. His stanch friendship for labor never led him to take a hostile position toward legitimate business. He was just and fair-minded and believed wholeheartedly in the American economic system. He recognized that America is something more than a classless society, that it is composed of many groups with diverse opinions and interests which any worthwhile government must seek to reconcile.

The personal service which Senator Walsh rendered to Massachusetts business interests, indeed to business throughout the Nation, is incalculable. For many years he served on the Senate Finance Committee and took a leading part in the consideration and formulation of tariff and tax measures. I cannot adequately outline his views on these matters here nor can I detail his action. He believed that the United States was its own greatest market, that foreign trade, while important, should not dominate national economic policy. In his own lifetime he had seen many instances of stalemated New England industry—unemployment, distress, and suffering which had been increased, if not caused, by an influx of cheaply produced foreign goods which undermined the American market and threw American workers out of their jobs. Accordingly he sponsored scientifically adapted tariff policies which would afford legitimate protection to business and still permit foreign goods to come into the country to check monopoly practices and prevent the cost of living from rising beyond the means of the average worker.

He never believed that tariff making ought to be solely the problem of politicians. He thought that businessmen of practical experience and scientific experts working as career men for the Government ought to deal with these problems jointly without periodic dislocation of the economy by politically drawn and politically prompted measures.

His theory of taxation also followed a true liberal but not a radical course. He was an ardent supporter of the principle of the ability to pay but an avowed enemy of the practice of soaking the rich. He believed that taxation in the extremely high brackets aiming at the dissolution of vested capital would have fatal effects upon the American system of free enterprise. An implacable foe of monopoly, special privilege, and lopsided power arising from concentration

of wealth, Senator Walsh was opposed to confiscatory tax schemes. Onerous taxes designed to control wealth socially had a definite limit, he believed, and that limit was reached at the point when incentive was discouraged and accumulated funds intended for business expansion, necessary replacements and adequate reserves were captured by governmental taxing rules.

The power to tax is the power to destroy was the principle always foremost in his mind and, while he strove in his public career to check and eliminate the great inequalities of wealth and power which developed from some of the well-known evils of monopoly capital, he saw gravest danger in closing the door of opportunity to business by repressive taxes. Like Emerson, he believed that America is another word for opportunity and that our Government must make it possible for every person who lives under its protection to have or be able to secure a chance to live decently and achieve advancement and success in a chosen career, in any field of human endeavor.

Monopoly practices and what he called invisible government by specially privileged groups exercising control over social and economic matters behind the scenes were the special object of Walsh's disapproval and bitter attack. He saw the great combinations of organized wealth, unregulated by the Government, an ominous power which in time would challenge social justice and democracy itself. He saw nothing evil in the size of business enterprises themselves but keenly felt the need for controlling and regulating the activities of large corporate groups, especially those affected with a public interest, because he felt their long-time influence in American economic life would be directed toward the elimination of opportunity for aspiring, ambitious, and talented men like Henry Ford to advance from poverty to successful business management bringing with them not only fine example for other young Americans but also untold benefits to the general public and the Nation as well.

Senator Walsh was a strong constitutionalist. He was a devout believer in the principles of the American Constitution and a keen student of the liberal philosophy which lay behind that great document. An able and astute lawyer, he early came to recognize and appreciate the great value of the judiciary as a balance wheel for the executive and legislative branches of the Government and especially for the protection of the rights of minority groups. Liberty is the greatest attribute of the American Constitution, but the Government is also designed to protect the property and civil rights of its citizens against encroachment by overzealous public servants or transient public clamor. To secure religious freedom he construed as one of the great aims of the Constitution. With him the basic freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and conscience required absolute protection at all times.

Discrimination based on intolerance, bigotry, and narrow-mindedness directed against race, creed, and station in life incurred Walsh's bitterest opposition. Exalting liberty and freedom as he did, respecting civil rights and private property as he did, it followed quite naturally that Walsh should look with great disfavor upon efforts to pack the Supreme Court. When this proposal was made he promptly joined as one of the great national leaders, in a determined movement to defeat it. One of the great speeches of his career was delivered on this question at Carnegie Hall, New York City, over a Nation-wide radio hook-up. The proponents had challenged the ability, vigor, and effectiveness of the so-called Nine Old Men charging them with physical feebleness, antiquated ultra-conservative concepts and reactionary legal doctrines. Let me quote briefly Walsh's remarks on that occasion:

> It will be a tragic day, my fellow countrymen, if that day ever comes, when the Supreme Court is subservient to any Chief Executive, to the Congress, or to any other individual, class or group, whether official or unofficial. The Supreme Court of the United States has been for more than 150 years our political refuge and strength. It has been the last citadel for the protection of our priceless liberties.

From the time he first entered the Senate in 1918 to the end of his service Senator Walsh took a burning interest in the foreign policy of the United States. As a freshman Senator he joined in the debate over the League of Nations and the Versailles Treaty. Always a foe of injustice Walsh saw in the treaty with its territorial rearrangement of Europe and Asia, and the League to enforce the status quo, gross violation of ordinary principles of justice. He did not believe that this Nation ought to meddle with the affairs of Europe or any other part of the world, but that if it became necessary for any reason to do so, our country should insist upon treating all nations, great and small, with fairness, impartiality, and justice. He did not believe that we ought to join with other strong nations to enable them to secure control over territories and subject peoples which would permit denial of basic freedoms and legalize social and economic exploitation. He was a stanch believer in the principle of self-determination which he saw violated and discarded in the treaty and proposed world government. On that occasion he spoke eloquently in the Senate and his speech has been said by many close observers to have turned the tide of battle in that great issue.

To understand Senator Walsh's attitude on foreign policy, one would also have to be acquainted with his position on national defense and his viewpoint toward foreign trade. In the first place, he was a man of peace who sincerely hated war. He saw in the bloody history of Europe, in the age-old animosities, in the bitter rivalries, in the strong nationalisms and imperialisms, the seeds of permanent dissension and conflict. European nations have been fighting each other for centuries, and will probably continue to fight each other. Movements like the Hague Conference to bring law and order into international relations and settle disputes likely to lead to war through justiciable tribunals rather than by force of arms were commendable but still in an early stage of development. Of themselves, they were lacking in the power to enforce their decrees. Other nations were desirous of securing the benefits of such tribunals but unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to implement them by furnishing money and manpower.

Disputes over boundaries and territories, and particularly arrangements between nations to exploit subject peoples, could not be brought into the forum of these international judicial bodies. Moreover, while peace was the great aim and disarmament the great hope of saving nations from each other, Senator Walsh did not believe that this Nation could disarm until other nations were willing to do likewise and would give sincere evidence of this willingness by joining in solemn compact. He observed that when such solemn compacts were executed they were frequently violated by the powerful against the weak.

In the 1921 conference at Washington relative disarmament had been tried but the spirit of the agreement was not kept by the powers signatory to it. The United States sank battleships, England threw away blueprints, and Japan merely pursued ways to circumvent the treaty. In a few years all the major powers were in effect circumventing the treaty until finally at its termination date it was not renewed and the wild race of armament was again resumed.

The senior Senator was greatly disturbed by this situation because he foresaw with remarkable accuracy that war was the inevitable result. As he saw it, reason had failed, argument and persuasion had failed, disarmament by example had failed. All the instruments of civilization for securing the peace had failed. There was nothing else for the United States to do but to protect itself. With these realities in mind, the realistic Walsh commenced to work vigorously for an impregnable national defense. Member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he had long studied the needs of the Navy and even in the face of repeated waves of economy and indeed extreme pacificism in the ranks of many of the liberals in the Senate, including some from west coast States, which later proved to be the most ready target of the Jap fleet and air force, Walsh turned much of his attention upon the development of an unsurpassed two-ocean Navy and an Air Force of commanding proportions.

Fresh in his mind were the experiences of Gen. Billy Mitchell. He often spoke to me about the irony of a high-ranking general of the Army, courageous and farsighted and bold enough to give utterance to up-to-date views, who was drummed out of the Army because he advocated the development of the Air Force. On many occasions he said to me personally: "This was an outrage and I cannot understand why the American Congress and people ever stood for it." The size and volume of our armed services would be of no consequences unless they are kept up to date and implemented with the most modern scientific

equipment and weapons. As enthusiastic as he was for expanded air power, he always contended that the battleship, the cruiser and destroyer and submarine, together with other auxiliaries of the fleet must have their proper place in a properly devised defense. If we maintain a mechanized, mobile army, backed by a well-developed National Guard and training in the schools and colleges, combined with the large powerful Navy containing every type of modern ship, and an overwhelming Air Force utilizing modern weapons, we need feel no fear, he believed. If war comes we shall be ready for it.

But work as he did for these ends, he could never secure them until the rumble of the war drums was literally heard in the distance. As chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee his efforts to build up the fleet and the Air Corps and to fortify critical strategic outposts were blocked.

Nevertheless, Walsh worked faithfully and effectively to build up the Navy, and there are few men, if any, in the Nation who can claim greater credit for the vast fighting fleet of the United States which contributed so greatly to victory in the late war. Walsh was a more intense supporter and admirer and devotee of the Navy than most of the leading figures in the Navy themselves. Throughout the fleet wherever the bluejackets gathered, wherever officers met to discuss the affairs of the Navy, the name of Senator Walsh was held in highest esteem and respect because men of the Navy of all ranks knew that in him the Navy and its air arm had a true and loyal friend who was a great power in the United States Senate working zealously to make their Navy, his Navy, and our Navy the greatest in the world.

Let me now return to his views on foreign policy. Senator Walsh was not only an astute judge of political movements but possessed a rare and unique intuitive sense. This enabled him at a very early date to apprehend and foresee the developments that were to lead us into war. He was greatly concerned over the Nazi-Fascist movements in central Europe, and he was particularly deeply aroused over the persecution and liquidation of helpless peoples because of their race and faith. He believed that the United States had a great mission in the world in maintaining peace and that if we firmly and consistently embraced neutrality, if we did not join on one side or the other of the threatened conflict or the conflict itself after it got underway, if we patiently waited, arming ourselves rapidly and effectively all the while so as to overcome our then almost helpless military and naval situation, an opportunity would come for us to use good offices between the conflicting nations. He did not believe it was possible for Germany to carry on a successful aggression against the United States, and he did not believe that Hitler would move to extend his power and influence over England or Europe once it was clear that the United States was prepared to fight. In the meantime he felt that an opportunity would surely come, if we sincerely and honestly remained neutral, for us to serve as the adjudicators and arbitrators between the belligerent nations.

Of course, the Nation actually adopted just the opposite policy almost from the start of the European war when our country took sides with the Allies. We repealed the Neutrality Act, we forced through conscription and lend-lease, we gave 50 destroyers to Britain together with other valuable equipment and weapons of war, we sent naval craft out into the high seas to search for and shoot at sight any German submarine that might be contacted or that could be pursued and apprehended.

Walsh resisted all these moves. He was especially upset over the deal which gave away 50 destroyers to Britain which he contended we urgently needed for our own defense. He was constantly worried about the status and location of the Pacific Fleet and the signs which came to him through unquestioned Government sources that the Japanese were heading directly toward a war with us. I can vividly recall the historic day of infamy that was December 7, 1941. The country was electrified with shock by the attack on Pearl Harbor but Walsh was not surprised. I can well remember he called me to his home that Sunday afternoon and drew from his pocket a written statement. It was directed to the people of his State and to the American people. It called upon them to throw all their resources, human and material, behind the war effort. "War will be declared tomorrow," he said, "but let us start to prepare tonight. The Nation is in peril and every American must pledge everything to the defense of the country. The road to victory will be strewn with bloody sacrifice, reverses and woe, but we must not flinch. With the help of God we will achieve victory and preserve our homeland and democracy."

Profound religious conviction possessed David I. Walsh. He was a devout Catholic who was most zealous in adhering to the fundamentals of his faith. I always felt that if the public service had not called him he would have had an avocation to the church, in fact I would not have been surprised if he had embraced it in later life. He was particularly well informed on all matters pertaining to his faith and his belief was deep-seated, sincere, and ever present. His consuming desire was to serve God and his country with his full heart and soul and he manifested during his life a loyalty and devotion to both that will long remain an inspiration.

He was especially interested in the educational and charitable works of the church and in the foreign missions and not only contributed substantially himself to these causes unostentatiously, but interested many other friends to do likewise. Outstanding alumnus of Holy Cross College, he assumed leadership of several drives to raise funds for that splendid institution. His last will and testament typified his unbounded generosity as it carried out a lifelong custom because by the terms of that document he bequeathed and devised about half of his personal fortune to the educational, charitable, and merciful work of the Church, including substantial gifts to Holy Cross, several charitable societies, and St. John's Church in Clinton. He established a fund for the expansion of the cemetery connected with the latter church and sometime later this year as the result of his benevolence a beautiful entrance gate which he thought out and designed himself in part will be erected at that cemetery, not so far from the hallowed spot where his mortal remains lie. He was a God-fearing, humble, and pious American as well as a great one.

Though still in robust health at the time he must have had a presentiment of impending death, for about 2 years before his passing he painstakingly arranged these various bequests and also personally selected a cemetery lot. In this place he attended to the reinterment of several deceased members of his family and personally chose a beautiful and impressive stone shaft which now rises toward heaven over his last resting place in the form of the Holy Cross by which he lived and died.

The declaration of war against the Axis Powers served to accentuate his active life. Now chairman of the all-powerful Senate Naval Committee, he plunged into his work with renewed and surprising vigor and with an energy that belied his years. Many of his younger colleagues could not keep pace with him. From early in the morning till late at night in lengthy conferences, committee meetings and Senate sessions, he was a virtual human dynamo. Out of his committee came a stream of essential emergency war measures, blueprinting the shape of the great and powerful fleet of combat vessels that was ultimately to smash submarine warfare and drive the Japanese Fleet from the high seas. He was a trusted confidant of the high naval command which relied upon him implicitly to drive the naval building program through the Senate and he never faltered. His committee had supreme confidence in his judgment, ability, and discernment which was shared by all of his associates in the Senate. There was hardly ever a question raised about legislation which he sponsored on the floor because his colleagues knew it had been carefully and wisely considered and weighed. This was true in peace as well as in war—another tribute to his fairness and impartiality and his knack for seeing the other fellow's viewpoints, harmonizing the opinions of those who worked with him, and reaching sound, sensible results.

For Senator Walsh all prewar issues, contentions, and controversies were settled as of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Though he had carried his advocacy of peace, his belief in neutrality, his earnest strivings to avoid war to his own people in the election of 1940 and though his views in that regard had been overwhelmingly sustained, there could have

been no more intense, no more ardent, no more zealous worker in the Congress for speedy victory.

The war years sped along. The dark days and hours of Midway and Guadalcanal and Bataan merged into the triumphs of Casablanca, Sicily, the Italian Campaign and the Normandy Beachhead. The mighty Navy and Air Force with which Senator Walsh was so intimately associated gradually took shape and its effects began to be felt. Step by step the Nazi enemy was pushed back in Europe, step by step, island by island, the Japanese enemy was forced to retreat back across the wide expanses of the Pacific. At last victory came, victory which had been forged out of the steel and fire of American arms, the unsurpassed bravery of American boys, the bitter sacrifices of the American people, and the blood of our noble sons.

This is it.

He exclaimed when the war ceased:

Now we must build the peace. It will be a long difficult job. Frightfully destructive forces have been unloosed on the world. Our first great problem will be to keep our own country from being dragged into the vortex. The best way to do this is to keep strong and impregnable while we work to resolve bitter animosities and insure the peace.

Let us see that social justice is done in America. Let us see that the workingman and his family is guaranteed a free and decent life and protected against exploitation. Let us discharge in full our obligation to the veterans and to our laboring people and after a while we may achieve the things we fought for.

Through the various peace conferences, during and after the war, Senator Walsh saw his own worst fears justified. He looked disapprovingly and with alarm at the concessions made to Russia, at the policy of appeasement toward that country which resulted in the abandonment of Poland, Lithuania and the other small nations. He believed that no lasting peace could be based on injustice no matter how urgent and compelling the reasons for temporary compromise.

The domestic situation also gravely concerned him. He was frankly disturbed by the spread of radical doctrines, by the growth of collectivist activities and the increasing danger of the police state. Staunch to the end in his advocacy of the cause of labor he was dismayed by the efforts which he thought were aimed at the basic principle of unionism—the right of collective bargaining and other advanced labor measures.

Fundamentally he believed that industrial peace could best be achieved by strengthening rather than weakening the opportunities of labor to bargain collectively through responsible leadership. In this way high standards of wages and living could be maintained, public education enhanced, public health improved, social conditions bettered, and thus there would be the most solid bulwark against communism and the most effective safeguards for free opportunity and free enterprise.

In one of his very last speeches in the Senate, Senator Walsh rose to the defense of our laboring people. The situation was packed with high drama. It was after midnight on the Senate floor. The Senate was considering a bill providing for additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes. Walsh spoke:

It is clear that there is a solid block of Senators, including members of both parties, determined to vote for almost any amendment restrictive of the rights of the workers. They urge that their purpose is to correct the excesses of labor unions. But that does not change the fact that their opposition is against every man and woman who belongs to labor organizations or who may choose to join them in the future.

The atmosphere of the Senate appears to be charged with a determination to pass legislation impetuously and primarily for punitive ends. Calm and wise judgment has disappeared. The question seems to be not so much the merits of individual amendments but the determined intention to classify Senators into two categories: one, the representatives of the employers and the other the representatives of the workers. By innuendo, if you happen to be a Senator championing the cause of the workers you are a strike sympathizer and should receive the condemnation and contempt that some people hold at the present time toward John L. Lewis.

With masterful phrases he sketched the background of the labor movement, the advances made in working conditions, the improvement in wages and hours and conditions of work, the long fight for social justice and human rights. He traced the building of social-security laws to care for the aged working people and pleaded with his colleagues not to offend or shackle labor by restricting bargaining rights and friendly relationships with their employers.

In the final analysis—

He said—

it is my opinion that the sympathetic attitude of management toward unions is the key to sound industrial relations and if the employers wholeheartedly accept the philosophy of collective bargaining, our labor unions would rise to the responsibilities which they have and fulfill their rich promises.

His following statement was most significant:

Unless there is a sharp change for the better in industrial relations, I fear that industry and labor will wake up some day to find a new philosophy, an extreme philosophy promulgated through the Nation. In my opinion radical economic changes will come if labor and industry cannot find a way peacefully to adjust their differences. The success of the American way of life is not through extreme restrictive measures, but through management and labor solving their individual problems through self-government and through industrial democracy. The preservation of the American way of life depends upon their success in solving their mutual problems.

Let it not be said of us when our record is scanned that in the heat of passion we attempted to undo the progress that labor has made through its long uphill hike for industrial freedom, that we have in a moment of excitement sought to abridge and reduce the rights of workers.

Let us consider these measures calmly and throw out the hysterical state of mind that the present situation has provoked.

Because a few labor organizations are being publicly excoriated on account of the public inconvenience suffered through their inability to maintain nonstrike relations with the employers, let us not stab in the back the millions of workers who are devotedly interested in maintaining industrial peace through sincere and wholehearted cooperation of labor and management.

As I said, those words were about the last that were uttered in the Senate by the then distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts on this subject. In a very real sense they epitomize his outlook and philosophy; his own blueprint for living and for getting along with his fellowmen; his own devotion and loyalty to the cause of the down-trodden and underprivileged; his never-ending zeal for the common people. In a little more than a year later this great American statesman whose unselfish service so brilliantly illumines his life and the people from whom he was sprung departed this mortal life. His last months and days were filled with bitter disappointment, defeat, and grief. One by one the members of his family were taken by the Grim Reaper. He himself was engaged in his last electoral campaign. Whether he sensed impending defeat or not, I do not know, but he never gave any indication of it.

His attitude was, "I have given the best years of my life to the people and I have made my record of loyalty to them. I am well able, physically and mentally, to carry on in the public service. If the people want me, well and good, if not, I will be resigned to lay down my heavy burden." Through it all, he never flinched, he never retreated, he never compromized his convictions. That artifice, betrayal, ingratitude and calumny of seething political life left a cruel impress upon his physical and mental powers cannot be doubted. His only reaction to his defeat was that he felt relieved of a heavy burden and would welcome the peace and comfort of private civilian life and the associations of his friends which were to be so tragically denied him.

He died as he lived—great statesman, great patriot, noble soul, loyal to the end, to the principles and ideals he so eloquently espoused, loyal and devoted to family and friends, steadfast in his Christian faith. His words on justice are appropriate:

Without a continuing strong sense of justice in the administration of the affairs of the Government, there is certain to come into existence a vast mechanism of oppression and the end of our liberties. It is the absence of justice that is responsible for the present holocaust in Europe; it is the absence of justice that has enslaved the human family in many parts of the world; it is the absence of justice that has denied the worker, through the years, his just share of the contribution he has made to the wealth that he helped to accumulate.

May I suggest that we all pause for a brief period tomorrow, as we unitedly perform our duties as citizens, to express silently but profoundly our gratitude to the God of Nations; to thank Him for the peace which we enjoy; to thank Him that we live in a land where civil and religious freedom is guaranteed; to thank Him for the opportu-

nities America has given to all mankind; to thank Him because, notwithstanding its shortcomings, we live in the greatest country on the face of the earth. Finally, let us implore His guidance to give you and me the inspiration and strength to help promote and establish the only worth-while purpose of government: "To promote justice."

I wish that time would permit me to outline more comprehensively the many fine public measures supported by this great and outstanding American during his years of service in the Senate. I could recount his unyielding devotion to the cause of the veterans whom he literally helped by the hundreds of thousands—individual cases which received his most solicitous and humane attention. He was the champion of practically all the great basic legislative proposals and measures which were finally shaped into what is now the veterans' program. Sponsor of a consolidated central veterans' agency, father of the presumptive clauses which have helped countless young American boys who otherwise would be left destitute, leader in improved hospitalization and medical treatment, staunch advocate of satisfactory compensation laws and bonuses for veterans, Senator Walsh was indeed one of the best friends the veterans ever had in Congress.

I wish I could also say more than a word about his devoted service to the cause of oppressed peoples throughout the world, his undying enmity of tyranny in any form, his gallant fight for every nation seeking liberation from bondage and struggling for self-determination. I would like to stress more also the broad liberality, the militant spirit of tolerance which animated this man. No one did or could fight more courageously for the underprivileged, the helpless, the aged, the blind, and those unable to help themselves through no fault of their own. Every race and group found in Senator Walsh a brave, fearless champion and the contributions he made to social justice and racial and religious toleration were absolutely monumental.

Time does not permit further elaboration here of the principles, ideals, and achievements of one of our Nation's greatest statesmen. But time will enrich the superb Americanism, greatness, and magnificent contributions to country of "Walsh of Massachusetts."

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; and

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1025. An act to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska; and

S. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution providing for appropriate observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1632. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $72,500 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 705); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1633. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of two picket boats to the city of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 647. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 3748, a bill to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 2232). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 648. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5588, a bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 2233). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 565. Resolution authorizing funds for study of plans for rehabilitation of Capitol Power Plant; without amendment (Rept. No. 2234). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 636. Resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to approve payment of gratuities during the recess of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2235). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on investigation of national resources for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2236). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 391. Resolution authorizing the printing of the publication entitled "The Hoover Dam Power and Water Contracts and Related Data" as a House document; with amendments (Rept. No. 2237). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 555. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the Eightieth Congress, Long-Range Agricultural Policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2238). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 557. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 146; without amendment (Rept. No. 2239). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 558. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 149, Eightieth Congress, second session; without amendment (Rept. No. 2240). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 588. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the study prepared for said committee during the Eightieth Congress, Long-Range Agricultural Policy—A Study of Selected Trends and Factors Relating to the Long-Range Prospects for American Agriculture, without amendment (Rept. No. 2241). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 611. Resolution authorizing a reprint of supplement IV of the report of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism—Five Hundred Leading Communists (in the Eastern Hemisphere, excluding the U. S. S. R.)"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2242). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 601. Resolution to provide for the transfer of the records of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid to the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 204. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2244). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6829. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 651. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 6829, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2249). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 652. Resolution providing for consideration of House Joint Resolution 150, a joint resolution to provide for the

restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Monument, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2250). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6818. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting; without amendment (Rept. No. 2253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6800. A bill to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOWE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4984. A bill to provide for the maintaining of the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the regiment of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6751. A bill to fix the rank of the assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements; without amendment (Rept. No. 2256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONKMAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6822. A bill to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOWE: Committee on Armed Services: H. R. 6698. A bill to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2912. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; with amendments (Rept. No. 2260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3479. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; with amendments (Rept. No. 2261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6709. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York a perpetual easement in, over, and upon a 0.29 acre parcel of land at New York Naval Shipyard; without amendment (Rept. No. 2262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5937. A bill to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1561. An act to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary termination of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5861. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 2265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 2266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans; without amendment (Rept. No. 2251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins; without amendment (Rept. No. 2252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 6829. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 6830. A bill to provide fisheries research in Gulf coast area; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 6831. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building to house the Wicker Park Postal Station in Chicago, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6832. A bill to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 6833. A bill to provide for a change in the design of the Booker T. Washington memorial 50-cent pieces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 6834. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 6835. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School district, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 6836. A bill to provide for the construction of a veterans' hospital in Broome County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6837. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of increasing benefits to the aged, the blind, and dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6838. A bill to provide emergency aid for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public facilities damaged or destroyed by certain catastrophes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6839. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6840. A bill to amend the act of March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations to Government employees, and for other purposes," to include part-time employees for whom there has been established a regular tour of duty; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6841. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; section 1, title I, Public Law No. 2 (73d Cong.), approved May 20, 1933, as amended; Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; and provide for the disposal of Government-owned war housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 649. Resolution for the relief of Rose Cohen, widow of Maurice G. Cohen; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 650. Resolution authorizing the passage of H. R. 6836; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6842. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Luz, Maria, and Raquel Porrata Doria 1.56 acres of land, more or less, in the municipality of Ceiba, P. R.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6843. A bill for the relief of Opal Hayes and D. A. Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 6844. A bill for the relief of Jean Bizzio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6845. A bill for the relief of Fella H. Holbrook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 6846. A bill for the relief of Harold L. Lindquist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6847. A bill for the relief of James Stewart Corp. and James Stewart & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6848. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 6849. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1934, to provide for allowances to the

heirs, representatives, and assigns of Frank J. Boudinot, deceased, in the event of favorable determination by the Indian Claims Commission of certain claims of the Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 6850. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Fruman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2068. By Mr. BURKE: Petition of W. S. McIntire and 39 others, calling for early passage of H. R. 2953; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2069. Also, petition of 92 Federal employees, calling for early action on the Federal pay-increase bill; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2070. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks, urging the execution of resolution adopted at its recent convention in connection with the suggestion program initiated by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2071. Also, petition of New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks, urging restricting by law discretionary powers of appointing officers in connection with those who have successfully passed civil-service examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2072. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of the Biddeford-Saco District, ZOA, Simon Spill, president, that the United States Government take immediate steps to promote peace in Israel and admit Israel as a member nation of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2073. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of St. Paul's Committee for Displaced Persons, urging passage of H. R. 6163, the displaced-persons bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2074. Also, petition urging passage of H. R. 6163, the displaced-persons bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2075. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the senior boys' class of the First Methodist Church, Needham Heights, Mass., urging enactment of civil-rights legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2076. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Constance Kennedy and others, of Coronado, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement and passage of H. R. 3748; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2077. Also, petition of Mrs. Rose Koons, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2078. Also, petition of E. E. Soles and others, of Mount Vernon, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation that will permit nonsectarian religious training on a voluntary basis in our public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the light of those who seek Thee, grant to our minds that illumination without which we walk in darkness and know not whither we go. Remember those who feel no need of Thee, who seem content with a careless, unexamined life, whose hearts are unvisited by desires of better things. Leave them not to themselves, lest they go down to destruction. Remember us, O Lord, who do not always remember Thee, and help us to accomplish our tasks without tension or strain, that we may do good work and merit Thy blessing. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 8, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. CLEVENGER had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, vice Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended;

S. 1082. An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion;

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws;

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations;

S. 2201. An act supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1948;

S. 2215. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes;

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; and

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses of the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments;

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho;

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of James B. Walsh;

S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes;

S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; and

S. 2040. An act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 329. An act for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 355. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 403. An act for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 945. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors;

H. R. 1170. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1782. An act for the relief of Albert (Jack) Norman;

H. R. 1783. An act for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.;

H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation;

H. R. 1902. An act for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Wooten;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek drainage district of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2435. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 2508. An act for the relief of James I. Matthews;

H. R. 2531. An act for the relief of Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev;

H. R. 3194. An act to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz;

H. R. 3807. An act to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Catoctin Recreational Demonstration Area, near Thurmont, Md., by the Secretary

of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3848. An act for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg;

H. R. 3934. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid treatment centers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3983. An act for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.;

H. R. 4133. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Harber;

H. R. 4179. An act for the relief of Paul E. Rocke;

H. R. 4292. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 4458. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane;

H. R. 4531. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4659. An act to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States;

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 4873. An act to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5036. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to 25, inclusive, 1948;

H. R. 5047. An act to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5048. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral rights;

H. R. 5113. An act for the relief of the heirs of John W. Mitchell;

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes;

H. R. 5154. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers;

H. R. 5189. An act to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department;

H. R. 5263. An act to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of certain real property quitclaim deeds to the minerals in or under such property;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy;

H. R. 5608. An act to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 5611. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5655. An act confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of Saint Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing one hundred and thirty-nine and sixty-two one-hundredths acres;

H. R. 5687. An act relating to the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeal to review decisions of The Tax Court;

H. R. 5693. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 64 and subdivision (h) of section 70 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5889. An act to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 5943. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece;

H. R. 5964. An act to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial;

H. R. 5983. An act to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status;

H. R. 6045. An act amending the act approved December 2, 1942, which provides compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States and certain other persons or reimbursement therefor;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6106. An act to amend the act of December 20, 1944, to provide for the issuance, without examination, of licenses to certain persons to engage in business;

H. R. 6127. An act to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6130. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6216. An act to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for Letters Patent of William R. Blair;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6239. An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6295. An act to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6332. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the Federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6368. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Conservatory;

H. R. 6406. An act providing procedures for the control of the use of penalty mail by Government departments;

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6524. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6628. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6696. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to standards of safety and sanitation in the case of certain cars and equipment used in the movement of express traffic or baggage;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California;

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6728. An act to authorize medical and hospital service for those employed in the maritime service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years;

H. R. 6759. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6766. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6794. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America;

H. J. Res. 378. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; and

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3628. An act to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; and

H. R. 5065. An act to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is proceeding this morning under a unanimous-consent agreement which divides the time from 11 to 12:30 between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. Do the Senators yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota informed me that he felt the Senate should proceed without a quorum call. What is the pleasure of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is perfectly agreeable to me. Under the agreement the proponents of the amendment have the longer time, but it would be unfair, in my opinion, to have all the remarks of the proponents of the amendment submitted before any division of time by the opponents, if they intend to divide the time. The Senator from South Dakota should close the debate, being chairman of the committee, but I wish to divide the time on our side between the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If the Senator from South Dakota desires to divide the time on the other side, I think at least one of those who will speak for the opponents of the amendment should speak before the concluding remarks of one of the proponents, leaving the conclusion of the debate to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure we will have no difficulty in working out that kind of an arrangement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to consume the time of the Senate during the discussion of the important legislation now the unfinished business, but I do wish to associate myself with the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and to submit a few remarks in support of it.

If we should end segregation in our armed services, and seek to enforce integration of the races, it would be a tragedy of great proportion. As General Eisenhower said in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Army is a mirror which we can hold up to our faces and see the United States of America. As we cannot expect to end overnight the pattern of segregation in the United States without infinite harm and mischief, so we cannot expect to force its end in the Army. I fear that such a step, if it were carried out, would remove our armed establishments from the ranks of history's greatest, a position they attained by hard, courageous conflict that won many brilliant victories, and it would relegate them to the ranks of listless mediocrity.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Georgia submitted some most impressive figures showing how much greater the crime record of the Negro soldier is than that of the white soldier. I dislike to discuss the subject further, and thereby expose the wretched crime record of civilian Negroes in contrast to the whites. I propose to show, however, that the crime record of the Negro soldier, although under strict military discipline, virtually follows the same pattern as the crime record of civilian Negroes, also that the Negro crime record is far more pronounced than that of the whites.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to read in detail the exhibits which I have to present to the Senate, but I wish to call the attention of Senators to certain crime statistics for selected cities during the years 1946 and 1947.

These figures conclusively prove a position that I have always maintained, Mr. President, and that is that the Negroes, given relatively more freedom in northern cities and States, engage in criminal and violent activities at a rate shockingly higher than Negroes in southern cities and States where we understand the Negro people and are able to cope with the situation. The more freedom and the more privilege a Negro is given, the more he will abuse that freedom and privilege. He will run wild and do violence to the society in which he moves. Later, during my remarks, I will point out that the crime rate among Negroes in the Army, where the American Negro perhaps had more privilege and more equality than at any other time of his life, closely paralleled the crime rate among Negroes in northern cities.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia has already cited crime statistics for the city of Detroit, Mich. I wish now to refer to the statistics for our Nation's Capital, the city of Washington. During the year 1947 in Washington, 6,011 persons were arrested on charges of murder, manslaughter, larceny, burglary, robbery, rape, aggravated assault, and auto theft. Of that number, 4,415, or 73.45 percent, were colored people, notwithstanding the fact that the Negroes make up only 21.87 percent of Washington's population of 1,176,612.

Figures for the crimes I mentioned show that the rate of arrest among white people in Washington is 17.3 per 10,000, and 171.8 per 10,000 colored people—a ratio of 10 to 1. In other words, in the category of crimes I mentioned, committed within the confines of the city of Washington, 1 white man committed a crime for every 10 colored people, despite the fact that white people outnumber the colored in Washington by almost 4 to 1.

Let us examine a few of the individual crime categories. In 1947, in Washington, 4 white people were arrested for murder and 63 colored people were arrested for the same crime—a ratio of 15 to 1. For burglary, 1,825 Negroes were arrested as compared to 540 whites—a ratio of more than 3 to 1. For aggravated assault, 999 Negroes as compared to 121 whites—or a ratio of 8 to 1.

The city of Detroit, Mich, had a population of 1,785,000, of which 11.43 percent is colored. The number of arrests made in Detroit for the same categories of crime just indicated was 3,057; and of that number, 1,647, or 53.87 percent, were colored people. That reflects a rate of arrest of 80.7 per 10,000 Negroes and 8.9 per 10,000 whites—a ratio of 9 to 1. In other words, every time 1 white man in Detroit was arrested for one of the crimes enumerated—that is, murder, manslaughter, larceny, burglary, robbery,

rape, aggravated assault, and auto theft—9 colored people were arrested.

In St. Louis, Mo., in 1947, there were 4,510 arrests made for the same crimes. Two thousand two hundred and ninety-three of that number, or 50.84 percent, were colored people, although Negroes account for only 11.76 percent of the 924,813 people who reside in St. Louis. The rate of arrest per 10,000 Negroes in that city in 1947 was 212.3, and the rate per 10,000 whites was 27.6—a ratio of 7½ to 1.

In contrast, Mr. President, let us examine the crime statistics, covering exactly the same categories as previously mentioned, for the city of New Orleans. In 1947 there were a total of 1,986 arrests made for the categories mentioned, of which 1,216, or 61.22 percent, were Negroes. The Negro population of New Orleans is much higher, percentagewise, than of Washington, Detroit, or St. Louis, yet the rate of arrest in New Orleans per 10,000 Negroes was 60.8, as compared to 171.8, 80.7, and 212.3 for those three cities, respectively. The ratio of white rate to Negro rate for New Orleans was less than 3 to 1, as compared to 9 and 10 to 1 for the other cities.

I have here, Mr. President, statistics for nine other southern cities, selected at random, and they show without a doubt that the Negro crime rate in the South is tremendously lower than that which prevails in northern cities. Bear in mind the rate of arrests per 10,000 Negroes in Washington, 171.8, and consider that the Negro rate in 1947 for Houston, Tex., was 61.0; for Charleston, S. C., was 51.4; for Shreveport, La., 54.1; and for Jacksonville, Fla., in 1946, was 29.9, all of this despite the fact that the Negroes constitute a much higher percentage of the population of the southern cities mentioned, sometimes approaching 50 percent.

Mr. President, I do not have time to read all of the statistics I have here, but I ask that the table to which I have just referred be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, these figures that I have been quoting compare with the figures submitted on yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Georgia as to the crime record of the colored soldiers in contrast to the white soldiers in the Army, and it is of this matter that I should like to speak next.

I hold in my hand a statistical table showing the rate per 100,000 enlisted men in the Army, by race and principal offense, committed to confinement during the year 1945.

Let us consider the crime of murder. The rate of commitment of white soldiers was less than 1 per 100,000, while the rate for Negro soldiers was 9 per 100,000, a ratio of more than 9 to 1.

During that year Negro soldiers were confined for the crime of rape at the rate of 13 per 100,000 and white soldiers were committed at a rate of less than 1, or a ratio of more than 13 to 1.

Consider manslaughter. The rate for Negroes was 12 while the rate for white soldiers was 2, a ratio of 6 to 1.

In the case of burglary and housebreaking, soldiers were sent to jail at a rate of 11 Negroes and 3 whites, a ratio of almost 4 to 1.

For robbery, the Negro rate was 11 and the white rate 3, again a ratio of almost 4 to 1.

Those figures, I think, Mr. President, are very impressive, and as I have indicated, they compare with the figures that I have submitted here today for Washington, Detroit, and St. Louis. In those cities the ratio of Negro crime to white crime ranged from 7 to 1 to 10 to 1, and the Army statistics I have just quoted show substantially the same trend among Negro soldiers.

Mr. President, because of lack of time I cannot read all of the statistics included in this table showing the military commitment rate, and ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a statistical study of 24,000 military prisoners was made by a War Department consultant. His study further substantiates the trend of higher crime among Negroes. I shall not take the time to read it, because of the fact that my time is limited, but ask that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to speak of another significant matter. During the period July 1940, to October 1947, a total of 38,109 enlisted men were dishonorably discharged from the Army. Thirty thousand eight hundred and fifty-one were white men, 7,258 were Negroes. Thus, Negroes, while composing less than 10 percent of the Army's strength, accounted for 19.04 percent of its dishonorable discharges.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a most interesting and revealing table of statistics compiled by the Bureau of the Census showing the number of white and Negro prisoners incarcerated in State and Federal prisons and reformatories in the Southern States and in the remaining States and the District of Columbia, and the rate of incarceration per 10,000 population. This table also bears out the crime trend that I have discussed here this morning.

For instance, Mr. President, in 1935, 10 Southern States had a total Negro male population of 5,779,958, of which 7,627 were incarcerated, or a rate of 13.2 per 10,000. In the same year, the 35 non-Southern States and the District of Columbia had a total Negro male population of 3,085,508, of which 8,735 were incarcerated, reflecting a rate per 10,000 of 28.3, more than twice the southern rate. Among white people in that same year, the same 10 Southern States had a total white population of 19,611,562, of which 9,980 were incarcerated, a rate per 10,000 of 5.1. The remaining 35 Northern and Western States and the District of Columbia had a total white male population of 84,718,040, of which 38,602 were jailed, reflecting a rate per 10,000 of 4.6. So you can see, Mr. President, that in that year the Negro rate in non-Southern States was 28.3 as compared to the white race of 4.6, a ratio of 7 to 1.

This table to which I have referred gives these same statistics for every year from 1933 through 1945, save 1936, and the same ratio, or higher, prevails for every single year. In 1945, the Negro rate of crime in non-Southern States was 38.5 and the white rate was 3.6, a ratio of better than 10 to 1. For the same year, the southern Negro rate was 10.6 as compared with a white rate of 2.6, a ratio of 5 to 1.

Mr. President, I do not have the time to go over all these figures but I ask that the table to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit D.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Those who favor an end to segregation in the armed forces advance the argument that the Negro's exploits in the recent war prove he is equally as good a soldier as the white American. I say they argue that line, but they fall far short of proof, because their argument is based on fancy and not fact.

During the war, we witnessed the War Department, the Office of War Information, and many other Government agencies carry on an amazing propaganda campaign aimed as an attempt to prove that the American Negro was a good soldier, indeed, a superior soldier. I suppose there is no actual accounting of the money that was spent for films, pamphlets, photographs, radio time, and so forth, through which this propaganda was presented, but certainly it ran into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It was well nigh impossible during the war to raise a voice against that propaganda because a would-be protestor was accused of race baiting, sowing seeds of racial unrest, delaying the war effort, and so forth. Now that the war is over, however, the cold logic of facts and statistics are available to put the lie to the claim that the Negro was a great soldier or even a good soldier.

As an interesting side light, Mr. President, I should like to bring the attention of the Senate to certain decorations awarded by the Army. During the recent war 289 Congressional Medals of Honor were awarded to Army personnel, and not one went to a Negro. Four thousand four hundred and thirty-four Distinguished Service Crosses were awarded Army personnel, and only five went to Negroes.

Now, in this instance, the Negroes cannot dust off their customary excuses for failing to equal the ability and performance of whites. They cannot claim discrimination or lack of opportunity. The Negroes demanded proportionate representation in the armed forces. They insisted upon having Negro combat units. The Negro press wrote glowing accounts of Negro bravery and heroism on the fighting fronts. We all know that the War Department spent thousands of dollars and millions of hours trying to convince the American people and the world that the Negro was a first-rate soldier. They bent over backward praising the Negro soldier and insisting that

he was equal to the white. If such were the case, it would seem that decorations should have gone to Negro personnel in approximate proportion to the number who served. But apparently the Negro's champions in the War Department could not find even one instance of courageous and intrepid action on the part of a Negro soldier that would warrant the award of the cherished Congressional Medal, and the five Distinguished Service Crosses awarded to Negroes fall far short of being their proportionate share.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator spoke of no Congressional Medals of Honor being awarded to Negro soldiers. Does the Senator know of any responsible officer in the armed forces who has ever stated that the Negro made a good combat soldier?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not. I expect to quote from a few Army officers in a moment, which will probably be an answer to the distinguished Senator's question.

I desire to quote from an article entitled "Report on the Negro Soldier," which appeared in Harper's magazine for April 1946. It was written by Mr. Warman Welliver, who served with the Negro Ninety-second Infantry as a captain from October 1943 to July 1945. I may say that Mr. Welliver is not a southerner and he appears to favor nonsegregation in fighting units, therefore his observation of the Negro in combat is especially revealing. Mr. Welliver wrote:

In early April the Ninety-second (including the reorganized Negro regiment) opened the Fifth Army's offensive some 10 days before the big push for Bologna and the Po Valley. After a week's hard fighting it broke through the enemy's heavily defended lines below La Spezia and began a gradually accelerating advance which carried it through Genoa to Turin by the end of the Italian campaign. This final blaze of glory was dimmed only by the fact that the communiqués kept referring to the exploits of the Four Hundred and Forty-second and Four Hundred and Seventy-third Infantry Regiments which were temporarily attached to the Ninety-second Division and which were composed of Japanese-American and white American soldiers respectively. Colored infantrymen of the Three Hundred and Seventieth were also mentioned, but it was evident that the other two regiments were doing most of the fighting. Actually the Three Hundred and Seventieth substantially repeated its disappointing performance of February and was soon taken out of the line.

In outlining the war history of colored troops, I have emphasized the performance of the Ninety-second Division for two reasons. It was the only colored division which saw hard fighting, and I had first-hand knowledge of what went on. With some few exceptions, I think it must be admitted that colored infantry units generally were ineffective. By ineffective I mean that they were unable to undertake determined offensive action, that they failed to hold ground in the face of enemy counter-offensives sometimes conducted with very limited forces, that their patrolling was listless, and that there were no colored infantry units of any size on which a commander could rely to carry out an assigned task involving contact with the enemy.

In one attack in February 1945 by a colored battalion of more than 400 men, less than 100 effective troops remained at the end of the second day. Most of the others had melted away. They were in caves on the side of a hill or in the town at the foot of the hill which they had managed to reach by escorting casualties to the aid station in the ratio of 5 to 10 to 1 casualty.

Reports that reached this country as to the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of the Ninety-second Division were so disturbing to the War Department that the Secretary of War sent his special Negro assistant, Truman Gibson, to Italy to investigate conditions within the division. When Gibson came back with his report that many units of the division had melted away and that there had been instances of panicky flight before the enemy, the colored press of this country called him a traitor to his race and demanded his resignation, despite the fact that he was a Negro and was undoubtedly soft-pedaling his report as much as possible. Gibson quoted the white officers of the Ninety-second Division as attributing these characteristics to the Negro soldiers: an absence of individual cooperation, a lack of pride in self and in race expressed by cutting and slashing each other, no combative spirit, no sense of shame, an evidence of lack of character, disposition to panic, and lack of motivation to fight. Negro officers and "noncoms" could not be made to make others do something unpleasant.

The records show that the Negro's performance as a solider in the First World War was even more disappointing. Maj. Gen. Robert Lee Bullard, commanding general of the Second United States Army, writing in his Personalities and Reminiscences of the War had this to say:

The Negro division (Diary, November 1) seems in a fair way to be a failure. It is in a quiet sector, yet can hardly take care of itself, while to take any offensive action seems wholly beyond its powers. I have been here now with it 3 weeks and have been unable to have it make a single raid upon the enemy. They are really inferior soldiers. There is no denying it. Their Negro officers have an inadequate idea of what is expected of soldiers, and their white officers are too few to leaven the lump.

Spent the day (November 5) going about the Army and seeing. I saw especially the Negroes, the Ninety-second Division, which after more than a month in the trenches cannot yet make a raid. It failed again on one today. Poor Negroes. They are hopelessly inferior. I've been talking with them individually about their division's success. That success is not troubling them. With everyone feeling and saying that they are worthless as soldiers, they are going on quite unconcernedly.

From about the 25th of October, then, until a few days before the armistice I put forth every effort to have this division execute some offensive operation, such as a raid, against the enemy. The division was large and composed of exceptionally husky, vigorous-looking soldiers, well equipped. The enemy troops against them were of second or third class, not by any means the best. I provided the most skilled French and American advisers and instructors for them in an effort to have them execute a successful raid. I never succeeded even to a slight degree. As I remember, in those 3 weeks this division of some 27,000 men captured 1 German.

It is commonly believed among Americans that French people have no objection to Negroes, but this I quickly found was an error. While there were very few French people in the region occupied by this division, they were not happy to have the Negroes among them. The Negro is a more sensual man than the white man and at the same time he is far more offensive to white women than is a white man. The little acts of familiarity that would pass unnoticed in a white man, become the cause of complaint against the Negro. This special Negro division was already charged with 15 cases of rape.

For these reasons, immediately after the armistice I recommended in effect that this division be sent home first of all the American troops, that they be sent home in all honor, but above all that they be sent quickly. The answer came that Marshal Foch would not, pending peace, approve the transfer of any division back to the United States. In answer I told the American headquarters to say to Marshal Foch that no man could be responsible for the acts of these Negroes toward French women, and that he had better send this division home at once. This brought the order, and the Ninety-second was, I believe, the very first division to be sent home. I was told that the division was received at home with great glorification. I was perfectly willing that it should be; the American Army abroad was relieved. My own sense of relief can be understood when I say that while a part of the division was waiting for its railroad trains to move it to its port of embarkation, among other things one poor Frenchwoman was ravished by five Ninety-second Division soldiers.

Altogether, my memories of the Ninety-second Negro Division are a nightmare. When all my thought, time, and effort were needed to make war against a powerful enemy, they had for a week to be given over entirely to a dangerous, irritating race question that had nothing to do with war-making, the paramount matter of the time. I fear that it will always be so with Negroes wherever they are in contact with whites. This thought and my experience led me to this conclusion: If you need combat soldiers, and especially if you need them in a hurry, don't put your time upon Negroes. The task of making soldiers of them and fighting with them, if there are any white people near, will be swamped in the race question. If racial uplift or racial equality is your purpose, that is another matter.

Mr. President, we are considering legislation for the selection and training of thousands of combat soldiers at a cost of millions of dollars. It is essential that these men be trained well, that they be trained in an atmosphere conducive to high morale, that their health be preserved. We must not allow this effort to become an experiment in racial amalgamation, or our goal will be impossible to reach. If Army segregation were ended, only strife and constant friction, bitterness and resentment could result.

The Army does not want to end segregation. Its leaders know what would result from enforced integration. I daresay the rank and file of Negroes, the testimony of some Negro leaders notwithstanding, do not want enforced association. It would make them uncomfortable. It would prohibit their promotion to higher grades, as General Eisenhower testified.

The Russell amendment, I believe, is a sensible approach to the problem. It would permit the Army to train together white and Negro troops who would have no objection, and retain segregation of those whose feelings and background would demand it.

EXHIBIT A

Crime statistics for selected cities, 1946 and 1947

	Percent of population	Murder	Manslaughter	Larceny	Burglary	Burglary and larceny	Robbery	Rape	Aggravated assault	Auto theft	Theft	Total arrests	Percentage of arrests	Rate per 10,000
Washington, D. C.:														
Population, 1947 estimate (1,176,612):														
White 919,232	78.12													
Colored 257,380	21.87													
1947—White		4	7	305	540		251	6	121	362		1,596	26.55	17.3
Colored		63	2	696	1,825		582	18	999	230		4,415	73.45	171.8
												6,011		
Detroit, Mich.:														
Population, 1947 estimate (1,785,000):														
White 1,580,800	88.56													
Colored 204,200	11.43													
1946—White		22	39	435	257		184	47	172	101		1,257	44.70	7.9
Colored		49	7	537	235		245	87	352	43		1,555	55.29	76.2
												2,812		
1947—White		21	22	508	305		194	52	186	122		1,410	46.12	8.9
Colored		55	3	646	205		217	81	385	55		1,647	53.87	80.7
												3,057		
St. Louis, Mo.:														
Population, 1947 estimate (924,813):														
White 816,048	88.23													
Colored 108,765	11.76													
1946—White		29	75	736	472		209	91	120	378		2,110	52.22	25.8
Colored		62	8	848	411		117	79	254	151		1,930	47.77	178.7
												4,040		
1947—White		39	95	844	362		172	99	216	390		2,217	49.15	27.6
Colored		83	41	899	468		156	118	338	190		2,293	50.84	212.3
												4,510		
New Orleans, La.:														
Population, 1947 estimate (550,000):														
White 350,000	63.63													
Colored 200,000	36.37													
1947—White		6	11	473	90		89	11	90			770	38.77	22.0
Colored		44	6	606	107		100	44	309			1,216	61.22	60.8
												1,986		
Atlanta, Ga.:														
Population, 1948 (355,000):														
White 213,985	60.28													
Colored 141,015	39.72													
1946—White		9		429			7	17	344	121		927	39.48	43.3
Colored		73		782			54	43	397	72		1,421	60.51	100.7
												2,348		
1947—White		19		433			49	21	238	102		862	37.20	40.4
Colored		75		742			97	41	426	74		1,455	62.79	103.1
												2,317		
Houston, Tex.:														
Population, 1947 (623,000):														
White 483,448	77.60													
Colored 139,552	22.40													
1946—White		23	5		157		63	21	34	36	412	751	47.92	15.5
Colored		58	3		144		46	22	143	19	381	816	52.07	58.4
												1,567		
1947—White		25	13		161		56	23	44	47	384	753	47.03	15.5
Colored		53	4		156		55	22	135	28	395	848	52.96	61.0
												1,601		
Dallas, Tex.:														
Population, 1947 (434,593):														
White 365,716	84.15													
Colored 68,877	15.84													
1946—White		19	2		222		66	20	266	72	483	1,150	54.27	31.4
Colored		47	2		151		52	21	259	35	402	969	45.72	140.8
												2,119		
1947—White		20	2		300		86	31	128	216	499	1,282	58.27	35.1
Colored		43	2		187		39	29	88	76	454	918	41.72	133.4
												2,200		
Charleston, S. C.:														
Population, 1947 estimate (71,275):														
White 39,488	55.40													
Colored 31,787	44.59													
1946—White		5				55			5	18		83	32.55	21.0
Colored		10				103		2	39	18		172	67.45	54.2
												255		
1947—White		4				64			10	7		85	34.27	21.5
Colored		10				95			50	8		163	65.72	51.4
												248		
Jacksonville Fla.:														
Population 1947 estimate (300,000):														
White 180,000	60.00													
Colored 120,000	40.00													
1946—White		5	15	181			37			72		310	46.33	17.2
Colored		34	12	243			51	6		13		359	53.66	29.9
												669		
Shreveport La.:														
Population 1947 (122,000):														
White 73,200	60.00													
Colored 48,800	40.00													
1946—White		2			14		1		8	16	77	118	30.10	16.1
Colored		14			35		3		30	7	185	274	69.89	56.1
												392		
1947—White		2			18		2		8	15	60	105	28.76	14.3
Colored		12			20		2	2	35	2	187	260	71.23	54.1
												365		
Birmingham Ala.:														
Population 1947 (315,000):														
White 179,550	57.00													
Colored 135,450	43.00													
1946—White		4		242	115		78	20	57	107		623	54.17	34.8
Colored		5		220	79		70	9	57	87		527	45.82	39.0
												1,150		
1947—White		64		482	222		66	6	331	34		1,205	49.67	67.3
Colored		61		460	195		99	20	340	46		1,221	50.32	90.4
												2,426		

Crime statistics for selected cities, 1946 and 1947—Continued

	Percent of population	Murder	Manslaughter	Larceny	Burglary	Burglary and larceny	Robbery	Rape	Aggravated assault	Auto theft	Theft	Total arrests	Percentage of arrests	Rate per 10,000
Columbia S. C.:														
Population 1940 (62,396):														
White 40,201	64.40													
Colored 22,195	35.57													
1946—White			2	20			3		5	21		51	30.00	12.5
Colored		8	2	53	6		9	2	30	9		119	70.00	53.8
												170		
1947—White		1	1	42	1		9		7	11		72	35.46	17.9
Colored		4		78	7		3	5	28	6		131	64.53	59.2
												203		

EXHIBIT B

ARMY CRIME STATISTICS SHOWING RATE PER 100,000 AT WHICH WHITE AND NEGRO SOLDIERS WERE COMMITTED TO CONFINEMENT FOR SELECTED OFFENSES

Rate per 100,000 enlisted men in the Army, by race (white and colored) and principal offense, of general prisoners in confinement at rehabilitation centers, disciplinary barracks, and Federal institutions during the year 1945

	Commitment rate [1]	
	Per 100,000 white	Per 100,000 Negro
Absent without leave	113	118
Desertion	75	105
Other military offenses	41	181
Civil offenses	78	229
Murder	—	9
Rape	—	13
Assault with intent to rape	2	10
Robbery	3	11
Assault with intent to rob	—	—
Manslaughter	2	12
Assault	7	69
Sodomy	2	5
Assault with intent to commit sodomy	—	—
Burglary, housebreaking	3	11
Larceny	29	38
Receiving stolen goods	—	—
Frauds against Government	6	13
Embezzlement	2	2
Forgery	10	8
Other offenses	11	28

[1] Rates based on an estimated enlisted personnel strength as of Dec. 31, 1944, of 6,353,807 white (89.14 percent) and 661,469 Negro (9.28 percent). A rate of less than 1 person per 100,000 is indicated by "—".

EXHIBIT C

STATISTICAL STUDY OF 24,000 MILITARY PRISONERS BY WAR DEPARTMENT CONSULTANT

(By Austin H. MacCormick, Consultant to the Under Secretary of War, War Department, 1946)

The following comment is taken from Statistical Study of 24,000 Military Prisoners:

Race: The relative proportion of general prisoners representing minority groups was considerably higher among general prisoners than in the Army as a whole. The distribution by race for soldiers in the Army as a whole was approximately 89 percent white, as compared with 9 percent Negro (a ratio of 10 to 1), and 1.5 percent for those of other races. This distribution closely corresponds to that of population figures for the United States. Among the 24,327 general prisoners studied, white prisoners constituted 80.6 percent of all commitments, as compared with 17.3 percent Negro (ratio of nearly 5 to 1), and 2.1 percent of other races. In the cases covered by the study the commitment rates were 307 per 100,000 whites, 633 per 100,000 Negroes, 457 per 100,000 of other races, and 341 per 100,000 of all races. With respect to military offenses, it should be pointed out that proportionately more Negroes than whites come from environmental situations which greatly vary from experiences and relationships in the military environment and that the Negro soldier will therefore find greater difficulty in making adjustments to the new conditions of the Army experience.

5. Bureau of the Census figures for male felony commitments during 1940 show 70.1 percent white, 29.1 percent Negro, and 0.9 percent other races.

6. Based on Bureau of the Census figures for male felony commitments during 1940 between the ages of 18 and 44, the ratio of white to Negro commitments was nearly 4 to 1, and the ratio of other races to white was about 3 to 1.

EXHIBIT D

IV. PREMISE: THE SOUTH AND THE NEGRO AND CRIME STATISTICS

C. Crime statistics: Northern States cannot cope with situation as the South

Year		Number of male prisoners	Total male population	Rate per 10,000
	COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL JAILS			
1933 [1]	Negroes:			
	13 Southern States	25,496	8,805,635	28.7
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	29,542	3,085,508	95.7
	Whites:			
	13 Southern States	35,273	24,146,167	14.6
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	140,602	84,718,040	16.6
	STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES			
1934	Negroes:			
	10 Southern States [2]	6,616	5,779,958	11.4
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	8,237	3,085,508	26.7
	Whites:			
	10 Southern States	9,319	19,611,562	4.7
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	35,772	84,718,040	4.2
1935	Negroes:			
	10 Southern States [2]	7,627	5,779,958	13.2
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	8,735	3,085,508	28.3
	Whites:			
	10 Southern States	9,980	19,611,562	5.1
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	38,602	84,718,040	4.6
1937	Negroes:			
	10 Southern States [2]	8,131	3,314,492	24.5
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	4,565	1,437,493	31.8
	Whites:			
	10 Southern States [2]	10,026	13,409,648	7.5
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	23,208	43,539,059	5.3

[1] First 6 months.
[2] 3 Southern States not reporting.

C. Crime statistics: Northern States cannot cope with situation as the South—Con.

Year		Number of male prisoners	Total male population	Rate per 10,000
	STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES—Con.			
1938	Negroes:			
	11 Southern States [3]	9,111	3,841,208	23.7
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	4,560	1,437,493	31.7
	Whites:			
	11 Southern States [3]	11,039	13,965,805	7.9
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	25,020	43,539,059	5.7
1939	Negroes:			
	11 Southern States [3]	8,548	3,841,208	22.3
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	4,402	1,437,493	30.6
	Whites:			
	11 Southern States [3]	10,791	13,965,805	7.7
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia	24,194	43,539,059	5.6
1940	Negroes:			
	11 Southern States [3]	9,292	3,787,082	24.5
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia.	4,536	1,437,493	31.6
	Whites:			
	11 Southern States [3]	10,579	14,336,644	7.4
	Remaining 35 States and District of Columbia.	22,633	43,539,059	5.2
1941	Negroes:			
	11 Southern States [3]	8,659	3,787,082	22.9
	Remaining 34 States and District Columbia (excluding Pennsylvania)	3,820	1,207,016	31.6
	Whites:			
	11 Southern States [3]	9,459	14,336,644	6.6
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Pennsylvania)	18,848	38,820,576	4.9
1942	Negroes:			
	11 Southern States [3]	7,322	3,787,082	19.3
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Michigan)	3,858	1,332,002	29.0
	Whites:			
	11 Southern States [3]	7,114	14,336,644	5.0
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Michigan)	15,243	40,954,600	3.7
1943	Negroes:			
	11 Southern States [3]	5,825	3,787,082	15.4
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Michigan)	3,475	1,332,002	26.1
	Whites:			
	11 Southern States [3]	5,386	14,336,644	3.8
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Michigan)	12,809	40,954,600	3.1
1944	Negroes:			
	11 Southern States [3]	5,447	3,787,082	14.4
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Michigan)	3,433	1,332,002	25.8

[3] 2 Southern States not reporting.

C. Crime statistics: Northern States cannot cope with situation as the South—Con.

Year		Number of male prisoners	Total male population	Rate per 10,000
1944	STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES—con.			
	Whites:			
	11 Southern States [1]	5,223	14,336,644	3.6
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Michigan)	12,516	40,954,600	3.1
1945	Negroes:			
	10 Southern States [1]	3,507	3,787,082	10.6
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Michigan)	5,509	1,332,002	38.5
	Whites:			
	10 Southern States [1]	3,549	14,336,644	2.6
	34 other States and District of Columbia (excluding Michigan)	15,746	40,954,600	3.6

[1] 2 Southern States not reporting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is not with any great measure of enthusiasm or pleasure that I shall vote for passage of the pending bill. I shall support it only from a sense of obligation and duty to do that which, under the circumstances, seems to be the wise and prudent course to follow for the protection and security of my country; but I do not at all relish the idea of a peacetime draft or conscription law.

It is regrettable that world conditions are such that we now find it necessary to take this extraordinary course in order to build our military to the strength which we feel is essential to afford protection and to meet any emergency or contingency that may arise. It would seem that the peoples of the world and the leaders of the governments of the world should by this time have tired of war and learned that there is no profit in war; that no happiness to humanity flows from war; that even for the victors there are many long years of suffering and struggle before they can gain economic, moral, and spiritual recovery.

But, Mr. President, we are faced with an unhappy situation in which obviously the world has not been freed of aggressors and would-be world conquerors, and those who would take advantage of their superior power and military strength to impose their will and their ideologies upon other peoples and upon weaker nations.

Our country was caught unprepared in two great world emergencies. I do not know, and we can only speculate, as to what might have occurred had America been well prepared at the beginning of World War I or World War II. Had we had the military strength and power which we soon developed in both those wars, we might well have avoided being drawn into them. It is highly probable that there would not have been a Pearl Harbor.

I regard this measure, as has often been said, as a measure in the interest of peace and not a measure designed particularly to prepare us for war. But we all know that those who speak with the authority and power to back up what they say, wield more force and influence than do those who talk loosely, even to the extent of boasting or threatening when they do not have the power to back up either their promises or their threats.

We are not a threatening country. We are not warmongers. We are not seeking war. We are undertaking to win the battle for world peace. We are not making the progress we had hoped to make in that direction. There is no dependable and reliable peace in the world today. Instead, following the cessation of hostilities, there have been many things to indicate, if not to point out with direct, conclusive emphasis, that another world war is possible.

I am convinced that if we are to make the maximum contribution to the establishing of a peace that will endure, in the light of conditions which obtain throughout the world today, it is imperative that we keep our military strength built to such a degree that when we speak in matters of foreign affairs and with respect to the policies of our Government in international affairs, we shall have the military power and strength to back up what we say, and command the respect of those to whom we say it.

For that reason, and in the hope that the enactment of this measure will contribute to peace and not to war, I shall support it. But, Mr. President, we are doing an unprecedented thing in this legislation. We are in peacetime reaching into the homes of the Nation and taking a large number of the youth of the land by the power of conscription. We are taking them away from their civilian pursuits, taking them out of the schools, where they, like other youth, are undertaking to prepare and equip themselves for a useful and better life. They are undertaking to obtain an education that will enhance the value of life for them and the joy of living. Mr. President, in taking them into the service, we are calling upon them, in fact demanding of them and exacting of them, that they forego their plans and their ambitions, in order to provide the military strength which we feel our country needs at this hour in order to give it adequate protection and more potent influence in world affairs as we undertake to establish an enduring peace.

Mr. President, this law will not be a popular one with many young men of the Nation who will be affected by it. It will not be a popular law with the parents of the young men who will be taken into the service and required to give 2 years of military service to their country. Although it will not be popular, nevertheless, as I have tried to point out, it is my judgment, and I am sure it is the sense of the Congress, that such action is necessary and is the better part of wisdom if the United States is to play its proper part and to have the influence which it should have in the establishment of peace.

When we do this unprecedented thing, Mr. President, when we take the young men from their homes and put them into military training, to many of them it will be a great disappointment. For the present, at least, their hopes and ambitions will be blighted. They will have to defer their life's plan and program until they have made this sacrifice for their country. Mr. President, I believe we should do it; but if we do it, we should undertake to do it under such circumstances and rules and regulations as will preserve for those young men and to them as much personal liberty as it is possible to grant. We should do it in a fashion that will respect the dignity of the individual so far as our doing so can be consistent with requiring of them this service to their country.

The pending amendment should have the support of every Member of Congress who is sincere in saying he is interested in protecting minority groups, that he is interested in protecting the dignity of the individual, and that he wishes to require this service at the least possible sacrifice to the individuals who will be required to give it. The pending amendment does not do violence to the integrity, the dignity, or the self-respect of any race, any class, or any individual who will be affected by the legislation. Instead, this amendment guarantees to each individual certain rights and liberties. It guarantees the right of choice with respect to his closest and most intimate associations while in the military service. It does not deny to the Negroes the right to associate with the whites; it does not deny to the whites the right to be associated with the Negroes and to be in the same units with them if they so choose. It simply accords to each individual the right to determine for himself whether, while giving this service to his country and while making this sacrifice for his country, he shall choose to serve in units, the personnel of which is made up of members of his own race.

What is wrong with that? Should not this right be granted and preserved?

Mr. President, we should remember that we are not now engaged in war. There is no demand or emergency which requires that our young men be in mixed units while in the service. We are not now engaged in battle. We are simply providing training, so as to be prepared should war come.

Under these circumstances, when we take into account the sacrifices we are requiring these young men of all races to make, certainly there should be accorded to them by the Congress of the United States, and under the law as enacted, every privilege, so long as it is not inconsistent with the best interests of the service, which they would take for themselves and have the right to take for themselves and do take for themselves in civilian life. Shall we say to them, "We will compel you to serve"—and yet, in order to appease an ideology that is false in its concept from the very beginning—the ideology that we must try to build up one minority group by law into an alleged, but false, position of being a superior race, we shall compel associations that

are repugnant to the consciences and sense of propriety and decency of a vast majority of those who will be conscripted into the service? Mr. President, we cannot by law make black white, and neither can we legislate superior intelligence out of the white race and transplant it into the black race. Segregation of the two races is just as prudent and necessary in military service as it is desirable in civilian life.

Mr. President, those who vote against this amendment will vote to impose by law a condition of servitude on the white youth of this Nation that they will righteously resent. It will also be said to the Negro youth, when he is drafted, "You cannot have the privilege of serving in a unit composed of other members of your own race. We deny that right to you, but we will place you in units where very likely you will meet"—and in all practical aspects of the matter we know they will meet—"with superior competition as regards opportunities for advancement, opportunities for recognition, opportunities of securing a commission, opportunities of advancing to the grade of warrant officer." Certainly their opportunities in those respects will be greatly impaired and lessened if they are forced to compete with the white race. Let us also consider what we shall be doing to the white boy who then will be taken away from his home, where he is under parental care and under the comforting and wholesome influence of home life and community life among friends of his own race. We shall also be taking him away from his school associations, where he is undertaking to avail himself of the opportunities afforded him to get an education. We shall be taking him away from all those pleasant friendships, associations, and influences, and placing him in the military service for 2 years. At the time when he registers for service and enters it, all that most of the white young men will ask will be, "Do not take me out of this home environment, this association with the members of my own race and my own color, away from my own friends, and put me in a unit where I am compelled to yield my self-respect and accept a social equality with the members of the Negro race that in civilian life I do not recognize as my social equals."

Mr. President, if we go that far, if we deny the liberty that preserves the dignity of the individual citizen of this Nation, and if by compulsion of law we force him to have intimate associations in such close contact as a mixed unit will require him to have, right at the very beginning of this program we shall break the spirit of and demoralize hundreds of thousands of young white men who love their country and who are willing to serve it devotedly both in peace and in time of war.

In this amendment they plead only that the Congress not compel them to do that which they do not do in civilian life and that which will not add to the morale of the Army we are trying to build. Shall we compel them to do it, if we do compel them to do it, solely for the sake of trying to get a few votes in an election?

That, Mr. President, is the truth about it. I want every white boy in America to know, if it is possible for me to convey the information to him, that if this amendment is not adopted the privilege of service with his own race will be denied him, simply for the sake of bidding for some Negro votes in the coming election. The mothers and fathers of white boys back home want the amendment adopted. They have a right to ask it of the Congress. Mr. President, I shall not take a position when there is no need for it, but when all military men of high standing in this country, those who have had experience in time of peace as well as in time of war, tell us it is far better to keep the races segregated, that it is in the interest of the service to do it, why should we disregard their advice, as well as disregard the right, the dignity, the self-respect of boys we are to induct into the service? Mr. President, I support the amendment and I associate myself with the very able argument presented in support of it last night by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I sincerely hope the amendment shall prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired. To whom do the Senators in charge of the time yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has asked for, I think, from 3 to 5 minutes. I yield a maximum of 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understand a motion is to be made to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to Senate bill 2655, the Selective Service Act of 1948. If such a motion is made I shall vote against its adoption the same as I have been voting on prior motions on other amendments to the pending bill.

I do not approve the procedure being followed here for the purpose of evading a vote. It is merely a parliamentary procedure to dodge the issue. This procedure should only be used when an amendment offered is not germane to the pending bill itself.

Senators offering these amendments are entitled to be heard, and the Senate should be given an opportunity to vote regardless of whether we agree with the amendments or not. I shall continue to support the right of Senators to have amendments considered, and, voted upon on the basis of their merits.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom do the Senators in charge of the time yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield a maximum of 15 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from South Dakota. I doubt very seriously that I shall occupy as much time as he has generously allotted to me. In view of my intention to vote against the pending amendment, I thought in fairness to myself, and also in order that I might state the reasons actuating my vote I would make some comment upon the pending amendment.

Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I wonder if I may have the attention of the able Senator from South Dakota, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who is in charge of the bill upon the floor, so that I may ask him whether he will summarize the position of the armed services upon this subject.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I do not know that I can state the complete position of the armed services in summary form. It is an involved question. Nevertheless, the committee, which has accepted the report from the armed services, believe they are now handling the question of races in a very satisfactory, agreeable way. The hearings before the committee were full and complete, including not only testimony by the armed forces but testimony from other sources.

The Army is operating under what is known as the Gillem report. Lieutenant General Gillem made the report, which has been accepted and fully approved by the Secretary. That means there shall be no order against including in any large unit of the armed forces a unit of the minority race, housed in separate barracks and having their own mess facilities. That is quite different from the system which was in vogue during, say, World War I. The plan seems to be operating now very nicely. In summary form, that is about the situation.

I refer the Senator for more complete details to the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, on universal military training, particularly page 652, which outlines the Gillem report very well. Beginning at the bottom of that page, it states:

1. The troop basis for the postwar Army will include Negro troops approximately in the 1 to 10 ratio of the Negro civilian population to the total population of the Nation.

2. To meet the requirements of training and expansion, combat and service units will be organized and activated from the available Negro manpower. Employment will be in Negro regiments or groups, separate battalions or squadrons, and separate companies, troops, or batteries, which will conform in general to other units of the postwar Army. A proportionate number of these units will be organized as part of larger units.

It continues with further details as to how the Army is now operating. Does that in general answer the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. That in a general way is what the Senator from Florida had in mind by the inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield, the Senator from South Dakota does not touch at all upon the policies in another great branch of the armed services, the Navy, which does not hold to such a position.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield, another great concern to me is, who knows who will be the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of National Defense, or the Secretary of the Navy, in years to come? That is what concerns me.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. The Navy is getting along very well with its policy of no segregation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wanted to have the statement which has been made by the able Senator from South Dakota, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, because I think there is a tendency to confuse the facts on this issue. Let it be remembered that this amendment proposes, by an act of the Congress itself, to prescribe the imperative principle of segregation. What I propose to do is to vote the way I voted on the so-called Langer amendments, which amendments were voted upon by the Senate; that is to say, to leave the matter to the discretion and good judgment and wisdom of the armed services themselves, rather than to prescribe by law a principle of imperative nonsegregation or a principle of imperative segregation.

Senators will recall and the RECORD will disclose that the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], in a series of eloquent speeches supported a number of amendments which would, by law, have prescribed the course which the armed services would have to pursue in respect to this question and problem. I announced on the radio during the "Meet the Press" program last week that it was my opinion that the whole subject should be left to the judgment, discretion, and wisdom of the armed services themselves to determine what was best for the services, and, secondly, what is best for everyone concerned. So in voting against the Russell amendment I am simply consistent with the votes which I cast against the Langer amendments, so as to leave the matter to the discretion, judgment, and wisdom of the armed services themselves.

I want to make it clear that we are talking about the prescribed official relationships of persons in the armed services of the United States when we are dealing with this amendment in the Senate. I want to make it doubly clear for the RECORD that I am not in favor of what the people in my section of the country call social equality, in the sense that the Government may tell one whom he can have in his home as a guest, who can eat at his table, who can have social relationships with him. That is a matter of personal prerogative on the part of every citizen of the United States. The Government has nothing to do with it. But when we legislate——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. In just a moment. We have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and I do not see how we in the Congress can, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, prescribe in a law an affirmative principle of segregation in official spheres outside of personal and social relationships. The Senate will recall that in respect to the regional educational measure which was considered recently, and of which southern Senators were, I believe, without a single exception, the authors and sponsors, we were prepared to accept an amendment to the effect that no opinion of the Senate was expressed on the question of segregation. That was left for the administrative agencies to work out. I pointed out, in my remarks upon that measure, that if, in its administration, a wrong should be done, the courts of the land were open to those who sought redress for those wrongs. The point was that we were not legislating segregation or nonsegregation on the face of the measure, and that if there were an improper exercise of authority administratively, that was a question for the courts of the land.

I am sorry to delay yielding to my friend from Mississippi so long. I now yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has said that segregation is a matter with which the Government has nothing to do. Does the Senator think that the State of Florida has no right to enact Jim Crow laws, or laws regarding segregation in schools?

Mr. PEPPER. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that neither the State of Florida, nor any other State, nor the Federal Government, has any right to prescribe the principle of segregation in interstate commerce. I distinguish between what a public carrier does administratively, and in the exercise of its discretion, and the passage of a public law by a State legislature or by the Congress of the United States respecting interstate commerce. I did not support the Langer amendment which would have denied to a railroad company the right to prescribe reasonable principles in the seating or in the service of its passengers; but if the question here were, Should the United States Government, when it issues a travel permit, issue a white permit to a white soldier and a black permit to a black soldier? I would not vote for that kind of legislation. I am leaving it open to be handled in a practical way according to what is reasonable, fair, and in the public interest generally. If there is an abuse of discretion, there will be time to examine the abuse in the courts. I shall not stultify my oath to uphold the Constitution by voting affirmatively to establish by law segregation or any other sort of discrimination among black, white, yellow, red, or any other segment of the citizenry of this country which the Supreme Court has held in violation of the Constitution of the United States. That is all I am standing for here today.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. EASTLAND. What about the dual school system? Is that a matter of choice, or has the State any authority with reference to it?

Mr. PEPPER. The United States Supreme Court has not yet held that a State cannot segregate its citizens in the schools. I said, on the "Meet the press" program last Friday evening, I thought that in the public schools, the high schools, and the colleges it was clearly in the public interest, in the Southern States, to preserve the principle of segregation.

Mr. EASTLAND. By choice or by law?

Mr. PEPPER. By law, under State statutes, because the United States Supreme Court has not yet held that it is illegal. It has held only that the races must be afforded equality of facilities. I said that the principle employed by the great State of Arkansas, which is one of the finest States in the Southland, where, in law schools, a small number of the colored race are admitted instead of building a new law school for them should apply in connection with graduate and professional schools, for example, medical schools, in handling a different race. The sensible principle can be worked out and used so the races could be served in the same institution. A sensible and reasonable way of handling this matter is all I am advocating here today.

Mr. EASTLAND. When has the Supreme Court held that in intrastate commerce there must not be racial segregation?

Mr. PEPPER. The Supreme Court has not so held as to intrastate commerce.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that the question should be left as a matter of choice, and that the State of Florida should not exercise its police power in that field?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Supreme Court holds that States may, in intrastate commerce, have a division of races if they require equal facilities for both races, I am not complaining about that. All I am saying is that we are not dealing with intrastate commerce, upon which the Supreme Court has not passed; we are dealing with the armed services of the United States, and the question involved is, What is our duty under the oath we took under the Constitution of the United States? How can I keep that oath and write into law the imperative principle of segregation among races in the armed services? We are not expected in Congress to write into law the details of how the armed services operate. Anything the defense authorities do that is sensible, reasonable, and has a fair basis of justification is up to them and their responsibility. If they abuse their discretion they are subject to review by the Congress of the United States.

All I am saying, Mr. President, and what I want to make clear today, is that I voted against the Langer amendments, and I shall vote against the Russell amendment on the same principle, that I am leaving the matter of handling personnel to the sensible discretion, the judgment, and the wisdom of the armed services. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has already disclosed the way in which the Army is handling the matter. I have not heard any criticism or complaint about the way in which the Navy is handling it. I believe it is better to let them handle it than it is for us to try to prescribe in a law the details of the operation of the armed services.

Mr. President, I want to say in conclusion that I know this problem is difficult. I have lived in the South all my life and

I know the problems. Yet, I am not insensible to the obligation of America not merely to tell the world about democracy, but to show it to them in its operation in this great land of ours. I realize that these problems have to be dealt with sensibly and sympathetically. They should be dealt with by persons who have some knowledge of the background of the problem. It is not a matter of politics. It is one of those difficult questions in social relationships in political democracy that we must work out.

Mr. President, while I do not contend or suggest that the problem can be solved overnight, and I would disclaim the judgment of anyone who said it could be worked out overnight, I am equally opposed to those who say we cannot make some progress in the matter and that we cannot look sympathetically upon the problem and aid understandingly in its proper administrative adjustment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not challenge the right of the Senator from Florida to hold any views he may care to as to the propriety of any law which provides in any way for segregation, but one cannot in good faith, fairness, and equity discriminate between a law enacted by a State and one enacted by the Federal Government in that very touchy field. I only express my surprise at the Senator's position which puts him clearly in conflict with the laws of the State of Florida, which segregate the races in the schools, and which segregate them in intrastate travel, because if one is opposed to a law, and challenges the right, under the Constitution of the United States, to have a law enacted by the Congress which touches the principle of segregation, that argument applies with equal force to a law enacted by a State.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Does he have time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the Senator, with his customary care against inaccuracy, would not want to leave it in the RECORD that I said I disagreed with the policy of my State with respect to segregation in the public schools, in the high schools, and in the colleges, and also that until the United States Supreme Court holds that there cannot be segregation in intrastate commerce, I disagreed with a State requirement for segregation inside the State. The Senator from Florida pointed out, the Senator from Georgia will recall, that we are dealing, not with intrastate commerce, but with the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator may seek to differentiate if he chooses, but the general statement he made—and I listened very carefully, and I must say I heard his statement with some surprise—was that there was no right to pass any law anywhere which would impose segregation as between the races anywhere in the United States, and that such a vote would violate the oath to uphold the Constitution. That was his statement. He made no reference to policy. He charged such laws were all violative of the Constitution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow, I shall not interrupt him any more, but I must say for the RECORD that the Senator from Florida never intended to make that statement and believes he never did.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will leave it to the RECORD as to whether or not he made that statement.

Mr. President, as I have said, the Senator can hold any views he chooses, and I do not challenge his right to hold such views. Though I totally disagree with his position, I would sustain him in his right to hold such views as he sees fit to entertain, but the Senator has wholly and completely misrepresented the pending amendment, and that I do challenge. He stated once that this was an amendment to enforce segregation by law. I made a note at the time, and that statement was followed by the one about the Constitution prohibiting it.

The Senator then made the further statement that the amendment preserves affirmatively segregation in the United States in the armed forces. I wish to say that that is not a fact. The amendment does not compel any segregated units in the Army of the United States. It merely recognizes the right of the individual whom we are taking from his home to give 2 years to his country to express a choice to serve, in the most intimate relations of life, with those of his own race. If he does not express the choice, he may be assigned to unsegregated units. So the statement of the Senator from Florida was absolutely in error.

The pending amendment is designed to protect the rights of those who will be compelled to give so much to preserve our institutions of Government, the rights of the individual white or the individual Negro, whether he lives in Georgia, Florida, or any other of the 48 States. It provides for no compulsory segregation, and I am surprised that the Senator from Florida, who undoubtedly has read the amendment, should have fallen into the error, which has occurred time and again in the reports in the press and on the radio, of calling the amendment a compulsory segregation amendment.

If it be a compulsory amendment as to segregation, it will be because the people of the United States prefer to live, in the most intimate relations, with their own kind. I say that if the 90 percent of the people of the United States who are white and the 10 percent of the Nation who are Negro express a preference to serve with the members of their own race, their right to their choice should be recognized here in the Congress. Failure to do so is to strike down a right that is sacred. It is sacred, notwithstanding the source from which it may be assailed, from a minority group, or from a Senator of the United States. It is the right to choose one's associates in life. When we deny the right of association, when we say that, whether we choose it or not, we must mingle on the most intimate terms with those with whom we prefer not to be associated, we are killing individual liberty in this country.

Mr. President, it will be a sad day in America when those who say that this amendment compels segregation, indicating, as they do, that all the people would prefer to express a choice, will deny the right of choice in choosing our associates to the people of the United States, whether they be white or black.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I shall support the pending amendment, but I do so with reservations. I shall support the amendment because if it shall be agreed to it will result in a segregated Army of the United States in 99 percent of the cases.

It is plain that if mixed units were organized in the Army their fighting efficiency would be destroyed, and I do not think that a soldier should be permitted by his election which would happen if he permitted himself to be placed in a mixed unit to lower the fighting ability of the unit in which he serves. I think from that point of view the amendment is wrong. But because I know that both Negro soldiers and white soldiers will choose to serve with their own races in reality, if the amendment shall be adopted it will result in segregation, and therefore I shall support it.

There is a great pressure campaign in this country to break down segregation in the Army of the United States, to make is a Black and Tan army, an attempt which would destroy the effectiveness of the Army, and would greatly lower its morale.

What worries me is that there is in this country, and in the Senate, and the House of Representatives, a callous disregard of the rights of the individual soldier, and a callous disregard of his safety and the fighting efficiency of the Army of the United States.

I have here a letter dated the 19th of July 1945, which I received from a high officer in American intelligence in the United States Army. On the first page in great letters he marked it "Confidential." There is fear in high Army circles to discuss the record of the Negro soldier. There is fear to give the American people the facts. So this officer has sworn me to secrecy, but he gives some very interesting facts about the conduct of the colored soldiers in the armed services. I read from the letter:

> There are good and bad everywhere; among all groups of individuals. The question raised by you—

Let me say that when I returned from Europe in 1945 I gave some information to the Senate and to the country which we received at the highest levels in the

American Army. My statements were challenged by the War Department, and I immediately received a great flood of mail, from soldiers and officers, from every section of the country, and from every continent of the earth, bearing out the accuracy of the statements I made. This letter was one of the communications I received.

Some were excellent soldiers. Some Negro soldiers were known to be outstandingly fine, capable, brave, wel-educated fellows.

Mr. President, this was from a high officer in the American intelligence.

The majority by their record were and are a pitiful moronic crowd who did and do the American cause a frightful harm.

Mr. President, I challenge anyone to point to any statement by any responsible official in the American Army or in the War Department that segregation should be broken down. All the information is that the fighting efficiency of our Army would be destroyed if such a course were followed. Soldiers train as a unit. In combat they act as a team. When there is a group in a unit which will not perform its full duty, that endangers the lives of all the others in the outfit. I say that for political reasons high officials in the Government are willing to endanger the life of the man who carries a gun for his country.

I read on from the letter of the military intelligence officer:

Their General Davis gives the report that the Negro was undisciplined—

General Davis was a Negro general in the American Army—

a hoodlum due to his low standards of moral and mental capacity. Their disregard for Army equipment cost the American taxpayer * * * a pretty sum.

Now, listen to this, Mr. President:

Statistics show conclusively that among millions of American troops in ETO, 70.1 percent of all major crime—

This, Mr. President, was written by a man high up in his department—

70.1 percent of all major crime—rape, sodomy, manslaughter, larceny, and unlawful sale of United States Government property (tires, gasoline, food, blankets) (black market)—was committed by 3.3 percent of the American troops. That minority were the Negro Americans. (Army troops were 15 percent colored. Division, corps, Army, service troops were 3.3 percent.) Their record of assault and rape in Africa, Sicily, Italy, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, Austria stinks to high heaven. The lunatic fringe is the black fringe in the Army.

This officer says:

It is regrettable that the Negro did not show as a soldier that he is due the rights and privileges in the American community that his race group demands at home. They abused all opportunity to qualify as equal people.

Mr. President, there have been placed in the RECORD statistics showing the tremendous venereal-disease rate among the Negroes. What is proposed to be done will endanger the health of the white American soldier. The criminal record of the Negro soldiers has been placed in the RECORD. We know that if the amendment is not adopted, politicians catering to Negro votes will abolish segregation and force the white boys from every section of the country to be obliged to associate and eat and sleep with Negroes, thereby endangering the health of the white boys and forcing them to associate with a group that furnishes 70 percent of the criminals in the American Army. I think it is a monstrous thing that we should take an American boy by force of law, by the power of his Government, and compel him to live under social conditions that he would not have to live under at home.

I go further, Mr. President. I said the Negro was not a good combat soldier. I have here a statement of a general in the great Army of the United States, not a law department general, not a synthetic public-relations general who has resorted to falsehoods to sustain the war record of this race in the Army, but a man who commanded front-line troops in combat in World War II and in World War I, a man with a distinguished war record. This is what he has to say respecting both wars:

As you may know—

This is a letter from a general who wrote me on May 29, 1948—

As you may know, the Ninety-third Division served in the European theater in World War I. After several trials, it was found that this division broke so badly it had to be pulled out of line.

It was endangering the line, and endangering the lives of thousands of innocent white American boys. Oh, no, Mr. President, their rights, their welfare, are not considered. We have men high up in the Government who would do such a thing as is proposed now to be done in order to cater to votes. The general who wrote me said further:

In World War II the Ninety-second Division served in the European theater and the Ninety-third Division in the Southwest Pacific. I had no direct observation of either of these divisions in combat; however, I have talked with quite a few officers who served with the divisions, and they are in full agreement on two points as to the Negro soldier.

This, Mr. President, is a general speaking. He actually commanded soldiers in combat. He wrote further:

First, he is afraid of the dark, and, second, he will not stand gunfire.

Let me say, Mr. President, that while I cannot go into them now, though later on in the debate I shall do so, I have confidential records from the War Department of the United States, given to me by a high-ranking officer in the American Army who is now retired, respecting the combat conduct of the Ninety-second Division in the European theater. He says that those records were actually taken from the files of the War Department and secreted in the War College because they did not want the American people to know the facts lest such knowledge would stop this drive to abolish segregation in the great American Army, the great all-conquering American Army.

I read further from the general's letter:

I understand that the War Department sent Brigadier General Davis, himself a Negro, to make an investigation and report on the failure of the Ninety-second Division. From my information his testimony was that elements of this division broke badly and it was necessary to place a white division in rear of them in order to prevent a breakthrough.

The Ninety-third Division—

The general wrote—

served in the Southwest Pacific under the command of Maj. Gen. Harry Johnson, of New Mexico. This division was employed on Bougainville in the defense of the perimeter mainly. One of the regiments of this division broke and had to be relieved entirely by elements of another (white) division. Although there was much pressure from elements in the White House—

This general said further—listen, Mr. President—

Although there was much pressure from elements in the White House to retain this division as a combat unit, nevertheless, the War Department decided very wisely not to do so. It was brought back to New Guinea, and throughout the subsequent action in the Pacific it was used in defense of bases and in guard duty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I shall speak later on the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I cannot see how anyone who favors segregation or how anyone who does not favor segregation can support the amendment. First of all, those who favor it differ as to its import. The eminent Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] says it does not enforce segregation in the Army, while a colleague who argues from the same base says it does enforce segregation in the Army. What a mischievous amendment this is to start with. First of all, it presupposes that a man coming into the Army shall be asked whether he wants to serve in an all-colored unit, an all-white unit, or a mixed unit.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator clearly misstates the amendment. There is no such choice in it.

Mr. TYDINGS. He shall express his preference for the kind of unit in which he wishes to serve.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no such provision in the amendment. The Senator should read the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot yield—I have only 3 minutes—unless the Senator will give me the time to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the time. If I had, I would give it to the Senator. Clearly he has not read the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. A man goes into the service, and he has the right to express a preference for the kind of organization in which he shall serve. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not correct. He may only express a preference as to whether he desires to serve with a unit composed only of members of his own race. He has no other alternative.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us suppose that he is colored and that he wishes to serve

with the white race. Or, suppose that he is white and wishes to serve with the colored race.

Mr. RUSSELL. He cannot do it under the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will only listen to me. The soldier does not have to write down what his choice is. He can say, "I do not want to serve with my own race."

Mr. RUSSELL. He cannot.

Mr. TYDINGS. He can say, "I want to serve with the other race."

Mr. RUSSELL. He cannot say it under the terms of the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. No power in God's world can stop him from writing that on his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be absolutely unauthorized by law. The amendment provides only that he may express a choice to serve with a unit composed only of members of his own race.

Mr. TYDINGS. Even now, without any law, he can address his commanding officer, through military channels, and, if he is a colored man, make a request that he be transferred to a white regiment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not yielded, and I will not yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can understand why.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I have stated is absolutely true now. The logical consequence is that we shall have men asking to serve in three different branches; namely, a colored branch, a white branch, or a mixed branch. That is inevitable. If we say to a colored man, "Do you wish to serve in units which are composed entirely of members of your own race?" and he says, "No; I wish to serve in units comprised of men of the white race"——

Mr. RUSSELL. I must insist that there is no such alternative.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course it is not in the amendment, but that is not the only answer he may make to the question. He may be asked whether he wants to serve with those of his own race. He may say, "No; I do not wish to serve with that race. I desire to serve with the white race." Or, if he is a white man, he may say, "No; I do not desire to serve with the white troops. I wish to serve with colored troops." The result would be that we would have confusion compounded in the armed services of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield me one more minute?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is this: The authorities on the amendment, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] disagree as to its merits. The Senator from Mississippi says that it enforces segregation——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Georgia says that it does not enforce segregation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am not yielding. I listened to the Senator and did not interrupt him. He said that he was supporting the amendment with reservations, because it enforced segregation.

Mr. EASTLAND. I made no such statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am surprised that Senators who come from the South and who abhor this attack upon their customs would inject this issue into an armed-services bill. I am astounded that they would alienate their real friends and sympathizers by impairing the national defense at a time when it is essential to enact legislation to build up the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota be gracious enough to yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say only that the confusion which the Senator from Maryland has undertaken to depict is imaginary. It is exceeded only by the confusion in his own mind as to what the amendment actually provides.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota be gracious enough to yield to me——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I cannot yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I would be terrifically concerned if I felt that the Senate would approve this amendment. Therefore I must have some real reasons why I do not believe that the amendment is necessary, or even germane to the bill.

The committee considered the amendment. I am concerned for a number of reasons. First, it is administratively impossible, I believe, in the first instance. It would require a complete disclosure of every registrant's intention at the time he registered. It would mean that the question would be put to registrants by each local board and by each recruiting office. I am wondering just what the thousands of explanations would be all over the country. True enough, we could send out a written memorandum as to exactly what the amendment means in terms of law, so that each local board and each recruiting office could place it properly before a registrant.

Nevertheless, I believe that those who would put the question to registrants or volunteers would have their own interpretation. They would be asked many questions by each one who came up for registration. I think it would require not only minutes, but hours, to explain it thoroughly to the men who come up for registration. I can see that there would be different explanations in cities where there are racial problems—cities such as New York, Chicago, and other cities. Probably in the South, where the colored folks are in a larger percentage, they would understand it. They would know what to answer when they came to the registration place. But in places where there are no racial problems—and that embraces a good percentage of the country—I am sure there would be thousands of different explanations.

I do not believe that the amendment is germane to the bill. I would move to table the amendment except that we had a unanimous-consent agreement last night to vote at 12:30.

I now yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add just a word to what the chairman of the committee has said. I listened to the testimony and the discussion in the committee on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, and I voted against it in the committee for two very simple reasons.

In the first place, assume that a unit was at the front, and that a man was wounded and the company commander needed to fill the place of the man who was wounded. He would have to inquire of the men who were available for substitution to find out if they could serve in that unit, and whether their preference was such as to make them available. That is simply impossible in time of war at the front.

My second reason is equally simple. The amendment provides that the term "unit" means—

> A group of persons serving in the armed forces who (1) share the same housing, messing, or sanitary facilities, or (2) participate jointly in recreational or social activities.

That would mean that someone would have to be placed at the door of a mess hall to find out if a man coming in to be fed was the type that could be fed in that mess hall.

Mr. President, I believe that the amendment is administratively impossible, and that is the reason why I voted against it.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum and allow me 1 minute? He has the time left.

Mr. GURNEY. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when I was speaking some question was raised about the interpretation of the amendment. Let us read the language of the amendment:

> Any person who registers as required by the terms of this act, and any person who hereafter voluntarily enlists in the armed forces of the United States, shall be afforded an opportunity to state in writing over his signature whether he has a preference to serve only in a unit all of the enlisted personnel of which are of his own race.

Obviously, if he says, "No," then he means he wants to serve with a unit whose other members are not of his own race. There is the answer in a nutshell.

Mr. RUSSELL. He has no opportunity to say "No." No place is provided.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the use of putting the question to him if he cannot answer it?

Mr. RUSSELL. To preserve the right of the individual to serve with a unit composed of members of his own race.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota suggests the absence of a quorum, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hatch	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Is it not a fact that, according to the unanimous-consent agreement, the question now is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, and not on a motion to table?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no motion to table. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LAND FOR ADDITION TO KANOSH INDIAN RESERVATION, UTAH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Kanosh Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-seventh annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT ON MILITARY CONSCRIPTION BY WESTERN REGION OF CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN, MCPHERSON, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Raymond L. Flory, peace secretary, McPherson College, McPherson, Kans., a statement of the Western Region of the Church of the Brethren on military conscription. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE WESTERN REGION OF THE CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN ON MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Peacetime selective service is one of the most conspicuous proposals ever offered for the ultimate regimentation of the American people. We oppose it on the following grounds:

1. We believe in the essential dignity and worth of the human personality. It is a matter of record that the armed services seek to develop a machine, not individuals. Military training thus becomes the antithesis of democracy.

2. We believe that no nation can long remain stronger than the moral caliber of its people. Training for war capitalizes on the baser instincts of men and weakens their moral fiber. It aggravates attempts to provide adequate housing, family solidarity, and social stability. The great nations of history have become victims of foreign enemies only after they have become victims of moral and social deterioration. In the long view, therefore, military training would weaken rather than strengthen the defense of our country.

3. We believe that the American people have not been given all the facts concerning the need for conscription. Many times even the Members of the Congress have been unable to get an evaluation of the whole picture except that which is given by the military staff for a calculated effect. We doubt that any special group can long enjoy such power and control without placing in jeopardy our democratic institutions. Military training would be a step in the direction of totalitarianism.

4. We believe that military conscription would reduce the chances of world peace. An obvious and consistent pattern in the history of civilization emphasizes the fact that vigorous military preparedness breeds fear, suspicion, hate, and war. Such was the case with ancient Athens, Napoleon's France, Hitler's Germany, and dozens of others. Military conscription would be a contributing cause of war in a day when the world is vitally interested in maintaining peace.

Respectfully submitted.

WESTERN REGION OF THE CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN,
RAYMOND L. FLORY,
Peace Secretary,
McPherson College, McPherson, Kans.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3214. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1559).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2825. A bill to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected; with amendments (Rept. No. 1584).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1857. A bill to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1560).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2322. A bill to provide for the sale of a part of war-housing project No. Fla-8252-1 to the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1569).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2739. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1582);

H. R. 4964. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier; without amendment (Rept. No. 1583); and

H. R. 5272. A bill relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1562).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 5508. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1561).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2692. A bill to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1570).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2460. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1563); and

S. 2464. A bill to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to provide for the development of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use; without amendment.

By Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4244. A bill to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1564).

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1969. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III; without amendment (Rept. No. 1572);

S. 2341. A bill to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; without amendment (Rept. No. 1573);

S. 2767. A bill to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1576);

S. 2782. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1574);

S. 2793. A bill to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1575);

S. 2794. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1577);

H. R. 4114. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1578);

H. R. 5820. A bill to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1579);

H. R. 6289. A bill to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 1580);

H. R. 6339. A bill to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title; without amendment (Rept. No. 1581); and

S. Res. 249. Resolution to continue a study of national health problems; without amendment (Rept. No. 1571), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1333. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1567); and

S. Res. 241. Resolution to investigate the impact upon consumers and business of recent Federal court decisions relative to the regulation of trade practices in interstate and foreign commerce; with amendments (Rept. No. 1566), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MALONE, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 6419. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1568).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT—HIGH PRICES OF CONSUMER GOODS (S. REPT. NO. 1565)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I ask unanimous consent to submit, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, providing for an investigation of the high prices of consumer goods, a report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

OUTLINE OF PROPOSED ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an outline of the proposed anti-inflation program of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who is the author of the concurrent resolution calling for the investigation into the high cost of consumers' goods, and who is a member of the committee investigating the subject.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF PROPOSED ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM OF SENATOR RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, OF CONNECTICUT, AUTHOR OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19

In the spring of 1947 is became apparent that the most salient problem facing the average American family was the high cost of the necessities of life and it still continues to be. An investigation of the matter in some detail led to the decision that before the Congress could wisely act to help the people, it should conduct an extensive inquiry into the causes of the high prices which prevailed. Accordingly I introduced on June 19, 1947, a resolution calling for such an investigation. On that date the retail price index stood at 157.1.

Last fall we held hearings all over the eastern part of the country. Our subcommittee heard persons representing every economic interest and stratum. On the basis of this testimony and other research we began to formulate proposals for action. As our hearings drew to a close the price index had risen (October 15, 1947) to 163.8.

In December, when it became evident that the magnitude of the job we had assumed would delay the presentation of a full report by the committee, I decided to apply what I had learned during my work on the subcommittee thus far. Accordingly I drew up the following anti-inflation program. When it was released on December 10, 1947, the price index stood at 167.

It seems worth pointing out that perhaps one of the most important influences of this investigation was psychological. Never before had such an extensive investigation of the "grass roots" of our economy been undertaken by committees of the Congress. There may well be much truth in the often-stated assertion that the simple fact of such a large-scale inquiry has had considerable influence in bringing about a consumer price consciousness and a producer price consciousness which may well have had a stabilizing and restraining influence on the price level. The fact that the problem of high prices is still an important issue, though somewhat clouded over by other concerns is made clear when we recall that the price index today still stands at 167.

Inflation must be attacked on a broad front and on every front. Success will require the adoption of policies which are essentially anti-inflationary in character. We must stop and reverse the trend of the last 14 years.

Inflation is nurtured by all segments of an economy. It follows that in combating inflation a certain portion of responsibility devolves upon each such segment. It has been borne out in the hearings of the several subcommittees for price investigation that the individual economic groups are too much inclined to place the blame for high prices upon groups other than their own.

A successful anti-inflation program will require the assumption of certain obligations and the acceptance of certain sacrifices by every economic segment. The producing groups, capital, management, and labor, must resolve their differences with a minimum of interruption to the flow of goods. The consuming groups must show constraint and prudence in competing for the limited supply of goods.

In this attempt to restore balance to the economy, it is the province of government to observe the workings of the production-consumption machinery and to advise and, if necessary, restrain the various segments of the economy with a minimum of limitation upon economic democracy.

There are three general fields in which these policies must be put into operation. They are listed as follows:

I. THE ADMINISTRATION

A. Cut down the cost of government wherever possible.

1. Insist on a full day's work for Government officials and employees.

2. Adopt more efficient methods in all Government departments and agencies wherever indicated.

3. Reduce Government personnel wherever possible—unnecessary Government personnel is needed in the production field.

4. Cut Government building and public works except:

a. Reclamation projects for bringing in new farm lands.

b. Antierosion projects to preserve existing farm lands.

c. Those that improve transport facilities (shipping).

NOTE.—For example, the highway program, parks, reservations, public monuments, and things of that nature can wait.

B. Apply all savings and budgetary surpluses (except those needed for reasonable tax reduction), to the curtailment of Government obligations held by banks, thus contracting the credit base.

C. Support a tax-reduction program giving relief to:[1]

1. Those in the lower income brackets (increased exemptions for dependents).

2. Business, big and small, in a way that will encourage:

a. Expanded production.

b. Maintenance of employment.

3. Farmers expanding their activities to increase farm production.

NOTE.—High taxes are a part of the cost of every item that we buy. (Carry-over profit provisions.)

D. Make better use of export controls having in mind:

1. Materials needed for production here.

2. Materials essential to defense.

3. Our future export business, particularly with Central and South America. Congress should appropriate money, if necessary here, to maintain essential personnel after program is submitted and budgeted by Department of Commerce.)

[1] This section was, of course, largely taken care of by the passage of the tax-reduction bill.

E. Reduce effect of inflationary buying by:

1. Adopting better buying methods for commodities for European relief and armed forces (seek the full patriotic cooperation of the boards and heads of the commodity exchanges).

2. Using more effectively the powers the administration now has to control speculation. (Further study may indicate additional legislative authority necessary here.)

3. Coordinating Government purchasing for European relief, and armed forces. It doesn't make any sense for Government departments, unknown to one another, to be in the market bidding against one another, or for foreign nations or Government agencies dealing with foreign nations purchasing commodities in our market, to be in competition with our own people and with one another.)

F. Save and process foods bought by the CCC. These can be used for food here or abroad. Release food commodities in storage after obtaining complete present inventory.

G. Develop programs for substitutes with nutritive value for foods and feed.

H. Encourage cooperation on the State level in:

1. Conservation of foods, feeds, fertilizers, and fuels (teaching most efficient use. This can be done on a State basis better than on a national level).

I. Enforce the antitrust laws to effectively curtail combinations both in business and in labor that have a tendency to artificially increase prices.[2]

J. Encourage thrift and the purchase of Government bonds, insurance, and savings accounts (people could be encouraged to save up wherever they can so that funds can be available when more goods are available and prices thereby will be lowered).

K. Get the building industry, from raw materials to finished product[3] together, to police their own industry and to eliminate the gray market in building materials and to stimulate housing.

The President and the administration, as a whole, must take the lead in these things. The Congress should cooperate by providing the appropriation and the legislation necessary. Let a joint committee of the leaders of the Congress call upon the President with these and such other proposals as may seem helpful—to obtain complete cooperation between the Congress and the administration.

All of these proposals will require the utmost cooperation on the part of the members of the Cabinet and the heads of the several administrative agencies. In this the President, himself, must indicate the leadership.

II. THE CONGRESS

A. Provide legislation requiring the retirement of the national debt along lines set forth in the Knowland resolution of last session, applying certain percentage of surplus to debt retirement and certain percentage to necessary tax reduction, as outlined herein.

B. Provide for tax reduction along lines outlined herein under "I—Administration—C."[4]

C. Take action on all appropriations consistent with economy program as set forth under "I—Administration—A."

D. Make appropriations necessary to carry out proposals set forth herein under "I—Administration—D, F, G, I," wherever necessary, after positive program implementing these policies has been developed and budgeted by appropriate agency.

E. Continue and strengthen export controls.

F. Continue consumer credit controls.

G. Continue Office of Defense Transportation and allocation of transportation, seeking cooperation with the railroads and with shipping lines.

H. Continue rent controls, making special provision for hardship cases on the part of landlords, and having in mind the encouragement of the construction of rental housing.

I. Increase the minimum wage to help those in the lower income brackets meet the present high cost.

J. Provide legislation designed to help contract bank credit:

1. By retiring Government indebtedness in the hands of banks.

2. By giving proper regard to loans for productive expansion and new products.

K. Develop program to increase agricultural production by bringing in new land; providing necessary fertilizer and farm machinery. Aid the farmer by spreading his taxes on his profits over more than 1 tax year. The farmer must have some form of guaranty that his investment in new production will be protected when farm prices fall off, as they are bound to do after European nations build up their farm programs.

III. NONE OF THE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES OUTLINED UNDER I AND II WILL WORK WITHOUT THE FULLEST COOPERATION FROM THE GENERAL PUBLIC, AND THAT MEANS YOU AND ME

A. Labor and management.

1. Work together to increase production (this may seem to some to be a cliche by this time—but it is not—it simply means, put in more work from the office to the foundry, and turn out more items where we are short. This will help everybody in the long run).

2. Keep profits down. Pass some of them along to the low-wage earners wherever possible and to stockholders, encouraging saving, your dollar will buy more later.

3. Hold back on wage increase demands, except where clearly necessary.

4. Conserve critical materials and fuel.

B. You and I:

1. Conserve food and fuel—buy carefully.

2. Put in a full day's work whatever your job is.

3. Buy Government bonds and save your money. (We did this during the war to build a reservoir of buying power to take care of postwar slack during what we thought was going to be the reconversion period.)

A new situation faces us—to preserve the peace and to make our victory complete, we must help Europe—by doing so, we help ourselves. It is in the traditional American humanitarian spirit. It is the best present insurance against communism and in favor of peace. It is in our own self-interest. If we save now, our dollars will buy more later.

If you represent labor or management—whatever your job is—cooperate in your Government program with patriotic fervor—your country's future, your children's future, your future, hangs in the balance. The sacrifice of broken bodies and broken hearts has brought us up the weary, toilsome way, till now the goal we all sought is within our sight. Have we yet the faith and the courage to go the rest of the way to attain it?

[2] An increase of more than $1,000,000 in the appropriation for antitrust activities in 1949 was a step in this direction.

[3] See the research provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

[4] See 1 above.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2834. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth R. Pendleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2835. A bill for the relief of Anthony Olivari and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2836. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2837. A bill for the relief of Andre Lan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for Mr. BUSHFIELD):

S. 2838. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Luther High Horse a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MALONE (by request):

S. 2839. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 2840. A bill for the relief of the McCormick Engineering Company and John E. Price, an individual doing business as the Okeechobee Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2841. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2842. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 2843. A bill to provide for a change in the design of the Booker T. Washington memorial 50-cent pieces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ELIZABETH R. PENDLETON—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 256), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2834) entitled "A bill for the relief of Elizabeth R. Pendleton" now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and such court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such section and report to the Senate giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 17, between lines 11 and 12, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"CONSTRUCTION, SEWAGE-DISPOSAL FACILITIES, NARRAGANSETT BAY

"For construction of intercepting sewers, treatment plants, and other facilities necessary to eliminate the pollution of Narragansett Bay resulting from the discharge of sewage from naval shore establishments in the area of Newport, R. I., $1,243,000."

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 329. An act for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 355. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 403. An act for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 945. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors;

H. R. 1170. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1782. An act for the relief of Albert (Jack) Norman;

H. R. 1783. An act for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.;

H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation;

H. R. 1902. An act for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Wooten;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2435. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 2508. An act for the relief of James I. Matthews;

H. R. 2531. An act for the relief of Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz;

H. R. 3848. An act for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg;

H. R. 3983. An act for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.;

H. R. 4133. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Harber;

H. R. 4179. An act for the relief of Paul E. Rocke;

H. R. 4292. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 4458. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane;

H. R. 4531. An act for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4873. An act to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy;

H. R. 5611. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5687. An act relating to the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeals to review decisions of the tax court;

H. R. 5693. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64 and subdivision h of section 70 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith;

H. R. 6130. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6216. An act to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair;

H. R. 6794. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; and

H. J. Res. 378. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3194. An act to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 3807. An act to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Catoctin Recreational Demonstration Area, near Thurmont, Md., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5655. An act confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of Saint Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing 139.62 acres;

H. R. 5889. An act to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title; and

H. R. 6239. An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3934. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid treatment centers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the contruction of hospitals; and

H. R. 6045. An act amending the act approved December 2, 1942, which provides compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States and certain other persons or reimbursement therefor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5047. An act to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6106. An act to amend the act of December 20, 1944, to provide for the issuance, without examination, of licenses to certain persons to engage in business;

H. R. 6295. An act to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the police department and of the fire department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6524. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; and

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia", approved August 9, 1939; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4659. An act to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States;

H. R. 5036. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5983. An act to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6368. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory;

H. R. 6448. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6759. An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6766. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 6696. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to standards of safety and sanitation in the case of certain cars and equipment used in the movement of express traffic or baggage; and

H. R. 6728. An act to authorize medical and hospital service for those employed in the maritime service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and

who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5189. An act to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department;

H. R. 5943. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece;

H. R. 5964. An act to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6406. An act providing procedures for the control of the use of penalty mail by Government departments;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer U. S. Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; and

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5048. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral rights;

H. R. 5154. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers; and

H. R. 5263. An act to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of certain real property quitclaim deeds to the minerals in or under such property; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 5113. An act for the relief of the heirs of John W. Mitchell; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes;

H. R. 5608. An act to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; and

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6127. An act to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6332. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LET'S DIGNIFY PUBLIC OFFICE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Let's Dignify Public Office, broadcast by him on June 1, 1948, over the facilities of Station KSL, which appears in the Appendix.]

SELECTION OF SENATOR LODGE AS CHAIRMAN OF REPUBLICAN RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Excellent Choice," published in the New York Herald Tribune for June 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES—LETTER FROM Z. CHAFEE, JR.

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter, dated May 28, 1948, on the subject of the Mundt-Nixon bill, addressed by Z. Chafee, Jr., of the Law School of Harvard University, to Senator WILEY, which appears in the Appendix.]

SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES—STATEMENT BY WILLIAM M. FLOYD

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject Service in the Armed Forces, made recently by William M. Floyd, national commander, Regular Veterans' Association, before the Senate Finance Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

CENTENNIAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a schedule of events at the centennial celebration of the University of Wisconsin, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF THOMAS C. BUCHANAN TO THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Buchanan's Defeat," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on June 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—DISCUSSION BY SENATOR MURRAY AND MR. J. ALBERT WOLL

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio discussion of the Taft-Hartley Act by Senator MURRAY and Mr. J. Albert Woll, general counsel for the American Federation of Labor, on May 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, having been appointed by the President of the United States a national delegate to the International Labor Organization, I ask leave to be excused from the sessions of the Senate from June 12 until my assignment is over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Committee on the Judiciary subcommittee considering House bill 5040 to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Public Works to meet today during the session of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANDENBERG BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Committee on Appropriations this morning, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, and chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, made a characteristically able and frank statement to the committee on the question before it regarding the appropriation for the European recovery program. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Senator from Michigan be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for the courtesy of this brief hearing regarding the ECA appropriation bill as it comes to you from the House. I have sought the opportunity only because of my deep conviction that you confront decisions which transcend fiscal considerations and involve a critical impact upon our prestige, our peace, and the peace and freedom of the world.

I hasten to make it plain that I do not and would not presume to intrude upon your functions to pass upon the propriety of

appropriations to implement the declared policies of Congress. I come only to plead that you do not make indirect use of the appropriating function to veto these declared policies of Congress, and thus to brand these policies before the world as capricious, unreliable, and impotent. We cannot build leadership for peace upon any such shifting sands.

When ECA was on the Senate floor I expressly invited your subsequent scrutiny of its detailed appropriations. I do so again. It is your responsibility. I would not presume to interfere. I am not here to speak of detailed figures or of specific estimates. These problems will legitimately arise when you have reported. I am here solely to plead for your basic allegiance to the declared policies of Congress when you deal with the ECA bill as it comes to you from the House.

I do so with greatest respect for the House. But I am sure my friends in the House—as well as in the Senate—would lack complete respect for me if I did not promptly assert my anxious disagreement with what I believe to be a dangerous and improvident decision.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to remember that both the Senate and the House approved ECA by overwhelming majorities. Thus they sanctioned the most ambitious enterprise for recovery and peace, on a basis of self-help and mutual cooperation, which was ever launched. They gave it immediate life with an advance of $1,000,000,000 from the RFC. They put it immediately to work. This sounded as though we meant business. I think we did.

So did western Europe. The countries proceeded to seek unprecedented unities in response to our self-help specifications. They accepted our good faith and proceeded to prove their own. They did it at the hazard of serious reprisals when communism declared bitter war upon the enterprise. More progress toward unification has been made in a few months than in centuries preceding. This is progress for peace and freedom—for us as well as them. It is the greatest possible insurance against the war we do not want. It is the greatest possible insurance against our need to use the increased armaments for which we concurrently vote other precautionary billions.

I do not mean to reargue the basic point. That point was settled when Congress passed the ECA enabling legislation after the most exhaustive study and debate which any subject has received in my time.

But I do mean to argue, Mr. Chairman, that the practical effect of the House bill is to repeal, by indirection, the intent and purpose of this legislation and to reverse this established American foreign policy both at home and abroad.

I do mean to argue that this Congress, as a matter of intelligent self-interest, cannot afford to throw our attitudes into doubt and thus to multiply the terrified confusion of a world in which the forces of aggression and subversion thrive upon confusion. We must not feed the very fires we would put out.

I do mean to argue that any such cynical reversal would be a major policy decision which should not be made through the back door of an appropriation bill. Indeed, it should not be made at all.

Again, with great respect, I take note of some of the revealing speeches on this issue in the other House. Here is one approach:

"It is a source of satisfaction to those of us who opposed this legislation to find that the Appropriations Committee has made a real effort to go at this job in an intelligent fashion."

No comment is necessary to underscore my point. I can understand the satisfaction of those who opposed this legislation if it still be their preoccupation to win the last battle after losing the first. But that is precisely why I am here today. I do not believe America can afford to be unreliable in a world which is groping for confidence and faith as the basis of security and peace.

The action of the House cuts ECA in sums variously estimated from a half billion to two billion dollars. The latter figure is probably closer to the net effect. I could understand specific amendments based upon specific reasons—even though, upon examination, I may disagree with them—provided the amendments are not incompatible with the purposes of the original act. I would be the last to say that the figures are untouchable.

But I do quarrel, Mr. Chairman, with any reductions which subvert the principles and purposes of the original congressional commitment. I emphatically quarrel with the final, over-all, meat-ax technique which arbitrarily spreads the net appropriation over 15 instead of 12 months which is equivalent to a horizontal cut of 20 percent and which, in my humble opinion, guts the enterprise.

In one fell swoop this takes away something like a billion dollars without a scintilla of regard for all of the carefully screened figures upon which all ECA estimates were made and upon which its program must be built.

The House committee report itself said: "It is admittedly impossible for anyone to state with any degree of assurance the actual needs of the participating countries within a billion dollars." Whereupon, without "any degree of assurance" more than a billion was cut away from what, admittedly, may be the needs of ECA if it is to succeed.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that, for our own sakes, we dare not deal with this vital problem in the life of the world, including us, in any such cavalier fashion. There is too much at stake.

I respectfully submit that any such action is calculated to change the character of ECA from recovery to relief alone—thus plunging us back into the dreary, hopeless, sterile, and utterly costly routines from which we must escape.

I respectfully submit that any such action reverses the overwhelming intent of Congress registered two short months ago; and nullifies the Senate's own action in refusing, on a roll-call vote, to hack off a comparable arbitrary billion from the original authority.

I respectfully submit that it violates the rules of scrupulous justification for ECA expenditures which Congress wisely enjoined upon ECA participating countries themselves, and that it seriously jeopardizes the success of a great peace-adventure which deserves its full chance to succeed if it is to be undertaken at all.

Most desperately important of all, Mr. Chairman, it "keeps the word of promise to the ear but breaks it to the hope." I respectfully submit that it inevitably undermines that confidence and morale abroad upon which recovery, independent freedoms, and peace so heavily lean; and that it serves the alien critics who plot to have these peace plans fail. Such reactions can be as grim for us as for others.

One last word and I shall have finished this unpleasant duty. Those who did not and do not believe in ECA may be right. The majority of us may be wrong. At best it is a calculated risk. But it is a risk to which the Congress is solemnly committed.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the time to attempt a general overhaul of ECA—when it has scarcely started. That time will come next January when we shall know whereof we speak. When the second annual appropriation impends, we shall know what kind of a job Administrator Hoffman and his staff are doing. We shall know to what extent self-help and mutual cooperation are meeting our expectations. We shall know from the vigilance of our "watch dog committee" how goes this battle for peace and freedom in which we have such a colossal stake. Then we can make an intelligent audit. We can act without irresponsibility.

Until then I beg of you—for the sake of the hopes by which free men live—that you give ECA a fair chance. Its mere creation already has paid heavy dividends. I ask it for what I profoundly believe to be the national interest of our own United States.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it is fairly well agreed by the majority of the people of the United States that the democracies of western Europe are engaged in a supreme struggle for survival. I also believe that the great majority of the people of our Nation are wholeheartedly in favor of the Marshall plan, as it was proposed by the Senate when it authorized certain amounts of expenditures for the rehabilitation and recovery of the democracies of western Europe. I am satisfied that at least a great majority of the people of the United States are diametrically opposed to what has been done by the House of Representatives in making an appropriation which represents a huge cut in the amount authorized by the Congress for the European recovery plan after full debate in both Houses and after page after page of testimony was taken at the hearings on that measure before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

As a result of the action of the House of Representatives, one newspaper after another in the United States, convinced of the wisdom of the bipartisan foreign policy of our Nation, has written some of the most intelligent and urgent editorials that I have read since I have been a Member of the Senate. In order that the Senate and the country may know what many of the leading newspapers of the Nation, regardless of their politics, are saying about the cut in the ERP program, as proposed by the House of Representatives, I shall take a little time at this point to comment briefly on some of the editorials and to place some of them in the body of the RECORD, if I may obtain unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. President, on Monday, June 7, the New York Times carried a strong editorial under the caption "Sabotage and the ERP." This editorial alone, if it is read by every sane, prudent, and reasonable person in America, should convince the Doubting Thomases of the value of the European recovery program as previously authorized by the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SABOTAGE AND THE ERP

At a crucial moment in history, when western democracy is engaged in a supreme struggle for survival in the face of new totalitarian aggression from the East, a few antediluvian Republican leaders have undertaken to stampede the House of Representatives into slashing the funds for the European recovery and other foreign-aid programs on which the outcome of that struggle depends. Their action is not yet fatal, and there is still hope that it will be amended by the Senate, and in the House

itself by a mobilization of the 142 Members who first voted for the aid program but found it compatible with their responsibilities to absent themselves when it came to voting on the appropriations. But the damage which the House action has already done is incalculable, and unless speedily reversed it is bound to have far-reaching repercussions on the whole world situation as well as the American Presidential election, which it would turn primarily into a fight over American foreign policy.

For the maneuvers which led to the debacle represent nothing less than a revolt of the surviving isolationist cohort within the Republican Party against the bipartisan foreign policy hammered out during the war and its aftermath by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Secretaries of State Byrnes and Marshall, and Senator Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles, which has been the mainstay of the western world and the basis of American leadership in it. The isolationist group, which has the support of such powerful figures as Representative TABER, the autocratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and Mr. HALLECK, the majority leader, has long been sniping at what it terms the policy of the "internationalists." Heretofore it has been beaten off by the aroused sentiment of the American people, every poll of which revealed overwhelming support for international cooperation that made isolationism a losing game. But now, in the closing days of Congress, this group is having its revenge, and is attempting to scuttle both the foreign-aid program and the reciprocal trade system that form the economic backbone of the democracies and the hope for their survival.

To the world at large its initial success now poses the same fateful question that confronted it after the First World War, when another Republican isolationist group succeeded in scuttling American adherence to the League of Nations and ratification of the guaranties to France. That question is how far it is possible and advisable to rely on the word of the United States. This question is all the graver because in the present instance it is not merely the word of an American President that is being repudiated but pledges made by Congress itself—pledges on which other nations have based economic and foreign policies that have exposed them to Russian enmity and vengeance. That involves not only American policy but American honor, good faith, prestige, and leadership, all of which are in danger of being betrayed. Certainly Russo-Communist propaganda is having a field day impressing Europe with the slogan that "you can't trust Washington." The political balance in Europe is already so delicate that a victory for American isolationism could easily lead to a catastrophe.

This is a situation which imposes a special responsibility on the Republican leadership, in particular the Republican Presidential candidates. Senator VANDENBERG, "fighting mad," has already let it be known that he will stand by the bipartisan policy and will lead the struggle in the Senate for a restoration of the cuts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star published, on June 7, 1948, a powerful editorial regarding what happened in connection with the cut made by the House of Representatives in the appropriations for the European recovery program. The editorial appears under the caption "The Communists make hay." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNISTS MAKE HAY

With a kind of sheepishness, the House followers of Representative JOHN TABER should find it at once interesting and instructive to read the reactions of Europe's Communist press to their deep slash in funds authorized for the European recovery program. With gleeful irony, the organs of the Kremlin in France, Italy, Germany, and elsewhere have lost no time in capitalizing on the event as evidence of how foolish it is for any country to depend on the promises of the United States.

Thus, in Rome, the Communist newspaper has headlined the story as "The Marshall plan cheat." Another Red headline asks, "Who can trust Washington?" Similarly, in Vienna, the "satellites" of the United States have been lectured for failing to follow the Soviet lead in refusing to take part in the ERP. Simultaneously, in Berlin, the Germans have been told that this is the end of an illusion and that western Europe must doubt the wisdom of trusting America. And in Paris, French leaders have been described as discovering now that they sold France for a slice of bread.

All this was to have been expected, of course. The Kremlin and its Communist international have been waging a relentless propaganda war against the ERP for months past, and the House action has supplied them with potent new ammunition. For that action can easily be presented in the worst possible light. The funds for the program have been cut approximately 25 percent. It is as if the United States first offered western Europe a whole loaf of bread to regain its strength, and then sliced off a quarter of it—a decision leaving the Marshall plan nations with considerably less than the minimum they must have to get back on their feet and become self-sustaining.

Although they should have anticipated the thing, Mr. TABER and his House followers apparently gave little or no thought to how the Kremlin and its agents would delight in the loaf-slicing and make propagandistic hay out of it. Nor do they seem to have given much thought to the fact that the great promises of the Marshall plan played a major role in effecting a Communist defeat in the Italian elections, and in strengthening the middle-of-the-road French Government, and in serving as the economic basis of the western union recently worked out by Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg.

In short, economically, politically, propagandistically, and otherwise, the House has committed a grave blunder in its reckless pruning of the funds previously authorized by Congress for the first year of the ERP. In terms of the cold war being waged between east and west, nothing could have given greater aid and comfort to the Soviet Union. In the circumstances, it must be hoped that Senator VANDENBERG will succeed in having the cuts restored in the Senate and that Mr. TABER and his followers in the House, reflecting soberly on what they have done, will then see the error of their ways and reverse themselves.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun for Sunday, June 6, published an editorial under the caption "New call for Mr. VANDENBERG." The editorial is a splendid and intellectual one upon the entire European recovery program, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CALL FOR MR. VANDENBERG

Both here and abroad there is widespread disappointment that the House of Representatives has seen fit to reduce by some 26 percent the amount of dollar aid for Europe authorized by the Economic Cooperation Act. The Europeans were led to expect that they would received some $4,300,000,000 in direct appropriations to last until April 3, 1949. The House decision is that they shall get $4,055,000,000, which must last until June 30, 1949.

Those familiar with the work of the Appropriations Committee, on whose authority the reduction is made, will know that it did not reach its conclusion arbitrarily. Representative TABER, its chairman, is a hard man, more determined than most that the suspicion of waste shall be kept out of Government operations. But he is neither vindictive nor stupid. The report with which his committee accompanied its recommendation for the reduction is a well-considered document.

Its essential argument is that the present rate of spending for European relief and rehabilitation suggests that the total authorized in the original act cannot usefully be expended by June 30, 1949. In addition, it argues that some of the outlays now planned were insufficiently considered. An example of this is the amount proposed for the mechanization of European farms. Here, the committee holds, there has been a failure to take into account the fact that many European farms are so small that mechanization is not economically feasible.

Moreover, the committee goes on to suggest, if it should in fact transpire that the appropriations made are insufficient, the Congress will be in session next January in ample time to make up deficiencies.

These are all cogent arguments and it would be possible to accept them were it not for one major consideration. This major consideration is wholly overlooked in the committee's report, but it was immediately spotted by the Secretary of State, Mr. George C. Marshall. It is that the cutting back of the expected appropriation will have serious political repercussions throughout Europe.

Every thoughtful person knows that, at the time Mr. Marshall first proposed his recovery plan, it was touch and go whether western Europe would disintegrate to such an extent that the strong Communist parties in the various countries would take over. Everyone knows, also, that it was the prospect of American help which strengthened the anti-Communist forces to such an extent that they were able to defeat the Reds in several decisive elections and consolidate their hold on the people.

The next step was bringing the disparate countries of western Europe together to such an extent that they would agree to lessen their economic rivalries and cooperate as they had never cooperated before. This was not easy, for in the complex equation was involved the question of the rehabilitation of western Germany, the mere proposal of which aroused deep-seated fears in France in particular. Actually, one of the great achievements of the Marshall project was the final agreement by the French Government to accept the plan for German industrial restoration. The amount of aid offered by the United States in the original authorization was a major factor in persuading the French Government to take this perilous political position.

The Russians, who oppose the Marshall plan because they know that it promises to restrain the Communist advance, naturally are making the most of the decision by the House of Representatives to cut back the promised program. Indeed, they have already begun to charge that the reduction proves that this country has no intention of keeping its promises. We could afford to ignore such a charge were it made only by the Russian propagandists. But we know too well that in all the western European countries there are anti-American forces at work, outside the Communist Party as well as in it, and that the opponents of the parties in pow-

er will be more than willing to use the proposed cut-back as proof of our unreliability.

All of this can be summed up in the statement that, while the pro-American forces in western Europe are in the ascendancy, they are not so powerful that the balance cannot be swung against them if we are inept in our dealings.

This is the consideration which the Appropriations Committee overlooked and which the House followed it in ignoring. If the undertaking to which we have put our hand is worth the effort and money we propose to put into it, it should not be jeopardized by a political mistake of this character.

Fortunately, the mistake is not irremediable. The Senate has yet to act on the appropriation bill. It seems a pity, at this late date in the session, to run into another crisis and to lay another burden on the shoulders of Senator VANDENBERG. But it appears as if that willing worker, who has already managed to steer the way around a dozen perils, must accept this new responsibility.

It will be up to Senator VANDENBERG not only to persuade his own colleagues to rectify the error made, but also, when the bill comes to conference, to argue it out with M . TABER. It will be a tough assignment, but because both are men of good will and respect each other's convictions, it will not be an impossible one.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on June 5, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin published an understanding editorial which I hope everyone will read, under the caption "Taberizing ERP." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABERIZING ERP

A tremendous lot of ground has been covered since Secretary Marshall made his Harvard speech on June 5, 1947, which proved to be the foundation for the European recovery program. Congress has accepted the program, an administering body under Paul Hoffman is functioning, the European countries have created their end of the organization, and goods are flowing under a provisional appropriation.

All that in a year is not a bad action record for a democracy. But still the battle goes on, and some of the Congressmen who voted for ERP give sad evidence that either they didn't understand the motives behind the Marshall plan or else they deliberately intended to sabotage it.

The House has lopped off somewhere between one and two billions from what Mr. Hoffman's experts believe will be needed to carry the load through fiscal 1949. Its Appropriations Committee's report contained some astounding statements, and Mr. TABER, chairman of the committee, on his own account, added still more. Administration estimates are attacked as being completely unstable, and the assertion is made that no one can come within a billion dollars of being accurate. If that be so, what makes Mr. TABER'S committee think its figures are any better than Mr. Hoffman's?

Die-hard isolationists are taking advantage of the appropriation battle to offer crippling amendments.

There has been a distinct change for the better in Europe since ERP was passed, but continued congressional fights such as this one, which apparently are going to be repeated every year, make it next to impossible to do long-range planning. Europe can never be certain the United States will keep its side of the bargain, or else will come along with too little too late.

There is still time for Republican leadership to assert itself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on June 5 the Times-Picayune, of New Orleans, published a most interesting editorial under the caption "ERP 'Slash'?" dealing with the cut made by the House of Representatives in the appropriation for the European recovery program. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERP SLASH?

The proposed alterations in the ERP and foreign-aid budget, voted by the House Appropriations Committee elicit properly a gesture of disappointment from Secretary Marshall, and are most disturbing even in their tentativity to those who are counting upon ERP to put the participating European nations on the threshold of economic security. By proposing a little less money, and spreading the whole a little thinner, the House committee would achieve a monthly reduction of about 27 percent in United States advances.

The original estimates for ERP never have been considered sacred. The Europeans received a tip at the outset not to pad their figures to offset some purely arbitrary cut. Surely no set of figures has received such a going-over, so many times, prior to its final modification and adoption by Congress. Most people considered that this adoption or authorization constituted a final settlement of the financial issue, even though technically the actual appropriations remained to be voted. Certainly nothing has happened since to indicate that our European and other foreign friends can get along with less.

As Mr. Marshall indicates, the situation now reverts to the old, original question: Is the "R" in ERP to stand for relief or for recovery? It is his opinion that if the proposed reduction is sustained, the funds remaining will not be sufficient for reconstructive application. It will be the old story of letting a dollar go down the drain in order to save a quarter.

European reaction to the move is confused. British editorialists think the proposal has something to do with current Anglo-American and Anglo-French differences in other diplomatic fields. Mr. Marshall's comment dissociates the State Department from any such bargaining.

Others, taking the cut rather for granted, tell Britons they must work harder than ever for their own salvation—a remedy which some Members of Congress might say is perfectly O. K. with them. Still others, betraying little knowledge of congressional appropriations procedures, seem to think that if the Senate should fail to concur with the House, or if President Truman should veto the reduced figure, the original authorization would stand.

Perhaps it's only a tempest in a teapot—a gesture accompanying tremendous defense appropriations. Even so, the recent peace talk kick-back showed how delicately balanced is the whole program for restoring the morale and the power of the Western World, and how easily fears, agitation, and misunderstanding can be aroused by a small thing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on June 8 the Washington Post published one of the most illuminating editorials I have ever read on this question, and I hope Mr. TABER and a few other Members of Congress will read the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they have not already read it in the newspaper. The editorial is entitled "What TABER Did for Zhdanov." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT TABER DID FOR ZHDANOV

There is one man in the Kremlin who must have heaved a sigh of relief when he heard about the blind and savage cut in the ECA appropriation. That is Zhdanov, member of the Politburo, and, in some eyes, Stalin's heir apparent. He was the genius back of the revival of the Comintern in October 1947. On October 22, Pravda reprinted his report to the new organization, which was called Cominform, shorthand for Communist Information Bureau. He said, "As for the Unfon of Soviet Socialist Republics, it will make all efforts to see to it that this [the Marshall] plan is not realized."

The Cominform then started an incessant drumfire on the people of the western countries to frighten them into withdrawing from an enslaving alliance with untrustworthy and imperialistic America. Intimidation kept pace with propaganda. Czechoslovakia and Finland already had been bludgeoned into nonparticipation, and Moscow, knowing how they felt about it, then sought to stifle resentment by absorbing the Czech Government and making a military pact with Finland. The Communists in Italy threatened rebellion all through the precarious days of an election in which Moscow made the issue Marshall versus Molotov. Elsewhere the pressure held a menace which made other countries fearful of reprisals. Even the bigger countries wondered when Moscow started to shake the uneasy position of all Europe by warlike moves in Berlin. Yet, 16 defiant countries, in spite of everything, held together and set up Marshall Europe—staking their future on faith that the United States would see the Marshall plan to fruition.

Their faith was vindicated when the plan, after the most scrupulous screening that any legislation can have had, became law. It was then that Moscow, with its sense of realism, began to prepare the way to accommodation. The oldest of political mottoes is, "If you can't lick 'em, jine 'em." An olive branch came out of Moscow which, though full of thorns and pretty shopworn, seemed to suggest a sort of truce in its bitter war on the Marshall plan. The Zhdanov fizzle had to be liquidated, and Zhdanov himself must have been feeling nervous, for Moscow now had words to eat and pledges to redeem. The Finns got from Moscow a cut in reparations; it was the pay-off for Moscow's failure to stop the Marshall plan. Finland had been told, "You can't trust Marshall, but you can trust Molotov," and the Finns have collected on Zhdanov's mistake. Something will yet have to be done for Czechoslovakia.

All this was going on when the TABER group suddenly decided to kick the heart out of the Marshall plan. The news was scarcely out when the Muscovites, unable to conceal their glee, began to dust off their anti-Marshall-plan propaganda. All they had to do was to remind a chagrined Europe that their warnings had come true. Mr. TABER has justified Zhdanov's propaganda at the very moment that the Muscovites were actually confessing the failure of it.

It is said in defense of the 25-percent cut that conditions have changed in Europe. Only one figure has changed. And that is the estimate of crops in Europe, and the estimate is exactly 1 percent above the last December's estimates on which the plan was based. Does that justify a slash of 25 percent? Moreover, Mr. TABER talks as if this were only a relief project. Leaving out aid to China, which is relief, the whole purpose of the ERP is reconstruction, not relief. It is an investment program in recovery the aim of which is to put Europe as an entity on its feet before it collapses on its knees

before Russia. It is impossible, as Mr. TABER says, to figure out exactly how much it will cost. It is impossible, indeed, to say whether it will be successful. But Senator VANDENBERG was right when he said that it is not what we can afford to do but what we cannot afford not to do that counts. The stakes are so great that the counsel of prudence, as Representative HERTER put it, is to be inexact on the safe side, given efficient administration.

The ERP proposition is something like an atomic pile. As our scientists discovered, that pile—the amount of uranium put in one place—has to be of a sufficient size or else it will not operate; there would be no reaction at all. Too many of the neutron bullets which are supposed to smash into other nuclei and thus create still other atomic projectiles would escape into space outside of the system unless the whole agglomeration is built up to a point known as the critical size. So also there is a critical size to our foreign aid, and the Paris Conference report, the Harriman report, and the administration all arrived at figures not too far apart in their appraisal of what it would take to make the operation truly chain-reacting—capable, that is to say, both of sustaining itself in a process of economic rehabilitation and of getting Europe off our backs.

These considerations, we believe, make sense to the American people. If the Marshall plan had not been acceptable to the American people, Congress would not have authorized it by overwhelming majority. They did not say, "O. K., if Mr. TABER agrees." They do not recognize any veto power in the hands of a single Congressman or a group when Congress already has spoken. Certainly they have more intelligence than to advertise to the world that Zhdanov was right when he impugned both the good name and the trustworthiness of the American Government, as he did, for instance, in the notes to the European governments warning them not to go to the Paris Conference which created Marshall Europe.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News, the Scripps-Howard newspaper published in Washington, there appeared on Monday, June 7, an extremely interesting and stimulating editorial under the caption "We can't afford it." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN'T AFFORD IT

The United States spent about $400,000,000,000 in 4 years of war. Is it worth spending $18,000,000,000 in the next 4 years to prevent another war? That was the question raised by American aid for foreign recovery. It was answered when Congress voted authorization of the Marshall plan. That action met with overwhelming support of the American people.

Now the House of Representatives, under Republican leadership, has reversed its earlier vote. By cutting an already tight figure by one-quarter it has jeopardized the entire program.

Although this has been done in the name of economy, it is the opposite. The spread between $400,000,000,000 and $18,000,000,000 represents a tremendous saving if the smaller investment succeeds in strengthening peace. There is also a saving in military preparedness, which must be increased much more if the European situation is not stabilized.

Of course, there is no absolute guaranty that the recovery program will keep western Europe from going Communist and prevent war. There is a risk—just as there is risk in everything a government does, or, for that matter, everything an individual does in life.

But it is a far better gamble than is usually possible. For one reason, because the investment required is so small compared with the alternative. For another reason, because, even if the recovery program failed to prevent war, at least it would give us some allies—which is pretty good economy both in terms of money and of men.

It is a far better gamble now than when Congress voted the authorization bill. The mere promise of Marshall plan help, plus interim aid, already has paid big dividends. On the economic side there has been a surprising amount of progress in European production. On the political side it has given the Reds their worst set-back in France, and has been largely responsible for the Italian election victory against Stalin.

We wonder whether the House GOP leaders—Speaker MARTIN, Majority Leader HALLECK, and Appropriations Chairman TABER—practice the same kind of insane economy in their personal affairs by dropping their fire insurance.

Fortunately, the Senate is not apt to be so stupid.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on June 5, Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, wrote an article under the caption "When Congress falters," and it was published in the Christian Science Monitor of that date. It is forceful and thought-provoking. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN CONGRESS FALTERS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Temporarily, at least, Congress is giving the country and the world a dangerous demonstration of democratic confusion.

The Communist propagandists, in Europe and in America, are turning to their purposes every sign that the United States cannot keep its hand firmly on the helm of world leadership and carry on a Presidential political campaign at the same time.

At the moment the political forces which dominate the House of Representatives are heedlessly and recklessly playing into the hands of the Soviet Communists. They could not be serving the Communists better if Henry Wallace had already been elected—and obviously it is not their real intention to do so.

And what is it that is makng the European-American Communists so gleeful—and so hopeful? It is this:

Two months ago, with the manifest support of the Nation, Congress decisively enacted the European recovery program, the 16 Marshall-plan countries organized to do their part, and the shadow of the iron curtain began to lift in western Europe. The congressional Foreign Relations Committees examined detailed evidence on how much money should be utilized for this purpose, and both the House and the Senate authorized an appropriation of $6,800,000,000 for the first 12 months. The House vote was 329 to 74; the Senate vote, 69 to 17.

After this action, after this congressional assurance that Europe was not to be left to be Communist prey, last week the House of Representatives, at the initiative of the isolationist chairman of its Appropriations Committee, Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, abruptly reversed its decision, repudiated its assurance, and casually lopped $1,800,000,000 from ERP.

It is a careful statement of fact to say that such a reduction of funds transforms the Marshall plan from an instrument of recovery to a method of dole, destined to fail before it is begun.

The second divisive action of the House of Representatives was to emasculate the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and then to renew it for a year instead of the customary 3 years—a renewal which, if the House attitude prevails, has every earmark of being not a renewal of life but a 1-year reprieve before formal burial.

With one hand the American Government is urging the nations of western Europe—and, indeed, of all the world—to find ways of opening wider the channels of world trade, and now with the other, that of the House of Representatives, it is warning the world that it is getting ready to weaken greatly, if not abandon altogether, one of the principal means of widening the channels of world trade.

Finally, in its haste and eagerness to adjourn before the Philadelphia conventions, Congress is turning the cold eye upon important social-welfare legislation to which both parties have been paying lip service at every expedient moment for the past 8 years. Republican and Democrats alike have long been saying kind words in favor of housing legislation, Federal aid to education, wider coverage for social security and enlarged benefits to meet inflation prices, and at least a beginning toward better guaranties of constitutional civil rights.

But the way things now are going in Congress, it will be all talk and no action at this session.

For many months it has been the Congressmen who were foremost in attacking the administration for not having a "consistent" foreign policy and sticking to it.

Today it is the Congressmen who at this stage are doing the most to prove to the rest of the world that the United States cannot pursue a consistent foreign policy—Congressmen who in the winter assure Europe that a full-bodied Marshall plan is approved and then in the spring hack that assurance to pieces.

Today it is the Congressmen who at this stage are advising the world that they are getting ready to see that the United States pursues an isolationist economic policy with one hand and an internationalist political policy with the other.

Both parties of course are momentarily in the grip of preconvention politics and political maneuvering.

On two paramount matters—cutting ERP and crippling the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—the Republican House has acted, in the judgment of many, against its own best interests as well as against the best interest of the country. Under the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG, the Senate has a fair chance to repair the damage. It needs to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on June 5 the Dayton Daily News gave to its readers an excellent editorial under the caption "Time To Talk to TABER." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO TALK TO TABER

When are Republicans going to tire of seeing their bipartisan record on foreign policy smirched by the usurpations of Representative TABER and his House Appropriations Committee?

Never were the folly and the fallacious pretentions of TABER'S committee more apparent than they are right now. TABER'S committee, exploiting its technical control over the pursestrings, has dared once more to negate Congress' entire economic policy toward Europe. It has voted crippling slashes

in the Marshall plan, the character and scope of which were fully debated in March and April, and settled to the satisfaction of all responsible parties. Now the debate will have to be spun out all over again.

TABER's committee has already, in one fell blow, achieved at least five harmful things:

(1) It has made slashes in Marshall plan funds which, if they should go through Congress, would make a mockery of our effort to build up Europe's economy.

(2) It has left room for doubts abroad as to whether America means business in its foreign policy or not. It weakens the confidence of our friends, and it emboldens our potential enemies.

(3) It has shaken the confidence of our own people in the firmness of our own dedication to the role of world power.

(4) It has smeared the Republican Party's record for essential cooperation in foreign policy matters.

(5) It has diverted the making of foreign policy legislation from its proper channel, which is from the rooms of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to the floor of the House. Imagine the embarrassment to this committee, just as it completes work on a conscientious, enlightened resolution committing the country to support of western European military pacts, to have this sabotage of its earlier work on the economic defense of Europe thrown across its path.

How long is the country going to permit its foreign policy to be obstructed by this narrow-minded committee which is dominated by the even more narrow-minded chairman? And how long are the Republicans going to permit the integrity of their bipartisan cooperation to be compromised by these myopic budget scanners?

It is time for the Republican legislative policy committee to talk to TABER like a Dutch uncle. If that doesn't do any good, it is time to reshuffle the committee assignments, and especially to drop TABER as chairman, even if this means throwing overboard the sacred principle of seniority.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Monday, June 7, the Boston Herald published a candid editorial under the caption "Guns or ERP?" This editorial begins as follows:

The war can be fought now with the machinery of European reconstruction—or it can be fought tomorrow with guns.

Mr. President, that is exactly what the Senator from Illinois believes. If the reduction in the European recovery program appropriation as voted by the House of Representatives is finally enacted by the Congress of the United States, then what is predicted in the first lines of the editorial published in the Boston Herald will surely come to pass. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUNS OR ERP?

The war can be fought now with the machinery of European reconstruction—or it can be fought tomorrow with guns. The House seems to prefer to do it the bloody way.

Last week the House voted $10,000,000,000 for the Military Establishment in 24 hours. It had previously appropriated $3,000,000,000, and had committed the Nation to still more billions by ordering a 70-group Air Force in an unbalanced splurge of armament building.

Then late Friday the House proceeded to give reason to its defense spending by lopping a quarter off the European recovery program. It was as if the majority wished to insure that the planes and tanks and guns and warships it was buying would have a practical use. The implements of war having been purchased, the implements of peace seemed less necessary.

Doubtless Representative TABER, who mangled foreign aid in Appropriations Committee, and Representative HALLECK, who got the mangling through the House, and the slim majority that voted it, did not do so with any deliberate intent to accomplish with guns what can be done with butter—and fertilizer, machinery, and raw materials. They were simply too blind, too tragically blind, to know that those were the alternatives and they were adopting the more terrible one.

They have forgotten so quickly the tenseness that lay on this country as Italy voted on April 18, when the hope held out by the Marshall plan and the promise of western cooperation must have been decisive. They have forgotten that the remarkable achievement of economic union by five European nations was made possible and can be sustained only under the inspiration, physical and moral, of American support. They have forgotten that this week French Foreign Minister Bidault must justify his support of Anglo-American plans for Germany or face defeat for the Centrist government we need in France. And Bidault cannot defend his position on any other basis than the certain assurance that America is firmly committed to European recovery.

They have forgotten that the well-disciplined Communists in western Europe can and will make stock of the House vote, as evidence that America is drifting isolationist again. They have forgotten that the plan Secretary Marshall projected just a year ago is the dynamic, integrating force against communism today.

Forgetting these things, the House majority has haggled over ERP money, the spending of which can save us many times larger expense in armaments and possibly in lives.

In some measure, the damage done by the House vote is irreparable. Coming on top of the vacillation of the administration on Palestine, the evidence of a split in the Republican Party on foreign policy and the hint of a rising isolationism will make our voice in international affairs less distinct, less assured, less responsible. What can they believe over there, the people who watch us, when they see us add billions to armaments and subtract billions from foreign economic aid?

So far as the damage can be repaired, we can hopefully count on Senator VANDENBERG to do the repairing. He has saved ERP before; let us prayerfully expect him to save it again. It will not be easy, for there is such a little time in which American public opinion can be made plain.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat for June 5, 1948, published an illuminating editorial under the caption "ERP shadow boxing." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERP SHADOW BOXING

As was to be expected, politics and the recent moderation of the cold war are putting the congressional paring knife on foreign aid funds. The House Appropriations Committee has voted a 26.7-percent slash in the approximately $6,500,000,000 over-all program, and recommended it be made to spread over 15 months instead of 12. Largest slice would come out of the $4,245,000,000 fund for the 16 so-called Marshall-plan countries.

This runs heavily counter to what Secretary Marshall and the administration had asked and to what friendly European nations had been led to expect they would get. Whether it would actually be a crippling blow to the whole program is something only those on the inside of all the details can know. It is doubtful, in fact, if the program is far enough along for anyone to be certain at what point frugality will become disastrous to Europe's recovery instead of merely painful to optimistic plans. Secretary Marshall, however, says the House reduction would make ERP "mere relief"—not reconstruction.

Repercussions already are beginning. London has registered disappointment and fears that it will force its imports down to the danger level. The Russian-controlled press in Germany is tolling the news as proof of its claim America's word is never to be depended upon.

Aside from this backlash—which better Washington statesmanship might have avoided—we think the tempest is not to be taken too seriously. No doubt the House will restore much of the trimming. But if it does not, and the Senate sustains the reduction, one may be pretty sure it will not wreck the program.

It was plainly in this season's cards for some Congressman to pay due political homage to economy as a balm to nationalist-minded constituents, while others would fight for maximum aid as a sop to the internationalists. But it is quite doubtful that either is willing to take responsibility for cutting the financial fuel to the point where the recovery mechanism is completely stalled.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Detroit News published on Saturday, June 5, on its editorial page, a powerful editorial under the caption "Have a care, GOP!" It may interest a number of the Members of Congress to read the editorial, so I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE A CARE, GOP!

Congress supposedly, after a sharp contest in both Houses, agreed some time ago on this year's foreign-relief program. The voting then defeated a series of proposed reductions and "authorized" the expenditure of $6,533,000,000.

That, as to policy and the money, is the recorded will of Congress.

But an "authorization" is not an "appropriation." The foreign-relief appropriation bill has come from the House Appropriations Committee (New York's JOHN TABER, chairman) in a form that cuts down the authorization 26.7 percent.

Since the European recovery plan receives by far the largest sum, it is by far the biggest sufferer.

In an effort to block this maneuver by creating such a storm of protest in the House that the Senate would stand firm and the larger sum would be sustained in conference, Chairman EATON, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, told the House that the cut would "breach faith, kill hope, and leave only charity."

That about says it. TABER's action will not save money for the American taxpayer; it will only lessen the chance that the billions we are going to spend anyway will achieve their political object.

Though this is a particularly vicious instance of control over major legislation by an inner House group composed of the chairmen of several key committees, the members of the small Rules Committee, Speaker MARTIN and GOP Floor Leader HALLECK, it is by no means the only instance in which the group has used methods worthy of a dictatorship.

It jammed through the bill emasculating tariff reciprocity. It killed UMT. It has succeeded thus far in preventing a vote, which a majority of the House desires, on the

Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. But for the unprecedented rank-and-file House revolt, the bill repealing Federal taxes on oleomargarine would have been buried in committee.

Charges that a "House oligarchy" exists are getting into the public prints rather numerously. As service of their cause in this year's campaign to hold control of Congress and elect a Republican President, the GOP-ers in the House ought to show themselves fair and liberal of mind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have many more editorials on this subject, but I think the ones I have previously referred to are sufficient at this time. My hope is that every Senator may find the time to read and digest these editorials before the Senate is asked to correct the immeasurable damage done by the House of Representatives in the unwarranted reduction of the appropriation for the European recovery program.

LIMITATION ON PRICES OF CATTLE, HOGS, AND SHEEP

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution passed by the Amherst Farmers' Union Local, of Amherst, Nebr., on June 4, 1948, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMHERST, NEBR., *June 4, 1948.*

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The following resolution was adopted at a meeting of the Amherst Farmers Union Local:

"Resolved, That we, the Amherst Farmers' Union Local, numbering 204 members, go on record as unanimously opposed to the radical changes in the price of cattle, hogs, and sheep at the big market centers and we ask that Congress pass a law that the price of cattle, hogs, and sheep must not advance or decline more than 25 cents per hundred on any one day."

Respectfully yours,

WILL C. MUELLER,
Secretary.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate proposes that thousands of young men be taken from their homes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Missouri offering an amendment?

Mr. KEM. I am.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that inasmuch as the amendment is a long one, it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that its reading be dispensed with.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to have that done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well; then the amendment will be printed at this point.

The amendment proposed by Mr. KEM is on page 66, after line 20, to insert the following:

TITLE II

That the Articles of War (41 Stat. 787 to 811, as amended) are hereby amended as follows:

Article 1 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The word 'officer' shall be construed to refer to a commissioned officer.

"(b) The word 'soldier' shall be construed as including a noncommissioned officer, a private, or any other enlisted man or woman.

"(c) The word 'company' shall be construed as including a troop, battery, or corresponding unit of the ground or air forces.

"(d) The word 'Battalion' shall be construed as including a squadron or corresponding unit of the Ground or Air Forces.

"(e) The word 'cadet' shall be construed to refer to a cadet of the United States Military Academy."

SEC. 2. Article 2, subparagraph (a), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) All officers, warrant officers, and soldiers belonging to the Regular Army of the United States; all volunteers, from the dates of their muster or acceptance into the military service of the United States; and all other persons lawfully called, drafted, or ordered into, or to duty or for training in, the said service, from the dates they are required by the terms of the call, draft, or order to obey the same;"

SEC. 3. Article 4 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 4. Who may serve on courts martial: All officers in the military service of the United States, and officers of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on courts martial for the trial of any persons who may lawfully be brought before such courts for trial.

"All warrant officers in the active military service of the United States and warrant officers in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of warrant officers and enlisted persons, and persons in this category, shall be detailed for such service when deemed proper by the appointing authority.

"Enlisted persons in the active military service of the United States or in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of enlisted persons when requested in writing by the accused at any time prior to the convening of the court. When so requested, no enlisted person shall, without his consent, be tried by a court the membership of which does not include enlisted persons to the number of at least one-third of the total membership of the court.

"When appointing courts martial the appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command and when eligible those enlisted persons of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for the duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament; and officers and enlisted persons having less than 2 years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the service, be appointed as members of courts martial in excess of minority membership thereof. No person shall be eligible to sit as a member of a general or special court martial when he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution."

SEC. 4. Article 5 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 5. General courts martial: General courts martial may consist of any number of members not less than five."

SEC. 5. Article 6 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 6. Special courts martial: Special courts martial may consist of any number of members not less than three."

SEC. 6. Article 8 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 8. General courts martial: The President of the United States, the commanding officer of a Territorial department, the Superintendent of the Military Academy, the commanding officer of an Army group, an Army, an Army corps, a division, a separate brigade, or corresponding unit of the Ground or Air Forces, or any command to which a member of the Judge Advocate General's department is assigned as staff judge advocate, as prescribed in article 47, and, when empowered by the President, the commanding officer of any district or of any force or body of troops may appoint general courts martial; but when any such commander is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried, the court shall be appointed by superior competent authority, and may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable.

"The authority appointing a general court martial shall detail as one of the members thereof a law member who shall be an officer of the Judge Advocate General's department or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States and certified by the Judge Advocate General to be qualified for such detail: *Provided,* That no general court martial shall receive evidence or vote upon its findings or sentence in the absence of the law member regularly detailed. The law member, in addition to his duties as a member, shall perform the duties prescribed in article 31 hereof and such other duties as the President may by regulations prescribe."

SEC. 7. Article 9 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 9. Special courts martial: The commanding officer of a district, garrison, fort, camp, station, or other place where troops are on duty, and the commanding officer of an Army group, an army, an Army corps, a division, brigade, regiment, detached battalion, or corresponding unit of Ground or Air Forces, and the commanding officer of any other detached command or group of detached units placed under a single commander for this purpose may appoint special courts martial; but when any such commanding officer is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried, the court shall be appointed by superior authority, and may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable."

SEC. 8. Article 11 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 11. Appointment of trial judge advocates and counsel: For each general or special court martial the authority appointing the court shall appoint a trial judge advocate and a defense counsel, and one or more assistant trial judge advocates and one or more assistant defense counsel when necessary: *Provided,* That the trial judge advocate and defense counsel of each general court martial shall, if available, be members of the Judge Advocate General's department or officers who are members of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States: *Provided further,* That in all cases in which the officer appointed as trial judge advocate shall be a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department, or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State, the officer appointed as defense counsel shall likewise be a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a

State of the United States: *Provided further,* That when the accused is represented by counsel of his own selection and does not desire the presence of the regularly appointed defense counsel or assistant defense counsel, the latter may be excused by the president of the court: *And provided further,* That no person who has acted as member, trial judge advocate, assistant trial judge advocate, defense counsel, assistant defense counsel, or investigating officer in any case shall subsequently act in any capacity as a member of the prosecution or defense or act as a staff judge advocate to the reviewing or confirming authority upon the same case."

SEC. 9. Article 12 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 12. General courts martial: General courts martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense made punishable by these articles, and any other person who by the law of war is subject to trial by military tribunals: *Provided,* That general courts martial shall have power to adjudge any punishment authorized by law or the custom of the service including a bad-conduct discharge."

SEC. 10. Article 13 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 13. Special courts martial: Special courts martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided,* That the officer competent to appoint a general court martial for the trial of any particular case may, when in his judgment the interests of the service so require, cause any case to be tried by a special court martial notwithstanding the limitations upon the jurisdiction of the special court martial as to offenses herein prescribed.

"Special courts martial shall not have power to adjudge dishonorable discharge or dismissal, or confinement in excess of 6 months, nor to adjudge forfeiture of more than two-thirds pay per month for a period of not exceeding 6 months: *Provided,* That subject to approval of the sentence by an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and subject to appellate review by The Judge Advocate General and appellate agencies in his office, a special court martial may adjudge a bad-conduct discharge in addition to other authorized punishment: *Provided further,* That a bad-conduct discharge shall not be adjudged by a special court martial unless a complete record of the proceedings of and testimony taken by the court is taken in the case.

SEC. 11. Article 14 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 14. Summary courts martial: Summary courts martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law, except an officer, a warrant officer, or a cadet, for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided,* That noncommissioned officers shall not, if they object thereto, be brought to trial before a summary court martial without the authority of the officer competent to bring them to trial before a special court martial: *Provided further,* That the President may, by regulations, except from the jurisdiction of summary courts martial any class or classes of persons subject to military law.

"Summary courts martial shall not have power to adjudge confinement in excess of 1 month, restriction to limits for more than 3 months, or forfeiture or detention of more than two-thirds of one month's pay."

SEC. 12. Article 16 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 16. Persons in the military service—how triable: Officers shall be triable only by general and special courts martial and in no case shall a person in the military service, when it can be avoided, be tried by persons inferior to him in rank. No enlisted person may sit as a member of a court martial for the trial of another enlisted person who is assigned to the same company or corresponding military unit.

"No person subject to miltiary law shall be confined with enemy prisoners or any other foreign nationals outside of the continental limits of the United States, nor shall any defendant awaiting trial be made subject to punishment or penalties other than confinement prior to sentence on charges against him."

SEC. 13. Article 22 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 22. Process to obtain witnesses: Every trial judge advocate of a general or special court martial and every summary court martial shall have power to issue the like process to compel witnesses to appear and testify which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue; but such process shall run to any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions. Witnesses for the defense shall be subpenaed, upon request by the defense counsel, through process issued by the trial judge advocate, in the same manner as witnesses for the prosecution."

SEC. 14. Article 24 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 24. Compulsory self-incrimination prohibited: No witness before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before any officer conducting an investigation, or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before an officer conducting an investigation, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to answer any question the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue or when such answer might tend to degrade him.

"The use of coercion or unlawful influence in any manner whatsoever by any person subject to military law to obtain any statement, admission, or confession from any accused person or witness, shall be deemed to be conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, and no such statement, admission, or confession shall be received in evidence by any court martial. It shall be the duty of any person subject to military law in obtaining any statement from an accused to advise him that he does not have to make any statement at all regarding the offense of which he is accused or being investigated, and that any statement by the accused may be used as evidence against him in a trial by court martial."

SEC. 15. Article 25 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 25. Depositions—When admissible: A duly authenticated deposition taken upon reasonable notice to the opposite party may be read in evidence before any military court or commission in any case not capital, or in any proceeding before a court of inquiry or a military board, if such deposition be taken when the witness resides, is found, or is about to go beyond the State, Territory, or district in which the court, commission, or board is ordered to sit, or beyond the distance of 100 miles from the place of trial or hearing, or when it appears to the satisfaction of the court, commission, board, or appointing authority that the witness, by reason of age, sickness, bodily infirmity, imprisonment, or other reasonable cause, is unable to, or, in foreign places, because of nonamenability to process, refuses to appear and testify in person at the place of trial or hearing: *Provided,* That testimony by deposition may be adduced for the defense in capital cases: *Provided further,* That a deposition may be read in evidence in any case in which the death penalty is authorized by law but is not mandatory, whenever the appointing authority shall have directed that the case be treated as not capital, and in such a case a sentence of death may not be adjudged by the court martial: *And provided further,* That at any time after charges have been signed as provided in article 46, and before the charges have been referred for trial, any authority competent to appoint a court martial for the trial of such charges may designate officers to represent the prosecution and the defense and may authorize such officers, upon due notice, to take the deposition of any witness, and such deposition may subsequently be received in evidence as in other cases."

SEC. 16. Article 31 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 31. Method of voting: Voting by members of a general or special court martial upon questions of challenge, on the findings, and on the sentence shall be by secret written ballot. The junior member of the court shall in each case count the votes, which count shall be checked by the president, who shall forthwith announce the result of the ballot to the members of the court. The law member of a general court martial or the president of a special court martial shall rule in open court upon interlocutory questions, other than challenge, arising during the proceedings: *Provided,* That unless such ruling be made by the law member of a general court martial, if any member object thereto, the court shall be cleared and closed and the question decided by a majority vote, viva voce, beginning with the junior in rank. *And provided further,* That any such ruling made by the law member of a general court martial upon any interlocutory question other than a motion for a finding of not guilty, or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may in any case consult with the court, in closed session, before making a ruling, and may change any ruling made at any time during the trial. It shall be the duty of the law member of a general or special court martial before a vote is taken to advise the court that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, and that in the case just considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in the accused's favor and he shall be acquitted; if there is a reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower degree as to which there is no such doubt; that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused is upon the Government."

SEC. 17. Article 36 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 36. Disposition of records—special and summary courts martial: After having been acted upon by the officer appointing the court, or by the officer commanding for the time being, the record of each trial by special court martial and a report of each trial by summary court-martial shall be transmitted to the headquarters of the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command, there to be filed in the office of the staff judge advocate: *Provided, however,* That each record of trial by special court martial in which the sentence, as approved by the appointing authority, includes a bad-conduct discharge, shall, if approved by the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction under the provisions of article 47, be forwarded by him to The Judge Advocate General for review as hereinafter in these articles provided. When no longer of use, records of summary courts martial may be destroyed as provided by law governing destruction of Government records."

SEC. 18. Article 38 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 38. President may prescribe rules: The President may, by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, prescribe the procedure, including modes of proof, in cases

before courts martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and other military tribunals, which regulations shall, insofar as he shall deem practicable, apply the principles of law and rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the district courts of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing contrary to or inconsistent with these articles shall be so prescribed: *Provided further*, That all rules and regulations made in pursuance of this article shall be laid before the Congress."

SEC. 19. Article 39 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 39. As to time: Except for desertion or absence without leave committed in time of war, or for mutiny or murder, no person subject to military law shall be liable to be tried or punished by a court martial for any crime or offense committed more than 2 years before arraignment of such person: *Provided*, That for desertion in time of peace or for any crime or offense punishable under articles 93 and 94 of this code the period of limitations upon trial and punishment by court martial shall be 3 years: *Provided further*, That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused shall not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid periods of limitation: *Provided further*, That this article shall not have the effect to authorize the trial or punishment for any crime or offense barred by the provisions of existing law: *And provided further*, That in the case of any offense the trial of which in time of war shall be certified by the Secretary of the Department of the Army to be detrimental to the prosecution of the war or inimical to the Nation's security, the period of limitations herein provided for the trial of the said offense shall be extended to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter."

SEC. 20. Article 43 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 43. Death sentence—When lawful; vote on findings and sentence: No person shall, by general court martial, be convicted of an offense for which the death penalty is made mandatory by law, nor sentenced to suffer death, except by the concurrence of all the members of said court martial present at the time the vote is taken, and for an offense in these articles expressly made punishable by death; nor sentenced to life imprisonment, nor to confinement for more than 10 years, except by the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members present at the time the vote is taken. Conviction of any offense for which the death sentence is not mandatory and any sentence to confinement not in excess of 10 years, whether by general or special court martial, may be determined by a two-thirds vote of those members present at the time the vote is taken. All other questions shall be determined by a majority vote."

SEC. 21. Article 44 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 44. Officers—reduction to ranks: When a sentence to dismissal may lawfully be adjudged in the case of an officer the sentence may in time of war, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, adjudge in lieu thereof reduction to the grade of private."

SEC. 22. Article 46 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 46.—Charges; action upon.—

"a. Signature; oath: Charges and specifications must be signed by a person subject to military law, and under oath either that he has personal knowledge of, or has investigated, the matters set forth therein and that the same are true in fact, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

"b. Investigation: No charge will be referred to a general court martial for trial until after a thorough and impartial investigation thereof shall have been made. This investigation will include inquiries as to the truth of the matter set forth in said charges, form of charges, and what disposition of the case should be made in the interest of justice and discipline. The accused shall be permitted, upon his request, to be represented at such investigation by counsel of his own selection, civil counsel if he so provides, or military if such counsel be reasonably available, otherwise by counsel appointed by the officer exercising general courts-martial jurisdiction over the command. At such investigation full opportunity shall be given to the accused to cross-examine witnesses against him if they are available and to present anything he may desire in his own behalf, either in defense or mitigation, and the investigating officer shall examine available witnesses requested by the accused. If the charges are forwarded after such investigation they shall be accompanied by a statement of the substance of the testimony taken on both sides.

"c. Forwarding charges; delays; service of charges: When a person is held for trial by general court martial, the commanding officer will, within 8 days after the accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and furnish the accused a copy of such charges. If the same be not practicable, he will report to superior authority the reasons for delay. The trial judge advocate will cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had, and a failure so to serve such charges will be ground for a continuance unless the trial be had on the charges furnished the accused as hereinbefore provided. In time of peace no person shall, against his objection, be brought to trial before a general court martial within a period of 5 days subsequent to the service of charges upon him."

SEC. 23. Article 47 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 47. Action by convening authority.—

"a. Assignment of judge advocates; channels of communication: All members of the Judge Advocate General's Department will be assigned as prescribed by the Judge Advocate General after appropriate consultations with commanders on whose staffs they may serve; and the Judge Advocate General or senior members of his staff will make frequent inspections in the field in supervision of the administration of military justice. Convening authorities will at all times communicate directly with their staff judge advocates in matters relating to the administration of military justice; and the staff judge advocate of any command is authorized to communicate directly with the staff judge advocate of a superior or subordinate command, or with the Judge Advocate General.

"b. Reference for trial: Before directing the trial of any charge by general court-martial the convening authority will refer it to his staff judge advocate for consideration and advice; and no charge will be referred to a general court martial for trial unless it has been found that a thorough and impartial investigation thereof has been made as prescribed in the preceding article, that such charge is legally sufficient to allege an offense under these articles, and is sustained by evidence indicated in the report of investigation.

"c. Action on record of trial: Before acting upon a record of trial by general court-martial or military commission, or a record of trial by special court-martial in which a bad-conduct discharge has been adjudged and approved by the authority appointing the court, the reviewing authority will refer it to his staff judge advocate or to the Judge Advocate General for review and advice; and no sentence shall be approved unless upon conviction established beyond reasonable doubt of an offense made punishable by these articles, and unless the record of trial has been found legally sufficient to support it.

"d. Approval: No sentence of a court-martial shall be carried into execution until the same shall have been approved by the convening authority: *Provided*, That no sentence of a special court-martial including a bad-conduct discharge shall be carried into execution until in addition to the approval of the convening authority the same shall have been approved by an officer authorized to appoint a general court-martial.

"e. Who may exercise: Action by the convening authority may be taken by an officer commanding for the time being, by a successor in command, or by any officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction.

"f. Powers incident to power to approve: The power to approve the sentence of a court martial shall include—

"(1) the power to approve or disapprove a finding of guilty and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense;

"(2) the power to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence and

"(3) the power to remand a case for rehearing under the provisions of article 52."

SEC. 24. Article 48 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 48. Confirmation: In addition to the approval required by article 47, confirmation is required as follows before the sentence of a court martial may be carried into execution, namely:

"a. By the President with respect to any sentence—

"(1) of death, or

"(2) involving a general officer:

Provided, That when the President has already acted as approving authority, no additional confirmation by him is necessary;

"b. By the Secretary of the Department of the Army with respect to any sentence not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, when the Judge Advocate General does not concur in the action of the Judicial Council;

"c. By the Judicial Council, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, with respect to any sentence—

"(1) when the confirming action of the Judicial Council is not unanimous, or when by direction of the Judge Advocate General his participation in the confirming action is required, or

"(2) involving imprisonment for life, or

"(3) involving the dismissal of an officer other than a general officer, or

"(4) involving the dismissal or suspension of a cadet;

"d. By the Judicial Council with respect to any sentence in a case transmitted to the Judicial Council under the provisions of article 50 for confirming action."

SEC. 25. Article 49 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 49. Powers incident to power to confirm: The power to confirm the sentence of a court martial shall be held to include—

"a. The power to approve, confirm, or disapprove a finding of guilty, and to approve or confirm so much only of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense;

"b. The power to confirm, disapprove, vacate, commute, or reduce to legal limits the whole or any part of the sentence;

"c. The power to restore all rights, privileges, and property affected by any finding or sentence disapproved or vacated;

"d. The power to order the sentence to be carried into execution;

"e. The power to remand the case for a rehearing under the provisions of article 52."

SEC. 20. Article 50 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 50. Appellate review.—

"a. Board of Review; Judicial Council: The Judge Advocate General shall consti-

tute, in his office, a Board of Review composed of not less than three officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department. He shall also constitute, in his office, a Judicial Council composed of three general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department: *Provided,* That the Judge Advocate General may, under exigent circumstances, detail as members of the Judicial Council, for periods not in excess of 60 days, officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department of grades below that of general officer.

"b. Additional boards of review and judicial councils: Whenever necessary, the Judge Advocate General may constitute two or more boards of review and judicial councils in his office, with equal powers and duties composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article.

"c. Branch offices: Whenever the President deems such action necessary, he may direct the Judge Advocate General to establish a branch office, under an Assistant Judge Advocate General who shall be a general officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department, with any distant command, and to establish in such branch office one or more boards of review and judicial councils composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article. Such Assistant Judge Advocate General and such Board of Review and Judicial Council shall be empowered to perform for that command under the general supervision of the Judge Advocate General, the duties which the Judge Advocate General and the Board of Review and Judicial Council in his office would otherwise be required to perform in respect of all cases involving sentences not requiring approval or confirmation by the President: *Provided,* That the power of mitigation and remission shall not be exercised by such Assistant Judge Advocate General or by agencies in his office, but any case in which such action is deemed desirable shall be forwarded to the Judge Advocate General with appropriate recommendations.

"d. Action by Board of Review when approval by President or confirming action is required: Before any record of trial in which there has been adjudged a sentence requiring approval or confirmation by the President or confirmation by any other confirming authority is submitted to the President or such other confirming authority, as the case may be, it shall be examined by the Board of Review which shall take action as follows:

"(1) In any case requiring action by the President, the Board of Review shall submit its opinion in writing, through the Judicial Council which shall also submit its opinion in writing, to the Judge Advocate General, who shall, except as herein otherwise provided, transmit the record and the Board's and Council's opinions, with his recommendations, directly to the Secretary of the Department of the Army for the action of the President: *Provided,* That the Judicial Council, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General shall have powers in respect to holdings of legal insufficiency equal to the powers vested in the Board of Review by subparagraph (3) of this paragraph.

"(2) In any case requiring confirming action by the Judicial Council with or without the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, when the Board of Review is of the opinion that the record of trial is legally sufficient to support the sentence it shall submit its opinion in writing to the Judicial Council for appropriate action.

"(3) When the Board of Review is of the opinion that the record of trial in any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the Judicial Council is legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, or that errors of law have been committed injuriously affecting the substantial rights of the accused, it shall submit its holding to the Judge Advocate General and when the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, such findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in accord with such holding and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the appropriate convening authority for a rehearing or such other action as may be proper.

"(4) In any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the Judicial Council in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the Board of Review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action or for other appropriate action in a case in which confirmation of the sentence by the President is required under article 48a.

"e. Action by Board of Review in cases involving dishonorable or bad-conduct discharges or confinement in penitentiary: No authority shall order the execution of any sentence of a court martial involving dishonorable discharge not suspended, bad-conduct discharge not suspended, or confinement in a penitentiary unless and until the appellate review required by this article shall have been completed and unless and until any confirming action required shall have been completed. Every record of trial by general or special court martial involving a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad-conduct discharge, whether such discharges be suspended or not suspended, and every record of trial by general court martial involving a sentence to confinement in a penitentiary, other than records of trial examination of which is required by paragraph d of this article, shall be examined by the Board of Review which shall take action as follows:

"(1) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, and confirming action is not by the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review deemed necessary, the Judge Advocate General shall transmit the holding to the convening authority, and such holding shall be deemed final and conclusive.

"(2) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, but modification of the findings of guilty or the sentence is by the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review deemed necessary to the ends of justice, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action.

"(3) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, the findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in whole or in part in accord with such holding, and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the convening authority for rehearing or such other action as may be appropriate.

"(4) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the Board of Review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action.

"f. Appellate action in other cases: Every record of trial by general court martial the appellate review of which is not otherwise provided for by this article shall be examined in the Office of the Judge Advocate General and if found legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, shall be transmitted to the Board of Review for appropriate action in accord with paragraph e of this article.

"g. Weighing evidence: In the appellate review of records of trials by courts martial as provided in these articles the Judge Advocate General and all appellate agencies in his office shall have authority to weigh evidence, judge the credibility of witnesses, and determine controverted questions of fact.

"h. Finality of court-martial judgments: The appellate review of records of trial provided by this article, the confirming action taken pursuant to articles 48 or 49, the proceedings, findings, and sentences of courts martial as heretofore or hereafter approved, reviewed, or confirmed as required by the Articles of War and all dismissals and discharges heretofore or hereafter carried into execution pursuant to sentences by courts martial following approval, review, or confirmation as required by the Articles of War, shall be final and conclusive, and orders publishing the proceedings of courts martial and all action taken pursuant to such proceedings shall be binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States, subject only to action upon application for a new trial as provided in article 53."

SEC. 27. Article 50½ is rescinded.

SEC. 28. Article 51 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 51. Mitigation, remission, and suspension of sentences.—

"a. At the time ordered executed: The power of the President, the Secretary of the Department of the Army, and any reviewing authority to order the execution of a sentence of a court martial shall include the power to mitigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part thereof, except that a death sentence may not be suspended. The Judge Advocate General shall have the power to m tigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part of a sentence in any case requiring appellate review under article 50 and not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, but the power to mitigate or remit shall be exercised by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army. The authority which suspends the execution of a sentence may restore the person under sentence to duty during such suspension; and the death or honorable discharge of a person under suspended sentence shall operate as a complete remission of any unexecuted or unremitted part of such sentence.

"b. Subsequent to the time ordered executed.—

"(1) Any unexecuted portion of a sentence other than a sentence of death, including all uncollected forfeitures, adjudged by court-martial may be mitigated, remitted or suspended and any order of suspension may be vacated, in whole or in part, by the military authority competent to appoint, for the command, exclusive of penitentiaries and the United States disciplinary barracks, in which the person under sentence may be, a court of the kind that imposed the sentence, and the same power may be exercised by superior military authority or by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army: *Provided,* That no sentence approved or confirmed by the President shall be mitigated, remitted, or suspended by any authority inferior to the President: *And provided further,* That no order of suspension of a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad conduct discharge shall be vacated unless and until confirming or appellate action on the sentence has been completed as required by articles 48 and 50.

"(2) The power to suspend a sentence shall include the power to restore the person affected to duty during such suspension.

"(3) The power to mitigate, remit or suspend the sentence or any part thereof in the case of a person confined in the United

States disciplinary barracks or in a penitentiary shall be exercised by the Secretary of War or by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army."

SEC. 29. Article 52 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 52. Rehearings: When any reviewing or confirming authority disapproves a sentence or when any sentence is vacated by action of the Board of Review or Judicial Council and the Judge Advocate General, the reviewing or confirming authority or the Judge Advocate General may authorize or direct a rehearing. Such rehearing shall take place before a court martial composed of members not members of the court martial which first heard the case. Upon such rehearing the accused shall not be tried for any offense of which he was found not guilty by the first court martial, and no sentence in excess of or more severe than the original sentence shall be enforced unless the sentence be based upon a finding of guilty of an offense not considered upon the merits in the original proceeding."

SEC. 30. Article 53 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 53. Petition for new trial: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the Judge Advocate General is authorized, upon application of an accused person, and upon good cause shown, in his discretion to grant a new trial, or to vacate a sentence, restore rights, privileges, and property affected by such sentence, and substitute for a dismissal, dishonorable discharge, or bad conduct discharge previously executed a form of discharge authorized for administrative issuance, in any court-martial case in which application is made within 1 year after final disposition of the case upon initial appellate review: *Provided,* That with regard to cases involving offenses committed during World War II, the application for a new trial may be made within 1 year after termination of the war, or after its final disposition upon initial appellate review as herein provided, whichever is the later: *Provided,* That only one such application for a new trial may be entertained with regard to any one case: *And provided further,* That all action by the Judge Advocate General pursuant to this article, and all proceedings, findings, and sentences on new trials under this article, as approved, reviewed, or confirmed under articles 47, 48, 49, and 50, and all dismissals and discharges carried into execution pursuant to sentences adjudged on new trials and approved, reviewed, or confirmed, shall be final and conclusive and orders publishing the action of the Judge Advocate General or the proceedings on new trial and all action taken pursuant to such proceedings, shall be binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States."

SEC. 31. Article 70 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 70. Charges; action upon, unnecessary delay: When any person subject to military law is placed in arrest or confinement immediate steps will be taken to try the person accused or to dismiss the charge and release him. Any officer who is responsible for unnecessary delay in investigating or carrying the case to a final conclusion shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

SEC. 32. Article 85 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 85. Drunk on duty: Any person subject to military law, who is found drunk on duty, shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

SEC. 33. Article 88 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 88. Unlawfully influencing action of court: No authority appointing a general, special, or summary court martial nor any other commanding officer, shall censure, reprimand, or admonish such court, or any member thereof, with respect to the findings or sentence adjudged by the court, or with respect to any other exercise, by such court or any member thereof, of its or his judicial responsibility. No person subject to military law shall attempt to coerce or unlawfully influence the action of a court martial or any member thereof, in reaching the findings or sentence in any case, or the action of an appointing or reviewing or confirming authority with respect to his judicial acts."

SEC. 34. Article 89 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 89. Good order to be maintained and wrongs redressed: All persons subject to military law are to behave themselves orderly in quarters, garrison, camp, and on the march; and any person subject to military law who commits any waste or spoil, or wrongfully destroys any property whatsoever or commits any kind of depredation or riot, shall be punished as a court martial may direct. Any commanding officer who, upon complaint made to him refuses or omits to see reparation made to the party injured, insofar as the offender's pay shall go toward such reparation, as provided for in article 105, shall be dismissed from the service, or otherwise punished, as a court martial may direct."

SEC. 35. Article 92 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 92. Murder—rape: Any person subject to military law found guilty of murder shall suffer death or imprisonment for life, as the court martial may direct; but if found guilty of murder not premeditated, he shall be punished as a court martial may direct. Any person subject to military law who is found guilty of rape shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court martial may direct: *Provided,* That no person shall be tried by court martial for murder or rape committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia in time of peace."

SEC. 36. Article 93 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 93. Various crimes: Any person subject to military law who commits manslaughter, mayhem, arson, burglary, housebreaking, robbery, larceny, perjury, forgery, sodomy, assault with intent to commit any felony, assault with intent to do bodily harm with a dangerous weapon, instrument, or other thing, or assault with intent to do bodily harm, shall be punished as a court martial may direct: *Provided,* That any person subject to military law who commits larceny or embezzlement shall be guilty of larceny within the meaning of this article."

SEC. 37. Article 94 is amended to read as follows:

"ART 94. Frauds against the Government: Any person subject to military law who makes or causes to be made any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"Who presents or causes to be presented to any person in the civil or military service thereof, for approval or payment, any claim against the United States, or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"Who enters into any agreement or conspiracy to defraud the United States by obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the allowance or payment of any false or fraudulent claim; or

"Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or against any officer thereof, makes or uses, or procures, or advises the making or use of, any writing or other paper knowing the same to contain any false or fraudulent statements; or

"Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, makes or procures, or advises the making of, any oath to any fact or to any writing or other paper knowing such oath to be false; or

"Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, forges or counterfeits, or procures, or advises the forging or counterfeiting of any signature upon any writing or other paper, or uses, or procures, or advises the use of any such signature, knowing the same to be forged or counterfeited; or

"Who, having charge, possession, custody, or control of any money or other property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, knowingly delivers, or causes to be delivered, to any person having authority to receive the same, any amount thereof less than that for which he receives a certificate or receipt; or

"Who, being authorized to make or deliver any paper certifying the receipt of any property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof, makes or delivers to any person such writing, without having full knowledge of the truth of the statements therein contained and with intent to defraud the United States; or

"Who steals, embezzles, knowingly and willfully misappropriates, applies to his own use or benefit, or wrongfully or knowingly sells or disposes of any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, money, or other property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof: *Provided,* That any person, subject to military law, who commits larceny or embezzlement with respect to property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, or with respect to other property within the purview of this article, steals said property within the meaning of this article; or

"Who knowingly purchases or receives in pledge for any obligation or indebtedness from any soldier, officer, or other person who is a part of or employed in said forces or service, any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, or other property of the United States, such soldier, officer, or other person not having lawful right to sell or pledge the same; or

"Who enters into any agreement or conspires to commit any of the offenses aforesaid;

"Shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine or imprisonment, or by such other punishment as a court martial may adjudge, or by any or all of said penalties. If any person, being guilty of any of the offenses aforesaid or who steals or fails properly to account for any money or other property held in trust by him for enlisted persons or as its official custodian while in the military serve of the United States, receives his discharge or is dismissed or otherwise separated from the service, he shall continue to be liable to be arrested and held for trial and sentence by a court martial in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had not been so separated therefrom."

SEC. 38. Article 104 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 104. Disciplinary powers of commanding officers: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the commanding officer of any detachment, company, or higher command, may, for minor offenses, impose disciplinary punishments upon persons of his command without the intervention of a court martial, unless the accused demands trial by court martial.

"The disciplinary punishments authorized by this article may include admonition or reprimand, or the withholding of privileges, or extra fatigue, or restriction to certain specified limits, or hard labor without confinement or any combination of such punish-

ments for not exceeding 1 week from the date imposed; but shall not include forfeiture of pay or confinement under guard; except that any officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction may, under the provisions of this article, also impose upon a warrant officer or officer of his command below the rank of brigadier general a forfeiture of not more than one-half of his pay per month for 3 months.

"A person punished under authority of this article, who deems his punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense, may, through the proper channel, appeal to the next superior authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged. The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, and superior authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment. The imposition and enforcement of disciplinary punishment under authority of this article for any act or omission shall not be a bar to trial by court martial for a serious crime or offense growing out of the same act or omission, and not properly punishable under this article; but the fact that a disciplinary punishment has been enforced may be shown by the accused upon trial, and when so shown shall be considered in determining the measure of punishment to be adjudged in the event of a finding of guilty."

SEC. 39. Article 108 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 108. Soldiers—separation from the service: No enlisted person, lawfully inducted into the military service of the United States, shall be discharged from said service without a certificate of discharge, and no enlisted person shall be discharged from said service before his term of service has expired, except in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, or by sentence of a general or special court martial."

SEC. 40. Article 110 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 110. Certain articles of war to be read or explained: Articles 1, 2, 24, 28, 29, 54 to 97, inclusive, 104 to 109, inclusive, and 121 shall be read or carefully explained to every soldier at the time of his enlistment or muster in, or within 6 days thereafter, and shall be read or explained once every 6 months to the soldiers of every garrison, regiment, or company in the service of the United States. And a complete text of the Articles of War and of the Manual for Courts Martial shall be made available to any soldier, upon his request, for his personal examination."

SEC. 41. Article 116 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 116. Powers of assistant trial judge advocate and of assistant defense counsel: An assistant trial judge advocate of a general or special court martial shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon the trial judge advocate of the court. An assistant defense counsel shall be competent likewise to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon counsel for the accused."

SEC. 42. Article 117 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 117. Removal of civil suits: When any civil or criminal prosecution is commenced in any court of a State of the United States against any officer, soldier, or other person in the military service of the United States on account of any act done under color of his office or status, or in respect to which he claims any right, title, or authority under any law of the United States respecting the military forces thereof, or under the law of war, such suit or prosecution may at any time before the trial or final hearing thereof be removed for trial into the district court of the United States in the district where the same is pending in the manner prescribed by law, and the cause shall thereupon be entered on the docket of such district court, which shall proceed as if the cause had been originally commenced therein and shall have full power to hear and determine said cause."

SEC. 43. Section 1 of article 121 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 121. Complaints of wrongs: Any officer or soldier who believes himself wronged by his commanding officer, and, upon due application to such commander, is refused redress, may complain to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the officer against whom the complaint is made. That officer shall examine into said complaint and take proper measures for redressing the wrong complained of; and he shall, as soon as possible, transmit to the War Department a true statement of such complaint, with the proceedings had thereon."

SEC. 44. This act shall become effective on the first day of the eighth calendar month after approval of this act.

SEC. 45. All offenses committed and all penalties, forfeitures, fines, or liabilities incurred prior to the effective date of this act, under any law embraced in or modified, changed, or repealed by this act, may be prosecuted, punished, and enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been passed.

SEC. 46. Section 8 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 61), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Judge Advocate General's Corps: The Judge Advocate General's Corps shall consist of one Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, one assistant with the rank of major general, three officers with the rank of brigadier general, and an active list commissioned officer strength to be determined by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, but such strength shall not be less than 1½ percent of the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the Armed Services of the National Military Establishment who are subject to the Articles of War, and in addition warrant officers and enlisted men in such numbers as the Secretary of the Department of the Army shall determine."

SEC. 47. Regular Army officers shall be permanently appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the commissioned officer grades of major general, brigadier general, colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and first lieutenant. The names of commissioned officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps below the grade of brigadier general shall be carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list. The Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be established by entering thereon the names of the officers concerned without change in their order of precedence on the existing promotion list. The authorized numbers in each of the several grades in the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, but the numbers thus authorized shall not exceed the following percentages of the total strength authorized for that list: 8 percent in the grade of colonel; 14 percent in the grade of lieutenant colonel; 19 percent in the grade of major; 23 percent in the grade of captain; and 36 percent in the grade of first lieutenant: *Provided*, That numbers may be authorized for any grade in lieu of authorization in higher grades: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not operate to require a reduction in permanent grade of any officer now holding permanent appointment.

Officers whose names are carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be promoted to the several grades as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers generally and the authorized numbers in grades below colonel on such list shall be temporarily increased from time to time in order to give effect to the promotion system now or hereafter prescribed by law for promotion-list officers.

Within the authorized strength of the Judge Advocate General's Corps additional officers may be appointed by transfer of qualified officers from other branches of the Army, by appointment of Reserve judge advocates or qualified civilian graduates of accredited law schools. Those originally appointed in the Regular Army in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with an amount of service for the purpose of determining grade, position on promotion list, permanent-grade seniority, and eligibility for promotion as now or hereafter prescribed by law.

SEC. 48. The Judge Advocate General shall, in addition to such other duties as may be prescribed by law, be the legal adviser of the Secretary of the Department of the Army and of all officers and agencies of the Department of the Army; and all members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall perform their duties under the direction of the Judge Advocate General.

SEC. 49. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General and general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps who are recommended for such positions by the Secretary of the Department of the Army. Upon the appointment of an officer to be the Judge Advocate General or Assistant Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, he shall at the same time if not then holding permanent appointment in such grade be appointed a permanent major general of the Regular Army.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so as to permit me to make an announcement of a change in an amendment?

Mr. KEM. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. For the purpose of debate later, I wish to announce that I am modifying my amendment "I" which is on the desks of Senators. The amendment now provides for a change from 24 months to 12 months. I am modifying it so as to provide a change from 24 months to 18 months. I shall debate the amendment later in the afternoon.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the bill now pending before the Senate proposes that many thousands of young men be taken from their homes and inducted into the armed forces, particularly into the Army. For my part, before I vote to take these young men from their homes, I want to know that they will be subject to a system of military justice consistent with the traditional ideas of fairness and justice of the people of the United States.

I have offered an amendment which consists of the exact language of House bill 2575, as passed by the House on January 15, 1948. The purpose of House bill 2575 and the purpose of my amendment are identical. They propose to correct the Articles of War to the end that the Army system of justice may be improved in certain important particulars.

I well remember my own experience during World War I, while serving as a member of an Army court martial, as a trial judge advocate, and as counsel for accused persons. It was apparent to me then that there was a crying need for change in the system of military justice. After World War I, certain changes were made to provide for a better review of

the decisions of general courts martial. Notwithstanding these changes, Mr. President, during World War II, and since, there has been extended, informed, and, I may say, bitter criticism of the administration of military justice under the existing Articles of War. I doubt if there is a Member of the Senate who has not received complaints about what are thought to be miscarriages of justice. Experience gained during the course of World War II indicates beyond any doubt that basic changes are urgently needed. The evidence obtained at extensive hearings indicates in general five basic defects in the present system.

First. Punishments imposed by courts martial are not uniform for the same offense under similar circumstances.

Second. Members of courts martial are subject to "command" influence in arriving at findings and imposing sentence.

Third. Punishments vary in degree for officers and enlisted men. Because officers could not be tried except by general courts martial, and because punishment for officers under Article of War 104 is limited to captains and lieutenants, and as to extent of punishment, officer personnel frequently is permitted to escape disciplinary action of any kind.

Fourth. Qualified defense counsel was too frequently not made available to persons being tried by courts martial, even for capital offenses.

Fifth. Appellate procedure is inadequate.

Mr. President, in my judgment the underlying causes of these defects are twofold: First, the substantive law, that is the applicable article of war, is not adequate and is in need of revision; second, the quality of personnel assigned to administer military justice is not always competent. I am reliably informed that to a considerable degree during World War II the actual trial of courts martial was conducted by officers of the line, and the members of the Judge Advocate General's Department who were trained in military law were by necessity kept in the headquarters of divisions or larger units. It is in the actual trial of the case where trained personnel is essential. At the trial, the soldier must be adequately represented by counsel and have his case heard by a court composed of competent personnel free from outside influences, or miscarriages of justice are apt to take place. The amendment I propose corrects these two fundamental defects.

I do not take the position that the amendment is a perfect solution. I do maintain that as a whole it is the best proposal that has yet been made. As I have said, the amendment is identical with the provisions of House bill 2575. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider the history of that bill, which has been passed by the House without objection.

Before the end of hostilities in World War II it was apparent to the War Department and to the Congress that a study of the Army system for the administration of justice was necessary. In 1944 and 1945, Col. Phillip McCook, a prominent New York lawyer, was sent by the War Department to the various theaters of operation to conduct such a study. Immediately after the end of hostilities the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice was appointed by order of the Secretary of War. The committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Arthur T. Vanderbilt, former president of the American Bar Association, now chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, and referred to as the Vanderbilt committee, consisted of nine outstanding lawyers and Federal jurists from eight States and the District of Columbia.

From March 25, 1946, until December 13, 1946, a period of almost 9 months, the members of that committee engaged in studies, investigations, and hearings, and availed themselves of voluminous statistical data of the Judge Advocate General's Department and other sources. At full committee hearings in Washington, the Secretary of War, and Under Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, the Commander of the Army Ground Forces, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General, numerous other officers, and the representatives of five veterans' organizations were heard. There were numerous personal interviews, supplemented by letters and the digesting of 321 answers to questionnaires from both military and nonmilitary personnel. Additional widely advertised regional public hearings were held at New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Raleigh, Atlanta, Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle. The subsequent report of the Vanderbilt committee was based on these extensive inquiries.

In addition, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, a Military Affairs Subcommittee in the House, under the chairmanship of the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, devoted more than 1 year to detailed study of the Army system of justice. The report of the Durham committee was thoroughly considered by the House Military Affairs Committee when the bill (H. R. 2575) was prepared.

Additional studies have been conducted by special committees of the American Legion, VFW, AMVETS, AVC, the New York County Lawyers Association, the War Veterans' Bar Association, the Judge Advocate Generals' Association, and the Phi Alpha Delta law fraternity. The reports and recommendations of each of these groups were made available to the Armed Services Committee and representatives of each of the organizations appeared before the committee in public hearings in support of their recommendations. Other witnesses, who, for one reason or other, had particular knowledge of the subject, or had had service and experience in the administration of justice during the recent war, were heard.

The combined efforts of these organizations and individuals represent the most comprehensive study of military justice that has ever been conducted in the history of this or of any other country.

The amendment I have proposed is the product of some of the best judicial brains in the country. In general, the main accomplishments of the amendment may be outlined as follows:

First. Enlisted men have been authorized to sit as members of courts martial.

Members of the Senate who have had occasion to serve on courts martial may remember that under the existing Articles of War enlisted men are excluded from sitting on those courts. There is no such thing as a trial by a jury of his peers, so far as the enlisted man is concerned.

Second. It subjects officers to trial by special courts martial.

As I have said, under existing law many officers, for many offenses, entirely escape disciplinary action, whereas, for the same offenses, enlisted men are tried and subjected to serious and onerous penalties.

Third. It prohibits the unlawful influence of courts martial or the members thereof.

I do not need to recall to any Member of the Senate who has had any experience with courts martial that the command influence, that is the influence of the officer who appointed and convened the court, is of tremendous importance and weight in the proceedings and decisions of the court. This amendment, as I shall explain in a few minutes, will, so far as it is humanly possible, do away with or curb that command influence.

Fourth. Warrant officers are authorized to sit as members of courts martial.

There is an intervening grade between enlisted men and commissioned officers, known as warrant officers. If there be any good reason why they should be excluded from sitting and taking part in courts-martial proceedings and the administration of justice in the Army, it has not yet been suggested.

Fifth. An accused, if he so desires, may have counsel at the pretrial investigation.

In a great many cases, Mr. President, before the regular formal courts-martial proceedings are conducted, there is what is called a pretrial investigation. In some cases, I am sorry to say, I think the pretrial investigations might be fairly criticized as a kangaroo court. The amendment provides that the person accused and who must stand trial is entitled to counsel from the very start of the proceedings against him. In other words, he cannot be brought before a kangaroo court and have admissions secured from him before he has the advantage of capable counsel to advise him.

Sixth. Authority to issue a bad-conduct discharge has been granted to general and special courts martial.

Seventh. The review and appellate provisions have been strengthened.

Again, Mr. President, as any Member of the Senate who has had experience with Army justice knows, the existing provisions are entirely ineffective and inadequate. What this amendment does is to provide for a review of the decisions of courts martial under principles consistent and consonant with the Anglo-American system of justice.

Eighth. A lesser punishment than death or life imprisonment for murder and rape has been provided.

Here, again, is an important defect in the present system. A defendant who is brought to trial on a charge of murder or rape is either convicted or discharged. If he be found not guilty he receives no

penalty at all. The fact that there may be extenuating circumstances in such a case before a court martial is a fact which the court is not permitted to consider.

Ninth. A lesser punishment than dismissal from the service for officers drunk during a time of war has been provided.

Here, again, there is an important defect in the present law. An officer found drunk in time of war has only one penalty that applies, as a matter of course, and that is dismissal from the service.

Tenth. The authority of commanding officers has been increased so far as pertains to officers and not to enlisted men.

Eleventh. A separate Judge Advocate General's court will be established.

The principles of the amendment, Mr. President, have been approved and urged by the principal veterans' organizations, by the National Judge Advocate Generals' Association, and by its component organizations in many States. They have also been approved by the Reserve Officers' Association. That is an important consideration, in that officers under the proposed code are subjected to penalties to which they were not previously subject, but the Reserve officers have realized the unfairness of the present situation and are themselves urging these changes in the law.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Do I correctly understand that the amendment passed the House and was approved by the American Bar Association?

Mr. KEM. I was just about to reach that point, Mr. President. The Senator from Utah has taken the words out of my mouth. I was about to say that the amendment, in the exact form in which it is here proposed, was approved by the American Bar Association and by local and State bar associations in many States.

Mr. WATKINS. I have understood that a great deal of time has been spent in preparing the amendment which the Senator is now offering.

Mr. KEM. Yes. It was prepared under the supervision and direction of a great American lawyer, the Honorable Arthur T. Vanderbilt, who is now chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

Mr. WATKINS. I have received numerous letters from men who served in the Judge Advocate General's Department, who are now Reserve officers, and who favor this amendment. They think it has been very well considered, carefully prepared, and would be in the interest of justice in the Army.

I now desire to associate myself with the argument made by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Has the Senator stated the names of those who collaborated in preparing the amendment?

Mr. KEM. I have not. I do not have the names here. I think I can get them. They are in the House report. The Honorable Arthur T. Vanderbilt was the chairman of the committee. I do not believe I have the other names, but they were distinguished lawyers who came from 8 States and from the District of Columbia, and included a number of Federal judges. I am sorry that I do not have the names and cannot give them credit at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will permit a question, the amendment is the official embodiment of the views of the American Bar Association, is it not?

Mr. KEM. It is the exact language of their bill, without a change in any particular.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I feel that what the Senator is presenting is of vital importance. It is my opinion that unless we see to it that the men who are brought into the service in one way or another, who fight the wars for the Nation, are treated with the justice and equity accorded our citizens at home, we cannot expect the men in the services to be satisfied.

I wish to tell the Senator from Missouri about two cases which went through my office during the war, which I think are very pertinent. One was the case of a man named Hicswa, a soldier in Japan, who had a wonderful record of 21 months service without blemish. Then just before his return to the United States of America he with other soldiers in the barracks got drunk and he killed two Japanese. He was tried and sentenced to death. In this country, if anyone gets drunk and kills another, he is sentenced to the penitentiary. Why should we invoke a different penalty or judgment on a man in the service than that visited upon a civilian at home? This boy was clearly drunk. Many others were drunk in the barracks on the day when he stabbed the Japanese. He had a bitterness in his heart against the Japanese because they had killed some of his buddies. The incident and the judgment pronounced against the soldier almost put his father and mother in the cemetery.

I went to see the Judge Advocate General and his Board of Review and then I saw President Truman about the case and the sentence was changed to life imprisonment; and that is where the case stands today.

Another case was that of one of the finest young men I ever knew, who while in the Quartermaster's Department and stationed in England violated certain rules. The generals helped him violate them, all the officers helped him violate the rules, because they did not take the time to write out orders when they wanted a carton of cigarettes, or something of the kind. They would throw the money on the table, and he put the money in a drawer in his desk. He was called away for 3 or 4 hours one day, and the money was stolen from his desk.

As I recall, a certain major in the British Army testified that the young man, who was a commissioned officer, had been taking this money, instead of writing out the orders and proceeding in the way prescribed by the rules of the Quartermaster's Department. An American sergeant testified against this American soldier, when he was tried by a court martial. He never had a lawyer. The only person who represented him, as I recall, was a captain, or an officer down the line in the Medical Corps, not one up the line. This officer had no legal training, no legal experience of any kind, and that fine boy was sentenced to the penitentiary for 5 years. He was sent back home and served 1 year in the military prison in New York State. Then I and a number of other Members of Congress took up his case. His employer was one of the outstanding companies in the United States, and they said they had full faith and confidence in this young man and felt he could not steal anything and they would give him back his job. That boy was humiliated and injured by that service in prison, which came about because he had no legal talent to see that he had a proper and fair trial before the court martial.

It was afterward proven that the major of the British Army who testified against him had been indicted and tried for a hold-up and a burglary—in fact, I think there were seven indictments against him. It took a whole year to get justice for this young American, but he finally was discharged from prison and reenlisted as a private, having previously been, as I have said a commissioned officer. He rehabilitated himself and is now occupying a very fine position in this country. The young woman to whom he was engaged had faith in him and waited for him, and finally married him.

Mr. President, I cite that case to show that the procedure the Senator from Missouri is seeking to bring about is vitally important, and that there should be established in the armed forces an improved system whereby there may be accorded to the men in the service a quality of justice certainly equal to that meted out to civilians at home.

I associate myself with the Senator from Missouri and I shall vote for his amendment.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator from New Jersey very much for the interesting statements he has made. The incidents he has related seem to me to dramatize in a very effective way the necessity for legislation of the kind proposed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Does the amendment cover all the branches of the service?

Mr. KEM. It covers the Army and the Air Force. The Navy has always had a

system of the administration of justice that is peculiar to itself. When the Vanderbilt committee undertook its studies it found it was not possible to cover in one enactment the administration of justice on the land and on the sea. Provisions which were entirely feasible and entirely effective and convenient on land could not be applied on shipboard. So the Vanderbilt committee decided that it would recommend this amendment, which is applicable to the armed forces on land, including the Air Force, and leave the question of the proper administration of justice at sea and in the Navy to subsequent study.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say to the junior Senator from Missouri that I have had a number of inquiries, and through my office assistance has been rendered to quite a number of soldiers who were involved in charges of various military offenses and had had sentences imposed on them. I wish to say to the Senator that I am very happy to find myself able to support the amendment he has proposed.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the cooperation and support of the Senator from Minnesota.

I may say, Mr. President, that I personally regret that it is not possible to offer at this time an amendment which would also cover the naval forces. I do not think any amendment should be offered except as the result of the most careful study and investigation, such as has been undertaken by the Vanderbilt committee. I claim no credit for the authorship of the amendment. I am merely offering an amendment prepared by the distinguished committee to which I have referred.

In addition to the various professional organizations which have endorsed the amendment, it has been endorsed formally by the board of governors of the Missouri bar, and I dare say by similar organizations in many other States.

So far as I know, the Army offers no serious objection to the proposed changes, except to the last four sections of the amendment, which provide for a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps, having a separate promotion list.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of those who are proposing the amendment, that is an essential change, made necessary in order to overcome the danger of command influence. This amendment will set up a separate corps, who will be charged with the administration of justice. They will be under the Secretary of War, but when an offense occurs which requires professional assistance, the soldiers will be entitled to professional assistance that is independent, and not responsible to the commanding officer. That is the nub of the amendment. That is the way the framers of the proposed law have undertaken to guarantee to soldiers freedom from influence of the command.

Proof of the urgent need for the changes in the articles of war proposed in the amendment is found in the attitude of lawyers who have had extensive experience in the civilian practice of law, and who also served in the Judge Advocate General's Department during the recent war. They know whereof they speak. They were charged with the duty of carrying out the provisions of the existing articles of war.

These lawyers, out of uniform again, are among the most articulate advocates of the principles of the amendment. The Senator from Utah has said he has received many letters from members of the Reserve Officers Association urging the adoption of the amendment. These men know what they are talking about. They served in the Army, they have had a background of civilian experience, they are thoroughly grounded in American principles of fairness and justice as administered in our courts, and their objective is to see that the boys who are inducted into the Army, as well as those who voluntarily enlist, shall have assurance that they will have the advantage of the protection of these fundamental principles.

Outside of the Army itself the only criticism of the provisions of the amendment which has come to my attention is that it does not go far enough. I think the American Bar Association, while approving the present amendment, would be entirely willing to go much further than the Vanderbilt committee has suggested, and I have been so advised.

In support of this amendment I have received telegrams from the chairman of the Missouri Judge Advocates Association, the president of the Missouri department of the Reserve Officers Association, and from the representative of the national organization of the Reserve Officers Association. I know that such telegrams are not of particular interest to other Members of the Senate, but I mention them as showing the support for the amendment in my own State, and I dare say if any Member of this body has any doubt whether there is similar support in his own State, he can assure himself by contacting similar representatives at home.

As I have said, Mr. President, it is important to note that these members of the Reserve Officers Association served in the Army as commissioned officers. It may be thought that they had the commissioned officers' point of view, and that therefore they would not want to subject other commissioned officers serving in the Army to these penalties and render them subject to trial. But I think it is obvious from the position they take that their fundamental conception of justice has been outraged by things they have seen taking place.

I received a telegram from the Reserve Officers Association of the United States—that is the national association—reading as follows:

Reserve Officers Association of the United States, by mandate of national convention, urges passage of military justice reform legislation in substance as contained in H. R. 2575. Urge adoption your proposed amendment to selective service bill.

The Board of Governors of the Missouri Bar Association, on January 30, 1948, passed this resolution:

Whereas during and subsequent to the recent war there were widespread charges of abuse in the administration of military justice; and

Whereas at the request of the American Bar Association the Secretary of War appointed a committee of distinguished American lawyers, which came to be known as the Vanderbilt Committee, to conduct an inquiry into such charges; and

Whereas many of the recommendations which were contained in the report of the Vanderbilt Committee were embodied in a War Department bill to improve the administration of military justice, known as H. R. 2575, and which bill was thoroughly considered, amended, and approved as amended by the House Committee on Armed Services on the recommendation of its legal subcommittee, which had conducted extensive hearings on said bill; and

Whereas said bill, as amended, was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives of the United States on January 15, 1948; and

Whereas said bill, as now amended and passed by the House, includes substantially all of the important recommendations of the Vanderbilt Committee and would appear to remove the principal causes for complaints against the administration of military justice and has been unanimously approved by the special committee of the Missouri bar on military justice: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Governors of the Missouri Bar hereby approves and urges the passage by the Senate of the United States of H. R. 2575 as passed by the House.

Since my amendment was offered I have received notice from the national headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of World War II, and the American Legion that these organizations support the amendment and earnestly urge its passage by the Senate.

The Congress has a duty to the young men of the United States when they are inducted into a peacetime army, and also it has a duty to the parents of these young men to provide a system of military justice that will guarantee a fair trial and assure the judicial safeguards cherished in the American system of jurisprudence. It is not enough to say we will get to this later. We have had investigations. We have had reports. The proposals contained in this amendment are the result of the most extensive study of military justice ever made in the history of the United States. The House has passed the bill. What we need now is action in the Senate. If the Congress has time to pass legislation to take these young men from their homes and bring them into the Army, it has time, Mr. President, to pass legislation to give them a square deal.

I urge the immediate adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, as part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials bearing on the subject. One is from the Sun, of Baltimore, of Thursday, June 3, 1948, headed "The points at issue in courts-martial reform," and the second is from the St. Louis Star-Times of June 4, 1948, headed "The courts-martial bill."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 3, 1948]

THE POINTS AT ISSUE IN COURTS-MARTIAL REFORM

A bill to revise Army courts martial was passed by the House of Representatives on

January 15 and since then has been in the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. This bill follows in general the recommendations of a committee appointed by the Secretary of War and composed of eminent members of the American Bar Association, including, among others, Judge Morris A. Soper, of this city.

In the main, the War Department accepted the recommendations of the committee. But it took strong exception to one which proposed that the Judge Advocate General's Department be made an agency independent of the field command, be given a separate system of promotions and also the right to remit, reduce, or suspend the sentences of courts martial. Over the objections of the War Department, the House added this provision as an amendment to the bill. It is still the chief subject of contention.

The purpose of the amendment is obvious. In its investigation, the bar-association committee found that field commanders frequently dominated the courts in the rendition of their judgments. The setting up of the Judge Advocate General's Department as an independent agency was designed to prevent such domination.

The War Department's contention is that military justice, as contrasted with civilian justice, involves not only justice but the morale of the Army, which is essential to winning wars. What might be regarded as a severe sentence in the case of a civilian is justified in that of a soldier who, if given a light sentence, would prefer to serve it rather than risk his life in battle. To deprive a field commander of control over courts martial is, therefore, in the eyes of military men, to weaken his authority over his men. Opposition to the proposal was expressed both by General Eisenhower and the then Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, himself a lawyer and a jurist.

Granted the impressiveness of these witnesses, the argument is not entirely convincing. Nothing has been presented to disprove that the very insistence of the field commander's claim to control the Judge Advocate General's Department reveals a desire on his part not only to be the accuser but also the judge. Any such system is repugnant to the civilian's conception of justice and, in time of war, the vast majority of our armed forces are civilians temporarily wearing the uniform.

The existence of the system serves to encourage the cynical view that courts martial often have been used not primarily to dispense justice but to impose discipline according to the dictates and whims of the field commander. It may well be asked whether this belief, rightly or wrongly held, is not worse for the Army's morale than the transfer of a field commander's judicial function to an independent agency especially trained for the work.

Furthermore, there is no reason to assume that an independent Judge Advocate General's Department, headed by officers of the Regular Army, would be any less concerned than field commanders with preserving the Army's morale.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of June 4, 1948]

THE COURTS-MARTIAL BILL

Veterans of World War II lost little time at the close of hostilities voicing their complaints against the courts-martial system which, they said, resulted in many miscarriages of justice for enlisted men. A bill designed to meet these complaints was introduced in the House last year and in January of this year received the approval of the Armed Services Committee. Today it lies buried in the Senate, and given little chance of going to a vote at this session.

Phillip A. Maxeiner, St. Louis attorney and chairman of the Missouri Judge Advocates Association, is urging Senator JAMES P. KEM to support a movement to tack the justice bill to the draft bill as an amendment. The measure is important enough to deserve the attention of Senator KEM.

Military men have opposed the section of the bill that sets the judge advocate's division apart from the regular chain of command. This provision is the very heart of the bill. It is designed to eliminate the influence exerted by commanders on courts-martial officers who belong to the lower echelons of brass. It was this pressure that formed the basis of the enlisted men's complaints.

Certainly the ends of justice could best be served by an independent division of Judge Advocates General comprised of men trained in military law and not answerable to area commanders. Before such a court a defendant would not be subject to the whims and animosities of his superior officers, a factor that led many veterans to charge that sentences varied from area to area and justice was on a catch-as-catch-can basis in many sectors.

It has always been important that this slipshod system be reformed, but emphasis is given the matter by the urgency of the defense program. Men should be able to feel when they enter the armed services that they are guaranteed justice before the military courts. Passage of the courts-martial bill should be viewed by Congress as an integral part of the program to put the services in readiness for emergency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. WATKINS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hatch	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, we have listened to a very able presentation by the Senator from Missouri of a subject in which every Member of Congress is vitally interested. I am sure that every Member of Congress has had a personal interest in the question during the war and the few postwar years, because at one time or another every Member of Congress has had called to his attention some trouble in the armed forces involving a member of such forces—court-martial cases, if you will.

An examination of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri indicates that the amendment substantially conforms to the language of the bill passed by the House, House bill 2575. In fact, I should say that it is identical. House bill 2575 was passed by the House on January 15. So far as the House of Representatives is concerned, that bill revises and modernizes, I may say, the courts-martial system in the Army and in the Air Force, but it does not cover the Navy.

In discussing the general problem of courts-martial legislation, which is what House bill 2575 is, and which is what this amendment is, one must recognize the fact that the unification of the armed services which was accomplished during the first session of the Eightieth Congress made it necessary for us to reexamine certain phases of the control of the Military Establishment. By that, I mean all three of its branches.

Almost concurrently with the introduction into the House of House bill 2575, which proposed to amend the Articles of War and thus revise the military justice system of the Army, there was introduced into the House a bill to amend the articles for the government of the Navy. The House Committee on Armed Services during the first session considered and finally favorably reported House bill 2575, which, after some amendment, was then passed by the House of Representatives and sent to the Senate. However, I wish to make it clear that no action was ever taken by the House Committee on the naval courts-martial bills, House bill 3631 and House bill 3687, which had been introduced at about the same time.

It has long been obvious to me as an individual Senator, and I think it is obvious to all other Members of the Senate, that to accomplish reforms in the military justice system of only one of the services would amount to piecemeal legislation, and would not accomplish the true purpose envisioned by the Congress when it passed the unification legislation, nor would it succeed in accomplishing the sort of equilization of benefits and penalties which was visualized by the various distinguished committees of the bar—committees from the American Bar Association, and so forth—which were appointed by the Secretaries of the Army and the Navy to study this problem during and immediately subsequent to World War II.

Personally, Mr. President, I believe there should be a uniform system all through the armed services. I believe that if a man belonging to the Navy commits a certain crime, and if a man in the Air Force commits the same sort of crime, both should be subject to the same sort of procedure for ascertaining guilt, imposing sentence, and so forth.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GURNEY. I prefer not to yield at this time. I wish to complete my statement, before yielding. Then I shall be glad to yield. I hope the Senator will oblige me in that respect, because I believe I have a fairly well-rounded presentation of this matter to make to the Senate.

Consequently, Mr. President, on May 3, 1948, when the lengthy consideration of the manpower problem made it obvious to me that the Committee on Armed Services probably would not have an opportunity at this session properly to study the problems of military justice, again as an individual Senator, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense, and expressed my concern over the fact that the courts-martial proposals of the two services did not provide a uniform system of military justice applicable alike to the enlisted and officer personnel of all three of our services. I then suggested to the Secretary of Defense that it might be well for the Defense Establishment to begin an over-all study with the thought that the Defense Establishment might wish to make a proposal early in the Eighty-first Congress for revision and, what is more important, standardization of the codes which control all the military services. Mr. President, I have just used the words "what is more important," but actually I do not think that is quite correct, because I agree with the Senator from Missouri that a modernized revision of the court-martial systems should be had at as early a date as possible. I think his argument on that point was excellent.

Subsequently, on May 14, 1948, the Secretary of Defense wrote to me and said that, after discussion with the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, they had come to a full agreement that such a study was desirable and should be undertaken. He said further that he had created a committe, composed of a representative of his office, who will act as chairman, and of the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. W. John Kenney; the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Gordon Gray; and the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Eugene Zuckert, which committee has been directed to develop proposals for the establishment of a uniform code of military justice, applicable to the entire National Military Establishment, for submission to the Eighty-first Congress. Since then I have talked to the Secretary of Defense. I have said that we want those conclusions early in January 1949.

About 3 weeks ago, on May 21, 1948, Mr. Forrestal wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives, reiterating the statements he had made to me, stating at the same time that he felt—and I most certainly agree with him—that such a uniform code, if enacted, will have the effect of superseding existing legislation in this field, as well as of superseding any legislation which may be enacted at the present session of Congress.

It seems only logical to me that the problem of the revision of codes for the fundamental control of the Military Establishment is of such consequence that it cannot be lightly considered by the Congress. Further, it certainly must not be hastily tacked onto a bill of such great importance as the manpower bill. I think it has less excuse for being offered at this time. It certainly must not be hastily tacked onto a bill of such great importance as the one now before the Senate, in an effort to enact a piece of legislation which will be repealed by other legislation—soon, I hope—which will probably be submitted and approved at the coming session of Congress, when time will permit careful and complete consideration of the entire problem in the light of the lessons learned after a year and a half under the Unification Act.

For these reasons, and in spite of the sincerity of purpose which I know motivates the Senator from Missouri and other Senators who have spoken on behalf of the amendment, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my letter to Secretary Forrestal, dated May 3, 1948, together with the Secretary's reply under date of May 6.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 3, 1948.

Hon. JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There is presently pending before the Senate Armed Services Committee, a House-passed bill to revise the Articles of War. This measure, should it become law, would be applicable only to those in the Army and Air Forces.

Pending also is a proposal for changing the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

* * * * *

Because these proposals do not provide a uniform system of military justice applicable alike to all three services, I think it would be well to have an over-all study made, and defense establishment proposals ready for the convening of the Eighty-first Congress.

This letter is a personal one from me and gives only my thoughts in the matter. It does not in any way reflect any action that has been taken by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Sincerely yours,

CHAN GURNEY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 6, 1948.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR CHAN: I have your letter of May 3, concerning the possibility of a more nearly uniform system of military justice applicable alike to all three services. We have had a number of discussions concerning the feasibility of such an approach, and it would be my thought that during the period after Congress adjourns, the three services could profitably look into this matter.

I offer the foregoing as my personal and interim comment. I intend to circulate copies of your letter to the Secretaries of the three Departments, for their comments—and I shall then write you again with further reference to this matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks another letter dated May 14, 1948, from Secretary Forrestal, stating that he has appointed a committee, which he names, along with a letter addressed by him to the chairman of the House committee under date of May 21.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 14, 1948.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: This is with further reference to your letter of May 3, 1948, suggesting that the National Military Establishment study the possibility of developing a uniform system of military justice, which would be applicable alike to all three services, and submit proposals with respect thereto at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress.

Since my earlier communication to you, I have discussed this matter with the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and we are in entire agreement that such a study is desirable and should be undertaken. As a result, I am establishing a committee which will be comprised of a representative of this office, who will serve as chairman, and of Under Secretary of the Navy Kenney, Assistant Secretary of the Army Gray, and Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert.

We will make every effort to develop proposals for a uniform code of military justice applicable to the entire National Military Establishment in time for submission to the Eighty-first Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 21, 1948.

Hon. WALTER B. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: I have recently discussed with the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force the general situation confronting us in the field of military justice. All of us are agreed that there is a real need for a uniform code of military justice applicable to the entire National Military Establishment.

Accordingly, I am establishing a committee to work out such a code, the committee to be comprised of a representative of this office who will serve as chairman, and Under Secretary of the Navy Kenney, Assistant Secretary of the Army Gray, and Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert. This committee will be instructed to make every effort to develop proposals for a uniform code of military justice in time for submission to the Eighty-first Congress.

Such a uniform code, if enacted, will, of course, have the effect of superseding existing legislation in this field, as well as any legislation which may be enacted at the present session of Congress.

There is one aspect of this matter that I should like to mention at this time. I have reference to the situation confronting the Air Force. Some legislation to provide a more explicit basis for the handling of military justice cases by the Air Force, especially with respect to appellate review, seems to be necessary. What I have in mind might properly be described as stopgap legislation, pending the enactment of a unified code. I hope that your committee will see its way clear to enact such stopgap legislation at the present session.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Mr. GURNEY. I assure the Senator from Missouri and other Senators that I am as thoroughly convinced as he is that the court-martial system should be

brought up to date. I am equally convinced there should be uniform procedure in the three services. For instance, in the Navy at the present time a court-martial sentence is finally and completely approved by the Secretary of the Navy. In the Army and in the Air Force that practice does not obtain. Courts martial are concluded in the Judge Advocate General's Department by the Judge Advocate General himself. Possibly the Secretary of each of the services should finally approve the sentences, at least in major cases.

There is another matter to which I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri. That is the fact that the system now proposed would take away from the commanding officer the control, a control which he probably should not have completely, of disciplinary action. In other words, at the front, a man who possibly did not want to go forward could resist an order to do so and thereupon be charged with the crime of retreating in the face of an enemy. As I understand, the pending amendment would possibly turn him over to the jurisdiction of the new Judge Advocate Court set up by the House bill and by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri. I think those two extremes, if they may be called such, should be dove-tailed.

I also want to make the point that the amendment has not had a chance for consideration at all by our committee. I do not believe the Senate wants to by-pass the committee on a piece of legislation such as this. Certainly I do not think the Senate wants to by-pass the committee, for the very specific reason that this matter is so important to the armed forces.

The court-martial system, with the summary courts and everything else, is vital for discipline in the Army. Our committee has not even had one extra day in which to study the proposal. I promise the Senator and the Senate that if I have anything to do with outlining work for the Armed Services Committee, this measure will be the first to be taken up in January 1949.

I hope the pending amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a number of questions?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. In the first place I desire to express my appreciation, which I know is shared by the other Members of the Senate, of the fine work done by the Senator from South Dakota and his associates on the Armed Services Committee. All Senators who have had contact with that committee know of the industry, the skill, and the devotion to duty exhibited throughout the session by members of that committee. I certainly do not want anything I have said or that I shall hereafter say to be construed as the slightest criticism of the Armed Services Committee. The committee enjoys my confidence and the confidence generally of the other Members of the Senate. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if it is not true that the House passed its bill on January 15 of this year?

Mr. GURNEY. That is entirely correct. I so stated.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that since January 15 there has been nothing except the pressure of other duties to prevent a hearing by the Senate committee?

Mr. GURNEY. There was the additional reason, as the Senator knows from his membership on other committees, that there are many times when the chairman calls a meeting but is unable to get a quorum, Senators being in attendance upon other equally important meetings.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if it is not true that extensive hearings were held in the House?

Mr. GURNEY. I know that hearings were held; how extensive they were I do not know.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower, and a large number of other representatives of the War Department appeared, and that the criticisms the Senator has made of the pending amendment were thoroughly investigated and fully stated, and that despite the criticisms, the House committee still reported favorably on the bill which was then in the House and which the House promptly passed?

Mr. GURNEY. In answer to that question, which is quite a long one, I may say that the Secretaries of War and Air, and the Chiefs of Staff appeared, as well as officers of the Judge Advocate General's office, and that while there was almost complete agreement on certain sections or phases of the House bill, there were certain keen disappointments on the part of the armed services by reason of other provisions of the bill. They severely criticized some sections of it and questioned whether it would go a long way toward breaking down the disciplinary system in the Army and the Air Force.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if any of the heads of departments, or any responsible officers, have suggested to him that any criticisms presented to the House were thoroughly aired there.

Mr. GURNEY. I think it is correct to say that they were thoroughly aired there, but I must remind the Senator that the House committee was not unanimous in reporting the bill.

Mr. KEM. I think the bill, when subsequently reported, was unanimously passed by the House, was it not?

Mr. GURNEY. I think that is correct.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has had something to say about the fact that the amendment does not cover the Navy. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the administration of justice at sea, and under conditions with which the Navy has to meet, is in substantial respects different from its administration by the Army on land.

Mr. GURNEY. That is entirely correct. Nevertheless, I am thoroughly convinced that we should have unification, so far as we can achieve it. We now have unification of the Air Transport Command. I am hoping that we shall have unification of water transportation as between the Navy and the Army. A subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee has been appointed to look into the problem of unification of the Medical Corps. I claim that a man in the Navy who becomes sick is just as sick as is a man in the Army who becomes sick. He requires the same kind of doctors to take care of him. So I am sincere in my statement when I say that if a high crime be committed in any branch of the service, the accused should be tried in the same way and should receive the same kind of sentence. I am not sure that can be accomplished if this amendment should be adopted and the Navy should continue to operate under its old, outmoded system.

Mr. KEM. Is there any reason whatsoever why the amendment could not be supplemented by additional legislation expanding its coverage to the Navy Department?

Mr. GURNEY. I will answer, very frankly, that it could. But our committee has not had an opportunity to study it. We do not know whether this amendment is one which we would recommend for a revised court-martial system in the Army.

Mr. KEM. So far as the objection that it does not cover the Navy is concerned, will not the Senator agree that that objection might be overcome at the next session by supplemental legislation?

Mr. GURNEY. It could be, but I cannot admit at this time that the Senator's amendment will be accepted by the Senate today.

Mr. KEM. No. I am not sure it will be accepted. But any Member of the Senate who wants to see justice done to members of the armed forces who are taken in the draft will vote for the amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. No member of the Armed Services Committee has ever even read it. It is long and complicated. It would take midnight oil to read and understand every section of it.

Mr. KEM. I think the chairman of the Armed Services Committee is covering a little too much territory. I have had some very intelligent discussions with members of his committee in regard to the amendment, and they exhibited very accurate knowledge of its provisions.

I should like to ask the Senator this question: Has the chairman of the Armed Services Committee not found that there is an insistent demand on the part of the American people for changes in the administration of military justice?

Mr. GURNEY. I cannot say that there is an insistent demand on the part of the American people. There is a very insistent demand from former officers in the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army, Air, and Navy Departments. I think those men are best qualified to say whether there should be a

revision. I think theirs would be the best evidence. But there is not a demand from the people all over the country.

Mr. KEM. Is there any group of our people who could offer informed criticism to better advantage than could the persons the Senator has just mentioned?

Mr. GURNEY. I am quite sure the best evidence would come from actually qualified lawyers who were members of the lawyers' division in the armed forces during the war when they had a large number of cases. But that does not relieve me of my responsibility as a Member of the Senate to see to it that the course of conduct of the armed forces is not broken down so that the Army, Navy, and Air Force cannot properly protect the Nation, because I know that the court-martial system is a very vital part of our whole military machine, and we cannot shirk our responsibility in that connection. I think we would be shirking it if we should adopt this amendment without a "look-see" into every paragraph of it.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator feel that he will fail to perform his responsibility if he does not undertake to meet a substantial objection which is being made to the present system of military justice before he drafts into the armed forces large numbers of additional young men?

Mr. GURNEY. No. I am quite convinced that I would not be shirking my responsibility. I think our troubles came during a period of stress when the men were overseas and fighting was in progress. But if we were very hopeful that there would not be any fighting, if we could undertake the work inside of 6 months, with the concurrence of the House in the idea that revision is necessary, I am sure we could quickly evolve a bill in committee which we could recommend to the Senate. At this time we are not in position to recommend or to disapprove this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have not heard all the discussion, but I have heard the colloquy which has just taken place. As one member of the Committee on Armed Services I have been carrying on a correspondence with several lawyers in different cities who are critical of the House bill to which reference has been made and who want it changed by the Senate committee. As a committee we have not taken the opportunity to go over the bill line by line and paragraph by paragraph. I certainly support the position of the chairman of the committee in believing that this is one of the first tasks of the committee in the coming year, but the amendment, merely because the House has passed it in the form of a bill, should not be attached blindfold, to the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. Does he feel that if the Senate takes a bill which has been prepared by a distinguished committee of American lawyers and jurists, headed by the Honorable Arthur T. Vanderbilt, a bill which has passed the House after extended and extensive inquiry there, a bill which has been endorsed by the American Bar Association, in principle, and by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, and by local and State bar associations, it would be taking such a bill blindfolded?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not say, as a very humble lawyer, that I was taking it blindfolded, but I would like to see a layman's criticism on the subject of courts martial——

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I wanted to answer the question of the Senator from Missouri by saying that the amendment which is now before the Senate was not prepared in its entirety by a group of very able lawyers of the American Bar Association. It came down from the Department. Parts of it were prepared by the American Bar group, but not all of it. Some of it was added by the House committee.

Mr. KEM. It has been endorsed by that body.

Mr. GURNEY. It is a joint effort of three or four organizations. Therefore it might be better and it might be worse. The committee has a right to change the language of a House-passed bill. I am personally not ready to say at this time that we should accept it as written.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I have been under pressure in the State of Kansas from Reserve officers. My administrative assistant was in the Judge Advocate General's division in World War II. In that way I feel pressure from Reserve officers who, I think, have a good proposal. It would help to relieve the pressure if I might have the assurance of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other members of the Armed Services Committee, that if the Kem amendment is not accepted, the question will be given early, earnest, and vigorous attention by the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator was not present when I outlined what steps had been taken to assure the Senate that this court-martial question would be gone into. First, we have asked the Secretary of Defense to set up a board and make a recommendation uniform as between the three branches. Second, he has replied that he has set up a joint committee, under the general idea of the Unification Act, composed of assistant secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and they are to report and have ready their ideas on this subject, in a uniform way, by the 1st of January.

I assure the Senator from Kansas and other Senators that if we should come back into session this summer I would recommend to our committee that we take the matter up for consideration during the summer session. If not, I assure the Senator we will take it up as the main order of business, if I am here and have any control over what may be taken up, in January 1949.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from South Dakota lives until next January and the Senator from Kansas lives until next January, we will be here at the next session. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for the assurance, and I am sorry I bothered him and was not present when he explained the situation.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question of the Senator from South Dakota. I think the Senator from South Dakota inferred that the adoption of the amendment would interfere with discipline among troops at the front. I should like to ask him whether under the amendment the commanding officer would not still have the right to prefer charges, and would not still have the right to appoint courts martial.

Mr. GURNEY. I have admitted that I have not read the amendment line by line. In a general way I can say that the answer is "yes" to the question propounded by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. The Senator, not having read the amendment, would not undertake to point out in what way it would interfere with discipline; would he?

Mr. GURNEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator be good enough to point that out?

Mr. GURNEY. I have already pointed it out.

Mr. KEM. At the risk of repetition, will the Senator do it again?

Mr. GURNEY. If the Senator will yield, under the amendment, as I see it, if a crime is committed, charges are preferred by the commanding officer of the particular unit. Immediately the accused is transferred from under the jurisdiction of the commanding officer and given into the jurisdiction of the Judge Advocate General's man who is on the ground. He immediately leaves the command post of the commanding general of the outfit, the one who might have the responsibility of going ahead in a particular engagement. I said that before, and I repeat it.

Mr. KEM. The commanding officer would still have the right to appoint the court and prefer the charges. Is not that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. I am informed by my assistant—I have not read the bill—that the commanding officer would appoint the court.

Mr. KEM. And prefer the charges?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator another question. In view of the admitted dissatisfaction with the administration of military justice under existing law, and in view of the fact that we are about to undertake something that has never been done before in the history of the United States, namely, a draft in peacetime, would it not be advisable for the Congress to meet the objections of these thousands of reserve officers, and thousands of parents who are really concerned about what is to be done to their sons when they are taken into the

Army? Would it not be advisable for us to meet this very reasonable objection and apprehension by adopting this amendment?

Mr. GURNEY. I think we will meet our responsibility. I told the Senator our committee would make the matter the first order of business.

I may, in response to the Senator's suggestion say that this is not the first time a draft has been made in peacetime. The Draft Act was originally passed in 1940, in peacetime. Our Army has had much experience with criminal prosecutions in the Army as a result of the war. Our committee wants to have a chance to examine the bill to which the Senator has been referring, and see that no injustice is done to the incoming selectees or volunteers, just as we want to be sure they are not being done an injustice by the present law.

Mr. KEM. If the Senator is really concerned about injustice to the incoming selectees and draftees, would he not be willing to accept this amendment and allow it to be attached to the bill, in order to assure himself that no man will be sent to the gallows who should not be executed, that no man will be sent to a long term of penal servitude who should not be, during the period between the passage of the draft law and its effective date, and the time, some time in the year 1949, when the Senate committee can act on this matter? Why not accept this amendment and let it be incorporated in the draft bill? Why not assure the parents of these young men that they are going to have a square deal when they are taken into the Army, and when the Senate committee has a chance to study the matter further, make such amendments and suggestions and consolidations as it sees fit?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not believe any of our boys were sent to the gallows unjustly during the last war, or World War I. I think the corrections which should be made in the court-martial system are not of that serious a nature. I would say the main ones are minor in nature, merely affecting matters of procedure. To my personal knowledge I have not found that a major punishment was inflicted which was not absolutely reviewed from stem to stern. If the Senator knows of any such case I am sure our committee would be glad to go into it.

Mr. KEM. To refresh the Senator's recollection, I call his attention to one class of cases. Under existing law a lesser punishment than death or life imprisonment for murder or rape has not been provided. In other words, any soldier charged with those crimes suffers the punishment of death or life imprisonment under the present law as a matter of course. Surely that is a situation which should be corrected, and corrected instanter, without any further delay.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, of course we all realize that discipline is necessary in the United States military forces. I can therefore understand the reluctance of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to accept an amendment which he does not thoroughly understand. I feel constrained, however, to speak in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], for the reason that in the last several generations there has not been any fundamental change in the methods of court-martial procedure which were originally adapted from the old English system. It is an antiquated system. It has never been revised in the light of the discipline now necessary in the Army and compatible with our increased education and understanding—and with the character of civilian punishment for like crimes.

I desire to call attention to two provisions in the report made by the Committee on Armed Services of the House after studying the bill, and we understand it was thoroughly studied by that committee.

First, it is proposed that enlisted men be authorized to sit as members of the courts-martial. They sit on every other jury in the world, on grand juries, and on important matters of the country, when they are not in the Army. There seems no valid reason to suppose they are not capable of sitting on juries in the Army.

Another provision is that the accused, if he so desires, may have counsel at the pretrial investigation. Counsel for an accused is accepted everywhere. It is not a question of rules and regulations of the Army. It is a question of simple justice.

All the veterans' organizations in the United States, I am informed, are in favor of the amendment, including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled Veterans. They have all served in the Army or in the military forces and they understand what is involved.

I served in the Army from a buck private to sergeant and then became an officer. My experience in that connection leads me to substantiate what my colleague, the Senator from Missouri has said, that the system, all the way through, is antiquated and needs revising.

As I have said, we all know the subject has been thoroughly studied, so in my opinion there is no reason why the amendment should not be adopted at this time.

In closing, I wish to say that it is time the Congress of the United States should show an interest in the welfare of the military service personnel, especially since we are about to pass drastic legislation for the further building up of our military organization. Enactment of the legislation covered by the amendment will give prospective military men and the fathers and mothers of the Nation added confidence that their sons and daughters will receive fair treatment and just consideration.

I shall vote for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to support the Kem amendment providing for a revision of the court-martial system. Before I give my reasons, I wish to commend the Senator from Missouri for the able presentation of his argument in support of his own amendment. I join in supporting his amendment for the following reasons:

First, it is generally conceded by almost all informed persons that there is need for considerable revision of our court-martial system. I find men in the armed services, including high officials in the Pentagon Building, all in agreement that we need substantial revisions in the system. In my judgment the very fact that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the various branches of the armed services have been giving attention to this subject is convincing evidence, so far as the Military Establishment itself is concerned, for my contention that revisions are needed.

I point out further, as both the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Nevada have pointed out, that veterans' organizations have undertaken a careful study of this question of court-martial reform and find themselves in support of the amendment pending before us.

Further, I point out that this amendment is the product of the work of a distinguished committee of lawyers, the Vanderbilt committee. They have brought forth a bill which I think is a great improvement over the existing court-martial system.

Another reason for my support of this amendment which I wish to add to this argument is that in the Seventy-ninth Congress I introduced a resolution (S. Res. 56) calling for an investigation of our court-martial system. Time and time again I have urged the Senate to take action on my resolution so that we can come forward with legislation providing needed reforms in the court-martial system. I was unable even to obtain a hearing on that resolution (S. Res. 56) in the Seventy-ninth Congress, although day after day from my desk on the floor of the Senate I placed in the RECORD convincing evidence of the need for a revision of the court-martial system. I reintroduced that resolution in the Eightieth Congress. The resolution is still pending before the Armed Services Committee. I have pleaded time and time again for consideration of the resolution, and for some action on it. I failed to even secure hearings on it.

I respectfully submit that to me the argument that further time ought to be extended to the Senate to consider this court-martial bill because we have not up until this time taken action on it is not impressive. The fact is that we have been delinquent as a body of the Congress in not taking action on court-martial legislation long before this. In my humble judgment a subcommittee could have been appointed months ago to take under consideration my resolution calling for an investigation of the court-martial system. I do not think it is a sound argument now, when we have before us a bill which has been drafted by a committee of distinguished lawyers such as the Vanderbilt Committee to say that the bill should not be adopted because the Senate committee has not held hearings on it. This bill has had extensive hearings in the House and was

passed by an overwhelming vote of approval by the House. It is supported by the veterans' organizations. It is approved, I am informed, at least in principle, by the American Bar Association. The Senator from Missouri has pointed out that several State bar associations have endorsed it after careful committee study. I claim that this bill has been so carefully prepared that it is deserving of a trial. We can change it if by experience it develops that it needs change.

The fact that we have not held hearings in the Senate is our own fault. I agree with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Nevada that we have a responsibility to the men who are to be brought into the armed services under the peacetime draft, and to the parents of those men, to proceed now with some improvements in the court-martial system. This bill will meet that need.

I believe that the adoption of this particular amendment at this time would have the advantage of giving us an opportunity in the next year to observe the operation of the suggested changes in the court-martial system. It will take at least a year to hold hearings and come forward with any other bill dealing with the court-martial system. The fact that the amendment does not include all the services I think is regrettable. Nevertheless, I do not believe that fact alone justifies rejecting the amendment. The amendment will cover the branch of the service which will take the largest number of men in the draft. It is particularly devised for the Army. It is the Army which is in the greatest need of court-martial revision although the Navy can stand some too. I think we can use it as an experiment, so to speak, in observing how the changes provided in this amendment, and proposed by the Vanderbilt committee, will actually work in practice. I think we need some experience to go on before we enact our final court-martial bill. I agree that this probably will not be the final court-martial bill, but I think there is no denying the fact that this amendment will provide many improvements over the present handling of courts martial. Therefore I submit that we ought to adopt the Kem amendment for a trial period. Then, as we proceed with the long delayed investigation of the court martial system in the Senate committee next year, we shall be in a position to make direct observations as to the operation of this amendment once it is put into practice. I think that is what we need. We need the type of investigation which will make it possible for us to observe courts martial in actual operation under such procedural changes as this amendment proposes.

As the author of the resolution for an investigation of courts martial, introduced in two Congresses, I have collected a great wealth of material on courts-martial abuses. I made that material available to a staff member of the Vanderbilt committee, and he told me that he found it of great value in the work of that committee when it came to drafting the recommendations which are embodied in this amendment.

Contrary to the opinion held by many, the greatest abuses in the court-martial system are not to be found in the combat zone. They are not to be found in the courts martial actually operating among troops going into battle, or in a combat area. Our real court-martial problems, and most of the abuses which have developed under the court-martial system, are to be found in camps in this country or in camps where our soldiers were kept abroad for long periods of time before they were sent into action. There have been many miscarriages of justice under the existing court-martial system. Many such abuses developed in England during that long period of time that our soldiers were there prior to the invasion of Europe.

I digress a moment to point out that I have talked with some of those who have been appointed to boards of review. When one talks with them he finds that they do not give the operation of our court-martial system a clean bill of health. Those who have talked to me have told me that their examination of the court-martial system show there have been miscarriages of justice. Yes, Mr. President, any fair investigation will show that there have been many miscarriages of justice. It has been found, for example, that many of the sentences have been highly arbitrary and unjustified. There have also been instances in which there was no adequate proof of a man's guilt.

After all, we have a citizens' army in America, and the basic civilian rights of our citizens to a fair trial ought to carry forward into the Army, insofar as common law judicial processes involving the guilt-finding process are concerned.

In talking with some of the members of boards of review, I find the general opinion that we ought to change in many respects the existing procedure. The Vanderbilt committee took advantage of the point of view of many men familiar with court-martial problems and has adopted many of their suggestions. Those suggestions are now embodied in the pending amendment.

Let me make one further point. I have yet to talk with the first lawyer who served in the armed forces during the last war, and who has now returned to civilian life, who does not say that the court-martial system needs drastic revision. There may be some who hold a contrary view, but if there are any, I have not talked with them.

As the author of the resolution in two sessions of Congress seeking to investigate courts martial, I have talked with a great many lawyers who served in the armed forces. I have found them unanimously of the opinion that revisions along the line of the suggestions found in the Vanderbilt committee report should be adopted by the Congress. Therefore, because I believe that the adoption of the Kem amendment at this time would give us a period for observing the operation of the amendment in practice before we undertake the enactment of a final court-martial law applicable to all the services, I shall support the pending amendment.

I close by saying that the fault for no action in passing court-martial legislation up until this time is ours. We now have a report, and a bill which has widespread support not only among distinguished lawyers, but among the veterans' organizations themselves. I believe that we ought to adopt the Kem amendment for a trial period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hope we may have a vote now on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

If Senators wish to make remarks on other subjects or to have insertions made in the RECORD, I promise to yield for that purpose immediately following the vote on the amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if I could ask the Senator from South Dakota a question in connection with the amendment. Has the Senator stated on the floor that the question of revision of the court-martial procedure will, in his opinion, receive the immediate attention of his committee, at the beginning of the next Congress?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. We promise to make it the first order of business, not only in the next Congress, but if we come back for a session during the summer, or at any other time, we shall take it up then. We are anxious to modernize the court-martial system in all three branches of the armed services. The amendment handles it for the Army and Air only.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely want to say that I am very much convinced that the court-martial system of the Army needs revision, extensive revision, both in detail and in philosophy, in many instances. I am prepared to support a considered proposal to rewrite the court-martial procedure and the philosophy upon which it is based.

I have the feeling, however, that the amendment, while it may have received extensive consideration in the other body, has apparently not received the consideration in this body that I believe such a major step in human justice in the armed forces demands. I shall therefore vote against the amendment, not because I am against the principle of the reorientation of the court-martial philosophy, but because I do not feel adequately informed upon the amendment and its repercussions upon the system of justice in the Army and the Air Force to justify an affirmative vote at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announced that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official committee business and is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New

Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is temporarily detained on official business and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Sparkman
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Cain	Kem	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Lodge	Thye
Dworshak	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	Malone	Umstead
Ecton	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Myers	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Gurney	O'Conor
Ball	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Byrd	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Capper	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	Lucas	Russell
Cordon	McClellan	Saltonstall
Donnell	McFarland	Smith
Ellender	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Feazel	McKellar	Tydings
Ferguson	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Murray	White

NOT VOTING—13

Bridges	Kilgore	Wagner
Bushfield	McCarran	Wiley
Connally	Magnuson	Wilson
Downey	Martin	
Jenner	Taylor	

So Mr. KEM'S amendment was agreed to.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER FLOOD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the protection of our internal economy, and safeguarding it from disasters which affect the national security, is of equal importance with programs for the maintenance of our armed might.

The serious disaster which has occurred in the Northwest bears on this point. The great flood which has been sweeping down the Columbia River and its tributaries has resulted in millions of dollars of damage. It has killed and injured people and destroyed valuable property in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and in my own State of Montana. The damages to property will exceed $100,000,000. The loss of life and the disruption of families of course cannot be measured in dollars. More than 100,000 families have been displaced, and the end has not yet been reached. The Columbia River is again rising. The danger is not over.

The Governors of Idaho and Washington have found it desirable to proclaim a state of emergency in certain areas. The Red Cross and the military services are rendering heroic service in the field. The home of the atomic energy plant, Richland, Wash., has been endangered.

There has not been such a destructive flood on the Columbia since 1894. Then the flood crest was 1,200,000 cubic feet per second. This year it exceeded 1,000,000 feet. The valleys have been built up greatly in the past 54 years, so the damage is naturally much greater at this time.

The main cause for the flood seems to have been an unusually warm spring in the upper Columbia area, with heavy snow melt and glacial melt, together with inadequate controls in the upper reaches. Heavy rain on the lower tributaries contributed to the situation from Montana down through Idaho and Washington to Oregon. Such a combination of conditions should reasonably be anticipated in any over-all study of the Columbia River system.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that if a comprehensive plan for the control and development of the Columbia River and its tributaries had been in operation, and such a program had been energetically carried out, the great damage now being created by the Columbia River floods could have been completely avoided or, at least, held to a minimum of damage. The wholesale destruction, social dislocation, and economic loss which have been caused by this flood is a reflection on the intelligence and capacity of the Congress to meet the problem of major floods in America.

No task of the Federal Government is more important than the control and development of the Nation's great river systems. The annual loss of rich top soil, which is our greatest asset, is a national disgrace. Because of the pressure of powerful lobbies in Washington, a comprehensive, integrated program for the control and development of the Columbia and its headwaters thus far has been blocked. No one can now dispute that such a program is the only effective way of meeting these recurring floods and disasters. That has been completely demonstrated by the record of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The great stumbling block seems to be power. If the Congress would surrender to the private power lobby and provide a program of river valley development under which all electrical power developed should be sold direct to the private utilities at the bus bars, the fight against the proposed river authorities would end immediately. Such a program, of course, would be a complete abandonment of the public interest and the national welfare.

Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial published in the Washington Post of June 2, entitled "Disaster in the West."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISASTER IN THE WEST

One outgrowth of the tragedy that has overtaken communities along the Columbia River in Oregon may be an intensified demand for a Columbia Valley Authority to place the problem of flood control on a regional rather than local basis. No such ex post facto movement can be much consolation to families which have suffered bereavement or have lost their homes or farmlands in the swirling rampage of the Columbia. But if the disaster serves as a dramatic though terrifying lesson as to what must eventually be done, then the $75,000,000 or more damage is not a total loss.

The Oregon floods and those now occurring along the Fraser River in British Columbia are in many respects symbolic of a sick land, stripped of its forest and grass cover and with little to prevent the rapid run-off of excessive rainfall. There are, of course, other complications in these areas. But the pattern is familiar. Every year it is repeated somewhere in the United States, with accompanying loss of life and property and thousands of tons of precious topsoil.

So far it is not possible to control the vagaries of the weather. There is no guaranty that, even if an extensive system of dams were built far up tributaries, with accompanying valley-wide soil and forest conservation measures, that a surprise cloudburst might not cause some damage. But to a substantial degree it is possible to control the effects of the weather, if not the weather itself, by eliminating an accumulation of bad land-use practices. There is the experience of the Tennessee Valley Authority to guide other efforts. Among its other accomplishments the TVA program unquestionably has served to reduce flood crests and minimize damage.

The one great point which TVA has driven home convincingly, it seems to us, is that no little plan will do. If the conservation of the country's resources now imperiled by floods is to be really effective, then it must be accomplished on a broad basis, resolving interagency conflicts through a single authority with decentralized operations. The best form of sympathy for the Oregon victims, aside from immediate relief, is to hasten meaningful steps to see that this appalling waste is not repeated.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this editorial is far more than a sympathetic expression of concern for the families which have suffered bereavement or have lost their homes or farmlands in the swirling rampage of the Columbia. It is a very real expression of concern for the future—a recognition of the demand of the Northwest now being echoed here in Washington that this problem must be met as a national duty.

The editorial suggests that the problem of flood control must be placed on a regional, rather than a local, basis. It says:

> If the conservation of the country's resources now imperiled by floods is to be really effective, then it must be accomplished on a broad basis, resolving interagency conflicts with decentralized operations. The best form of sympathy for the Oregon victims—

And those in Washington, Idaho, and Montana, I might add—

> aside from immediate relief, is to hasten meaningful steps to see that this appalling waste is not repeated.

It says further:

> The one great point which TVA has driven home convincingly is that no little plan will do.

It suggests that there may be an intensified demand for a Columbia Basin Authority.

I believe that such an authority would have had the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, which has been agitated for a quarter of a century, constructed by now. That dam would hold back 3,000,000 acre-feet of water and is probably one of the biggest storage reservoirs that will be constructed on the Columbia River system. It took a long time to get authorization for it through Congress. It was only the other day that the House cut the Budget Bureau's figure for next year's work. I believe that the Senate should not only restore the cut but should increase the amount and speed up the whole western reclamation program. The Hungry Horse storage alone, of course, would not have prevented this vast flood. But it would have lowered the crest to some extent and, together with other projects now contemplated in the Columbia drainage system, will prevent a disaster in the future.

Mr. President, we are approaching the usual time of year when floods on the Missouri are expected. Practically every other year of this decade has seen a flood there. I have been informed that the danger in the Missouri Valley is not great this year. I hope that will turn out to be true. As Senators know, I have been concerned with this flood danger on the Missouri for some time. I have not been satisfied with the past work of the Army engineers in corseting and tightening the river for navigation and relying on mudbanks to stop overflow in floodtime. The farm leaders of Missouri pointed out last year that the navigation works have produced this result in the State of Missouri: That a flow of 300,000 second-feet in 1929 would cause no floods, but in 1944, a flow of 200,000 second-feet caused a severe flood. The 1947 floods seem to have indicated the same increasing tendency of the river to get out of its corseting that the Army engineers have spent so much money on.

In March of this year, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 197. It was a resolution for the creation of a review board to reexamine the hasty compromises between navigation and irrigation that were made in the Omaha compromise of 1944. That board was to find out about the operation of flood control; also what the farmers would have to pay for water; what the power customers would have to pay for power; and what use the navigation works and dams would be. I believe that the people of the Missouri Valley are in for a great shock when they find out what these figures are going to be.

The engineering review board would be obligated to propose a new plan and program for the river on the basis of established facts in regard to costs of water for the several purposes.

That measure—Senate Joint Resolution 197—was introduced by me on March 16. It was referred to the Committee on Public Works. No hearings have been held on it. As far as I know, no hearings have been scheduled for it. I regret this exceedingly.

I do not believe that we can ride along with the present mess in the Missouri, any more than we can ride along with a situation where a whole town can be flooded without warning in Oregon. Nobody with responsibility seems to have been in a position to warn the families of Vanport ahead of time of their danger.

The evidence of danger on the Missouri is already available. It is not only direct danger to life; it is also danger to the hopes of the people, to their farms, their livelihoods, and the future of their children. Rather than wait until the damage is done, as it was at Vanport, before warning the people, the Congress should do its warning job—and its correction job—now. Later, it will be too late.

Mr. President, I ask that a very able column by Marquis Childs, discussing this subject, appearing in the Washington Post of June 3, 1948, be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

(By Marquis Childs)

The terrible floods in the Northwest are a kind of handwriting on the wall for anyone who cares to read. It is a warning, in words a mile high, of the cost of failure.

The tragedy in Oregon, so vividly described in the press and on the radio, comes in the immediate aftermath of another event that put Oregon in the headlines. That was the Republican primary fiercely contested by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and Harold Stassen.

They talked about housing. They talked about the development of river basins and flood control. And then the rains came and the floods came, to show that promises are empty unless they are backed by more than words.

Under the pressure of high-priced lobbyists, the Republican Congress is chipping away at the Tennessee Valley Authority. TVA has demonstrated that it can control devastating floods and at the same time produce low-cost power to benefit a whole region. On at least three different occasions the TVA system has functioned to prevent damage from flood waters.

It is fairly clear that only through such an over-all coordinated approach as TVA can the job on our river valleys be done. Only through such an all-out attack can the evils of erosion be checked and the damage done by man be overcome.

The Army engineers have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on flood control over many, many years, and yet year after year the headlines tell of mounting flood damage. The Army engineers are an efficient corps, but no amount of efficiency can compensate for the pick-and-choose tactics that result from the grab bag of flood control held out by Congress.

Stassen, in his campaign in Oregon, flatly opposed regional authorities for river basins. Dewey at first said he favored "development on a regional basis for the drainage valleys of the Missouri, Columbia, and the Willamette Rivers." Two days later, however, he announced that a Missouri or a Columbia River Valley Authority would be the equivalent of "tyranny." In Oregon they explain this sudden shift by saying that Dewey got some pointed prompting from David B. Simpson, a Portland realtor, who was one of the New York Governor's principal backers.

A Columbia Valley Authority is one of the hot issues in Oregon politics. Ardent boosters for a CVA want a system of storage reservoirs near the headwaters of the river. These storage basins would back the surplus water and release it gradually. The possibility of a disaster like that at Vanport would be greatly reduced.

This is not merely a wordy argument among politicians. Behind the politicians' promises are men, women, children fleeing for their lives before a wall of dirty water that sweeps down unchecked.

Housing is another issue which sometimes, in political speeches and before congressional committees, has an empty sound. But the refugees who fled from Vanport could tell us something about "housing."

They were living in flimsy, barracks-like apartments built as temporary quarters for the thousands of war workers who came to Oregon's shipyards. Most of them were veterans with their families. They could find no other place to live.

Here in Washington the little band of men who rule the House have decided there shall be no housing legislation from this Congress. They are sabotaging a measure already passed by the Senate.

After long an patient effort, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT got a bill through the Senate providing for a modest minimum of houses to be built with a Government subsidy. Because of this provision in the bill the oligarchy in the House means to kill it.

While the news dispatches said nothing about the schools at Vanport, it is a good guess that they were inadequate or worse. Many States, overwhelmed by the influx of war workers, have been unable to provide enough schoolrooms or enough teachers. The same little band in the House is holding up a bill to grant a minimum of Federal aid for education.

We are going to hear a lot more promises from the politicians. When the two parties gather in Philadelphia to nominate their candidates they will put together platforms, which are traditionally full of promises.

Some day people may begin to wonder a little about the relation between promise and performance. Perhaps even the political carpenters at Philadelphia will think about it a little as they promise and promise and promise.

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR AERONAUTICS PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, there is on the desk House bill 6628, dealing with the lighter-than-air aeronautics program. I ask that the House bill be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by title.

The bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes was read twice by its title.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the language of Senate bill 2464, as reported today from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to study, and plan for, experimental lighter-than-air rigid airship construction and operation. The Commission shall report to the Congress as soon as practicable in the first regular session of the Eighty-first Congress the results of its study with such recommendations for further legislation as it may consider desirable and feasible for the development and operation of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use.

SEC. 2. The United States Maritime Commission, with the consent of the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereon in conducting the study provided for in this act.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the United States Maritime Commission to carry out its functions under this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Maine what is the status of the Senate bill?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senate bill was reported this morning by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was unanimously reported. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are entirely in accord.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was reported only this morning; was it?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not yet on the calendar?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. Unanimous consent will be required for the proposed action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assume that the Members of the Senate have not yet had an opportunity to examine the bill; is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. The bill has been in the Senate for a long time, but has been before the Senate committee, and now it has been reported to the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I mean the Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity to examine the bill as reported by the Senate committee; have they?

Mr. BREWSTER. Not except as they could examine the House bill, which is practically identical with the one now reported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill as now reported by the committee is the same as the bill which was passed by the House; is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; they are practically identical.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Were hearings held on the bill?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was the report unanimous?

Mr. BREWSTER. It was unanimous in both the subcommittee and the full committee.

This matter was taken up with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who apparently is out of the Chamber at this time. I took it up with him, with the idea of having the bill considered following the quorum call.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was because of the temporary absence of the Senator from Illinois that I have asked these questions.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not personally familiar with the measure at all.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maine another question. Inasmuch as the Senate is now working under very great pressure—because the Senate itself meets at an early hour and remains in session until late at night, and several of the Senate committees are meeting at the same time, so that often it is impossible for Members of the Senate to be on the floor of the Senate and to know what is going on, and frequently it is impossible for more than a scattering of the members of a committee to attend the committee hearings—I ask the Senator whether the meeting at which the bill was unanimously approved was a well-attended meeting?

Mr. BREWSTER. There was only 1 of the 13 members absent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 6628 and insert in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2464 as reported today from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6628) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCFARLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2464 is indefinitely postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

INCREASE IN CERTAIN BENEFITS PAYABLE UNDER LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (b) of section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $35 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $12 per week: *Provided, however,* That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $12 per week, he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

SEC. 2. So much of subdivision (c) of section 8 of such act, as amended, as precedes paragraph (13) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Permanent partial disability: In case of disability partial in character but permanent in quality, the compensation shall be 66⅔ percent of the average weekly wages, which shall be in addition to compensation for temporary total disability or temporary partial disability paid in accordance with subdivision (b) or subdivision (e) of this section, respectively, and shall be paid to the employee, as follows:

"(1) Arm lost, 312 weeks' compensation.
"(2) Leg lost, 288 weeks' compensation.
"(3) Hand lost, 244 weeks' compensation.
"(4) Foot lost, 205 weeks' compensation.
"(5) Eye lost, 160 weeks' compensation.
"(6) Thumb lost, 75 weeks' compensation.
"(7) First finger lost, 46 weeks' compensation.

"(8) Great toe lost, 38 weeks' compensation.

"(9) Second finger lost, 30 weeks' compensation.

"(10) Third finger lost, 25 weeks' compensation.

"(11) Toe other than great toe lost, 16 weeks' compensation.

"(12) Fourth finger lost, 15 weeks' compensation."

SEC. 3. Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Reasonable funeral expenses not exceeding $400.

"(b) If there be a surviving wife or dependent husband and no child of the deceased, to such surviving wife or dependent husband 35 percent of the averag wages of the deceased, during widowhood, or dependent widowerhood, with 2 years' compensation in one sum upon remarriage; and if there be a surviving child or children of the deceased, the additional amount of 15 percent of such wages for each such child; in case of the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or dependent husband, if there be one surviving child of the deceased employee, such child shall have his compensation increased to 35 percent of such wages, and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased employee, to such children, in equal parts, 35 percent of such wages increased by 15 percent of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided*, That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ percent of such wages. The deputy commissioner having jurisdiction over the claim may, in his discretion, require the appointment of a guardian for the purpose of receiving the compensation of a minor child. In the absence of such a requirement the appointment of a guardian for such purposes shall not be necessary.

"(c) If there be one surviving child of the deceased, but no surviving wife or dependent husband, then for the support of such child 35 percent of the wages of the deceased; and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased, but no widow or dependent husband, then for the support of such children, in equal parts 35 percent of such wages increased by 15 percent of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided*, That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ percent of such wages.

"(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than $52.50 nor less than $18, but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased."

SEC. 4. Subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 10 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) If the injured employee shall have worked in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, whether for the same or another employer, during substantially the whole of the year immediately preceding his injury, his average annual earnings shall consist of 300 times the average daily wage or salary for a 6-day worker and 260 times the average daily wage or salary for a 5-day worker, which he shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"(b) If the injured employee shall not have worked in such employment during substantially the whole of such year, his average annual earnings, if a 6-day worker, shall consist of 300 times the average daily wage or salary, and, if a 5-day worker, 260 times the average daily wage or salary, which an employee of the same class working substantially the whole of such immediately preceding year in the same or in similar employment in the same or a neighboring place shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"(c) If either of the foregoing methods of arriving at the average annual earnings of the injured employee cannot reasonably and fairly be applied, such average annual earnings shall be such sum as, having regard to the previous earnings of the injured employee in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, and of other employees of the same or most similar class working in the same or most similar employment in the same or neighboring locality, or other employment of such employee, including the reasonable value of the services of the employee if engaged in self-employment, shall reasonably represent the annual earning capacity of the injured employee."

SEC. 5. Subsection (m) of section 14 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(m) The total compensation payable under this act for injuries shall in no event exceed the sum of $11,000: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to cases of permanent total disability or death."

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act shall be applicable only to injuries or deaths occurring on or after the effective date hereof.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BALL, Mr. IVES, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL-FOREST LANDS WITHIN SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST, MINN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1090) to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 3, to strike out "of" and insert "or"; on the same page, line 17, after "Acts", insert "except as provided hereinafter"; and on page 8, to strike out lines 1 to 20, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall pay to the State of Minnesota, at the close of each fiscal year from any national-forest receipts not otherwise appropriated a sum of money equivalent to three-quarters of 1 percent of the fair appraised value of such national-forest lands as may be situated within the area described in section 2 of this act at the end of each fiscal year; and the payments made hereunder shall be distributed to each of the three aforesaid counties in conformity with the fair appraised value of such national-forest lands in each county: *Provided*, That the fair appraised value of the lands shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at 10-year intervals and his determination shall be conclusive and final: *Provided further*, That the first payment to the State of Minnesota under the provisions of this section shall not be due until the close of the first full fiscal year after approval of this act: *And provided further*, That the provisions of the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260), and of section 13 of the act of March 1, 1911, as amended (36 Stat. 961; 38 Stat. 441), shall not be applicable to the national-forest lands to which this section applies.

Mr. THYE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN BRIDGES ACROSS STREAMS, RIVERS, ETC., IN MARYLAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2201) Supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1948, which was to amend the title so as to read: "An act supplementing the act entitled 'An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State,' approved April 7, 1938."

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Speaking as the acting majority leader of the Senate, I wish to ask whether it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the Senate should concur in the House amendment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the amendment was caused by reason of a misprint in the bill, the year 1948 being used instead of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Massachusetts that the amendment merely makes a correction in the title.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement. I am not sure that all Members of the Senate heard the announcement last night, but it is the intention of those in charge of the legislative program that, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, we remain in session until we conclude this bill and all amendments thereto. I respectfully ask that the Senators cooperate, as they have done, and be prepared for a night session. By a night session, I mean a late session, if necessary, to terminate the draft legislation today, if possible.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for 30 years, from 1919 to 1948, veterans' organizations of this Nation have advo-

cated universal military training. Four million eight hundred thousand men served in World War I. Fourteen million men and women wore the uniform of the United States in World War II.

During the 30-year period, 1919 to 1948, such legislation has never been brought before the Congress of the United States for a vote.

Military service, in a time of emergency, is the price of citizenship. Nevertheless, our entire experience from the Civil War to the present time has proven conclusively that our citizens will not volunteer in sufficient numbers. We tried twice in the past 30 years to keep out of wars without training. Let us try it once with training.

Twice in my lifetime, Mr. President, I saw our young men being murdered because of insufficient preparation: Once, in 1918, in France, and again in 1942 and 1943, in Alaska, in the Aleutians, and in the South Seas. Insufficient preparation and training for the men going into the front lines, and insufficient equipment, with planes that fly a little slower and guns that shoot a little shorter—is not war, Mr. President, that is murder. I do not care to be a party to sending American boys into war without proper equipment and without proper training.

Under this amendment technical training for sizable groups of citizens, chosen through aptitude tests, is available. There is provision for seeing them through technical schools and into the laboratories. They would receive initial training in these professions, and make their living in these professions, if there were no emergency. But if there were an emergency they would then be ready. They would have the necessary physical and technical training, to fit them to pass the tests for the ROTC, and go on into the colleges for their proper special training in the field of electronics and related sciences, which is a very necessary training in all future wars, as it was in the one through which we just passed. It will be even more necessary in the years to come. We should not send men into war without the necessary specialized training for the job to which they are to be assigned, and it is impossible to secure such training within a few weeks or months or even years in the sciences and technical fields. It has to be done when the time is available, during time of peace.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to Senate bill 2655 and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD. This amendment is in effect the House bill on universial military training which was reported out of the House committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment proposed by Mr. MALONE is on page 1, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE I

That (a) this title may be cited as the "Selective Service Act of 1948."

Strike out the word "act" wherever used in the bill in reference to the "Selective Service Act of 1948" and insert in lieu thereof the word "title."

At the end of the bill add the following:

TITLE II

CHAPTER I—NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS

SEC. 100. (a) There is hereby created the National Security Training Corps of the United States hereinafter referred to as the corps, to be composed of trainees who shall be inducted into it only for training as hereinafter provided, and who shall be organized, administered, and trained in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission by appropriate departments and agencies of the United States. As used in this title the term "Department concerned" means the Army Department or the Navy Department or such other department or agency as may be appropriate. The terms "military training" or "military training program" as used in this title means the training for duty with the armed forces of the United States.

(b) (1) There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government a commission to be known as the National Security Training Commission (hereinafter called the "Commission"), which shall consist of three members one of whom shall be a member of the armed forces, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This Commission shall report directly to the President. The terms of office of the members of the Commission shall be for terms of 5 years each, but any individual appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such member. The President shall select the chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. It shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted.

(2) The members of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per annum, and the chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(3) The Commission is authorized subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

(4) The Commission shall have an executive director, who shall be appointed by the Commission and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. No active member of the armed forces of the United States or any component thereof, and no member of the Commission, shall be eligible to serve as executive director. The executive director shall perform such duties in connection with executing the functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. For this purpose any power, function, or duty of the Commission may, at the direction of the Commission, be exercised or performed by the executive director.

(5) The Commission shall determine the policies and standards of the program. It shall not attempt to operate directly any phase of the program, but, in all instances, the operating agencies shall be subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission and under its general supervision, inspection, and control. The operation of the program, as it applies to all persons qualified for any form of military training, shall be the direct responsibility of the several service agencies. As to persons not qualified for any form of military training or who are conscientious objectors of varying degrees, the Commission shall determine the extent to which their training should be handled by these services, by other existing agencies of the Federal Government, or through other organizations, public or private, created or selected by the Commission.

(6) In order to provide the Commission with the best technical advice available on matters that may enter the program, with particular attention to the formulation of policies pertaining to the moral, religious, recreational, information and educational, and other nonmilitary phases, there is hereby created a general advisory board which shall consist of not less than 10 nor more than 25 persons (one of whom shall be appointed chairman) appointed by the President principally from outstanding civilian leaders: *Provided, however,* That not less than 3 members shall be selected from the armed forces. The chairman and members of the board shall serve for such terms as the Commission shall prescribe and shall receive compensation for services and actual expenses incurred when actually serving with the board.

(7) The powers of the Commission shall include the authority to operate a system of full-time civilian inspectors in order that the Commission may—

(a) be informed of the manner in which the program is actually operating in the field, including the military training program;

(b) be informed of the extent to which its policies are being carried out;

(c) make such recommendations, based on the reports of its inspectors, to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or to the President, as it considers necessary for improvement in any phase of the program.

(8) The Commission shall in collaboration with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy submit recommendations to the President for periodic revisions of title II, chapter 3, entitled "Code of conduct for the military training program of the National Security Training Corps," of this title.

(9) The Commission shall in collaboration with the heads of the departments concerned submit recommendations to the President as to the rate of implementation of the training program established pursuant to the provisions of this title.

(c) The Commission after consultation with such governmental departments and agencies as it deems necessary may formulate a program of nonmilitary training of value to the security of the Nation for those persons who are not physically or mentally acceptable for military training and those exempt from military training pursuant to the provisions of sections 206 and 207, chapter II, title I, of this title.

(d) (1) The training under this title in the National Security Training Corps shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

(2) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act in the National Security Training Corps is being given, as the Commission may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of the National Security Training Corps and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of members of such corps, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person into any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Commission or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

(3) No person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency shall sell, give, or in any way supply any intoxicating liquors to any trainee in training in the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

SEC. 101. (a) The period of military training shall be for 6 months, unless sooner terminated at the discretion of the head of the department concerned, followed by induction into one of the several alternative programs as hereinafter provided: *Provided, however,* That with the consent of the trainee the head of the Department concerned may extend the period of membership in the corps for the purpose of furnishing hospitalization, medical, and surgical care for injury or illness incurred in line of duty: Time necessary for induction and assignment to a training unit shall be included within the said period of training: *Provided further,* That the 6-month period be continuous and be devoted to such phases of military training in the ground, air, or naval component of the corps, as may be prescribed by the head of the department concerned; and that the following period be devoted to completion of one of the alternative programs, the choice of alternative being granted to the trainee, subject to such quota limitations and standards of qualification and selection as may be prescribed by the President: *And provided further,* That the period of service in each of the alternative programs mentioned below other than (1), (2), (10) shall be prescribed by the President by regulations in order to insure completion of training in the alternative programs, and to provide appropriate annual quotas under each of the alternative programs, hereinafter provided:

(1) Additional training in the National Security Training Corps for a period of 6 continuous months.

(2) Voluntary enlistment in any of the Regular services, including the Coast Guard, for such period as may be authorized by law or regulations for each service at the time of such enlistment.

(3) Enlistment in the National Guard or Organized Naval Reserve or Organized Marine Corps Reserve for at least such period as the President may prescribe.

(4) Enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army and assignment to an organized unit for at least such period as the President may prescribe.

(5) Entrance into either the Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies.

(6) Enrollment in the Naval and Marine Corps officer procurement program as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 of Public Law 729, Seventy-ninth Congress.

(7) Enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Naval Reserve for at least such period as the President may prescribe, and entrance upon a college course, including Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps training, and an agreement to accept a Reserve commission in the appropriate service if offered upon completion of the course.

(8) Enlistment in the Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve, and entrance into either the United States Merchant Marine Academy or a Navy-accredited State maritime academy accompanied by an agreement on the part of the trainee to accept a commission in the Naval Reserve at the completion of the course, if offered.

(9) Enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve for at least such period as the President may prescribe, and the pursuance of an approved course of technical or specialist training in such school, college, or university as may be approved by the head of the appropriate Department.

(10) Enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army or Volunteer Naval Reserve or Volunteer Marine Corps Reserve for a period of 6 years: *Provided,* That during the 6-year period of enlistment such trainee shall be subject to a maximum of 6 months' active-duty training, of which not more than 1 month will be required in any 1 year: *Provided further,* That this alternative of 6 years' enlistment in one of the enlisted Reserve Corps is open only to a trainee who is unable to select any of the preceding alternatives because they are not available to him in his community or, if available, because their quotas are already filled, or he is otherwise ineligible for reasons over which he has no control.

(b) Under regulations prescribed by the President, scholarships with such Government aid as may hereafter be provided shall be offered by the head of the Department concerned to specially selected trainees enrolled in the alternative program specified in (7) and (9) above: *Provided,* That the acceptance of any such scholarship shall be accompanied by an agreement on the part of the trainee to perform service in one of the components of the armed forces upon completion of the course for which such scholarship is provided, for at least such period, as the President may direct.

(c) The Commission may, upon the recommendation of the head of the Department concerned or the local board having jurisdiction, at any time recall for a period of 6 months for active military training in the corps any person serving in or selected for training in any of the alternative programs mentioned above other than (1), when it appears to the head of such Department or to such local board that such person is unwilling to enter upon or to complete satisfactorily his period of training in his selected alternate program: *Provided, however,* That any trainee who, having been selected for training in any of the optional or alternative programs, shall knowingly refuse or fail to enter into his selected program, or who shall conduct himself therein with the intent to evade the obligation entered into, and to train therein, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction by a civil court, shall be punished by a fine not to exceed $500, or imprisonment for 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Upon successful completion of the first 6 months' period of training prescribed herein, each trainee shall be furnished with a certificate of training; and upon successful and satisfactory completion of an additional 6 months' training in the corps or upon the successful completion of his selected option or alternate program as provided for herein, the trainee shall be given a certificate of discharge from the corps.

(d) The President, by regulation, shall provide for a system of training credits so as to allow transfer from one alternative program to another.

(c) The Commission may, by regulation, provide for the administration and enforcement by the Selective Training System of the optional or alternative programs herein provided.

SEC. 102. (a) A selectee shall be considered to have been inducted into the corps and to have become a trainee of the corps and subject to the rules, regulations, and code of conduct thereof—

(1) upon taking and subscribing to the following oath or affirmation: "As a member of the National Security Training Corps, I, , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me according to law and the rules of the Code of Conduct of the National Security Training Corps. So help me God"; or

(2) upon being otherwise actually inducted into the corps pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Commission: *Provided,* That failure or refusal of a selectee, who has reported for induction as ordered, and who has been advised that he is acceptable, to accept actual induction, shall be in violation of this act and as such liable, upon conviction by a civil court, to punishment by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) Any person inducted into the corps for training other than military training shall not be subject to the code of conduct of the corps, and any such persons shall be deemed trainees within the purview of sections 103, 106, 110, and 111 of this title.

SEC. 103. Each trainee shall receive a cash allowance during the period of training herein provided at the rate of $30 per month; and shall be furnished necessary transportation, including transportation from his home to the place of induction and training and from place of separation to his home, quarters, and subsistence, or a monetary allowance in lieu thereof at a rate to be prescribed by the Commission not exceeding the rate provided for members of the armed forces; such clothing and equipment as may be prescribed by the President; such hospitalization, surgical, medical, and dental care, and other services and supplies now or hereafter provided for members of the armed forces of the United States while on active service as the President may prescribe: *Provided,* That no cash allowance shall accrue in any case in which pay or allowance do not accrue under laws or regulations applicable to members of the armed forces subject to such modifications as may be made by the code of conduct or regulations prescribed for the corps.

SEC. 104. Personnel of the armed forces and the Reserve components thereof and such civilian personnel as may be necessary notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946" (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.), with respect to the maximum limitation as to the number of civilian employees, may be used to instruct and train the members and organizations of the corps and to provide the administration, supply, hospitalization, and medical, surgical, and dental care of trainees and the furnishing of other services and supplies referred to in section 103 thereof, and such use may be made of personnel, property, and facilities of the United States or of the armed forces for such purpose as the President may deem necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this title. Civilian and military personnel of the armed forces employed or detailed for duty with the corps shall be in addition to and in excess of the authorized strengths allowed to the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

SEC. 105. The President shall prescribe the uniform to be worn by trainees, which uniform shall include a distinctive insignia. Upon honorable termination of training, a trainee may be authorized to retain permanently such articles of clothing and equipment as may be prescribed by regulations of the President. If a trainee is discharged otherwise than honorably, he may be authorized to retain underclothing, toilet articles, and only such nondistinctive articles of outer clothing, together with such civilian outer clothing as may be necessary to provide reasonable protection against the elements. Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, a traineee honorably separated from the corps may wear the uniform of the corps upon any such occasion and under such conditions as the President may prescribe.

SEC. 106. (a) Upon the application of a trainee, a dependency allowance shall be

paid to his dependents during the period of training in the corps beginning on the first day of the month in which an application is made and ending on the last day of the month in which notice of termination of or cessation of dependency is received by the disbursing officer making payment of the allowance: *Provided*, That the total number of payments shall not exceed the total number of months actually served in the corps by the trainee.

The dependency allowance shall be paid without regard to the trainee's pay status: *Provided, however*, That if a trainee shall remain absent without leave for a period of 1 month, the allowance may be terminated by the head of the Department concerned, or officer designated by him for that purpose.

(b) A dependent within the meaning of this section is a person who at the time of the trainee's induction was or shall thereafter within the period of the trainee's service in the corps become dependent upon him for chief support and who is a wife, child, parent, stepparent, parent through adoption, grandparent, person who for a period of not less than 1 year immediately preceding the trainee's induction stood in loco parentis to the trainee, brother or sister of the whole blood or half blood or through adoption, stepbrother, or stepsister.

(c) The dependency allowance contributed in whole by the Government without a reduction or charge to the cash allowance of the trainee, shall be—

1. for one dependent, $50 per month;

2. for two or more dependents, $65 per month.

(d) The determination of all facts, including the fact of dependency, as defined in subparagraph (b) above, which it shall be necessary to determine in the administration of this section shall be made by the local board with whom the trainee is registered and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government. Such local board may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and the head of the Department concerned may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this section whenever he finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this section unless such erroneous payment or overpayment be determined to have been made as a result of gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States. No recovery shall be made from any officer authorizing any erroneous payment under this section unless such payment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

(e) The monthly dependency allowances payable under the provisions of this title shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom or on behalf of whom they are paid; and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, garnishment, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatsoever.

(f) Whoever shall obtain or aid others to obtain or receive any dependency allowance or payment under this section, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(g) Whoever in any claim for dependency allowance or in any document required by this section or by regulations made under this section makes any statement of a material fact, knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(h) Any person who has been entitled to payment of a dependency allowance under this section and whose entitlement to payment of such allowance has ceased shall, if he thereafter accepts payment of such allowance with the intent to defraud, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(i) No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any dependency allowance payable under this section. Any person violating or causing a violation of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000.

SEC. 107. Persons who have been inducted into the military training program of the corps as provided in section 102 hereof shall, from such time of induction and until separation from the corps into one of the alternate or optional programs or upon separation from the corps otherwise accomplished, be entitled to the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. The terms "persons in military service" and "period of military service" in section 101 of the cited act shall be deemed to include the persons named and the periods of time specified in the preceding sentence. For the purpose of this title, the cited act shall continue in effect until this title is repealed: *Provided*, That, wherever under any section in provisions of the cited act a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed as defined above prior to the termination of this title, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

SEC. 108. A trainee shall be pecuniarily liable for the loss of and damage to property of the Government and for costs incident to his apprehension and return, including rewards paid, in case of unauthorized absence, to the same extent as provided by law or regulations in the case of persons subject to military or naval law where such liability is not provided for by the code of conduct of the corps, and the amount of liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance: *Provided, however*, That the head of the Department concerned may in his discretion remit any such liability in whole or in part.

SEC. 109. Upon successful completion of the training, including successful completion of a selected alternative program, as provided in section 101 of this title, trainees will not be subject to further compulsory military training or service, but will revert to full civilian status, and as such are liable to call for further training or service as members of the armed forces only during a national emergency expressly declared by Congress or by the President and then only through a national selective-service system: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall in any way limit or prohibit the call to active service in the armed forces of any person who is a member of a Regular or Reserve component of the armed forces.

SEC. 110. In case of the death of a trainee during the period of training, the costs of the recovery of the body, cremation, transportation of remains, suitable casket, burial, transportation of baggage, and payment of only the accrued or undisbursed cash allowance owing the trainee at the time of death shall be paid by the head of the Department concerned in the same manner as prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the armed forces.

SEC. 111. (a) If any trainee shall suffer illness or injury in line of duty or dies as the result of such illness or injury, he and his beneficiaries shall be entitled to all the benefits, not furnished under this title, which are prescribed by law for civil employees of the United States who suffer disability or death while in the performance of duty, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, hereinafter called the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, shall have jurisdiction in such cases after separation of the trainee from the corps and shall perform the same duties with reference thereto as in the case of civil employees of the United States now within its jurisdiction: *Provided*, That employee's compensation shall not be paid concurrently with the cash allowance based upon the trainee's period of training: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of determining the benefits to which entitled under this section, the total compensation received by a trainee under this title in cash and in kind shall be deemed to be $87.50 per month: *Provided further*, that all original claims for compensation for disability shall be made within 60 days after the illness or injury. For any reasonable cause shown, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission may allow original claims for compensation for disability to be made at any time within 1 year. All original claims for compensation for death shall be made within 1 year after the death.

(b) All determinations as to line of duty shall be made by the head of the Department concerned under regulations prescribed by the Commission and shall be conclusive upon the United States Employees' Compensation Commission whether made before or after the filing of a claim. The head of the Department concerned shall establish a board of review consisting of five members, at least three of whom shall be officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army or officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps assigned to law duties, and in order to constitute a quorum there shall be present not less than three members, one of whom shall be an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army or an officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps assigned to law duties. The board on its own motion, or upon the request of a trainee, former trainee, beneficiary if the trainee is deceased, or the United States Employees' Compensation Commission shall review the determination of line of duty made in the field or determine originally the issue of line of duty in cases in which no prior determination has been made in the field. Such review or hearing shall be based upon all available records of the Department concerned and such other evidence as may be presented before it, but the board shall not be limited in its inquiry to material which is presented to it but may request or require additional evidence or information. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit and the person requesting the review of the hearing shall be allowed to appear before the board in person or by counsel, and the person requesting the review or hearing may call witnesses in his own behalf. The determination of the board shall be final, subject only to review by the National Security Training Commission.

SEC. 112. Except as otherwise herein specifically provided, trainees in the corps shall not, solely by reason of their training therein, be entitled to any rights, privileges, gratuities, or benefits provided by law or regulations for personnel or former personnel of the armed forces or civilian employees of the Government.

SEC. 113. (a) Claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property, real or personal,

and for personal injury or death caused by trainees of the corps acting within the scope of their employment while under the administration, instruction, and training of the Army or the Navy or otherwise incident to the military training program of the corps under the direction of the Army or the Navy shall be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, settled, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372), as amended, and title IV of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), and the first section of the act of December 28, 1945 (Public Law 277, 79th Cong.), and the regulations promulgated thereunder, subject to the requirements, conditions, and limitations therein appearing. For the purpose of the application of said acts to this section the terms "military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army" and "otherwise incident to noncombatant activites of the War Department or of the Army" in the first section of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372), as amended, and the terms "military personnel or civilian employees of the Navy Department or of the Navy" and "otherwise incident to noncombatant activities of the Navy Department or of the Navy" in the first section of the act of December 28, 1945 (Public Law 277, 79th Cong.), shall be deemed to include, respectively, the terms "trainees of the corps" and "otherwise incident to the training activities of the corps"; and the terms "employee of the Government" and "a member of the military or naval forces of the United States" appearing, respectively, in subsections (b) and (c) of section 402 of title IV of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), shall be deemed to include the term "trainee of the corps."

(b) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Navy, and the Secretary of Air and their designees are authorized to exercise with respect to claims of members of the corps, while under the administration, instruction, and training of their respective departments, for damages to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, the respective powers conferred upon the Secretary of the Army and his designees by the act of May 29, 1945 (Public Law 67, 79th Cong.), and the Secretary of the Navy or his designees by sections 2, 3, and 4 of the act of December 28, 1945 (Public Law 277, 79th Cong.), and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

SEC. 114. Except in time of war or other national emergency, only those persons who successfully complete the training as provided in section 101 of this title, and those persons who are not subject to training thereunder or who are within exemptions of subsection A (1) and (a), (b), (c), and (d) of subsection A (11) of section 205, chapter II, title II, of this act, or who are otherwise exempted pursuant to the provisions of this title, shall be eligible under any law for appointment as an officer in any of the components of the armed forces of the United States, or for voluntary training for such appointment.

SEC. 115. The President is authorized to make all regulations necessary or expedient for the administration of this title.

SEC. 116. The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is hereby designated, empowered, and directed to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Army Department in carrying out the provisions of this title. The Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Navy Department, is hereby designated, empowered, and directed to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent for the Navy Department in carrying out the provisions of this title. The Quartermaster General, Marine Corps, is hereby designated, empowered, and directed to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent for the Marine Corps in carrying out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 117. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 118. When used in this title—

(a) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(b) The term "district court of the United States" shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and the possessions of the United States.

SEC. 119. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 120. Nothing contained in this or any other title shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to individuals registered for, or in training in the National Security Training Corps, or to members of the Reserve components of the armed forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, if prior to such registration, training, or active duty such individuals or members were receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation.

SEC. 121. No individual who has been convicted of any crime not punishable by death, or individual who has been committed to jail, corrective institution, or institution for juvenile delinquency, shall by reason of such conviction or commitment be relieved from liability for training under this title, but may be trained as directed by the Commission.

SEC. 122. This title shall become effective immediately.

CHAPTER II—SELECTIVE TRAINING SYSTEM

SEC. 201. Definitions: When used in this title—

(a) The term "Director" shall refer to the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records, who shall be the Director of the Selective Training System established by this act.

(b) The term "local board" refers to the local selective-training board.

SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby created and established a Selective Training System with a national selective-training office, and a State selective-training office in each State, the District of Columbia, Territories, and possessions of the United States, for the registration, examination, classification, assignment, delivery, and maintenance of records, of men registered under this title. Such System shall be in the Office of Selective Service Records and the Director thereof shall be the Director of the System.

(b) The Director is hereby authorized—

(1) to create and establish within the Selective Training System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, the District of Columbia, Territories, and possessions of the United States. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the Director determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation. Such intercounty local board within its area shall have the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Local boards, under rules and regulations promulgated by the Director, with the approval of the Commission, shall have the power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from assignment for training under this title, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of local boards shall be final, except when an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Director may promulgate with the approval of the Commission. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Training System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and not members of the armed forces. The decision of appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the Director. The Director, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from training under this title, and the determination of the Director shall be final. No person who is an officer, member, agent, or employee of the Selective Training System, or of any such local board or appeal board or other agency, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from training, as provided for in this title, by reason of his status as such officer, member, agent, or employee;

(2) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of title II, chapter II, of this act, subject to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this title may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States; and

(3) to utilize the services of any or all departments or agencies and any and all officers or agents of the United States and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, the District of Columbia, Territories, and possessions of the United States and subdivisions thereof in the execution of this title;

(4) to promulgate, with the approval of the Commission, the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of title II, chapter II, of this act.

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission is authorized to delegate to the Director any authority vested in it under title II, chapter II, of this act. The Director may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the Commission and any other authority vested in him under this title, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose, pursuant to such rules and

regulations as he may promulgate with the approval of the Commission.

(b) In the administration of this title, voluntary services may be accepted.

SEC. 204. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the effective date of this title shall have attained the seventeenth anniversary of the date of his birth and has not attained the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, and of every other such male citizen or person upon thereafter attaining the seventeenth anniversary of the date of his birth, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time and place or places in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by rules and regulations promulgated by the Director with the approval of the Commission: *Provided,* (1) That diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and consular agents of foreign countries, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the Director and approved by the Commission, residing in the United States, who are not citizens of the United States and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to register; and (2) that except as hereinafter otherwise provided, every male citizen and every other male person who enters the United States shall be required to register within 30 days from the date of his entry, if he would at any time have been required to register had he been residing in the United States; and (3) that every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this title upon publication of a public notice fixing the time for any registration under this section.

SEC. 205. (A) Under regulations prescribed by the Director and approved by the Commission, except as hereinafter provided, every male citizen of the United States and every male declarant alien not otherwise exempted under the provisions of this title, residing in the United States, who on the effective date of this title shall have attained the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth and shall not have attained the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, and every other such male citizen or male declarant alien upon thereafter attaining the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth, shall be liable for training: *Provided,* (1) That diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and consular agents of foreign countries, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the Director and approved by the Commission, residing in the United States, who are not citizens of the United States shall be relieved from liability for training; (2) that every male person who is a citizen of the United States and every male declarant alien, who enters the United States at a time subsequent to the period in which he would have been required to train had he not been absent from the United States, shall be liable for training regardless of age; (3) that no person shall be inducted for training after having attained the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, except as otherwise herein provided; (4) that any registrant under this title who has attained the eighteenth anniversary of the date of his birth and has not attained the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth may volunteer for immediate induction for training, except, that a registrant who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth must have the prior consent of his parents, or parent having custody of him, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis to him; (5) that any registrant who, on the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth, is successfully and satisfactorily pursuing a standard course of study, on a full-time basis in a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, if he so requests, be entitled to have his induction or assignment postponed until his graduation therefrom, or until he ceases to pursue satisfactorily such course of study, or until he attains the twentieth anniversary of the date of his birth, whichever occurs first, except that any such registrant whose induction has been so postponed shall be liable for training regardless of age; (6) that under such rules and regulations promulgated by the Director with the approval of the Commission, the Director is authorized to provide for deferment from training under this title, for extreme hardship, temporary disability, or reasons vital to the national interest; (7) that every registrant shall be physically and mentally examined by the local board examining physicians and such other persons to be appointed by the President for that purpose, and the local board shall classify the registrant as to the type and kind of training he is capable of performing and shall assign him to that training; (8) that subject to such quota limitations and standards of qualification and selection as may be established from time to time by the President by regulations to insure a proper balance of trained manpower between the ground, air, and naval arms, each trainee may have the option to request and receive the training in the service of his choice within the corps; (9) that no man shall be inducted for military training under this title unless and until he is acceptable to the armed forces for such training; (10) that the Director with the approval of the Commission is authorized to make exemptions of such groups of registrants as are necessary in order to limit inductions to the maximum number which can be trained by available military or civilian personnel and facilities; (11) that no registrant under this title shall be liable for induction who (a) is now serving or has heretofore served honorably in any of the armed forces of the United States in active Federal service, or of the armed forces of any nation allied with the United States at any time during World World II; or (b) shall hereafter enter into any of the armed forces of the United States on active duty, and complete a minimum of 1 year's honorable service therein; or (c) is enlisted and is serving, on the effective date of this title, in any one of the following organized active reserve components of the armed forces of the United States: (1) The federally recognized National Guard; (2) the Organized Reserve of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps: *Provided,* That in either case failure to complete such current enlistment shall render such person liable to induction and training regardless of age; or (d) on the effective date of this title is a cadet of the United States Military Academy, a midshipman of the United States Naval Academy, a cadet of the United States Coast Guard Academy, a member of the Senior Division Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval aviation college program, so long as he satisfactorily continues in and completes 2 years training therein: *Provided,* That until such time as the program reaches full scale implementation, the President may conditionally exempt from induction or conditionally discharge from training any registrant or trainee who has been accepted for admittance to any of the service academies enumerated, in order that such person may enter such service academy wherein he shall complete not less than 2 years of training in order to be relieved of liability for induction or further training hereunder.

(B) No exception from registration, exemption, deferment, or postponement of induction for training under this title shall continue after the cause therefore ceases to exist.

SEC. 206. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant or noncombatant training who, by reason of religious training and belief, or humanitarian convictions, is conscientiously opposed to participation in military training in any form: *Provided,* (a) That any such person claiming exemption from combatant training only, because of conscientious objections and whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted or assigned under this title, be assigned to noncombatant training as defined by the Commission, or (b) if he is conscientiously opposed to participation in either combatant or noncombatant training shall elect to be assigned for a period of 1 year for training with such department or agency, other than the War or Navy Departments, as may be prescribed by the Commission. Any person claiming exemption from either combatant or noncombatant training, or both, shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal with the appeal board, the appeal board shall forthwith refer the matter to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board (1) that if the objector is inducted or assigned for training under this title, he shall be assigned to noncombatant training as defined by the Commission, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in either combatant or noncombatant training, he shall elect in lieu of such induction or assignment to be assigned to and for such training with such department or agency, other than the Army or Navy Departments, as may be prescribed by the Commission. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board, in making its decision. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training because of conscientious objections is sustained, shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

SEC. 207. Registrants who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the date of their birth but who have not attained the twentieth anniversary of the date of their birth, and who are found by the local board to be physically or mentally disqualified for military training shall be assigned to such training as may be prescribed by the Commission, or, if found by the local board in accordance with standards prescribed by the Commission, and rules and regulations promulgated by the Director with the approval of the Commission, to be physically or mentally disqualified for any type of training, shall be deferred from training by the local board. The names of such persons so deferred, together with the cause for such deferment, shall be maintained in a separate register by the local board in accordance with the rules and regulations to be prescribed therefor.

SEC. 208. (a) Every person liable for training under this title, except those whose training shall have been deferred or postponed in accordance with the provisions of this

title, shall be assigned, called, and delivered by his local board for training at the time and place fixed by the Commission for the type of training to which he has been assigned: *Provided*, That a volunteer for training under 18 years of age may be delivered for training to which he has been assigned, at the training period next following the date upon which he was accepted as a volunteer, whether or not he has attained the age of 18 years.

(b) The Commission after consultation with heads of departments and agencies concerned will determine induction dates and numbers to be inducted on those dates in such a manner as to provide a constant uniform training load on all training agencies in order to effect maximum economy and efficiency in the operation of the program.

SEC. 209. No person liable for training under this title shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such training; no substitute as such shall be received or enrolled for training; and no person liable for training hereunder shall be permitted to escape such training or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of training by the payment of money or any valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such training or liability therefor.

SEC. 210. (a) Each trainee, for a period of 6 years after completion of the first 6 months of training, shall be required to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Director with the approval of the Commission.

(b) It shall be the duty of each trainee, upon completion of 6 months of basic military training, to submit evidence of such completion to his local board, and upon release from basic training of a military character, following his election to enter upon one of the optional forms of training provided, to report to his local board and to advise such local board of the optional training he has elected to enter and to report to the local board concerning any subsequent changes therein.

(c) It shall be the duty of every trainee, upon completion of training of a nonmilitary character hereunder, to submit evidence of such completion to his local board, or upon release from basic training of a nonmilitary character, following his election to enter upon one of the optional forms of training as may be prescribed for those with basic training of a nonmilitary character, to report to his local board and to advise such local board of the optional training he has elected to enter and to report to the local board any subsequent changes herein.

(d) Each local board shall maintain a register of registrants, which shall contain a current record of the address, occupational, dependency, training, and service status, and such other information as may be required, of all trainees who have undergone basic training, or registrants exempted from training, for a period of 6 years following completion of the basic training or from the date of exemption from training as the case may be.

(e) After the 6-year period referred to in (d) above the records of individual registrants shall be deposited for service and preservation in the Federal Record Depot of the Office of Selective Service Records in the State which has jurisdiction of the registrant.

SEC. 211. Under such rules and regulations as may be promulgated by the Director with the approval of the Commission, all funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the selective training system are also available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of (1) emergency medical care including hospitalization, (2) transportation of the remains, and (3) burial of the remains, including preparation of the body, of registrants who suffer illness, injury, or death while acting under orders issued under the provisions of title II, chapter II, of this act.

SEC. 212. Any person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of title II, chapter II, of this act, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty or having and exercising any authority under said title II, chapter II, of this act, or rules, or regulations, made pursuant thereto, who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certification as to the fitness or unfitness or liability or nonliability of himself or any other person for training under the provisions of this title, or rules or regulations, made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades registration, induction, or training of any of the requirements of title II of this act, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to evade registration or training or any of the requirements of this title, or of said rules or regulations, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of title II, chapter II, of this act, or rules or regulations made pursuant to title II, chapter II, of this act, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere in any way by force or violence with the administration of title II, chapter II, of this act, or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or conspire to do so, or any person selected for training under this title who shall refuse to complete the training as prescribed under this title, shall upon conviction in the district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such case shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

SEC. 213. Nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title and the regulations pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated member of the Selective Training System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections.

TITLE III

CHAPTER III—CODE OF CONDUCT

SEC. 301. Title: This title shall be known as the Code of Conduct for the Military Training Program of the National Security Training Corps hereinafter referred to as the "code."

SEC. 302. Statement of policy: Any act or omission of a trainee in the military training program of the corps which tends to hinder or impede his training is hereby declared to be contrary to the purpose of title II of the present act. The disciplinary punishment of trainees of the military training program as hereinafter provided shall be consistent with the maintenance of discipline.

SEC. 303. All trainees subject to provisions: All trainees, as defined in section 304 (a) infra, shall, from the time of actual induction as provided in section 102, chapter I, title II, of this act, and until actually discharged from the corps under the provisions of this act or regulations promulgated thereunder, be subject to the provisions of this code: *Provided*, That upon the issuance to the trainee of the certificate of training as provided in section 101, title II, of this act, and upon entrance into, and thereafter so long as he shall successfully and satisfactorily pursue his selected option or alternate program, other than an additional 6 months' period of training in the corps, the trainee shall not be subject to the provisions of this code.

SEC. 304. Definitions: The following words when used in this code shall be construed in the sense indicated in this section unless the content shows that a different sense is intended:

a. The word "trainee" shall be construed to refer to a person inducted for training in the military training program of the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 102, chapter I, title II, of this act and until validly discharged from the National Security Training Corps.

b. The word "officer" shall be construed to refer to a commissioned officer.

c. The words "civil authorities" shall be construed to refer to law-enforcement authorities of the United States and of the Territories, and authorities of the several States, including political subdivisions thereof, such as counties and municipalities.

d. The words "commanding officer" shall be construed to refer to an officer of the Army of the United States, United States Navy, or United States Marine Corps, empowered to exercise command of any detachment or company of trainees, or similar units or higher units.

e. The words "National Security Training Corps Court," hereinafter referred to as a "national security training court," shall be construed to refer to a court appointed for the trial of trainees, composed of five officers of the service to which the trainee is assigned for training, of which three shall be a quorum, one of which three shall be of the rank of major or lieutenant commander or above. One member of the court, if practicable, shall be a lawyer and shall act as a law member of the court. In the event no member of the court is a lawyer the president thereof shall act as law member.

f. The words "appointing authority," for the purpose of appointment of a national security training court, shall be construed to refer to (1) an officer of the Army of the United States, United States Navy, or United States Marine Corps, who commands a trainee regiment, or comparable unit; and (2) superior military training authority.

g. The words "reviewing authority" shall be construed to refer to the officer acting as commander of the camp, post, or station whose approval shall be necessary to the validity of the sentence of a national security training court.

h. The words "staff judge advocate" shall be construed to refer to a naval or Marine Corps officer, or to an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army of the United States, assigned to a reviewing authority to perform law duties, or in his absence, the acting staff judge advocate. The staff judge advocate shall be a lawyer.

i. The words "superior military training authority" shall be construed to refer to an officer of the Army of the United States, or the United States Navy, or any component thereof, superior in the chain of command over trainees.

j. The words "extra duty" shall refer to additional work or duty assigned to trainees as punishment.

SEC. 305. Mode of enforcing discipline: Violations of the Code of Conduct for the Military Training Program of the National Security Training Corps shall be punishable in the discretion of the commanding officer (a) by disciplinary punishment administered by a commanding officer of a trainee company or higher command, unless the accused shall demand trial, or (b) by national security

training courts. Trainees shall be likewise subject to prosecution in the courts of the United States and of the Territories for crimes and offenses against the United States, and in the courts of the several States for crimes and offenses against the States or any subdivision thereof.

SEC. 306. Disciplinary punishment by unit commander: A commanding officer of a trainee company or higher command may, for minor violations of the Code of Conduct for the National Security Training Corps, impose disciplinary punishments upon trainees of his command without the intervention of a national security training court unless the accused demands trial by that court. Punishment assessed by a commanding officer shall not constitute time lost to training within the meaning of section 378 hereof.

The disciplinary punishment authorized by this section may include admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not exceeding 1 week, extra duty for not exceeding 1 week, restriction to certain specified limits for not exceeding 1 week, but shall not include forfeiture of cash allowance or confinement under guard. A trainee punished under authority of this section who deems the punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense may appeal to the next superior military training authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged.

The commanding officer who imposed the punishment, his successor in command, or superior military training authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment.

SEC. 307. Trials: Trials of trainees for violations of trainee discipline hereinafter set forth shall be by a national security training court, which shall not include the accuser or the immediate commanding officer of the accused. The senior member of the court shall be the president.

SEC. 308. Appointing authority: A national security training court may be appointed by an appointing authority as herein defined.

SEC. 309. Who may serve on national security training courts: All officers of the service to which the trainee is assigned for training shall be competent to serve on a national security training court. When appointing such court, the appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for such duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament. Officers having less than 2 years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the corps, be appointed as members of a court in excess of minority membership thereof.

SEC. 310. Influencing the court: Any attempt on the part of the appointing or reviewing authority, or superior military-training authority, to influence a national security training court or its members, or to admonish, censure, or reprimand the court or its members for any act or omission, is hereby prohibited and shall constitute an offense against the Articles of War.

SEC. 311. Appointment of trial judge advocate and defense counsel: For each national security training court the appointing authority shall appoint a trial judge advocate and defense counsel, who shall, if practicable, be lawyers. The accused shall have the right to be represented in his defense before the court by counsel of his own selection, civilian counsel at his own expense, or military counsel of either service if such be reasonably available, provided the use of such optional counsel will not unreasonably delay the trial, otherwise by the defense counsel duly appointed.

SEC. 312. Jurisdiction: A national security training court shall have power to try and punish any trainee for any offense made punishable by the Code of Conduct for the Military Training Program of the National Security Training Corps.

SEC. 313. Allowable punishments by a national security training court: The punishments authorized by this code upon conviction of a trainee for any offense herein made punishable shall consist of any of the following punishments and no others: Admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not to exceed 3 months, extra duty for not to exceed 3 months, restriction to certain specified limits with or without extra duty, for not to exceed 3 months, and confinement with or without useful work for not to exceed 3 months, and, where specifically authorized, bad-conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge: *Provided*, That admonition, reprimand, or bad-conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge as provided for in section 341 of this title may be included together with or in addition to any of the punishments allowed under this section.

SEC. 314. Arrest: A trainee charged with an offense may be placed under arrest or in confinement as circumstances may require; but when charged with a minor offense only, a trainee shall not ordinarily be placed in confinement. Only a commanding officer or superior military training authority or an officer duly designated as his representative shall have power to place a trainee in confinement.

SEC. 315. Preferring charges: Any person subject to the provisions of title II of this act or military or naval law may prefer charges, which shall be under oath, that he has personal knowledge of or has investigated the matters set forth therein and that the same are true in fact to the best of his knowledge and belief. In the event a trainee is placed under arrest or in confinement, charges shall be filed within 48 hours of the time thereof. Otherwise a trainee shall be released from such arrest or confinement unless the commanding officer, acting upon the recommendation of an officer duly designated by the appointing authority to conduct a preliminary hearing or investigation, and who having conducted or begun to conduct such a hearing or investigation at which the trainee is present and informed of the grounds of his confinement recommends that the accused be not released, directs that the arrest or confinement be continued.

SEC. 316. Action by commanding officer: Charges will be filed with the trainee's immediate commanding officer, who will inquire into the facts and circumstances of the case and expeditiously dispose of the matter or without delay forward the charges together with the names of the witnesses and a statement of their prospective testimony with his written recommendations to the appointing authority.

SEC. 317. Forwarding charges; delays; service of charges: Unless the charges are disposed of without trial, the unit commanding officer will, within 48 hours after accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the appointing authority. If the same be not practicable, he will report to superior authority the reason for delay. The unit commander will cause to be delivered to the accused a copy of the charges.

SEC. 318. Action by appointing authority: The appointing authority, in his discretion, may refer the charges for trial, order them dismissed, or make such other disposition of them as he sees fit; and no charge will be referred to a court for trial unless it has been found that a thorough and impartial investigation thereof has been made as prescribed herein that such charge is legally sufficient to allege an offense under this code, and is sustained by evidence indicated in the report of investigation.

SEC. 319. Investigation of charges: The charges shall be set forth upon a charge sheet and shall be in the form of a charge setting forth the particular section of the code alleged to have been violated, together with a specification setting forth the substance of the alleged violation. No charge shall be referred for trial until after a thorough and impartial investigation thereof shall have been made. This investigation will include inquiries as to the truth of the matter set forth in said charges, form of charges, and what disposition of the case should be made in the interest of justice and discipline. At such investigation full opportunity shall be given to the accused to cross-examine witnesses against him if they are available and to present anything he may desire in his own behalf, either in defense or mitigation, and the investigating officer shall examine available witnesses requested by the accused. If the charges are forwarded after such investigation they shall be accompanied by a statement of the substance of the testimony taken on both sides.

SEC. 320. Staff judge advocate: Every reviewing authority shall have a staff judge advocate, with one or more assistants, who shall be officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army of the United States or officer of the United States Navy assigned to law duties and who shall advise the appointing or reviewing authority as to all matters prescribed by the present code and shall perform such other duties as may be devolved upon them by law, regulation, or custom of the military or naval service.

SEC. 321. Assistant staff judge advocate: An assistant staff judge advocate shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by this code or by law, regulations, or the custom of the military or naval service upon the staff judge advocate.

SEC. 322. Action by trial judge advocate: The trial judge advocate of the court to which the charges have been referred will, within 24 hours after receipt thereof, cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had. A failure so to serve such charges will be a ground for a continuance. The trial judge advocate shall, immediately upon serving the charges upon the accused, notify the defense counsel thereof. No trainee shall, against his objection, be brought to trial before a national security training court within a period of 48 hours subsequent to the service of charges upon him.

SEC. 323. Trial judge advocate; prosecution: The trial judge advocate of a national security training court shall prosecute in the name of the United States.

SEC. 324. Oaths: The trial judge advocate shall administer to the national security training court the following oath or affirmation: "You, ———, do swear (or affirm) that you will well and truly try and determine, according to the evidence, the matter now before you, and that you will duly administer justice, without partiality, favor, or affection, according to the provisions of the Code of Conduct for the Military Training Program of the National Security Training Corps, and if any doubt should arise, not explained by the said code, then according to your conscience and the best of your understanding. So help you God?" When the oath or affirmation has been administered to the members of the court, the president of the court shall administer to the trial judge advocate an oath or affirmation in the following form: "You, ———, do swear (or affirm) that you will faithfully and impartially perform the duties of a trial judge advocate?"

All persons who give evidence before the court shall be examined on oath or affirmation administered by the trial judge advocate in the following form: "You swear (or affirm) that the evidence you give in this case shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help you God?"

SEC. 325. Arraignment, pleas, and motions: The accused shall be arraigned at which time the charge and specifications shall be read to him by the trial judge advocate. The accused shall plead guilty or not guilty. In the event the accused refuses to plead, the court shall enter a plea of not

guilty. Prior to so pleading, or at any other time, the accused may make any pertinent motion which the court shall dispose of as justice may require.

SEC. 326. Challenges: Members of a national security training court may be challenged by the accused or trial judge advocate for cause stated to the court. A majority of the court shall decide the challenges by secret written ballot but challenged members have no vote. Upon a tie vote the challenge shall be sustained. Each side shall be entitled to one peremptory challenge.

SEC. 327. Process to obtain witnesses: Every trial judge advocate shall have power to issue the like process to compel witnesses to appear and testify, which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue and such process shall run to any part of the United States, its possessions and Territories. The accused shall have the right to like compulsory process to obtain the presence of witnesses: *Provided*, That in either case such compulsory process may be denied by the appointing authority when it appears that the expected testimony is neither material nor necessary or that the witness is not reasonably available, except that the accused may, in such cases, provide for the appearance of such witnesses at his own expense.

SEC. 328. Refusal to appear and testify: Any person who refuses to appear and testify as a witness in accordance with process shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor for which such person shall be punished upon information in a court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof by fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment not to exceed 6 months, or both.

Fees of a witness not subject to military law, or laws governing the Navy, and his mileage, at the rates allowed to witnesses attending the courts of the United States, shall be duly paid or tendered such witness, such amounts to be paid out of the appropriation for the compensation of witnesses. Every person who before any national security training court or in connection with or in relation to any proceedings or investigation before it or had under the provisions of this act is guilty of any of the acts made punishable as offenses against public justice by any provision of chapter 6 of the act of March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States" (vol. 35, Stat. L., p. 1088), or any amendment thereof, shall be punished as therein provided.

SEC. 329. Compulsory self-incrimination prohibited: No witness before a national security training court or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before a national security training court or before an officer conducting an investigation, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to answer any question the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue when to answer may tend to degrade him.

The use of coercion or unlawful influence in any manner whatsoever by any person subject to military law to obtain any degrading statement not material to the issue, or any self-incriminating statement, admission, or confession from any accused person or witness, shall be deemed to be conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, and no such statement, admission, or confession shall be received in evidence by a national security training court.

SEC. 330. Depositions; when admissible: A duly authenticated deposition taken upon reasonable notice to the opposite party may be read in evidence before any national security training court in any case, if such deposition be taken when the witness resides, is found, or is about to go beyond the State, Territory, or district in which the national security training court is ordered to sit, or beyond the distance of 100 miles from the place of trial or hearing, or when it appears to the satisfaction of the national security training court or appointing authority that the witness, by reason of age, sickness, bodily infirmity, imprisonment, or other reasonable cause, is unable to, or, in foreign places, because of nonamenability to process, refuses to appear and testify in person at the place of trial or hearing: *Provided*, That at any time after charges have been signed as provided in section 315, and before the charges have been referred for trial, any authority competent to appoint a trainee court for the trial of such charges may designate officers to represent the prosecution and the defense and may authorize such officers, upon due notice, to take the deposition of any witness, and such deposition may subsequently be received in evidence as in other cases.

SEC. 331. Former jeopardy: No trainee shall, without his consent, be tried a second time for the same offense by any court or authority created under the provisions of this act, but no proceedings shall be considered a trial until the reviewing authority shall have taken final action upon the case.

SEC. 332. Limitations as to time: No person subject to the code of conduct shall be liable to be tried and punished by a national security training court for any offense committed more than 1 year before arraignment of such person: *Provided*, That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused shall not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid period of limitation: *Provided further*, That this section shall not have the effect to authorize the trial or punishment for any crime or offense barred by the provisions of existing law.

SEC. 333. Evidence: Insofar as not otherwise prescribed in this code or by an Act of Congress or by regulations promulgated under authority of this act, the rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the district courts of the United States will be applied to the national security training courts.

SEC. 334. Rulings on legal questions: The law member shall rule in open court upon all interlocutory questions other than challenges arising during the proceedings: *Provided*, That any such ruling made by the law member upon any interlocutory question other than for a finding of not guilty, or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may at any time consult with the court in closed session before making a ruling, and may change any ruling made at any time during the trial.

SEC. 335. Burden of proof: The burden of proof shall at all times be upon the prosecution. Before being convicted the accused shall be proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

SEC. 336. Findings: After both sides have rested and after any argument of counsel, the court shall make its findings as to the charge and specification, which findings it shall announce in open court.

SEC. 337. Findings of guilty: In the event the accused is found guilty the court shall receive evidence as to the age and service of the accused, together with any evidence of previous convictions by a national security training court and any other pertinent data submitted by either side, for consideration by the court in fixing the punishment.

SEC. 338. Sentence: The court shall thereupon sentence the accused. The sentence shall be announced in open court.

SEC. 339. Vote on findings and sentences: The findings and sentence shall be determined on secret written ballot by a two-thirds vote of the members present concurring.

SEC. 340. Policy as to sentence: The court shall adjudge a minimum sentence consistent with the maintenance of discipline and shall, if it believes such action consistent with the foregoing policy, recommend to the reviewing authority that he suspend the execution of the sentence in whole or in part.

SEC. 341. Bad-conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge: The court upon proof of two previous convictions by a national security training court or if otherwise satisfied from the evidence that the accused is incorrigible, shall have the power to adjudge bad-conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge from the National Security Training Corps, in addition to any other punishment authorized by this code. A bad-conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge shall be effective only when ordered executed by the reviewing authority, after the record of trial has been held legally sufficient to support the sentence by the judge advocate general of the service concerned. The holding of the judge advocate general shall be final and conclusive.

SEC. 342. Effect of bad-conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge: The execution of a bad-conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge shall forfeit any right to credit by the trainee for time served in training, but shall not prevent the trainee, upon the recommendation of the War or Navy Department, respectively, in its discretion, being reinducted for all or part of the training prescribed by law.

SEC. 343. Preparation of record of trial: The trial judge advocate shall prepare the record of trial, which shall include in narrative form the testimony of the witnesses. The trial judge advocate and the defense counsel shall agree upon the record and the statement of the testimony, and shall authenticate the record in certification of their agreement, and the record shall thereafter be authenticated by the president of the national security training court. In the event of disagreement, the testimony of the witnesses and any other part of the record in dispute shall be stated by the national security training court, whose decision evidenced by the signature of its president shall be final.

SEC. 344. Disposition of record of trial: The record of trial shall be transmitted to the reviewing authority who shall forthwith refer it to his staff judge advocate or officer assigned to law duties for consideration and advice. After having been acted upon by the reviewing authority, the record of each trial by a national security training court shall be transmitted to such general headquarters as the President may designate in regulations, there to be filed in the office of the staff judge advocate or officer assigned to law duties.

SEC. 345. Approval by reviewing authority: No sentence of a national security training court shall be carried into execution until it shall have been approved by the reviewing authority and in the case of a sentence involving a bad-conduct discharge or a dishonorable discharge until the record of trial has been held legally sufficient as provided in section 341. However, a sentence involving withholding of privileges, extra duty, restriction, or confinement shall run from the date of the announcement of the sentence by the court. Neither an acquittal nor a finding of not guilty shall require approval by a reviewing authority and neither shall be disapproved.

SEC. 346. Powers incident to power to approve: The power to approve the sentence shall include the power to approve or disapprove a finding and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense and to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence and to order a rehearing: *Provided*,

however, That no rehearing shall be ordered upon any charge or specification upon which the accused has theretofore been acquitted by the court nor shall a court on rehearing have power to increase the sentence originally imposed. The power to approve a sentence shall include power to mitigate or remit the sentence or suspend, for a period not exceeding the period of training, the execution of a sentence or any part thereof but shall not include the power to increase the sentence. The reviewing authority or his successor in command and higher military training authority shall have power to vacate the suspension of any sentence, or any part thereof, and order it carried into execution.

SEC. 347. Segregation of trainees: So far as practicable, trainees held in confinement shall be segregated from members of the armed forces so held.

SEC. 348. Surrender of trainee to civil authorities: Any trainee who is accused of a crime or offense punishable by the laws of the United States or the Territories or of the several States or a subdivision thereof shall be surrendered, upon application duly made, to the civil authorities for trial: *Provided*, That any proceeding, trial, or period of punishment resulting therefrom shall not operate to relieve the trainee from any liability for further training in the corps.

SEC. 349. Return of trainees held by civil authorities: The appointing authority when advised that a trainee is held in custody by the civil authorities shall in appropriate cases make application for his return to training control; the trainee unless already tried by the civil court for the offenses with which he was charged by the civil authorities may be brought to trial before a national security training court, or the case shall otherwise be disposed of, in the discretion of the appointing authority.

SEC. 350. Jurisdiction of the United States courts: The several district courts of the United States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction of the crimes and offenses defined in sections 351 to 358, inclusive.

SEC. 351. Desertion: (a) Any trainee who deserts or attempts to desert the military training program of the National Security Training Corps shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both.

(b) Any trainee who quits his organization or place of duty under such circumstances as to indicate an intent not to complete his training and remains absent therefrom for a period of more than 1 month shall be deemed a deserter.

SEC. 352. Advising or aiding desertion: Any trainee or other person who advises or persuades or knowingly assists another to desert the military training program of the National Security Training Corps, or who harbors a deserter, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both.

SEC. 353. Escape from confinement: Any trainee who, having been duly placed in confinement, escapes therefrom shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $1,000 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both.

SEC. 354. Assaulting officers, warrant officers, flight officers, petty officers, noncommissioned officers, or other persons in authority: Any trainee who, on any pretense whatsoever, strikes an officer, warrant officer, flight officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person in authority over such trainee, or draws or lifts up any weapon or offers any violence against such person, being in the execution of his office, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

SEC. 355. Collective insubordination: Any trainee or other person subject to the provisions of title II of this act who attempts to create or who begins, excites, causes, instigates, encourages, or joins in any collective insubordination tending to hinder or impede training under title II of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $2,000 or imprisonment for 1 year, or both. Collective insubordination within the meaning of this section shall include any concerted action in the nature of a strike, including a sit-down or slow-down strike, or walk-out, picketing or boycott, which tends to hinder or impede training under the provisions of title II of this act.

SEC. 356. Failure to suppress collective insubordination: Any trainee or other person who, being present at any occurrence involving collective insubordination, does not use his utmost endeavor to suppress the same, or knowing or having reason to believe that such collective insubordination is to take place, does not without delay give information thereof to his commanding officer or other competent military authority, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both.

SEC. 357. Property loss, damage, or wrongful disposition: Any trainee who willfully, or through neglect, suffers to be lost, spoiled, damaged, or wrongfully disposed of, any property furnished for or intended for use under the provisions of law providing for training in the corps shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both, and may be required to make good the loss or damage, in whole or in part, and when required to make good the loss or damage the amount of the liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance.

SEC. 358. Waste or unlawful disposition of property: Any trainee who sells or unlawfully disposes of or willfully or through neglect injures or loses any arms, ammunition, accouterments, equipment, clothing, or other property issued for use in accordance with provisions of title II of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both, and when required to make good the loss or damage, the amount of the liability determined thereunder may be collected by stoppage against the authorized cash allowance.

SEC. 359. Absence without leave: Any trainee who fails to report at the fixed time to the properly appointed place of duty, or goes from the same without proper leave or absents himself from his command, guard, quarters, stations, camp, or ship without proper leave, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 360. Disrespect and insubordination: Any trainee who behaves with disrespect or in an insubordinate manner toward an officer, warrant officer, flight officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person having lawful authority over him, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 361. Breach of arrest: Any trainee who, having been lawfully placed under arrest, breaks his arrest before he is set at liberty by proper authority shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 362. Release or escape of prisoner: Any trainee who without proper authority releases a prisoner committed to his charge, or suffers a prisoner committed to his charge to escape, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 363. Drunk or disorderly: Any trainee who shall be found drunk or disorderly in quarters, station, ship, command, or under such circumstances as to bring discredit upon the National Security Training Corps, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 364. Offenses of sentinels: Any trainee posted as a sentinel or watch who is found drunk or sleeping upon his post or leaves his post before he is regularly relieved, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 365. Disobedience of lawful orders: Any trainee who willfully disobeys or fails to obey any lawful command of his superior officer, warrant officer, flight officer, petty officer, noncommissioned officer, or other person having authority over him in accordance with law, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 366. Assault: Any trainee committing an assault shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 367. Assault and battery: Any trainee committing assault and battery shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 368. Committing a nuisance: Any trainee who shall commit a nuisance shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 369. Carrying a concealed weapon: Any trainee who shall carry a concealed weapon without proper authority shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 370. Discharging a firearm: Any trainee who shall through careless or without proper authority discharge a firearm in camp, quarters, station, ship, or command shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 371. False official statement: Any trainee who shall make a false official statement or report shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 372. False swearing: Any trainee who shall swear falsely before a national security training court or any officer thereof or in any investigation, proceedings, or course of justice had under or arising out of this code, or who shall make a false oath to an affidavit, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 373. Indecent exposure: Any trainee who shall indecently expose his person shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 374. Possession of intoxicating liquor: Any trainee having in his possession intoxicating liquor in violation of orders in camp, quarters, station, ship, or command, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 375. Larceny, embezzlement, and obtaining property under false pretenses: Any trainee who shall take, steal, and carry away, or embezzle or obtain by false pretenses money or property of the value of $20 or less, shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 376. Miscellaneous offenses: Though not mentioned in the preceding sections, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and trainee discipline, all conduct of a nature to hinder or impede training or to bring discredit upon the National Security Training Corps, of which a trainee may be guilty shall be punished as a national security training court may direct.

SEC. 377. Conviction; effect thereof: Conviction by a national security training court of an offense denounced by this code shall not be deemed a conviction of crime for any purpose.

SEC. 378. Making good time lost: Every trainee may be required to make good any time lost to training as a result of his own willful act or neglect, and this shall include time lost in desertion or absence without leave and time lost by a trainee due to restraint prior to trial resulting in conviction

or restraint imposed as a result of a sentence by a national security training or civil court.

SEC. 379. President may prescribe rules: The President may, by Executive order, which he may modify from time to time, and which shall be published in the Federal Register, prescribe the procedure including the rules of evidence and maximum limits of punishment, not exceeding the maximum limits of punishment authorized by this code, in cases before national security training courts: *Provided*, That nothing contrary or inconsistent with this code may be so prescribed.

SEC. 380. Trainee; separation from National Security Training Corps: No trainee lawfully inducted into the military training program of the National Security Training Corps shall be discharged from that corps without a certificate of discharge signed by such officer as may be designated under regulations prescribed by the head of the appropriate department; and no trainee shall be discharged from the National Security Training Corps before his term of training has expired, except by order of the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or by sentence of a national security training court: *Provided*, That in order to record the condition of final separation of an individual from the military training program of the National Security Training Corps and to specify the character of service rendered by the trainee during the period of training covered by the discharge, if the President shall, by regulations, provide for the types and conditions of discharges to be effected, except that a bad-conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge may be adjudged only by a national security training court in accordance with the provisions of section 341 of this code.

SEC. 381. Certain sections of code to be read and explained: Sections 302, 303, 304A, 305, 306, 313, 314, 350 through 378, 380, 382, and 383 of this code shall be read and explained to every trainee at the time of his induction or within 6 days thereafter and shall be read and explained once every 3 months to all trainees.

SEC. 382. Complaints of wrongs: Any trainee who believes himself wronged by his commanding officer or any other person having authority over him and who, on due application to his commanding officer, is refused redress, may complain to the next higher military training authority who shall examine into the complaint and take proper measures for redressing the wrongs complained of.

SEC. 383. Injuries to property; redress of: Whenever complaint is made to any commanding officer that damage has been done to the property of any person or that his property has been wrongfully taken by persons subject to this code, such complaint shall be investigated by a board consisting of any number of officers from one to three, which board shall be convened by an appointing authority and shall have, for the purpose of such investigation, power to summon witnesses and examine them upon oath or affirmation, to receive depositions or other documentary evidence, and to assess the damages sustained against the responsible parties. The assessment of damages made by such board shall be subject to the approval of the appointing authority, and in the amount approved by him shall be stopped against the cash allowance of the offenders. And the order of such commanding officer directing stoppages herein authorized shall be conclusive on any disbursing officer for the payment by him to the injured parties of the stoppages so ordered.

Where the offenders cannot be ascertained, but the organization or detachment to which they belong is known, stoppages to the amount of damages inflicted may be made and assessed in such proportion as may be deemed just upon the individual members thereof who are shown to have been present with such organization or detachment at the time the damages complained of were inflicted as determined by the approved findings of the board.

SEC. 384. Effective date of code. The provisions of this code of conduct shall take effect on the effective date of title II of this act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the amendment and, as will be noted, my name appears on it with that of the Senator from Nevada as a sponsor.

Am I to understand that the Senator will offer the amendment as a complete substitute for the pending bill, or merely as an addition to the pending bill?

Mr. MALONE. It is an addition to the pending bill, and is designed to take the place of the draft law after perhaps 12 to 18 months, when in the event of acceptance of the amendment there will be no further use for the draft law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When I discussed the amendment which the Senator has proposed, it was my belief—and apparently I misunderstood the position of the Senator from Nevada—that this training bill would be offered as a substitute to take the place of the draft. I joined in it because, I wish to say frankly, Mr. President, in my opinion a general, reasonable training bill for the young men of the country, based upon the general principles of this amendment, would be of far greater use than the draft legislation which is pending before the Senate.

However, I must say in fairness, and with all respect for the Senator from Nevada, that I do not want to subscribe to the idea of having a draft act and also having this training bill. I should like to see the training bill substituted for the draft bill. I wanted to make my position quite clear on that point.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I accept the statement of my colleague from West Virginia and I regret the misunderstanding. The draft bill will answer the question of the immediate emergency the President of the United States says is impending. Furthermore, the veterans' organizations of the United States—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled Veterans—have recommended a combination of the two bills for that very purpose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I take the position, and expect to discuss it a little later, that the draft is not necessary, that had the voluntary enlistment plan been carried through as it was initiated in 1945, and as it was intended to be carried through, there would be no call today for a draft in peacetime.

I am somewhat familiar with the subject, because I helped to introduce the legislation in 1945, and I know of the opposition it met at that time, even at the hands of the military authorities. I know that subsequent to that time there were acts and policies put forward by the War Department which absolutely blocked the enlistment of men into the Army.

The facts are set forth in the RECORD, and I expect to discuss this matter later in my own time. It is my belief, if I may repeat, that a reasonable training program of the young men of the country along the lines provided in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada would be a preferable substitute for the draft bill which is before the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished colleague from West Virginia in many things he has said. The fact remains, however, that regardless of whose fault it was the rules and regulations laid down in the draft legislation did not prevent a shortage of men in the Army, and the President of the United States and the State Department, and all the authorities in the Administration who have in their charge the foreign policy, say legislation is necessary to meet an emergency, and that is why I offer this as an amendment, to take up the load in 12 to 18 months when the draft legislation would no longer be necessary, even in the event of an emergency.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In reply to the statement of the able Senator on the subject of the shortage, I hold firmly to the view that if the classification test which is being given were lowered, if the passing mark which existed during the war and prior to the war were made lower, or even raised to just a reasonable extent, there would be no shortage of men for the Army. There are no shortages for the Navy. The Navy gets along on voluntary enlistments today, the Air Corps has its voluntary enlistments, but the Army has raised its passing mark, for the foot soldier, in particular, until there is a shortage, through the act of the military alone.

Mr. MALONE. I understand it is the opinion of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that it is the qualifications the men are expected to possess which limits voluntary enlistments. Is that true?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to say, Mr. President, that there are few people in this Nation who believe that the Kaiser would ever have gone to war if we had had a definite foreign policy and had been prepared to fight to maintain it.

There are few who believe that Mr. Hitler of Germany or the Mikado of Japan would have gone to war with us if we had been prepared to fight, and they had understood definitely what would cause us to fight; if the countries of the world had been informed of the areas and the nations we considered it necessary to protect for our own ultimate safety, and if we had been prepared to offer such protection. But we always practically said we would not fight, or gave that definite impression, and upon investigation any nation would naturally decide that we probably could not fight, at least could not get ready in time to be a factor in any world war. In both cases, therefore, we were forced into the war before we had an opportunity to properly prepare for the conflict.

Few people believe at this time that Stalin, or anyone else in the world, would attack us at this time, or within any reasonable time, if we have properly trained men, and the necessary equipment. Our people want us to lay down a foreign

policy and let them know what it is, and let the world know definitely what would cause us to fight. In other words, name the nations and the areas whose integrity we were prepared to protect for our own ultimate safety. But we still do not have a foreign policy at this late date—we blow hot and cold.

I wish to recall now that this is the same administration that stopped General Patton outside of Berlin, and waited until the Russians could bring equipment from Russia and move into Berlin first, before any of our military forces were allowed to go into that city.

This is the same administration that dismissed the greatest army ever assembled and gave away the greatest aggregate of equipment, including thousands of dollars' worth of surplus transportation equipment and arms, ever known in the history of the world, all before establishing any international or foreign policy at all.

This is the same administration, Mr. President, which recognized Russia in 1933 without any safeguard whatever, and now tells us, through the message of the President, that Russia is threatening our own safety through the threats to the safety of other nations in the world.

This is also the same administration that made fantastic promises of territory to Russia at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and few if any of us knew what promises were made, and there is a strong suspicion that Russia even now has taken no territory that was not either promised definitely or promised through implication at one or more of these conferences.

Mr. President, if we are to avoid a third and greater conflict, we must remain strong and able to protect ourselves until such time as the United Nations can take over the job or the major problems of the world have been settled. We are still technically at war. We are advised by the President of the United States that the peace of the world is again threatened. Therefore, it is imperative that we be ready for any emergency until the peace of the world is reestablished.

Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD an explanation or digest of the bill, and I ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF TOWE BILL (H. R. 4278)—TITLE, "NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING ACT OF 1947"

POLICY STATEMENT

1. Every male citizen owes equal obligation to undergo training to fit him to contribute to country's protection in emergency.

2. Adequate preparedness will prevent wars and needless sacrifice of human life.

3. A citizenry trained for defense is bulwark of democracy, keystone of preparedness, and can best be assured through training of youth for national security.

TITLE I

Chapter I: Creates National Security Training Corps, to be administered by a National Security Training Commission of three members, one of whom shall be a member of armed services. Members to be appointed by President, subject to confirmation by Senate. Term of appointment, 5 years. Salary of Chairman, $15,000; other members, $12,500. Commission would be empowered to employ and fix compensation of subordinate officers and employees, subject to civil-service laws and Classification Act of 1923. Executive direction would be in hands of a civilian Executive Director, salary $12,000.

Commission would determine policies and standards, but would not directly operate any phase of program. Operation of program, as applied to all persons qualified for any form of military training, would be responsibility of service agencies, subject to general supervision, inspection, and control by Commission. Commission would determine extent to which training of conscientious objectors and persons not qualified for any form of military training should be handled by armed services, other existing agencies of Federal Government, or through other public or private organizations. In consultation with other governmental agencies it would formulate a program for such nonmilitary training.

Commission would employ full-time civilian inspectors to report on operation of system and provide basis for recommendations by Commission to Secretaries of armed services and the President for improvement of any phase of program. In collaboration with heads of departments concerned, Commission would recommend to President rate of implementation of training program as prescribed by law.

A general advisory board of not less than 10 nor more than 25 members, not less than 3 of whom would be chosen from armed forces, others to be outstanding civilian leaders, would advise the Commission particularly on policies pertaining to moral, religious, recreational, information, educational and other nonmilitary aspects of program. The bill requires that all training be carried out "on the highest possible moral, religious and spiritual plane"; banishes disorderly or questionable resorts from areas around military camps; and provides $1,000 fine and year's imprisonment for supplying intoxicants to trainees.

Training formula: Six months' continuous training in camp, followed by induction into one of several alternative programs, optional with trainees, subject to quota limitations and standards of qualification and selection to be prescribed by regulation.

Options: 1. Additional training in National Security Training Corps for a second period of 6 months. (It is anticipated that many of the men choosing this option would either be sent to service schools and trained as technical specialists, or be assigned during the second 6 months to training cadres, and used as instructors.)

2. Voluntary enlistment at any time in any of the Regular services, including Coast Guard. (It is anticipated that operation of UMT system would encourage enlistments and thus strengthen the Regular establishment).

3. Enlistment in National Guard or Organized Reserves (thus providing them with a continuing flow of trainee-recruits to bring them up to authorized strength and keep them there).

4. Entrance into one of service academies on the usual terms.

5. Enrollment in Navy and Marine Corps officer-procurement programs or in college ROTC or NROTC units, plus enlistment in Enlisted Reserve, under an agreement to accept a Reserve commission if offered on completion of course. (To provide continuous flow of junior officers.)

6. Enlistment in Enlisted Reserve of any of the services for a term to be prescribed, and enrollment in approved courses of technical or specialist training in schools, colleges or universities to be approved by service secretaries. (To insure adequate supply of higher-grade specialists and technicians).

7. Enlistment in ERC for 6 years (the catch-all option) by those who for any reason could not choose one of the other alternatives, subject to 6 months' additional active duty training at the rate of not more than 30 days in any calendar year. (Set up for those to whom other options are not open, and having the value of making them available for further training as considered necessary or desirable.)

There is further provision for scholarships with Federal aid to selected trainees, subject to agreement on their part to serve in armed forces as required, following completion of studies.

Pay at rate of $30 a month is provided for all trainees during period of training in camp, with additional allowances for dependents. ($50 for one, $65 for two.)

Chapter II (title I): Sets up a selective-training system patterned after the Selective Service Systems of World Wars I and II, operating through State and local boards, to register and induct men of appropriate age groups. Registration at 18, induction at 19, except that 18-year-olds could be inducted at that age with parents' consent.

TITLE II

Provides for a special code of conduct adapted to youth and circumstances of trainees, with specific penalties for various offenses, to be administered by NST courts with broad powers. Trainees violating State and Federal laws would be turned over to civil authorities for trial.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Nevada is offering a bill as an amendment which would in effect be a substitute for the pending bill?

Mr. MALONE. I am offering it as an amendment to the bill itself.

Mr. President, I have in my hand resolution No. 859 of the Twenty-ninth Annual convention of the American Legion held in New York City, August 28 to 31, 1947. The resolution is as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Whereas the peace of the world is again in jeopardy, threatening the safety of our people and urgently requiring that this Nation rebuild its security structure on the broadest possible basis as the sole protection against destruction of our civilization and the loss of our freedom; and

Whereas the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, after 6 months' intensive study and deliberation, has submitted a profound and statesmanlike report recommending universal military training as an indispensable element in a comprehensive and integrated program for the national security; and

Whereas the House Committee on the Armed Services in the Eightieth Congress favorably reported H. R. 4278, endorsed by the national commander of the American Legion, to provide for a system of universal military training as recommended by the commission, and setting as a declaration of policy that (a) every male citizen of the United States owes an equal obligation to undergo training which will fit him to contribute to its military protection in emergency; (b) adequate preparedness is the best protection against wars and the needless sacrifices of human life; and (c) a citizenry trained for defense is the bulwark of democracy and the keystone of preparedness, and can best be assured through the training of the Nation's youth for the national security; and

Whereas the American Legion has consistently fought for the adoption of an adequate program of universal military training; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in convention assembled in New York, August 28–31, 1947, That—

1. We urge that a special session of the Congress of the United States be called forthwith to enact legislation strengthening our national defense and providing for universal military training as the basic element thereof.

2. All members of every post of the American Legion be urgently requested to petition their Representatives and Senators to vote favorably on universal military training.

3. Each department of the American Legion be directed to institute forthwith a militant program of information and education for the benefit of the American people, that they may understand the importance of immediate action on this measure, and the dangers to our homes and to our country which requires its enactment without delay.

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to all United States Senators and Representatives, to the President of the United States, and to all newspapers, patriotic organizations and civic agencies.

Mr. President, I have received a letter from the adjutant of a post of the American Legion in my own State of Nevada. This is a typical letter from a legionnaire who does not understand how the Congress of the United States can avoid taking a position on such an important piece of legislation for 30 years, and I shall read it for the RECORD.

It is addressed to me and is as follows:

Answering your letter to the Post of April 7.

Carson Valley Post has always been in favor of universal military training. This matter was again considered at the meeting held on May 4, at which time it was unanimously voted for by all present, both War I and II veterans.

What we don't understand—

I call the Senate's attention to this paragraph which is typical of the mail received in my office.

What we don't understand is, that all the polls show that a majority of the people in all the States, Rotary clubs, Kiwanis clubs, and other service clubs, the American Legion, and the VFW, are for universal military training, but Congress, for some reason, is opposed to this bill. Both Houses always want a substitute of some kind, different than what the people want.

Yours respectfully,

GROVER L. KRICK, *Adjutant.*

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point my answer to the letter addressed to me by Mr. Grover L. Krick, adjutant of the Carson Valley Post, No. 11.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1948.

Mr. GROVER L. KRICK,
Adjutant, Carson Valley Post, No. 11, Gardnerville, Nev.

DEAR GROVER: I have your letter and I, like you, am unable to understand why Congress has been so reluctant to prepare for emergencies, when it is so obvious, and has been to every ex-serviceman, that the only way we are going to keep out of trouble—if, in fact, we can at all—is to be ready for it.

Few people I have ever met believe that either the Kaiser or Hitler would have ever gone to war if we had been ready to fight and had laid down a foreign policy, naming the areas and the nations of the world, including the European countries, it is necessary to protect for our own ultimate safety. But instead of that, in each case we were denying that we would fight and upon investigation by these men it was evident that they concluded in each case that we could not prepare ourselves in time to be a factor in the war. Therefore, we were forced into two world wars entirely unprepared, and as I said on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, murdered a lot of good boys before we were able to make ourselves really felt.

I am enclosing copy of my talk on the occasion of the airplane budget presented by the Appropriations Committee for a 70-group air force.

I am also enclosing a reprint of a summary of my address on the Marshall plan, and you will note that I emphasized that it wasn't necessary to put out $17,000,000,000 in Europe if we would, in fact, lay down a policy based upon the Monroe Doctrine, letting the world and the American people know what would cause us to fight—and feed the hungry people in the world to the extent possible without upsetting our own economic equilibrium until they raised the third crop following World War II—and then loan money for the rehabilitation of industry only on the same terms that we loan it to our own citizens through the RFC rules, either through the RFC itself or the World Bank.

You and I carried the banner for universal military training between the two world wars and I am still for it. As outlined in my previous letter, I believe that we must put a lot of emphasis on education and technical training for a sizeable group of citizens since the electronics field is highly technical and little understood and offers the only salvation in keeping ahead of the world not only in military offensive and defensive weapons, but in general progress.

Will appreciate it, Grover, if you will read the two addresses and write me again. Very little they are doing here, and nothing I saw in Europe, makes any sense to me over the long range. For 15 years the Congress of the United States has been jammed around through emergency government and very little long-range legislation has been enacted. Certainly the Marshall plan, the selective free trade through the trade agreements and named with the catchword "reciprocal trade," and the International Trade Organization, do not make sense as far as this country is concerned.

I hope you will note particularly the last part of my Senate address on the Air Corps appropriation. And, on further consideration, I am enclosing, also, a copy of my entire debate on the Marshall plan. I had a 25-minute address to make and it required 2 days to make on account of the running debate. You will notice that I debated the claim always made by the disciples of the gift loans to foreign nations that we would or should receive strategic and critical materials in return. I also secured a direct admission that the gift loan as outlined in the Marshall plan is nothing more or less than adopting a policy of making up the trade balance deficits of each of the 16 European Marshall-plan nations for the preceding 12 months annually, which is a dangerous precedent.

I hope you will study these things as I know you can and understand the far-reaching economic "one world" set-up behind it. That is the real danger.

Will you attend the convention in Elko in August? I hope to be there since I believe we will finish our work here prior to the Republican convention in Philadelphia and then we should be home early in June. I am looking forward to a real visit with you. Please give the gang my best regards.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter just received by me from Paul A. Hammel, commander, Department of Nevada, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a telegram from Bryon P. Burt, department commander of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Las Vegas, Nev., June 2, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: In reply to your telegram of the 28th May to me and 2d June to Franklin, our department adjutant, I am putting down briefly the ideas that we both believe are predominant in the minds of the veterans of Nevada in regard to the legislation in Washington on the subjects "Draft" and "UMT."

1. Definite opposition to any bonus plan to increase voluntary enlistments.

2. Definite opposition to conscription by draft of 18-year-olds.

3. We believe there is a need for a temporary draft law—to apply to 19 years of age and up, with all overseas wartime veterans exempted, and all wartime veterans with State side service of a year or more to be exempted.

4. Definitely favor a UMT bill for permanently building up of the Reserves.

5. Opposed to giving to peacetime draftees the so-called benefits of wartime veterans.

We believe that those five things fairly well covers the ideas here with the exception of stock piling and scientific research which are naturally covered under different bills.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. HAMMEL, *Commander.*

Ely, Nev.

Hon. GEO. W. MALONE,
U. S. Senator from Nevada, Washington, D. C.:

Retel American Legion Department of Nevada stands behind universal military training 100 percent. Department makes no recommendation with reference to draft.

BRYON P. BURT, *Department Commander.*

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I wrote to Mr. Forrest M. Bibb, adjutant, Darrell Dunkle Post, No. 1, the American Legion, Reno, Nev., a copy of which was sent to all other American Legion posts in the State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 7, 1948.

Mr. FORREST M. BIBB,
Adjutant, Darrell Dunkle Post, No. 1, The American Legion,
Reno, Nev.

DEAR FORREST: I have received your copy of the resolution passed by the Darrell Dunkle Post, No. 1, of Reno, Nev., favoring universal military training.

As you probably know, I have carried the ball for universal military training, which we used to call the universal draft in the old days, for 25 years all during the time that I was department commander of the department of Nevada, through two terms as national executive committeeman for our State, and as national vice commander.

You probably also know that I served for many years on the national defense committee of the national organization of the American Legion.

I remember that about 1930 we met in Washington and tried to get the Congress of the United States to appropriate money to build 800 planes which in the light of sub-

sequent events does not seem like very many planes. At that time our idea was to have the machinery set up, together with the necessary dies, and by turning out the latest in flying equipment be in a position in case of emergency which, of course, no one anticipated at that time except that the American Legion members know through experience that an emergency can arise at any time, and the Congress turned us down.

I remember that I addressed the Legion in New Jersey soon after that and said, among other things, that many boys were literally murdered in the First World War on account of lack of equipment, and I was qualified to testify in that regard, since I had a battery of field artillery in France early in 1918 and we received our nice new shiny 4.7 field artillery guns just 2 weeks after the armistice. In the meantime we had used French 75's. I said at that time when you send young men into battle with guns that shoot a little short of the other fellow's and planes that fly a little slower, that was not war, that was murder.

I was special consultant to the Senate Military Affairs Committee on examination of Military Establishments during the war and also special consultant to the Secretary of War on strategic and critical minerals and materials, and among other things we followed the Japs into Dutch Harbor. I made the report on Dutch Harbor, the Aleutian Islands, and all of Alaska which raised a lot of trouble for a good many people in Washington; also later in 1943 the report on New Guinea and the South Seas.

The first report was made in 1942 and we practically had nothing in Alaska, and if you will remember, right after that we started moving equipment into that area. We flew into Nome and I made the remark to the Senator who was with me that if we had a couple of 45's apiece we could take Nome ourselves since they had no equipment whatever, and that was less than 30 miles from Siberia.

I hope that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, headed by CHAN GURNEY, who is working on this matter, brings out a bill that will provide not only for the required physical training which will be less in proportion than for World Wars I and II, but with emphasis on mental and technical training with special reference to the electronics field which covers nearly everything from radar to the atomic bomb. I believe that it will be necessary and that we should provide examinations through aptitude tests and take some of these boys not only through high school and colleges but into the laboratories with special emphasis on the ones that show ability to absorb such training, then if there is no emergency let them go out into private life and make a living in the regular way just as engineers and technically trained men always do until they are needed. This is a vital thing and such training must be provided.

There was a bill introduced in the Senate on March 25 of this year to "promote the progress of sicence; to advance the national health, property, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes."

This sets up an organization known as the National Science Foundation and would provide for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences and would form a basis for just such training as I have suggested.

I believe that nearly every person who mentions universal military training has his own conception of such training. I have outlined my conception of what is necessary to you and I will be glad to have you present it to the post and to hear from you officially with any ideas that you may have. If the post does not meet right away, I will be glad to hear from you at once with a supplemental letter after it has been presented to the post because I think this legislation will come before us very soon and I expect to take an active part in the debate at that time.

Please give my regards to the boys and I will look forward to hearing from you.

Best personal regards,

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I want to refer briefly to the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services held from March 17 to April 3 of this year, and to the testimony of James F. O'Neil, national commander, the American Legion. His testimony will be found beginning on page 782 of the hearings held on April 1. His testimony is in part as follows:

The American Legion is composed of more than 3,000,000 members, and it has an auxiliary of 1,000,000 women, and in my capacity of national commander, I am speaking for both organizations.

Since 1919 the American Legion has supported universal military training. In fact, out of the first convention in Minneapolis, Minn., in November 11 and 12, 1919, there was adopted a resolution referring to the very subject which is before you, and if I may be permitted to read from a prepared statement which has been submitted to you, I shall read that resolution:

Mr. President, the resolution was adopted in 1919, immediately upon the return of the veterans from the First World War. The resolution read by Mr. O'Neil is as follows:

That a large standing army is uneconomic and un-American. National safety with freedom from militarism is best assured by a national citizen army and navy based upon the democratic and American principle of the equality of obligation and opportunity for all.

We favor a policy of universal military training, and the administration of such policy should be removed from complete control of any exclusively military caste.

We favor a national military and naval system based upon universal military obligation, to include a relatively small Regular Army and Navy and a civilian army and navy capable of rapid expansion, sufficient to meet any national emergency, on a plan which will provide competitive and progressive training for all officers.

We recommend that military training be encouraged in high schools and colleges.

We favor the continuance of training camps for the training and education of officers to serve in case of national requirement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I missed a portion of the argument of the Senator from Nevada. I wonder if the Senator has covered the subject of the number of young men he anticipates training each year? Is it the number usually spoken of—1,250,000? That is the number which has been estimated previously.

Mr. MALONE. The number of boys who come of age every year is about 1,250,000 but because of various disabilities probably not over 850,000 will be eligible for training.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask the Senator further whether he has given any thought to how these young men would be housed, the number of barracks that would have to be built, and what that would do to our housing problem in this country, keeping in mind that there is a tremendous shortage of lumber, of nails, of plywood and of all building materials that go into the construction of homes and of barracks? In other words, if it is proposed to build barracks for a million young men, the question is: What will happen to the housing situation? Has the Senator given any thought to that?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; that has been given considerable thought, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin. When young men from 19 to 25 are housed in training or in the Army we will not build each one a house costing $15,000.

I will also say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the housing program is the greatest mess I have ever observed in my entire experience. Veterans have been priced out of the market. They are being asked to pay $10,000 or $15,000 for a $6,000 home immediately after being discharged from the Army. In effect, the average veteran is being gypped out of his savings and income for a period because the Government is forced to take over many of the houses.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we are to build barracks for one and a quarter million young men, what effect will such a program have on the housing problem? We have a serious shortage of lumber today. We are using all the lumber as it is cut. We are using green lumber. We are short of nails. The nail companies tell us that their capacity is between 16,000,000 and 18,000,000 kegs a year. If we use the lumber which would be required to build barracks for a million men, the question is, Can we build any homes at all?

Mr. MALONE. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin that, if we would keep some of our material at home, instead of trying to house and board everyone else in the world, it should not be complicated. This is something that we must prepare for until such time as the United Nations takes over or we can otherwise settle some of the important problems of the world. I will say to the Senator that, in my humble opinion, it is not a question of whether we take some of these materials to house the necessary men and train them so that they may be ready, when and if the great emergency which the President assures us exists, really comes. Is it not better to preserve peace than planks and nails? Also if Russia is half the menace she is purported to be, as we are told through our armed services and the State Department, very little housing will be necessary for the million and a quarter at home. In less than a year we shall be sending those young men into battle, and if this training is not provided, unprepared, as usual. In my opinion, the question which the Senator has raised is a secondary consideration.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it the Senator's thought that with the 6 months' training provided in his proposal we can produce real soldiers? If we give the boys the type of training which the Senator suggests in his amendment, is it his thought that we shall then have soldiers who will be ready to go into combat? Before the Senator answers that question, let me say that I have read the report of the President's committee appointed to study

this question. I believe that it is quite generally conceded by those who wrote the report that if the plan for universal military training is adopted, it will not equip a single unit to go into combat, nor will it equip a single young man to go into combat. The Senator is referring to preliminary training, is he not?

Mr. MALONE. I am referring to preliminary training which would be available to each one of these men for 6 months. Then the aptitude tests would show who might be available for further training. I have already covered the point. I am sorry the Senator was not in the Chamber. What we need more than ever is to take some of our young men who meet the aptitude and other general ability tests through the high schools and colleges and into the laboratories, so that they will have some understanding of the basic technical training so necessary in modern war. I refer to the technical training, including the sciences leading to an understanding of electronics, for example, which is the foundation for radar and other modern war requirements.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it the Senator's thought that if we adopt his amendment, a year, 2 years, or 3 years from now we shall have additional combat units which will be ready to fight on a moment's notice; or does the Senator anticipate giving the boys preliminary training which would make it easier to pick them up and make soldiers of them at some later date?

Mr. MALONE. Preliminary training and a little discipline would be very good for all of them. Then they would be in the Reserve, and could take their choice of the armed services reserve. They would have an opportunity to go further with their training, and become real soldiers. Also they would have the opportunity, if they showed proper aptitude and ability, to continue their education through the ROTC in our various colleges. When they complete their work they would have sound basic education and a means of earning a living, and would be available for the armed services at any time, just as our reserve scientists and engineers are at the present moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask the Senator one further question. Keeping in mind the fact that there is a saturation point beyond which we cannot go in spending, and keeping in mind that the cost of the training program would be between $3,000,000,000 and $7,000,000,000 a year, and that if the Senator's program were adopted it would not give us a single additional combat unit if war should come upon a moment's notice, and not a single soldier trained to fight a war—keeping all those things in mind, does not the Senator believe that it would be much better, instead of spending the huge amount of money which would be necessary for a training program for squirrel hunters, if you please, to concentrate on a smaller number of men and train them better? Instead of taking a boy and keeping him for 6 months of the year, or taking a great mass of men for that purpose, would it not be better to take fewer men and train them not for 1 year, but for 5, 10, or 15 years, so that if war should come in 1949, 1950, 1951, or 1952, we would not have a great mass of men who would know merely how to about-face, and who would be qualified as pheasant hunters, but men who could fight the war of 1950 or 1955? Is not the Senator thinking in terms of 1918, 1928, and 1940, and not in terms of 1950, 1955, and 1960?

Mr. MALONE. In the first place, I deny the correctness of the Senator's premise; I subscribe to none of his assumptions.

Let us consider first the cost. Mr. Forrestal, the director of the armed services, assures me that the highest estimate of cost is much less than $2,000,000,000 a year. He believes that the cost would be well below that figure, actually less than $1,250,000,000 per year.

Second, some of these men would be ready. I would have to debate separately with the Senator each of the points which he makes, since I think they are erroneous.

When I think that many of the illustrious veterans of both wars had only 6 months' training, I certainly cannot agree with my distinguished colleague that they were only squirrel hunters. If the men in World War I had all had 6 months' training our losses would have been cut in half.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask the Senator another question.

Mr. MALONE. Let me complete my answer. We are not, however, thinking of World War I or World War II—not about 1920, 1812, or any other war. I feel we are looking forward to 1960. If the President of the United States is to be believed then there is danger of another emergency. In World War II, I was a special consultant to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, which is now the Armed Services Committee. We followed the Japs into Dutch Harbor, where I made the report on Alaska, and then went to the South Seas in 194? to report on that area.

To illustrate what I mean by training, one day in Washington a Columbia professor came to see me. He was very much agitated. I was the only one he knew connected with the Senate Military Affairs Committee. He said, "You must save the boys whom we are training in electronics." This professor, Dr. Sorensen, was drafted from California Tech by Columbia University to train the boys in this particular highly technical field. He had under his direction 25 or 30 boys who had gone through all the preliminary training. They were the cream of the crop, boys who showed aptitude, and who, like the boys I have in mind, could be taken through the ROTC, through the high schools, colleges, and laboratories, and who could be training in peacetime, rather than in wartime. This man was doing it in wartime. The 25 or 30 boys were about to be drafted. He said, "You must save them." I said, "I cannot save them, but I will see someone who may be able to do the job."

The boys were exempted. The professor said, "These boys have now reached the point where they know more than most of the older men know about fundamental electronics. They are equipped to go ahead." We, the older men, are not equipped. That, I will say to my able colleague from Wisconsin, is why I am thinking about preliminary training and discipline for the young men of this Nation. In addition to any other training which they might receive, further training would be given to the top men, who are suitable for such training. When the time comes, they will be ready.

Admittedly the crop of engineers and scientists which we have at the present time is insufficient in numbers. Their number must be supplemented; and the best way to do it is through a systematic method, not by trying to hire an army and paying men large salaries to go into the Army for 15 or 20 years. The suggestion has been made that we pay soldiers $1,000 or $5,000 to enlist in the Army, and in addition pay them high salaries. When we reach that point, we shall be like the English, who hired the Hessians during the Revolution. A handful of barefooted people whipped them all, because their heart was not in their work.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I correct in the statement that today we must make a decision as to whether we shall train fewer men, and train them better so that they will be ready to fight upon a moment's notice, or whether we shall train a great mass of men, giving them the fundamentals, with the hope that if and when war comes, there will be sufficient delay to enable us to pick up those young men and train them thoroughly? Is the Senator aware of the fact that he is now proposing that this Nation do exactly what France did prior to World War II? Is the Senator aware of the fact that the same experts and would-be experts and so-called experts who say we should train a great mass of men inadequately—the same so-called experts who say that is the way to make this Nation strong—are the same ones who, prior to World War II, and also during the early stages of that war, when there was the so-called phony war, were telling us that we had nothing to worry about, that France had the strongest land army in the world, and that France could stop any other nation in the world—simply because France then was doing what the Senator now proposes that the United States do? Will not the Senator admit that if those experts did not blind their eyes and close their ears to the facts which history has taught us, they would realize that if France had done what the real experts now propose that we do—namely, have modernized, highly trained forces, and keep abreast of the times technically—then the German Army would not have been able to rip the French armies to bits in a period of days.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Senator's questions and statements confuse me somewhat, because again I do not agree with the premise upon which he bases his questions. So I do not believe he is correct in the statements he has made; first, the plan under this amendment has no similarity to the French plan or procedure whatever. The French simply went to sleep, and depended upon the Maginot line, which most experts never expected to hold against a well-trained modern army.

I am saying that when we must depend upon a professional army, paid for fighting services done, our Nation will have started down the hill to defeat and ruin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, when I was serving in the Pacific there were many times when we would have been happy to trade 5,000 poorly-trained young men—although they were trained better than they would have been under the plan of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada—for one well-trained expert.

If I may cite an instance, let me say I recall we had a night-fighter squadron composed of excellent fliers; there was no question about that. We also had a group of boys in the radar pit. Of course, the efficiency or lack of efficiency of the boys in the radar pit fairly well determined whether the squadron of fighters would be successful. Those radar boys had been trained for about a year. Our night fighters did a fairly good job, we thought, until we got what we would call a professional soldier. He was a marine who had been in electronics for about 20 years and had grown up with radar. We put him in the radar pit, and from that night on we had a bunch of heroes in the air; from that night on not a single Japanese flier got through to our men.

That sort of thing has happened thousands of times in the combat zones. If we talk to any man who was in combat in the closing days of World War II, he will say that the plan of training a great mass of men to execute "about face" and to take down and set up again the simpler weapons of war will contribute more to our defeat than anything else we could do.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that the sergeants run the Army. In fact, I had in France one of the best top sergeants in the world, and I myself served as a sergeant for awhile. They run the Army. But in order to get good top sergeants it is necessary to survey a great many men. The good top sergeants rise to the top only in the process of training a great many men. However, if we train only a few men, there will be no possibility of developing enough good men at the top.

My able colleague from Wisconsin was in the Pacific fight and has much valuable first-hand experience. I had heard of his fighting unit before I met him—and I respect his experienced judgment.

I do not agree, however, with the Senator from Wisconsin in regard to his decision as to the effect of this measure.

It is primarily designed to bring the competent men to the attention of the military authorities of the Nation's armed services so that a top force of technically trained men sufficient to meet any emergency is earmarked in advance.

Inasmuch as the Senator has referred to the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training, I wish to show the Senator in detail what I meant a while ago when I referred to the fact that, under the plan, when those who enter the Army show the requisite aptitude and ability to absorb additional education and training, they may elect to continue a college education through the ROTC and go into the laboratories later to get the requisite training and receive the 4 to 6 years of training which is necessary in order to become scientists or engineers, and to be ready for any emergency.

It is not simply a matter of having trained soldiers. Of course, we could have a large standing Army. But under the present plan we shall have a relatively small but highly trained standing Army with well-trained civilian reserves as provided for through this amendment. Of course, the size of our standing Army should have some connection with current conditions in the United States as presented to the Congress by the President, and when he implies that a great emergency is impending—then it becomes imperative that such legislation represented by the combination draft and universal military training bills be passed. Under the present circumstances, we have nothing to take the place of a large standing Army, and we have no adequate standing Army.

So, Mr. President, I wish to read one section of the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training, and later I shall offer it for the RECORD. The fourth comment that is made in the report is as follows:

> In the case of a person who receives his basic training under the Army and who does not elect to remain for another 6 months in training, or to enlist, and who is not admitted to a service academy, the following options should be available: (1) Enlistment in the National Guard for the term of enlistment fixed at the time the choice of option is made (at the present, 3 years), with the same obligations as any enlistee in that organization (today, 48 evenings of armory or equivalent training, and 2 weeks of camp each summer); (2) enlistment in an Organized Reserve unit for the period fixed at the time of election (current thinking is 3 years), with the same obligations as any other member of an active Reserve unit, obligations which are in general comparable to those in the Guard; (3) enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for the period fixed at time of enlistment and enrollment in an ROTC course at a college or university, with an agreement to accept a Reserve commission, if offered, upon graduation therefrom (with or without Government aid as described subsequently); (4) enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for the term prescribed at the time thereof and enrollment in courses of study in civilian trade schools, vocational schools, or colleges which would provide training in professions, skills, or arts of value to the military in time of emergency and which have been approved by the Secretary of War as fulfilling such purposes (with or without Government aid as described subsequently); and (5) in the case of any person who cannot take advantage of either educational option or enlist in the National Guard or a unit of the Organized Reserve, either because of the location of his place of residence, place of employment, or place of study or because of a lack of vacancies, enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for the period designated at the time of such enlistment (current thinking, 6 years) subject to recall for not more than 1 month of active training during each year of such enlistment. Quotas would be established from time to time for all but the last-mentioned catch-all options so as to provide the most appropriate balance of persons in each group in accordance with developing military requirements.
>
> Additional comments are also necessary with respect to (a) the two so-called educational options themselves and (b) the options available to persons who wish to pursue their education further after completion of basic training. The ROTC option is designed to provide general officer training, while the other has the purpose of training persons in courses which are necessary for types of enlisted specialists for which a war creates large demands, such as radio and radar operation and maintenance, automotive maintenance, and machine-shop work, or in college-level courses, like physics, chemistry, electrical engineering, neurology, medicine, and the ministry, which lead into professions which are always in great need in wartime. While both of these options would have quotas, the inability of an individual to select one of these options (because the educational institution of his choice provided neither of them, because their quotas were filled, either generally, or at the institution he selected, because the special approved courses given at such institution were not ones which he cared to take, or because he lacked the qualifications therefor) would in nowise preclude him from pursuing his education in the manner which he desired. If, for any one of the foregoing reasons, he did not select one of these two options, his obligation would then be to enlist in either the National Guard or a unit of the Organized Reserve or, if neither of these was open to him, to go into the final catch-all option.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the Senator from Nevada and I will agree that our problem today is to get the most by way of preparedness from every dollar spent. If there is any better method of preparedness than UMT, I believe both the Senator and I would agree that method should be adopted.

Keeping that in mind, let me ask the Senator whether he does not think it might be well before we embark upon this experiment to examine into what is going on in the Army today, to find out why we do not have more competent men in the Army? As the Senator knows, men in the three lower pay grades, while they are being paid an adequate wage, are being paid in such fashion that it is impossible for any of those men to get married, and that a young man who is married could not very well enter the service unless he could start as an officer.

What I have in mind is this: I think if we could spend only a small part of the money the Senator suggests spending upon the experiment, to provide a family allowance and travel allowance for men in the lower pay grades, we would have a very great flood of enlistments. If the Army, instead of refusing as they now do to take young men for 18 months, would start taking enlistments for 18 months, would we not get more men and better men in the service, if we should take a part of the money which the Senator suggests be spent and build in various parts of the country additional service colleges like West Point and Annapolis, so that our young men could be adequately trained? If we did that, would it not be much better than inducting young men into the service, keeping them there for 6 months, then weeding them out, and letting some of them return home, bearing in mind, as we should,

that so far as 6 or 8 out of every 10 men are concerned, the money spent on them will be wasted, for they will never make soldiers?

I ask the Senator if we could concentrate on the young man who is especially proficient in science, for example in electricity, and spend the money on him, would it not be entirely possible that he might develop into a scientist and possibly invent something which would make half a million trained robots useless? In other words, now that the time is here when one bomb dropped on a city may kill half a million men in an instant of time, and when by means of bacteriological warfare whole cities may be wiped out, what good is to be accomplished by spending time and money training great masses of young men? Should we not attack the problem intelligently and say, "This is 1948, not 1918," and should we not prepare for world war III—not by training men to be placed in a great Maginot Line, to be wiped out overnight by an atomic bomb or through bacteriological warfare?

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator from Wisconsin has finished his speech and his statements, I may again say that I do not agree with the premise upon which he bases many of such statements. He is denying the basic duty of all citizens to serve the country and is trying to place the burden on a selected few. He is saying most of our boys are not fit to fight. We have seen our boys tried. We know they can fight. The only thing they need is discipline, a hard core of fundamentals. Just as no doubt the Senator from Wisconsin entered the service green in World War II, I went in green in World War I. The young man needs somebody to teach him how to keep his head down when he is going up against the hidden enemy. He needs the fundamental training.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MALONE. Allow me to answer the remainder of the Senator's questions.

The Senator says, "Let us train one scientist. Let us train the cream of the crop." That is exactly what the pending bill provides—nothing more nor less. It provides that young men shall be brought into the Army and instructed, and then they are eligible for further technical training in the trades and sciences to the extent of their aptitude and ability. But we do not intend to place all the burden on a few. Is that democracy? I do not think so. They get an opportunity to see what the flag looks like and to salute it at least twice a day for 6 months. I may say to the able Senator from Wisconsin that, in my humble opinion, that in itself is very helpful in training for good citizenship.

The Senator will recall that before World War II many high-school students paraded over the country, saying they would not fight for this Nation in an emergency. They did not mean it. They simply did not understand what was going on and wanted to identify themselves. But when one stands at salute twice a day to the flag, as the Senator did and as I did, he will never forget what the flag means. I think it implants something within a man. There will be fewer parades by young people saying they would not fight for this country in times of emergency.

We know that many men, as the Senator says, do not possess the aptitude for high school or college. The way to find such men is to bring them in for 6 months as the amendment provides, teach them fundamental discipline and give them the necessary fundamentals. During the 6 months, it could be determined whether they have the aptitude to learn and to pursue further technical training. If they do, and if they elect to do so, they may go on under the ROTC. From such young men, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, he will get the one scientist or two scientists of whom he speaks.

I am not an expert on the atomic bomb, but I am in the engineering business, and I understand the fundamentals. I am told by competent authorities that it is very doubtful if any number of atomic bombs would stop the next war within a reasonable time. The Senator well knows that when soldiers go into action against the enemy, many of them may be shot down, but they will continue the fight. The Senator has seen them do that. Similarly, when a bomb is dropped on soldiers, they do not quit; they keep on fighting.

Mr. McCARTHY. I saw large numbers of them quit after a bomb had dropped on them.

Mr. MALONE. But the Nation did not quit, the Army did not quit. Once in a while a soldier might quit, but it would be because he was out of his mind for a few minutes. For every one that quits two disciplined men spring forward.

But what I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is that even in the case of the cream of the crop it is the aptitude test which is important. Let the young men get the fundamental technical training, and then, having secured such training, through the ROTC in the high schools and the colleges and the laboratories, they may elect to attend, and then, if there is no emergency, let them enter business and earn a living the same as anyone else. If they are called, then they will be ready to respond.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was interested in hearing the able Senator from Wisconsin ask, With the atomic bomb and bacteriological warfare and other great modern improvements in the art of destruction, what is the use of military training? That is a very challenging question. I should like to ask him if he means by that that we should do away with our Army and Navy?

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope I make myself clear to the Senator. What I mean is that war, as the Senator and I agree, is the science of death and destruction. That is what it is. The side that can kill and destroy the most rapidly wins. The science of death and destruction called war is becoming more and more technical. If we go back to the days of the Grecian and Roman wars we find that great masses of men were trained to handle the sword, and to handle it well. A million men on one side of the line were roughly as strong as a million men on the opposite side. But now that the science of death and destruction is more highly developed, I believe that instead of training great masses of men to "about face" and, as the Senator from Nevada says, to salute the flag, and, instead of furnishing money for that, we should train fewer men, but train them better. There is a saturation point in spending beyond which we cannot go. Possibly we can spend $10,000,000,000 a year, possibly fifteen, possibly eighteen.

Mr. TYDINGS. I see the Senator's point.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish my answer. I say, once we decide how much money we can spend—let us say, $18,000,000,000 a year—then it is a question of how we can get the most preparedness for that amount of money. It cannot be done by thinking in terms of World War II. With all due respect to my friend from Nevada, who played a large part in helping to win World War II—he was a very important engineer, gave up much of his own income, and did a tremendous amount of work to contribute to the winning of that war—I will wager that if he had, in the latter days of World War II, seen the extent to which we progressed technically and scientifically, he would not be on the floor of the Senate urging that we prepare for world war III in this way.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not arguing with the Senator. I am only asking, if we took his point of view, where would we be? My question was, in view of what the Senator and I both know about the modern art of destruction and its possibilities for the immediate future, does he think we should do away with our Army and Navy? Either Yes or No. It is almost as simple as that.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is so simple that it does not require an answer. I am saying that we must build up a technical Army and Navy more powerful than any other in the world. But we cannot do it by training a mass of young men to be good squirrel hunters.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator says that we have the atomic weapons, and this, that, and the other thing, and that all we need is to man airplanes and put atomic bombs into them, and, one, two, three, the enemy is whipped. I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin goes that far, but people who argue down the same lane in which he is walking seem to think it is unnecessary any longer to keep up the Army and Navy. I should like to get a Yes or No answer to my question. Then we can discuss whether we need an Army and Navy.

Mr. McCARTHY. I feel that our Army is inadequate to fight world war III. I say that by adding a great mass of men to the Army we shall not make it an adequate Army to defend the country. We should do everything possible to get not draftees, not forced labor in

the Army, but to get volunteers. There are a number of ways in which that can be done, as I am sure the Senator will agree with me. As of today, a young man who wants to live a normal life, get married, and raise a family, cannot enlist in the Army, mainly because of lack of allowance for transportation of the family. Let us take, as an example, young John Jones, who has a wife and a baby. He enlists in the Army and must start at the bottom, in the lower pay grade. If he is a normal young man, or even if he is above average, it requires 2 or 3 years' service to get beyond the lower pay grades. Let us say he is a buck private or a corporal and is stationed in California. He receives orders to go to New York. If he is in the lower pay grades there is no provision to move his family from California to New York. The first thing that should be done is completely to revise our pay schedule so that we can get not the least efficient young men, but the most efficient young men, in the service. We are still operating on the theory on which we operated prior to World War II, and that is that the Army is an occupation for "bums"; that we have to get young men who have very little ambition, because they are the only young men who will join the Army.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator has said that we are proceeding on the theory that the only way we can operate at this time is to get an army of bums, or words to that effect. In other words, the implication is that because of the present pay schedules we are not attracting the right kind of men. If there is one thing that I have heard the Armed Services criticised for more than any other thing it is the fact that they have set the standard for enlistment in the Army too high. So I would take exception to what my good friend from Wisconsin has said as to what is apparently his interpretation of the intention of the Army, because, as I have observed, not only first hand and from hearings before the committee, but also from the criticism which has been directed against the Armed Services on this floor and on the floor of the House, the criticism has been that the requirements are too high and that they should be lowered so that we can get in more men.

What does my friend say with reference to that point?

Mr. McCARTHY. First, let me say that I am not blaming the Army for failure to revise the pay schedules. I think that is up to this body. I was in the service for some time. I worked with a great number of enlisted men. Not a week goes by but what I am contacted by a half-dozen of those young men who would like to get back into the service. They think that by some magical means a Senator can get them a sergeant's rating, or a technical sergeant's rating. They all have the same story: They would not object to starting at the bottom and working up, but many of them have become married. Some of them are extremely competent young men, and they know that if they start at the bottom they have no control over their destiny. They may be transported from California to New York, and back across the continent again, within a matter of months. We should be able to say to these young men, "We shall not increase the schedule, we shall not lower the standards, but if you will join the service, the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, if you are shifted from one station to another, we will give you a travel allowance so that you can move your family." That may seem simple to us, but it is not simple to them.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to make another point in this connection with that, because I think the Senator has raised a very interesting question which bears upon many phases of what we are discussing. I am sure that my friend is aware of the fact that the Army is under criticism because it has been said that if we could get all the recruits we need we could lower the term of enlistment to 2 years. The Army seems to think it should be 3 years. Why? The obvious reason is that the Army would like to do many of the things that my friend suggests should be done for men in the service, but it cannot do them for a man who is in for only a year, 18 months, or 2 years, without making the cost prohibitive. What I assume the Senator would like to do, and what I think we ought to do, is to make it possible to have careers for young men in the military forces. That would mean a better profession along some of the lines the Senator has suggested. But in talking about this bill we are met with amendments, suggestions, and opposition, all of which tend to drive down the length of service a man is to perform, the length of time he will be in the service, and all that sort of thing, which, in the long run, makes the cost of maintaining our armed forces almost prohibitive.

I am quite in agreement with what my friend says, and I wanted to take this opportunity to point out that the things which he and all of us desire to have carried out in the services are not inconsistent, so far as the cost is concerned, with a limitation such as is proposed upon the length of service, and such as will be proposed in an amendment to be offered later, as I understand.

So that the opportunity to establish a condition which will make it possible for a young man to follow a career in the services must be upon a program of a longer term of service than 18 months, or of 2 or 3 years.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for giving me an opportunity to make that point at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I heartily agree with the Senator from Connecticut that we cannot make a soldier in 2 or 3 years. It takes a long period of time, and each year it takes longer.

If the Senator from Nevada will yield one further minute, because I must leave at 4 o'clock, there is one thing which I believe the Senator overlooks and which a number of my other good friends overlook, that is that when we talk about preparing a boy to fight world war III we should stop and look at the inescapable facts. We would heartily agree that 6 months' training would equip a young man to fight world war III far less adequately than 3 days' training would have equipped him to fight World War I. I am afraid that is one of the things that many well-meaning persons overlook.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to answer the Senator from Wisconsin and I regret that he must leave the floor. Again I must say that I agree with few of his premises.

The 6 months' training is not supposed to make a man a soldier. It is supposed to lay the foundation and to bring out his aptitude and ability through aptitude tests; the qualified men may then go on. If their ambition is to go on, the opportunity is there. Then the trades education and training available in the National Guard and in the Regular Army, the technical training already described in the ROTC are available, in accordance with his aptitude and ability. A spark will be kindled in some of these men and some of the best trained soldiers and officers in the world may be developed from the ranks of these men.

Mr. President, the Senator talks about the inability of the men, of their incompetence. Such men are soon weeded out in training of this kind. The Senator has seen the corporal with seven men besides himself, he has seen the sergeant with the group of such squads, he has seen the lieutenant with the platoon, and the captain walk with the company. Every one of those men, within a matter of days, not weeks, knows who is who in the outfit, and knows whom to recommend for further training. If the recommendation is favorable, they may go on to greater training and may perhaps develop the one man, this scientist, who may do the thing the Senator has suggested, make a discovery that revolutionizes the methods of warfare. One man may invent something that may kill half a million men as the Senator suggests. The question is how to discover and train and equip the specialists while imparting the fundamentals to the group. I believe the best and most efficient method yet suggested is through the universal military training.

I am told by competent authorities that there is no question that if we had a war with Russia, Russia would take the Middle East in a comparatively short time, and that she would take Europe before we could get really started, and that it might take us 10 to 20 years to regain that area and reestablish the boundaries of the nations as we know them today. I am advised by competent authorities that the next war, regardless of the atom bomb and regardless of all the improved methods of fighting, could be a 10- to 20-year war, it could be a longer war than anything known to our generation, a devastating, wealth-destroying catastrophe. Therefore, if we do not have the trained

personnel, if large numbers of our personnel are not trained in the fundamentals, together with a substantial nucleus of men trained in the electronics and other highly technical necessary subjects, we could easily lose the war through neglect. There is a great and serious question in the minds of competent military authorities as to how long the next war might last. We have heard it said, "Just explode one bomb and the war is over," but nothing has happened that would guarantee that result, and the authorities do not expect it.

Only theorists and would-be experts go off on a tangent and talk about a push-button war.

One of our prominent military experts was heard to comment that about all we have so far to fight a push-button war is the button.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the pending bill is made necessary because our voluntary system of enlistment has more or less failed. Our armed services need more men to properly man our Military Establishment and notwithstanding all inducements heretofore made by the Congress a sufficient number of volunteers cannot be obtained.

As I understand, under the pending bill every male person from 19 to 25 is subject to the draft, and every male person from 18 to 19 years of age can volunteer, and if he should serve 1 year, he will then not be subject to draft, but will be placed in the Reserve.

I notice that the Senator's amendment does not in any manner change the pending bill. It is in addition to it.

Mr. MALONE. It is in addition to it, that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand, also, that, under the Senator's amendment, every male from 19 to 25 would be subject to universal military training. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator state his question again?

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I correct in saying that under the Senator's amendment every male person from 19 to 25 would be subject to universal military training?

Mr. MALONE. I call the Senator's attention to page 40, line 4 of my amendment. The age of the registrants is 18 and not over 20. So there is really no real conflict between the two.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose all male persons from 19 to 25 were to take up universal military training, how could the present deficiency in manpower in our armed services be overcome?

Mr. MALONE. I consider it all a matter of phasing. That for the first 12 to 18 months universal military training would be gradually built up until it would slowly eliminate the need for the draft portions of the bill. Men would gradually be available for the National Guard, the Reserve, instead of loading up these components all at once.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the Senator's amendment, if all male persons from 19 to 25 took up universal military training, then they could not be drafted, could they?

Mr. MALONE. I believe I have already answered that question. I refer you again to the provisions of my amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose they did take up universal military training; would it not be necessary for the Congress to enact additional legislation whereby they could be forced into the service of the United States during peacetime?

Mr. MALONE. No this amendment will gradually eliminate the need for any draft.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are they exempt from the draft under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. MALONE. Actually the draft section of the bill and my UMT section are two separate programs. Naturally the two would be coordinated. The one is a short-, the other a long-range program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since they are eligible for universal military training they must be exempt, in which event, should the Senator's amendment be agreed to, it would be highly improbable for our armed services to obtain sufficient manpower to properly operate our military establishments.

Mr. MALONE. The number who would go into the draft is definitely limited. They would not take the 18-year-old men but only the older men who have never served. Therefore, there need be no conflict between the two programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there a conflict between the Senator's amendment and the bill we are now considering?

Mr. MALONE. I think not. It all depends on proper phasing. Of course, the draft would take precedence over anything. But even so, there is a limited number required by the draft.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator's amendment exempt any male persons from 19 to 25 from the draft, if they choose to take the training provided for under his amendment?

Mr. MALONE. I do not think it would be necessary, because the draft would take precedence.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the Senator's view?

Mr. MALONE. That would be my opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee on the floor of the Senate, and I wonder if he would like to comment on the views expressed by the proponent of the pending amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for an answer?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. In my opinion, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada absolutely could not be dovetailed without first going carefully over the bill as reported by the Armed Services Committee and deleting from it the training provisions on a volunteer basis. In almost every section of the committee draft bill which is presently before the Senate, on almost every page there would have to be an amendment by striking out the training provision for 161,000 on a volunteer basis.

The universal military training bill now proposed by the Senator from Nevada contains a separate section covering training for every man of a certain age group as he becomes 18. There would be in each year 850,000 new availables. In the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada there are provisions whereby they can forego the training while they are 18 and can take the training later, if they desire to finish their school—19, 20, or on up to 21 years of age, I believe. Those provisions conflict with the provisions recommended by the committee. I cannot see any hope of the two operating in a dual way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose male persons from 19 to 25 were to take advantage of universal military training all at once, would it not be impossible for the armed services to obtain the manpower necessary to properly man all our military establishments and services?

Mr. GURNEY. It would be quite possible, because I cannot think that the Congress would pass a universal training measure and then not appropriate funds to carry out its provisions. I know what such a measure would do. It would require more Reservists to be called to the colors to act as instructors, more trainees, and the building of more training establishments. It would depend on how fast the Congress told the Army to proceed with the program. But certainly the provision of optional time as to when the men should come in under universal military training should be very carefully worked out and dovetailed into the draft provisions of the bill recommended by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I thought. The Senator from Nevada simply proposes to add his amendment to the pending measure without in any manner attempting to dovetail his proposal into the pending bill. I am quite certain that many conflicts in the two proposals must exist.

Will the Senator from Nevada tell us when and under what circumstances those trained under the provisions of his amendment, could be called to service?

Mr. MALONE. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota, that the two programs would have to be phased very carefully but I feel it could be accomplished. As one program increases, the other slackens off.

Mr. ELLENDER. During peacetime?

Mr. MALONE. My proposal is offered as an amendment to the bill. A draft is provided for in peacetime as the bill is now. The bill and the amendment would provide a combination. The draft would no doubt take precedence over any military training, and take precedence over any choice the men would make of the services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Eliminating that feature, can the Senator state whether or not future legislation would be required in order to draft Reservists in peacetime?

Mr. MALONE. No, I think not; because the regular draft would be provided for.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about the Senator's amendment. Let us forget the draft feature of the pending measure for the moment.

Mr. MALONE. I think it is not necessary, because the two measures provide a combination. If I had substituted my amendment for the draft then it would be an important issue.

Mr. ELLENDER. The pending measure will be effective for 2 years if enacted as written?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. At the end of 2 years the Senator's amendment would, I presume, be still effective?

Mr. MALONE. Yes, it would be effective after that time. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. When it does become effective under its own provisions, when and under what circumstances could Reservists be called in time of peace?

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the able Senator from Louisiana that during the next 2 years there will no doubt be considerable legislation in this regard. In other words, we need not worry beyond 2 years. We have a bill here which takes care of the period of 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to obtain an answer respecting the Senator's own amendment. Should his amendment prevail, when and under what circumstances could Reservists be called in peacetime?

Mr. MALONE. As a matter of fact, my amendment doesn't call anyone up for service, it merely calls young men up for 6 months training. No Reservists are even mentioned or contemplated.

Mr. ELLENDER. During peacetime?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Without further congressional action?

Mr. MALONE. Yes, I think so, because they can be called for the military training at once.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. That is for military training. But I am talking about what would happen after they have been trained and became Reservists. Could they be called by the Army to fill the gap in the event the Army could not secure a sufficient number of men on the voluntary basis?

Mr. MALONE. Only in case of a national emergency. That is the purpose of the Reserve. But if there were any emergency, certainly legislation would be enacted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. In case of emergency there would be legislation enacted. But I was wondering to what extent the Senator's amendment is self-operative in that the Army would be able to utilize the Reservists in order to fill in the gaps whenever the Army is in need of men during peacetime.

Mr. MALONE. That is the purpose of the phasing. I think it would do what the Senator has in mind. It is my opinion that once you had this number of men taking military training, you would have no trouble in securing the number of men you would need for a peacetime Army.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have stated on many occasions that I believe Congress should enact a law providing for universal military training. I fear that the pending amendment would be in conflict with the bill now under consideration, and I shall vote against the amendment. I am sorry that the Armed Services Committee did not see fit to report a bill which would have included universal military training. I believe it would be feasible to dovetail a bill providing for universal training into the pending measure and make it workable.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have read a part of the testimony given by James F. O'Neil, national commander of the American Legion, before the Committee on Armed Services in its hearings held from March 7 to April 3, 1948. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain testimony of Mr. O'Neil, beginning on page 782 and ending on page 783.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American Legion is composed of more than 3,000,000 members, and it has an auxiliary of 1,000,000 women, and in my capacity of national commander I am speaking for both organizations.

Since 1919 the American Legion has supported universal military training. In fact, out of the first convention in Minneapolis, Minn., on November 11 and 12, 1919, there was adopted a resolution referring to the very subject which is before you, and if I may be permitted to read from a prepared statement which has been submitted to you, I shall read that resolution:

"That a large standing army is uneconomic and un-American. National safety with freedom from militarism is best assured by a national citizen Army and Navy based upon the democratic and American principle of the equality of obligation and opportunity for all.

"We favor a policy of universal military training, and the administration of such policy should be removed from complete control of any exclusively military caste.

"We favor a national military and naval system based upon universal military obligation, to include a relatively small Regular Army and Navy and a civilian army and navy capable of rapid expansion, sufficient to meet any national emergency, on a plan which will provide competitive and progressive training for all officers.

"We recommend that military training be encouraged in high schools and colleges.

"We favor the continuance of training camps for the training and education of officers to serve in case of national requirement."

That is the end of the resolution adopted in 1919.

Since my election as national commander of the American Legion I have traveled 72,000 miles in these United States. I have made public appearances in 374 communities. I have talked with thousands of people, Legionnaires, non-Legionnaires, veterans, nonveterans, and citizens in every walk of life. I have made it a point to conduct question periods when it was possible during the talks which I have made, and in every instance I have included in my messages to the Legionnaires and to the public at large reference to UMT.

I can report to you accurately that the public opinion polls which reveal a preponderance of the public support UMT, that it is the case. As a matter of fact, the people are quite perturbed and somewhat upset to think that the Congress of the United States has not acted before this time on this very important matter which we consider vital to the security of the Nation in the hope of peace in the world.

I have a son who would be subject to the provisions of UMT, and I trust and hope that the Eightieth Congress will make it possible for that youngster to enjoy the benefits and, what is more, to prepare himself so that he might survive in case of an emergency and that he would be in a better position to serve his fellow man.

I have been privileged to go to the universal military training experimental unit at Fort Knox, and there I have had the opportunity to discuss this training with boys at first hand. And I mingled with many of the youngsters in training and selected those for questioning who came from my own area, so that we might feel more or less upon a common ground.

I am deeply impressed with the citizenship training values of UMT as well as its possibilities in training men militarywise, young men for service to their country in case of need. And I have a definite feeling that this is one of the reasons why Russia fears UMT more than she does the atomic bomb, because presumably Russia will be able to attain the knowledge and the know-how to produce atomic bombs, but she will never be able to offset the spirit that can be developed, the interest and welfare of our country, through the media of UMT.

These youngsters would be less subject to the infiltration tactics which are being employed throughout this Nation by the Communists of the United States, the agents of Soviet Russia.

The American Legion, as I say, has since 1919 advocated UMT. In fact, I am the twentieth national commander or his representative to appear before the Congress on Capitol Hill in support of the UMT.

As to selective service, we recognize that this is stopgap legislation at best, and in commenting on it, I would like to make some reference to some of the testimony that has been submitted here relative to calling into service or back into service those men who have already served.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of the statement of Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which appears beginning on page 796 to page 798, inclusive.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful for this opportunity to express the viewpoint of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in regard to pending legislation providing for the establishment of a system of universal military training and a limited selective service.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars numbers approximately 2,000,000 veterans of overseas service in this Nation's wars and recognized military and naval campaigns. Over 80 percent of our number are veterans of World War II. We are vitally interested in the issues confronting this committee, the Congress, and the Nation, particularly as they relate to the security of the United States.

For many years the national encampments of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have endorsed the adoption of a system of universal military training. We have steadfastly maintained that our Nation must be strong in peace, that the price of preparedness and vigilance is small compared with the enormous cost of war in both lives and treasure.

It has been the experience of those of us who have served in overseas theaters and in combat areas that the task of whipping an army into shape after declaration of war is not only a tremendous task but has all the earmarks of a gamble on the security of this country. That is why for several years prior to World War II and again since 1945 we have insisted that our Nation institute universal military training so that in the event of any

future emergency we could have available a well-trained Reserve force.

In the generation that has just passed the United States has twice sent its young men to foreign lands to wage war against aggressor nations. In both instances the aggressor nations, Germany and Japan, were at the outset little impressed with the industrial capacity of the United States to wage war.

On the other hand, these nations were impressed with the attitude highly prevalent among our leaders that events abroad gave little cause for alarm; that preparedness in the form of expanding our armed services or instituting universal military training or selective service might be misconstrued as warlike. In both instances we paid a dreadful price in lives and resources for our failure to properly evaluate these forces of evil.

Where we exercised a sympathetic understanding of world events, we nevertheless failed to transmit this understanding into action.

We must never again lead ourselves to the brink of disaster as we did in 1941 when the Congress, a few months before Pearl Harbor, preserved our already tardy Selective Service System by the narrow margin of one vote.

We are today faced with a harsh set of facts which make those of 1940 and 1941 fade in comparison. Our failure to "carry a big stick" in the days prior to World War II was justified by many of our leaders on the meager hypothesis that it was utterly fantastic to even think that German or Japanese territorial aggrandizement would extend to these shores. Whether or not there was any basis for this approach to world events in 1940 and 1941 is today too academic for discussion. We, of course, have our own ideas on this point.

I would qualify the above to this extent and at the same time express our gratitude at the great number of distinguished citizens who have changed their minds on the subject of universal military training and have now joined ranks with those of us who have been in the fight for universal military training for many years. Events of recent months have more than justified our long-standing arguments.

However, in the main, many of our leaders are today applying a similar mental approach when it is as clear and as sure as night following day that the forces of evil are slowly but surely rallying the resources of the world island of Europe, Asia, and Africa against this last great stronghold of democratic capitalism.

There is no compromising with this evil which, of course, is identified as the forces of world communism under the present-day direction of the Soviet Union.

For centuries nations have risen, declined, and been consigned to oblivion for the reason that they have failed to meet the challenges generated by newer nations and newer and more virulent ideologies.

Century after century the pattern has repeated itself until now the great states of the Mediterranean Basin, central and western Europe, and Great Britain lie prostrate, bled white by the last two global wars. Both recent world wars served to launch two new world powers; one, the United States, representing the last great universal state of Christian democratic civilization; and the other, the Soviet Union, the purveyor of that gross perversion of human dignity, known as communism.

The United States is therefore confronted with its greatest challenge since its birth as a free nation. No friendly nation is now available to contain an enemy power until we are ready for battle. This one is on us from the beginning.

There is only one way, in our opinion, to allay the tragedy of another world conflict; and that is to be strong, to stand with our feet on the ground rooted in the strength of our collective effort to be ready for any eventuality. World communism is on the march because it believes us decadent. It has borrowed a leaf from Hitler's book, without reading the last chapter, that the issue may be resolved before we can rise out of our normal peacetime complacency.

The action of this Congress in enacting universal military training will have the effect of a shot heard around the world. We will have then thrown down the gauntlet, and the world will then know that this Nation is ready to meet any challenge.

It will raise the hopes of the peoples of western Europe who today stand astride one avenue of approach of world communism. It will indicate to these nations that perhaps the spread of communism in Europe is not a one-way trip of world dictatorship.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of the letter to the committee from Edgar C. Corry, Jr., national commander, the AMVETS of World War II, which appears on pages 1072 to 1037.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMVETS OF WORLD WAR II,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1948.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: The national executive committee of AMVETS has been assembled today, from all over the Nation, to consider and recommend to the Congress an integrated program of military and industrial mobilization. The prestige and security of the United States and other democracies are daily more seriously threatened by Soviet Russia and its satellites. To meet the exigencies of the present world situation, AMVETS urges Congress to take immediate action toward establishment of a military striking force capable of resisting aggression anywhere on the face of the earth. Once attained, the United States must continue to maintain sufficient air, naval, and military might to assure that no nation, or combination of nations, in the world will attack it or subject other democratic nations to totalitarian rule.

The program adopted at AMVETS' national conventions, and reasserted at this meeting of its national executive committee, calls upon Congress for the following legislation:

1. Selective service should be enacted without further delay, to fill out all the armed services to their authorized strength, and expand them further if necessary. All men between the ages of 18 and 25 should be eligible who are not physically or morally undesirable. Deferments should be granted to fathers, and to students actually enrolled in medical, dental, scientific, or clergy courses, or preliminary work leading to such courses in collegiate or secondary schools. War veterans should be exempted from such service until all eligible nonveterans have been inducted, then those should first be considered who have had less than 90 days' service, followed by those with less than 1 year, before calling in veterans who have served for longer periods. Students under deferment should be required to report to the selective-service system periodically, and inducted if their courses are discontinued. It is urgently requested that a veteran of World War II shall serve with each local draft board throughout the country.

2. A striking air force, second to none, including at least a 70-group air force and adequately equipped Reserves, should be developed as swiftly as possible.

3. Industrial mobilization is strongly endorsed, placing all industrial and natural resources under Government supervision, along with the labor and skilled employees necessary to their utilization in the war effort, and in this connection AMVETS adopts the conclusions of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch in his earlier testimony before your committee.

4. Universal military training is of paramount importance to the continuance of this program as a future policy of assurance against aggression and destruction of world peace. Legislation recommended by the Compton report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training was necessary to national security when it was handed down a year ago; and it is absolutely imperative that immediate action be taken at this late date to build up a trained Reserve capable of defeating the totalitarian hordes that are being trained to dominate the world.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement of Francis M. Sullivan, director of national legislation, Disabled American Veterans, which appears on pages 972 to 974 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1948.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Senate Committee on Armed Services,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: There is enclosed herewith a statement on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans endorsing the principle of universal military training and selective service which your committee has under consideration at present. It will be appreciated if you will accept the statement as an endorsement of universal military training by the DAV and insert the statement in the record of the hearings.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am,
Respectfully yours,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN, DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL LEGISLATION, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, REGARDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The Disabled American Veterans respectfully recommend and urge the Committee on Armed Services to report a bill providing for universal military training and selective service. At our last national convention, held in Las Vegas, Nev., August 17–23, 1947, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Be it resolved,* That we urge the Eightieth Congress, when it reconvenes in its second session, that its first order of business shall be the enactment of proper legislation to bring into being universal military training."

It is significant when an organization comprised of service-connected disabled veterans favors legislation for the training of a peacetime Army. If there is any justification for opposing universal military training certainly it would be likely to appear in a group of disabled veterans. However, it must be borne in mind that these men are first of all American citizens and are keenly aware of the critical times in which they are living. It cannot be said with any degree of sincerity that they are warmongers. They feel that their first responsibility is to the Nation which they served so ably in time of war, and their primary concern is to protect and maintain the freedom and sovereignty of their Nation for which they so unselfishly fought and suffered.

The action of the members of the Disabled American Veterans in adopting a resolution endorsing the principles of universal military training is predicated on the principle of pre-

paredness. We feel that universal military training, while a costly venture for a peace-loving Nation, will be, in the long run, cheap insurance to maintain the freedom from oppression and tyrannical despotism that has been ours for over 150 years. These veterans are not asking someone else to shoulder the tremendous cost of universal military training because they individually comprise a large segment of the tax-paying public who will, in the final analysis, bear the cost.

Your committee has patiently listened to arguments for and against universal military training, but in no other individual or group of individuals is the request for universal military training as deep-rooted as in the Disabled American Veterans.

The Members of the Senate and House of Representatives recently were addressed by the President of the United States apprising you of the present serious threats to our freedom by the Soviet Government. In the past few weeks we have seen similar threats converted into reality in Czechoslovakia and Finland. We do not want to see the doctrines of communism extended any further. The DAV is fully conscious of the critical international situation and believe that only through a program of universal military training can the governments responsible for this action be made to realize that the United States of America is unified and ready to back its foreign policy with armed might if necessary. In this connection, attention is respectfully invited to DAV national security resolution No. 1, adopted at our last national convention:

"Withhold from all other nations all information concerning the atomic bomb and other secret weapons, and continue the production of such weapons for our own use in any new war emergency.

"Provide whatever appropriations are required to rebuild and maintain our regular armed forces and civilian components at such strength and in such a state of readiness as to make it unwise for any hostile nations or group of nations to provoke war with the United States.

"Proceed immediately under the Unification Act to (a) expand and coordinate scientific research for military purposes; (b) adopt an adequate program for industrial mobilization and stock piling of strategic materials; (c) organize world-wide intelligence service able to keep the country adequately informed of totalitarian purposes; (d) organize the armed services into a single effective, land-sea-air team capable of destroying the military potential of any enemy who may attack us."

We believe these are necessary complements to UMT.

The DAV is a nonpolitical organization according to the express terms of its congressional charter and is, therefore, not seeking political favor in urging this committee to give serious consideration to supplementing UMT with a workable selective service law. It is our position that the period between passage of a UMT law and the time when thousands of trained young men will be in the Reserves is a vulnerable one. While we believe UMT to be an essential long-range program to insure our national security, Congress should, at the same time, prepare the Nation for any eventuality by enacting a draft law.

The DAV is affiliated with the National Security Committee, which committee, through its chairman, the Honorable Owen J. Roberts, endorses legislation providing for UMT and selective service simultaneously. This position is likewise urged on Congress by the President, the Secretary of National Defense, and the heads of the armed services.

It is, therefore, respectfully recommended that this committee take immediate and effective action (1) to insure an efficient universal military-training program supplemented by a draft provision to bring the armed forces to full strength requirements, and (2) to provide a program for industrial mobilization and the stock piling of strategic materials.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on page 404 of the committee hearings we find the testimony of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. He stated as follows:

Mr. BARUCH. This is a summary. These are my recommendations:

1. Enact promptly universal military training, so valuable in the mental and physical disciplines it will teach.

2. Compulsory rehabilitation of all youth with physical or mental defects, not to perpetuate the neglects of the past.

3. The training period must be long enough so the precious time of our youth is not wasted.

4. Immediate reenactment of selective service, as requested by the President.

5. Immediate adoption of a total plan for industrial and economic mobilization so that universal training rests upon a solidly grounded pyramid of total preparedness. This mobilization plan should be enacted into law at once, to be on hand, to be put into effect on proclamation by the President and with the concurrence of Congress.

6. To avoid wrecking ourselves, set someone to watch the impact upon our economy of the partial mobilization we are entering upon and to maintain a constant inventory, balancing all our growing commitments against our resources.

These last two measures I emphasize most strongly, although not within the province of this committee, as a warning that no slack exists in our economy today and that any sudden or full rearmament could wreak a terrible inflationary havoc unless necessary controls are exercised wisely and in time.

Mr. President, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch is well known to the Members of Congress. He has acted as adviser to Presidents and to congressional committees through two world wars, and I particularly direct the attention of the Members of this body to his testimony.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain portions of the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, the title of the report being "A Program for National Security." The portions I wish to have printed are found, first, on page 71, under the heading "Educational opportunities in basic training," and second, a portion beginning on page 77 and extending to page 82, under the section "F. The Options."

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN BASIC TRAINING

We found great difference of opinion as to whether a training program would on the whole have a net educational value for the average individual. No one would advocate such a venture purely with conventional educational objectives in view, or would argue that such objectives could not far better be attained by the equivalent amount of time spent elsewhere. Such a program can, however, under present circumstances, provide some positive educational values in certain specialized directions at least. Insofar as formal or vocational education for the average trainee is concerned, these advantages are definitely and narrowly limited. Any effort to introduce such education on a large scale would fail in its purpose and, at the same time, would materially detract from the accomplishment of necessary military objectives. Opportunities for such education would include tutorial assistance, some vocational classes, testing and accreditation, and the various courses and services made available by the United States Armed Forces Institute.

There is a great opportunity in this program for extensive vocational guidance which could be of great benefit to every man in selecting the right occupation and in deciding what further education, if any, he should undertake. The armed forces already include a great deal of individual testing as a part of their regular program of classification and assignment. It is entirely feasible to supplement this program with vocational-aptitude tests which could, together with the results assembled from the trained observation of persons during the basic period, provide a sound basis for individual counseling. We recommend that this constitute a mandatory, on-duty portion of the program. We recognize that the extent of its practicability depends almost entirely upon the willingness of educators, and of educational groups and institutions, to participate in this venture on a broad basis. With their full help, such a program could be of inestimable value to many individuals and of long-range benefit to the country.

We think, also, that during such training period it will be possible significantly to reduce illiteracy among successive generations of male youth as they reach maturity. The success of the armed forces literacy program during World War II is a clear indication of what can be done in this regard. While the present existence of extensive illiteracy is a serious indictment of our educational system and a condition which should be corrected at its source as promptly as possible, we can and should take advantage of this training period to remedy present deficiencies.

F. THE OPTIONS

1. Introductory: The options herein discussed are in general to take effect after a trainee has completed his 6 months' training in a training camp. While they are options in the sense that a trainee may choose one from among them, one of the options will have to be adopted by every trainee. Upon his completion of 6 months' basic military training a man should be grounded in those fundamentals of soldiering which have been described above and would be qualified for many useful and necessary forms of military service. Moreover, he would continue to be so qualified, even in the absence of further training, although to a diminishing extent, for perhaps 5 years thereafter, and his ready adaptability for important home-defense duties would last for approximately ten additional years.

However, in spite of this training, a man would not be prepared for immediate service as an officer or to take over, without further instruction, some of the highly technical jobs which constitute such a large and important element in a modern military force. Moreover, his actual utility for immediate, effective service in a military operation must remain limited until, and unless, he is integrated into an active military organization and trained to work as an integral part of it. The options are specifically designed to take care of these problems, to provide the opportunity and occasion for officer and specialist training and to bring men into units where they can learn to use the lessons of basic training in group action. In addition, of course, the options have the very important objective of keeping a man's basic training fresh, of maintaining its carry-over value at the highest possible level and for the longest practical period under the circumstances of civilian living.

In an important sense, the options are also the goals of the basic training period as well

as extensions of the training process itself. The manning of the National Guard and other Reserve components at complete strength and with men who already know the fundamentals is in itself a major purpose of the entire universal training program. It is a purpose, moreover, which we see no other practical way of fulfilling. Thus, the options which lead men into these units not only provide a further opportunity for necessary training but also a means of assuring the constant effective strength of those vital elements of defense. Similarly, the creation of a large reserve of officers, all with the basic training of an enlisted man as well as more advanced instruction in leadership, military tactics, and strategy, is a primary objective attainable through no other program that has been suggested to us.

Because most of the options serve immediate military ends in themselves, the number to be accommodated in each should be varied from time to time as military requirements change. The quotas established for each at any given moment should represent military decisions based on present or future military needs. Moreover, developments in the art of warfare or the emergence of new weapons could from time to time require drastic revisions in the whole pattern of options, necessitating the dropping of some, the addition of others or an alternation in the content of those retained. Flexibility of this character in the options is of equal importance with flexibility in the basic training itself.

In framing a program of options we have kept the foregoing military objectives foremost in our minds, but other factors have also materially influenced our thinking. Foremost among these was the conviction that the options should so operate as to provide the least possible interference with the normal civilian lives of our young people once the basic training period is over. They should be framed insofar as practicable to permit a person to select the place where he wishes to live, the occupation he wants to follow, and the educational ends he desires to pursue. The options must also be so constructed that the principle of universality and equality of obligation is given full and continued recognition. The burdens imposed by each option should, so far as possible, fall with substantially the same weight as those imposed by every other. There should be no short-cuts through which a person may evade some or all of his responsibility. This equitable distribution of the burdens will be one of the major operating problems of the program.

It will be an essential job of the commission to make certain that the composite effect of each option, in terms of its length, intensity, and other relevant factors, is approximately the same as the effect of each of the others, and to see that appropriate conversion factors are worked out so that an individual's transfer from one option to another will neither decrease nor add to his total obligation. The ties of a particular option should not be such as to limit the freedom of a person to change the general patterns of his life, in terms of residence, occupation, or schooling, but neither should its impact be so heavy or so light that its initial selection, or subsequent abandonment in favor of another, constitutes an advantage or a disadvantage.

To the greatest degree possible, the options should also provide an opportunity for real choice among alternatives for every individual. However, it would be a mistake to overemphasize the extent to which this objective can be attained in practice. Geographical considerations, individual limitations, and the maximum and minimum capacities of each of the options, both generally, and in particular localities or at specific educational institutions, will necessarily impose serious restrictions on this freedom of selection. Such factors will often preclude the possibility of any real selection unless a man wishes to change his habitat. We would strongly urge that any arbitrary and unnecessary barriers to such freedom of choice be removed and that there be no discrimination in this regard against any individual because of his race, creed, class, or national origin.

At the present time, the precise operation of the options in practice must be somewhat a matter of conjecture. It is difficult at this moment to predict the options which individuals are most likely to select or the factors which will influence their choice. This again emphasizes the need for great flexibility in the option phase of the program.

2. Options open to those with basic training of a military character: We have given careful study to the foregoing general considerations and have examined them specifically in the light of future military requirements as they appear to us today. As a result we have come to the following general conclusions concerning the options that are of greatest urgency at the present time and the general manner in which they should operate.

First, any man, irrespective of the service under which he receives his first 6 months of training, should be able to discharge his entire obligation by continuing in universal training for the balance of a year. No man should be compelled to do this, but every man should have the opportunity to. This option has significant military value in at least one very important respect, for it would give the services the opportunity to give men certain kinds of long-term specialist and group training which might, because of limitations in facilities and equipment, prove difficult under the other options. Qualified persons in this group should have the opportunity to attend service schools. Others should be given training in actual leadership by using them in cadres for the operation of the basic training program of a succeeding class of trainees. This option would be particularly important to the Air Forces and the Navy, for in both of these the proportion of persons requiring long-term technical training is high. Those persons who indicate, either upon entrance into training or shortly thereafter, that they intend to remain for the entire 12 months should be channeled as soon as possible into special activities particularly adapted to a year's training.

Second, a man should be permitted to discharge all or part of his universal training obligation by enlistment in one of the regular services for at least the minimum term of enlistment, provided that he has the minimum qualifications therefor at the time of his application, and that a vacancy exists. This option would be exercisable either before, during, or at the termination of the basic training period. The military significance of this alternative is obvious, and we think that many boys, impressed in the course of their training with the opportunities for a career or for technical training which should be made available in all services in the postwar period, will enlist.

Third, entrance into a regular service academy should be considered as an option and no person should be admitted to one of these academies who has not previously completed basic training or a full term of enlistment in one of the services. All our future officers should have this experience. Too often in the past, a deep chasm has existed between officers and their men because the former have never shared in, and consequently do not understand, the problems of enlisted men. Limited facilities would make this option available to only a relatively few men and their selection presents a special problem because of existing laws relating to service academy appointments. We hope that experience in universal training will lead a large number of our most qualified boys to seek appointments in these academies. The quality of our future armed forces and merchant marine will largely depend on their ability continually to attract a sufficient share of the countrys' best young men.

Fourth, in the case of a person who receives his basic training under the Army and who does not elect to remain for another 6 months in training, or to enlist, and who is not admitted to a service academy, the following options should be available.

(1) Enlistment in the National Guard for the term of enlistment fixed at the time the choice of option is made (at the present, 3 years), with the same obligations as any enlistee in that organization (today, 48 evenings of armory or equivalent training, and 2 weeks of camp each summer); (2) enlistment in an Organized Reserve unit for the period fixed at the time of election (current thinking is 3 years), with the same obligations as any other member of an active Reserve unit, obligations which are in general comparable to those in the Guard; (3) enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for the period fixed at time of enlistment and enrollment in an ROTC course at a college or university, with an agreement to accept a Reserve commission, if offered, upon graduation therefrom (with or without Government aid as described subsequently); (4) enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for the term prescribed at the time thereof and enrollment in courses of study in civilian trade schools, vocational schools, or colleges which would provide training in professions, skills, or arts of value to the military in time of emergency and which have been approved by the Secretary of War as fulfilling such purpose (with or without Government aid as described subsequently); and (5) in the case of any person who cannot take advantage of either educational option or enlist in the National Guard or a unit of the Organized Reserve, either because of the location of his place of residence, place of employment, or place of study or because of a lack of vacancies, enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for the period designated at the time of such enlistment (current thinking, 6 years) subject to recall for not more than 1 month of active training during each year of such enlistment. Quotas would be established from time to time for all but the last-mentioned catch-all options so as to provide the most appropriate balance of persons in each group in accordance with developing military requirements.

Additional comments are also necessary with respect to (a) the two so-called educational options themselves and (b) the options available to persons who wish to pursue their educations further after completion of basic training. The ROTC option is designed to provide general officer training, while the other has the purpose of training persons in courses which are necessary for types of enlisted specialists for which a war creates large demands, such as radio and radar operation and maintenance, automotive maintenance, and machine shop work, or in college level courses, like physics, chemistry, electrical engineering, neurology, medicine, and the ministry, which lead into professions which are always in great need in wartime. While both of these options would have quotas, the inability of an individual to select one of these options (because the educational institution of his choice provided neither of them, because their quotas were filled, either generally, or at the institution he selected, because the special approved courses given at such institution were not ones which he cared to take, or because he lacked the qualifications therefor) would in no wise preclude him from pursuing his education in the manner which he desired. If, for any one of the foregoing reasons, he did not select one of these two options, his obligation would then

be to enlist in either the National Guard or a unit of the Organized Reserve or, if neither of these were open to him, to go into the final catch-all option.

Two additional facts about these educational options deserve special mention and clarification. In the first place, a man could elect one of these options only if he met the standards of the educational institution to which he applied for acceptance and, in addition, in the case of special courses, such institution's prerequisites and qualifying standards therefor. In the second place, the special courses under the second educational option would be regular ones of the institution he was attending which had been approved by the Secretary of War as meeting the requirements of the Army and would not be courses which had been developed by the War Department and unwillingly forced upon an educational institution. However, the War Department and educational institutions should work together in the development of courses which might serve the purposes of both.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, considerable latitude has been taken in this debate, and some seem to hold the theory that the American people are unwilling to accept their personal duty and responsibility as citizens to share in the common defense. I personally do not subscribe to that theory. Our history bears concrete evidence to the fact that Americans are willing to make any necessary sacrifices for their country and their ideals in time of emergency. I suggest that it is necessary to have a definite method of calling the men and women of this country in an emergency, so that everyone is called in his turn, to do what he can do best. That is the purpose of universal military training. I agree also with the draft legislation for the emergency that the President of the United States has said is impending. It is not my purpose to debate the subject at this time as to whether or not such an emergency is impending. So under this plan it is not necessary, or even advisable, in my opinion, to ask for volunteers. Under this bill the responsibility is shared alike by citizens in all walks of life.

I for one would be deeply embarrassed if any Member of Congress should propose that the obligation for service in the armed forces in this emergency should or must be accompanied by the payment of a bonus. I do not believe that we can buy the kind of service necessary in time of war. When one becomes a paid soldier, when he receives a salary for going into danger in time of emergency, he becomes a mechanical soldier. He is not then fighting for the ideals of the homeland. He is fighting for pay. I ask this body if any pay within the ability of this country to meet could be set to make such service attractive for American citizens to make a business of being soldiers and taking pay for going to war and fighting and to fight the battles of this country.

Mr. President, I believe that we still want a relatively small, well-trained standing army and a large, well-trained citizen army.

A commercial army could mean that men from the wealthier ranks could avoid their responsibilities by foregoing some trifling amount of money, thereby placthe burden of national security on our less fortunate people.

In addition to maligning the character of the American citizen, such a suggestion presents clear evidence to the peoples of the world that we are in favor of world peace and security only if it does not interfere with our own lives, and that we will give anything but ourselves. True world leadership cannot be exercised by a nation which has grown soft. The world knows it. I do not believe that we can shirk our world responsibility, and I do not believe our citizens expect us to do so.

Mr. President, my amendment is practically the House bill as it was reported from the House committee. Under the terms of that measure trainees would be paid at the rate of $30 a month during the period of training in camp. They would also receive additional allowances for dependents. Such allowances would be $50 for one dependent and $65 for two.

There are no provisions in any universal military training bill for making the trainees eligible for any form of Government insurance or free insurance during their training period. The reason for this is that it is visualized that the hazards of such training will be small, and furthermore, the men themselves will not be in the Military Establishment during their tour of training. If they were to be made eligible for Government insurance, this would in effect be a blow to the established insurance companies.

Almost everyone who has studied the universal military training program agrees that it must stand or fall on the necessity for having trained manpower fit for military service in case of a future emergency. However, in all fairness, the educational advantages which would accrue to the individuals themselves and to the country at large from such a program deserve emphasis. In a technological age, military training involves more than the old "squads left" and "squads right." Our military manpower must be trained for a technological age. For this reason many educational opportunities for technological training will be offered to universal military training trainees. A complete discussion of these educational opportunities is contained in the report of the Compton commission, from which I have quoted liberally.

Particular reference has been made to the education and training which will be available to trainees, but as a direct result of the selection made by trainees during the program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a partial list of the training which is available to 6-month trainees.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Map reproduction, construction equipment mechanics, high-speed radio operators, automotive mechanics, office machine service, light-metal worker, bomb-disposal technician, radar repairman, radio repairman, various construction operator courses, various clerical courses, heavy construction carpenter, topographic drafting, topographic technicians.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize again that in the first place the United States Senate had to take the bit in its teeth and pass a 70-group Air Corps bill, since no coherent program was ever presented to this body. I believe that it is necessary now to do the same thing, through adding a universal military training amendment which will have the effect of making this country strong in trained manpower—trained in the trades and in the sciences.

I wish to recall a part of my remarks on the floor of the Senate on March 8, 1948, when I said:

1. The peace and safety of this Nation is seriously threatened, through the complete absence of a definite foreign policy, telling our own people and the nations of the world what we consider will threaten our ultimate peace and safety, and the complete absence of a military organization spearheaded by an air corps to enforce our pronouncement.

2. The basic subject of foreign policy has never been discussed with the American people, through two world wars, and now the Marshall plan is in the same category. The basic subject at issue (as it was in 1823 when the Monroe Doctrine was established to protect South America and the Western Hemisphere from encroachment from the European empire-minded nations) is what areas—and naming the nations in the European and Middle East countries, including Asia and the South Seas—is it necessary for us to currently protect for our own ultimate safety? Until this decision is made no plan to make it effective can be intelligently discussed.

I challenge the State Department to name the nations of the 56 member countries of the United Nations Organization whose integrity we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety, to tell the world and the American people the truth, so that any empire-minded nations may be apprised of our intentions and thus avoid what could well develop into a third devastating world war, and that our own people may prepare for their own defense, through rebuilding our military organization spearheaded by an air corps that could keep any other nation on the ground in the event of war.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD further excerpts from my speech on that occasion.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If we should decide, after full consideration of our experience through two world wars—and our improved methods of defense and offense—that a threat to the integrity of any member nation of the United Nations Organization, by any other nation would constitute a threat to our ultimate safety—then President Monroe's exact words could be utilized in announcing an extension of the established Monroe Doctrine, leaving out any reference to the Western Hemisphere, and say, in effect, to the world and to the American people that:

"We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

We should then build at once a military force, spearheaded by an air corps that would bear silent evidence to all concerned that we were ready and able to enforce the extended doctrine, just as we have enforced the original Monroe Doctrine covering the Western Hemisphere for more than 125 years, and which kept us out of a major war for more than 75 years.

The Congressional Air Policy Board has recommended a long-range military plane purchase program, which would provide a

35,000-plane striking force costing $16,800,000,000 over a 5-year program. The President's air policy board's recent report closely parallels this document.

The Armed Services Committees of Congress should immediately check these reports and if found correct recommend their adoption and the appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress of the United States for the entire 5-year program.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, to make this program effective, a program which the Congress later enacted and the President signed, for a 70-group air force, and to make effective the preparations which the War Department is making, it is necessary to furnish and make available over the years trained manpower.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, is it not a fact that there is an amendment now pending before the Senate, namely, the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] for himself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada has further remarks to make regarding his amendment, I think this would be a good time to have him do so.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am ready for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] because the Chair believed it had been understood that the Senator from Indiana would be recognized next.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I did not understand that the Senator from Nevada had submitted his amendment. Inasmuch as he has submitted it, of course it is now the pending question, and therefore I shall take my seat.

I shall ask to be recognized, so as to present my amendment, after the amendment of the Senator from Nevada is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICTR. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Nevada would, in my opinion, have been very excellent legislation had our committee been able to approve it. We considered the matter at hearings on the over-all problems confronting the United States today. We took testimony regarding the necessity for draft legislation, but we chiefly took testimony relative to the universal military training program which had been advocated by the Compton commission report and other reports which have been before the country during the past few years.

I say to the Senator from Nevada that personally I am a very firm believer in the worth-whileness of a proper universal military training program, and I had hoped that our committee would be able to report favorably on such a measure.

Nevertheless, after exhaustive hearings and executive sessions, all of them taking a little more than 3 months, the committee has reported a bill which, by means of a selective-service system, will meet the manpower needs of the three branches of the service; and the committee has also incorporated in the plan a program for a small volunteer force of 161,000 men who are to be trained on a 12 months' basis, whereas the plan of the Senator from Nevada provides for only a 6 months' period of training. I feel that at this late hour there is no possibility of properly dovetailing the proposal of the Senator from Nevada with the plan reported by the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to hear the Senator from South Dakota express his views regarding a reasonable general military training program. When I attended the hearings on the bill, it was my belief—although apparently I misunderstood the situation—that the plan now incorporated in the amendment of the Senator from Nevada would be offered as a substitute for the draft bill, and in lieu of it. I believe that a reasonable general training bill will be far more preferable for our Nation than a draft bill, in peacetime.

I wish to ask the Senator whether he will consider accepting this amendment as a substitute for the entire draft bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. Of course, the answer is "No."

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that the Senator from South Dakota is representing his committee and the action of the committee, of course. But it seems to me that would be a reasonable solution of the entire problem.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to make a short observation and then ask a question.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to yield the floor if the Senator wishes to make an observation. I have yielded for a question, and I still yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota—and this matter has been before the committees of the Congress of the United States for 30 years—since 1919—why there was no time to arrive at a reasonable solution of the question and put the universal military training program squarely before the Congress for a vote, or to point out the objections to it.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that it was my hope that we could handle the matter in just that way. But along came the needs for manpower in the Regular forces because of their occupation duties and because of the world situation; and in attempting to dovetail together the two ideas of training and the needs of the Regular Military Establishment, the committee has offered this bill, which incorporates a plan for training a small force on a voluntary basis and also a plan for selective service to fill the manpower needs.

Mr. President, I hope the proposed addition to the bill, as set forth in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, will be rejected.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, we have heard much talk of emergencies. The Government has been run on emergencies for the last 14 years. Certainly this last emergency is not the first one to confront the Congress of the United States. I have been a close observer of the Government operation and of the Congress for the past 14 years and the recurring emergencies during that period should have demanded such a study. In 1941 we were finally forced into World War II. There were many differences of opinion regarding why that happened. This is not the time or place to discuss the merit of our action. Immediately we entered the war we not only immediately scrapped the training idea, but we wrecked a well set up industrial mobilization plan.

However, in view of the recurring emergencies during the last 14 years and during the time when the able Senator from South Dakota has been a Member of the Senate, I ask what has continually delayed the study of this proposed legislation, which has constantly been advocated by practically every veterans' organization of any magnitude in the United States—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans, and many other substantial organizations—and why at this time, after these many years, was it considered impossible to make a study of this proposed legislation and to present it to this body?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a reply?

Mr. MALONE. I certainly do.

Mr. GURNEY. I cannot give the Senator all the answers. All I can say is that ever since hostilities ended, I have known of the difficulties of preparedness and I have known of the need for building a strong reserve. Personally, ever since World War I, I have believed in some sound training program.

Nevertheless, I cannot give the Senator all the answers as to why this legislation has not been considered by the Congress before.

Our committee have had the question brought to us, as the Senator knows; and we started its consideration on March 12. The result is the bill presently before the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONE. I shall yield in a moment to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I wish to say in closing that I see no reason why the amendment cannot be coordinated perfectly by the armed services with the draft bill, to which the amendment is offered, for there is no real interference or conflict between them. The amendment is supplementary to the bill, and carries recommendations which in some form or other have been before congressional committees for the past 30 years, but have never reached the floor for a vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if it is not true that a majority of the Committee on Armed Services were in favor, informally, of a universal military training bill? In short, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada is a copy of one of the bills we considered. Is it not then true that the committee dropped that proposition when we found it impractical by reason of the attitude of the House? Is it not also true that the bill originally reported by our distinguished chairman, the Senator from South Dakota, had a training provision in it, with an induction feature, which was then dropped because we believed it impractical to endeavor to obtain passage this year? In other words, did not the committee consider the whole amendment, did not many members of the committee favor it, and did not the committee then drop it because of the need of national security?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts is correct. My recollection coincides with his on that situation. As a matter of fact, as I recall, we had in executive session decided to set down hearings on a universal military training bill prior to the time when the President appeared before Congress on the 17th of March with his recommendation for a selective service law. We began, I think, the very afternoon of the day on which the President read his message.

The first witnesses—the witnesses whom we heard for several days, as a matter of fact—were witnesses appearing in behalf of a universal military training program. We had the report of the Compton committee, with extensive testimony from Dr. Compton, as chairman of that committee, and from other members of the committee, favoring universal military training.

I may say, Mr. President, we also heard witnesses in opposition to a universal military training program. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct, as my recollection goes, that a majority of the committee felt that some form of universal military training was highly desirable and, as a matter of fact, essential. We were confronted in committee with the necessity of meeting two requirements; the one, to fill up the components of the armed forces with needed manpower, as the manpower was authorized at that time. As the Senate knows, thereafter the manpower requirements were enlarged by an increased authorization for the armed forces. Some way must be found, we knew, to fill up those components. We felt that the selective-service system was the most democratic method, that it was the method we had tried in the past; that it was our traditional way of dealing with that particular feature.

The other requirement as we saw it then was that we begin at once to build up some kind of reserve. To that end we thought universal military training would meet those requirements. I think the majority of the committee felt, and very strongly, that we ought to have some form of universal military training.

We realized, however, that it would be highly improbable, and probably impossible, to get a universal military training program through this session of the Congress. We were confronted with facts. We knew that some form of selective-service legislation was necessary, and we felt it might be lost because of the opposition to universal military training if we incorporated both those features in one bill, although we felt that the national needs required it. Personally I felt very strongly that way, as did, I believe, the majority of the members of the committee.

We reported a bill in which, as reported, provision was made for the drafting of men 18 years of age, about 161,000 of them a year, into a training program, so that they could be trained for a year and then go to one of the reserve components of the armed forces.

After the bill was reported it became apparent to us that that feature of the bill was not acceptable to the House, and therefore an amendment was submitted which took away the compulsory-induction feature with respect to 18-year-olds and put it on a voluntary basis exclusively. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, before that amendment was submitted there was a provision in the bill for voluntary enlistment of 18-year-olds for the training program, and we felt very strongly in commiteee that the compusory feature, although it would be helpful, would not be entirely necessary because we felt we could get a sufficient number of volunteers.

Nevertheless, we felt that a training program for 18-year-olds was so essential that we were warranted in reporting a bill containing an induction feature.

However, after the bill was reported, it became increasingly apparent that we were not going to get that kind of provision in a selective-service bill through the House, because of the opposition to training there, not only on the basis of opposition to universal military training but also on the basis of supposed cost, although the bill we reported, with the program, would have been well within the estimates for the armed services for the coming year.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that our bill is in its present form. It is not because the committee is opposed to universal military training, I may say to my good friend from Nevada; at least the majority of them, I believe were not. It was rather because we felt that this form of selective-service bill with the voluntary provision for training to build up the needed reserve was the kind of bill which would meet with most general agreement not only in the Senate but in the House of Representatives, and we recognized that we could not debate the matter indefinitely; it was an emergency matter. It was necessary to meet an urgent situation. Consequently, we reported a bill which we felt, and which I personally still feel, should meet with substantial support from the Senate and also from the House.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I ask the Senator from Connecticut if he understands that the amendment offered was identical with the House bill which had been reported by the committee?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, I understood that. It was a bill very much like one we had considered in our committee, though not identical with it.

Mr. MALONE. The question in my mind was whether the committee's reason for not including it was because they thought the House would not take such a bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is it exactly. We were advised the House would not approve a bill of that kind. We knew the matter was urgent and that time was really of the essence in the situation. Consequently we reported the bill upon which we felt we could get the most general agreement.

Mr. MALONE. Then the House is responsible for the committee's not further considering the universal military training feature of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not want to pass upon the judgment of the House. I do not think that is within our province. But the Senator can draw his own conclusions.

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the Senator from Connecticut, with all due respect to predictions as to what the House would do, that this is the time, in my judgment, to bring before the Senate the bill that the Senate wants, and then to send it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] for himself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in view of the statement I have made, I desire to make it quite clear at this time that I am not joining in this amendment as an addition to the bill which is before the Senate. I did join in it, and would join in it, if the amendment were offered as a complete substitute for the bill which is pending.

I make that statement so that the Senate will understand my position on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appreciates the correction.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN DISEASES OF HEART AND CIRCULATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2215) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "National Heart Act."

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this act is to improve the health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of

diseases of the heart and circulation; assist and foster such researches and other activities by public and private agencies, and promote the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results; provide training in matters relating to heart diseases, including refresher courses for physicians; and develop, and assist States and other agencies in the use of, the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis and treatment of heart diseases.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

SEC. 3. (a) The heading of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) is amended to read "Title IV, National Cancer and Heart Institutes."

(b) Title IV of such act is further amended by inserting "Part A—National Cancer Institute" between the heading of such title IV and the heading of section 401, and by adding immediately after section 406 the following new part:

"PART B—NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

"ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTE

"SEC. 411. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a national heart institute (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Institute').

"HEART DISEASE RESEARCH AND TRAINING

"SEC. 412. In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to heart diseases the Surgeon General, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Heart Council (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Council'), shall—

"(a) conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of heart diseases;

"(b) promote the coordination of research and control programs conducted by the Institute, and similar programs conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"(c) make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities, and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this part;

"(d) make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private agencies and institutions, and to individuals for such research projects relating to heart diseases as are recommended by the Council, including grants to such agencies and institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, equipment, and maintenance of such hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, and for the care of such patients therein, as are necessary for such research;

"(e) establish an information center on research, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart diseases, and collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, information as to, and the practical application of, research and other activities carried on pursuant to this part;

"(f) secure from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad who are experts in the field of heart diseases;

"(g) in accordance with regulations and from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose (1) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Institute and elsewhere with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train research workers and procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States and abroad, and, in addition, provide for such fellowships through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions; and (2) provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships, in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees as he may deem necessary, the number of persons receiving such training and instruction, and the number of persons holding such traineeships, to be fixed by the Council, and, in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeships through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 413. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 412 all appropriate provisions of section 301 shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General, and grants-in-aid for heart disease research and training projects shall be made only after review and recommendation of the Council made pursuant to section 414.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Administrator acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this part may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

"FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL

"SEC. 414. The Council is authorized to—

"(a) review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, and certify approval to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under section 412, any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases;

"(b) review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution or agency, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research projects relating to heart diseases, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart disease;

"(c) review applications from any public or other nonprofit institution for grants-in-aid for training, instruction, and traineeships in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of such applications for grants-in-aid as it determines will best carry out the purposes of this act;

"(d) collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through appropriate publications for the benefit of health and welfare agencies and organizations (public or private), physicians, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

"(e) recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 501 for carrying out the purposes of this part; and

"(f) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this part.

"OTHER AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO HEART DISEASES

"SEC. 415. This part shall not be construed as superseding or limiting (a) the functions or authority of the Surgeon General or the Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to the study of the causes, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases; or (b) the expenditure of money therefor."

NATIONAL ADVISORY HEART COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) Section 217 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The National Advisory Heart Council shall consist of the Surgeon General or his representative, the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Army or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Navy or his representative, who shall be ex officio members, and 12 members appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator. The 12 appointed members shall be leaders in the fields of fundamental sciences, medical sciences, education, or public affairs, and 6 of such 12 shall be selected from leading medical or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of heart diseases. Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the members first appointed, three shall hold office for a term of 3 years, three shall hold office for a term of 2 years, and three shall hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment. None of such 12 members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. Every 2 years the Council shall elect one member to act as Chairman for the succeeding 2-year period."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 217 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The National Advisory Health Council shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters relating to health activities and functions of the Service. The Surgeon General is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council and, where appropriate, any member or members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or the National Advisory Heart Council, in connection with matters related to the work of the Service, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine."

(c) The heading of section 217 of such act is amended to read as follows: "National Advisory Health, Cancer, Heart, and Mental Health Councils."

(d) Subsection (e) of section 208 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Members of the National Advisory Health Council, members of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, and members of the National Advisory Heart Council other than ex officio members, while attending conferences or meetings of their respective Councils or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence."

(e) Paragraph (d) of section 301 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private institutions, and to individuals for such research projects as are recommended by the National Advisory Health Council, or, with respect to cancer, recommended by the National Advisory Cancer Council, or, with respect to mental health, recommended by the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or, with respect to heart diseases, recommended by the National Advisory Heart Council;".

(f) Paragraph (g) of such section 301 is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Adopt, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council, or, with respect to cancer, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, or, with respect to mental health, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, or, with respect to heart diseases, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Heart Council, such additional means as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section."

CONTROL GRANTS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 314 of such act is amended by redesignating subsections (e) to (j), inclusive, as subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) To enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of part B of title IV and to assist, through grants, States, counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the State, and public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, and other organizations, in establishing and maintaining organized community programs of heart disease control, including grants for demonstrations and the training of personnel, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for such purposes. For each fiscal year, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, shall determine the total sum from the appropriation under this subsection which shall be available for allotment among the several States, and shall, in accordance with regulations, from time to time make allotments from such sum to the several States on the basis of (1) the population and (2) the financial need of the respective States. Upon making such allotments the Surgeon General shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts thereof."

(b) The subsection of such section 314 herein redesignated as subsection (f) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That in the case of amounts to be paid from allotments to any State under subsection (e), the Surgeon General may determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury amounts to be paid to a county, health district, other political subdivision of the State or to any public or nonprofit agency, institution, or other organization in the State, if he finds that payment to such subdivision or other organization has been recommended by the State health authority of the State, and (1) that the State health authority has not, prior to August 1 of the fiscal year for which the allotment is made, presented and had approved a plan in accordance with subsection (g), or (2) that the State health authority is not authorized by law to make payments to such other organization."

(c) The subsection of such section 314 herein redesignated as subsection (g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The moneys so paid to any State, or to any political subdivision or other organization, shall be expended solely in carrying out the purposes specified in subsection (a), or subsection (b), or subsection (c), or subsection (e), as the case may be, and in accordance with plans, approved by the Surgeon General, which have been presented by the health authority of such State, or, under the circumstances specified in subsection (f) (1), by the political subdivision, or the agency, institution, or other organization to whom the payment is made, and, to the extent that any such plan contains provisions relating to mental health, by the mental health authority of such State."

(d) The subsection of such section 314 herein redesignated as subsection (h) is amended to read as follows:

"(h) Money so paid from allotments under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) shall be paid upon the condition that there shall be spent in such State for the same general purpose from funds of such State and its political subdivisions (or in the case of payments to a political subdivision or to an agency, institution, or other organization under circumstances specified in subsection (f) (1), from funds of such political subdivision or organization), an amount determined in accordance with regulations."

(e) The subsection of such section 314 herein redesignated as subsection (i) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the health authority or, where appropriate, the mental health authority of the State (or, in the case of payments to any political subdivision or any agency, institution, or other organization under the circumstances specified in subsection (f) (1), such subdivision or organization) finds that, with respect to money paid to the State, subdivision, or organization out of appropriations under subsection (a), or subsection (b), or subsection (c), or subsection (e), as the case may be, there is a failure to comply substantially with either—

"(1) the provisions of this section;

"(2) the plan submitted under subsection (g); or

"(3) the regulations;

the Surgeon General shall notify such State health authority or mental health authority, political subdivision, or organization that further payments will not be made to the State, subdivision, or organization from appropriations under such subsection (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State, subdivision, or organization from such appropriations for activities in which there is such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Surgeon General shall make no further certification for payment to such State, subdivision, or organization from appropriations under such subsection, or shall limit payment to activities in which there is no such failure."

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Section 2 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (l), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by inserting after paragraph (m) the following new paragraph:

"(n) The term 'heart diseases' means diseases of the heart and circulation."

(b) The term "National Institute of Health", wherever appearing in the Public Health Service Act, is hereby changed to "National Institutes of Health".

(c) The word "title", wherever appearing in sections 403, 404, and 406 of the Public Health Service Act, is hereby changed to "part."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has studied this measure, and recommends that the Senate accept the amendment of the House of Representatives. Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF CARIBOU NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1037) to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho, which were, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "lots 1, 2, 3, 4," and insert "lots 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9"; on the same page, line 11, strike out "lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7", and insert "lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10"; on the same page, line 13, strike out "west half" and insert "east half"; on page 4, lines 6, and 7, strike out "east half" and insert "lots 1 and 2, northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter"; on page 7, line 11, strike out all after "section 5" down to and including "quarter" in line 14; on the same page, line 23, after "half;" insert "and"; on the same page, line 23, strike out all after "section 36" down to and including "quarter", where it appears the second time in line 25; and on page 8, line 18, strike out "south half northeast quarter,".

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RESTORATION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO TOWN SITE OF WADSWORTH, NEV.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1871) to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev., which was, in lines 9 and 10, to strike out "shall be sold at a price of $25 per lot" and insert "may be sold at a price of not less than $25 per lot, provided such sale be approved by the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribal Council."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT THE PRESTON BENCH PROJECT, IDAHO

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1987) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws, which was, on page 2, line 3, to strike out "seventy-eight" and insert "seventy-four."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GURNEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Is this message from the House a privileged message?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a privileged matter.

Mr. GURNEY. Very well.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its version of the bill, ask the House for a conference thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CAIN, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SPARKMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. For what purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. To suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum until the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Indiana has been read?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 7, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and add the following:

Provided, however, That no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act until (1) the President proclaims, not earlier than 75 days after the date of enactment, that an insufficient number of persons is on active service in the armed forces to maintain an adequate national defense, and (2) that a sufficient number of such persons cannot in his judgment be obtained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary request for call to active duty.

Immediately upon the issuance of such proclamation, the provision of this act authorizing the induction of persons into the armed forces and the ordering of persons into active service without their consent shall be effective, but no person shall be ordered into active service without his consent under this act prior to 90 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brewster	Buck
Baldwin	Bricker	Butler
Ball	Bridges	Byrd
Barkley	Brooks	Cain
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Capper	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Cooper	Knowland	Russell
Cordon	Langer	Saltonstall
Donnell	Lodge	Smith
Dworshak	Lucas	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarthy	Stennis
Ecton	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McFarland	Taft
Feazel	McGrath	Taylor
Ferguson	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Malone	Thye
George	Martin	Tobey
Green	Maybank	Tydings
Gurney	Millikin	Umstead
Hatch	Moore	Vandenberg
Hawkes	Morse	Watkins
Hayden	Murray	Wherry
Hickenlooper	Myers	White
Hill	O'Conor	Wiley
Hoey	O'Daniel	Williams
Holland	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Ives	Pepper	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senate is about to vote upon a measure on which conscientious, sincere, honest people can disagree. I rather suspect that any Senator could make a good case either for or against a draft bill in peacetime. Many, of course, will argue that by universal military training and by drafting our boys into the service we will avoid war. Others will take the opposite position, and tell us that it will involve us in war.

I wish I had the intelligence to know which is the best procedure. I remember that at one time we placed our hope in the United Nations, and for the United States now to enter upon the course of drafting its men one might argue is directly opposed to the hopes and the ambitions we had for the United Nations.

The amendment I am offering is very simple. It provides that, if after 75 days following enactment the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and the head of our foreign affairs, has been unable to secure a sufficient number of volunteers to bring the armed forces to the strength they should have in order to assure the safety of the Nation, he has the authority to declare the law in effect. Or if in his opinion during the 75-day period world conditions have so adjusted themselves that we do not need as large an Army as anticipated, he need not declare the law in effect. That is how simple the amendment is.

It is easy for one to argue that the President has already asked for the legislation, and that therefore it must be needed. It is easy to argue that the Armed Services Committee has considered this matter for days, and has come to the conclusion that the legislation should be passed today, and become effective immediately. I am not going to quarrel with that, but I am saying to the Senate, I am saying to the President of the United States, and I am saying to the American people, let us make one more effort, let us take 75 days more and see if we cannot avoid doing that which I know every Senator dislikes. I am satisfied that those who vote for the draft measure are doing so, not because they personally like the idea—and I am sure their prayers were that it would not be necessary—but they are voting for it because they feel that it is absolutely necessary.

Let us take 75 days more. I am not so certain but that the very fact that we pass the legislation, the fact that the world knows the President of the United States may put it into effect, will not have the desired effect. If our people know that failure to get a sufficient number of volunteers will result in the draft law becoming effective, that of itself may bring a sufficient number of voluntary enlistments into the armed services to give us ample protection.

I think Congress could well pass the legislation and say to the Commander in Chief, who is the President of the United States: "Here are the tools with which to work. If, after 75 days, you think it is necessary to act, you may do so." I believe the American people will appreciate our taking that position in respect to this legislative proposal.

I rather feel that since the war ended we have had too much negative talk in respect to our armed forces. I should like to make the observation that no nation other than a nation actually in war was ever so well prepared for war as is our Nation tonight.

Let me enumerate our strength. Maybe the time has come when we should start advertising our strength to the world, and taking pride in our strength, instead of doing what in my opinion we have been doing for the past many months—in fact for a couple of years—and that is trying to tell the world and our own people how weak we are. Let me enumerate our strength.

No. 1. We have the atomic bomb.

No. 2. We have already trained 14,000,000 boys who were discharged from the various services no longer than 2½ years ago. We have those boys who served, who were on combat duty. I am not saying that we should call them back into the service. Of course not; but I am telling the Senate the strength we have. I doubt if at any time in our future history we shall ever be in such a position—and I hope we never shall be, because it will mean that we will have fought another war. I doubt if ever again we will have as many as 14,000,000 trained men. We have them now. If we were attacked by another nation tomorrow we could call back into the service 14,000,000 men. I suspect we could place most of those from the Navy on the same ships on which they served during World War II. I suspect we could place others in the same divisions, in the same regiments, in the same companies. I suspect that in many instances we could put many back into the Air Force and have them flying the same airplanes they flew before. I remind the Senate again our strength is 14,000,000 trained men.

No. 3. We have the largest Navy in the world. I believe it to be a fact that we have a greater navy than all the other countries of the world combined. It is a fact that we do not at the moment have sufficient personnel to man our entire Navy, meaning, of course, the vessels and the equipment; but among the 14,000,000 trained men of whom I spoke are men who manned those vessels

and were a part of their personnel prior to the end of the war.

We have a large, a fine, a good Air Force, in spite of what some may say. We have been belittling our armed services, our armed might, and our Air Force. I say that we have an excellent Air Force. We have at the moment a large Air Force for peacetime.

Possibly our greatest strength, and the one to which we seem to pay no attention, lies in our productive facilities. We have the greatest productive facilities of any nation in the world or of possibly all nations combined. When the war ended our Government wisely asked that all tools, dies, and jigs used in manufacturing the materials and equipment needed for World War II be inventoried and cataloged, oiled, and boxed. The Government today has those tools, dies, and jigs. They are inventoried, they are cataloged, and our Government knows exactly where they are stored. Tomorrow they could be shipped back to the same factories that ceased using them 2½ years ago. Those factories could begin making the very same items which they were making, with, in most instances, the same management in charge, and the same trained personnel available for operating them.

Mr. President, I say that constitutes strength. This Nation of ours is well prepared for war. It is so far in advance of any other nation in the world that their strength can hardly be compared with ours.

Oh, yes, there are those who will say that one other nation in the world has manpower by the millions. I agree with that. But they are five or six thousand miles away. That is not the kind of strength that wins wars during these times. I say we do have strength. We are well prepared.

We have a problem today that we did not have prior to World War II. We have occupation forces in the Far East and in Europe, and we must maintain those occupation forces. I am one of the first to admit that world conditions today require that we remain strong. I shall not argue that point with anyone because I believe it to be a true premise.

There is no difference between us on the Senate floor as to what we should do. The difference lies in how best to accomplish the result we want to achieve. Frankly I shall always vote for a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. I shall vote to protect the Nation against any potential enemies. But, Mr. President, when Senators begin voting for a draft in peacetime, if they are conscientious—and they are conscientious, just as conscientious as I am—it certainly must do a little something to them inside. It does to me.

There may be some Senators who will stand up and say that I am offering the amendment for political reasons. In order to save time, I may say that I am not. I believe the best interests of the Nation, the best interests of the armed services, the best interests of the Commander in Chief himself lie in giving him this tool, giving him the opportunity to have a sufficient number of our men voluntarily enlisted to bring the armed forces up to the point where he feels they should be. I am not so sure that the legislation we are now considering should not be permanent legislation, giving the President the right to invoke it at any time when in his opinion we are in danger. I am sincere in that statement. I believe it is the best possible treatment we can give the subject.

In fairness to our forefathers, in fairness to those who founded this Nation, and to those who had the responsibility for guiding the Nation for 165 years—who refused to adopt the draft in peacetime—in fairness to our boys and in fairness to our girls, in fairness to all our people I believe we should enact legislation of the sort I have recommended. The President would have the right to invoke not earlier than 75 days after its enactment, but to invoke at any time when in his personal opinion he believes we are unable to secure sufficient volunteers properly to protect the Nation, or when in his personal opinion world conditions are such that he finds our armed services lack a sufficient number of men.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has said that he feels that his amendment is a good one because he wants to give one more opportunity for men to volunteer. I should like to ascertain from the Senator what inducements there are for men to go into the Regular forces that have not already been offered them. What will they see in the next 75 days that will induce them to enter the service if they have not gone in up to the present time?

The bill is drafted in such a way as to induce men to go into the Reserves, to build up the National Guard and the Reserve forces so that ultimately we can reduce the strength of our Regular Army.

We know that at the present time there are a sufficient number of volunteers for the Air Force; we know that there are a sufficient number of volunteers for the Navy; but we also know that the Ground Forces have been decreasing in number and that their effective strength has been falling off. The inducements in this bill are for 18-year-old boys to enter the service for a year of training, to go into the National Guard system and into the Reserve system. To support the Air Force and to make our Navy effective, we must build up our Ground Forces. The Ground Forces of the Regular Army must be built up either by men who will volunteer for 3 years' service, or from the draft of men between 19 and 26. That is our immediate problem of security. That has been the problem of security for the past 4 or 5 months. The President came forward with his message on March 17. We hoped, through universal military training, to build up sufficient strength so that it would not be necessary to have a draft. In the first week in June we know that the Ground Forces are still falling off. What inducement is there for a boy between the ages of 19 and 26 to go into the Regular Army today if he has not already done so?

Mr. CAPEHART. First, we might lower the standards. It seems quite strange that we get a sufficient number of volunteers for the Air Force and for the Navy, but not for the Army. In my opinion, if we enact this legislation and our people realize that we mean business and that if young men do not enlist they will be drafted, a profound influence will be exerted upon them.

The first question is, "How big is big?" How big should the armed services be? In my opinion, the armed services should be no larger than is necessary to protect the Nation under existing conditions at a given time.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me finish my thought.

World conditions are flexible. They are in a state of flux. I understand that a truce has been reached in Palestine. That troublesome problem may be over soon. The world is changing. If we say to the world, "We passed a draft bill, and any time that our armed services are not at the point where the Commander in Chief, the President, feels they should be, he has the right to draft," in my opinion it will have a good effect upon the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator in reply that to make our Air Force effective we must support it with sufficient Ground Forces. The experts in our Air Force and the experts in our Ground Forces today tell us that we have not an adequate number of men to do the job.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me answer the question, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

As I stated a moment ago, the question is, "How big is big?" How big should the armed services be? I think it depends upon existing conditions at a given time. My opinion at the moment is that they are too small, and that we need more men. My position is that before we adopt a draft in peacetime, we should take 75 days more and see if we cannot solve the problem in what I like to think of as the American way of doing things.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Indiana that it gives us a bad feeling in the stomach to pass a draft bill. But the security of our country comes first. Does not the Senator agree with me that for the next 6 or 8 months we shall be passing through a very critical period in the world's history? Is not now the time to look to our security?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me answer in this way: I do not believe the Senator feels that some unforeseen situation is going to arise in the next 75 days. I am sure I do not. We are establishing a permanent policy. The bill originally called for 5 years' service. It now has been amended and reduced to 2 years. The able Senator knows the history of legislation. Once we get our foot in, we

seldom take it out. That is the reason why I think we might pass this legislation and put it up to the armed forces and the Commander in Chief, saying to them, "We would like to have you make one more effort. Perhaps world conditions will so adjust themselves in 75 days that you will not need as many men as you now think you need. If not, you may invoke the draft law."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that I think his amendment is well-intentioned, but I shall vote against it because I think it is a futile gesture. I think it would accomplish nothing.

The present authorized strength of the armed services is 1,066,000 men. The total we want to get under this bill, which is the total which has been recommended by the experts and authorities, is 1,520,000 men.

How will they be divided? A good many times we have heard the question asked, "Why does the Army need a selective-service law? The Navy and the Air Corps can always get recruits." Perhaps the figures will be somewhat of an answer to that question.

Under the proposed bill the personnel strength of the Army is fixed at 900,000 officers and men. This would include 110,000 trainees inducted for a 12 months' period. On the other hand, the Navy has a present authorized strength of 668,882 officers and men. Under this bill it is proposed to reduce that number to 588,000. So obviously it will be easier for the Navy to get men. Its requirements are only about half the requirements of the Army.

How about the Air Force? The strength of the Air Force is fixed at 468,000, which includes 15,000 trainees. Therefore its requirements are less than 50 percent of those of the Army.

It is no doubt true—and the testimony so indicated—that it is easier for the Navy and the Air Corps to get recruits, but that very fact indicates that we cannot get a sufficient number of recruits for the Army unless we have a selective service system, and unless we put it into effect immediately.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator seems to be proceeding on the assumption that something is going to happen very soon. He ignores completely what I enumerated in the four or five points I mentioned.

If we are going to have trouble within the next 6, 8, 10, or 12 months, then we shall be calling upon the 14,000,000 trained men whom we discharged from the service 2½ years ago.

I have no argument with this proposed legislation, except I am sorry it is necessary, and I am rather convinced that it is necessary.

I am asking the Congress to make one more effort to handle this matter in what I consider to be the American way. I am hopeful that during the period suggested, world affairs will so adjust themselves that perhaps we shall not need so large an Army and Navy and Air Corps as we think we do.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment.

Let me say that in view of the pace at which we are going at the moment in making expenditures for military purposes, those expenditures cannot help but have a very serious effect on the domestic economy of the Nation if they continue over a period of 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18, or 20 years—if, as a matter of fact, they do not actually bankrupt America.

If there is an emergency in the offing, I shall sit down and withdraw my amendment. However, if there is no emergency in the offing, then I think we should adopt the amendment. I say further that if an emergency is in the offing, then the boys whom we shall call to the service under this bill are not the ones we shall need or use. In that event we shall need the 14,000,000 men who are properly trained, and who were discharged from the service 2½ years ago.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GURNEY, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio, who I believe first requested that I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not hear the Senator's first explanation of the amendment, however, as I understand the amendment, it would not interfere with setting up the draft boards or with registration or the classification required; would it?

Mr. CAPEHART. No.

Mr. TAFT. Then why would it in any way delay the process of drafting the men? How would the amendment provide a 75-day delay?

There is another question which I should like to ask: Will it take 75 days to set up the draft boards and to register the men and classify them so that a call may be issued? Does the Senator know whether that will take 75 days?

Mr. CAPEHART. I suspect that the chairman of the committee can tell us that.

Mr. TAFT. Will the chairman of the Armed Services Committee tell us? Will it not be 75 days anyway before the draft boards can be set up and before the men can be registered and classified?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the record in World War I and the record in World War II bear out the statement the Senator from Ohio has made, I think. His estimate might be off a few days, but it takes approximately 75 days to set up the boards and to have them register and classify the men and then select the men. As a matter of fact, it might be as long as 90 days before the first selectees would be called.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the amendment, it provides that no person shall actually be inducted or drafted into the actual service until a call is issued by the President. So I cannot see that any delay would be involved.

The only question is whether at the end of the 75 days, when the machinery is all ready, the President will make a definite finding that no men are necessary to be obtained by that method.

Is not that the provision of the amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. It is.

Mr. TAFT. I think the President probably would issue a call anyway. So I do not see why the President should not be required to make the call himself. I do not see anything wrong with the amendment, nor do I see how the amendment would delay the procedure under the act.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, inasmuch as this particular procedure is being discussed, if the chairman of the committee would like to discuss it now, I shall be happy to wait.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Very well, Mr. President; I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, along the line of the questioning begun by the Senator from Ohio, let me say I see nothing in the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana which would stop the naming of the members of the selective-service boards, and then the registration, classification, and so forth of the men by the boards.

Would the Senator from Indiana say that the amendment is intended to stop the taking of those necessary steps?

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought that was understood. I thought it was understood that the amendment provides that no person shall be ordered into the service or inducted into the service under this act without his consent. The amendment deals only with ordering them into service without their consent.

Mr. GURNEY. That is my understanding of the amendment.

Therefore, I shall not address myself to the other steps outlined by the Senator from Ohio, because I repeat that this amendment only stops the actual induction after 90 days, after the machinery is set up.

Mr. CAPEHART. All the machinery would be set up; the work of setting up the boards and having the boards register and classify the men, and so forth, would go forward. This amendment has to do only with the question of actually ordering the men into the service.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator. That is the only point I wish to make clear, and now it is stated in the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think we owe it to the American people and to the boys themselves to take 75 days in the way I have proposed. I am praying that during that 75-day period world conditions will so adjust themselves that the draft will not be necessary or that voluntary enlistments will provide the necessary number of men. But if that does not happen, the necessary machinery will be set up, and the President may call the boys into active service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Indiana is making a very persuasive ar-

gument, but I do not believe he is giving it the thought that he would have given it if he had been on the Armed Services Committee.

The Senator from Indiana said that to vote for a draft in peacetime makes a fellow feel bad inside; that is as near as I can recall the Senator's exact words. I agree that we do not like to vote for a draft in peacetime. But the Senator from Indiana is not proposing that we do not vote for the draft; and he is not proposing that we do vote for the draft. What he is proposing is that the President of the United States, rather than the elected representatives of the people, shall say whether a draft policy shall go into effect.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the President has already said that——

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator to let me make three points, and then I shall get out of his way.

After all the criticism about centralizing power in the hands of the Chief Executive, much of which, in my opinion, has been justified criticism, I cannot imagine that we would place in the hands of the President the power to draft or not to draft men, rather than enact a law saying that men shall or shall not be drafted. That is my first point.

My second point is this: No one is going to be drafted for 75 days, anyway, under this bill. There will not be a single, solitary draftee for 75 days or possibly 90 days after this bill becomes law. During that period we shall go through only the preliminary motions.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish, please.

Mr. CAPEHART. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. During that period of 75 or 90 days we shall go through only the preliminary motions of creating all the machinery with which to draft the men. So we do have, under the bill, from 75 to 90 days in which to make the effort, which the Senator from Indiana says he would like to see made, to reconcile the international differences so that the draft would not be necessary. Therefore, under the bill we have that lull, that period of grace, anyway, without the Senator's amendment.

Now the third and, from my point of view, the most important consideration I should like to suggest to the Senator, is this: The Congress will probably recess or adjourn within about 2 weeks, possibly in a month. It will then go away from here. To all intents and purposes it will probably be away until next January. We are living in a realistic international era. Senators cannot legislate after they have gone home, and I would not be a bit surprised, after the machinery which creates policy, which is the Congress, has been put in the shed and oiled against rust, for use possibly 6 months later, in January, and when certain people know it is not available for use immediately, there might be another bit of pressure put on here or there in the international situation. We shall then be at our homes, and the Army cannot draft a soldier unless we give them the authority. Our friends and late allies know that just as well as we do. So we are going to put an insurance policy on the United States of America while we are home for the next 6 months. That is the purpose of the pending bill. Mr. President, I will wager you—I shall not wager much——

Mr. WHERRY. Two bits?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say two bits—that we shall not be away from this Congress 30 days before Senators will hear of some change in the international situation. It was not long ago we were holding our breath wondering about the outcome of the Italian election. It was not long ago that certain railroad trains and airplanes could not go to a certain large city where our troops needed bread, butter, and clothing. It was not very long ago that we were taking counter actions against certain policies which were inimical to the safety and welfare of our troops. But in the meantime we won the Italian election; we passed ERP, we increased the limit to which we were going to build up an air force from 50 to 70 groups; we had a draft bill on the calendar of both Houses.

The situation has been pretty decent for the last 60 days. If we leave the Congress and leave the country with an inadequate force, which the Air Force, the Navy, and the Army all say is inadequate to keep our present commitments, we shall spend much more money in the long run and take from the American people much more liberty in the long run than would be taken by a farsighted policy which leaves the country secure while we are home for the next 6 months.

The stronger this Nation is when we walk out of this door at the end of this session, the less likely international friction is going to be and the less chance there will be of war. Those are the thoughts I want to submit to the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me answer the Senator's third point first. I have more confidence of course in the President of the United States than the able Senator from Maryland evidently has, because I am certain that if the situation should exist which he describes, the President would immediately declare the law in effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, that has nothing to do with it. The point is that Congress did not declare a policy.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Congress has declared a policy. Congress will pass legislation spelling out exactly what the President can do and what he cannot do. All the amendment says to the President is, "If, in your opinion, at the end of 75 days you do not have sufficient men, and if world conditions are such that you believe we should draft our boys, you may do so." It is spelled out, nothing is being left to the imagination.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. We do not have sufficient men now. What miracle in the next 75 days, even with no international friction of a violent nature being present at this good hour, what miracle in the next 75 days is going to make us not need men that we need right this moment? Certainly things cannot be any better in the next 75 days than they are at this moment, and the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force say they cannot keep the commitments which we have assigned them with the meager forces they have.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator will wait a moment, the Air Force this month is limiting the number of men who can enlist.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. CAPEHART. They have more than they need.

Mr. TYDINGS No; that is not true. We are, by the pending bill, increasing the number of men the Air Force is authorized to have.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would the Senator think of permitting everybody who wishes to enlist in the month of June to do so?

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator that the Air Force is the smallest and most popular of the three branches of our armed forces.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield if the Senator will let me finish this statement.

It is the most popular, the most spectacular, the most dynamic, the most magnetic of all three branches. It is in an embryonic state. Any man who goes into the Air Force now is pretty certain to be a corporal or a sergeant in no time at all, if he has any ability. Men have already been taken from the Regular Army and transferred to the Air Force. They have climbed the ladder of promotion by leaps and bounds, because the Air Force had to get men to build itself up, to provide the framework. It is not quite fair to use this emergent little situation for the long pull for which the bill is designed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. For the information of the Senate, I may say that the reason the Air Force is not now accepting unlimited volunteers is that it is presently authorized only to have a smaller number.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. GURNEY. The funds for the next fiscal year do not become available until June 30. The present strength is about 397,000. The authorized increase under the pending bill is 453,000, with 15,000 extra trainees.

In reference to the amendment, I may say to the Senator from Indiana that the committee felt, and I am sure they sincerely felt, that it was their responsibility first to decide whether it was necessary that the pending bill be made a law. They looked at the world situation and decided it was necessary. The committee then felt sincerely that, having made that decision, they should take the responsibility and recommend to Congress on their own responsibility that the bill should be put into effect. Personally, if I could not have accepted the responsibility, I should not have liked to vote the bill out of committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I may make this comment, the Congress must depend upon the information it receives from the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, and the armed forces. Those are the sources of

information to be used as the basis for arriving at legislation.

Mr. GURNEY. May I say to the Senator from Indiana it is no small proposition we are up against?

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, it is not. That is why I think we should possibly go a little slow.

Mr. GURNEY. We have to double our intake of men into the Ground Forces in order to maintain a figure just a little bit above the present authorized strength. The bill therefore is necessary. I admit frankly that the Army will get its men just about as quickly, or it can get them just about as quickly, under the Senator's amendment as it could if the amendment were not agreed to. I think I have admitted that before.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives has incorporated this amendment?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is in the House bill now.

Mr. GURNEY. It is in the House bill just as the Senator has introduced it, so far as I know.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to yield. I think I promised to yield to the Senator from Connecticut, if the Senator from Nebraska does not mind.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if it is not a fact that the President of the United States has said time and time again to the Congress that it should put the draft into effect just as quickly as possible? He has made his position known. He has further recommended that we adopt UMT, which of course will not be adopted by this Congress. So I do not see any reason for any future reference of the matter to the President, when he has already said that he wants draft legislation and wants it now.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I rather feel that the international situation is clearing. I am sure the President would not be on a 3-week trip if that were not so. I understand the Palestine situation is clearing. A truce has been declared.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana mistakes the temporary lull for a complete tendency toward the settlement of our international difficulties, I congratulate the Senator on his optimism, but I do not congratulate him on his judgment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee as to his interpretation of the words of the bill, which read:

> The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the armed forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this act such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the personnel strengths of the respective armed forces authorized by section 2 of this act.

Does the Senator feel that that requires the President to keep the armed forces at the total figure which the bill fixes, or is that left to his discretion in the words "authorized from time to time"?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is my interpretation that he is authorized. As the Senator knows, no call can be made by selective service in any one month until the Commander in Chief, the President, in person, has authorized that specific call, and he must thereafter, each month, authorize a further specific number for each specific month. Therefore, I think under the bill, the President takes the same action that is required under the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Indiana. I am sure the Senator from Ohio will agree with me.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know. I wondered about it. The language of the section seems ambiguous. I am very glad to have the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say to the Senator that during World War II, under the operations of the 1940 Selective Service Act, the President did actually say each month what the call should be. The bill presently before us is not changed to any great extent, certainly not in that particular section, from the 1940 act.

Mr. TAFT. We have an authorized personnel strength for each of the three armed services, and then say that the President is authorized to induct "such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the personnel strengths."

Mr. GURNEY. Certainly we should leave that discretionary power to the President, because other sections of the bill definitely say that he shall bring the men in only when there are proper facilities to receive them, such as barracks and good sanitary conditions. Therefore we could not tell the President that he must bring in a certain proportion of the increased increment each month.

Mr. TAFT. I am wondering whether the President could say, at the end of 75 days, "I do not think 900,000 men are necessary for the Ground Forces, but Congress has said so, and I am bound by it. Therefore I must issue this call, although I do not think it is necessary." Could he say that, under the terms of the existing law?

Mr. GURNEY. No; I should not say that the President could say that. The committee felt that the President would not in any way increase the number of men merely because of his own belief that that was necessary. Certainly he should find a definite need for each increment as he orders the selectees brought in.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the Senator from South Dakota has said, that as is obvious to the Senator from Ohio, the Congress has the power of appropriation, has exercised that power in relation to the personnel strength of the three armed forces in the past few years, and has made it impossible for the authorized strength of personnel to be fully enlisted. Obviously Congress has that power and will exercise it in the future as it has in the past. Even if the President wanted to get the armed forces up to the full authorized strength, he could not do so unless appropriations were made available for the payment of the increased personnel.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services what the objection is to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I did not get much light from the statement of the distinguished Senator. If the amendment does not delay the draft, and we pass a bill which establishes the policy, I cannot understand why there is any objection.

Mr. GURNEY. I will read what I had prepared——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not have to go all through that.

Mr. GURNEY. I said it is a matter of the utmost importance to the safety and welfare of the Nation. To delegate this all-important decision to the administrative determination of the executive branch of the Government is to delegate one of the most important functions of the Senate and the House. Our responsible military leaders have certified the need. Our committee has agreed with the certification of need. We believed that the committee, when it approved the bill, should first arrive at a decision as to whether the legislation was necessary. If we had not arrived at that decision and had thought it should be left to the President, we should not have reported the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot see that there would be any delay. If there were a delay of 6 month or 9 months——

Mr. GURNEY. I can state frankly that the men could be drafted just as quickly under the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Suppose the conditions were such at the end of 75 days that the President felt he could not or did not want to call for additional men. The legislation would still stand, and possibly 120 days or 3 months or 6 months later conditions might develop which would make it necessary for the President to draft men to protect the Nation. I think it is a sensible, practical way of accomplishing it.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please. I should like to make myself clear, because I expect to vote for the amendment. I cannot see how the amendment would hurt the proposed legislation. It would not delay the draft. It would delegate authority to the President to push the button in the event that he should finally be the one to put

the induction of men into effect after 90 days. All the policy is set out in the bill. If we authorize it, it is not the President authorizing it; it is the Congress. Who should be more informed as to the urgency of the situation in which we find ourselves, namely, the international situation, than is the President of the United States? I reached the floor only a moment ago, and I have not had all of the subject explained to me, but it seems to me that in this particular amendment we are stating a policy. There is no delegation of authority so far as the authorization is concerned. We say to the President, if he wants to induct men into the service at the end of 90 days to go ahead. Perhaps he will not want to induct as many men as are stated under the authorization. Maybe we shall have sufficient volunteers so that we shall not have to put the draft into operation. Have the Senators thought of that? Many men will volunteer. They want to go into the Air Corps about which the Senators have been talking. If this amendment is agreed to, we might not have to make the selection provided for.

Mr. President, I cannot see anything wrong with the amendment. Congress has assumed the responsibility of establishing this policy. All the President has to do is to say, "All right. I will put it into effect, if it is needed." If it is not needed, he does not have to put it into effect. It seems to me the argument against the amendment falls of its own weight.

I shall support the amendment. I think it will help the draft bill. I think it will help to ease the minds of many persons in this country. I voted for the 70-group air force, and I shall vote as much as any man has ever voted in support of our military forces.

I cannot see anything wrong with the amendment, and I shall support it.

Mr. CAPEHART. May I have the yeas and nays?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say——

Mr. CAPEHART. A parliamentary inquiry. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator from Indiana had yielded the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDING I wish to take the floor in my own right. I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Before I yield the floor, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I say without any feeling of partisanship that I am afraid the Senate may have been unwittingly a little thoughtless. I think the Senate has a pretty good Armed Services Committee, and it has certainly one of the best chairmen presiding over any committee of this body in the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. The pending bill does not come before the Senate after a hearing of 5 minutes. The bill has been in the Armed Services Committee, and hearings have been conducted which extended over many weeks. We have had before us General Eisenhower, General Bradley, Admiral Denfeld, General Vandenberg. We have had had men from MIT before us. We have had General Hershey before us. We have had messages from General Clay, commanding our armed forces in Germany; we have had messages from General MacArthur, in Tokyo, and after all this testimony from men who are in a better position, I believe, to know whether or not this country's armed forces are in a position to defend and carry out its present commitments than are we, after all that testimony, the pending bill comes before the Senate with a unanimous report. There was not one vote in the committee, Democratic or Republican, against the bill.

The chairman of the commitee has tried in a nonpartisan fashion, in a fair fashion, to give an explanation of every point that has been under attack in connection with the bill. And what have Senators on the other side of the aisle done to their chairman? They have taken the bill and literally torn it into shreds. They have turned down the advice of General Bradley; they have turned down the advice of General Eisenhower; they have turned down the advice of General Vandenberg; they have turned down the advice of Admiral Denfeld; they have turned down the advice of General MacArthur; they have turned down the advice of General Clay.

We are a great lot, we are. We know. We know that all is secure. There is not one Senator on this or the other side of the aisle who can from memory write down the size of the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force tonight. But those men who advised us can tell instantly, right out of their heads. They can tell how many divisions we have in Europe, how many we have in Austria, how many we have in Japan. They can tell what would happen if a crisis occurred. And let me say to the Senate that we would lose everything we have in Europe in a matter of days, because our force is inadequate. We have not two combat divisions in Europe today to keep a commitment on a front that reaches from the Mediterranean all the way to the Baltic.

Is your boy over there? If he were, it would make a lot of difference.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not now, but I shall yield in a moment. If your boy were over there it would look a lot different. Most of our boys are not over there now, but somebody else's boys are over there, and it is up to us to put the flag behind them and not to expose them, and to say, "Oh, well, we will lose only 50,000 or 70,000 or 100,000 men. What's that? We can make that up right away."

I remember a debate in 1940 when the Draft Act was passed. There was not going to be any war then. Senators will be surprised at the size of the vote against the enactment of the Draft Act in 1940.

Without wishing to reflect, I call it to mind only because it is history, but a majority of the Republicans in the House and in the Senate voted against the enactment of the draft act in 1940. I do not question the motives of any one. The men who voted against it were inspired by as much patriotism, as they saw the picture, as inspired those who voted for it. I reflect on them not at all, not as to their patriotism, but their judgment was faulty.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, if the draft act had not been passed in 1940 there would have been as large an Army and Navy at the time of Pearl Harbor as if the act had been passed. We could have obtained by voluntary enlistment every man who was in the armed forces on the day of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland declines to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The draft act was passed in 1940. In 1941, 3 months before Pearl Harbor, a majority of the Republicans in this body voted against extending the act.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment. I am telling the facts of history. I am not making any charge. I am not saying that motives were not the finest, but I am saying that we should have learned from that grim experience that war comes quickly, that it comes without any warning, and the poor devils who have to go forth and meet the first impact of the war, like those at Pearl Harbor and those in the Philippines, those who must land on the beaches, are quite often the victims because in our well intentioned desire for peace, we have failed to give them the protection and the training and the equipment they should have.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I see no relationship, and certainly no other Senator can see any relationship, between what the able Senator is discussing and the text of the amendment. No one is talking about not voting for the draft bill; nobody is talking about that. The Senator is talking about something entirely different. He is trying to inject politics into the situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sorry——

Mr. CAPEHART. I say there is a big question mark in my mind as to whether I should vote to draft the boys of America on the basis of an emergency existing in the United States when the President of the United States is on a 3-weeks trip to the western area of the United States, and the Secretary of State is on a vacation. I am not so certain they feel that such an emergency exists so that it is necessary for us to do something which we have never done in 165 years. I am just about to make up my mind to vote against the draft bill on account of the

fact that someone is trying to inject politics into this situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. I shall not lose my head or become angry because the Senator says I am injecting politics into it. Certainly if calling the roll on a question of policy which was before this body, in order to illustrate the mistake once made before, and about to be made again, is politics, then I am guilty of the soft impeachment of the Senator from Indiana. What I said is the truth, and the RECORD bears it out. There is no record to support the statement made by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I merely wanted to say to the Senator from Indiana that the Congress did pass a selective service act in 1940, and that was in peacetime. It was done about 8 years ago.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. Let me develop this point, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

We passed a draft act in 1940. The same arguments were made then which are made now, that there was not going to be any war. The then distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, an able, eminent and fine American, and, if I may use the words, I say "my friend," Senator Borah, went to the White House and told the President of the United States that there was not going to be any war; that he knew more about the situation than the President did; just as we know more about it than General MacArthur, General Bradley, Admiral Denfeld, and General Eisenhower.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The President of the United States is the one who said there was going to be no war. In two different speeches he said so, and he assured the mothers of America that their sons would never be sent overseas to fight.

Mr. TYDINGS. He may have said there would be no war——

Mr. CAPEHART. So if others were wrong, the President of the United States was equally wrong.

I regret exceedingly that it is necessary to inject into this debate the question of who has been right in the past and who has been wrong. Let us get on with the business before us of passing the draft bill if an emergency exists such as the able Senator might well think does exist.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Indiana has held the floor for a considerable part of the afternoon. I have not been talking for more than 10 minutes. Now he is talking about terminating debate. I have not brought any politics into the debate. I have simply mentioned the record. Since when, in pointing to the record, can one be charged with politics? But the President to whom the Senator just referred—and certainly I was not one of those who always gave him allegiance in his domestic policies at least—that President sent Congress a draft bill which the majority of the party on the other side did not support. That is history.

Yes, Mr. President, the same old thing was true after World War I. The same old thing is true after World War II. Just get the prisoner's nose a wee bit out of the door and the lawyer will have a hard time to secure his fee. So it is with war. Once we have defeated an enemy there is never going to be another war; we do not have to bother with the idea of war.

Mr. President, it was not long ago when the Italian elections were held, and if they had gone the other way rather than the way they did, we would have had a draft act almost immediately. We would have had a draft act within 30 days after the Italian elections had they gone the other way. Who knows what the future will be in this uncertain world? If we want to save the lives of American boys, as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has said, let us make our country strong and keep it so. By doing so we will spend one cent compared with the hundreds of dollars we will be obliged to spend eventually if we keep the country weak.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield just as soon as I read a paragraph from the report of the committee. Why leave this matter up to the President when the report submitted by the chairman of the committee begins with the following language:

> When the President, on March 17—

April, May, and we are now in June—nearly 90 days ago—

> asked the Congress for the temporary reenactment of selective service, and for the enactment of universal military training legislation, he pointed to our badly depleted military strength as one of this Nation's greatest dangers.

The report continues:

> He recalled that the 3 years which have elapsed since the end of the fighting in Europe have failed to bring peace and that today the threat to the peace and security of the world seems as real and as serious as at any time in the past.

That is what the President said. What is the use of leaving it up to him? He has asked Congress for this power now. He has asked that we establish a firm, definite, sure, assertive policy, not one that is willy-nilly, but something that is down to earth, something which speaks with the language which can be understood as America's will to be strong.

I remember, Mr. President, that in the war we wrote into bill after bill, and when we could not put it in bills, we put it in reports, and when we could not put it in reports we obtained oral commitments from the leaders in our armed services, that men would not be sent abroad until they had 6 months' training. Oh, it was different then. We wanted them to have 6 months' training before they came in contact with the enemy. We cannot always give them 6 months' training after war starts. We have been pretty lucky. We have two great oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific, which heretofore have given us the priceless luxury of time. Today those great oceans are no more than brooks. Scores of men in the present Congress have flown across them in the matter of a single night to the east, and in the matter of a day or so to the west. We do not have that element of time any more. We are either to be ready the next time or we are going to rue the day.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has made mention of the 6 months' training bill which was enacted during the war.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will take his seat I shall yield to him in a moment. I promised to yield next to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Go ahead.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska next.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I made reference to the Senator's remarks concerning the 6 months' training bill. The Senator will recall that that bill was enacted during the war, that it applied to the 18-year-old draftees, and that it was passed after the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate learned that the young men being drafted at that time were actually being sent into battle, some with 14 weeks of training, some with 12 weeks, and then some with as little as 10 weeks of training.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is what brought about the enactment of that law; because the military at that time, Congress felt, was too precipitate in the matter of sending those men into action.

I believe the Senator from Maryland is making a great speech on the subject of preparedness. I agree with his idea of strength and preparedness. But I say it is beside the point of the matter of drafting. My point is that I believe that if the voluntary enlistment plan had been given to us by the Army, as it was by the Navy and the Air Force, the Army would not be calling for a draft today.

Without further trespassing upon the able Senator's time I wish to say to him that I am in full agreement with the idea of preparedness and have been during all my service on the Military Affairs Committee and the Armed Services Committee. I have wanted a strong force for this country, but I have not wanted to resort to enforced service in our Army in peacetime when I felt we could secure voluntary forces.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia. I certainly do not want any involuntary service in the Army, Navy, or Air Force in peacetimes except that which we must have, and which we cannot get in any other way for the safety of the Nation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that it has been my intention, and I hope to do so, to review the history of the voluntary enlistment bill. I see on the floor the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] who

worked upon the subcommittee which brought forth that bill. I had the honor to serve upon it myself.

I see in the Chamber the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] who at that time was chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. Therefore the Senator from West Virginia knows something about the beginning of the voluntary enlistment bill. I have followed it throughout its course. Without trespassing upon the time of the Senator from Maryland, I hope to review the history of that measure, and I hope to reveal what has been done under it and what has not been done under it. I draw the conclusion definitely, and with all respect to the high officers of the military, that all has not been done that could have been done to bring abount a volunteer Army.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, to whom I promised to yield next, let me say to the Senator from West Virginia—and I am sorry that I feel called upon to say this, but I say it simply to present a point, the wisdom of which he will appreciate immediately—that several weeks ago one of our colleagues in the other body, a Member of the House, uttered a statement which was carried very widely in the press, to the effect that enlistments ought to be induced in part by the promise of a $1,000 or $1,500 bond.

I have talked with officers in the recruiting services of both the Army and the Navy since that statement was made. The day after it was made, the recruiting wave went down almost vertically, and it has been down ever since, because the man who was thinking of volunteering assumed that if he volunteered before such a law was passed he would lose his $1,000 or $1,500. So he said, "I am going to wait until that idea is incorporated into law."

My point is this: That is only one thing that has deterred enlistments. There have been a number of small things like that which have constantly deterred enlistments. At the time of the Italian elections enlistments went up, because the feeling of the country was pretty ebullient at that time, and patriotic men of high purpose and emotion went down to the recruiting office and enlisted. The enlistments in all branches went up precipitately.

But the point I wish to get over is that recently enlistments have been falling off. Only last night by accident I happened to run into General Bradley, who is Chief of Staff of the Army, and one of the most distinguished soldiers on the face of the earth. I shall not attempt to quote his entire statement, but among other things he said:

> An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Give us these forces now, and they will do more to ward off difficulties in the future than anything else. Frankly, we are finding it very difficult to keep our commitments for the United States with the inadequate forces at our disposal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield. I am sorry that I did not yield to the Senator before, because he is always most gracious in yielding.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we can all compliment the distinguished chairman of the committee with just as much feeling as the Senator from Maryland has complimented his work on the Armed Services Committee. We can do the same thing with respect to every other member of the committee, and I wish to do so this afternoon.

But these questions are very vital. Some of us may have a difference of opinion or judgment. That is the reason why some of us may take exception here and there in connection with amendments which are being offered. But that is no reflection upon the untiring efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for whom I have deepest affection and regard.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland a question. What does all he has to say have to do with the amendment now pending? I am asking for light. The pending amendment would not delay the draft one day. After we establish the policy of Congress, what difference does it make whether we go this route, or whether we leave the amendment out, so far as the situation in Europe or at home or anywhere else is concerned? When the time comes to cast a vote on this particular piece of legislation, I shall cast my vote with the full knowledge that the 64 or 65 pages in the bill will lay down the legislative policy.

The only thing this amendment does is to say that a period of 90 days must elapse before the induction of any person. Then it will be up to the President of the United States to use his good judgment as to how to proceed, and as to the numbers to be drafted each month during the continuation of the draft, if we must have a draft.

I do not know what is wrong with this amendment. I cannot see why this talk about backing up the boys is any more applicable whether one is for this amendment or against it. That is the point which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate. I have stated that I am for the amendment. I believe that everything that could be done under the provisions of the bill without the amendment could be done with the amendment, so far as our patriotism, loyalty, and judgment are concerned in providing an army for the national defense, and the strength we need to meet the emergency.

I highly respect the Senator from Maryland, and I respect his judgment. He has had a great deal of military experience and has a very fine record. We are profoundly thankful for his advice. But I should like to have him point out, if he can, one thing in this amendment which in any way weakens, destroys, tears apart, or guts the bill. It is my intention to vote for the amendment, on the theory that it provides the draft. It provides exactly what the military want. It does the job exactly as it would be done without the amendment, except that it provides for a waiting period of 90 days before the President of the United States is given the power to place in effect the substantive law, when he chooses, after the 90-day period.

Mr. GURNEY and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, let me say in answer to the comment made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] that the ground forces were slow in getting volunteers. For the information of the Senate, let me say that the ground forces are maintaining a force 120,000 larger than that of the Navy, and 151,000 larger than that of the Air Force. There is glamor to the Air Corps and the Navy. That is a fundamental feature which appeals to the young lads of the Nation. Nevertheless, for my money, the boy with the infantry combat badge on his lapel is just about the grandest person in Uncle Sam's fighting forces. I believe that the ground forces have an appeal. Nevertheless, under the volunteer system, they have had to support a larger force than either the Navy or the Air Force. They have done a good job. They have had a great many volunteers.

To answer the Senator from Nebraska, I think the amendment would make just a little difference. Without the amendment, I think we could push through more rapidly the organization of the local draft boards and the registration of those who are coming in under the act. We could push through more rapidly the classification of the registrants. Under the amendment of the Senator from Indiana a man could not be drafted until after the lapse of 90 days. I believe that if we could shove up the time a little—perhaps as much as 30 days—it would be to our advantage, provided Congress appropriates the money to establish the draft boards.

As I previously stated, the committee accepted the responsibility for reporting the bill. If it had decided that there was no use for the bill, it would not have accepted the responsibility, and in that case would not have reported a bill at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will bear with me for a moment, the Senator from Nebraska asked me a number of questions, and before we get into other fields I should like to address myself to some of those questions.

Of course there is no danger in the world today. Everyone knows that. There is nothing to worry about. What we ought to have is a bill to reduce the size of our Army and Navy and our Air Force. I do not know what Senators were thinking of the other day when they built up the Air Force from 50 to 70 groups, involving an expenditure of several billion dollars. I cannot imagine that the great military and naval appropriation which is going through here in a day or two will be necessary. There is no danger in the world. Look at

Korea. How wonderful everything is going in occupied Korea. The Russians are in the north and the Americans are in the south, and every Saturday night they meet on the border. It is the hardest thing in the world to keep them from shaking hands across the international line. Each insists on the other coming down and spending the week end with him. Conditions are beautiful.

What about China? Is anyone worried about China? Good gracious, the most peaceful country in the world. There are only about 400,000,000 people in China, and all of us know that things in China are all right. There is no emergency.

And let us consider India. The people of India and the people of Pakistan, on the other side, can hardly wait to open their arms and embrace each other, every time they meet. Conditions are wonderful in India—just beautiful.

And in a little country like Greece, the people just go out and shoot at one another for sport. No one gets killed. They always manage to miss the other fellow. There is no real trouble in Greece.

And if we go to Austria, we find the Austrians sitting there, with the American Army in one part, the British Army in another, and the Russian Army in another. So there is no trouble. Probably our Army will get out on Monday, and the British will get on on Tuesday, and the Russians will get out on Wednesday, and the Russians will go back, and no one else will be left.

And of course there is no trouble in Germany. There are four zones over there; but from what I have heard on the floor of the Senate, I understand that the Russians are going in with us. We were going to put the French zone and the British zone and the United States zone together, and the Russians were going to have another zone, because we could not agree. But I am glad to learn this afternoon that there is no more trouble about it.

Consider Czechoslovakia. Why, Mr. President, it is the most peaceful place in the world. There is nothing to worry about in Czechoslovakia. Liberty and individual freedom and happiness are overflowing in Czechoslovakia.

And consider poor old Finland. We used to admire Finland when that little country single handedly stood up and defied a whole great empire. But today there is nothing to worry about in Finland.

And the Norwegians and the Swedes and the Danes—why, bless my heart, they have not thought about shooting off a gun since the end of the Civil War in this country, when General Lee gave his sword to Grant at Appomattox. They have not thought a thing about war ever since then.

So, Mr. President, everything is "hotsy totsy." There is no need for a draft. We need not worry about war. The United Nations will take care of that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, let us consider what my good friend the Senator from Nebraska proposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not opposing this draft bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say that. I said let us consider what the Senator from Nebraska proposes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maryland is trying to insinuate that I am opposing the draft bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, here is what the Senator from Nebraska proposes——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have not said whether I am for or against the draft bill. So for the Senator to make that statement on the floor of the Senate challenges the honesty of the Senator from Nebraska. I have not said one word about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I merely suggest that we consider what the Senator from Nebraska proposes. He proposes that we in Congress ought not fix tax rates. He will deny this, but I ask him to wait a minute. He proposes that we in Congress ought not to fix income-tax rates different from those we now have, but that we should leave that matter to the President and should let him decide when the new tax rates should go into effect. The Senator from Nebraska proposes that the Congress give the President the power—in principle—to fix tax rates.

The Senator from Nebraska, or the Senator from Indiana, who is the real author of the measure, proposes that Congress not declare a draft act and say that the draft act shall be an affirmative piece of legislation, but he proposes that the President shall do it, just as the President could do with the tax rates.

He proposes that the President ought to make trade agreements with other countries, within the limits fixed by the Congress, of course. He proposes that reciprocal trade agreements ought to be in the exclusive province of the President.

Mr. President, the principle in all those measures is identical.

And when it comes to price control, the Senator proposes that we in Congress should pass a piece of legislation covering the high cost of living, and that we should say to Mr. Truman, "Whenever you think it wise, call back the OPA and set up a price control again." That is what the Senator from Indiana proposes and that is what the Senator from Nebraska endorses.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is exactly what the President asked for—not the Senator from Nebraska. That is what the President asked for in his platform.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am only saying that the President is willing——

Mr. WHERRY. Of course he is.

Mr. TYDINGS. Or, rather, I am saying that the Senator from Indiana, supported by the Senator from Nebraska, is willing to have the President of the United States say whether or not the youth of this country shall be drafted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to point out to the Senator from Maryland that that is not at all what I said and that is not what is in this amendment. The Senator from Maryland is begging the question. He has made a speech here sarcastically intimating that because there is no trouble in the world, as he says, some of us who have offered to support this amendment apparently do not want to put a draft law into effect. The Senator from Maryland knows better than that. The Senator from Maryland is one of these professional needlers. He is one of the best the Democrats have. But when we get down to brass tacks about this amendment, the only thing involved is that the Senator from Maryland wants to protect the President, and does not want to make him press the button that will put the draft into operation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor for a moment, and I am not yielding.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Nebraska for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and the Senator from Maryland is one of the most courteous Senators, and I appreciate it. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, when we analyze this amendment, if we do so fairly and honestly, we find that it would not take one line out of the proposed substantive law. Under the amendment, Congress will be making the authorization all the way through, and Congress will be setting the policy. We say, "Here is what is going to happen."

Mr. President, in order for the Senator from Maryland to make the speech that he has just made in attacking that position, he had to go around three city blocks to bring in politics.

If Senators analyze the amendment fairly, and leave politics out of consideration, they will see that there is no difference between the policy of this amendment and the policy of the draft law which the Senator from Maryland, who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, advocated in the committee.

If the situation over the world is so bad as the Senator says it is——

Mr. TYDINGS. I said it is good.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why did the Senator limit the legislation which he proposed to provide for 90,000 men? Why did not he provide in it for 14,000,000 men, if the situation is as bad as he says it is?

Mr. President, there is nothing to what the Senator has said but a lot of politics; that is all there is to it. It is a shame for a Senator to bring into the discussion of this proposed legislation a political argument.

I am serious about this, Mr. President; I am serious when I say that I think if this draft law is enacted, it will help get

volunteers into the armed services. That is one of the reasons I think it is good; and I think the Senator from Maryland will agree with me that if the draft law is passed, there will be many volunteers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there will be so many volunteers that the armed forces will not be able to take care of all of them.

Mr. WHERRY. Then there will be no need for a draft law. That is why I am in favor of the amendment and that is why I think it is constructive.

Mr. President, I am not interested in a question of whether Mr. Truman presses a button or whether the Congress presses a button and thus decides who shall go into the armed services if there is a war and who shall run the risk of being killed in combat.

But we, the Congress, are making the authorization. We are hoping and praying that we do not have to use it, because we want a volunteer army if we can obtain one. I do, and I think the Senator from Maryland does. The amendment merely says to the President: "If the necessary number of volunteers do not come forward now, Mr. President, and if the emergency exists, we give you the authority to call for the men." What is wrong with that?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a thing in the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Then let us adopt it.

Mr. TYDINGS. And we say, "Mr. President, if you think the country needs more revenue, put those tax rates into effect; and if you think we need more world trade, put into effect the tariffs you think wise, within certain limits; and if you think the cost of living has gone too high, you, Mr. President, determine whether to reestablish the OPA or not." Mr. President, that is all there is to it.

I do not mean to say that any Member of this body would be guilty of having any political bias or political motive. Far be it from me to suggest that any of the 96 men who make up this august body would be motivated by such a sordid thing as politics or partisanship. But I do hope that my friend, the next time, will look at himself very closely in the mirror.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. The able Senator from Nebraska I think not only let the cat out of the bag, he burned the bag up. He said "What you are afraid of is pressing the button and letting the President get hell for putting the draft into effect." Now I did not say that. But, it begins to look that way. It seems to be the impelling motive among others that leads my distinguished friend on the other side to take the position he has so nobly espoused. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Maryland, because I also should like to reply to the Senator from Nebraska. I say there is no politics in this matter at all. Let me give a bit of personal experience. Last November, with half a dozen other Senators, I was in Trieste, which was being held at that time by 5,000 Americans and 5,000 Englishmen, with, less than 6 miles away, 100,000 Yugoslavs in well-organized divisions. Why? Because we were strong at home, and they had respect for us. They had respect for those 10,000 men in Trieste.

Let us trace briefly the history of this matter. We had a universal military training bill here last year. It was not acted on, although we did act on the unification bill. This year the universal military training bill was again brought forward.

On March 17 the President said, "I want selective service." As a result, the universal military training bill was gradually shelved and put aside, because we realized we could not pass it. Instead, a selective service bill was reported out. We did that, not because of an emergency, not because we wanted the President some time later to push a button. We did it because we wanted to remain strong. We did it because we wanted to maintain the respect of other nations in the world, when it is so important to world negotiations, so important in getting the United Nations going, so important in getting trade treaties under way that we remain strong.

We in the Congress have responsibilities. We are the representatives of the American people. The President is the Chief Executive. Are we to turn the decision back to the President for him to say there is a second emergency at some time in the future, so that he may press the button? It is not a question of an emergency; it is a question of remaining strong. How are we in Congress to live up to that responsibility?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I prefer to finish first.

Mr. WHERRY. Can we not remain just as strong under the amendment as without it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We are not living up——

Mr. WHERRY. Can we not remain just as strong? Can we not get just as many men, and get them just as soon?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the meantime, it would give occasion for other nations of the world to say, "No; Congress does not assume its responsibility of keeping the country strong." We have the largest volunteer army now in the history of the world, and it is not enough. So we say, "No; we will let the other nations say we are not going to remain strong; we are going to leave it to the President to say, 'Yes; now I think we have got to be a little stronger, so I am going to push the button.'" I say to my good friend from Nebraska, who needles me many times privately, never publicly [laughter]——

Mr. WHERRY. If I may ask, why is the Senator picking on me now, in public? I do not understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because the Senator used the word "politics" in connection with the Committee on Armed Services. There was no politics. Heaven knows, we are not seeking to enact a draft bill because of politics.

Let me say one more word, and I shall thank the Senator from Maryland. We are enacting the pending bill in order to keep this country strong, to retain the respect of the other nations of the world. We are not going to do it if we enact a push-button draft bill. We are going to do it if we take the responsibility of enacting a draft law in order to keep the country strong and avoid emergencies. I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I promised to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania. I yield to him first.

Mr. MYERS. I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. As the Senator from Maryland said, he let the cat out of the bag. The Senator from Nebraska indicated he wanted to make Harry S. Truman push the button to send the boys into the armed services. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, that is not the statement I made at all.

Mr. MYERS. I do not yield. I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us get the record straight, anyway.

Mr. MYERS. I have the record straight. We are talking about push-button legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. President Truman had the intestinal fortitude to recommend the draft bill. The Committee on Armed Services had the intestinal fortitude to vote to report favorably the draft bill. Let us, the 96 Senators, have the intestinal fortitude to vote on a draft bill and not say the President of the United States must push the button.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. Not yet, no. Something has been said about this business of politics. It seems strange to me that the time for pushing the button, for starting to draft our young men, is put a month before the Presidential election. The timing is no coincidence. If we did not have a Presidential election scheduled for 1948, I do not think we would ever have this amendment before us. I believe the amendment was born in politics. I believe politics is its only purpose. For 18 months we have been delimiting the power of the Executive; we have been restricting the power of the Executive. Now we say all power for drafting our young men must rest in the Executive. We do not want to take the responsibility. We want to say, come next October, "Well, it is up to the President. He has said there is an emergency. It is his doing." Of course there is politics in the debate on this amendment but the politics lies in the amendment itself. The Senator from Nebraska finally indicated what the purpose of the amendment is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. Not yet. The whole purpose of the amendment is to allow its advocates to be all things to all people. To those who oppose the draft, the drafting of our boys could be blamed on the President, for he would have to push the button. And to those who favor the

draft, advocates of this amendment could also say "We voted for the draft." I say I am willing to take my responsibility. I am willing to vote tonight for a draft bill, and to say when it shall become effective. I am not willing to send the President a bill requiring him alone to determine whether or not there is to be a draft. I believe a temporary selective-service law is necessary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. Just a minute. The Senator will have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania does not yield.

Mr. MYERS. I believe all the evidence indicates that a temporary draft law is vitally necessary. I think that otherwise this country may be in danger and that our hopes for a decent world, a free world, will be jeopardized unless we keep our armed forces up to minimum strength. We should keep politics out of it, as the Senator from Maryland said.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield in a moment. I think the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Florida have both been asking me to yield. I think I promised the Senator from Florida to yield to him, first.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should merely like to appeal to the Senator—

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska. I will ask him as a favor to me, who would also like to participate in this debate, not to be too long in his reply. I do not think I can be any more courteous than that.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all right. I realize I have taken a good deal of time. I shall not attempt to answer the distinguished Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska. I only ask him in his reply not to take any more time than he thinks is necessary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the past 3 months I have taken very little time in direct debate on anything. I did not intend to get into this debate this afternoon. I simply asked a question as to what the amendment contained that would in any way hurt the draft bill. No one has answered that question. Senators have made speeches, they have charged politics, they have done everything in the curriculum but answer the question. If someone can give me an intelligent answer, showing that the adoption of the Capehart amendment would delay or take one man away, or do anything detrimental to the bill, I should like to hear it. I should like to vote intelligently on the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland will attempt, through the floor facilities at his disposal, to answer the interrogatory of the distinguished and able acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I would say to the Senator, with as much seriousness as I am capable of, that, in my opinion, conditions in Germany today, while quiet at the moment, are fraught with the gravest possibilities.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is in the making over there an international line which will cut Germany and her homogeneous population completely in half, with one-half being under the domination of a government whose philosophy is alien to what has been, for the most part, the economic philosophy of the German people, and whose political philosophy is one of domination, perhaps from a long distance, of the people who live in that zone. On the other hand, there are three zones being melted into one, in connection with which we have committed this Nation to an expenditure of $17,000,000,000.

It was not more than a couple of months ago that the distinguished President pro tempore of this body, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in one of the most eloquent addresses I have ever heard in this or in any other place, pleaded with all of us to save democratic institutions and freedom all over the earth.

Does the Senator from Nebraska, or does any other Senator, assume that in the passage of a mere 60 days before that commitment is even in part carried out, all the evils of the world have retreated into obscurity, and that peace and good will are the part of all mankind on this earth?

In Austria the same situation that exists in Germany is coming into being. In Greece the situation is most tense. In the Holy Land we have representatives trying to put out the fire while it is still in its embryonic stage and before it can spread into a great conflagration, consuming the remaining vitality of men and economic resources.

In the Far East, to jump about a bit, the situation in Korea is very tense. We members of the Armed Services Committee have heard, behind closed doors, on several occasions the commanding officers of our forces there who have told us things which it would not be politic to mention too broadly, for fear people might think some imaginary hocus-pocus was being erected to frighten them.

In China the situation is deteriorating from bad to worse, and so much so that the House of Representatives, without any request from the administration, insisted on voting several hundred millions of dollars to do in China the same thing, at least in part, that was done in other countries.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will permit me to conclude, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Maryland will remember that he has agreed to yield first to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall keep all commitments, so far as a man who has certain political slants unlike those of his colleagues is able to do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall be glad to yield time to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, those are the facts of life. I am not frightened that progress has not been made. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska and with the Senator from Indiana that we have made some progress in the past 60 or 90 days. That is all to the good. I pray God that we may, in January or February, when we reconvene, find that the world is so situated that we no longer need this measure or similarly drastic and far-reaching defense measures. But that happy day has not yet come. We must not retreat on the eve of victory and lose all the hard-won gains which we have achieved. They have been hard-won gains, particularly in Italy, in Greece, in Trieste, and in Germany. Like some other Members of this body I have been to Greece and to the frontier between Greece, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. I was in Trieste last summer, along the whole frontier, with General Bryan, first, to the northern part, and then the southern part. I went over the whole situation in Germany, and so far as I was able to go down into the Russian zone. The same in Austria. I will tell Senators that the men who are in charge of the affairs of this Government in those countries do not have the free and easy nonchalance which we arrogate to ourselves in the security of this Chamber. They ask us for men, for strength, and they say to us, "If you will give us that strength, we believe we will be able to prevent the outbreak of another great war."

I am making a plea for economy—for economy of human life, for economy of human resources, as well as for the eventual economy of dollars and cents and of the material things which we have promised to give in such abundance. We must do this so that we can be strong, until the task is completed. To retreat now would be folly, false economy, and false reasoning.

I yield now to the Senator from Florida. I hope he will not make too long a speech, for I am anxious to quit.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to speak very briefly on what I believe to be strong and insuperable objections to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and so ably supported by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. What I shall have to say will not involve politics in any way, but will simply give my views as to why the amendment would not only completely change the nature of the bill, but would do violence to it in two ways, which I am sure the Senate does not want to follow.

First, I want to say, Mr. President, that I strongly and unequivocally support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and I hope that my discussion may bring out some added argument that has not yet come into the debate.

It seems to me that perhaps a quick survey of some of the vital parts of the report of the committee will indicate what we are trying to do in this bill.

First, the committee quotes the President's request. I shall not restate that. I shall quote only this much of it:

> In the face of this critical condition, there has been a consistent dissipation in the strength of our armed forces during the past months as new enlistments have failed to keep pace with the separations from the services.

Next, I come down to the point at which the committee is drawing its conclusions and I read as follows:

> The committee came to the conclusion that enactment of a bill containing both selective service and universal military training was inexpedient at this time both from a fiscal standpoint and from the standpoint of practicability. It is not considered that the active services can reach the strength required this year and also initiate universal military training.

The emphasis is placed upon reaching the desired strength this year.

> The committee finally developed a bill the primary purpose of which is to provide for quickly bringing the regular services to the strength recommended by the Secretary of Defense and concurred in by the committee.

In other words, speed is the essence.

Mr. President, if the distinguished Senators will bear with me a moment, I should like an opportunity to develop the first two purposes of the bill, as stated on page 3 of the report:

> (1) To increase the authorized strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;
>
> (2) To bring the strength of the services up to these authorized ceilings by means of a selective-service program—

And so forth. There are other purposes stated upon which I shall not dwell. I want to make it clear that, in my judgment, the first objection to the amendment is that it departs from instead of carrying out and subserving the objective of the bill, quickly to bring the armed forces to the newly authorized strength which, for the first time, would be permitted under the provisions of this bill. To carry out this purpose it is necessary to have selective service and to have it quickly. That is emphasized over and over again by the committee.

But I call attention to the fact that under the amendment as drafted there is created a stand-by selective-service law instead of an immediate one. It has to be stand-by for 75 days, I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, and it may be stand-by after that 75 days is over, throughout the 2-year period which the law has been amended to cover.

In other words, if the amendment shall become operative, it is crystal clear that this particular law would not be an immediate selective-service law applicable, in the judgment of the Congress, now, or when it became law, but would instead become a stand-by law, which the Congress would say could not be invoked for 75 days, and which might not be invoked, in the wisdom of the President of the United States only, for the rest of the 2-year period.

Mr. President, unless I have been misinformed by the report, and unless I have been wholly misled by what I have heard about the state of world affairs, we do not need a stand-by selective-service act, but instead, an immediate one as recommended by the committee. If all we are trying to do is to pass a stand-by selective-service law not applicable for 75 days, and perhaps not at all, we are doing a different kind of job from that which the people of this Nation are looking to us to do.

The second point to which I call attention—and I hope the Senator from Nebraska will give his attention to this—is the fact that the only provision in the bill under which our armed strength is required to be raised to the new number authorized, thus requiring the application of the draft, is contained in section 4. The only place in the bill that shows clearly that we are not simply authorizing this new strength, but are working to that strength just as quickly as possible, under the objectives of the bill and under the report of the committee, is found in section 4. I am not going to weary the Senate by quoting at length from it, but I shall quote the last few words from that particular section, the words showing the purpose of selective service, namely, "to provide and maintain the personnel strengths of the respective armed forces authorized by section 2 of this act." That is the purpose, that is the reason why the bill is being voted, that is why it is being put into immediate effect.

And now I call to the attention——

Mr. TYDINGS. I will have to ask the Senator if he will not make his speech in his own time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am trying to hold up the hands of the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe I am giving the Senator from Nebraska some meat into which he can put his teeth. I am trying to do so.

I call his attention to the fact that under this amendment—and I hope the Senator will follow the wording of it—we are actually asked to substitute the judgment of the President of the United States as to what number throughout the 2-year period will constitute enough troops "to maintain an adequate national defense." We are asked to substitute that changing test of strength for the standard of strength prescribed by the bill, in the judgment of the committee and the leaders of our armed forces, and I do not believe that any mere human being, whether he is serving from now until next January in the high position of our Chief Executive, or thereafter, during the rest of the 2-year period, should be substituted for, or that his judgment should be put in place of that of the Congress of the United States, which has the high responsibility upon its heart, whether or not we want to acknowledge it, to say when our Nation is sufficiently armed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Florida for a most pertinent contribution to the debate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I shall close in just a moment. I wish to say just this further word. If this amendment shall be agreed to, it is clear that instead of working to the new authorized strength required by the bill we will work instead to those standards which "the President proclaims, not earlier than 75 days after the date of enactment," when he finds that in his judgment "an insufficient number of persons is on active service in the armed forces to maintain an adequate national defense." And so we are asked by this amendment to utterly change the bill by making it a stand-by law, and to change the bill further by resigning our obligation and responsibility and placing it upon the President to decide whether or not our armed forces are adequate from time to time at the end of 75 days and thereafter during the 2 years. I do not think the Senate or the House or the Congress of the United States as a whole proposes to do either of those things. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator, and certainly I agree with what he has said.

I shall conclude with just one more thought, and this is directed more in behalf of the chairman of the committee than to anything else. I wish to say it with a very deep degree of seriousness, and with complete sincerity.

We had a great many witnesses before our committee before we agreed on this piece of legislation. They included men high in the civilian branch of the Government, as well as military leaders. We debated the bill paragraph by paragraph pretty thoroughly, and the Armed Services Committee is I believe one of the ablest committees of the Congress. I wish to read the personnel of the committee:

CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota, chairman; STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire; EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, of Wyoming; GEORGE A. WILSON, of Iowa; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, of Connecticut.

And on the Democratic side, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia; HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia; LISTER HILL, of Alabama; HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia; BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina, and myself.

Mr. President, I do not believe such a committee would in normal times recommend a bill to do a thing so abnormal as this bill would do if it had not been upon the testimony of men competent to know, men who were on the spot, who told us what they thought was the minimum requirement. They wanted universal military service; they were not satisfied with what the bill provides. But the bill was designed finally to meet the wishes of some Members of the House of Representatives who, for one reason or another, wanted to tone it down to pretty much its present form. This bill does not represent what our committee would have brought in. It represents in part the desire of the Senate committee to accede to the wishes of some members of another body.

Gentlemen, you have torn this bill pretty well to pieces. Over the objection of the chairman of the committee, supported by the members of the committee, you have reduced the time from 5 years to 2 years. You have put in the bill certain things which are highly controversial, which in my humble judgment

have done much to weaken the whole text of the bill.

There have been frequent debates over matters which should be decided extraneously from the military policy involved, and should not have been interwoven, in my judgment, into the military policy involved here. The commitments of this Nation abroad warrant consideration of military policy without involvement of such domestic or political questions whatsoever. Nevertheless, men who for the moment in good faith have dimmed their eyes to the conditions outside of our country, offered these amendments, as was their right.

In my judgment, it was a mistake. Besides, we have whittled the bill, by amendment after amendment, until it is hardly more than weak soup; there is hardly anything in it. And now it is proposed that we whittle it still further by giving the President the opportunity and the power to set it at naught for its whole lifetime—for its whole lifetime—by the very men who say, "This thing of turning over the power of the Congress to the Executive ought to be halted. It will ruin this democracy."

I hope the orators on both sides of the aisle who adhere to that philosophy in the coming campaign, if they vote for this amendment, will say: "I disapprove of transferring the power of the legislature to the Chief Executive. I will oppose it. I have opposed it, except in the case where I told him he could put the country under a draft law if he wanted to without consulting me any more about it." I hope they will be fair enough to bring that to the attention of the great audiences which are going to be addressed by the candidates. And if they do not, if they are going to play fast and loose, some of us may follow them and make speeches, in which we will present the facts in the case, and perhaps convince some people that they may not be as worthy of belief when they say they expect to carry out the philosophy which they espouse.

The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has tried to explain the philosophy of the bill and the evidence which was brought before our committee. It is rather significant that the Senate has seen fit to take his bill, in which he is supported by the majority of the members on the committee of his own party as well as by the Democrats, and tear it to shreds.

Yes, Mr. President; I remember the speeches which were made on the Senate floor in times past. I knew what a dark day it was in December 1941. I knew what a dark day it was when our boys hit the Omaha and Utah beaches. I remember the statements made by Senators on this floor—I know they meant it when they made those speeches—that never again would this country be unprepared and our boys have to go forth, because of our weakness primarily, to take part in a great war.

Mr. President, this is the day of the pay-off for those statements. If Senators meant what they said then, with the complete evidence of all the experts in the country in agreement on the philosophy of the bill, a bill reported with almost unanimous approval by the members of the Armed Services Committee, then make good on those speeches which were uttered on this floor in those dark days of World War II, and do not leave the country in a position where, if international events should degenerate, we would leave those who are weakly supported in Europe and in the Orient to the mercy of an overpowering foe, and wash our hands of their great sacrifice because, forsooth, we did not have the courage or wisdom to back them up with a vote on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to make one statement in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, because I know his devotion to accuracy. I think the comment he made concerning the reduction of the life of the bill by my amendment yesterday, from a 5-year to a 2-year basis, with the right of Congress at the end of the 2 years to vote to continue the draft if it was considered that an emergency existed at that time, seems to give the impression that the majority of the Armed Services Committee was against that amendment. The record is perfectly clear that 7 of the 13 members of the Armed Services Committee voted for the 2-year amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the House?

Mr. MORSE. No; in the Senate yesterday afternoon. A majority of the members of the committee, after thinking over the matter, decided to support the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I find the Senator from Oregon is correct in that statement. I had assumed before the Senator from Oregon corrected me that such was not the case. I find I was in error.

Mr. MORSE. I have talked also to those men, and they have told me that after thinking the whole thing through, with the right of the Congress to continue the draft after 2 years they thought the amendment was a good amendment. They represent a majority of the Armed Services Committee. The fact remains that a majority of the Armed Services Committee voted for the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. The fact is that a majority of the Armed Services Committee, an overwhelming majority, voted in the committee for the original provision of 5 years.

Mr. MORSE. Including the Senator from Oregon.

Again in the interest of accuracy let me say that the Senator from Maryland will fail to find anything in the RECORD showing that the Senator from Oregon offered any amendment in regard to segregation. I did not want to take any of the honors away from the Senator from North Dakota. But the Senator from Oregon made his statement prefectly clear on the floor of the Senate as to his position on the segregation matter, and he said that in his judgment neither the Congress nor the people of the country were ready for any such amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the Senator said nevertheless that he favored it.

Mr. MORSE. I stated that I hoped the time would come when that principle of giving those constitutional rights to all Americans would be recognized by the Congress, but the Senator from Oregon offered no amendment on that subject.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Oregon offered no amendment on the subject of segregation, but he made an eloquent speech in which he said he favored the principle of it, that he would support it, but that he did not think it was opportune at the moment. But the Senator from Oregon did praise the Senator from North Dakota who offered the amendment providing for segregation.

Mr. MORSE. I said I did not want to take any honors away from the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Oregon added to the honors of the Senator from North Dakota by supporting the position of the Senator from North Dakota by the remarks he made concerning him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield again?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from Maryland that I think the record in this debate is perfectly clear that following the report of the bill to the floor of the Senate a good many members of the Armed Services Committee, as the result of points of view brought out in the debate, have revised their thinking on the bill, and I think that is highly commendable.

Mr. TYDINGS. I accept that statement.

Mr. MORSE. My interpretation of the motives which impelled them, based on what they said to me, will remain the same.

I want to say to the Senator from Maryland that after listening to the debate I have decided to vote against the Capehart amendment. I have decided to vote against it for the same reason that caused me to vote to report the bill to the floor of the Senate. There has been much said here about an emergency. Senators can disagree with my interpretation of emergency, but I think my interpretation of the emergency is this, and it has been true for many months past, that Soviet Russia has no friendly intentions toward the United States, and I am satisfied that the moment she thinks we are weak enough for her to succeed in an aggressive policy toward us she will proceed on that course of action. That is why I think that for the next 2 or 3 years we must follow the course of action which is outlined in this draft legislation. If I did not believe that as we stand here today there is a serious danger of a war in the immediate future with Russia I would not vote for this draft bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I want to make one observation. The able Senator from Maryland has made a great speech. He has tried to fortify his position on the basis that great experts have approved the bill. He has by inference stated that we who support my amendment do so for some sinister reason, and that we were at some time or

other opposed to something that caused something else to happen.

Let me say to the able Senator from Maryland and other Senators that so far as I am personally concerned, the civilian experts whom he mentions, those whom he would like to have me follow, have had a perfect record of failure. I shall not take the time of the Senate tonight to go over the record. They have failed in every international scheme they have entered into. Their record includes World War II. Their record includes the present threat of World War III. They passed a neutrality bill and then repealed it. They have a record of inconsistency on every side. I ask, How can any man who wants to do a little thinking for himself, follow a group of experts who have a perfect record of failure? My idea of experts and of leadership is men who at some time or other are successful. That is the kind of men the able Senator from Maryland would hire to operate a business. The test of leadership is keeping out of trouble, not getting into trouble.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I say that they have failed to bring peace to the world. They have failed to keep this Nation out of world wars. They have failed to accomplish the stated purpose in all international schemes. I am for a strong America and I am for a strong armed force. I have voted for it. But I am becoming a little tired of having held up to me as experts and men whom I should follow men who if I read history and the record correctly have brought nothing but chaos. At least nothing but chaos has developed from their leadership.

My idea of leadership in the White House and leadership in the Congress is men who keep us out of war, men who have peacetime relationships with other peoples throughout the world. That is my idea of successful men.

I am not saying that all of these things could have been avoided. I do not think they could. But I want the RECORD to show that I for one—and I am speaking as a citizen—am becoming tired of being asked to follow leaders who have such a record. They have tried to be a part of the leadership of the world, but they have brought it to the chaos which exists tonight.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know whether the Senator was present or not, but the witnesses whom I summoned to the stand in my imaginary cross-examination were such men as General Eisenhower, General Bradley, Admiral Denfeld, General Vandenberg, and General MacArthur. Does the Senator from Indiana contend that those eminent gentlemen have been failures?

Mr. CAPEHART. Now the Senator is becoming technical. He came over on this side of the aisle today and tried to embarrass the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] by getting him to admit that he would eliminate the Army and Navy. I do not propose to debate that sort of question with the able Senator from Maryland, because he knows that he is not frank when he makes the statement.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I resent that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I apologize.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want the Senator from Indiana to get these words——

Mr. CAPEHART. I apologize.

Mr. TYDINGS. In spite of his apology, I want the Senator to get these words burned into his brain: The Senator from Maryland yields neither to the Senator from Indiana nor to any other Senator on any point of sincerity in connection with this or any other question coming before this body. I have not charged anyone with playing politics. The charge has come entirely from the other side of the aisle. But I believe that my silence is more eloquent than the speeches of some who has spoken.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was interested in the statement made by the able Senator from Indiana as to his lack of faith and confidence in the leaders of this country, including the President of the United States. I am wondering why he is willing to delegate such a responsibility to the President of the United States, instead of having the Congress assume it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was not talking about the President of the United States. I was talking about the leadership of the United States over the past 16 years.

Mr. LUCAS. This is a part of the "past many years."

Mr. CAPEHART. In my opinion, our leadership have failed in all our international schemes.

Mr. LUCAS. Under this amendment the able Senator is willing to let the Congress out, and pass to the President of the United States the responsibility for one of the most important decisions to be made. For the past 10 years I have heard from the other side of the aisle nothing but condemnation because of the delegation of authority to the President of the United States or the executive branch of the Government. Yet the able Senator, by his amendment, is willing to place in the hands of the President of the United States one of the most important responsibilities affecting mankind. Why is not the Senator willing to assume that responsibility himself, as a Member of Congress?

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill itself states that the President must determine the number that he will call into service each month. The bill itself gives the President the right to place the law in operation.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I am talking about. The Senator would place that great responsibility on the Chief Executive, the very individual to whom it has been said time and again the Congress, under a Democratic administration, has been delegating too much power. But when it comes to the point of delegating power where great responsibility is involved the Senator from Indiana, as a Member of Congress, is not willing to assume the responsibility.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, 3 months from now the condition as to drafting men may be entirely different from what it is today. Under the terms of the bill as interpreted by the chairman of the committee, the President would have discretion as to whether or not to issue a call.

We have spent 2 hours on what to my mind is a very small difference. I cannot see the difference. Under the terms of the amendment the President would have to make an actual proclamation instead of merely issuing a call for the draft; but so far as I can see, that is the only difference. If we are to debate points of that sort indefinitely, we shall certainly be here the rest of the year. I suggest to the Senate that if there is still a hope that we can get away by the 19th of June—and apparently, so far as I can discover, every Member of the Senate wants to go, judging from the protests which arose against the possibility of having to continue—we shall simply have to cut short debate as much as possible and vote on measures after they have been adequately debated.

I very much hope that we can finish consideration of the bill tonight. It seems to me that we are debating what is in reality a very slight difference. It is perfectly legitimate to argue either for the bill or against it. The amendment does not involve the basic question as to whether or not there shall be a draft. It does not involve any great change in the President's discretion or responsibility. It seems to me that the point has been adequately discussed. I hope that we can vote on the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make one reply to my good friend from Ohio. I am just as anxious as is any other Senator to conclude this debate. Practically all the amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services have come from the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that I was not in any way criticizing the Democratic side of the aisle. In fact, I was talking more to Republicans than to Democrats.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has just called my attention to the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] offered an amendment last night. However, the greater part of the debate has been on amendments from the other side of the aisle.

We are ready to vote on the bill at any time, as soon as we can get through with these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Buck	Holland	Revercomb
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Stewart
Donnell	Lucas	Taft
Dworshak	McClellan	Taylor
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McGrath	Thye
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Malone	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Watkins
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is also detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is unavoidably detained and is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "Yea", and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who would vote "nay" if present, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—24

Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bricker	Kem	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Vandenberg
Capehart	Malone	Watkins
Capper	Millikin	Wherry
Ecton	Moore	Wiley
Ferguson	Revercomb	Williams
Hickenlocper	Robertson, Wyo.	Young

NAYS—57

Aiken	Gurney	Maybank
Baldwin	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Buck	Hill	O'Conor
Byrd	Hoey	O'Daniel
Cain	Holland	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Ives	Pepper
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Cordon	Kilgore	Russell
Donnell	Knowland	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith
Eastland	Lucas	Sparkman
Ellender	McClellan	Stennis
Feazel	McFarland	Stewart
Flanders	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McKellar	Thye
George	McMahon	Tydings
Green	Martin	Umstead

NOT VOTING—15

Bridges	Jenner	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	McCarran	Tobey
Bushfield	McCarthy	Wagner
Connally	Magnuson	White
Downey	Reed	Wilson

So Mr. CAPEHART'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For a privileged matter, the Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit a conference report and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, and 20.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,015,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from ts disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$207,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$648,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 9.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not object to taking up the conference report, but would the Senator mind explaining briefly what the House bill carried in the way of appropriations, and also in regard to transfers of the service from one department to another, and what the Senate did, and what the conferees have done?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall do that. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the statement on the part of the House managers which appears in the House proceedings of the RECORD for today, relative to this bill, and then the same request just prior to the time we take up the next bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Amendment No. 1 strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the language providing for

the performance in the Office of the Secretary of the union-registration functions of the Secretary under title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947. The effect of this action on the appropriation for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, is to delete $75,000 applicable to the transferred function and provide an increase of $75,000 for functions and activities remaining in the Office of the Secretary as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 appropriates $1,015,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,031,555 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the language in the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards referring to industrial health activities.

Amendment No. 4 inserts the provision of the Senate providing for the performance in the Bureau of Labor Standards of the union-registration functions of the Secretary under title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out the provision of the Senate in the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards providing for the performance in that Bureau of certain youth research and employment functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates $320,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House and $450,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended for this item includes $90,000 and $30,000, respectively, for the union-registration functions and the Federal-State Cooperation Branch instead of $97,288 and $40,412, respectively, as proposed by the Senate. While no specific allocation has been allowed for the Reports and Public Service Branch of the Bureau, it is not the intent of the managers on the part of the House and Senate to prohibit continuation, within the several allocations approved for the Bureau, of those activities heretofore included in such branch which are ancillary and essential to conduct of the basic safety and labor standards activities provided for.

Amendment No. 7 appropriates $115,000 for penalty mail costs of the Department, instead of $105,000 as proposed by the House and $130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $207,500 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, instead of $415,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9, relating to salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics, is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $274,200 for salaries and expenses, Women's Bureau, as proposed by the House instead of $326,735 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 strikes out the provision of the Senate limiting the functions of the Wage and Hour Division with respect to certain activities under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Amendment No. 12 appropriates $5,000,000 for salaries and expenses, Wage and Hour Division, as proposed by the House, instead of $4,887,700 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14 appropriate $1,400,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,371,200 as proposed by the House, of which amount not to exceed $41,000 may be allocated for expenses of the Employees' Compensation Board of Appeals as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16 appropriate $1,900,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of Education, instead of $1,796,700 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore the provision of the House providing that not less than $487,400 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education. The amount recommended for this appropriation includes funds needed to maintain present staff and an additional amount for printing as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17 inserts the provision of the Senate limiting payments to States for vocational rehabilitation for the first quarter of fiscal year 1950 to an amount not exceeding the corresponding figure for such purpose for the first quarter of fiscal year 1949.

Amendment No. 18 appropriates $648,850 for salaries and expenses, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, instead of $622,700 as proposed by the House and $675,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20 appropriate $40,000,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authorizations for grants to States for hospital construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize allotments to the States for fiscal year 1949 on the basis of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 21 appropriates $9,400,000 for salaries and expenses, National Labor Relations Board, as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House. Although the language of the appropriation as finally recommended permits apportionment of the appropriation for obligation during the first 7 months of fiscal year 1949, the managers on the part of the House and Senate desire to emphasize that such language is permissive only and not a mandate to allocate the full amount to that period, and that they are recommending $9,400,000 as being adequate to handle during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1949 the work load projected in the President's budget estimate.

Amendment No. 22 inserts the provision of the Senate prohibiting use of the appropriation of the National Labor Relations Board in actions or procedures relating to agricultural laborers.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 23 appropriates $2,940,000 for salaries and expenses, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $150,000 for expenses of boards of inquiry appointed pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE VII—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 25 rescinds $10,000 of the appropriation for civilian war benefits, Federal Security Agency, 1948, as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,000 as proposed by the House.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the able Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader, that perhaps we should look at both the bills together, because in the normal course of events the two bills would have been handled as one bill. However, because of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, which at that time had not been acted upon by the two Houses of Congress, the House Appropriations Committee decided to divide the bill, to contain the Federal Security portion of it and the matter relating to the USES in the second bill, which is known as the supplemental bill, and which I shall take up immediately following this one.

The basic differences between the two Houses were, first, in the amount of appropriations. I can say, generally speaking, that the Senate considerably increased the House appropriations in the bill which passed this body. In the conference, generally speaking, the amount that we came out with was substantially about halfway between the House figure and the Senate figure. That is not true in all cases. In the Bureau of Labor Statistics the House had originally cut the amount to $2,500,000. The Senate had increased the amount to $4,250,000. We came out of conference with $4,073,000, which is the amount the Bureau had to operate on this year. So in that case we more nearly approached the Senate figure.

The basic change was in the United States Employment Service. As it now stands, the USES is in the Department of Labor. Under the statutes as they now exist, had peace been declared, 6 months after the declaration of the ending of the war the USES would have reverted to the Federal Security Agency and would have been under the Social Security Administrator. The testimony before the Committee on Appropriations in both the Senate and the House of Representatives indicated, I think, almost without exception that everyone agreed that ultimately the USES and the unemployment compensation should be tied in together. There was a difference of opinion as to where they might preferably be tied. The Department of Labor felt they should be in the Department of Labor. There were others who felt, and the House position was, that the two should be combined and then set up as a separate bureau outside the Social Security Administration. After a full and free conference and recognizing the fact that we have two Houses of Congress, and, as the able Senator from Kentucky knows perhaps better than any other man on the floor of the Senate, there has to be a give-and-take in order to reach a compromise decision, so that legislation can go through.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will just let me continue. The other basic change which we made was in the so-called rider that appeared in the House bill. We felt the rider would adversely affect the Government employees whose union leaders had not accepted that particular provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. Employees would be penalized, particularly in the Government Printing Office where the ITU has not complied with certain sections of the law. They are not required to comply with it unless they want to take advantage of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947.

So we struck out the rider and the conference committee agreed with the Senate's position in that regard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to make this preliminary observation. I have always felt that USES ought to be in the Department of Labor, and I was opposed to its transfer to Social Security. But that transfer has been made. As I understand, it has been relegated to a comparatively unimportant position in the division of employment of the Social Security Service, which seems to minimize the importance of USES. In addition to that, some of its functions were transferred by the Senate to the States prior to the adoption of the legislation which is now the subject of conference. The amount of money provided in grants to the States has been reduced by approximately $15,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that the House allowed for the combined amount of grants $123,000,000. The budget estimate had been $145,000,000. The Senate had allowed $136,500,000. We have come out of conference with a figure of $130,000,000, which is a substantial increase over the amount allowed by the House, but is below the figure fixed by the Senate. It is approximately halfway between the two positions.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to delay consideration of the conference report. I am sorry that the report comes in apparently in a form which I regard as representing too great a yielding on the part of the Senate conferees. I am thoroughly familiar with the necessity of making concessions on both sides. USES has been one of my pet legislative policies ever since it was established. I have always felt that unemployment was a national problem that should be dealt with as such, and for that reason I objected originally to the transfer of some of the functions of USES to the States because of the different standards established in the different States and the results involved. But that is water over the dam. I shall not argue about that now. I do regret, however, that in the process of transferring that agency it has apparently been regarded as somewhat of an unimportant adjunct to the social-security organization. Instead of standing out as an important agency whose function is to endeavor to find jobs for unemployed persons, it has been given a subordinate position. I hope that my fears will not be realized, and that as a subordinate agency away down the line in the social-security establishment, its importance will not be overlooked, especially if there should come a time when there should be great unemployment. At present that does not present an acute problem, because we have widespread and universal employment. There are nearly 61,000,000 persons gainfully employed in the United States. Whether we can hope for a continuation of that condition is speculative. As our population increases I hope the proportionate employment will increase. But if there should come a reaction, a recession, or a slump of any kind which would involve large unemployment, I do not believe the Federal Government could escape its responsibility as a national agency in dealing with a national problem. If it should become really acute, the people of this country will demand, as they did heretofore, that the problem be dealt with from a national standpoint.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Kentucky that I do not yield to him in having a desire to see USES do a good job. I agree with him fully that not only in hard times, but I think, in time, when employment is at a high level, USES has an important job to do, because in times such as the present, when we have a high turn-over in positions, USES can perform a very useful job for the worker and for industry. I do not believe its transfer will fundamentally adversely affect the work of USES. I will say to the able Senator, as I am sure he already knows, that in all the States, I believe, save one, it has been the policy to combine unemployment compensation work and the employment service so that there will be the closest type of coordination between those two agencies.

We were faced with the problem that the Senate and the House of Representatives had, by affirmative action, determined that they would not combine the two in the Department of Labor. The bill contains appropriations amounting to $1,866,053,700, a large part of that amount being in social-security payments and in pay rolls of Government employees. We are approaching the adjournment period, and under the circumstances, I felt, as one Senate conferee, and I am sure the other conferees felt the same way, that we had to maintain the Senate's position as fully as we could without producing an absolute deadlock. The bill, as it comes out of conference, fairly represents a compromise position between the two Houses of Congress. Under our representative system of Government, I am sure the Senator will agree with me that if the two Houses sit at arms length and neither House yields, we would jeopardize the entire bill itself.

Mr. BARKLEY. I fully appreciate that. I would also be fair enough to say that I think some of the present difficulties involved in the conference report are probably chargeable to the Senate itself by reason of the action which it took in regard to the bill, which the conferees of the Senate had to represent in conference.

I shall not delay consideration of the conference report, but I should like, if the Senator will permit at this time, to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my comment on the subject three pages involving a comparison of the appropriations and also involving some comment upon the effect of the transfer of USES and its location as a part of the social-security establishment.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Effects of H. R. 6355, Federal Security Agency supplemental appropriation, 1949

	Salaries and expenses	Grants to States
1. Original 1949 Budget request:		
USES	$5,270,000	$72,000,000
BES	1,150,000	73,650,000
2. House action: Combined appropriation for USES and BES	5,312,000	123,000,000
(Provided for transfer of USES to FSA to be combined with BES in a new bureau under the Federal Security Administrator.)		
3. Senate action:		
USES	5,000,000	68,000,000
BES	1,196,671	68,500,000
(Eliminated House reorganization rider and reinstituted USES in Department of Labor.)		
4. Conference report: Combined appropriation for USES and BES	5,754,000	130,000,000
(Provides transfer of USES to Social Security Administration as a division of the existing Bureau of Employment Security.)		

5. Earmarking in conference report:		
For all Employment Service administration functions		$4,754,000
For veterans' employment service	$2,265,000	
For farm placement	495,000	
For all other USES administrative functions	1,994,000	
For Unemployment Compensation		1,000,000

EFFECTS OF CONFERENCE ACTION ON FEDERAL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1949 (H. R. 6355)

This conference action contains three major features:

1. It would transfer the United States Employment Service from the United States Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency's Social Security Administration. There it would become a division of the Bureau of Employment Security.

2. It would reduce the appropriation from the amount requested for grants to the States for both unemployment compensation and employment service programs by $15,650,000.

3. After making specific exemptions for the Veterans' Employment Service and the Farm Placement Service, it would reduce the budget request of the United States Employment Service by $516,000, or more than 20 percent.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

1. Through substantive legislation in an appropriation measure, the United States Employment Service is reduced in status from a Bureau to a Division in the Bureau of Employment Security in the Social Security Administration. Thus, the USES is submerged by being reduced two organizational levels.

2. The bill would reverse the position taken by both Houses of Congress last month that any reorganization of the employment service and unemployment compensation should not be undertaken until the completion of the Hoover committee investigation.

3. Executive Order No. 9617, which placed the United States Employment Service in the United States Department of Labor, would be set aside.

4. Emphasis on job-finding functions at the local office level are endangered by lack of accountability for expenditure of identifiable employment-service funds.

5. The transfer and reorganization of the employment service would be undertaken at a time when serious manpower problems for national security and agricultural production exist.

BUDGET DEDUCTIONS

1. The reduction of State grants by $15,650,000 will require staff reductions in the States and the closing of some local offices, and the curtailment of some essential functions at a time when both agricultural and industrial recruitment and placement activities need to be expanded. This comes when administrative costs, including rents, salaries, and equipment are rising rapidly.

2. Federal expenditures for the Veterans' Employment Service and farm placement program are excluded from any budget reduction, so that a 20-percent cut would have to be made in the remaining parts of the United States Employment Service upon which these two programs are in large measure dependent for technical and program services. (The USES was cut 57 percent last year, which brought the organization down to where it is smaller now than it was in 1941.)

3. United States Employment Service staff would be reduced so as to make it impossible to meet fully the requirements of other Federal agencies responsible for the national security programs (for example, coordination of manpower resources with expanding production requirements).

4. The bill would curtail services rendered to the States by the United States Employment Service in the field of coordination of local employment office activities and gearing these activities to national needs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from California two or three questions. I have not had an opportunity to study the report, but, as the Senator knows, I always try to lay my facts on top of the table.

When word of the conference report reached me this afternoon certain representations were made regarding it, and I simply want to check up on those representations to make certain that I have been correctly informed.

My first question is, is the effect of the conference report to transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to a divisional status in the Bureau of Employment Security of the Social Security Administration?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is the effect of that transfer to accomplish the result by way of a legislative rider on an appropriation bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That the action is in effect a legislative rider on an appropriation bill, in frankness I would have to agree with the Senator from Oregon. That is the way, I might say, the bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives, except that it had provided for the setting up of a separate bureau outside and apart from the Social Security Administration.

As the Senator from Oregon knows, and as I have already mentioned in my discussion with the Senator from Kentucky, the law as it now stands on the statute books provides that within 6 months after the war has ended and peace has been declared, the USES would, under existing statutes, revert to the Federal Security Administration.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from California knows that, as a general policy, the junior Senator from Oregon does not approve of legislation by way of riders on appropriation bills, because I think there is always a great danger of abuse in such procedure, especially in the closing days of a Congress. I wonder if the Senator, so long as I am using his time now, will extend me the courtesy of making a parliamentary inquiry on that point. If not, I shall be glad to wait and use my own time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I raise a parliamentary inquiry, in view of the answer to my second question, so kindly given me by the Senator from California, as to whether or not a conference report that contains a legislative rider is subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair it is, but the pending conference report does not contain a legislative rider, as the Chair understands. The provision was inserted on the floor of the House as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The answer of the Senator from California then should be interpreted, as to this particular section of the conference report, that it has the effect of a legislative rider, although technically in fact it is not a legislative rider because it was inserted in the bill on the floor of the House. Is that the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad I raised the point of order, because I wish to assure the Senator from California, and I want to make clear for the record, that if I had had a point of order I could have stood on, I would have raised it, because of my devotion to the policy I have stated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will yield for a moment, I will say that I do not think the Senator from Oregon feels any stronger than does the Senator from California regarding the use of so-called legislative riders. It was not only because of the way I felt about the other rider to which I have referred, relative to the nonpayment of employees because their officers had not complied with certain sections of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947. The law did not compel them to comply. In the case of the Government Printing Office employees, there was no reason for them to do so. Not only did I disagree with the principle of the thing, but I also felt that it had no place as a legislative rider in an appropriation bill, and for that reason the Senate committee struck it out, the Senate sustained our action, and we were able to sustain our action in conference.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me a moment to give a notice?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire to give notice at this time to the Members of the Senate that later, before the session closes today, I hope to have opportunity to ask unanimous consent of the Senate to consider a resolution for relief purposes in connection with the present flood emergency in the Pacific Northwest. My colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the two Senators from Washington join in the resolution. I merely make the statement now, and I hope the Members of the Senate will remain for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was answering the junior Senator from Oregon. The material added by the House was in effect legislation on the bill. I am also fully convinced that it is not subject to a point of order on the floor of the Senate because it had been inserted in the House.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the Senator's statement, and I assure him that we share the same point of view in regard to legislative riders.

If the Senator will permit two or possibly three more short questions——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield there in connection with the statement regarding the legislative riders, I am prompted to say that, regardless of the objection to legislative riders on appropriation bills, if either House attaches one to a bill and it goes to conference, the conference report would not be subject to a point of order because the rider was retained or because it was eliminated. In either case a point of order could not be made against the conference report on that account, no matter how objectionable the rider might be.

Mr. MORSE. My third question is, Does the Senator from California share my opinion that this conference report in effect is a reversal of the action which both the Senate and the House took on the Employment Service when we acted on Reorganization Plan No. 1?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should have to amplify that somewhat. I voted against reorganization plan No. 1 for several reasons, one of them being that there is a commission studying the executive branch of the Government, and I thought that, since we expected a report of the commission within 10 days after the Eighty-first Congress convenes we could very well await the report of the commission, which undoubtedly will make certain suggestions. That is the position we took in the Senate committee, and that is why we made a very basic change in the House language when we reported the bill to the Senate.

However, I will say to the Senator from Oregon again that the fact remains that the law as it stands, had we declared a state of peace, would have required that the USES return to the Federal Security Administration within 6 months after the declaration. So that actually there is statutory provision today on the books which would do what we have accelerated here.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for that statement, because there is really an answer, in the statement just given, to the next question I wish to ask, that

is, as to the work of the Hoover Commission. The fact is that the Hoover Commission is at work on the whole question of employment and workmen's compensation, and we will find, as a result of this action tonight, that in due course of time we may have to retrace our steps, in that after the study of the Hoover Commission they might recommend that we go right back to the present situation so far as the employment service is concerned, rather than transfer it, as we are doing in this conference report, to the Security Administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is entirely possible. Of course, I have no way of knowing what their recommendation will be. I may say that this agency, unfortunately, I think, for them, also has been transferred from place to place, and it may be transferred again after the Commission reports.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's position, and I am satisfied that the conference report is going to be approved. I prefer not to have this section in it, but I am going to face the realities. I ask unanimous consent, without taking time to read it, to have inserted at this point as a part of my remarks a page-and-a-quarter statement on the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 9, 1948.

The action of the Senate and House conferees in transferring the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to divisional status in the Bureau of Employment Security of the Social Security Administration by means of an appropriation bill is completely inconsistent with the position taken by both the House and Senate in rejecting the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948. Furthermore, this action reduces an essential service of government with responsibilities of great significance in our national defense and European recovery programs to a status which will seriously impair its effectiveness in a very critical period in our history.

The Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was authorized by Public Law No. 162, approved July 1947, and was established with Hon. Herbert Hoover as chairman. The Commission has already begun studies bearing upon the question of employment service and unemployment compensation administration and organization and is directed to report to the Eighty-first Congress in January 1949. I do not know what its recommendations will be, nor do any of us know what fundamental changes in governmental policy with regard to manpower may be necessary during the next year in view of the unsettled international situation. I, therefore, strongly urge that the United States Employment Service be maintained in the Department of Labor until the Hoover Commission reports.

While it is contended by the proponents of this attempt to legislate substantive changes in the executive branch through appropriation riders that this action will provide for economies, there is no substantial indication that the economies achieved will compensate for the drastic effects of the action proposed at this time. Further, it may well be that any action taken now will not be in complete harmony with the Hoover Commission's recommendations or the action taken by the Congress on such recommendations, in which event the problem will be even more complicated in the coming year. In the interest of maintaining an effective functioning public employment service system, capable of providing urgently needed recruitment and placement services to industrial and agricultural workers and employers at a critical period of time, I, therefore, urge that the action proposed by the conferees for reorganization and submergence of the United States Employment Service be rejected.

Effects of H. R. 6355, Federal Security Agency supplemental appropriation, 1949

	Salaries and expenses	Grants to States
1. Original 1949 Budget request:		
USES	$5,270,000	$72,000,000
BES	1,150,000	73,650,000
2. House action: Combined appropriation for USES and BES	5,312,000	123,000,000
(Provided for transfer of USES to FSA to be combined with BES in a new bureau under the Federal Security Administrator.)		
3. Senate action:		
USES	5,000,000	68,000,000
BES	1,196,671	68,500,000
(Eliminated House reorganization rider and reinstituted USES in Department of Labor.)		
4. Conference report: Combined appropriation for USES and BES	5,754,000	130,000,000
(Provides transfer of USES to Social Security Administration as a division of the existing Bureau of Employment Security.)		

5. Earmarking in conference report:		
For all Employment Service administration functions		$4,754,000
For veterans' employment service	$2,265,000	
For farm placement	495,000	
For all other USES administrative functions	1,994,000	
For Unemployment Compensation		1,000,000

EFFECTS OF CONFERENCE ACTION ON FEDERAL SECURITY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1949 (H. R. 6355)

This conference action contains three major features:

1. It would transfer the United States Employment Service from the United States Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Administration. There it would become a division of the Bureau of Employment Security.

2. It would reduce the appropriation from the amount requested for grants to the States for both unemployment compensation and employment service programs by $15,650,000.

3. After making specific exemptions for the Veterans' Employment Service and the Farm Placement Service, it would reduce the budget request of the United States Employment Service by $516,000, or more than 20 percent.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

1. Through substantive legislation in an appropriation measure, the United States Employment Service is reduced in status from a bureau to a division in the Bureau of Employment Security in the Social Security Administration. Thus the USES is submerged by being reduced two organizational levels.

2. The bill would reverse the position taken by both Houses of Congress last month that any reorganization of the Employment Service and unemployment compensation should not be undertaken until the completion of the Hoover committee investigation.

3. Executive Order No. 9617, which placed the United States Employment Service in the United States Department of Labor, would be set aside.

4. Budget review and analysis, audit of State operations, merit system administration, and the functions in the regional offices would be consolidated.

5. Emphasis on job-finding functions at the local office level are endangered by lack of accountability for expenditure of identifiable employment service funds.

6. The transfer and reorganization of the employment service would be undertaken at a time when serious manpower problems for national security and agricultural production exist.

BUDGET REDUCTIONS

1. The reduction of State grants by $15,650,000 will require staff reductions in the States and the closing of some local offices, and the curtailment of some essential functions at a time when both agricultural and industrial recruitment and placement activities need to be expanded. This comes when administrative costs, including rents, salaries, and equipment are rising rapidly.

2. Federal expenditures for the Veterans Employment Service and the farm-placement program are excluded from any budget reduction, so that a 20-percent cut would have to be made in the remaining parts of the United States Employment Service upon which these two programs are in large measure dependent for technical and program services. (The USES was cut 57 percent last year, which brought the organization down to where it is smaller now than it was in 1941.)

3. United States Employment Service staff would be reduced so as to make it impossible to meet fully the requirements of other Federal agencies responsible for the national security programs (for example, coordination of manpower resources with expanding production requirements).

4. The bill would curtail services rendered to the States by the United States Employment Service in the field of coordination of local employment office activities and gearing these activities to national needs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was stated, I think on the floor of the Senate, or probably in the House, that the whole question should await the report of the Hoover Commission, which has not been made, and may not be made for quite a while. Therefore, there seems to be an inconsistency involved in the provision of the conference report in regard to this transfer. Why has it been found necessary to act now upon this matter without awaiting the report of the Hoover Commission, in view of the statement heretofore made that it should await it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can only answer the Senator from Kentucky in this way: The chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from California, personally felt that it would be better to await the report of the Hoover Commission. I so stated my position in the committee. The committee so reported to the Senate, and the Senate approved of that action. I can say, however, that those who voted on the other side of Reorganization Plan No. 1—and if my recollection is correct I believe the Senator from Kentucky, or at least a good many of the Senators on the other side of the aisle did——

Mr. BARKLEY. I voted for the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. They would have consolidated these agencies under

the Labor Department and would not have awaited the report of the so-called Hoover Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have left them where they are.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It would have left the USES where it is, but it would have taken the Unemployment Compensation Commission from where it is, and transferred it to the Labor Department.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to register my protest against the growing practice of legislating on appropriations bills. I think it brings about the weakening of our legislative processes, and particularly when we only 2 years ago enacted legislation prohibiting it. I believe that if the Congress is to formulate rules of procedure the Congress should observe them.

I understand that not only in this case is the Appropriations Committee of the House transferring agencies of Government from one place to another, but we learn from the newspapers tonight that they are also dismembering other agencies of Government through another appropriation bill which is to come up later, and will transfer a part of the War Assets Administration to one agency of Government and a part of it to another, and abolish the remaining part.

I read in the newspapers that members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had been consulted about this matter. I do not know what members were consulted. Certainly the chairman of the Senate committee was not consulted. I do not know of any other members of the committee who were consulted. I understand the chairman of the subcommittee handling the matter in the House was not consulted, although I have not taken pains to verify it.

In other words, the Appropriations Committee, in a manner not in accord with the rules of the Senate, is attempting to do wholesale legislating and rearranging of Government agencies. Certainly if they show this utter disregard of the rules which we ourselves have laid down they are not likely to have any very high regard for any recommendations which the Hoover Commission may see fit to make.

In this particular case, in transferring the USES from the Labor Department to the Social Security Agency we are not only violating our own rules of procedure in the Congress, but what should be of particular interest to the Senators on this side of the aisle is that we are going directly contrary to the pledges of the Republican platform of 1944, which held that such agencies should be consolidated within the Department of Labor. Whether that was right or not, I do not intend to say. But I do not want to permit this moment to pass without objecting strenuously to further legislating on appropriation bills, and I wish to express the hope that from now on the committees of the Congress will observe the rules which they themselves have agreed to.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. IVES. It is my understanding that we are considering both H. R. 5728 and H. R. 6355, although one bill is immediately before the Senate for action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from California. In the conference report on H. R. 5728 I note on page 4 that under amendment No. 10, $274,200 for salaries and expenses are allowed the Women's Bureau. The Senate amendment, as I understand, allowed $326,735. That is a reduction of something like $52,535. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the Senator if he would kindly indicate what the effect of that reduction is going to be. Various things have been told me about it, and I am not quite clear concerning it in my own mind.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can say to the Senator from New York very briefly that for this particular item in the appropriation bill, as the Senator will recall, the budget estimate was $336,000. The House had recommended and passed $274,200, and the Senate committee recommended to the Senate and the Senate passed an appropriation of $326,735. The item went to conference.

The House committee eliminated in its original appropriation bill the so-called field offices. There were nine of them. The testimony before the House rather strongly indicated—I do not know whether the Senator has had an opportunity to read it—at least to the satisfaction of the House at that time, that the field offices were not performing a service of sufficient magnitude or importance to justify the retention of those field offices, and the work they were doing could better be done out of the main office. Therefore they eliminated the sum of $61,800, bringing the total amount to $260,300.

However, there were added to that amount three new positions, amounting to $7,674; there was added a pay increase under the Ramspeck Act within-grade promotions of $4,635; there was added the pay in excess of 52 weeks amounting to $1,011, and certain other items amounting to about $580, or an increase of $13,900 other than in the items for the so-called field offices. So that the reduction is primarily in the field offices.

I will say to the Senator from New York that it has been the general feeling of the House—and I must say that in this particular instance I do not entirely agree with them—but generally I think they have made a point that if we are ever to begin to cut down the tremendous cost of Government there should be a consolidation and a lessening of the vast number of offices we have around the country.

I do not know how it may be in the Senator's State, but I think it is true in a great many of the States of the Union, that we have agencies which are fairly closely related and yet if a person wants to take problems dealing with social security he has to go to one office; if he is dealing with unemployment compensation he has to go to another office, if he is dealing with the old-age and survivors insurance he has to go to still another. If he is dealing with some other bureau or department he has to go to another office. All of them require rental to be paid; and telephone operators and stenographers perhaps are not being so fully utilized as they could be if we had a consolidation of some of these activities and offices within regional areas and proper groupings or regional offices that would perhaps begin to make at least a certain dent in the vast Federal governmental machinery which has been established and which is costing the American taxpayers approximately $40,000,000,000.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I am in full accord with what the Senator has to say about the reduction in overlapping agencies, and also in competing agencies. There are some conflicts, too, which should be eliminated. The State of New York has just undergone quite a streamlining in that connection, so far as the whole welfare field is concerned, in order to do exactly what the Senator is indicating. However, in this particular instance it was my understanding that the function of the Women's Bureau was a function peculiar unto itself, and that there was not and actually is not any overlapping. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think generally speaking the Senator is correct. I think the general enforcement rests within the various States. I think the chief job normally would be the passing on of information which is gathered in one State to another State—a sort of clearinghouse of information, helping to bring more enlightened and progressive methods to the attention of States which perhaps otherwise would not be familiar with them. I am not so certain that it is essential that these offices be set up and continued in order to do that particular job, although undoubtedly, if properly manned, there would be a service which they could perform.

Mr. IVES. The Senator has stated that the hearing held by the House committee indicated that there was no justification for the field offices. Did the Senate committee hold any hearing on that question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. IVES. What did the Senate committee determine?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We held our hearings after the bill had been passed by the House. As the Senator well knows, the time we have to work on these bills after they come to us is very limited. I am hopeful that some day we may have a little better distribution of bills coming to the Senate. However, I will say to the Senator that sufficient testimony was presented so that I felt that there was at least a reasonable doubt, and the doubt was settled in favor of the Women's Bureau by giving them at least another year to demonstrate to the House

that these offices are necessary or desirable.

Mr. IVES. I take it the distinguished Senator felt that there was real justification for the request made on behalf of the Women's Bureau.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I personally felt that there was; and I should like to have seen them continued for another year, in the hope of demonstrating to the House that perhaps it would not be as economical to cut them out as the House felt it was.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in what I have to say I want it distinctly understood that I intend in no way to be critical of the able Senator from California or of his committee. I believe that, faced with the circumstances with which they were faced, they have done a very good job. I know very well that the distinguished Senator from California did his best to retain such items as the appropriation for the Women's Bureau, and to keep intact appropriations for the unemployment compensation and the USES functions of the Government, leaving them where they were placed by the Senate. I am well aware of that. I merely wish to point out that I feel there is ample justification for the funds which were requested for the Women's Bureau, and which were agreed upon by the Senate committee and by the Senate itself.

I should like to emphasize what has already been said in connection with the merging, as it were, of the USES and the unemployment compensation services of the Government. It seems to me that in dealing with such subjects, before there is any radical change in policy, we should await the report of the commission now studying the whole governmental organization. I refer to the Hoover Commission.

At the same time, while I realize that there is still money left with which the Women's Bureau can function, I also realize that if it is to accomplish many of the purposes for which it was originally intended—and still is carrying out, I believe—it is necessary that most of the branch offices be left in operation. I gather from what the able Senator has said that most of them are to be closed as a result of this reduction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think all of them will be closed.

Mr. IVES. I think that is a most unfortunate situation. When it comes to the question of the merging of the USES and the Unemployment Compensation functions of the Government, I fully agree with what has already been said by Senators who have preceded me in discussing this subject. I myself opposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 primarily because I felt that we should await the report of the Hoover Commission. I feel that that same reason applies equally in this instance. I agree with what has been said about attaching riders of this nature which would place substantive matter in appropriation bills. Such procedure is entirely out of order. I regret very much, Mr. President, that there is nothing which can really be done about these matters at this particular time. Apparently the hour is too late for their reconsideration by the conferees. As the distinguished Senator has indicated, were such reconsideration to be had, the bills themselves might be in jeopardy, and that situation certainly would not make such reconsideration worth while.

Again I wish to say that while I do not agree with certain items in these two bills, as I have indicated, at the same time I do not want to level criticism at the able Senator from California. However, I feel that another year when these questions are again before us, greater consideration should be given them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from New York.

Does the Senator from Vermont have a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. No. I am merely maintaining a vertical position in the faint hope that a small amendment, which I have had in my hands for many hours past, may eventually be brought to the attention of this august body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5728, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 9, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed to be stricken and inserted by said amendment insert "$4,073,000."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 19½, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 21, 23, 24, 34, 35, and 36, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (e), (g), and (l) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft and the objects specified in the paragraph immediately following the caption "Public Health Service" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, $1,115,000, which amount shall be in addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere for the same purposes and shall be available for transfer to the appropriation 'Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth,' in such amounts as the Surgeon General may determine."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$36,122,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,455,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$235,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,694,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$818,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11 and 25.

The Senate recedes from its amendment to the title.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15, 37, 38, and 39 relate to the transfer, proposed by the House, of the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

The Senate has receded from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 37, 38, and 39, and amendment No. 11 is reported to the House in disagreement. The managers have agreed that the managers on the part of the House will offer, in the House, a motion to recede from disagreement and concur with the amendment of the Senate with amendments.

The effect of the action on the various amendments in the conference and the motion of the managers is to transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency and to provide for the administration of that Service by the Bureau of Employment Security under the jurisdiction of the Social Security Administration within the Federal Security Agency rather than as an independent bureau in such agency as originally proposed by the House; to appropriate $130,000,000 for grants to States for the combined operation instead of $123,000,000 as proposed by the House and $136,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and to appropriate $5,754,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security instead of $5,312,000 as proposed by the House and a combined total of $6,196,671 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount allowed for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security, $5,754,000, it is intended that $4,754,000 shall be for the division having jurisdiction over the employment service (of which $2,265,000 is specifically earmarked for the Veterans' Employment Service and $495,000 is intended to defray the cost of the Farm Placement Service) and $1,000,000 shall be for the division having jurisdiction of the unemployment compensation system. The cost of housekeeping services and other common operations for the consolidated bureau which will serve both divisions will be charged to these allotments in such proportionate manner as represents the value of services rendered.

Amendments No. 6, 19½, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 40, and 41 make changes in section numbers, titles, and formal language to conform to action on remainder of the bill.

Amendment No. 7 strikes out language proposed to be inserted by the Senate to institute a scholarship program for training of doctors.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $9,028,000 for mental health activities, as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,278,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9 authorizes contracts in connection with mental health activities in the amount of $2,300,000, instead of $2,720,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $1,115,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $700,000, as proposed by the House, for emergency disease and sanitation investigations and control in the Territory of Alaska, and permits the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to carry out the program either through direct operations of the Service or by grants to the Territorial government or both such methods as he may determine to be in the best interests of the government.

Amendment No. 12 appropriates $1,350,000 for the Bureau of Public Assistance instead of $1,246,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,417,993, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 appropriates $36,122,000 for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance instead of $36,244,300, as proposed by the House, and $36,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17 allocates $67,000 from the trust fund to the Office of the Commissioner of Social Security instead of $55,000, as proposed by the House, and $80,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 appropriates $1,455,000 for the Children's Bureau instead of $1,385,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,524,737, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates $235,000 for the office of the Commissioner of Social Security, instead of $166,000, as proposed by the House, and $302,500, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates $1,694,000, for the office of the Administrator instead of $1,533,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,855,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21 strikes a proposal, by the House, to increase the salary of the Administrator.

Amendment No. 22 appropriates $818,700 for the Division of Service Operations instead of $815,000, as proposed by the House, and $822,418, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25, authorizing transfer of funds instead of a direct appropriation, is reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer, in the House, a motion to recede from disagreement and concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 31 restores a section, proposed by the House, authorizing transfers among certain appropriations, and deletes a section, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the Administrator to make transfers related to consolidations of functions in the office of the Administrator. The section proposed by the Senate is identical with a section included in the 1948 appropriation act and sought to be included, but denied by the House, in the appropriation bill for 1949. The managers on the part of the Senate and the House will not look with favor upon any consolidations and transfers, undertaken under authority of the 1948 act since the hearings in the House Committee on Appropriations on the 1949 bill, which are not in conformity with the 1949 appropriation act as finally passed by the Congress.

Amendments Nos. 34, 35, and 36 strike from the bill language proposed by the House, to forbid employment of members of labor organizations which are not in compliance with the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6355, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 9, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25 to the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

"BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY (SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION)

"Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants to the several States (including Alaska and Hawaii) in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49–491), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. III), including, upon the request of any State, the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, $130,000,000, of which not to exceed $675,000 shall be available to the Federal Security Administrator for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia and for use in carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in Puerto Rico: *Provided,* That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, prior to July 1, 1950: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 5 (a) or section 6 of the act of June 6, 1933, or in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Federal Security Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the act of June 6, 1933, and with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further,* That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Federal Security Agency and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

"In carrying out the provisions of said act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and

maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall apply.

"Reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen: For payments to seamen as authorized by title XIII of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. XIII), $750,000.

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $5,754,000, of which $2,265,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

"Grants to States, fiscal year 1950: For making, after May 31, 1949, payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1950, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for the fiscal year 1950.

"Effective July 1, 1948, the United States Employment Service, including its functions under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is transferred to the Federal Security Agency, and on and after such date the functions of the Secretary of Labor with respect to the United States Employment Service are transferred to the Federal Security Administrator and shall be performed by him or, under his direction and control, by such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as he may designate. There are transferred to the Federal Security Agency, for use in connection with the functions transferred by the provisions of this paragraph, the personnel, property, and records of the Department of Labor related to the United States Employment Service, and the balances of such prior appropriations, allocations, and other funds available to the United States Employment Service as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine. The provisions of section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong.) shall apply to the transfer effected by this paragraph in like manner as if such transfer were a reorganization of the agencies and functions concerned under the provisions of that act."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11.

The motion was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 63, line 9, after the word "President", it is proposed to insert the words "after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board."

On page 66, line 7, after the word "President", it is proposed to insert the words "after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like in a very few words to explain the purpose and effect of the amendment. As the bill stands, it provides for the drafting of both persons and business. The drafting of persons is to be under the control of the draft boards. The drafting of business, however, is to be under no control or regulation whatsoever. So far as the terms of this bill are concerned, it would be possible to turn the entire peacetime economy of the Nation over to the control of the military services.

As a matter of fact, the Congress has set up a body to look after the interests of the civil production of the country during peacetime, and that body is the National Security Resources Board. This very simple amendment to section 18 of the bill merely provides that whenever the President determines it is in the interest of the national security to take over or control or otherwise manage any element of the peacetime economy, he shall first consult with and get advice from the National Security Resources Board. That requirement seems to me to be not only a reasonable one, but also a very necessary one if we are to make sure of preserving our peacetime economy during peacetime.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota whether he has any objection to the amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, on the contrary, I believe the amendment more clearly states the intention of the committee. I think the amendment would aid the bill. It would not disturb in any way the provisions of section 18.

In fact, as I have said, the amendment more clearly states the position of the committee. Therefore, I am glad to accept the amendment as a part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Feazel	Lucas
Baldwin	Ferguson	McCarthy
Ball	Flanders	McClellan
Barkley	Fulbright	McFarland
Brewster	George	McGrath
Bricker	Green	McKellar
Bridges	Gurney	McMahon
Brooks	Hatch	Malone
Buck	Hawkes	Martin
Butler	Hayden	Maybank
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Cain	Hill	Moore
Capehart	Hoey	Morse
Capper	Holland	Murray
Chavez	Ives	Myers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel
Donnell	Kem	O'Mahoney
Dworshak	Kilgore	Pepper
Eastland	Knowland	Reed
Ecton	Langer	Revercomb
Ellender	Lodge	Robertson, Va.
Robertson, Wyo	Taft	Umstead
Russell	Taylor	Vandenberg
Saltonstall	Thomas, Okla.	Watkins
Smith	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Sparkman	Thye	Wiley
Stennis	Tobey	Williams
Stewart	Tydings	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I should like to offer at this time, and I submit it to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

It is an amendment to section 18 (a) of the bill, on page 63. That section refers to the utilization of industry, and it authorizes a priority designation by the President, in case he determines an emergency exists, for materials that have been authorized by Congress for the exclusive use of the armed forces.

My amendment proposes to add, after the comma in line 14, on page 63, following the words "United States," the words "or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission."

The purpose of the amendment is to make available to the Atomic Energy Commission, in the event the President finds it is necessary, the same priorities as are now provided in the bill for the materials which have been authorized by Congress for the exclusive use of the armed forces.

I have submitted the amendment to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I understand that he approves it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 63, line 14, after the word "States", it is proposed to insert "or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I believe the amendment would not be in violation of the intentions of the committee. I personally have no objection to the amendment; in fact, I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up for consideration at this time my amendment lettered "I," and ask to have the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "twenty-four" and insert in lieu thereof "twelve."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the clerk to the fact that I have perfected that amendment, and the word is "eighteen" not "twelve."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be noted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me state the amendment so that there will be no doubt as to what it is about. The amendment proposes, on page 6, line 23,

to strike out "twenty-four" and insert in lieu thereof "eighteen."

Mr. President, I think this amendment is of exceeding importance, and I hope the Senate will hear me through on it, because it is my opinion that if individual Senators will carefully weigh the merits of the amendment a majority of the Senate will share my point of view as to its preference over the present 24-month provision in the bill.

I desire to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I hope I have made clear that I think a draft is necessary in order to meet an emergency in international affairs which I believe exists at the present time. Unless I were convinced that a serious emergency exists, I know of nothing that could possibly persuade me to vote for a draft in peacetime. I said a few moments ago in colloquy with the Senator from Maryland that I believe the draft bill should be put into effect now and that we should not wait for any future declaration of the President for putting it into effect, because after spending the weeks that those of us in the Armed Services Committee spent, both in public hearings and in executive conferences, with men high in our Government, including both civilian and military officials of our Government, I reached the conclusion—and it was very difficult for me to reach it, for I would like wishfully to think that there is no real danger of war—that there is actually a great danger of war. If I did not think there was a great danger of war at the present time I would not vote for any draft bill.

I am inclined to think a great many millions of American people are "enjoying" a false sense of security in America tonight, because I am one who honestly believes that our defenses are so weak today that our national security demands their strengthening as rapidly as we can possibly strengthen them. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say that because in my judgment the record of Soviet Russia since VJ-day is clearly a record of noncooperation with the United Nations in the interests of promoting world peace.

Furthermore, I think the record of Soviet Russia certainly raises the presumption that she does not have friendly intentions toward the United States. Therefore, it is my opinion that unless we proceed to make ourselves sufficiently strong to protect our national security and enforce the peace, if necessary, we may wake up in the not-too-distant future to discover that Russia is taking aggressive acts toward us that will force upon us a state of war.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am convinced that if the American people will unite behind a program for the strengthening of our national security to the point that we can defend the peace, that will greatly alter Russia's attitude and policies in the field of international relations.

Therefore, I lay that down as the major premise of this speech. I reiterate it in this sentence: I am supporting a draft in peacetime because I am convinced that a strengthening of our national security is necessary in order to make perfectly clear to Russia that we shall remain united in a determination to resist any aggressive attitude or policies or acts on her part toward disrupting world peace.

The second premise to which I wish to move in this argument is that I am also cognizant of the fact that an emergency never remains in a status quo condition. Human events and international events do not stand still. I think we must face the fact most solemnly tonight that we are either going in the next 2 or 3 years to solve most of the problems that are endangering the peace of the world today or by the end of that time we shall find ourselves much nearer to war than we are even tonight.

I shall put that in a different way, because unless that viewpoint of mine is understood, it is impossible to understand my position on the pending bill or on the amendment. I restate it this way: I do not think that human events or international relations ever stand still. We are moving in the direction of something. We are going to move in the direction of something during the next 2 or 3 years so far as international relations are concerned, and that something is going to be either more peaceful relations with Soviet Russia or more warlike relations with Soviet Russia.

I do not take, and have never taken, the position that the full responsibility for working in the direction of peace at the present time rests upon Soviet Russia. I think we also have a great responsibility. I think it is too easy for us to see ourselves as we like to think we are, and it is too easy to see the Russians as we imagine them to be. I believe there are many things we must do in international conferences, in our relations with Russia, which we have been inclined stubbornly to resist in some of our international conferences with Russia. I think we must get over the idea of giving to the American people the impression that we are completely right and Russia is completely wrong on all matters.

I am convinced that the record is perfectly clear that the overwhelming responsibility for the strained relations existing between those two great powers has been Russia's noncooperation in the United Nations and in international conferences in Europe. We have only to look to her negative attitude and the constant use of the veto to establish my point.

I think it is also clear that there is considerable evidence available to us at this time that was not available as short a time as 120 days ago. That is not a long time. The Russian leaders finally started to understand that they could push our country just so far until we would finally say, "That is as far as we shall go." I think Russia is beginning to read the stop signs which we have placed on the highway of international relations. I think one of those stop signs which has had a very persuasive and convincing effect upon the Russian leaders is the action we have already taken in the Congress of the United States in connection with national security. I believe Russia discovered that we meant business, so far as defending ourselves and strengthening ourselves so that we could defend the peace, when we voted appropriations for a great increase in the Air Force.

I think Russia read another stop sign when it learned we intended to vote the necessary appropriations for Navy improvement.

I think Russia read another stop sign, Mr. President, when it realized we were going to pass in this session of Congress substantial military manpower legislation.

I believe, Mr. President—and this is the third premise I want to lay down—that Russia will thoroughly understand that a draft bill passed at this session of Congress, with a provision in it that it will not be continued after 2 years, without affirmative action of the Congress, and that we shall not take men for more than 18 months, if my amendment should be adopted, will be a strong indication that we intend to remain united in support of an adequate national-defense program, but at the same time, to frame a law and pass it in a form which also shows that we are working for peace and not for war.

That is why, Mr. President, I fought yesterday as hard as I did for the adoption of an amendment which would require affirmative action on the part of Congress after 2 years. I said in the course of my speech in support of that amendment that I felt a 2-year provision instead of a 5-year provision would serve clear notice not only on Russia, but on our friends in freedom-loving countries, that we do not have any intention to build up over a 5-year period or a longer period a powerful military machine, with the danger that once it is put into operation it may follow the course which military machines have so frequently followed in the course of history, of ultimately leading countries into war because of the power of the military machine itself. I said, in the course of my speech in support of that amendment, that in the United States we need to guard against the development of a military psychology. We need to recognize always that there is a clear line of distinction between preparedness to protect the national security of the Nation and preparedness to conduct a war. I want to repeat that, Mr. President, because that sentence, too, sheds a great deal of light on my thinking about our Military Establishment. There is a great difference between developing military preparedness necessary to protect the national security of the country and developing a military preparedness program for war.

I think we must constantly recognize that our self-assurance that our ideals and objectives are peaceful is not always shared by peoples in other countries. We have only to go to other countries to hear disturbing and alarming discussions with reference to American imperialism and American military plans and objectives. We can travel in parts of Europe today and find people who are convinced that it is only a matter of time before they will be caught in the middle of a war between Russia and the United States. Although we know we seek only peace, that is not agreed to and accepted

as a fact by a great many people, who are not in the satellite countries, but are in countries which are still free and friendly to the United States.

What I am trying to point out in this part of my remarks is that we have a duty, it seems to me, in the interest of peace, to develop a draft law which will strike that happy balance, giving to us the manpower protection we need to protect the national security and prepare us to defend ourselves in case of aggressive attack, and the type of manpower legislation which might create the impression, and would be inclined to create it, that our endeavor is not an endeavor to prepare for peace, but to prepare for war. There is quite a difference.

So I am satisfied as a matter of personal conviction that my amendment requiring affirmative action on the part of Congress will serve clear notice that we are preparing for peace and not for war, that we are seeking only to follow the instinct of self-preservation, that we are seeking only as Members of the Congress to live up to our solemn duty to build our defenses sufficiently strong to guarantee to our people that we have the defenses essential to protecting us in case of attack.

The responses I have received from all over this Nation in support of the fight I put up yesterday for the 2-year limitation satisfy me that the next point I am about to make should be given very serious consideration by the Members of the United States Senate as they consider the merits of my amendment.

I wish to put the point this way; I say that we, as elected representatives of a free people in a representative form of government, have a definite political responsibility—and I use the word "political" in its highest sense—a definite and solemn political responsibility to seek to carry out the will of our constituencies.

Oh, yes, I have said, and say now, that we also have a responsibility of representing our constituencies on the basis of facts as we find them, and on the basis of our studies and committee hearings and debates in the Senate, believing that if we act on those facts the people themselves, once they have possession of the same facts, will approve of the action which we take.

Mr. President, we also must consider one very important fact which should be inherent in the debate on any legislation of such magnitude and implication as the pending legislation. That fact is, of course, the desire of the American people on a matter of national policy.

The question of the size of our Military Establishment, and the question of the length of service which should be required by law of young men drafted into a peacetime Army, are questions of national policy, and vital Nation policy, too. They are questions which, in my opinion, the American people have a right to have their elected officials answer in accordance with their will.

Mr. President, as we sit here tonight, called upon to vote my amendment up or down, one of the facts, or shall I say one of the factors, which we should consider and weigh before we vote, is the question, What is the will of the American people in regard to the length of service for which a boy should be drafted and placed in the Army?

Reasonable men can differ as to the interpreation of the will of the American people on that question. My vote, so far as the weight of that factor is concerned, is going to be resolved in favor of the judgment on my part that the American people generally will that the service should not be in excess of 18 months.

I have some evidence in support of that judgment on my part, and that evidence takes a variety of forms. It is based upon many conversations as I have gone about this land. It is based upon audience reactions in open-forum discussions on military manpower legislation; it is based on a great mass of correspondence and telegrams I have received on the subject.

I find, Mr. President, that overwhelmingly those sources of public opinion lead me to the conclusion that the American people generally will 18 months as a maximum of service under the draft law, in preference to 24 months.

I have the most recent evidence in the form of the latest announced Gallup poll which was printed in this morning's newspapers. I read from the Washington Post one paragraph setting forth the results of the Gallup poll on the draft. This is what the paragraph says:

> While 70 percent of voters think Congress ought to pass a draft law, when it comes down to a choice between universal military training and the draft, twice as many would choose UMT as the way to build up our armed forces. If a draft has to come into being, the public believes 18 months, rather than the 2 years.

That Gallup poll came as no surprise to me, because for the past several months, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have deliberately, in my many public discussions in this country raised the question of military manpower legislation. I have sought to provoke discussion among my audiences in order to learn the attitude of the members of the audiences on the question of military manpower. I have talked to a very good cross section of the American people in those audiences—labor audiences, businessmen's audiences, general audiences. All I can say to my colleagues in the Senate on that subject is that on the basis of those many observations I am satisfied that my proposal for 18 months represents the will of public opinion as of tonight.

Mr. President, I would ask my colleagues to think ahead to 2 years from now. A few minutes ago, before he went down to dinner, one of my colleagues came to me and said, "Wayne, this is the first one of the issues, so far as your stand on this legislation is concerned, with which I cannot go along with you." I said, "I respect your point of view. I do not think the merits support that point of view, but I venture a little bet with you that, 2 years from now, when the Senate of the United States comes to consider whether or not to continue the draft, you will then say to me, 'Wayne, it would be easier for us to continue the draft if we had voted for 18 months of service 2 years ago.'"

I believe that, Mr. President. I believe that when we vote on this amendment tonight we had better have our eyes ahead to 2 years from now, because in my opinion 2 years' requirement in the peacetime draft is more likely to become very unpopular with the people of the country than popular. Of course, one can shrug that off. One may say, "after all, if we think we ought to continue a draft 2 years from now, and if we think we ought to require 2 years' service, that is the way we should vote." I do not share that point of view. I think there is an area in between the position that we ought to vote what we think and the position that we ought to vote what the people ask for irrespective of what the facts may be. I think we have the duty of getting the facts to the people, and then, on the basis of their understanding of the facts, follow their will. That takes time on most controversial issues.

I believe we have to be political realists about this problem, too. We should recognize that we have a responsibility of leading the people to a better understanding of the importance of strengthening our national security, and taking them out of the dream world in which they are now living.

When I refer to their sense of false security, after all, Mr. President, if this is to remain a free government by the people, then let us recognize that as surely as we sit here tonight some of us will not sit here in the future if we adopt the attitude that we will follow a course of action irrespective of the will of the people.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should rather finish my remarks, and then I shall subject myself to cross-examination.

That, Mr. President, is pretty sharp political realism. I say to my colleagues tonight that I believe some consideration should be given to my argument on this point. I do not say it should be conclusive consideration; I do not think that this particular argument alone should determine a vote for my amendment, but I say that I think it should receive weight.

I repeat the argument this way. I think tonight we ought to look ahead to what is going to confront us 2 years from now when we are called upon, as we shall and should be called upon, to determine whether or not we shall continue or discontinue the draft. In my judgment, for whatever it may be worth, that if the emergency 2 years from now is somewhat similar to the emergency that exists tonight—and I think it is either going to be much better 2 years from now or a great deal worse—but speaking from a hypothetical for the moment, assuming that there is not a great change, I think there is a chance of not continuing the draft 2 years from now if it provides for a 24 months' service period. Why do I say that? I say it because I am satisfied that a 2-year-draft period will accumulate a great deal of opposition and resentment to the idea of a draft at all.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I would not have thought of voting for a peacetime draft if I were

not convinced that there is a serious danger of war with Russia. But at the same time, as I said the other day, I do not believe in engaging in fear psychology.

As I listened to some of the high military officials pleading their case before the Armed Services Committee over the weeks, I was satisfied that many of them were overselling the emergency, that many of them were asking for more than was necessary to set up a sound national security program. I have not changed my opinion on that point. They clearly oversold the emergency when they asked us at one time in our hearings for a program that would have amounted to $21,000,000,000, and probably much more. I said at those hearings, and I said on the floor of the Senate at about the same time, that I did not think our private-property economy could stand such an expenditure for very many years. As the result we have cut it down somewhat.

I am going to say something about the expense of my amendment, which I have no doubt will be used as a part of the argument against it. I shall comment on that before I finish. But I wish to say that in 2 years from now it will be very difficult, unless conditions in the world are much worse than they are today, to convince the American people that we should continue to take young men for 24 months into the service of the Army by way of a peacetime draft.

The Gallup poll, shows that the present state of public opinion is that it would prefer a UMT program to an emergency draft program. I have stated many times, and I now repeat that I would rather vote for the military manpower program recommended by the American Legion in its 1946 program than for the pending draft law tonight if world conditions tonight were identical with world conditions in 1946. I am inclined to think that if we had adopted the program of the American Legion in 1946 in respect to military manpower, world conditions would be greatly improved tonight, because we would have been serving notice on Russia for 2 years that we intended to maintain our military manpower in such condition that we could defend ourselves and enforce the peace. I do not want any misunderstanding as to my position in regard to the program of the American Legion in 1946. The possibility of adopting that program now is nil. The advantage of that program has been greatly lessened because of the events which have occurred since 1946.

Mr. President, if I am correct—and I am willing to let future events determine whether I am correct—that the American people are going to have to be sold on the idea of a peacetime draft of 2 years duration, then we had better consider very seriously tonight the possibility of putting this draft into operation on an 18 months per draftee basis.

I have referred to the question of national policy as to national security. There is another policy involved. There is the policy of fairness to the individual. I do not think I have to dwell on this point to convince my colleagues in the Senate that it is a very serious matter to take a young man out of civilian life and collect from him 2 years of service in a peacetime draft army. I think that in fairness to the young men of the country we in the Congress have the responsibility to make certain that we shall have fixed the period of service at the minimum in order to accomplish the objective which we have in mind in the passage of a draft law. I think we must make certain, in fairness to the young men of the country, that we do not require them to serve one single month longer than necessary to meet the broad objectives of our draft program.

So I want to make that question, Mr. President, one of the tests for Senators to meet when they come to vote upon my amendment. Will 18 months of service do the job? Will it meet the objectives we have in mind? There are two main objectives. One, to give us the necessary military manpower in such number as to meet the immediate emergency of a threatened war with Russia. To give us a military manpower sufficient in number so that if an international incident should cause a sudden war we would be in a position at a moment's notice to proceed to defend ourselves in that war. That is the first objective of the amendment. The second objective, and of equal importance, and in the long run even of greater importance, is the objective of passing a bill that will build up our Reserves so that not only this year and next year and the year following, but for years to come we will have the Reserve Army necessary to protect the security of the Nation. I do not want Senators to lose sight of those two objectives of the bill. I take the affirmative on the proposition that my amendment is consonant with those objectives. In fact, I think it would better promote those objectives than would the 24 months' service provision in the pending bill. Why do I say that? I say it on the basis of a statistical analysis of our military manpower problem which I wish briefly to discuss.

Let me make clear by reiteration that as we consider this legislation I think we ought at least to indulge the assumption that if we build our defenses to meet our immediate needs the emergency will lessen and not grow worse. Let us not forget that assumption. I think it is a sound assumption to make; if it it not a sound assumption, we should frankly recognize tonight that we are on the way to an inevitable war. I will not make that assumption because I happen to believe that war is not inevitable. I happen to believe that if we are willing to make the sacrifice for peace that we should make, we can avoid war. I happen to believe that we should proceed to build up our defenses now so as to make clear to Russia that if she does not join us in making sacrifices and compromises for peace we shall be ready to protect ourselves against any aggressive course of action she may follow. I am not suggesting in that sentence the slightest thought of appeasement or a "Munich." I am saying that we are not going to have peace on the basis of American-dictated terms any more than we are going to have peace on the basis of Russian-dictated terms. There is an area in international conferences and attempts to reach international policies and understandings through the United Nations, in which we too must be willing to make sacrifices in negotiations with Russia, as she in turn should do with respect to us. I do not believe that I have to dwell on that point to prove it.

As I said the other day, we have the responsibility of being willing to make sacrifices for peace in order to help reestablish the economic life of other countries which want to join in a peaceful arrangement, in an international economic agreement represented by such a great movement as the great European recovery program. I hope that in due course of time Russia will come to recognize the great mistake she made when she walked out of the Paris Conference in connection with the European economic recovery program. As we keep faith with the legislation which we recently enacted in the form of the Marshall plan she will come to recognize the great importance of that program. I have every reason to believe that we will keep faith with that legislation by seeing to it that the fund which is finally approved by the Congress corresponds to what I think were the clear moral commitments on our part when we passed the Marshall plan, in contrast with the proposed cuts of the House Appropriations Committee.

I mention these points in order to nail down with as much emphasis as I can my point that we must be ready to make sacrifices for peace to avoid war. We must make certain that we do not follow a course of action in adopting a type of military manpower legislation here tonight which could possibly be subject to the interpretation that we have warlike intentions.

The statistics of my amendment will meet the two great objectives of this draft law—first, to give us the manpower necessary for immediate preparedness to protect us in case of sudden attack, and second, to build up the reserve necessary in order to give us some continuity in military manpower legislation.

I wish to point out that my amendment, on the basis of the man-power statistics of the bill itself, would give us 54,000 reservists 6 months sooner than would the pending bill. What kind of reservists would they be? They would be reservists who would have received their basic training. I believe that the testimony before our committee makes very clear that so-called basic training can be given in 12 months. I know that witnesses of the military can be paraded through the Senate who will say, of course, that they would like to have a longer time. I would be the first to admit that we can make a better soldier with 18 months of basic training than with 12 months. But let us not forget that when we were talking about a universal military training program—and, after all, the draft proposal was an afterthought—we did not have in mind the draft in addition.

Let us review for just a moment the startlement which hit the floor of the Senate when we became aware one day that the President was recommending not only a universal military training

program but a draft, too. Let the RECORD also show that some hurried telephone calls to the Pentagon Building shortly after that news was announced on the floor of the Senate brought forth the reaction that there were some down there who, one would think, would know that the President was about to recommend a draft, who were just as unaware of it as were Members of the Senate prior to the announcement on the floor of the Senate.

I am not seeking to thrash old straw. I am relating that fact because it is an important fact in the chronology of this legislation. Let me put it this way: At one point in the history of this legislation we were talking and thinking entirely in terms of a UMT program, with no draft at all. So when, in the Armed Services Committee, we started to consider the idea of having a draft along with a UMT program, I am frank to confess that I was exceedingly negative about it in the beginning. I thought it was a rather remarkable thing that for weeks we should have had long discussion and consideration of a UMT program, and suddenly have dropped in our laps a proposal for a draft, too. But I proceeded to consider the facts which were developed during the hearings, and I became satisfied, as I stated at the beginning of these remarks, that an emergency existed which justified our giving consideration to a draft.

It should be a draft limited to an emergency period, with frequent reviews, even during that period, if it is to extend beyond 2 years. It should be a draft which does not impose a longer period of service upon the individual than is necessary to give him the training he needs in order to produce an army which can protect our national security.

If under a UMT program a trainee could receive the minimum basic training which the Army felt was sufficient in order to justify the Army in recommending a 6 months' UMT program, and thereafter the trainee could be sent into the Reserves for further training, I submit that at least there is a presumption—and I think a very strong presumption—that a 12 months' basic training period under the draft law would give us a soldier at least sufficiently trained so that he could be assigned to active military duty.

That leads me to this point: What do we want in this connection? We want, first, men who have been given sufficient basic training so that thereafter we can send them into the Reserve, to form component parts of a reserve army. But, we need something more, and that is one of the two reasons—I wish to be frank about this—why I have modified my amendment today from a 12-month proposal to an 18-month proposal. I talked to some persons high in the military, and I reviewed some of our record at the hearings. I came to recognize that in this legislation we are not only seeking reservists, but we need many thousands of men to take active posts in the Army at the present time. My amendment will provide 6 months of such service. It will take 12 months to give the men their basic training; and then they will be available, with that training, for 6 months of so-called active duty assignment. If I am correctly informed by the military, what they have in mind in that regard is, of course, assignments in various foreign posts where men are needed—in the occupied areas of Germany, in Korea, in Alaska, and in our other outposts. But I submit that a requirement of 6 months of such employment, on top of 12 months of basic military training, is all that in fairness we have a right to ask of inductees in a peacetime draft army.

So I say the amendment will meet the two objectives which we must meet: namely, first, it will give us a reserve army well trained in basic training; and, second, it will give us 6 months of service from each man in so-called active-duty assignments. I think that is a fair proposition. I think the American people can be convinced that that is fair and proper. But I seriously question the fairness of assigning a man to active duty for 12 months after he has received basic training for 12 months.

I have said that my amendment will give us 54,000 reservists 6 months sooner than will the pending bill. Furthermore, my amendment will continue to give us, at each 6-month period, those 54,000 reservists, in round numbers, and thereby the amendment will meet the second objective of this proposed draft law.

Mr. President, for how long a time will the amendment do it? That is a $64 question, and I am willing to try to answer it. I think the amendment will do it for the period of the emergency. I say that because I am convinced that either we are going to solve this emergency in 3 years because either international relations are going to get better in 3 years, or they are going to get much worse. Of course, if they get much worse, if at the end of 3 years they are much worse than they are now, then, our discussion tonight will become a highly academic one, because I venture to suggest that then the Senate of the United States will be talking in terms of total mobilization, not only of manpower, but of the economy of the United States.

Therefore, from my statistical analysis of our manpower needs, I am satisfied that my amendment will meet the two objectives—both that of protecting the national security now, and that of providing a continuous chain of manpower supply for our reserve army for years to come.

Mr. President, if in these opening remarks I answer at least some of the arguments which I fully expect will be made against my amendment, I think I shall save considerable time in the debate. So I wish to caution the Members of the Senate not to fall into the fallacy of assuming that the 903,000 men we need tonight, we shall need 36 months from tonight. I make two points about that matter. If we need 903,000 men 3 years from tonight, I think we are going to need millions more than that number 3 years from tonight. I am satisfied that the thinking of some of the proponents of the 24-month program is in terms of a continuing demand for manpower in the military corresponding to the 903,000 that I admit we need tonight.

Mr. President, let us face the issue. I simply do not think we can go on indefinitely in peacetime building up any such active military manpower or Military Establishment as the 903,000-man need tonight indicates, because these military expenses have a way of becoming cumulative, and there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in the matter of Federal costs for our Military Establishment. It is my hope and prayer that 3 years from tonight, 36 months from tonight, the curve of manpower needs for the military will be on the way down, and will not be constant. I think one of the fallacies at the Pentagon Building is that those who are in authority there are thinking at least in terms of a constant level of higher manpower needs, instead of in terms of a reduction of those needs as soon as international conditions improve.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think we should try the plan for 18 months' service now. If world conditions become worse, then when we come to reconsider this entire draft law 2 years from now we can increase the number; or if conditions grow worse in the meantime, there will be nothing to stop us from proceeding immediately to increase the required period of service in the draft.

But, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the state of public opinion is what it is in regard to this measure anyway, is it not more sensible and more in accordance with good common sense for us to proceed, first, with an 18 months' service requirement and say to the American people that we shall try that and shall endeavor to see if that will meet the two great objectives we have in mind? Then if we find that it does not, we can modify it.

Mr. President, I have from time to time been critical of the military, and I fear that some of my criticisms have given some people the impression that I have very little sympathy for the military. The contrary is the fact. I have great respect and admiration for the remarkably good over-all job the military is doing. But I have responsibilities in the Senate and as a member of the Armed Services Committee. When I find that mistakes are being made and abuses being practiced, I intend to make known my views on those mistakes and abuses. I made them known in many respects when I introduced some weeks ago my bill for a true unification of the armed services in the interests of the elimination of waste, inefficiency, and unnecessary cost in the military.

I spoke on that subject a few days ago, and shall not repeat myself tonight, except to say that one can have admiration and respect for the job the military is doing, as I have, and still be at the same time a constructive and in some respects a harsh critic of the military. So in connection with manpower and the statistics on manpower, I point out that I think the military is subject to some fair criticisms. I think there is a great waste of manpoyer in the military. How much of a waste? I should hate to

venture a guess. But I simply want to say for the RECORD that I think the Military Establishment wastes a great deal of manpower. I do not think it has worked out, particularly in its administrative branches, a procedure promoting the greatest efficiency in the use of manpower. Hence I believe we have a right to insist that when we pass a draft law the military shall make the most efficient use of every member of its personnel. That means also a full day's work, for officers as well as men in the ranks.

Then, too, I believe we need to recognize what I at least consider to be another waste in manpower, in that they refuse to accept in the military men who meet the capacity standard test with a grade of 60 to 80. They have been subjected to great criticism for the refusal on their part to take men in the so-called 60 to 80 bracket. I asked them some questions about that during the hearings. The answers did not saisfy me. They said a man making a score of 60 on the standard classification test is unsatisfactory. As Senators know, that is a so-called intelligence-quotient test, along with so-called adaptability of the individual to certain physical tests. Witnesses told me they did not accept men, or did not like to accept men, who made a test score lower than 80, because they did not think they made good soldiers. I certainly would admit they do not make as good soldiers as men who make a score of 60, but we are talking about a peacetime army. We are talking about a national-security program and a preparedness program that ought to develop a total civil-defense program.

We need to recognize that in the event of another war we shall have to mobilize our entire citizenry almost 100 percent. I found nothing in the testimony of Army witnesses convincing me that there is not a place in the Military Establishment for men who make a test score of from 60 to 80. There is a great variety of jobs to perform in the Army. They do not all have to carry guns or be trained to carry guns, for that matter. When we are dealing with the taking in peacetime of so many hundreds of thousands of our boys, I think the Army should be called upon to make the most efficient use it can of those who make a score of from 60 to 80 in the so-called Army standard test.

I talked earlier about the public opposition ahd public resentment to a peacetime draft which I fear is going to develop. We need to watch the causes of negative reaction on the part of the public.

Let us take a hypothetical case or two. Let us go into any small town in America and draft boy A, who makes a high score on the Army standard test. But we do not take boy B, because he made a score of 60, 65, or 70. Yet A knows that B holds a job. The boy A knows that B has been able to maintain a good economic existence in the community. He knows that B is going to continue to hold that job while A under this bill spends two precious years in the Army. The boy A and his parents, relatives, and friends are not going to appreciate particularly a procedure that takes A but leaves B at home.

There is another class of boys that I think the Army should be called upon to use more efficiently in connection with its operations. There was a great deal of criticism of the failure of the Army, even during the war, to make use of a larger number of these boys. I understand why it did not. But we are talking again about the training of men who can be of service to the country in case there is a sudden war brought upon us, or as reservists for protection in the in the years to come. I refer in this group to the IV–F's. A great many IV–F's who were heartbroken because some physical infirmity, which did not make it impossible for them to perform a good day's work and compete in every respect with so-called fully able-bodied men, kept them out of the service. I know of no sadder group of men I met during the war than some of my friends who were so-called IV–F's, rejected for the Army because of some slight deficiency in eyesight or because of some minor physical infirmity which in no way would have prevented them from performing a great deal of military service.

Therefore I say, Mr. President, we need to look into the statistics and make certain as to how many of these boys could be used in order to spread the responsibility of service and in order to keep down to the minimum the length of time which individuals may have to serve in the Army. My statistical report shows that it is expected that we shall have 1,458,000 actual IV–F's. It may be that none of those boys could be used in the Army, but I do not believe that such is the case, if they represent a repetition of the IV–F problem which faced us during the war. I do not know what percentage of them could be used, but I am satisfied it would be a considerable percentage. So I say that one effect of my amendment providing for 18 months' service will probably be to cause the Military Establishment to reconsider its use of manpower and make a much more efficient use of it than it is doing at the present time.

The next point I desire to make is that I believe one of the effects of my amendment would be only the cumulative effect of carrying on for an additional 6 months this program, so far as manpower is concerned. I think that is an advisable thing. I think my amendment will spread the burden of military service over a larger number of boys, and that, as a result of my amendment, fewer boys will be exempted. I think that is desirable, in order to be fair to all of the boys.

I was going to take the time to go with some considerable detail into the statistics, but I have talked longer than I intended. So that the opponents of my amendment will know that I am seeking to be absolutely fair in this argument, I point out that I am satisfied, as I am sure the chairman of the committee is satisfied, that these statistics supplied to us by the Military Establishment and which will be found set out on the chart to my left, are in fact correct.

I may say to my colleagues that I appreciate their desire to vote, but I want to give them assurance that interruptions by calls of "vote" will not cause me to finish my speech any sooner than I would otherwise finish it, because I think we are dealing with a matter so important that I intend to make the record as clear as I can for future reference.

These statistics, Mr. President, I think are of vital importance to the Members of the Senate. Under the bill we have created 150,000 new positions for the Army, and I am satisfied we need them. We are confronted next year with a loss of 260,000 in the Army because of replacement needs. In Air we are creating 56,000 new positions, and I am convinced we need them, but we are confronted with a loss and replacement of 166,000. In the Navy we have created 33,000 new positions, and we are confronted with a loss of 100,000, due to replacement needs.

In the Marine Corps we are creating 10,000 positions, and we are confronted with a replacement loss of 28,000. The result is, when we look at our manpower needs, that we are creating positions totaling 349,000 and we are faced with a loss, due to replacements, of 554,000, making our manpower needs tonight 903,000 men. I am perfectly willing to join with the opponents of my amendment in an admission and stipulation that for the year 1949 we in fact need 903,000 men. I agree to that. The point at which I differ with my colleagues on the committee is that I do not think there is any evidence which supports the conclusion that 3 years from now we shall need any such body of men. If we do need them then, we shall have ample time 2 years from now, when we reconsider the draft law, to make such changes in the manpower requirement as we may need.

How is it proposed to meet this manpower requirement of 903,000 men? This represents intelligent guesses, Mr. President. They are the guesses of the best advisers our committee could secure, and I am willing to accept the guesses. I want to be exceedingly fair in agreeing with my colleagues on the facts as to the statistical needs for this year. How do we propose to get the 903,000 men? Here are the guesses: We shall probably get from 17- and 18-year-old boys 200,000 enlistments. I think that is an accurate guess. I think that approximately that number will see with respect to their future obligations under the draft advantages to them in the bill which will lead them to enlist. I think there will be quite a number of 17- and 18-year-old boys who, so to speak, have the wanderlust which has always characterized our boys in America and has made us to a large degree, I think, the strong people we are, who will want to take a turn in the Army. They will recognize that they will be taking care of a future obligation which they probably would have to meet under a future draft. I think there are many boys coming out of high school at the age of 17 and 18 who would prefer to fulfill their military service obligations before they go on to college. So I think it is a reasonable and fair guess that we will get 200,000 of them from enlistments.

Then from the 19 through the 25 age group it is estimated we will get two-hundred-and-forty-thousand-odd enlist-

ments and of reenlistments of former servicemen the prediction is we will get 190,000. I think that is about correct. Then we have probably 57,000 active-duty reservists who will help meet this 903,000 need. That leaves about 216,000 we will have to get through the draft of 19- through 25-year age groups, making our total of 903,000.

Mr. President, there will undoubtedly be considerable discussion by those who seek to reply to me, and I wish to cover this point now, because I think by doing so I shall save time, and shall not have to spend so much time in rebuttal. There will be considerable discussion in the debate tonight about our manpower pool.

It is estimated that we have in this country physically fit, nonvets, and men with no dependents, available as of January 1, 1949, to the number of 660,000 as of June 30, 1948. I repeat that figure, because it is a vital one in this debate. We will have as of June 30 of this year, available January 1, 1949, in our so-called manpower pool of physically fit, nonvets, and men with no dependents, 660,000 men.

We will add to that pool, by 18-year-olds reaching the age of 19, an additional 230,000 men, and we will lose from the pool, by men now 25 reaching the age of 26, and therefore not subject to the draft, about 50,000, leaving us 840,000 men as of January 1, 1949.

We will be short some 456,000 men, leaving us a total of 384,000, and the 456,000 men of whom we will be short will be found in the groups of enlistments which are listed as the 240,000 in the 19-through-25 age group, and the reenlistments of former servicemen. So that we will then have on January 1, it is estimated, about 384,000 men.

My position is that that is a sufficient number on which to start this draft army, and meet the two objectives of protecting the Nation so far as the immediate emergency is concerned, and building up the necessary reserves. When we take into account that we can add to the pool if we will lower the standards somewhat, and take more men in the 60 to 80 standard test bracket, and if we will also take a large number of capable IV–F's, we can increase the pool. I think it is clear that those men can be of tremendous service to the country, at least on the home front in uniform, in case of a sudden war. I think they should be called upon to assume their full share of responsibility.

Mr. President, I close with this last argument, that is, the argument of expense. I fully expect that it will be alleged that of course my proposal will cost more money, and that therefore I am in somewhat of an inconsistent position, because I am also argiung at the same time for reduction in the cost of the Military Establishment. I think the inconsistency is only on the surface, because I think my argument is to be weighed in terms of the objectives I seek. What I seek is the development of a peacetime army which will protect our national security so far as the immediate emergency is concerned, and will build up our reserve army so as to take care of our future needs in the years immediately ahead by means of a military draft law so phrased that we will be able to review and reconsider and change it 2 years from now. Keep in mind those three points when I say, Mr. President, that there is nothing inconsistent in my position in urging my amendment.

I wish to add this statement about the cost feature. If I have to make a choice between relieving hundreds of thousands of boys of what I believe to be an unnecessary extra 6 months' service, unnecessary insofar as meeting the objectives of the legislation are concerned, and paying a substantially higher bill for the cost of the draft I am willing to vote and will have no hesitancy in voting for the higher cost. I think the boys themselves, and the parents of the boys, and the people of the country as a whole, have the right to expect us to make that additional expenditure, if my assumption is correct that we shall be able to meet the objectives of the legislation with 18 months of service.

We have billions of dollars to spend in the protection of our national security in the relief of peoples abroad, and I am for that expenditure. I think it is essential in the interest of peace. Then certainly, Mr. President, we should not hesitate to pay whatever the additional cost may be in order to relieve boys of an unnecessary 6 months of service in a peacetime draft army. I think the American people will agree with me on that point, and will be perfectly willing to pay the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, with apologies to the Senate for speaking as long as I have spoken, but making a speech I thought was necessary in order to make my record on this amendment perfectly clear, I offer the amendment to the Members of the Senate, firm in the conviction and belief that it is not inconsistent with the objectives of the bill, and that it is an amendment which will receive wide public approval throughout the Nation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I appreciate the many brilliant contributions which the Senator from Oregon has made to this question of military policy. I particularly remember the convincing support which he gave to the proposal to increase the number of effective units in the armed services. But I must disagree with him on the amendment which he offers tonight.

I disagree with him, however, in spite of the fact that some of the statements which he made are appealing. It certainly is true that when our military experts, whether in uniform or civilians, seek to scare the Congress or frighten the American people, that is an improper and reprehensible procedure, one which always grieves me, and one which it is not at all necessary to follow, because in my judgment both the Congress and the American people are well aware of the gravity of the world situation.

I cannot agree with the Senator, however, that the United States runs much of a risk of being drawn into war because we are too well prepared. That has never happened to us. We have been in war on an average of about every 30 years in our history, and it has never been because we were too well armed; in fact, the contrary has almost always been the case. I agree that the United States is a civilian country, and it should remain a civilian country with a civilian psychology. I beleve it would be very unfortunate if we developed a military psychology in America, but I believe we would run no more risk of developing a military psychology if we were to draft men for 2 years than if we were to draft them for 18 months.

When it comes to the question of Russia I submit to the Senate that the attitude of Russia is not at stake in the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. A very great statesman, a world figure, said quite recently:

> Russia can neither be conciliated, appeased, nor provoked.

I repeat that:

> Russia can neither be conciliated, appeased, nor provoked.

Therefore it is not going to affect our relations with Russia very much whether we draft a man for 2 years or for 18 months. We can disregard that consideration.

The proposal of the Senator from Oregon is a particularly appealing one to me personally. I know how disagreeable and inconvenient is peacetime military service. I have one son who will be 21 in July and another who will be 18 in August, so I am one of the parents to whom the Senator from Oregon refers, and I have studied the bill not only with the eye of a Senator but also with the eye of a parent.

Now let us look and see what the amendment does. First of all, it will add, I am told—I cannot vouch for the complete scientific pinpoint accuracy of this figure—but I am told it will add something like $300,000,000 extra to the cost of maintaining the armed services. To be sure, that is not a conclusive factor. There are expenditures of government which are worth making, and if this were worth making on military grounds, that would be a sum which we could afford. But certainly, Mr. President, the people of this country, and that includes the young men of military age, and it includes their families, have an interest in maintaining healthy public finances, because healthy public finances are the foundations for new jobs and new opportunities for everybody, and we do not want to spend $300,000,000 extra unless we have to do so.

If a young man is drafted for 18 months—I am going to ask Senators to do a little arithmetic—there must be subtracted a month and a half, because that is the 45 days leave which under the law every man in the armed services is entitled to receive at the end of his service. If a month and a half is subtracted from 18 months that leaves 16½ months.

Then if he is going to be sent to Europe, 1 month must be allowed for the trip to Europe, because a soldier does not travel as the ordinary civilian passenger does. He must go to an embarkation port and wait until the unit in which he is to sail is built up. So that means 1 month subtracted from 16½ months, which leaves 15½ months. Then 1 month must be allowed for the trip coming back from Europe, which leaves 14½ months.

Then if there is a 4 months' training period that leaves 10½ months for service.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I will not yield just now. I will a little later.

The Senator from Oregon said there would be a 12 months' training period. I have never heard of that being contemplated. I understood the training period to be 4 months. So with a 4 months' training period that will leave 10½ months for service. If there should be a 12 months' training period, as the Senator from Oregon suggests, then, of course, the country would get no service at all from the soldier.

But let us assume I am correct, and that the training period is for 4 months, and not for 12 months, that would give the country a 10½ months' period of service by the soldier. Ten and a half months' service is all to the good. But in a unit composed of men who give a 10 months' period of service there would not be the efficiency, there would not be the coordination, there would not be the team play there would be in a unit in which the soldiers have served together for a much longer time.

There is another fact. This proposal will result in cutting down the volunteering program for the Navy and the Air Force, which is going so well, because it is doubtful whether a young man will enlist for a 3-year period if he can get this 18-months' period of service, and I believe, and I think the Navy and the Air Force believe, that the enactment of the amendment would seriously curtail their volunteering program.

But the final factor, and the thing which I think is most serious, is that if we adopt the amendment it will throw out all the calculations regarding manpower on which the bill is based. Senators see the chart on the wall which portrays in a very graphic and a very detailed manner the conditions as respects military manpower in this country—the number of young men in the different age groups, the number that can be deferred, the number that can be put into the Reserve. If the amendment is adopted and we shift the period from 2 years to 18 months it is bound to change the calculation regarding the Reserve and regarding the deferment. It may require the changing of the deferment for married men, for example. It may change the result which we would get insofar as building up the Reserve is concerned.

If we want prompt and effective action, if we want to do the thing which is most efficient from a military standpoint I think we should vote against the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts was deducting the various amounts of time out of the period of service for which these young men are being trained. I did not catch it all. He said a month, I believe, to get to Europe, and a month to come back, and at the beginning he deducted a month for something else—getting dry behind the ears, probably. I did not hear that. Maybe we would have to deduct the time spent out with the frauleins and the mademoiselles. That would take some time off. And perhaps the time spent in hospitals recovering from ailments incident to fraternization should be deducted also. Of course, by that time the boys would not be trained at all.

I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon for the simple reason that I do not want to see our country militarized, and anything that will tend to get a young man back more quickly into civilian life before his initiative and his ideas of individual responsibility have been completely dulled by the regimentation of military life appeals to me. That is why I am in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that I am opposed to the methods of legislation being pursued in the Congress at the present time, legislation by Chinese torture, keeping Senators here until they finally give up and vote "yea." It is a sort of a third-degree proposal. I will ask anyone on the floor or anyone in the galleries if they have ever seen a sadder spectacle than the bedraggled Senators here on the floor tonight hoping, and praying probably, for the end of this matter to come sometime. In fact, we have heard Senators like schoolboys here this evening shout "Vote! Vote!" under their breath to try to hurry up the proceedings. I frankly do not see the necessity of this procedure.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, may I yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Maine for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question to the distinguished Senator from the second best potato State in the Union. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I cannot comment on that statement because the rules do not permit. I took notice of the Senator's comment about the Chinese torture to which we are being subjected, and I wondered whether or not the Senator considered his speech to be in that category?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. So long as Senators like it I will add to it. I always try to oblige.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska. If I were to yield to anyone, I would yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there are at least three or four more speeches, and two or three amendments which we must consider. If the distinguished Senator will yield long enough, I should like to suggest to Senators that they consider whether or not there is an opportunity to get a unanimous-consent request to vote some time tomorrow on the pending amendment and all other amendments, as well as on the bill itself. If there is to be objection to such a request, there is no use in submitting it. I appreciate the time the Senator has allowed me. I would not have stopped him, except that he was interrupted anyway. If there is any time to propose such a request, it is now. If such a proposal were made, would any Senator object to it?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota would object.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, this seems a strange time for this great country of ours to adopt a proposal of this nature. It seems to me that at this moment in history our country is incomparably stronger, in comparison with any other nation in the world, than we have ever been in our past history. I believe that to be a fair and accurate statement of the facts.

We have never had peacetime conscription, and we have always done better than our enemies who had peacetime conscription. I cannot understand the logic of those who now propose that we should imitate the enemies we have vanquished down through the years. They fell for the foolish idea that it is possible to have peace by getting ready for war; and they came to the sad end which they deserved. The old admonition is that those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword. Certainly, Mr. Hitler found that to be true. The German people found it to be true twice in practically one generation. On the other hand, there are examples of countries which have been peaceful and which have had no military training. They have gotten along wonderfully well. We are one of them.

I am opposed to any protracted period of service for our young men in a peacetime army, because such service would tend to develop a class like the old Junker clique in Germany, especially with our Army doing as it is doing today, insisting on very high standards for those inducted into the armed services. Being in the Army tends to become a badge of superiority. One who is in the Army is not an average citizen. He is above the average.

Today I was talking with a mining engineer who served in the last war. He stated that he went through college with all A's, and should be considered above average. He is holding a job as a mining engineer; and yet the other day he got hold of the examination blanks being used at the present time for volunteers for the Army. They must pass a test before they are accepted. This man said that he could not begin to pass the test. It is a foolish thing. The requirements for an ordinary private are practically as tough as the requirements for entering West Point.

Let me cite an example. Over in the House of Representatives the other day there was a discussion between Representative BROWN of Ohio, and Chairman ANDREWS, of the House Armed Services Committee. Let me read an item from the News-Sentinel of Fort Wayne, Ind., of June 3, 1948. It will be self-explanatory. The item is headed "House chairman flunks."

It there anything to the charge that the Army keeps its enlistment standards so high many good men are barred?

Light is shed in the following exchange between Representative BROWN of Ohio, and

Chairman ANDREWS, of the House Armed Services Committee, during which the former asked questions used in the Army general classification test of Mr. ANDREWS:

He asked these questions of Mr. ANDREWS. These are some of the questions which the Army asks volunteers. I should like to know what relation they have to a man serving in the armed forces. Mr. BROWN asked this question:

What is the definition of the word "ambient"?

I think I have pronounced the word correctly. I have to guess at the pronunciation, much less the meaning of "ambient." A Senator asks me how to spell it. It is spelled "a-m-b-i-e-n-t." I hope the Senator is wiser now. I am not. If the applicant does not know what "ambient" means, he is not up to standard. I admit that I have flunked on the first question. Mr. ANDREWS had to admit it, too. His answer was, "I do not know."

Mr. BROWN. What is the definition of the word "torsion"?

That word is spelled t-o-r-s-i-o-n. I wonder how many Members of this body could pass this examination. I will wager that the number would be very few. Mr. ANDREWS answered:

I do not know.

Mr. BROWN. What is the definition of the word "recondite"?

I hope I have pronounced it correctly.

Mr. McMAHON. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Connecticut says that that is not the correct way to pronounce it. Perhaps he could get in the Army today. Mr. ANDREWS had to admit that he did not know. He replied:

I can't say.

Mr. BROWN. I am afraid you and I are going to stay out of the Army.

I shall have to join those gentlemen. I could not make it, I am frank to admit, Mr. President.

I do not believe that the Army has tried at all to get men voluntarily. In fact, I think it has deliberately plotted and schemed, with fool questions like these and tests which bear no relation to the work to be done by the boys, not to get the men voluntarily, so that it could fasten a military way of life upon America.

Mr. President, we are going in for militarism in many ways, and in a big way. We are going in for an armament economy. I do not believe that the idea of the armament economy, coming from our Wall Street government, as it does, is inspired by any fear of Russia. Russia is simply used as Hitler used it, as the bogey man to scare us so that we will fall for the armament economy, and so that the cartelists who are running our Government can make fabulous profits from war equipment. There is no other reason for the armament economy.

We were just at the point in this country where supply was catching up with demand, where one could buy a $1,500 automobile for $1,500, and get it. We had about reached the point where one could buy a $125 ice box, like the one I have in my home, which I bought before the war started, and get it for probably $125—and get delivery on it.

Those in authority did not want that to happen, so they figured out—they did not figure it out, they simply took another page from Mr. Hitler's book. They have torn nearly all the pages out of it. There are only one or two left—the Mundt bill and one or two others. They took another page from Mr. Hitler's book, with his armament economy, to save the cartelists and monopolies from figuring out some way to see that the workers of the country were paid enough to buy the products which they produce.

So here we go with an armament economy. Once it is saddled on us it will be impossible to get rid of it, because when a large segment of our industry is making guns, tanks, and planes, jobs will depend upon making guns, tanks, and planes. Profits will depend upon making guns, tanks, and planes. We may promise, if the opportunity offers, to change all that and make it impossible for the workers to make peacetime goods and still have jobs, but their reasoning will be, "I have a job making guns, and the one that is promised me making automobiles or some other useful article is not quite as concrete as the one I have making guns."

Mr. President, the Bible says, "Where your purse is there also is your heart." Nothing truer was ever written. So if we once get this armaments program well under way, we shall never get rid of it. It will become bigger and bigger. I fail to find in history any instance where a country built up a great arms establishment and then did away with it without using it. In other words, we are getting into the quicksand; and when we get in so far, it will be impossible to get out.

The end, of course, with conditions what they are in the world today, would not be just another conflict—out of which we might emerge with only our cities destroyed or, as some persons have become used to saying in the past, our civilization destroyed—in other words, that some of us would still be living in caves or some other place; but the other day I read a statement by Admiral Zacharias, one of the foremost authorities on the superduper weapons we have nowadays. Admiral Zacharias said the atom bomb is now the fourth most destructive weapon. In other words, Mr. President, we have three that are better—or worse—whichever way one wishes to look at it. He also said that if 250 of our present-day atom bombs were exploded there would be no place—he did not say in the District of Columbia—if any atom bomb were dropped here, but there would be no place habitable; he did not say in all New England; he did not say in all the United States, or in all the American Continent; he said there would be no place on this globe habitable.

I want to ask those who are listening whether they have figured where they will take their families when those 250 atom bombs are dropped. I have been thinking about it myself. I have not figured it out to my satisfaction at all. So I have figured that the best thing to do is to try to keep the peace.

Mr. President, I suppose we have thousands of such bombs. After all, we have been working on them hard, and we have been spending lots of money on them, so we ought to have that many if we have been getting our money's worth out of the process. I cannot conceive of our going into a war. It would be a tough proposition, because if we got into one, we would not only have Russia against us, but probably we would have almost every other country in the world against us, for the boys who are conducting our foreign policy have succeeded in alienating friends to an extent never before seen in all history, and probably we would end up by fighting almost all the rest of the world in such a knock-down, drag-out fight that I do not think it would be possible at all, when we had exploded 249 atom bombs, for someone to say, "Whoa, wait a minute; if another one is exploded all of us will be gone goslings, so we had better call it off right here." I do not believe they would be able to do it. I do not believe they would be able to get together and figure out the rules in time to allow only 249 atom bombs to be exploded. That would be a rather sad state of affairs. Then when it dawned on us what had happened, that the whole world was so radioactive that all of us were doomed to extinction, then we could go out and dig our graves. It would be more gruesome than what happened in Germany on a smaller scale, but we would be forced to do it.

So I cannot conceive what is behind the proposed draft. If we have the means to destroy the world, why worry whether those who are destroyed have on a uniform or whether they are in civilian garb? Why worry, if we are going to kill everyone in the world? I think that might be quite a deterrent to any aggressor. We could say, "Look here, boys. We may not be able to lick you, but, by thunder, we will kill everybody."

Mr. President, that is rather like a fellow going into a bank with a bottle of nitroglycerine in his hand, and saying, "If you don't hand over the money, I will throw this on the floor." That sort of threat has worked time and time again. The bank clerks just hand over the money so quickly that it makes one's head swim.

So it would work that way. If we are going into a war in which everyone will be killed, we might just as well tell Russia or anyone else, "We are going to throw the nitroglycerine on the floor, boys, if you start anything; so you might just as well not start it."

I think that would be much more sensible than to begin to regiment our country—not only our boys; but I have here before me the Wall Street Journal or some other kind of journal or financial paper that I was looking at a while ago. It is dated Thursday, March 18, and it says:

Truman call for partial mobilization foreshadows revival of key wartime control, United States experts say.

GOP leaders see plans for tax relief unaltered.

Well, thank God for that. That is something, anyway. We may all be con-

trolled or regimented, but we still will get our tax relief. That is fine. We shall have more money in our pockets when they atomize us. [Laughter.] I think the Republicans had better stop worrying about tax relief, and had better begin to figure some atom relief. That really would be more sensible, I believe.

So here they go, voting for this silly scheme that will not help us win a war at all. We already have the atom bomb, and we can win a war, as much as anyone can win a war nowadays; we can kill everyone. In addition to that, we not only propose to take this totalitarian step of regimenting our young men, but we are going to regiment everyone—business people, workingmen, and everybody else. When this thing begins rolling, and all the billions of dollars are being spent on guns, commodities will be so scarce again that we shall have to bring back the OPA and every other kind of conscription, and that will be the end of all the things the boys will have been trying to defend. So it simply does not make sense, Mr. President.

Frankly, I do not believe we would be doing any of these silly things if it were not for a lot of artificial propaganda to scare the daylights out of people with a Russian bogeyman. That is another thing that Hitler did. Our cartelists have not thought up anything new at all; they even use the same bogeyman, Russia, to scare people with. They have a Taft-Hartley law to scare the labor unions, like Hitler did. They have the loyalty test or authority with which they can scare people out of the Government, just like Hitler did. And now they are kicking the Mundt bill around, so they can put all of us in jail. I have no doubt that I would wind up in jail. After all, I just got out of jail. [Laughter.] Because of this Mundt bill, they can put you in jail if you say anything that any Communist has said—and the Communists say a lot of things, and it is awfully hard not to say anything they say.

Then, of course, they say you are a Communist by association of ideas—not by physical association, but because you have said something the Communists have said; and then it is demanded that you register as a Communist fronter; and, of course, I would tell them to go to Birmingham, and then they could throw me in jail. If I had to serve 2 years and pay $5,000, or if I had to pay off the fine, the Lord knows how long I would be there, because I could not pay it, for I am broke, more broke than I ever was before. I had to buy a house in which to live here in Washington. It cost $15,000. I could not rent a place, because I had three boys. It is a crime too, nowadays, to have children. I guess it should be a crime, if they are going to "atomize" the poor little devils. We really should think of that. But anyway, landlords will not rent a family a place in which to live if there are children; and I have them. So I had to buy a house, and I had to pay $15,000 for it. I am doing all right, though. I have it all paid off except $10,000. [Laughter.]

Earlier in the evening the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] said, "War comes quickly. War comes without warning." He cited the attack on Pearl Harbor as an example. I do not believe there is any menace in the world today, with Adolf Hitler objectives in mind. I believe the Russians would like peace. I sincerely believe so, and there are many reasons why I do. One of them is, the Russians have figured out some crazy-fool idea whereby they live better in peacetime than in wartime. We all know that is crazy, of course. That is not the way it is here. But that is a reason why they should want peace; is it not? It is not very consoling. I am glad the Russians have not yet figured out our scheme. That makes a reason for them to want peace over there. If they have peace their living standard will go up; and we all want that.

Another reason why I think the Russians might want peace is that there are no profiteers in Russia, nobody gets rich from war. In the war, if the Russians found anybody with any kind of scheme to get rich, they shot them. Of course, the death penalty has now been done away with in Russia.

Another reason why I think they might be satisfied to stay home and mind their own business is, they have a big country, with much territory and a great many people. I guess they are the most self-sufficient nation in the world insofar as natural resources are concerned. All they need is peace in order to develop their country, so they can have relative abundance. By that I mean more abundance than they have now, at least.

Their greatest ambition, as I understand—and I think it is a very laudable ambition—is some day to overtake us in industrial production.

Another reason for my thinking we might get along with them is, I have heard Stalin and his associates accused of many things, but I have never heard a single person say they are fools. In fact, they say they are very smart; sometimes deploring the fact. What they contend is a fact anyway, that our boys just cannot match wits with them. Anybody who would start a war nowadays is a fool, because we can kill them all, everybody, and there is no percentage in it; so I think perhaps we might be able to get along with the Russians if they had confidence that we really wanted to get along with them.

But let us examine that. Let us reverse the situation between Russia and ourselves. Let us for a few moments imagine we are Russians. It was Mr. Truman, the President of this country, who, when he heard that Hitler had invaded Russia, said, "Good! I hope they kill off each other. We ought to help whoever is losing, to be sure they do."

Do you imagine, Mr. President, it makes the Russians feel good when they recall that statement by Mr. Truman? Do you imagine they think now that he, all of a sudden, loves them? Mr. Truman, I know from past experience, does not love the Russians. I understand it is not cricket to quote anything a President has said to you, so I shall not; but I am saying that if anyone mentions Russia to Mr. Truman, he almost has apoplexy. So how can it be expected that Mr. Truman could get along with the Russians?

Consider the fact that our Secretary of National Defense, Mr. Forrestal, is the former president of Dillon, Read & Co. It is a Wall Street banking house. They are all in cahoots in New York—name one, and you name them all. The firm of Dillon, Read & Co. was very active in financing Adolf Hitler to power, with the understanding of course that he would fight Russia. But when Hitler got all the armaments he wanted he double-crossed the boys. He went in the wrong direction, like Corrigan.

To carry it a little further, the firm of Dillon, Read & Co. is the principal financial agent of Standard Oil and Texaco, two companies controlling the Arabian-American Oil Co. The circle is complete, coming back to Mr. Forrestal, who, as Secretary of Defense, has authority to say whether we shall use steel to build pipe lines in Arabia or what we shall do with it.

Consider that the right-hand adviser of the President is Admiral Leahy, a Fascist sympathizer most certainly, bosom pal to old Marshal Petain, the fellow who ruled France for Adolf. That may not look very good to the Russians.

Consider also that the Under Secretary of the Army is Mr. Draper, a former vice president of Dillon, Read & Co. I say to you, Mr. President, that in our Government practically every job of any consequence is filled by a banker or a general. Every job that does not have a banker in it or a general is filled by a banker that became a general during the war. [Laughter.]

But, getting back to Mr. Draper, he is the man who, when he was vice president of Dillon, Reed & Co., was most active in setting up the cartel arrangements between our monopolists and Hitler's. We were going to decartelize Germany. What a joke! Roosevelt figured out a scheme; all the boys were appointed; then Roosevelt died. But the boys were sent over to decartelize Germany. They have all come home, everyone of any consequence. Most of them quit voluntarily or have been squeezed out.

One of the former big shots of the decartelization program is now director of the new party in Maryland. He had never evidenced any interest in politics before, but he said the things he saw when he was in Europe trying to decartelize Germany cured him of politics as it is usually played. So he is in up to his neck, trying to help the new party. But the decartelists have all returned. I read the other day that the last one had come home. I have forgotten his name, but he is a bosom pal, a bosom friend, the paper said, of Mr. Royall, our Secretary of the Army; so he must be quite a big shot, himself, not a radical. He came home and took a blast at the radicals just the other day.

Mr. Draper went to Germany. He is an expert on cartels. Having set them up, he ought to know how to tear them down. I am happy to say our decartelization program is proceeding apace. The program is now under control. A fellow named Hawkins is in charge of decartelization in Germany. He is Mr. Draper's son-in-law. It is not a pretty picture, when one looks over the situation.

We are assisting scoundrels all over the world. When we cannot find any scoundrels in business, we set them up, and then we help them.

The cartels are being built up again in Germany. Yes, we have cut out the denazification program. Our boys are going right back into business with the Nazis. Of course they never got out. They hobnobbed in Switzerland with their German pals all during the war. Our cartelists gave away military secrets to their German pals after the war had started. None of them have been tried, they probably never will be. The statute of limitations has probably run on them by this time, or will presently, before anything can be done about it.

But we are building up the Zaibatsu in Japan, a big family, putting them right back into business, the boys that exploited the poor Japanese. We are setting them up again in business.

We are building up a cordon around Russia. We are trying to contain Russia, just like a half-dozen men trying to contain a herd of wild buffalo. It is absolutely ridiculous. But we are helping bad people everywhere. In China we are helping Chiang Kai-shek, whose government is so corrupt that it takes a part of the guns we send them to fight the Communists and sells them to the Communists. That keeps the Communists in business, which scares us so badly that we send China more guns, which are sold to the Communists, and we are scared some more, so that we send China more guns.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said recently that the amount of aid we had given to France and the Netherlands, under the Marshall plan, approximately equaled the money spent in reconquering Indochina and Indonesia. They should have minded their own business, let those people alone, and not have reconquered them. They had governments established and were doing all right. Whether or not they were doing all right, it was their business. But the Frenchman and the Dutchman went back as soon as they could recover—and they recovered with our guns, incidentally—and the amount they spent approximately equaled what we have given them under the Marshall plan. We were told that the Marshall plan was not a military undertaking. What difference does it make whether we give them food so they can manufacture guns, or give them guns and let them raise the food? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. President, we are helping reaction everywhere in the world. In Greece we are helping the same Government which Hitler placed in power. There are one or two old men there to help to fool us. In fact, one of them is named Sophoulis. We are shooting people in Greece. Hardly a day goes by that we do not read in the newspapers that 10 persons have been shot. Sometimes the figure is as high as 100. Even women are being shot along with the men. They are not shot in battle. We just yank them off the street and say, "Hey, you look like a Red to me"; and we line them up and shoot them. It is getting so bad, Mr. President, that I read in the newspaper recently—believe it or not—that the British have asked us to kind of ease up a little in Greece. Of course I do not mean they asked us. Our boys are not doing the shooting, but we are running the show. If we told them to stop shooting those poor people, they would quit. But it is getting so tough that the British want us to let up a little. Of course, they could give us lessons in how to shoot people; they are experts at it. The French and the Norwegians have protested. I have been very busy and have not had time to read the newspapers every day, and perhaps many others have protested. I do not know.

But that is the situation in the world, Mr. President. We are losing friends everywhere. We lost our friends in South America. There are some cardboard governments down there which we are supporting, but they will not amount to a hill of beans if any trouble starts. They will not last as long as it takes to say "Jack Robinson."

We just got through with the Bogota Conference. That was the last straw.

I always like to quote authorities, of which I am not one. This is from the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 20, 1948. The New York Herald Tribune should be very friendly toward the bipartisan foreign policy, all phases of it, in fact, because I understand that we are soon to be called upon to appropriate $10,000,000 as a slush fund to be delivered to the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, Time magazine, Life magazine, Newsweek magazine, and Reader's Digest. We are to turn over the $10,000,000 as a reward for those publications for helping to sell the American people and the rest of the world the Marshall plan. In other words, the people are to be made to pay for being sold. That is some racket. So the New York Herald Tribune ought to be very friendly. Of course, what I am about to read is written by commentators who get their columns in uncensored. These commentators are not radicals; they are rather conservative gentlemen.

On this side of the page there is an article by Walter Lippmann. I shall not read all of it, only a paragraph. On the other side of the page is an article by Sumner Welles. I do not believe anyone can name two writers who are considered to be more expert in their field of foreign affairs.

With regard to this Red business, Mr. Lippmann has this to say:

> The stereotype assumption that all discontent is Communist inspired, that all discontent emanates from Moscow, will, if we persist in holding to it, be as fatal to our hopes and policies as it is contrary to our traditions and our genius.

That is a pretty plain statement, Mr. President. Of course, many people are beginning to see that the Red scare is artificial. It has been whipped up out of all proportion. Even tonight the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who was taking me to task for the Red complexion of some of the things I have said, denied that he said the Russians were not all to blame. I was flabbergasted when he said it.

Mr. Sumner Welles has this to say:

> The Conference—
>
> Meaning the Bogotá Conference—
>
> provided new evidence that the inter-American system is in real danger of collapse. For this Communist intrigues are not responsible. It is due chiefly to our own policies in recent years. The impression of the public here that all is well is being deliberately fostered in Washington.

Of course, the phrase "deliberately fostered" is only a polite way of saying that they are lying to us. They are telling us that everything is going well in South America. It is not true. I saw an article recently which said that our big monopolists were urging that Marshall plan funds be used to coerce and force Argentina to lower her trade barriers and to make Brazil pay up. In other words, the Brazilians have bought things from us for which they cannot pay. They have no dollars. So we will loan them funds out of the taxpayers' money. More Marshall plan dollars. Then they can pay our monopolists their profits, and everything will be lovely. In fact, that is what will be done with a good part of the Marshall plan money. It will be taken out of the taxpayers' pockets and paid over to the monopolists.

I have said, Mr. President, that this Red smear has many people cowed to the point where it is almost impossible to stand up and say for them what they think or even to vote their convictions, if they want to be reelected to office, because if they do not vote for everything that is against Russia, no matter what it is, they are smeared as Reds and their name is Dennis, and they know it. Here are some of the lengths to which the Red smear is going. I hold in my hand a copy of Newsweek magazine. That is one of the pork-barrel publications which is getting in on the $10,000,000. It was to have been $15,000,000, but the House cut it down to $10,000,000. Here is Newsweek for June 7. My picture is on page 4. It is the same picture that appeared in Newsweek on May 17. That was when I was arrested in Birmingham and my picture was put into Newsweek. The same picture is in again this week. Do you know why, Mr. President? It is because someone, Eve Bacon, wrote a letter to Newsweek, and this is what it said:

> I have just been examining your photo of Senator GLEN TAYLOR and of the Soviet plane Yak 9 in the same issue.
>
> My picture got into the same magazine with the Russian plane Yak 9. Therefore, I am suspect.
>
> It seems to me the design on TAYLOR'S tie and the insignia on the Yak's fuselage are identical.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, that shows the lengths to which the Red smear has gone in America. But that is not all. It says:

> Is the Senator a member of the Soviet air force?

[Laughter.]

I have been accused of being tainted and "reddish," but that is the first time I have been actually accused of being a member of the armed forces of the Soviet Union.

So, on the strength of that, they reprint my picture with the necktie in question, and there is a picture of the Yak fighter plane below my picture. The insignia on the Yak plane is a star, a five-pointed star. It could have come out of the flag behind the Presiding Officer in the Senate at this moment, just as well as it could have come off a Yak fighter plane, but here is a chance to smear Senator TAYLOR, more particularly Vice Presidential candidate TAYLOR, so they reprint the whole business.

There is a circle around my necktie, to spotlight it more so that one will not miss it. They were afraid some of the people who read the story would be so stupid they would not know where a necktie was, so they put a circle around it.

Mr. President, I have on that necktie now. Here it is, right here. The design is a sort of a maple leaf. I will let the senior Senator from Louisiana say. I ask the Senator, is not that more of a maple leaf than a star?

Mr. ELLENDER. It certainly is.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have the word of one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate that the design is more of a maple leaf than of a star.

Of course, in the picture the bottom part of the design is sort of covered up. It shows about three prongs that look like a star. So you are convicted. That is about the way the Mundt bill will operate when it is passed, with such evidence as this.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that this tie was sent to me by a precinct committeeman in Idaho, a former Democratic precinct committeeman, who is now with the new party. He would not know a Communist or a Yak if he saw one face to face.

Mr. President, here is another example of what the Communist bogey has done to people. Here is a clipping from the Twin Falls Times-News of Twin Falls, Idaho. Twin Falls is the most rabidly Republican town in the State of Idaho. Senators can rest assured that any member of the city council in Twin Falls is a Republican. He is not only a Republican, he is a black Republican, a hidebound Republican, a mossback Republican, any kind of a Republican one wants to call him that means he is a Republican and nothing else but. It seems that these good councilmen out in Twin Falls decided to raise the ante on the slot-machine operators, and here is the heading on the article. It says:

City to take 50 percent of slot income. Operators call council communistic.

[Laughter.]

So they have it really going great guns, and I think this Red smear, artificially stimulated out of thin air, is the reason why we are considering this bill at all. If it were not for that we would not even be considering it.

Here is another example of anti-Russian propaganda that is going on in the country, and that has been going on ever since the war ended. My colleagues will remember that one day the Russians were the heroes of Stalingrad, but almost overnight they were the villians of the Kremlin, and the boys have been hard at it ever since. Ever since Roosevelt left us and the boys got out of control, and Wall Street took over, the tune changed completely, because I guess about that time they made the proposition to these papers, "We will give you $10,000,000 one of these days if you will just whoop it up against Russia."

The most awful scare they had was the submarine scare. There were submarines everywhere. I was not in Washington, but I guess they were in the Potomac. They were everywhere else. I was on the west coast, and the headlines were about submarines. Of course it all fizzled out, and we found that the submarines were off the Aleutian Islands, or over near Hawaii, closer to Russia than to the United States. No one knew whether they were our submarines or Russian submarines, and it did not make any difference, because they had a perfect right to be where they were. But it was a big thing for the newspapers for a while. The Navy deliberately fed it along, instead of cooling it down and keeping cool heads.

At the particular time to which I am referring I was in San Jose, and the San Jose newspapers could not resist the temptation to milk the situation dry of everything it was worth. Here is the headline, about 2 weeks after the thing was all blown up, a big headline clear across the top of the page:

Submarine sighted off coast.

That was getting close to where I was, and the submarine might have some rockets or something, I was not far from the coast, so I grabbed the paper in a very excited sort of way, because I thought the article would be three columns in length anyway, under that kind of a big headline, but it fizzled out, it was like a tadpole, and here is what it said:

Sub thought United States vessel maneuvering.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is a typical example of what the American people have had to put up with ever since the war ended. The wonder is that they have kept as calm and cool as they have actually kept. I think the American people are wonderful that they are able to come up with the right answer as often as they do, as quickly as they do.

I was interviewed shortly after I came to Washington by a writer for a magazine, I believe he was, and after he finished the interview he got up, went to the door, turned around, and said, "Senator, what is your basic faith?" I had never been asked that question, and I had to think a minute, but it did not take me long to answer him, and I said, "Well, sir, my basic faith is in the ultimate good judgment of the American people."

I used that word "ultimate" because of things like what we find in this headline. It takes the American people a while, but things finally percolate, they finally soak in. Where they get their information, I do not know. In fact, if we read some of the magazines, or if we get the New York Times and the Herald-Tribune and read them all the way through—and that is a job, for there is much printed in them—we find the truth after a bunch of misleading headlines, and the headline is all the ordinary worker reads. He comes home tired after a hard day's work, and if he picks up the paper, if he can afford to subscribe to it, and looks at the headline, "Submarine sighted off coast," he says, "Oh, my gosh; we have to fight those Russians." Then he turns over to see how the Yankees are doing, and how Dick Tracy is doing, and then it is time to go to bed. Most generally one can find the truth in the paper somewhere, if he can pursue it far enough.

Mr. President, I wanted to speak on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. I am in favor of it. If we must have this draft, let us not keep the boys in so long that they get the military complex and become enamored of the brass and the braid and one thing and another. I just cannot see the use of any of it, but let us go easy as we can, for the time being anyway, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" have it, and amendment is defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. What action are we taking?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment was defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Which amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I was going to ask for the yeas and nays. I was not aware that the Presiding Officer was putting the amendment to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator having asked for the yeas and nays on his amendment, I wonder if it is possible to accommodate his wish?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not after the announcement for the vote has been made, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, it is getting rather late. I do not care or propose to detain Senators long to listen to my explanation of my amendment to the bill. I explained the amendment earlier in the debate. The amendment I offer will not alter or change any of the provisions of the draft bill which is now before the Senate. It will simply change the effective date of the bill. It will change the effective date of the bill so that the bill will become effective to draft the boys into the Army on the same date that a tax bill becomes effective to draft excess profits of the war profiteers.

I have heard many persons talk on this subject. I have heard great speeches on

the question of why we should always draft war profits at the same time we draft the boys. But nothing has ever been done about it. It has simply been talk. I propose now that the time has arrived when we are getting ready to draft the boys, the youth of the Nation, and put them into the Army, into the military forces, that we also draft war profits, the profits to be made from the blood that is spilled by these boys.

It is very difficult to deal with this subject and get the draft of war profits tied into the bill as it comes before us, because tax measures in the Congress must originate in the House of Representatives. So we are unable to add a tax measure to this bill in the United States Senate. But we can, by adopting my amendment, make the draft bill become effective on the same date that the Congress makes effective a bill that will tax all war profits 100 percent. That will accomplish the same result.

The Nation has fought and won several wars, and we have had this same war profit question to put up with ever since the first war we fought. We always will have it to put up with unless we do something about it. The vast profits which were made during the recent war are fresh in the memory of the citizens of the Nation.

I shall review some of the history of war profits. First I want to call attention to the fact that it is not a new proposition. George Washington, our first President, in a letter to the President of the Congress dated August 16, 1777, said:

> From its earliest days this country has been confronted with attempts on the part of merchants and vendors—

And I quote President Washington, as follows—

> to avail themselves of the difficulties of the times, and to amass fortunes on the public ruin.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Has the amendment of the Senator from Texas been stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 64, line 22, after the word "effective," it is proposed to eliminate the word "immediately" and substitute the following:

> On the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations and individuals 100 percent of all profits and earnings in excess of average annual profits and earnings of such corporations and individuals for the 3-year period immediately preceding such date.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Later the Father of his Country on March 21, 1779, wrote another letter calling attention to some of the problems he had to contend with at that time with reference to war profiteers. I read from George Washington's letter:

> Our conflict is not likely to cease as soon as every good man would wish. The measure of iniquity is not yet filled. * * *
>
> Speculation, peculation, production, engrossing, forestalling * * * affording too many melancholy proofs of the decay of public virtue * * * and too glaring instances of its being the interest and desire of too many who wish to be thought friends, to continue the war. * * *
>
> Cannot this common country, America, possess virtue enough to disappoint them? Is the paltry consideration of a little dirty pelf to individuals to be placed in competition with the essential rights and liberties of the present generation, and of millions yet unborn?
>
> Shall a few designing men for their own aggrandizement, and to gratify their own avarice, overset the goodly fabric we have been rearing at the expense of so much time, blood, and treasure? And shall we at last become the victims of our own abominable lust for gain?
>
> Forbid it heaven. Forbid it all and every State in the Union. By enacting and enforcing efficacious laws for checking the growth of these monstrous evils, and restoring matters, in some degree to the pristine state they were in at the commencement of the war.
>
> Our cause is noble, it is the cause of mankind. And the danger to it is to be apprehended from ourselves.

That is from George Washington's letter of March 21, 1779.

We have been confronted with the same problem in each war since then. As I said, we have won every war we have fought, and it is to the eternal glory of our Nation that our citizens, our people, are so patriotic and so thoroughly sold on our system of government and so much in love with our country that they are willing to support to the utmost the Army and the Navy and the entire military forces in such quantity and to such an extent that we shall always be able to win our wars. God grant that we may have no more. But the same citizens of this country have expressed themselves, and the expression is on the lips of many of them. If our boys must be drafted and put into the Army, forced to give up their private lives, their schooling, and perhaps all of their future life, and perhaps to die, should they do that to continue in existence a system which makes a profit out of those boys?

We all agree that that system should be abolished. But up until the present time nothing has been done except talk. We now have ample time to give consideration to this subject. There is no urgency at the present time. No foreign foe is gnashing at us. No foreign foe is threatening us immediately. We are preparing; and by preparing we are adopting a bill to draft the boys. We hear very little opposition to the draft bill. I believe that the people are in favor of it. The boys are willing to go into the Army. We must have protection. We must have preparedness. But unless at the same time we adopt the draft bill to take the boys, we make effective on the same date a tax bill taxing the war profits, such a tax bill will never be enacted.

I happened to be in the Senate at the time war was declared, at the time of Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941. Soon after war was declared we commenced to enact legislation. We saw that we were going to have inflation. We saw that we were going to spend billions of dollars. There was a discussion on the floor of the Senate. I took the same position then that I am taking now, that the profits should be taken out of war.

It was impossible to get anything done at that time; but on the floor of the Senate, on January 3, 1942, or about that date, I proposed a 100-percent tax on profits and earnings. If that proposal had been accepted by the Congress there would have been no need for OPA. If we had enacted a tax law to take 100 percent of the profits of the business concerns of this Nation, would they have robbed the consumer by exorbitant prices when they would have known that at the same time the profits they made by that process would be taxed 100 percent? Of course they would not have done it, and prices would not have advanced as they did. If we had enacted that legislation at the beginning of World War II, there would have been no need for OPA or price control. There would have been none of the enormous profits that were made by the war profiteers, and we would not be burdened today with a debt of $250,000,000,000, because the taxes would have held down the debt.

But such legislation was not enacted. That is what encourages me to come before my colleagues in the Senate Chamber at almost the midnight hour to plead with them not to make the same mistake again. While we have time let us consider this subject, and let us not be too frantic to rush into drafting the boys and forget to draft the dollars.

It is a difficult problem to deal with, but it can be dealt with. I know that there are Senators who would be glad to have their names subscribed to a bill to tax war profits at the same time the boys are drafted into the Army. As I said before, we cannot put the tax measure into this bill, but Congress has the right to enact tax legislation; and if my amendment is added to this bill, we shall see a tax bill originated in the House of Representatives. Members of Congress want the draft bill to become effective at the earliest possible date. I have no desire to delay the effective date. I will lend my assistance to having the tax bill introduced and rushed through Congress to become effective on the same date as the draft act.

Mr. President, we have in the RECORD a sad history of the enormous profits which were made out of the last war—profits made out of the blood of the boys whose bodies are scattered all over the world. I wish to read a part of the RECORD. The subject was covered fully and thoroughly by former Representative John M. Coffee in an article entitled "Who Made the Money in This War?" Mr. Coffee said:

> When the full bill for participation in the war is presented to the American people, it is expected to total $336,000,000,000. That is almost 11 times the cost of World War I. It is the equivalent of taking $2,551 from the pocket of every man, woman, and child in this country.

A few weeks ago I heard an able Senator state on the floor of the Senate that when we went into World War II we had a public debt of about $25,000,000,000. No one dreamed at that time that when

we came out of World War II that debt would be increased tenfold, and amount to more than $250,000,000,000. But it did. With prices going up as they are, and war becoming more furious and costly, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] stated on the floor of the Senate that it is entirely reasonable to expect that the same ratio will prevail when we get into world war III, if we do. Unless something is done to curb inflation, we might start into World War III with a debt of $250,000,000,000 and come out with a debt of $2,500,000,000,000. That figure is no more shocking to us now than was the figure of $250,000,000,000 when it was spoken of as the debt we might have at the end of World War II. That statement was made as we entered World War II.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator will recognize that the figure he has given as the cost of World War II is considerably more than the total worth of everything within the United States during World War I.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate the contribution of the able Senator. He is entirely correct.

I read further from Mr. Coffee's article:

That, in dollars and cents, is the price we have paid for victory. It does not take into account the cost in human lives; 259,637 killed, 35,328 missing, 651,934 wounded. It does not include the suffering, the sacrifice, and ultimate waste of war.

There is another side to the ledger, the credit side. For there are those in the United States, as in other countries, who have made an enormous profit from the war.

In the years that preceded World War II a series of congressional investigations uncovered startling evidence of World War I profiteering. Public opinion was shocked and outraged, even though only a meager trickle of the sordid details ever reached it. Evidence was produced, for example, that—

British, French, German, and American industrialists made a profit from every soldier killed on either side.

Four years of war profits created 22,000 new millionaires in this country.

Think of that, Mr. President. Now we find that 4 years of war profits created 22,000 new millionaires in this country. But our then President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, said at the beginning of the war, "Positively no millionaires will be made out of this war." With that assurance from our President and Commander in Chief, nothing was done by the Congress to make his statement solid and make it stand up. So, instead of creating no new millionaires, no war millionaires, we created 22,000 new millionaires during that war. That is a very sad commentary, Mr. President.

I read further from the article by former Representative Coffee:

During the four war years—1915–18—United States industry made a profit, after taxes, of $28,500,000,000.

That was in World War I.

The article continues:

Net earnings of United States corporations in those 4 years were as high as in the preceding 10 years.

By 1926, according to a Federal Trade Commission report, 59 percent of the Nation's material was in the hands of 1 percent of the population; 31 percent was owned by 12 percent of the people; the vast majority (87 percent) owned less than 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

I wish to have it fully understood that I am not standing on the floor of the Senate tonight advocating the abolition of our profit system in the United States. I believe in a profit incentive; and I am willing, and I think all the citizens of the United States are willing, to have normal profits made by the citizens and by the corporations of the country during wartime. But what our citizens are opposed to is excessive profits.

So although in the amendment I am offering tonight to this bill, I cannot lay down the exact type of tax bill which should be passed by the Congress, the amendment does lay down the formula to be applied on all excess profits, all profits above normal profits—with the normal profits to be determined by the average profits for the 3 or 5 years immediately preceding the date of the tax bill or the emergency. The excess profits over and above the normal profits are all I am seeking to reach. That is all I am asking to have taxed 100 percent. When our boys are giving, as they are, of their future lives and of their very lives, is it asking too much to ask that the businessmen and corporations sacrifice merely their excess profits? I do not think so.

I read further from the article:

About 30 percent of the national wealth was owned by corporations. Some 70 percent of all corporate stock was owned by only 1 percent of the stockholders.

Thus, as the Nation increased in wealth, its people as a whole became poorer. More economic power passed into the hands of fewer men. War had accelerated this process.

Just after Pearl Harbor the late President Roosevelt pledged that there would be no profiteering from this war. It was precisely to prevent the excesses of World War I that Congress imposed heavy war taxes (in some cases four times the prewar level) and applied a surplus-profits tax to all corporate earnings.

The extent to which this noble purpose was fulfilled has just been revealed in separate studies made by Government and private agencies.

But, Mr. President, the excess-profits tax and the increase in the normal income tax which we imposed did not reach in and get the profits I am proposing to take by my amendment. I am proposing that Congress enact legislation which will tax the excess profits made because of the fact that we are entering an emergency so great that we must draft the boys and put them into the armed forces.

There have been no serious objections to my amendment. About the only objection which has been raised to it—and I shall call it an excuse rather than a reason for objecting—is that the amendment might delay the date when this draft bill would become effective. Well, Mr. President, why rush? Congress is still in session. What is more important than to be fair with the boys we are drafting when we pass this legislation? It would not require Congress very long to pass such a tax bill. It could be done in a hurry, and it should be done; it should be done immediately. If it is not done immediately and if it is not made effective on the same date when this draft bill becomes effective, I make the statement now on the floor of this Senate that it will never be done.

Every Senator on this floor and every Senator who is not on this floor understands this problem. I would not hope that I might enlighten Senators further. It is a problem that is close to their hearts. It is a problem they would like to have solved. It is a problem they fully understand.

Mr. President, because of the lateness of the hour I do not wish to impose upon the Senate, but to give Senators an opportunity to vote on this amendment. There are several Members of the Senate who have expressed to me their desire to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. I have taken up that matter with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who has this bill in charge, and with the acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. They have promised me that if I will not talk too long on this amendment at this late hour, they will use their influence to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. If a yea-and-nay vote can be had, I am willing to let the matter stand right where it is and discontinue my talk. If the Senator from South Dakota is willing to request the yeas and nays——

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have been reading this amendment. I should like to know whether it is the Senator's intention to attempt to draft dollars in business, the same as young men?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The attempt is to draft the excess profits made out of the emergency which we anticipate, and for which we are calling the boys into the service.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for another question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am amazed that we should have an amendment like this one. During the war we had almost unlimited and uncontrolled profiteering. Of course, it was a patriotic duty and a privilege for the young manhood and young womanhood of our Nation to serve in uniform in time of emergency and in time of war. On the other hand, we had men like Benny Myers and other racketeers here at home with one hand waving the American flag and the other hand deep in the Federal Treasury. That was the kind of patriotism that was exemplified by many of the so-called patriots, the superpatriots and synthetic patriots during the war.

I should like to ask the Senator whether, in peacetime, even though we may face a great emergency, he has any hope or expectation that we can take the dollars in this country and place them in the same category as the Nation's manpower? Of course, young men and women are willing to serve their country

in war or in a peacetime emergency. But have we the right to draft the dollars of the Nation, the business, and industry of the country in peacetime, or should we permit them to profiteer? Are we willing to erect standards permitting the almighty dollar in this country to demand its last pound of flesh while at the same time we draft young men to serve, not in war, but in peacetime? Is that the object of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I might thank the Senator from Idaho and say that the object of the Senator from Texas is not to permit excess profits to be made and kept when those profits are made from the blood that is shed by the boys who are fighting our battles. In offering the amendment I have no hope of doing away with all crooks in the future. We always have had them and always shall. The amendment is not particularly aimed at reforming crooks, whether in the Army or elsewhere in the Government service, or on the outside. It is a fair proposal to tax any American citizen making excess profits as a result of the anticipated emergency. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has requested the yeas and nays. May we have the order for them?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays when we vote on the bill. I also request them on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand that the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am hoping we may have a quick vote on the amendment. I will say that, so far as I recall, it is the first amendment that has been offered dealing with any question other than that of manpower. I do not believe we should consider the amendment germane to the bill. I think the Congress has through the war years depended to some extent on the renegotiation authority effectively to police profits or excess profits. We of course depend also on the regular revenue bills with respect to the excess-profits tax.

I cannot for the committee accept the amendment. I do not believe it is within the province of the Armed Services Committee to deal with tax measures. I therefore request that the Senate decide the question. Since the yeas and nays have been ordered, I am perfectly willing to let it come to a vote now.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator from South Dakota surely would not claim that an amendment fixing the effective date of the bill is not germane, would he?

Mr. GURNEY. No; I would not quite say that. I merely said that the bill recommended by the Armed Services Committe dealt with manpower. That is the entire purpose of the bill. I do not feel that the Armed Services Committee would have jurisdiction over a tax measure. I therefore said I hoped Senators would decide whether they want the amendment in the bill, and that I had no way of accepting the amendment for the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas. In fact, I had an amendment of my own, somewhat similar to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas. I was waiting to offer it when the Senator from Texas submitted his amendment. I must say his amendment is worded better than mine, although as I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas only takes the profit out of war in wartime. Is that correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would say it takes the excess profits from the date the tax bill becomes effective, which I would consider to signify an emergency. We might not yet be in war at that time.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is much better. A while ago I said that this country was being maneuvered into an armament economy, not as a measure of self-defense, but because the big monopolists and cartelists, having tasted the fabulous profits of war, are loath to part with such easy, ill-gotten gains. Of course if the amendment is agreed to it will have little effect, because all Senators will remember that at the start of the recent war the big fellows capable of producing armaments engaged in a sit-down strike; they would not produce guns, armaments, and planes for us until they got cost-plus. In other words, they were to make the guns and no matter what the cost, they could be as extravagant, as frivolous, as careless of cost as they possibly could be, and on top of the amount, whatever it was, they got a certain percentage. So in fact the more a product cost, the larger the percentage of profit—cost-plus; the more the cost, the more the plus. We had to agree to it in order to get the war started, to get it going. That was the first strike of the war.

Of course, if we again become involved in war, or even start an armament program in peacetime, those fellows will lose all interest in it. There would be no armament program if the profit were taken out of it, bringing it down to a reasonable figure. That is the idea of the armament program, to enable them to make the lovely profits they made during the war. It will ruin the rearmament program, everybody knows it. There is not much chance of the amendment being adopted. If it is adopted, it will have to be repealed before they can get the guns made. There would be no object in making tanks if the manufacturers could make just as much out of automobiles or some other useful product not requiring them to convert in order to make it.

I have before me some pages from the United States News and World Report. This is no radical publication. Mr. David Lawrence is the editor. He is known as a reliable gentleman; that is, he does not tell any falsehoods, though he may not tell all the truth. I shall quote from an article in the United States News and World Report of May 14, on the subject of the rearmament program. It says:

> Armament in any case is to be revived as a major United States industry.

Can you imagine, Mr. President, talking about armaments as "a major United States industry?" Remember that the publication caters primarily to businessmen. Of course this statement was not meant for everybody to read. But the statement is:

> Armament in any case is to be revived as a major United States industry—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

> sustaining a boom that had begun to sag.

If anything could be plainer, more callous, more cynical, more unmoral than that statement, I should like to know what it is.

> Armament in any case is to be revived as a major United States industry, sustaining a boom that had begun to sag.

There, Mr. President, we have the plain, unadulterated, unvarnished truth. The armament program is a program of profits and not of protection. There is no need for a great undertaking like this. As pointed out a while ago, we have the atom bomb. We can just end everything. There are three other weapons which are worse than the atom bomb. I do not know what they can do. But if we should start manufacturing a lot of small arms, tanks, and other things they never would be used. There would be no one alive to use them. So the idea is to sustain a boom that had begun to sag. There were evidences of it.

This is the only way the cartelists, who have moved into the White House, could think of to sustain the boom which had begun to sag. Of course there is the other way of seeing that the wages paid to workers equal the value of the product they produce. But they cannot conceive of that, Mr. President. If the worker received enough money to enjoy the good things he produces, he would get too frisky. The age-old axiom of exploiters is to keep the folks they exploit as far down as they can possibly keep them.

I read further:

> Living standards of the public will be influenced, too—

By this armament economy which is being started to sustain a boom that had begun to sag.

> Living standards of the public will be influenced, too. Just as the civilian supply was

about to catch up with demand, the military steps in to take a larger share of goods and manpower. Armament spending will take steel, aluminum, copper—

That is right, Mr. President. I know small fabricators who use sheet steel. They are being forced out of business. They cannot get anything with which to work.

The little fellows will be frozen out in this country by the armament program, just as they were frozen out in Germany. They could not get materials with which to continue in business. Pretty soon there will be allocations on top of lack of materials. This is just a scheme by cartelists to destroy America's genuine private enterprise operated by the little individual or the little company. That is the hope, that as they get the armaments program going they will get controls and allocations, and the little fellows will be frozen out. As an additional weapon they are tightening up credit.

But the article goes on to say that they will take those scarce materials that otherwise could go to civilian industries to produce goods for civilian use.

Armament, too, will draw on manpower that could otherwise be employed in civilian industry. As a result, people in general will enjoy—

Listen to what people will enjoy, Mr. President. This is a very smooth way of putting it:

People in general will enjoy fewer goods than they might otherwise have enjoyed.

I am sure it is a great consolation to the American people that they are going to enjoy fewer goods than they might otherwise have enjoyed.

However, they will be expected to gain in satisfaction from the feeling of security that spending on armaments can give.

I am sure, Mr. President, that all of us feel very secure when we know we have a lot of tanks, boys with rifles, and things of that sort, that can rush madly about when the atom bombs start falling. It makes no difference where they fall. They can fall in North America, South America, Asia, or Africa. When 250 of them have been exploded the jig is up. Everyone dies. So this scheme of an armament economy, building guns, is absolutely ridiculous.

I have another quotation from the United States News and World Report.

When the Marshall plan was being considered I contended that it would turn out to be more military than anything else. I did not know how they were going about it. I knew, because of the people running it, that was the way it would be. That is the way it was with Greece. We did not like the deal in Greece when it was brought up. I opposed it, but it was put through anyway. Some of us contended it would turn out to be a military undertaking rather than a humanitarian undertaking. Sure enough, that is what it turned out to be, and sure enough, that is what the Marshall plan will turn out to be—a military plan. If we do not send them the guns, which we will, we will send them other things so that they can make guns. The guns will be made one way or the other.

Here is what the United States News and World Report has to say about the situation:

Money invested in Europe by private investors is to get some Government protection. Profits, if any, will be paid in dollars.

In other words, our boys are going to Europe, and the Marshall plan is to be used to enable our businessmen to gain control of Europe's economy. But what is the use of gaining control of Europe's economy and letting our monopolists have that field to exploit also, if they cannot get their profits in dollars? They cannot spend francs or marks or lira over here. So they figured out a good scheme. They will tax the American people—they are taxing them—for $6,000,000,000 worth this year, $17,000,000,000 altogether, under the Marshall plan. Then they will take the taxpayer's dollar to pay the profits of our exploiters, our cartelists, made out of exploiting Europe.

The article says:

The idea is to lessen the risk of doing business abroad and encourage new enterprises. European recovery, too, will be helped.

Note that last sentence, Mr. President:

European recovery, too, will be helped.

We shall help our boys, first, to get their profits out of Europe. If, after that, it helps Europe, that is very nice, also; but they want to get the dollars out first.

It is beginning to be apparent, Mr. President. I did not know what the joker was in the Marshall plan. I voted against it because I thought it should be channeled through the United Nations if we wanted to help anyone. In that way it would build up the United Nations. In fact, the United Nations is an organization designed for the very purpose of helping people. But we are absolutely callous, insofar as the welfare, the future, and the success of the United Nations are concerned. The amendment I offered to channel aid through the United Nations was rejected. We went ahead unilaterally with the Marshall plan. It is plain now why we did it. Our object was not to help hungry people. In fact, our bipartisan coalition was so cynical about this Marshall-plan thing——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question only.

Mr. McMAHON. I have a question I wish to ask the Senator. It is 12 o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I got here at 9 o'clock this morning. Does the Senator think he is making any converts?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not believe anyone ever makes very many converts on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Then why does not the Senator sit down? [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR. I am talking for the same reason the Senator from Connecticut often talks, to hear myself talk, probably.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not blame the Senator; he would get better than that.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest again, in view of the fact that there are other amendments to be offered and apparently other speeches to be made, that time would probably be gained by setting an hour tomorrow for a vote on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto, and the final passage of the bill. I say this sincerely, and this is not suggested to cut anyone off. I am not saying what the hour should be. The Senate has been in session two nights until nearly 11 o'clock; we started the session today at 11 o'clock this morning, and we have been at work a long time; we have to keep going for another week, and we must keep ourselves physically fit and tolerant and able to do business.

I am merely suggesting again, attempting to fill the shoes of the majority leader, the hope that Senators, in the consideration of the very vital question before the Senate, might reconsider and let us see if we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote at some hour tomorrow, with some division of time that would be satisfactory to everyone. I think that is the only sensible thing to do. We could continue in session all night, and if we did we might get the bill out of the way, but when we had done that we would not be in any shape to proceed with a full day's work tomorrow.

I do not mean any disrespect to anyone. I am perfectly willing to make the hour as late tomorrow as any Senator may suggest. If the Senate does not think there has been enough debate, we should continue the debate. It is only in a spirit of cooperation that I am attempting to work out a constructive program, and I am asking once again whether there would be any objection to a unanimous consent request that the Senate vote on the pending amendment and any amendments to the bill, and the bill itself, at a hour tomorrow which would be satisfactory to the Members of the Senate.

For the information of Senators, I may say that the Senate is to recess tonight until 12 o'clock tomorrow, so that the session would start at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator from Idaho yield for a remark on the subject under discussion by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. As I see it, there is an amendment pending on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. There is an amendment to be offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] which I am sure will not take more than 5 minutes. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. There is an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Nebraska. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. It will take how long?

Mr. WHERRY. It will not take the Senator from Nebraska 10 minutes to present it. I am not sure it will provoke debate, but I think it is an amendment which should be discussed.

Mr. GURNEY. Are there any other amendments?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Washington has an amendment, I believe.

Mr. CAIN. I have an amendment which I can easily dispose of, up or down, in less than 10 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. There is one amendment to be offered by the Senator from Montana which I am sure the committee has agreed to accept; it is a small one. Enumerating these amendments, I am hoping I can ascertain if there are others to be offered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield at this moment to permit me to say a word, with the understanding that we will not lose the floor?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make a comment to the acting majority leader and to the Senator having the bill in charge. I think it is highly to be desired that we vote if possible on the entire bill within the next hour tonight. I think we can do it.

I wish to make a further comment. I suppose all is fair in a parliamentary war, but I did not know we were engaged in a parliamentary war here tonight, and I think the record should be perfectly clear. I am very good natured about it, and have a good sense of humor about it, but I should like to have the record clear as to what happened in regard to the vote on my amendment.

I think for the record and for future reference the RECORD should show that when the Senator from Idaho finished his last speech, the action taken by the Chair on my amendment was not heard, I am sure, beyond the front row, at least on this side of the Chamber, and those of us in support of the amendment did not know that a vote had even been taken, and there still were speeches on both sides of the amendment to be delivered. We want the RECORD to show that, it was not because anyone either for or against the amendment in the back part of the Chamber was not ready to protect his position on the amendment, but we simply could not hear any announcement by the Chair, and it was not until the word "noes" was used, that any of us realized that there was even a vote being taken.

I merely wish to say that under those circumstances I think parliamentary fairness and good sportsmanship would justify a reconsideration of the vote, so that those of us who favored the amendment who desired very much to have a record vote on my amendment could have it.

Mr. President, if that does not meet with the pleasure of every Member of the Senate, I do not intend to press the matter. I merely want the RECORD to show, however, that those were the physical circumstances under which the vote was taken. I wish that under those circumstances the acting majority leader, who was not the Senator from Nebraska at the time, had suggested the absence of a quorum, because I felt it was well known that there were speeches still to be made on the amendment, both for and against it. I wish the Senator having the bill in charge had suggested a delay or a quorum call so that all sides could have had a fair opportunity to complete the debate on the amendment.

I, myself, am not going to ask for unanimous consent for reconsideration, because I always take my lickings. I hope that this explanation, however, will cause the Members of the Senate themselves to decide whether under the circumstances they think that they should let that action stand without at least an attempt to have a record vote on my amendment. But if they want to stand on the basis of the vote which has been taken under those circumstances, Mr. President, I shall take it with a smile, but the Senate is making a record on the point, I suggest, which I do not think is in keeping with the parliamentary fairness which should prevail in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. As I recall, immediately after the vote in question was taken, I inquired of the Chair, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon, as to whether or not the vote might be reconsidered, and I think the Chair informed the Senator from Washington that it would take a unanimous-consent request to have the vote reconsidered.

I have since been advised, on what appears to be good authority, that that decision was unintentionally incorrect, and if the President pro tempore, who now sits in the chair, were to affirm the fact that it was an incorrect decision, I should like to ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Oregon was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is a motion to reconsider in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will rule upon the point with a brief explanation. The Chair has inquired into the situation. The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was in the chair at the time. In the first place, there seems to be considerable doubt whether the Senator from Delaware did indicate that unanimous consent was necessary to obtain a reconsideration. The Senator from Delaware wishes to say something on that point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware happened to be in the chair at that time, and it is my recollection, and I think the RECORD will so show, that the request of the Senator from Washington was not on reconsideration; that the request of the Senator from Washington was whether or not it would be possible to have a yea-and-nay vote at that time after the result of the voice vote had been announced. The Senator from Delaware, who was occupying the chair at that time, said that it could not be done since the result had been announced. I do not recall that the Senator from Washington asked for a reconsideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I think that clears up the record. The Chair will rule on that point, because, as the Senator from Oregon has indicated, the record ought to be clear.

Unanimous consent was not necessary and is not necessary to move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon was defeated, but if the amendment is reconsidered, then the amendment becomes subject to a basic point of order because of the fact that it requires a reconsideration of a committee amendment beyond the time limit for asking for the reconsideration.

Therefore, as the situation stands, the present request of the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and from Washington [Mr. CAIN], is entirely justified, and any Senator is entitled to move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. A unanimous consent request, if granted, of course, would accomplish the same purpose and take less time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Of course.

Mr. WHERRY. If that request failed, a motion to reconsider would be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in order to cut——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska was speaking. Has the Senator from Nebraska concluded his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. I had not concluded, but I——

Mr. GURNEY. I beg the Senator's pardon for interrupting. I was going to ask if that request could be made now when there was an amendment pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent request can be entertained at any moment.

Mr. WHERRY. But a vote would come after the pending amendment has been acted upon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Unless there be included, as part of the unanimous consent request, the request that the pending matter be temporarily laid aside?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as the situation has been clarified, I think the Senator from Oregon is entitled to a record vote, a yea-and-nay vote. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that after

a vote has been had on the pending amendment, the Senate proceed to vote on the Morse amendment by the yeas and nays, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL]. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] still has the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Presiding Officer. I was quoting from——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield further?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry we did not reach any agreement on the unanimous-consent request respecting the hour at which to vote on the bill. I should like to suggest that a vote be had on the bill, let us say, at 2 o'clock tomorrow or 3 o'clock or any other o'clock agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Make it 5 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if he would suggest an hour which would be acceptable to him when the Senate could vote on the bill and all amendments thereto.

Mr. GURNEY. Inasmuch as there are not many amendments, I suggest that if the Senator from Idaho does not intend to hold the floor for more than 10 or 15 minutes, action could be had on the amendments with respect to which notice has been given in the last hour or so, and we could probably finish action on them in 30 minutes. If there are other amendments to be offered, however, I do not know how long it would take to consider them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I might want to speak at some length on the bill after action on the amendments is concluded. I want to be entirely fair with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and say that I will want to speak at some length on the bill. I make that statement now so there will be no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest that a final vote be taken at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I hope that suggestion will be satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Nebraska is submitting in the first instance a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. I include in my unanimous-consent request the request that a final vote be had on all amendments or motions and on the bill itself at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, the time to be divided between the proponents and the opponents of the measure between the hours of 12 and 2 o'clock. There would have to be included in the unanimous-consent request the request that the time of the proponents be in charge of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and some Senator will have to be named as being in charge of the time allotted to the opponents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the unanimous-consent request is to be considered it is first necessary to waive the requirement for a quorum. Is there objection to the waiving of the requirement of a quorum for the purpose of considering the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have included in the request that I be granted at least 15 minutes before the vote is taken on my amendment, in order to answer any questions that might arise and to make any other statement I may desire to make at that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object I wish to say I want to confirm the suggestion which has been made, but in all fairness I say that I wish to have at least 30 minutes to speak on the bill. I shall try to condense my remarks to within that time. I had intended to speak for a longer period. Can the Senator from Nebraska assure me that I may have 30 minutes before 2 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of that statement, and in view of the fact that the Senator from Texas wants 15 minutes, which means 45 minutes for the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Texas, I suggest that the Senator from Nebraska amend his request to make the hour for final vote 3 o'clock. Inasmuch also as there is a diversity of interest in regard to the time not controlled by the chairman of the committee, I am perfectly willing myself to take the responsibility of parceling out the time among those Senators who want to discuss the amendment for one-half of the time before 3 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to accept that suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has heard the statements just made. The request is now altered so as to fix the time for final voting on all amendments, motions, and on the bill itself at 3 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no Member of this body is more anxious than the Senator from Georgia to expedite early conclusion of the legislation, but I should like to ask that the Senator from Nebraska include in his request an understanding to the effect that no amendment may be considered and offered which is similar in substance to an amendment which has been heretofore rejected by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to accept that amendment to my request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska includes the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia in his request. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that under these circumstances the Senator from West Virginia may be assured of not less than 30 minutes?

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself will guarantee to yield to the Senator from West Virginia that much time out of the time I shall have under my control.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Thursday, June 10, 1948, at the hour of 3 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending or that may be made to Senate bill 2655, the Selective Service Act of 1948, and upon the final passage of the said bill: *Provided*, That no amendment shall be considered in order which is similar in substance to an amendment which has been heretofore rejected by the Senate.

Ordered further, That the time between 12 o'clock noon and 3 o'clock p. m. on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, there is a typographical error in my amendment. Where the place for insertion is stated in my amendment, I should like to amend it so as to change "page 64" to "page 66," and change "line 22" to "line 15."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to alter his own amendment, and the change will be made as requested.

FLOOD RELIEF IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I will say to the Senator that I ask him to yield in order that I may present a unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration of a joint resolution to provide emergency housing relief in the flooded area around Portland, Vancouver, and the Columbia Basin. I ask the Senator to yield for that purpose, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for that purpose. I am one of the sponsors of the resolution.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution, which I send to the desk, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 231), to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," was read

the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 303 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940 (Public Law 849, 76th Cong.), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: *"And provided further,* That moneys derived from the rental and operation of such property and funds from the reserve account established by the Administrator pursuant to this section 303, not exceeding in the aggregate $10,000,000, shall be available and may be used by the Administrator for expenses found necessary in the provision of stopgap emergency housing in the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area for persons and families displaced as the result of the destruction of the temporary housing at Vanport, in Multnomah County, Oreg., and other persons and families in such area rendered homeless as a result of the present flood, and in providing such stopgap emergency housing the Administrator may act without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have objected to several resolutions coming up for immediate consideration; but this is a relief measure. This is an emergency, and I think it is in a category by itself. I shall make no objection to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] as modified.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I hold in my hand the transcript of a short colloquy between the then Presiding Officer, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, a little while ago. The transcript shows that the Senator from Washington merely asked whether or not a yea-and-nay vote could be had, and the answer was, only as the result of a unanimous-consent agreement. I wish to make that explanation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I assure the long-suffering President pro tempore that it is not my intention to proceed at any length. I simply wish to finish saying what I was saying. If every other Member of the Senate leaves the Chamber, it makes no difference. As I stated a while ago, I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] when he pointed out that no converts are made by speeches on the floor of the Senate. Usually we are talking for the benefit of the folks back home—not particularly our home. Sometimes we address our remarks to the country in general. At least we have hopes that they will reach the country in general. That is the reason why I am speaking tonight, and not with any hope of changing the mind of the Senator from Connecticut, most certainly.

I was saying that the armaments program is not designed for national defense. It is designed as a gigantic grab-bag to enable cartelists and monopolists to enrich themselves. Before I take my seat, I should like to read one further heading from the United States News and World Report. I read from page 13 of the issue of May 14:

Arms costs are about to start a new spiral upward.

New billions for defense will keep business booming, bring a draft—

We must have soldiers if we are to have tanks, or it would look phony—

check living-standard rise—

It is too good—

maybe add to taxes.

It is Congress, not the White House, that goes in for big-scale spending this time.

Mr. President, I disagree with that statement. The White House started scaring people to death, telling them that they were in danger of being attacked practically immediately. That started the ball rolling. I admit that Congress became stampeded and took the bit in its teeth, and is determined to spend our last red cent.

Arms dollars will flow to business in bigger and bigger numbers after midyear, will enter a long, upward trend.

All I can say is that with our present national debt, the long upward trend of armament spending on top of what we now owe can only inevitably end in bankruptcy of this Nation and bring an end to all the things that those who are appropriating these fabulous sums pretend to hold so dear to their hearts. Those of us who are accused of being pinks, Reds, bolsheviks, and disloyal are the ones who are defending our American way of life by trying to preserve the solvency of this great Nation, practically the only solvent capitalistic nation left on earth.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate Thursday and Friday, to attend the Indiana Republican State Central Committee Convention.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Henry J. Tasca, of the District of Columbia, to be United States alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William Ford, and sundry other persons for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tracy S. Voorhees to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herbert A. Bergson to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Air Force nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes a. m., Thursday, June 10, 1948) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock noon the same day.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Tracy S. Voorhees to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Herbert A. Bergson to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE AS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE AFORE-MENTIONED TITLE

To be major generals

Lewis Hyde Brereton
Junius Wallace Jones
Harold Mark McClelland
Eugene Lowry Eubank
Frederick Mercer Hopkins, Jr.
Orvil Arson Anderson
Earle Everard Partridge
Lyman Perley Whitten
Bob Edward Nowland
Orval Roy Cook
Charles Trovilla Myers
John De Forest Barker
Arthur William Vanaman

To be brigadier generals

William Eugene Farthing
Richard Cox Coupland
Clayton Lawrence Bissell
James Wrathall Spry
Patrick Weston Timberlake
Joseph Smith
John Maurice Weikert
William Lloyd Richardson
Glenn Oscar Barcus
Leon William Johnson
Laurence Sherman Kuter
Joseph Hampton Atkinson
Roger Maxwell Ramey
Samuel Egbert Anderson
Truman Hempel Landon
Francis Hopkinson Griswold
Edwin William Rawlings

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

William L. Alison, Minter.

FLORIDA

Loyd C. Olive, Bartow.

[*Omitted from the Record of May 26, 1948, p. 6485*]

IN THE AIR FORCE

James Rodgers Allen to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Air Force of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Annalee Stewart, of Chicago and Boston, offered the following prayer:

Loving Father of all mankind, create in us the mind and heart that was in Christ Jesus. Help us to look at the world through His eyes and think His thoughts after Him. May we never allow any barriers to come between ourselves and Thee or between ourselves and people anywhere.

Eternal Spirit of Creative Love continually remind us that the world is in Thy hands plus our hands. This is a great responsibility, for we know that Thou dost not want the world to continue in the direction it is now going. There is so much fear, suspicion, and planning for the destruction of mankind.

Help us to be willing to face the unalterable reality that there are spiritual forces greater than any man-made ones and that we can be the channels through which Thy spirit can flow into the lives of others.

Help us to believe that no situation is hopeless so long as men and women have the courage to be the instruments of faith where there is fear, hope for despair, trust in place of suspicion, and creative good will instead of hate. May we seek always to provide those conditions in America and the world so that youth everywhere may unite in learning ways to build bridges of friendship and understanding between the nations.

Give us the wisdom and courage for the facing of this hour when the world looks to America for spiritual leadership in creating the foundations of peace.

"Fearless and unconquerable Gentleness,
Touch, calm, and embolden us,
And all men.
Take from our frightened hands the bomb and bayonet;
Arm us with spirit instead.
Arm us with compassionate faith in one another,
By the courage of our faith in Thee;
That where we come in every land,
Life will enter, and not death!"

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 263. An act to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; and

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) entitled "Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2237) entitled "An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALL, Mr. IVES, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL ADVISORY HEART CONTROL

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized, in the engrossing of the bill S. 2215, which was passed yesterday, to delete lines 18 and 19 on page 24.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] is unavoidably absent. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Speaker appoint an additional conferee on the part of the House to replace the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] at the conference on the bill H. R. 6500, the legislative appropriation bill for 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] to fill the vacancy.

The Clerk will notify the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BRAMBLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Major Williams.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today on the independent offices appropriation bill and to include therein a number of excerpts from the committee hearings.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include, to be printed in the permanent RECORD of May 17, 1948, following the memorial exercises in the House of Representatives, a poem written and copyrighted by Stanley Kimmel entitled "The Other Unknown Soldier."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely gratified to learn that rules had been granted on two vitally needed veterans' measures. I refer to H. R. 3748, which provides additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans, and H. R. 5588, which increases the compensation of certain veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities who have dependents. Both of these bills were reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in my opinion represent a fulfillment of an obligation to those who gave so much.

The Republican leadership has demonstrated again its sympathy and wholehearted support of just and equitable veterans' legislation.

WANTON DESTRUCTION OF FISH

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, a neighbor of mine, Mr. James H. Hayes, has sent to me an article he took from the June 1948 issue of the magazine Field and Stream, which graphically depicts, and also shows by a photograph the wanton destruction of striped bass through seining down here along the Virginia coast.

The sad part of it is that this 240,000 pounds of striped bass so caught were just on the verge of their spawning season, and through this wanton destruction some 900,000,000 eggs were destroyed and lost as potential fish and as a natural resource.

While this may involve the States themselves and their conservation commissions, as the article states, nevertheless our own Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries should do what it can to bring about a correction of this situation.

The following is the article from Field and Stream:

SAVE THE SPAWNING ROCKFISH—A GRIM TALE OF A RECKLESS HAUL OF STRIPED BASS—A LESSON ON THE WASTE OF A NATIONAL ASSET

(By Bill Leetch)

A tremendous school of striped bass, locally called rockfish, was sighted by commercial fishermen in the vicinity of Westmoreland State Park, Va., during the week of February 15, 1948. Dropping whatever work they had been doing, the men got busy. Out came the nets from storage, and a haul estimated at between 22 and 30 tons was made.

The news spread like wildfire among the seine haulers up and down the Virginia shore of the Potomac. Lookouts sighted another tremendous school the following day and again the men went to work with a larger seine. The haul for that day was described as ranging between 80 and 100 tons. All told, the men labored for nearly 72 consecutive hours of seining and loading the fish into hastily built pens, trucks, and carts. So tremendous was the catch that thousands of fish were spread out on the beach while the men rushed back to catch more.

This heavy catch in the Potomac, plus other heavy catches elsewhere in the Chesapeake Bay area, glutted markets in Richmond, Norfolk, Baltimore, and Washington, depressing the price to 3 cents per pound. Some of the fish were hauled as far north as Philadelphia and New York markets. With the markets loaded the bass were sold for fertilizer. One old-timer, who has been a waterman for 59 years, is reported to have made the statement: "In all of my years I have never heard of such a haul, and I'll say there isn't a man here alive today who will see another one."

The old timer is right. Unless something is done to put a stop to this stupid waste of a national asset, there won't be enough fish left in a few years to make seine hauling profitable. The striped bass or rockfish are just on the verge of their spring spawning. The roe was literally dripping out of many of them and vast numbers more were heavy with roe. We are told in round numbers there were 120 tons of fish caught which, reduced to pounds, gives us the astounding figure of 240,000 pounds of rockfish. Let us suppose only one-half of these fish were females—potential egg layers. Statistics on the proclivity of these fish then enable us to state that they would have laid approximately 900,000,000 eggs. If only 1 percent of these eggs hatched and the young fish lived and reached maturity of about 2 pounds apiece, we would have had roughly 9,000,000 fish weighing some 18,000,000 pounds. Figured at the going market price of around 30 cents per pound, their progeny then would be worth some $5,400,000. Actually the price which this great catch of stripers brought was somewhere between forty and fifty thousand dollars at the maximum. If that isn't selling one's birthright for a mess of pottage we don't know the meaning of the word.

The netting of these tons of striped bass in the lower Potomac is a sad commentary on the lack of wisdom of the conservation departments of Maryland and Virginia, and imposes a strong feeling of nausea among sport anglers. We cannot find it in our heart to blame the commercial fishermen, stupid as they may be to kill the goose that lays their golden eggs. Regardless of their lack of perception in netting these fish, which in a short time would have spawned millions of eggs, they were within their legal rights under the present laws governing these waters. But we do blame the conservation departments of both States, and the short-sighted legislators who make the laws permitting the destruction of parent fish at this season of the year. If permitted to continue on any such scale, the species will eventually be destroyed, even as the sturgeon was which formerly inhabited these same waters and which suffered their fate through the same cause.

Indignation over laws permitting such a wholesale destruction of gravid striped bass is running high in angling circles. State Senator Charles W. Crowder, of Virginia, introduced a bill in the legislature of that State which would, if passed, have closed the seining season for rockfish from February 1 to May 31. After a 2-hour hearing before senate and house committees, it died aborning. Insofar as we know, there has been no further action taken.

Unquestionably, the early spring netting of spawning sport fish, such as the striped bass, should be prohibited. These wonderful fighters, whose natural spawning grounds lie in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, and whose productive efforts, if protected, would supply the whole Atlantic seaboard north of the Virginia capes with untold numbers of their progeny, affording not only millions of dollars income to thousands of people, but recreation and sport for the literally hundreds of thousands of anglers who pursue them with rod and reel, deserve a better fate at the hands of so-called conservationists. It astounds us that sport anglers, who numerically and in political power, when organized, far surpass the commercial fishermen, will not organize and put a stop to this sort of stupid waste. If all sportsmen's organizations and individual sportsmen would band together in this common cause, they could remedy the situation in short order.

We'd like it clearly understood that the issue is not one of commercial versus sport fishermen. It is purely a matter of commonsense conservation to preserve sufficient brood fish to perpetuate and increase the species for the benefit of all. The State of New Jersey set a good example recently when a bill to prohibit netting was passed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I suggest that he refer the matter to the Special Committee on Fish and Wildlife Conservation.

Mr. POTTS. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, HOUSE PRESS GALLERY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 653) providing for an additional employee in the House Press Gallery (Rept. No. 2267) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective May 1, 1948, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House compensation for the employment of an additional Assistant Superintendent, House Press Gallery, at the basic rate of $2,400 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOMEN'S SPIRITUAL APPROACH TO THE SOLUTION OF WORLD PROBLEMS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and also to have permission to print the prayer we have just heard in such form as may be most useful to the membership. There have been many requests for copies of this prayer that we heard this morning, and I should like to have permission to have it printed.

The SPEAKER. It will be printed in the RECORD of today's proceedings.

Mrs. BOLTON. It will be printed in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I would like to have it reprinted.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will have to take that matter up with the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mrs. BOLTON. Unless I reprint it myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman can do that.

Mrs. BOLTON. I tried to get information on that, Mr. Speaker, but was unable to get information as to what the cost would be.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Ohio can print it at her own expense under the general rule with regard to reprinting matter that appears in the RECORD, and can have as many copies printed as she desires.

Mrs. BOLTON. There have already been requests for some thousand copies.

The SPEAKER. If the gentlewoman wants to have a large number printed, she would have to take it up with the Joint Committee on Printing and the Committee on House Administration.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the usual fashion?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Ohio may address the House for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of the Congress of the United States we have had a prayer delivered by an ordained minister who is a woman.

I commend to you the thoughts in that prayer.

We women feel very strongly that we cannot agree with men in their assumption that the only solution for differences between nations is war. We believe with every atom of our being that the might of the spiritual forces of the universe can defeat any material force regardless of apparent strength. We who know the power of the creativeness of the Almighty believe that war need not be.

The women of these United States and women all over the world are asking that men join with them in a joint effort to draw upon the strength and the intel-

ligence of the Eternal and Almighty God that these great spiritual forces may have opportunity to make themselves felt.

It is significant indeed that for the first time in our history a woman's prayer has opened a session. Annalee Stewart has expressed in sincere and beautiful language the woman's inmost desire for this country and for the world. Let us indeed refuse to draw down upon mankind death in all its most horrible forces. Let us rather draw upon the great stream of life which carries peace upon its tide.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain developments of the last day or so, many Members have asked me about the program of the House for the balance of this week and for next week. These inquiries that have come to me lead me to make this brief statement.

It is our plan to proceed with the program already announced, which means that today we will undertake to dispose of the independent offices appropriation bill, and then proceed with consideration of the displaced-persons bill, after which for the balance of the week we shall consider measures having to do with extension of the farm program, extension of commodity credit, extension of social security, and Revenue Code provisions, and other rules.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that by the end of next week we can very well conclude the consideration of all of the measures that we ought to pass and that we can afford to pass. If measures are reported and rules granted we can next week take up the matter of selective service, the housing bill, and other bills which may be determined upon. Also, it is likely we will have some suspensions Monday.

I see no reason for the House to do anything other than to continue with its program in the hope that we may conclude action on the measures before us by June 19.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of and at the conclusion of any previous orders heretofore agreed to, I may address the House for 30 minutes on the subject Pertinent Observations on Communism, Socialism, and Capitalism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES AT KEFLAVIK AIRPORT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter from an Air Force officer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the consideration of the bill for Air Force installations in Iceland, I took strong exception to the $10,000,000 expenditure therein authorized. An Air Force officer stationed for 10 months at Keflavik agrees with my position and I include his June 1 letter as a part of my remarks:

JUNE 1, 1948.

The Honorable ELLSWORTH B. BUCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the Staten Island Advance your comments regarding the expenditures of funds for various items at the air base at Keflavik, Iceland.

Having been an officer stationed at Meeks Field, Keflavik, Iceland, for a period of 10 months, I am fully acquainted with the field conditions. I agree with you that it is a waste of funds that could be put to better use.

There is located at Keflavik the following:

One 40 x 100 Quonset hut, which was used as a basketball court and movie, and which also had a stage.

One 40 x 100 Quonset hut in the town of Keflavik (Red Cross recreation hut).

One 40 x 150 Quonset hut used as a mess hall (seating 700 men at a mea!).

One complete hospital with all necessary buildings such as showers, kitchen, wards, operating rooms, quarters for personnel, heating system, water system and electrical system. This is located approximately 3 to 5 miles from the field.

One 16 x 40 Quonset hut used as a chapel, altar and all complete.

One officers' recreation and mess complete with bar, fireplace, kitchen, mess room and recreation rooms (2) all with inlaid battleship linoleum.

One Hotel De Guik with fireplace and approximately 20 private rooms for personnel flying through and staying overnight.

In and around the field are approximately 400 huts that could be put to use. Judging from other huts I seen up over a period of 5 years, those above should be in good condition.

True the field will need maintenance but by no stretch of the imagination are the items for building needed.

I hope that the above information will be of use to you in preventing this waste of funds.

If this information is used I would prefer that my name not be used.

Very truly yours.

END THE PARTITION OF IRELAND

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, a delegation of women from New York and Philadelphia today presented to you a petition signed by 300,000 Americans of Irish descent. The petition urges that the President and the Congress of the United States should make such necessary representations to England as will bring about the end of the partition in Ireland.

The petition entitled "End the Partition of Ireland," reads as follows:

To the President and the Congress of the United States of America:

This petition, presented under rights reserved in the Federal Constitution, recites:

That countless thousands of American citizens of Irish birth or blood are smarting under the indignity of the forcible partition of Ireland by England;

That England instituted this partition under impelling threat of superior force;

That England, by subsidy and otherwise, has maintained this partition against the voice of the overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland;

That since the days of President Washington the Irish have been a potent force in the upbuilding, the maintenance, and the defense of the United States of America;

That the United States of America now has the undoubted power, and merely by the application of economic sanctions, to require that England cease the continuing wrong which she is inflicting upon Ireland.

Wherefore, it is hereby petitioned that the President and the Congress of the United States of America make such necessary representations to England as will bring about the end of the partition of Ireland.

This petition bears the signatures, as I have said, of 300,000 Americans of Irish descent. It could well have borne the signatures of 3,000,000 Americans with equal ease, since there are some 30,000,000 Americans today who trace their ancestry back to the Emerald Isle. However, these names are appended to this petition as a token of the thought and desire of all Americans of Irish descent, as well as of all people who are interested in the God-given right of freedom and the recognized right of small nations to their freedom and independence.

The right of Ireland to freedom and independence has been denied through the centuries by the imposition of the force of British arms. Yet despite this armed subjugation of the Irish people, they have remained a nation distinct and separate, and not one of the efforts of their English conquerors has been able to change the character and nature of the Irish. Smarting under the yoke of British domination, the Irish have never ceased to fight to regain their freedom, nor to petition the British for their complete liberation. In fact, during the First World War the British promised that Ireland would be granted their independence following the end of hostilities. A home-rule bill had been passed by the British Parliament prior to the first war, but its effects were suspended as a result of the outbreak of hostilities. Then on the promise of freedom following that war, 300,000 Irish volunteered for service in that war, and suffered greater casualties than did the Belgian Army as a result. Despite these efforts and these solemn promises, the Irish nevertheless were denied their independence.

Following that war, England inaugurated the program of partition and cut off from the rest of Ireland, six of the nine counties of the Province of Ulster, and created out of them Northern Ireland, establishing therein a separate parliament and a separate government from the rest of Ireland, and keeping this new government subject to the

British Parliament and to British domination and control. Little wonder that during the recent war, the Irish could place but small confidence in any of the promises of England, and since Ireland was not subjected to attack at any time, she therefore declined to join with England in a fight to preserve the rights of small nations to their independence. Having been deceived once, Ireland wisely refused to be tricked a second time with empty promises. Moreover a small nation such as Ireland could offer little of herself in modern warfare, lacking as she does aircraft and munitions plants, and so would have had to receive complete armament from outside sources at the expense of the nations already engaged in that conflict.

The friction that has existed between the British people and the Irish can readily be eliminated and a spirit of friendship and good will be created between these peoples, if the English will but put an end to the forced occupancy of a part of Ireland and return to that nation the complete freedom and independence to which all of Ireland, not just a part, is entitled. It is on this account and for this purpose that so many Americans of Irish descent are making this appeal to the President and the Congress at this time. I am sure that a suggestion by our State Department to the British Government would bear great weight in bringing about an end to partition and a withdrawal of British troops from Ireland. With all the aid which this country is giving to the British, they would undoubtedly be in a receptive mood for any overture which the United States might properly make in this regard.

Throughout the centuries the economy of Ireland has been closely tied to that of Great Britain, and because of the location of the two countries, this is necessarily so. How much better it would be if that relation between the countries were to be placed upon a complete basis of amity and good will. This can only come to pass by the elimination of the division of this nation and the reunification of the entire 32 counties of Ireland; by the removal of the British control over the Belfast government; by the withdrawal of British troops and eliminating the secret police, known as B Specials; and finally by an abrogation of the Civil Authorities Act, under which the constitutional rights of the people in Northern Ireland are denied them.

In an effort to encourage the people of Ireland and to cooperate with them in their peaceful attempt to reunite all of Ireland into one undivided nation, this petition has been presented to the Speaker of the House today. This delegation of women has come to us as representatives of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, an organization which was created with the sole objective of aiding in bringing about a united Ireland. The American League for an Undivided Ireland was created as the result of a mass meeting of delegates from practically every important Irish organization in the United States, that meeting having been held in New York in November of 1947. Such organizations as the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Clan na Gael, the United Irish Counties Association of New York, Inc., the Gaelic League, the American Irish Historical Society, the Sean Oglaigh nah Eireann, the League for Irish Freedom of San Francisco, the Anti-Partition League of Philadelphia, the Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago, the Irish Cultural Society and others, all sent their delegates to the New York convention, and directed that the American League for an Undivided Ireland should carry on in their behalf the work of promoting an end to the partition of Ireland.

The delegation from the American League for an Undivided Ireland, which made the presentation of the petition this morning to the Speaker, consisted of the following persons:

Mrs. John Jerome Rooney, Mrs. Peter McDowell, Mrs. Anastasia Dowling, Mrs. J. Barron, and Mrs. Eileen McPeake, all from New York City.

Mrs. Rose McCrealy, Mrs. Evelyn Mooney, and Mrs. James Cregan from the city of Philadelphia.

Accompanying the ladies were Mr. Charles T. Rice, national vice president; Mr. Michael McGlynn, chairman of the publicity committee, and Mr. Sean Keating, chairman of the National Council of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, and Congressmen James J. Heffernan, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; Franck R. Havenner and Richard J. Welch, of San Francisco, Calif.

As American citizens they come before the Congress and present their petition asking that this Nation use its good offices in bringing about the unification of Ireland, so that at last the Irish people, one of the most ancient of all European nations, may once again take its rightful place as a free and independent republic amongst the democratic peoples of the world. The Congress through the President and the Department of State can do much to achieve this end and to right the wrong that has been perpetrated upon the Irish Nation during the past quarter of a century.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include letters and extraneous matter.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the minimum wage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, to the everlasting discredit of this, the Eightieth Congress, the minimum wage level still remains at 40 cents an hour, $16 a week, $832 a year, at a time when the cost of living is at the highest peak of our history. We have a yearly wage of $832 when, by the most meager of standards, $3,700 is required to maintain a family of four in a year's period.

Low wage standards, standards that will not support decent living conditions, are prevalent in many areas of the United States. Low wage rates, making for low levels of living, breed disease, malnutrition, illiteracy, low moral standards—all evils inherent in poverty. Is the Congress blind to these results and to the terrible impact they have on our social ideals and our economy?

Over one-half of our population is excluded from the benefits of the Fair Labor Standards Act, yet the tendency seems to be to narrow its scope rather than to expand it. An increase in the minimum wage at this time to 75 cents an hour, or $1,560 a year, would at least be realistic, although it would not remove the hardship of insufficient income. Further, an advance in minimum-wage rates, sanctioned by the Federal Government, would have the effect of forcing a corresponding advance for uncovered groups, thereby benefiting all low-wage groups.

No corporation, company, or individual has the right to exist upon the labor of underpaid workers. Why should they prosper thus? It is a moral question. Some will say that the employer will be forced out of business if forced to pay higher wages, but has he any right to be in business at the expense of the well-being of his employees and their families? Business or industry has a moral obligation to provide its employees with a living wage. A living wage for workmen is the burning issue.

If unitedly they cannot provide it for themselves, then the Government must aid. Our employees are far behind in this regard. Perhaps if we had a living wage for all wage earners, we would need have no fear of communism. It would starve for want of a fertile soil for its nourishment.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY RAISE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if this Congress adjourns on June 19, or recesses as the case may be, without taking action granting an adequate pay raise to Federal employees it will be failing in one of its most important obligations. Only Congress can relieve the present economic difficulties of the postal workers and other Government employees. It is our duty to do something about it.

I believe the average Member of Congress had high hopes that this matter would be adjusted long before these final busy days of the Eightieth Congress. More than 200 Members of this House either appeared personally before or presented statements to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service demanding approval of legislation to increase Federal worker's salaries. Most of these Members, as I did, urged an increase of not less than $800. Some of us appeared before a Senate committee recommending a $1,000 annual increase.

There is, therefore, a clear majority in this House who favor at least an $800 increase for postal employees and their fellow Federal workers. But it begins to look as though this will be another instance in which the will of the majority will not be considered.

I need not go into any argument in justification of a pay increase. The fact that so many Members have urged favorable action at this session is evidence individual Congressmen are aware of the needs of these faithful and deserving employees.

What then, holds up favorable action? Apparently the road block is the Republican policy committee.

The House will not have the opportunity to work its will on this legislation. If the Republican policy committee decides in its generosity that it will permit consideration of a salary-increase bill before we go home, it will be on the terms of the party committee. And what are the latest report on those terms—instead of an adequate increase to meet present high cost-of-living conditions they will offer a $400 raise to each postal employee and an average increase of $360 to the other groups of Federal employees.

The Republican policy committee makes those terms notwithstanding the fact the recommendations of the majority of the Members of Congress called for a minimum increase of $800, and notwithstanding the fact that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service recommended an increase of $585.

The Republican leadership tells the postal workers they can take the $400 increase "and like it."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the postal employees will take it but I am very certain they will not like it, any more than they have liked the "run-around" they have been given since the start of this session on the pay-raise issue.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I believe it proper now to determine what and who are holding up the bills providing Federal salary increases. Weeks and weeks ago your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, after exhaustive hearings, favorably reported bills providing increases in the salaries of post-office employees and other Federal employees. The amounts suggested were well below minimum amounts requested. These two bills have since been and are now before the Committee on Rules.

Under our system of majority party control, it is not at all difficult to trace and place responsibility for the failure of this House to have before it for consideration these meritorious measures. I was very disturbed a moment ago when the Republican floor leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], failed to mention among the bills to be considered before adjournment, salary increases for Federal employees. I sincerely hope it was an oversight on his part. There is, however, no escaping the fact that with power goes responsibility, and the Republican leadership has the power and responsibility to make it possible for this House to consider these measures before adjournment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not list all of the measures that would be considered. I said we had time to do all we ought to do and could afford to do.

Mr. LYLE. Yes; I understand. That is why I am disturbed. I do not know what the gentleman thinks about these bills and whether he thinks we ought to pass salary increases before we adjourn. The attitude of the Republican leadership on this vital question not only disturbs me, but millions of Federal employees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in Drew Pearson's column of yesterday I was named as one of the Members of Congress in opposition to the educational bill, as was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS]. Let me say that that is one of those damnable lies that has always been produced by Drew Pearson. I have no authority to tell the Members of this House who is going to bring that bill up. Before Mr. Pearson publishes any such misleading information he should first ask me or any one of these gentlemen that he has named as being against their bill, and ask us what our position is, which he has not done.

FLOODS IN WOODLAND, WASH.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram from the Washington State Association of County Commissioners.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, in the great Columbia River Valley flood tragedy which already has wrecked property damage estimated at $140,000,000, much has been said about the tragedy at Vanport, Oreg., where 4,000 homes which helped to house a city of 18,700 have been completely wrecked and demolished by the floodwaters.

Other cities along the river also have suffered great damage. I had a telegram from public officials of Woodland, Wash., town of 2,000 in the center of a rich agricultural and dairying area which estimated the damage in that town of 2,000 at almost $7,000,000.

The telegrams of these Woodland public officials read:

> Your telegrams received. Keep up the good work. Here is a more complete picture of the disaster. Present conservative estimates of our losses show $1,406,000 to governmental subdivisions, $5,253,000 to individuals and small businesses which is a staggering loss to our community of 2,000 people. We are writing off 58 farm homes and 110 other farm buildings as complete losses. All other farm homes and farm buildings partially damaged. Eighty percent of Woodland proper is in water. Seepage is a serious problem to the balance of the town. Engineers tell us that water will not be down from its present level for 2 or 3 weeks, which is rapidly making total losses out of present partial losses in both the town and the farming community. We feel that much more than loans will be required to relieve the desperate plight of our people.
>
> E. E. Glover, L. R. Chester, Cliff Thomas, Norton Rogers, C. A. Button, Dirk Kroon, Ted Wall, Sr., Hugh L. Jacobs, W. R. Meeker.

Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK:

In re our telephone conservation:

Though much of area still submerged, preliminary estimates by county engineers in Columbia flood area indicate total damage of nearly $3,000,000 to county roads, bridges, dikes, other public property under their supervision. Final total may be higher, but in any case damage is too great for county government to repair unaided.

Some of these roads and structures are on Federal-aid highway systems, others are not. But under Public Roads Administration, general administrative memorandum No. 317, which covers procedure for expenditures of emergency relief funds for reconstruction of flood damage, such funds are limited to use on roads, etc., which are on Federal systems.

Therefore it is imperative to Washington counties that appropriation for emergency funds remove this limitation on use, making equally eligible for aid roads on the systems and roads not on system. For precedent see section 7a, H. R. 2798, amendment to Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved July 13, 1943.

Also definition of "type of work eligible for emergency relief funds," paragraph 7, page 3, General Administrative Memorandum 317, needs to be changed since "excessive rainfall" is one of principal causes of damage, particularly in Yakima, Douglas, Chelan, Okanogan, Kittitas, and Whitman areas.

Detailed letter follows this wire to you, HORAN, and HOLMES. Thanks for your help in this vital matter.

R. C. WATTS,
Executive Secretary, Washington State Association of County Commissioners.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Friday it will be remembered we had a very busy session, which extended into a late session. We adjourned about 9:30 p. m. Among the bills passed on that day and late in the session was one which was very important, and I know it was of great interest to every Member of the House of Representatives. We passed that bill under circumstances which prevented any debate on it. I refer to the bill that increased old-age pensions by $5 per month, and increased the blind pension by $5 per month, and also an increase of $3 for dependent children. This matter came before the House as an amendment to a bill that had passed the House and that had passed the Senate on last Friday. That bill was one considered and reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It was a bill that defined provisions of the law with reference to some social-security legislation. It was known as the Gearhart bill. This bill had been given much consideration by the Ways and Means Committee and had, of course, passed the House. I want the membership of the House to know that the adoption of this amendment in that bill was a matter that was deemed very expedient at the time. There was no intention to shut off debate. The Committee on Ways and Means had at different times given consideration to the matter of raising these pensions and I think would soon have introduced a bill to provide for such increases. But in the stress of circumstances the committee had not been able to reach it. Increasing these benefits by $5 is very important to the groups that I have mentioned, and is a matter in which I am sure every Member of the House is very much interested. I dare say that every Member would have approved the action taken in bringing the matter up as quickly as possible just as was done by the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee last Friday. I am glad that these increases have been made, and I hope the President will approve the bill as amended.

PALESTINE—THE UN TRUCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, according to the radio early this morning the Arabs and Jews in Palestine have both accepted the United Nations mediator's truce terms. Assuming the truce news to be correct, it confirms what many of us have been saying here for months—that British policy and British support maintained and could stop the Palestine conflict. If there is a truce I offer two suggestions: First, that an Anglo-American commission of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergy be immediately put together and dispatched to the Holy Land to inspect and report on damage to the religious shrines and to take measures to avoid further destruction; second, that in the ensuing negotiations the President and the State Department should follow an American policy of justice, not an invalidated British policy of appeasement and intrigue, by insisting on respect for Israel's independence and integrity as the only way to attain a real Jewish national home.

I appeal to the innate decency and the love of liberty and justice of the British people to hold their government in line—they are noted for their forebearance, here is a chance to show it. The words of their Ambassador here, Sir Oliver Franks, offering cooperation, are a happy augury. The United Nations is on the threshold of its greatest achievement if it can settle the Palestine conflict. Let the Anglo-American peoples act jointly to do it now.

DISPOSING OF LANDS ON THE CABAZON, AUGUSTINE, AND TORRES-MARTINEZ INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6457) to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations. This bill was on the Consent Calendar yesterday and was objected to, I feel through a misapprehension, because I discovered that the Members were reading the original draft of the bill and not the bill which was before us on yesterday. I have cleared this matter with the objector who objected to the consideration of the bill on yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, upon application therefor filed by any holder of allotted lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, or Torres-Martenez Indian Reservations, to issue to such holder a patent in fee to such lands.

(b) In any case in which any such allotted lands are nonirrigable and there are situated on the same reservation irrigable lands which are in tribal ownership, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, with the consent of the holder of such allotted lands, to forthwith issue to such holder a patent in fee to an equal acreage of such irrigable lands in exchange for the allotted lands of such holder, after which fee patents shall be issued for such lands as provided for in subsection (a).

SEC. 2. (a) With the consent of the respective tribes affected, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell, within 2 years from the date of approval of this act, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, all tribal lands upon the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martenez Indian Reservations, including all lands accepted by the Secretary in exchange for allotted lands under subsection (b) of the first section of this act. Such land shall be sold in 40-acre parcels, and no individual, corporation, cooperative, or association, shall be permitted to purchase more than one parcel.

(b) The proceeds of the sale under subsection (a) of this section of tribal lands on any reservation shall be distributed per capita to the Indians of such reservations living on the date of enactment of this act, as soon as practicable after such sale.

(c) Any of the lands described in subsection (a) of this section which, in the opinion of the Secretary are unsuitable for cultivation, shall, with the approval of the tribe affected, be appraised and sold at not less than the appraised value, by the Secretary to the Coachella Valley County Water District, within 2 years from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the first section of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is directed, in any case in which an allottee of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine or Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations is deceased, to determine the heirs of such allottee and to divide such lands among the heirs so determined in accordance with their respective interests: *Provided*, That any case in which the Secretary determines that, by reason of the number of such heirs or the size of such interest, division is impracticable, he shall sell such lands at public auction, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, and shall distribute the proceeds thereof to such heirs.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Martenez" and insert "Martinez."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "a", insert the word "trust", and after the word "patent", strike out the words "in fee."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "with" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (c), and with."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "Martenez" and insert "Martinez."

Page 3, line 5, strike out all of section 3 and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the first section of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is directed, in any case in which an allottee of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, or Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations is deceased, to proceed with the probating and division of such allottee's land estate in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 855): *Provided*, That in any case in which the Secretary determines that, by reason of the number of heirs or the size of interest, division is impracticable, he shall sell such lands, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, and shall distribute the proceeds thereof in accordance with the provisions of such act of June 25, 1910."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 1, line 7, delete the period after the word "lands" and insert a comma and add the following: "free from any incumbrance created or incurred by the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 2, at line 17, after the word "parcel", delete the period and insert a semicolon and the words "provided that any member of the tribe whose lands are sold pursuant to this section shall have a prior right to purchase such parcels."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Are the amendments agreeable to the committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. They are, Mr. Speaker.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. HART asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

SUPPLEMENTAL INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 651 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived, and it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order which might otherwise be made against H. R. 6829, the supplemental independent offices appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1949. It also waives points of order against amendments to the bill which may be offered from the floor by direction of the Committee on Appropriations.

The Appropriations Committee has included language in the bill to terminate the War Assets Administration as of August 31, 1948, and to transfer the functions of that agency to other agencies of the Federal Government which are equipped to administer them. This provision was included in the bill for two reasons: First, to reduce the cost of disposing of surplus property, and, secondly, to expedite its disposition. At present, the cost of disposing of surplus war property is 59 percent of the proceeds the Government realizes from such sales. These costs can be reduced materially by transferring the functions of the War Assets Administration to other Government agencies which are already equipped and staffed to handle them.

This bill is a part of the effort that has been put forth by the Republican Congress to eliminate duplications and overlapping among Government bureaus. We all realize that any attempt in this direction is necessarily legislation by its very nature. But it is legislation which the American people have demanded ever since the mushrooming growth of the Federal Government started 16 years ago. Unfortunately, there are those who would obstruct legislative proposals of this kind, and a single objection could prevent consideration of this important section of the bill. By waiving points of order against the bill, this rule permits the membership of this House to decide on each provision of the bill solely on its merits.

During this session and the last session of Congress, the Appropriations Committee, and its members have earned the respect, and the confidence of nearly every Member of this House. The Appropriations Committee has recognized, and eliminated many of the inefficient and expensive functions of the Government Bureaus. In order to accomplish this task, they have had to take the bull by the horns. With the cooperation of the majority party of the House, the Appropriations Committee has eliminated a number of wasteful functions formerly performed by the Federal Government, and has done a remarkable job in safeguarding the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I would like to take this opportunity to praise the efforts in this direction of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, our colleague the gentleman from New York, Congressman JOHN TABER, and the other members of the committee. By adopting this resolution, the Members of this House can express their willingness to cooperate in eliminating wasteful functions of the Government.

Under this rule the provisions of this bill stand or fall on their own merits. There is nothing about the rule which could be objectionable to any Member who believes in the American principle of majority rule, and I urge you all to vote for its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any opposition to this rule. I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on our side we are in favor of the rule and we are anxious to facilitate consideration of the bill. I have no requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 19½, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 21, 23, 24, 34, 35, and 36, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (e), (g), and (i) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft and the objects specified in the paragraph immediately following the caption "Public Health Service" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, $1,115,000, which amount shall be in addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere for the same purposes and shall be available for transfer to the appropriation 'Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth,' in such amounts as the Surgeon General may determine."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendand insert "$36,122,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,455,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$235,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,694,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$818,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11 and 25.

The Senate recedes from its amendment to the title.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15, 37, 38, and 39 relate to the transfer, proposed by the House, of the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

The Senate has receded from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 37, 38, and 39, and amendment No. 11 is reported to the House in disagreement. The managers have agreed that the managers on the part of the House will offer, in the House, a motion to recede from disagreement and concur with the amendment of the Senate with amendments.

The effect of the action on the various amendments in the conference and the motion of the managers is to transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency and to provide for the administration of that Service by the Bureau of Employment Security under the jurisdiction of the Social Security Administration within the Federal Security Agency rather than as an independent bureau in such agency as originally proposed by the House; to appropriate $130,000,000 for grants to States for the combined operation instead of $123,000,000 as proposed by the House and $136,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and to appropriate $5,754,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security instead of $5,312,000 as proposed by the House and a combined total of $6,196,671 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount allowed for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security, $5,754,000, it is intended that $4,754,000 shall be for the division having jurisdiction over the employment service (of which $2,265,000 is specifically earmarked for the Veterans Employment Service and $495,000 is intended to defray the cost of the Farm Placement Service) and $1,000,000 shall be for the division having jurisdiction of the unemployment compensation system. The cost of housekeeping services and other common operations for the consolidated bureau which will serve both divisions will be charged to these allotments in such proportionate manner as represents the value of services rendered.

Amendments Nos. 6, 19½, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 40, and 41 make changes in section numbers, titles, and formal language to conform to action on remainder of the bill.

Amendment No. 7 strikes out language proposed to be inserted by the Senate to institute a scholarship program for training of doctors.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $9,028,000 for mental health activities, as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,278,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9 authorizes contracts in connection with mental health activities in the amount of $2,300,000, instead of $2,720,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $1,115,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $700,000, as proposed by the House, for emergency disease and sanitation investigations and control in the Territory of Alaska, and permits the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to carry out the program either through direct operations of the Service or by grants to the Territorial government or both such methods as he may determine to be in the best interests of the government.

Amendment No. 12 appropriates $1,350,000 for the Bureau of Public Assistance instead of $1,246,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,417,993, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 appropriates $36,122,000 for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance instead of $36,244,300, as proposed by the House, and $36,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17 allocates $67,000 from the trust fund to the Office of the Commissioner of Social Security instead of $55,000, as proposed by the House, and $80,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 appropriates $1,455,000 for the Children's Bureau instead of $1,385,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,524,737, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates $235,000 for the office of the Commissioner of Social Security, instead of $166,000, as proposed by the House, and $302,500, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates $1,694,000, for the office of the Administrator instead of $1,533,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,855,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21 strikes a proposal, by the House, to increase the salary of the Administrator.

Amendment No. 22 appropriates $818,700 for the Division of Service Operations instead of $815,000, as proposed by the House, and $822,418, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25, authorizing transfer of funds instead of a direct appropriation, is reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer, in the House, a motion to recede from disagreement and concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 31 restores a section, proposed by the House, authorizing transfers among certain appropriations, and deletes a section, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the Administrator to make transfers related to consolidations of functions in the office of the Administrator. The section proposed by the Senate is identical with a section included in the 1948 appropriation act and sought to be included, but denied by the House, in the appropriation bill for 1949. The managers on the part of the Senate and the House will not look with favor upon any consolidations and transfers, undertaken under authority of the 1948 act since the hearings in the House Committee on Appropriations on the 1949 bill, which are not in conformity with the 1949 appropriation act as finally passed by the Congress.

Amendments Nos. 34, 35, and 36 strike from the bill language proposed by the House, to forbid employment of members of labor organizations which are not in compliance with the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KEEFE. The thing which is effected in this conference report in which the House is most interested is the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Administration and the consolidation of that agency with the Bureau of Employment Security and the necessary consolidation and reorganization that was proposed by the House at the time this bill originally passed.

The Senate in passing upon this bill completely changed the entire purpose that was involved in the passage of the House bill. In the conference the Senate receded, with this agreement on the part of the House: Instead of setting up in the Federal Security Agency a new bureau, the Bureau of Employment Security, handling unemployment compensation and the United States Employment Service handling the employment services of the Nation, instead of setting up a new bureau there, we agreed finally to have the consolidation take place in the Social Security Administration so that the line of authority of the consolidation will be through Mr. Altmeyer, the Social Security Administrator, to Mr. Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator.

In connection with the situation it will be observed that for this combined operation the House had appropriated $123,000,000. The other body increased that appropriation for administrative expenses to about $136,000,000. The net result of the conference agreement was that $130,000,000 was appropriated for grants to carry out this program.

Other than that, the changes relate just to conciliation as between the House and the Senate in the matter of appropriations where they had increased the House estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the two sections of the bill as it passed the House for the appropriations for fiscal year 1949 for the Labor Department and the Federal Security Administration. After spending a day in conference with the other body on Monday we have come up with this conference report and with one major disagreement, although it is only a major disagreement with the conferees

on the part of the House and the Senate. Those of us on the minority side in the House do not like the conference report as it is brought back for your consideration this afternoon.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations has just stated, one of the principal pieces of legislation that we have in this appropriation bill is the combining of the USES and the UC into one agency under Mr. Altmeyer of the Social Security Administration in the Federal Security Administration. During general debate on this bill when it was before the House I attempted to have this stricken from the bill, for one reason because I am getting sick and tired of every appropriation bill that comes before the House having to go to the Rules Committee to be made in order because it contains legislation. I do not believe more than two or three appropriation bills have been presented to the House this year that were not accompanied by a rule waiving points of order on legislation. Oh, I know there are other circumstances where they claim that this is in the form of a limitation, but whether it is a limitation or not it is a limitation in the form of legislation on an appropriation bill.

This matter of importance that the chairman of the subcommittee says is in this bill, the combining of these two agencies into one, taking the United States Employment Service out of the Department of Labor and putting it into the Social Security Administration is something that was thoroughly debated by the House under the reorganization plan of the President that was sent here last March. It was thoroughly debated in the other body and turned down. As far as I am concerned the reasoning that was good then is good today.

Every Member of Congress who spoke on the reorganization plan of the President asked this body to turn it down because we have appropriated $750,000 for the so-called Hoover Commission to investigate and go into the matter of the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. We have asked that commission to report not later than 10 days after next January to this body. I understand on good authority that the Brookings Institute is being paid now to make a thorough study of this combination of the two agencies that we are consolidating in this bill for the Hoover Commission. The Hoover Commission does not know at this time what it wants to do with these two agencies. I do not believe there will be any disagreement with the statement that we should agree the two should be combined but whether they should be combined in the Department of Labor or in the Federal Security Administration is the question and there is a great deal of thought being given to that at the present time by the Hoover Commission. If we as Members of Congress set up a committee for this specific purpose the least we can do is wait until we receive the report of that committee next January. That was the wish of this body only last February or March when it voted that way. That was the wish of the other body when it voted almost overwhelmingly against this reorganization plan under the principle and idea that the Hoover Commission can do a more thorough job than we can as members of a subcommittee on appropriations to make this so-called consolidation.

But that is not all that is in this bill. The budget estimates for grants to States for USES and UC were in the neighborhood of $145,000,000. The House allowed them $122,000,000 or $123,000,000 which was a cut of $22,000,000 or $23,000,000. The Senate allowed in the neighborhood of $133,000,000 or $134,000,000, which was still a cut of $10,000,000 over their budget for this year. We have finally agreed on a figure of $130,000,000.

The majority of the committee in conference has agreed to that, not the minority, because the minority did not go along with these agreements at all. In the face of their spending $133,000,000 last year and having to come to the Congress for a supplemental appropriation bill, we still reduce them. I thought it was the idea of Congress to get away from all these deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills that come in here year after year. Here we find one of the most important agencies of our Government that spent three or four million dollars more last year than we are going to allow them in this conference report, which forces them to come back here for a supplemental bill for three or four million dollars. I say that is an invitation to them to come back for a deficiency appropriation or to make a request for another supplemental appropriation. In my line of reasoning, that is not good government.

This reminds me of what I said on the floor 2 or 3 months ago that practically every appropriation bill that has been before the House this year has been treated much more fairly than has the appropriation for the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor was founded the year I was born, 35 years ago, by one of the most outstanding Republican Presidents you have ever had in this country. It was a Republican baby back in 1913 and it has developed into and has become now a division of government with Cabinet rank. However, in the last 5 or 6 years it seems as though there is a determined effort on the part of the Republican Party to do what they can to emasculate the Department of Labor because it has to do with labor in general. In the past 7 or 8 years you have been whittling down its appropriation year after year.

Last year, when this bill was before the committee, you cut it about 25 or 30 percent. This year you cut it 25 percent. Why, you even cut it 20 percent below what it was in the year 1948. You cannot name one other appropriation bill that has been brought before this Congress that has been cut so drastically as the Department of Labor appropriation bill. On the other hand, we find this very same concerted move to build up the Federal Security Administration in our country. I wonder just what the reason behind it is. Why, we even attempted in the House to make the Federal Security Administrator almost a Cabinet Member by raising his salary to $15,000. But that was cut out in the conference report because the Senate refused to go along with it. I think there is something behind this whole thing; that there is a reason for building up the Federal Security Administration, and in time you will find it to be one of the most powerful Government agencies that we have in existence. It will be one that will be almost uncontrolled, and then we will see what this House will do with it at that time if you cut down the Labor Department every year as you are doing. You will be saying to the country that you do not want the Labor Department to remain as a Cabinet position, but let it be swallowed up in the Federal Security Administration. That, in my opinion, is exactly what this House is coming to in the next 2, 3, or 4 years.

There is one other item in the report that the Senate receded on, and that was one of the smallest items in the entire bill. It has to do with the Women's Bureau. We are spending in the neighborhood of about $300,000 for the Women's Bureau, the only bureau in Government that has to do with the labor relations and the advancement of the cause of the women in this entire country, and here we find ourselves in a position where we are cutting out from under their feet the five or six regional offices that they have at the present time. In my opinion that is pretty small potatoes.

While we are appropriating three or four million dollars for the Children's Bureau in our country we are cutting out a measly sum of $50,000 or $60,000 from the Women's Bureau, it only being allowed $250,000 to take care of the welfare of some 16,000,000 or 17,000,000 women who are working in industry in our country at the present time. That is one of the things that I do not agree with.

Now, we had a lot to say about the Veterans' Reemployment Rights Division. I remember when the second supplemental bill was up that a statement was made by someone on the other side to the effect, Why, we have given the veterans everything they asked for. We did give the Veterans' Employment Services what they asked for in their budget this year. Last year we cut them about 30 or 40 percent. But, when we came back to the Veterans' Employment Rights Division of the Department of Labor, which is still a law of this Congress, a law that was passed by this Congress and is still in effect, this appropriation subcommittee decided to take away all its funds as of July 1 of this year. But the Senate committee gave back to the Veterans' Employment Rights Division practically what they asked for, in conference. They finally agreed on 50 percent of what they asked for in this coming fiscal year. Now there is one point in disagreement that affects every veteran that has enlisted in our armed services in the last 2 or 3 or 4 years; every veteran whose time was up in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who reenlisted at the time his enlistment was up. These are rights that were promised to them by this Congress. Now we are in effect taking away 50 percent of their rights by giving them 50 percent of the appropriation that they asked for for the Veterans' Employment Rights Division which now rests in the Department

of Labor. If the draft is passed in this next week, if selective service is reinstituted by this Congress, there is going to be more need then, because the same provisions that exist now will undoubtedly be written into that law and it will be necessary to have such a division as the Veterans' Reemployment Rights Division. I believe that the managers on the part of the House and the Senate are making a serious mistake in cutting down this appropriation by 50 percent, at a time we are considering to draft people into the services again for the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, for all practical purposes the Department of Labor is wiped out; it is left in name only.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is what it is coming to be. It is practically just what it is today. And, if we follow the same steps that we have followed and the same action that we have taken in the past 3 or 4 years, there will be no Department of Labor and there will be no man in the Labor Department of Cabinet rank. I am convinced that the Department of Labor will finally be swallowed up by the Federal Security Administration, and that it will be just another division, such as the Employment Security Division that we are going to have in the Social Security Administration.

I know that we have written into the report that the USES is not to lose its identity and that the Unemployment Compensation Commission is not to lose its identity. But at the same time we heard so much by the States people in this program—they had us so confused in our committee that at first when they appeared before our committee, they were all for this program as we have it at the present time. Two or three weeks later they were against it. I have it on pretty good authority that during the past week end, they have been convinced it is a pretty good thing. So three times in 3 or 4 months, they have changed their minds. I doubt if there is a person in this body who really knows where we are at the present time, so far as concerns these two agencies being consolidated into the Federal Security Administration.

Mr. Altmeyer is going to be head of the Social Security Administration. I think he is a very, very able man. But I remember when this proposition was put up to him—this was his baby—this is what he wanted because if he did not get it this way, he said before our committee that he might as well give up his job because his job did not amount to anything since what he had left, taking the UC out of his administration would not leave him anything. I understand now that he is all for it. He should be for it because it saves his job and makes a bigger fellow out of him and gives him a bigger department of government to look after, which is something that he wanted right along.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I will vote against this conference report. I could not sign it, with all deference to the work that has been done and all the hearings that have been held by the subcommittee. I am not satisfied with the amounts given. I do not believe they are enough to effect good, efficient administration by these various departments. I would rather cut out a department by legislation any time rather than reduce its appropriations in an attempt to make it incompetent and make it the laughing stock of the country. That is what you are doing if you adopt the conference report. I personally cannot vote for it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, you will note that none of the members of the minority conferees on the part of the House affixed their signatures to this conference report on H. R. 5728, the regular Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill for 1949.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Just so that there may be no mistake, the statement made by the gentleman is true, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] did not affix their signatures. But let it be understood that the two Democratic Senators who were members of the conference committee affixed their signatures to the conference report and that you two are the only ones who failed to sign it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything about the Senators. I said that none of the conferees on the part of the House on the minority side signed the conference report, and I stand by that statement.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and I attended every minute of the conferences and listened with disgust to the results of the deliberations in which the majority conference members of both the House and the other body decimated the Department of Labor; in which they shamefully cut items such as the one for mental-health activities and the one for the Bureau of Labor Statistics so that the American public will be blindfolded as far as finding out what is happening to the cost of living. They are following the usual pattern laid out by the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. The principal lobbying in behalf of this silly reorganization and transfer of the United States Employment Service from the Labor Department to the Federal Security Agency was by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in behalf of big business. Floods of telegrams have come into my office in the past week, each from a chamber of commerce urging the transfer, but none from anyone on behalf of labor. This is a concerted effort, as pointed out a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to break down organized labor and to decimate and annihilate the Department of Labor. I must admit that the gentleman from Wisconsin and the majority members of his committee have labored diligently since the present majority party took over the leadership of the Eightieth Congress, and they certainly have succeeded in hamstringing practically every item in the Labor Department-Social Security Agency appropriation bill which is for the benefit of organized labor and for the benefit of the little man in this country.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out an item in this conference report for mental health activities. That is an item with which most of the Members of the House should be concerned. We all know of the alarming increase in mental disease and know that more, not less, must be done at the Federal level if we are to cope with it. This House voted at the time H. R. 6355 was originally before it, the sum of $10,278,000 for the mental health program. Now, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] the conferees on the part of the House have cut the item to $9,028,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not yield at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. That is the most unfair statement I have ever heard on this floor.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not yield. I reiterate my statement. It was the gentleman who suggested that the House recede. He has all the time. He has called this conference report up without giving the committee members on this side of the aisle an opportunity even to read it. It was brought up this morning with about 5 minutes' notice although on yesterday the gentleman advised me it would not be called up until this afternoon. It was not more than 5 minutes from the time the report was first handed to me by the Clerk that the gentleman from Wisconsin called up the report for action on this floor.

The majority conferees have done a meat-ax job on activities of the Office of Education; on activities of the Women's Bureau; on the work of the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights; and on the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, even though General Motors and every newspaper in the country recognizes the value of the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

They have drastically cut the Bureau of Labor Standards, and every other item in the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency appropriation bills to which the United States Chamber of Commerce is opposed.

Only yesterday afternoon we had before us another chamber of commerce matter, the District of Columbia sales tax. I do not believe there were a half dozen Members on the majority side of the aisle who voted to oppose that District sales-tax bill. Wait until we see the job the chamber of commerce does on public housing. We have all heard about the monstrosity called a housing bill that is going to be brought out on this floor as a result of the hearings on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. It now appears the majority party considers slum-clearance projects socialistic and to be avoided. Therefore, I expect the majority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency are

not going to permit the American people to have a sorely needed public-housing bill.

The same applies to appropriations for the European relief program. Remember what the majority party did to those appropriations last Friday night? It is just too bad we did not have a roll call and a permanent record to see where everyone stood on the action which the next day made Stalin and his red Fascists so gleeful.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the adoption of this conference report as well as the conference report on the companion bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency for the reason that the amounts allowed them are insufficient and unfair.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is not necessary for me to answer the snarling harangue you have just heard in the well on this bill. I have been subjected to that ever since the gentleman from New York has been a member of this committee. But I am astounded at the last language that he employs. This conference report in its printed form came to me exactly at the same time that it came to him. The gentleman well knows that the Printing Office was bogged down last night. You did not get your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until late. I did not get it until the same time that the gentleman got it. He had the same notice that I had.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield.

I am amazed at this attempt to drag in all the old red herrings of politics into this situation. Ever since this bill has been on the floor we have heard the same line of chatter from the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. The fact of the matter is, this represents a compromise between the House and Senate action, as you all know. The two Senators who sat on this conference signed their names, Senator MCKELLAR and Senator RUSSELL, but the two irreconcilables on the House committee refused at all times to sign anything or to do anything that would not accord with the wishes of those to whom they are subservient. You have heard that expression here about the chambers of commerce. I received hundreds of telegrams from people all over the country supporting the action of this Congress who have no connection with chambers of commerce. Every governor in this Union favors the action that we have taken. Every State administrator favors the action that we have taken; and the gentlemen who stand out as recalcitrant at all times stand alone in their position with the exception of the little few whom they have associated with them on the other side.

Let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I was simply astounded that the gentleman from Rhode Island would seek to drag into this debate the charge that we have done something to the veteran. Just think of it. We have in this bill that originally came to us a proposal to continue the veterans' reemployment rights division. That was transferred to the Department of Labor from the Selective Service organization when that went out of business. Now, the gentleman knows just as well as I do that there is absolutely no function at the present time for that outfit to perform. Unfortunately the Committee on the Armed Services has not brought in legislation to repeal that bill. I understood all the time that they had that legislation. The only reason they did not do it is because they thought it was unnecessary; the thing expired as a matter of law. Every man who was taken into the armed services under the Selective Service Act in World War II has been retired long ago, and if he has any veterans' employment rights he has exercised them a long time ago. There are 3,300 officers scattered throughout the country who can advise any veteran as to his employment rights. All this outfit can do is to make a recommendation to the United States District Attorney in any district in the United States who, after all, is charged under the law with the responsibility for protecting the employment rights of a veteran.

The gentleman well knows that and his talk is so far removed from the facts that it has no relation to the situation whatsoever and is stuck in here to try to inject a note of sour, measly, dirty politics that ought not to be injected into this situation when we are trying to consider a matter that affects the welfare of the people of this country in trying to give to the people of this country a sound administration of a function of government that is supported by the governors of every State in this Union.

I wish I had the whole suitcase full of telegrams that have come to me from people who know what they are talking about. This proposal has the support of all the people who know anything about it. The unfortunate part is that the gentlemen on the minority do not know too much about what this situation is that is involved here but they can make a lot of dirty, nasty, political cracks and try to make it appear that the gentleman from Wisconsin is trying to destroy the Department of Labor. If there has been any destruction of the Labor Department it has been the result of the action of the President of the United States in his reorganization programs that have heretofore taken place and not because of the action of the Congress of the United States or the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 96, noes 30.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS). Obviously, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 137, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—228

Allen, Calif.	Gallagher	Meyer
Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Michener
Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	Miller, Conn.
	Gavin	Miller, Md.
Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Gillette	Mitchell
	Gillie	Morton
Andrews, N. Y.	Goff	Muhlenberg
Angell	Goodwin	Mundt
Arends	Gossett	Murray, Wis.
Arnold	Graham	Nicholson
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	Nodar
Bakewell	Griffiths	Norblad
Banta	Gross	O'Hara
Barrett	Gwinn, N. Y.	O'Konski
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne, Iowa	Patterson
Beall	Hagen	Phillips, Calif.
Bender	Hale	Plumley
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Potter
Bennett, Mo.		Potts
Bishop	Hand	Poulson
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Ramey
Boggs, Del.	Harvey	Rankin
Bolton	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Bradley	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Bramblett	Hess	Rees
Brehm	Hill	Reeves
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Rich
Buck	Hoeven	Riehlman
Buffett	Hoffman	Rizley
Bulwinkle	Holmes	Rogers, Mass.
Burke	Hope	Rohrbough
Butler	Javits	Ross
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenison	Russell
Camp	Jenkins, Ohio	Sadlak
Canfield	Jenkins, Pa.	Sanborn
Case, N. J.	Jennings	Sarbacher
Case, S. Dak.	Jensen	Schwabe, Mo.
Chadwick	Johnson, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Scott, Hardie
Chiperfield	Jones, Wash.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Church	Jonkman	
Clason	Judd	Scrivner
Clevenger	Kean	Seely-Brown
Coffin	Kearney	Shafer
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Corbett	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Cotton	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Coudert	Kunkel	Snyder
Cravens	Landis	Stefan
Crawford	Latham	Stevenson
Crow	LeCompte	Stockman
Curtis	LeFevre	Stratton
Dague	Lemke	Sundstrom
Davis, Ga.	Lewis, Ky.	Taber
Davis, Wis.	Lewis, Ohio	Talle
Dawson, Utah	Lichtenwalter	Taylor
Devitt	Lodge	Tibbott
D'Ewart	Love	Tollefson
Dolliver	McCowen	Towe
Dondero	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Doughton	McDonough	Vorys
Durham	McDowell	Vursell
Eaton	McGarvey	Wadsworth
Ellis	McGregor	Weichel
Elsaesser	McMahon	Welch
Elston	McMillen, Ill.	Wheeler
Engel, Mich.	Mack	Wigglesworth
Engle, Calif.	MacKinnon	Wilson, Ind.
Fellows	Macy	Wolcott
Fenton	Maloney	Wolverton
Flannagan	Martin, Iowa	Wood
Fletcher	Mason	Woodruff
Foote	Mathews	Youngblood
Fuller	Meade, Ky.	
Fulton	Merrow	

NAYS—137

Abbitt	Brown, Ga.	Crosser
Abernethy	Bryson	Deane
Albert	Buchanan	Delaney
Allen, La.	Burleson	Domengeaux
Andrews, Ala.	Cannon	Donohue
Bates, Ky.	Carroll	Dorn
Battle	Celler	Douglas
Beckworth	Chapman	Eberharter
Bell	Chelf	Evins
Bland	Colmer	Fallon
Boggs, La.	Combs	Feighan
Bonner	Cooley	Fernandez
Brooks	Cooper	Fogarty
Brophy	Cox	Folger

Forand	Klein	Price, Fla.
Garmatz	Lanham	Price, Ill.
Gary	Lea	Priest
Gordon	Lesinski	Rains
Gore	Lucas	Rayburn
Gorski	Lyle	Redden
Granger	Lynch	Regan
Grant, Ala.	McCormack	Richards
Gregory	McMillan, S. C.	Riley
Hardy	Madden	Rivers
Harris	Mahon	Rogers, Fla.
Hart	Manasco	Rooney
Havenner	Mansfield	Sabath
Hays	Marcantonio	Sadowski
Hébert	Mills	Sasscer
Hedrick	Monroney	Sikes
Heffernan	Morgan	Smathers
Hobbs	Morris	Somers
Holifield	Morrison	Spence
Huber	Multer	Stanley
Hull	Murdock	Teague
Isacson	Norrell	Thomas, Tex.
Jackson, Wash.	Norton	Thompson
Jarman	Pace	Trimble
Jones, Ala.	Passman	Vinson
Jones, N. C.	Patman	Walter
Karsten, Mo.	Peterson	Whitten
Kelley	Philbin	Williams
Kennedy	Pickett	Wilson, Tex.
Keogh	Poage	Winstead
Kilday	Powell	Worley
Kirwan	Preston	

NOT VOTING—65

Barden	Harless, Ariz.	Nixon
Blatnik	Harrison	O'Brien
Bloom	Hartley	O'Toole
Boykin	Hendricks	Peden
Buckley	Horan	Pfeifer
Busbey	Jackson, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Ploeser
Carson	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Rockwell
Clippinger	Kee	St. George
Courtney	Kefauver	Scoblick
Cunningham	Kersten, Wis.	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	King	Short
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	Lane	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Larcade	Stigler
Elliott	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	Lusk	Twyman
Fisher	McConnell	Vail
Hall, Leonard W.	Meade, Md.	West
Halleck	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Harrison against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Phillips of Tennessee for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Carson for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Dirksen for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mrs. Lusk against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Peden against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Twyman for, with Mr. Courtney against.

Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Nixon for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Harless of Arizona against.

Mr. Rockwell for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Murray of Tennessee against.

Messrs. STANLEY, ALBERT, BEALL, BONNER, BROOKS, WINSTEAD, and REDDEN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Beginning on page 8, line 19, strike out the balance of page 8, all of pages 9, 10, and 11, down to and including line 3 on page 12.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the language of the House amended to read as follows:

"BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY (SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION)

"Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants to the several States (including Alaska and Hawaii) in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49–491), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. III), including, upon the request of any State, the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, $130,000,000, of which not to exceed $675,000 shall be available to the Federal Security Administrator for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia and for use in carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in Puerto Rico: *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, prior to July 1, 1950: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 5 (a) or section 6 of the act of June 6, 1933, or in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Federal Security Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the act of June 6, 1933, and with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Federal Security Agency and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

"In carrying out the provisions of said act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall apply.

"Reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen: For payments to seamen as authorized by title XIII of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. XIII), $750,000.

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $5,754,000, of which $2,265,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

"Grants to States, fiscal year 1950: For making, after May 31, 1949, payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1950, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for the fiscal year 1950.

"Effective July 1, 1948, the United States Employment Service, including its functions under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is transferred to the Federal Security Agency, and on and after such date the functions of the Secretary of Labor with respect to the United States Employment Service are transferred to the Federal Security Administrator and shall be performed by him or, under his direction and control, by such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as he may designate. There are transferred to the Federal Security Agency, for use in connection with the functions transferred by the provisions of this paragraph, the personnel, property, and records of the Department of Labor related to the United States Employment Service, and the balances of such prior appropriations, allocations, and other funds available to the United States Employment Service as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine. The provisions of section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong.) shall apply to the transfer effected by this paragraph in like manner as if such transfer were a reorganization of the agencies and functions concerned under the provisions of that act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 19, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and insert the following:

"Terminal leave: On request of the Federal Security Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer such amounts as may be necessary, but not to exceed a total of $300,000, from unexpended balances of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1948, to an appropriation account to be established for the payment of annual leave of employees separated from the service as a result of transfers or consolidation of functions, or reductions of appropriations provided herein, to remain available until December 31, 1948."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 25 and agree to the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 25 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. KEEFE (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this conference report was not made available to any of the Members until about an hour ago. I have not had a chance to read it myself, and I am constrained to object. I think it should be read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, and 20.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,015,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$648,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 9.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Amendment No. 1 strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the language providing for the performance in the Office of the Secretary of the union-registration functions of the Secretary under title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947. The effect of this action on the appropriation for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, is to delete $75,000 applicable to the transferred function and provide an increase of $75,000 for functions and activities remaining in the Office of the Secretary as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 appropriates $1,015,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,031,555 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the language in the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards referring to industrial health activities.

Amendment No. 4 inserts the provision of the Senate providing for the performance in the Bureau of Labor Standards of the union-registration functions of the Secretary under title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out the provision of the Senate in the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards providing for the performance in that Bureau of certain youth research and employment functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates $320,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House and $450,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended for this item includes $90,000 and $30,000, respectively, for the union-registration functions and the Federal-State Cooperation Branch instead of $97,288 and $40,412, respectively, as proposed by the Senate. While no specific allocation has been allowed for the Reports and Public Service Branch of the Bureau, it is not the intent of the managers on the part of the House and Senate to prohibit continuation, within the several allocations approved for the Bureau, of those activities heretofore included in such branch which are ancillary and essential to conduct of the basic safety and labor standards activities provided for.

Amendment No. 7 appropriates $115,000 for penalty mail costs of the Department, instead of $105,000 as proposed by the House and $130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $207,500 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, instead of $415,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9, relating to salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics, is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $274,200 for salaries and expenses, Women's Bureau, as proposed by the House, instead of $326,735 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 strikes out the provision of the Senate limiting the functions of the Wage and Hour Division with respect to certain activities under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Amendment No. 12 appropriates $5,000,000 for salaries and expenses, Wage and Hour Division, as proposed by the House, instead of $4,887,700 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14 appropriate $1,400,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,371,200 as proposed by the House, of which amount not to exceed $41,000 may be allocated for expenses of the Employees' Compensation Board of Appeals as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16 appropriate $1,900,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of Education, instead of $1,796,700 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore the provision of the House providing that not less than $487,400 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education. The amount recommended for this appropriation includes funds needed to maintain present staff and an additional amount for printing as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17 inserts the provision of the Senate limiting payments to States for vocational rehabilitation for the first quarter of fiscal year 1950 to an amount not exceeding the corresponding figure for such purpose for the first quarter of fiscal year 1949.

Amendment No. 18 appropriates $648,850 for salaries and expenses, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, instead of $622,700 as proposed by the House and $675,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20 appropriate $40,000,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authorizations for grants to States for hospital construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize allotments to the States for fiscal year 1949 on the basis of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 21 appropriates $9,400,000 for salaries and expenses, National Labor Relations Board, as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House. Although the language of the appropriation as finally recommended permits apportionment of the appropriation for obligation during the first 7 months of fiscal year 1949, the managers on the part of the House and Senate desire to emphasize that such language is permissive only and not a mandate to allocate the full amount to that period, and

that they are recommending $9,400,000 as being adequate to handle during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1949 the work load projected in the President's budget estimate.

Amendment No. 22 inserts the provision of the Senate prohibiting use of the appropriation of the National Labor Relations Board in actions or procedures relating to agricultural laborers.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 23 appropriates $2,940,000 for salaries and expenses, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,540,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $150,000 for expenses of boards of inquiry appointed pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE VII—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 25 rescinds $10,000 of the appropriation for civilian war benefits, Federal Security Agency, 1948, as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,000 as proposed by the House.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 86, noes 24.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 109, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—256

Abbitt	Canfield	Engel, Mich.
Abernethy	Case, N. J.	Fellows
Allen, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Fenton
Allen, Ill.	Chadwick	Fernandez
Andersen, H. Carl	Chapman	Fisher
Anderson, Calif.	Chelf	Fletcher
Andresen, August H.	Chenoweth	Foote
Andrews, N.Y.	Chiperfield	Fuller
Arends	Church	Gallagher
Arnold	Clason	Gamble
Auchincloss	Clevenger	Gathings
Bakewell	Coffin	Gavin
Banta	Cole, Kans.	Gearhart
Barrett	Cole, Mo.	Gillette
Bates, Mass.	Cole, N. Y.	Gillie
Beall	Cooley	Goff
Beckworth	Cooper	Goodwin
Bender	Corbett	Gore
Bennett, Mich.	Cotton	Gossett
Bennett, Mo.	Coudert	Graham
Bishop	Cox	Granger
Blackney	Cravens	Grant, Ala.
Boggs, Del.	Crawford	Grant, Ind.
Boykin	Crow	Gregory
Bradley	Curtis	Griffiths
Bramblett	Dague	Gross
Brehm	Davis, Wis.	Gwinn, N. Y.
Brophy	Dawson, Utah	Gwynne, Iowa
Brown, Ohio	Devitt	Hagen
Buck	D'Ewart	Hale
Buffett	Dirksen	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bulwinkle	Dolliver	Halleck
Burke	Dondero	Hand
Burleson	Doughton	Hardy
Butler	Eaton	Harness, Ind.
Byrnes, Wis.	Ellis	Harvey
	Elsaesser	Hedrick
	Elston	Herter
	MacKinnon	Sarbacher
	Macy	Schwabe, Mo.
	Mahon	Schwabe, Okla.
	Maloney	Scott, Hardie
	Martin, Iowa	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
	Mason	Scrivner
	Mathews	Seely-Brown
	Meade, Ky.	Shafer
	Meade, Md.	Short
	Merrow	Sikes
	Meyer	Simpson, Ill.
	Michener	Simpson, Pa.
	Miller, Conn.	Smith, Kans.
	Miller, Md.	Smith, Ohio
	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Va.
	Mitchell	Smith, Wis.
	Morton	Snyder
	Muhlenberg	Stanley
	Mundt	Stefan
	Murray, Wis.	Stevenson
	Nicholson	Stockman
	Nodar	Stratton
	Norblad	Sundstrom
	O'Hara	Taber
	Patman	Talle
	Patterson	Taylor
	Phillips, Calif.	Teague
	Pickett	Thompson
	Potter	Tibbott
	Potts	Tollefson
	Poulson	Towe
	Price, Fla.	Van Zandt
	Ramey	Vorys
	Reed, Ill.	Vursell
	Reed, N. Y.	Wadsworth
	Rees	Walter
	Reeves	Weichel
	Regan	Welch
	Rich	Whitten
	Riehlman	Wigglesworth
	Rizley	Wilson, Ind.
	Rockwell	Wilson, Tex.
	Rogers, Fla.	Wolcott
	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton
	Rohrbough	Woodruff
	Ross	Worley
	Russell	Youngblood
	Sadlak	
	Sanborn	

NAYS—109

Albert	Garmatz	Morris
Allen, La.	Gary	Morrison
Andrews, Ala.	Gordon	Multer
Angell	Gorski	Murdock
Battle	Harris	Norton
Bland	Harrison	O'Konski
Boggs, La.	Hart	Pace
Bonner	Havenner	Passman
Brooks	Hébert	Peterson
Brown, Ga.	Heffernan	Philbin
Bryson	Hobbs	Poage
Buchanan	Holifield	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Preston
Camp	Isacson	Price, Ill.
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Priest
Carroll	Jarman	Rains
Celler	Javits	Rankin
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Redden
Combs	Jones, N. C.	Richards
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Davis, Ga.	Kelley	Rivers
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Rooney
Deane	Keogh	Sabath
Delaney	Kirwan	Sadowski
Dingell	Klein	Sasscer
Domengeaux	Lanham	Smathers
Donohue	Lesinski	Somers
Dorn	Lucas	Spence
Durham	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Eberharter	McCormack	Trimble
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Vinson
Fallon	Manasco	Wheeler
Feighan	Mansfield	Williams
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Winstead
Folger	Mills	Wood
Forand	Monroney	
Fulton	Morgan	

NOT VOTING—65

Barden	Douglas	Johnson, Ind.
Bates, Ky.	Elliott	Johnson, Okla.
Bell	Ellsworth	Johnson, Tex.
Blatnik	Evins	Kee
Bloom	Flannagan	Kefauver
Bolton	Hall, Leonard W.	Kersten, Wis.
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	King
Busbey	Hartley	Lane
Carson	Hays	Larcade
Clark	Hendricks	Lea
Clippinger	Horan	Ludlow
Courtney	Jackson, Calif.	Lusk
Cunningham	Jensen	Lyle
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.	McConnell
	Murray, Tenn.	Phillips, Tenn.
	Nixon	Ploeser
	Norrell	Plumley
	O'Brien	Rayburn
	O'Toole	Robertson
	Peden	St. George
	Pfeifer	Scoblick
		Sheppard
		Smith, Maine
		Stigler
		Thomas, N. J.
		Twyman
		Vail
		West
		Whitaker
		Whittington

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Peden against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Carson for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Jensen for, with Mr. Stigler against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Lane.

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Whitaker.

Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Evins.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Horan with Mr. Harless of Arizona.

Mr. Vail with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Twyman with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: On page 4, line 14, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$4,250,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert "$4,073,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

VETERANS' FLIGHT TRAINING

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, several times during this session of Congress, attempts have been made to abolish the veterans' flight training program from the public law generally known as the GI bill of rights. To date, I and other Members have successfully opposed such measures.

I now find that this proposal appears in the independent offices bill, now before the Congress.

As chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee dealing with the Civil Aeronautics Administration and as a member of the joint congressional aviation policy board, lately dissolved, I feel that I am qualified to pass on to the House my considered opinion of this rider in the independent offices bill.

First, however, I should like to point out that wise economy in Government has no closer friend in the Congress than this member, as the various agencies of Government for which my committee appropriates money would promptly verify. But just as I am a foe of unbridled Federal spending, so am I the enemy of false economy. And false economy is most certainly the label which must be affixed to any measure that would remove the veterans' flight training program from the GI bill. Let me tell you why.

Reasonable objections can certainly be raised over parts of the veterans' training program. It is difficult for me to believe that instruction in, for example, ballroom dancing makes any contribution to the welfare of either the veteran or this country. However, those who compare ballroom dancing with flight training, I am afraid have devoted little study or thought to the latter.

It seems ridiculous to me that a Congress which on the one hand is authorizing this Government to spend billions of dollars for an Air Force; which may act on a bill to draft young men into the military service; is on the other hand proposing a measure that would abolish a program which already has trained thousands of men as pilots.

The GI flight-training program is expensive—yes. But it is not nearly as expensive as it would be to draft, feed, clothe, and give these same men comparable training in the air. Flight training is far more than just a hobby for our ex-servicemen. The GI program is giving this country a valuable pool of young men trained in the fundamentals of aviation—the theory of flight, navigation, meteorology, radio, maintenance, and so forth. The program is giving us this reserve at a time, which this Congress has officially admitted, when such a reserve is of inestimable value to this Nation's security.

The age of air travel is upon us. And yet the aviation industry of the United States of America is struggling under a burden which some, with this measure, would increase. Thousands of small airfields over the country would have to shut down if this measure were to become law. These small airfields will some day become part of a vital network of air transportation—unless we kill them off.

It would be false economy indeed to remove this flight-training program at a time when our aviation industry is tottering; at a time when more people need to be made air-minded; at a time when we are attempting to build a strong peacetime Air Force.

Knowing this, can any thinking Member of this House think for a moment of abolishing this GI flight-training program?

The obvious and logical answer is emphatically "No."

HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, SMITH of Ohio, KUNKEL, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6570.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be confined to the bill and consume not to exceed 2½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. This bill is not being brought in under a rule, it is being brought in under the regular right of the Committee on Appropriations?

The SPEAKER. A rule has already been adopted waiving points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6829, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to you with the unanimous support of the subcommittee in charge of the bill and, so far as I know, with the unanimous support of the Committee on Appropriations as a whole.

The bill passed in February with reference to the independent offices made provision for some 30 agencies carrying a total of something less than $1,000,000,000.

This bill makes provision for six agencies carrying a total of about $5,800,000,000 or $504,570,000, or 8 percent, below the budget estimates.

I shall run briefly over the six agencies, involved and the action recommended in each instance.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Your committee recommends an appropriation for 8 months amounting to $340,000 as compared with an appropriation on a 12 months basis for the current year of $445,000, and estimated expenditure of $410,000.

The cut recommended amounts to $105,000, the amount allowed being approximately the same on a monthly basis as for the current year. Sixty million dollars for liquidation expenses is recommended for inclusion in the bill.

HOUSING EXPEDITER

Your committee recommends an appropriation of something over $15,000,000 as compared with a request of $20,500,000, a reduction of $5,327,000.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. JAVITS. It is a question entirely upon the item for the office of the Housing Expediter. I notice the reduction of the committee has voted is of a sum of approximately $4,000,000 for so-called liquidation expenses, assuming that the Housing and Rent Control Act runs only until April 1, 1949, and the agency will be liquidated thereafter. I rise to ask whether or not the gentleman has questioned the witnesses. I do not find it in the RECORD, as to whether, if the agency takes that cut it will prorate it over the 9 months? In other words, the agency will not assume that it will ultimately get the money, but will

reduce the $15,000,000 appropriated by what it estimates to be the cost of liquidation, and therefore materially cripple Rent Control Administration, which the people of my district are vitally interested in sustaining unimpaired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is no intention of crippling rent control in any sense of the word. The appropriation recommended is made available on a 9-month basis. The $4,132,000 to which the gentleman refers is a reduction in funds suggested for liquidation expenses, which at the end of 9 months can be taken care of in the event it is determined not to extend the life of the agency.

Mr. JAVITS. Can the gentleman assure us that the agency itself will not operate on the theory that it must deduct that liquidation money from the $15,000,000 appropriated?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think it is very clear that the intention of the committee is that the agency shall operate on the funds recommended, for a period of 9 months, and that the liquidation expenses, if any, will be provided for at a later date.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I notice the gentleman passed over the item of the Atomic Energy Commission. Is the gentleman going to return to that later?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I expect to deal with each of the six agencies briefly. I mentioned the two smallest ones first, in order to dispose of them.

The cut reflects not only the item to which the gentleman from New York has referred, but $195,000 in penalty mail, and as to the balance, a reduction in the number of investigators requested. The agency had 44 investigators on the pay roll as of April 1. This appropriation will permit it to have 358 investigators during the remaining 9 months of its existence.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

This agency requested an appropriation of $550,000,000, together with contract authorizations amounting to $400,000,000, an over-all total of $950,000,000. This compares with cash in the current year to the extent of $259,000,000, and contract authorizations to the extent of $400,000,000, or an over-all total of $659,000,000.

Your committee recommends an appropriation in the amount of $501,850,000 and, in addition, the full amount requested in respect to contract authorizations, $400,000,000, or an over-all total of $901,850,000, a cut of $48,150,000.

Your committee appreciates the vital importance of the work of this agency particularly at this time under existing world conditions. It desires, of course, to see the maximum results attained by the agency in the military field.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I think it must be stated to the House that your committee has been unable to obtain the type of information which it desired to obtain and which it felt it was reasonable to ask, from the Atomic Energy Commission. Moreover, your committee has been unable to escape the conviction that this agency has been operating on a basis of lavish expenditure.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, it is my understanding that one of the clerks of your committee has been cleared so that any information that is available to members of the Commission might be made available to members of the House Committee on Appropriations. I would like to ask you whether or not that employee of your committee has been cleared and has been able to furnish you with any information that you felt you should have.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to my colleague from Pennsylvania that the committee had as an investigator one of the outstanding members of the certified public accountants profession in America. He was, as he necessarily had to be, cleared, in order to work with the Atomic Energy Commission. Nevertheless, neither he nor the members of the committee were able to obtain the character of information which they sought to obtain, as I will develop in just a moment in the course of these remarks.

I want to call attention in passing to the fact that a year ago the agency was literally hardly able to furnish any information in regard to available funds, in regard to obligations, in regard to personnel, either on the rolls or in contemplation, or in regard to the detailed duties or salaries of the personnel.

Under date of April 29 I addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Commission. I put aside entirely funds requested in respect to the manufacture of the bomb and the manufacture of plant facilities for the bomb. I picked out at the suggestion of our investigator important items aggregating about $255,000,000 and requested the Commission to give me a list of these items, which were primarily research and development and housing-construction items, in the order of priority, as to necessity, importance, or desirability—an ordinary break-down such as any business would make if it were about to embark on a program of expansion with limited funds.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of my letter at this point in the RECORD:

NEW YORK, *April 27, 1948.*

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIGGLESWORTH: Last Thursday, April 22, I had occasion to discuss with four of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission, viz, Chairman Lilienthal and Commissioners Strauss, Waymack, and Pike, the matter of a supplementary presentation of certain of the items included in the Commission's budgetary request for the fiscal year 1949; such a supplementary presentation (dealing with amounts of proposed obligation) as I had previously discussed with Chairman TABER and yourself. On the day following this conference I submitted to the Commission's assistant budget officer an analyzed restatement of proposed fiscal year 1949 obligations (aggregating approximately $685,000,000), which showed items aggregating somewhat over $250,000,000 as being the kind of proposed expenditures as to which I was confident the work of the Appropriations Committee would be considerably facilitated by means of a supplementary statement in which the Commission would express its opinion with regard to the relative priority—from the viewpoint of necessity, importance, desirability, etc.—of the various items comprised in such a group. Insofar as research and development items are concerned, such viewpoint might possibly also reflect the degree of expectancy of success with regard to such undertakings, ranging, say, from a feeling of a reasonable hope of success, on the one end, to something like taking a gamble, on the other.

In my discussion with the Commission, I indicated, by way of example, that of this aggregate of items for this sort of analysis there was the proposed expenditure for substantially rebuilding the community facilities at Oak Ridge, as to which the fiscal year 1949 proposal contained an obligation amount of approximately $35,000,000. Admitting my approach to be wholly that of a layman without the benefit of the technical knowledge which the Commission commanded, I raised the question of whether, in the further development of nuclear science, the particular activities at Oak Ridge might not conceivably become of diminishing importance relatively (say, as compared with Richland) to an extent where the present community expenditures might perhaps be better thought of as for the purpose of minimum expenses (to keep the town's facilities livable, of course) rather than a larger program of re-creating a permanent community.

While our conference produced no expressed agreement on the part of the Commission to undertake and present such a review as that indicated in the preceding. It was my opinion and also that of Mr. Montgomery of the Senate Appropriations Committee staff, who accompanied me, that our presentation of the matter could not have failed to leave with the Commission a realization of the need of supplying just this sort of information in order that ultimate action of the Congress might be on the basis of the best possible informed judgment in the circumstances.

Very truly yours,

E. A. KRACKE.

APRIL 29, 1948.

Hon. DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have just received a letter from Mr. E. A. Kracke, member of the investigating staff of the House Appropriations Committee, a copy of which I enclose herewith, and have noted the suggestion which he has made in the matter of a supplementary presentation of certain of the items included in the Commission's budgetary request for the fiscal year of 1949.

This recommendation has previously been discussed with Chairman TABER and myself and meets with our full approval.

It will be greatly appreciated therefore if the Commission will be prepared to comply with the suggestion at the time of the hearings.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH.

Subsequently, on May 7, I received a letter from the Chairman, Mr. Lilienthal, in which he stated that the Commission was undertaking to prepare the information for presentation at the hearings in accordance with my request. Mr. Lilienthal's reply follows:

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, May 7, 1948.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Appropriations Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIGGLESWORTH: Your letter of April 29, 1948, transmitting a copy

of a letter addressed to you from Mr. E. A. Kracke, of the investigating staff of the House Appropriations Committee, has been received by the Commission.

The Commission is undertaking the preparation of supplemental information for presentation at the time of the hearings in accordance with your request.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Chairman.

Subsequently a letter was delivered to me in person by the General Manager, Mr. Wilson, a letter marked "Secret" which included a statement to the effect that the Commission has not attempted to express its opinion with regard to the relative priorities despite the suggestion that this be done.

The first three paragraphs of the letter are as follows:

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIGGLESWORTH: In further response to your letter of April 29, 1948, there is attached a secret analysis of the items in our 1949 budget in the amount of $255,096,274 which was shown in schedule B of the "Restatement of proposed fiscal year 1949 obligations" submitted to staff of the Commission by your investigator. It is our hope that, with this analysis in your hands as of today, your subcommittee can be prepared to start hearings on the Atomic Energy Commission 1949 estimates by the middle of this week. This is especially important inasmuch as the managers of our field operations are presently available in Washington for this purpose.

You will note that we have not attempted to express opinions with regard to relative priority in this analysis despite Mr. Kracke's suggestion that this be done. Our entire 1949 budget as presented to the committee reflects our best judgment as to balanced programs of research and production to carry out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and to maintain and enhance the leadership of this country in the field of atomic energy. It is our view that all phases of the budget program as presented deserve equal priority when considered in this light. Any reduction which the Congress might make in these estimates would require a restudy of the whole program to gear it to a slower rate of attainment of these objectives.

Our analysis does, however, give the committee data which should be useful in judging whether the Commission is placing the proper emphasis on "short term" as compared with "long term" objectives. In part I of the analysis, for example, most of the items shown under the first two column headings relate to short-term objectives while those in the last two columns relate to long-term objectives. Similarly, in part II, the first column reflects items primarily required to meet short-term program needs whereas the items shown in the second column relate to long-term program considerations.

Instead, your committee was furnished a list of projects in four parallel columns, every single item in every one of the four columns being said to be essential for one purpose or another and said to be equally essential.

A project in respect to fish in the Northwest was considered just as essential as a project which might have a bearing on the manufacture of the weapon.

It was impossible to obtain any expression of opinion as to relative importance; and, for my part, it was equally impossible to escape the conclusion that the Commission simply declined to cooperate with the Congress.

Without going too much into detail I may mention among other things that the record shows that the cost of housing construction by this agency is very much more expensive than construction elsewhere. It shows also that the cost of operation for three communities operated by the Commission is even more out of line with costs elsewhere.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman advise the Committee the unit cost of houses the Commission is building in the various areas? Information I have received is that it runs around $27,000. I wonder if the gentleman's information would verify that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman from New York, subject to verification, that my impression is the same as his.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, in the case of one-, two-, and three-bedroom apartments or houses the cost ran $14,000, $16,000, $18,000, and maybe the highest was $20,000, if my memory serves me correctly, and I think it does.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In the sphere of operation of community facilities, just to give you two or three examples, the Department of Commerce figures for 200 cities of 25,000 to 50,000 population show a per capita cost for police of $3.50. By comparison with this there is a per capita cost at Hanford of $14.12, at Los Alamos of $18.85, and at Oak Ridge of $21.53.

If we take fire protection, as compared with $3.52 in the Department of Commerce figures, we find $13.53 per capita at Hanford, $12.14 at Los Alamos and $15.55 at Oak Ridge.

Similar comparisons can be made as to schools and highways.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I hope the gentleman and his committee took into consideration that the installation at Los Alamos, N. Mex., is completely isolated and high on top of a plateau with one road only for transportation purposes from Santa Fe, Albuquerque, and other communities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman that an exact comparison with operations elsewhere may not be possible or fair, but the figures are so far out of line as to command attention.

I may add that there is great variation between the three communities. For instance, the net cost to Uncle Sam at Hanford, with a population of some 18,000 people is about $1,100,000, whereas at Oak Ridge, with a population of 36,000 or about double that at Hanford, the net cost to Uncle Sam is $10,000,000.

In other words, it requires 10 times as much money to operate a town with twice the population of Hanford.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, there are two different types of operation. In Oak Ridge you have your closed type of operation; in Hanford you have the open type of operation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, I think the Commission admits it has no uniform accounting structure, and that this is reflected in the wide variations in the cost of operations in the towns to which I have referred.

The research and development program of $152,000,000 seems to be both expensive and lacking in coordination.

Administrative expenses reflect the highest percentage of high salaries in the Government, I believe, and include a request for 2,850 automobiles, largely because the Commission apparently wants to equip with motors the universities and industries which take on contracts for it.

The point of view of the Commission in regard to financial control is perhaps well reflected in the fact that the general manager at Oak Ridge has authority to make purchases and enter into contracts ranging up to $5,000,000, and as many of them as he sees fit, without prior approval by the General Manager, let alone any member of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine any competently run business indulging in any such delegation of power.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the General Manager of the Commission stated, and I quote:

> That 10 percent of the activities can be considered as having no direct relevance to the military activities of the Commission.

I want to point out also that some 3 months ago, when the original justification for this agency was presented, it called for exactly the same amount as subsequently requested in a revised justification. After the original justification was presented, the Commission appeared before the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations, which was very critical of its construction activities. As a result the Commission revised its justifications, resubmitted them, took out $40,287,573 from its construction activities, and sprinkled it over its other activities so that the over-all total was exactly the total which had been originally presented.

In other words, 3 months ago, outside of construction activities, the agency was satisfied with $40,287,573 less than requested in its revised justification.

Your committee feels that the reduction recommended can be readily absorbed, first, in administrative expenditure in respect to which a specific cut is recommended; second, in respect to the costs of operation of community facilities, in respect to which a specific reduction is recommended; and third, in the field of construction costs, in the field of nonweapon, nonbiological and nonmedical phases of research and development, and in the field of prior obligations in respect to which the agency

estimates that it may require as much as $250,000,000.

Your committee is confident that the vital functions of this Commission will not be impaired in any way by the suggested reduction.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. With the permission of the gentleman, I should like to quote from the report of the committee on this item for the Atomic Energy Commission, in which it says:

> There is some feeling among the membership of the committee that the Commission has taken advantage of its strategic position in modern military defense to avoid facing the practical realities on less important and subsidiary elements of their budget. The impression left with the committee is one of general extravagance.

That concludes the quotation from the report of the committee. I should like to state that there are many or, at least, several members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy who share those same views as expressed in the report to which I have just referred.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I want to add my endorsement to what the gentleman from New York has said. I think we have arrived at a time now when the Atomic Energy Commission should submit its request for funds to the Congress just the same as any other department does, and let them all be reviewed, so that we may know that the American people will get a return of 100 cents on every dollar.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I would like to say that the Commission has appeared before the committee in many sessions during the last year and a half, and in no instance has the joint committee condemned them for extravagance of operation. There has been no evidence brought before our committee as such to condemn them for extravagance of operation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Has the gentleman consulted the investigators of his committee?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I have not consulted the investigators, but I have attended every meeting that the Commission has been to. I have heard the questions and I have heard the answers, and it is not necessary for me to consult an investigator when I know that no such charge has been made in our committee for a year and a half.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think some of the things his investigators have on hand might be of interest to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They should be presented to our committee, then, in open session.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much time, but there are three other agencies here that I want to discuss.

THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Your committee recommends an appropriation of $102,300,000 plus $75,000,000 in contract authorizations for the United States Maritime Commission. This compares with a request for $141,800,000 in appropriations and $60,000,000 in contract authorizations. This is an increase of about $15,000,000 in contract authorizations and a decrease of about $39,400,000 in appropriations.

These are the cuts recommended.

There is a reduction of $13,400,000 in the operating subsidy requirements. This reduction results from a new plan which has been worked out by your committee investigator with the Maritime Commission, and with which the Maritime Commission is very much pleased. It has expressed in a letter its appreciation to our investigator. In substance the new plan provides that instead of paying the full estimated subsidy every year regardless of the earnings of the subsidized lines, there shall be paid only the subsidy less the amount that it is estimated will be subject to recapture and thereby returned to the Treasury of the United States. For those who are interested in the details, you will find a letter embodying them at page 611 of the committee hearings.

There is a $10,000,000 reduction in the cash column of the construction program. The committee has allowed the over-all request in full plus $5,000,000 for design and specifications but it has moved some $10,000,000 from the cash column to the contract authorization column, in the belief that the cash will not be needed in full in the period under consideration.

There is a $1,100,000 reduction in respect to drydocks which it was originally planned to purchase but which the Navy Department advises are not available at this time.

There is a $10,700,000 reduction in money requested for the purpose of bringing home and placing in the reserve fleet some 86 vessels originally sent to Russia on lend-lease account. In the absence of any arrangements to bring those ships home the money has been deducted.

Then there is a reduction of $4,600,000 with respect to administrative expenditure and the reserve against contingencies. The committee investigator is particularly critical of the Field Audits Division of the Commission. He reports accentuated overstaffing and both useless and inefficiently conducted work. He recommends the transfer of one-half the staff to accounting and temporary backlog work with a very substantial saving.

There is an increase recommended in respect to the maritime training fund. This amounts to $1,265,880, giving a total appropriation slightly below that recommended by the House a year ago. This permits a pay increase for cadet midshipmen from $65 to $78, in accordance with Annapolis standards. It permits an increase in the number of cadets at the State maritime academies. It permits the normal operation of Kings Point, St. Petersburg, Pass Christian, Alameda, and the Maritime Service Institute.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POTTS. As the gentleman knows from conversations I have had with him in respect of the State maritime training program, I have been very much interested in it and am very appreciative, and I think the country as a whole should be very appreciative of the action the committee has taken in awarding a sum for this purpose which will enable the State maritime schools, of which there is one in my district, to train cadets for the merchant marine to the extent of 900. I think that in these perilous times the money will be well spent.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that the committee appreciates his interest and strong support of this item and shares his views of its importance.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Can the gentleman advise me whether in his opinion adequate allowance has been made by the committee in this bill for proper operation of the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point? At a recent visit there, I was advised that the funds were so short for the operation of that particular academy it was necessary to employ members of the Cadet Corps in various menial occupations to the detriment of their studies. I wonder whether the gentleman is satisfied that there is an ample amount in this bill for the proper operation of that particular academy with which I am especially concerned.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That has been the unanimous intention of the committee, I will say to the gentleman, and in my opinion there should be ample funds for that purpose.

Mr. HAND. Can the gentleman advise me to what extent the committee cut the budget estimate in that particular, or has not the Budget been cut down to that fine point? That is just the training item?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It has been increased.

Mr. HAND. It has been increased?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

This will be the first year Mr. Chairman, during which the Commission will have been on a strict appropriation basis.

The Comptroller General was very severe in his indictment of the agency in his testimony in December, first, in respect to his audits for the fiscal years 1946 and 1947 and, second, with respect to the failure by the Commission to install the accounting system which he has sought to have installed for many years.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from his comments in this connection:

The accounting records for the fiscal years 1946 and 1947 have not been completely recorded or adjusted to the facts. On the whole, the accounting records were in even worse condition than in prior years.

The survey disclosed that the books and records were in a more deplorable condition than that which prevailed in the prior years audited, when little, if any, reliance could be placed on internal controls due to laxity in accounting methods and inaccuracies in accounting results. The financial transactions for the fiscal year 1946, other than cash transactions, had not been completely recorded in the books, so that the accounts at the year's end were not in accord with the facts. Neither the cash transactions nor the noncash transactions for the fiscal year 1947 were completely recorded in the books. As a result, the June 30, 1947, balances of the book accounts did not substantially represent the factual status of the respective accounts, nor did the entries in the accounts reflect all the transactions pertaining thereto which had occurred during the fiscal year.

During the fiscal years 1946 and 1947, the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration failed to maintain adequate and current records of their financial transactions. The examination of the accounting records disclosed that such records were in even worse condition than in prior years and that the accounting deficiencies reported in prior audit reports were considerably aggravated.

In view of the incomplete and inaccurate condition of the accounting records it was not practicable to prepare financial statements for the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration showing the results of operation for the fiscal years 1946 and 1947, and the financial position at the close of the respective fiscal periods, and, therefore, it is not possible to furnish a certificate in this connection in accordance with generally accepted accounting practices.

Referring to the accounting system which the General Accounting Office had sought to have installed since 1937 and which had not yet been installed, he said:

Ten years of frustration in our dealings with the Commission in this and many other matters has just about exhausted our patience.

There appears, however, to be an improvement in conditions at the Commission. Your committee is advised that the accounting system just referred to has finally been installed and is awaiting approval by the General Accounting Office. Your committee is also advised that the Commission will return to the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year an unexpended balance of about $250,000.

The Commission still continues to act on the one hand as the majority stockowner of the American President Lines and on the other hand as its governmental regulator, subjecting itself inevitably to charges of favoritism and retaining what to my mind is an impossible position.

The committee is advised, however, that the suit pending to determine the ownership of the line has been heard in court, that a decision is expected in the near future, and it has received the assurance of the Chairman of the Commission and of Commissioner Carson that, in the event of a finding to the effect that the line does in fact belong to the Commission, immediate steps will be taken to bring about its disposal.

The testimony of the Navy is to the effect that we would be short to the extent of 116 tankers in the event of an emergency. This is a sad commentary when we recall the pressure last year from the State Department and other sources resulting in the sale foreign of 133 tankers.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken more time than I intended, but I must say something about the Veterans' Administration and surplus-property disposal.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

For the Veterans' Administration your committee recommends $5,125,000,000 in cash and $43,000,000 in contract authorizations, which compares with a request for $5,479,000,000 in cash and $43,000,000 in contract authorizations, a reduction in the budget estimates of $354,600,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield for a question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why was that done? What justification was there for that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentlewoman will permit me to complete my statement, I hope I shall be able to explain the situation in detail.

May I say in passing, as of possible interest, that the $3,000,000 which was made available in the deficiency bill several months ago is to be largely paid back to the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year, as an unexpended balance.

As the House knows, your committee has had the advantage of reports during the past 2 years by outstanding investigators. These investigators have pointed out the possibility of far better service for our veterans at greatly reduced costs through reorganization and other administrative economies.

We also have this year a new Administrator, Gen. Carl Gray, who, as the Members know, has an outstanding record, not only in both World Wars, but as a business executive.

The reports have been brought to the Administrator's attention. He has expressed great interest in them, but has suggested that they be laid aside for the time being pending an over-all examination in the field, upon which he has already embarked.

The committee has complied with his request.

You will find the cuts recommended in the report.

For administration, hospital, and domiciliary services, the request was made for 936.7 million dollars. Your committee recommends that ever cent be allowed in respect to medical care. This means an increase in the medical field next year of some 14,000 people and some $74,000,000.

Your committee also recommends that every cent be paid in respect to other administrative expenditure with one exception. That exception is an item of $18,000,000. It represents the cost of operating 13 branch offices during April, May, and June 1949, that is to say, during the last quarter of the present fiscal year.

Your committee has had reports from veterans and from veterans' organizations and has also seen the recent findings of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, all of which indicate the possibility of better service with less money through the curtailment or elimination of these branch offices and the transfer of the lower-paid personnel where essential to regional offices.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD certain quotations from veterans' organizations and from the subcommittee referred to.

I quote a paragraph or two from the report of the Subcommittee on Administration and Finance of the Veterans' Administration, Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, second session, page 21:

RECOMMENDATIONS: BRANCH OFFICES

1. That a substantial reduction shall be made in the supervisory personnel and branch offices, over and beyond the reduction recently announced by the Administration while this report was in the process of being written. That the funds saved by such reduction be used in payment of salaries where needed in the lower-income brackets employed in the regional offices; or, putting it in another way, those employed on the production line.

2. That the branch offices at some date in the not-too-distant future be abolished, with the exception of a small supervisory group to make on-the-spot supervision of the operation of regional offices and other facilities in the areas under the jurisdiction of the branch offices as now constituted, this reorganization to take place as soon as the insurance accounts are straightened out.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

I quote also from a recent statement by a national representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

The recent announcement of a reduction in personnel in the Veterans' Administration caused little surprise to the officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who have been for many months cognizant of the fact that the Veterans' Administration has been far overstaffed for the past 2½ years in some of its activities.

Quoting further:

The principal problem confronting us today is the need for low-salaried essential personnel in the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, and the means of providing this personnel without requesting additional funds from the Congress of the United States.

We submit that this problem could be solved by abolishing the branch offices as they are now constituted, leaving the national service life insurance in the present 13 locations, under directors of insurance who will report directly to the Assistant Administrator for Insurance at Washington, by decentralizing the dependency-claims work from the branch offices to the regional offices, and by leaving in certain selected branch offices very small and well-trained supervisory forces for the supervision work in their areas.

We are convinced that such action should not only materially improve the service to the disabled veterans but should also result in savings to the taxpayers over and above the

money needed for the employment of essential personnel in the regional offices.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Also, I include a copy of a resolution adopted by the national council of administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at its meeting in Kansas on October 16, 17, 18, 1947.

ECONOMY OF ADMINISTRATION IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the appropriations currently granted to the Veterans' Administration represent one of the largest single items of Federal expenditures; and

Whereas most of our citizens are under the mistaken impression that all of this money is dispersed to our disabled veterans and their dependents; and

Whereas a large part of these funds is used to pay the salaries, traveling, and other expenses of high-salaried staff, coordinating and planning, and supervisory personnel, whose duties have little or no bearing on direct benefits to veterans; and

Whereas the preparation of forms, flow charts, reports, news releases, and other nonessential issues of the Veterans' Administration is very costly, time-consuming, and requires the services of hundreds of employees in their preparation, printing, distribution, and reading; and

Whereas certain divisions of the branch and regional offices of the Veterans' Administration are nonoperating administrative offices, which consume the services of highly paid staff personnel while contributing little direct benefit to the rehabilitation of veterans; and

Whereas the operation of branch offices as now constituted makes it necessary for adjudicating work to be performed in certain instances both in the regional office and in the controlling branch office at considerable expense and with a great loss of time; and

Whereas millions of dollars have been obligated for the benefit of private architects for hospital plans and specifications which are now found to be impractical and useless; and

Whereas all of these activities and others add to the cost of administering direct benefits to veterans without adding appreciably to the service, and in fact in some instances retarding the service to disabled men; and

Whereas it is our studied opinion that unless the action contemplated in this resolution is taken immediately our veterans will be confronted with legislation similar to the infamous Economy Act of 1933, which reduced the meager benefits that were paid to veterans of World War I who suffered disabilities in that war, and to the widows and orphans of those who made the supreme sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national council of administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at its meeting in Kansas City, Mo., October 16, 17, and 18, requests the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to immediately eliminate those positions and units of organization which are not contributing to direct benefits to our veterans and their beneficiaries, thereby eliminating millions of dollars of unnecessary overhead now charged against veteran benefits.

Also I include recommendations of other veterans' organizations:

AMERICAN LEGION

Resolution No. 290: "Urges decentralization to regional offices of adjudication of all claims for death compensation and pension, insurance, or burial allowance."

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Resolution No. 16: "That the number and jurisdiction of branch offices be reduced, death cases to be decentralized to regional offices."

Resolution No. 38: "Urges that the 13 VA branch offices be abolished, processing and adjudication of death claims and insurance to be transferred to the regional offices, supervisory and inspection services to central office."

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Resolution No. 21: "Entire handling of death pension claims be decentralized to the regional office level."

Resolution No. 36: "Urges abolition of VA branch offices to be replaced by three area offices."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the branch offices simply overlap other departments of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In my opinion, that is largely a fact. Rather than take definite action at this time, however, the committee has decided to recommend that the funds be withheld for the last 3 months of the year, so that a new Congress can consider that broad question in the light of the Administration's field survey.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield for a question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me why that $3,000,000 was not needed for the hospital and other personnel? I am wondering if this is not the case. I know at Maguire General Hospital recently the medical section found out that they were short 11 attendants. They probably were not taking that into consideration. They did not get the money for those attendants or other personnel until the last 10 days or so.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Last autumn the agency expected to have a large deficiency. As time went on it found its estimates were in error and it now expects to turn back two or three million dollars at the close of the fiscal year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would also like to say it was admitted there was a shortage of attendants. Those attendants are now being replaced. I do not think they took that into consideration when they made this cut.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That I do not know. The committee was simply advised that the Administration was in a position to turn back between two and three million dollars as of June 30.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think if the gentleman goes into that he will find that such is the case. The gentleman knows they are behind in their work in Massachusetts in the payment of subsistence allowances.

I would like to say to the gentleman that our inspection committees have gone out and made certain findings and, in some cases, certain recommendations. As far as I know, practically no one of those recommendations has been carried out. I would like to state that insofar as insurance is concerned, my subcommittee on insurance—and I also signed the report as chairman of the main committee—finds that recommendations were made which they thought would be carried out. Mr. Howell, the man who was investigating for former President Hoover, had made certain recommendations, and he thought they were being carried out. They are not being carried out. I think the situation with regard to insurance is as bad as it was when we made the report.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sure that the gentlewoman's activities in this connection will be very helpful to a better service for our veterans.

The second item for reduction is an item of $1,000,000 for printing and binding. Only about half the amount appropriated will be spent this year and there is a large carry-over of supplies.

The third item is a reduction in penalty mail costs, $3,600,000.

The fourth item, $4,000,000, with respect to military and naval insurance, is a reduction freely conceded by the Veterans' Administration.

The fifth item, $28,000,000, is merely the cash margin with respect to hospital and domiciliary facilities between the funds on hand and the estimated expenditure for 1949.

The sixth item, $50,000,000 is a reduction in respect to pensions. It has no effect on the payment of pensions, of course, because they must be paid as and when they become due. There is however a $156,000,000 carry-over in prospect, which will give the agency about the same amount as it had this year. The administration's estimate for the current fiscal year was too high by about $480,000,000 and your committee feels that the proposed reduction is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

The seventh item, $250,000,000, is in respect to readjustment benefits, $50,000,000 in respect to readjustment allowances, and $200,000,000 in respect to education and training.

Again in respect to readjustment allowance there is a carry-over in sight of $609,000,000. Here again the Veterans' Administration's estimate for this year was too high by about $440,000,000. The committee's estimate is based on trends for 1947 and the first part of 1948. The allowances will of course be paid as and when due.

A word as to the proposed reduction of $200,000,000 in respect to education and training, in respect to which a number of questions have been presented to me this morning.

This recommendation grows out of language which the committee recommends on page 14 of the bill, reading as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readustment Act, as amended, shall be expended for tuition, fees, or other charges, or for subsistence allowance, for any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, and which is determined by the Administrator to be avocational or recreational in character.

This language is recommended pursuant to a report of the Bureau of the Budget several months ago which you will find on page 424 of the hearings. I urge a careful reading of the report. It

demands action in the interest of the veteran.

The language is recommended also pursuant to the recommendation of the President in his budget message.

It is recommended with a view to holding this training within the intent of the law to that training which is strictly vocational or occupational as distinguished from that training which is avocational or recreational in character.

I have presented this language to high officials in the Veterans' Administration, to high officials in the American Legion, to high officials in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to outstanding veterans on the floor of this House. All have agreed that the proposed language is desirable, that it is desirable in the interest of veterans with a view to eliminating criticism and adverse reaction and with a view to removing any possible tendency toward another economy act.

I call your attention to the fact that the language does not affect any course before July 1, 1948; that it does not affect any legitimate course of any character which is helping a veteran in his vocation or his occupation. No such course will be touched in any manner. It merely authorizes General Gray, as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, to determine what course is within the intent of the law and what course is not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts for the very lucid explanation he has given concerning this particular language. My colleague from Montana, Mr. D'EWART, and myself both have received communications from our State to the effect that if the words on page 14 relative to readjustment benefits are allowed to remain in the bill, that some of these flying schools which participate in the flight training program will be forced to the wall and out of business. Is that true?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No legitimate flight training course should be affected in any way by this language.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I am concerned about the way the Veterans' Administration will administer this proviso. I have heard from Harland Herrin and Col. Frank Wiley about this proviso and they are very much disturbed by the possibilities this will have on legitimate flight schools. It is my hope that every consideration and protection will be given to legitimate flight training schools.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further along that line?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, this proviso on page 14 is not intended to interfere with any young veteran who wants to take flight training for the purpose of equipping himself to use that flight training in his business or occupation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It certainly is not.

Mr. CURTIS. But it is intended to cut out the frivolous and recreational?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; dancing, photography, and various other types of courses which have been bringing the program into disrepute, and which are described in the report of the Bureau of the Budget on page 424 of the committee hearings.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. The thing this bill does is to make the program work the way it was intended to work and to do away with frivolous courses but not to interfere with the rehabilitation of the veterans in any way.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman from New York states the facts exactly.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I wish to congratulate the gentleman and the committee on the hard work they have evidently put in on this bill. I quite heartily agree with the gentleman that a lot of these frivolous things like mixing drinks and dancing should not be paid for by the Federal Government, but I quite agree with the gentleman from Nebraska that when a fellow learns the art of flying which will eventually help him not only in his business but the country in case of war, we should give these young men that training. The majority of those who take it are young boys who went into the Army right out of school. Their training will prove a big help to the country in the future, and I am sure the Administration will take that into consideration when it determines what courses are necessary.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman and his committee on their work.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure that if the gentleman from Massachusetts were administering this language we should have no concern, but the record is quite clear that the attitude of the Veterans' Administration is against flight training in all its forms. There is every reason to be concerned about leaving this language in the bill. The basic law provides that nobody in the Veterans' Administration shall interfere with the course at any school or college. Still they have refused to allow a veteran to take as part of his elective course flight training. I want to see these fly-by-night schools and institutions eliminated, but the places they are hitting the hardest are State universities which are offering this as a part of their supplemental course. The subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] has had days of hearings on this subject and I think it was very clearly developed that the attitude of the Veterans' Administration toward flight training is that it should be cut out altogether. I hope some way will be found to do what the gentleman says he wants done, and that is eliminate the superfluous programs, yet not interfere with legitimate flight training in legitimate flying schools. There is plenty of testimony that those who control the program in the Veterans' Administration will eliminate flying altogether.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the debate on the floor today should make it very clear to General Gray what the Congress expects to be done.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that this so-called GI flight training under existing arrangements has developed into a racket in some cases? What the committee is trying to do is eliminate the racket by placing the administration of same in the hands of Veterans' Administrator, Mr. Gray, and it is not the intention of the committee or the Congress to eliminate legitimate flight training.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Connecticut spoke about the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs on training and education. I would like to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts and also to the gentleman from Connecticut that the full committee reported a bill that was introduced and amended by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY], which I think will correct the abuses of flight training, without being as hard and fast as this is. I think under this provision of the bill many men who want to take flight training as a sort of preparation for war and business will be barred from doing so.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman from Connecticut spoke about those who are going to administer this bill. He is absolutely correct. It is their intention to cut out every flying school and I think in the gentleman's remarks he should let the committee know and the Veterans' Administration know that this shall not apply to legitimate flying schools.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume the Veterans' Administration will read the record we are making here today in connection with the administration of this language. I will be more than happy to do anything I can to make the intent of the committee clear.

Mr. TEAGUE. A veteran may want to take up aeronautical engineering, in which flight training is also taken with that course. Would the gentleman consider that avocational or recreational?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Any training that is taken with a view to helping the veteran in his occupation or his business falls within the intent of the aid which the Congress clearly intended to extend to our veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will say that flight training in an aeronautical engineering course, of course, would do that.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSS. May I call to the gentleman's attention a provision on page 12 which reads:

It is noted that this does not affect any veterans enrolling prior to July 1, 1948, and that the determination as to whether a course is avocational or recreational is vested in the Administrator.

Now, do you not say there that the Veterans' Administrator has complete and full authority to make the final determination as to what course, no matter what course in our educational system, is avocational or recreational, whether it be dancing, golfing, accountancy, or anything else; the final determination, as I understand it, is placed in the hands of the Veterans' Administrator?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is placed there, and I think it is the best place to place it. Someone has got to make the determination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. It occurs to me that it might be helpful at this point in connection with this matter to point out one or two observations in the report prepared by the Veterans' Administration at the request of the Director of the Budget in connection with this flight training matter, appearing on page 426 of the hearings. It makes the point that—

More than 90 percent of all flight training serves no occupational purpose.

Out of a total of 339,300 veterans who entered various flight-training courses up to November 1, 1947, 16,300 have completed advanced courses; 204,600 dropped out before completion of advanced flight training; 118,400 are currently enrolled.

The ratio of completions of advanced courses—which indicate possible vocational use—to total terminations, including dropouts, is 16,300 to 220,900, or 7.4 percent. From a training standpoint, therefore, more than 92 percent of all veterans who have completed or withdrawn from flight training to date have not qualified themselves to use it occupationally.

Yet, for that, up to November 1, 1947, $250,000,000 has been the cost of that program.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman will recall that I appeared before the subcommittee and asked for an appropriation of $50,000 for a swimming pool for the paraplegics at the McGuire Hospital at Richmond, Va. Will the gentleman tell me what action was taken by the committee on that request?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that any request by the gentleman from Virginia always receives very sympathetic consideration, and a request of this character would naturally receive particular consideration. The committee did not feel that it was in order to put in the bill an item of $50,000 for a particular hospital. I am sure, however, if the project has such merit, as the gentleman from Virginia feels that it has, the Veterans' Administration will have no difficulty in finding the amount that he suggests in the funds which are otherwise made available.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman will recall that Dr. Magnuson testified that a swimming pool had a definite therapeutic value for paraplegics. Those boys who are doomed for the rest of their days to a wheel chair have certainly made the greatest sacrifice for their country that can be made, and I think that anything within reason that they ask for should be given to them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to bring up the matter of the amputee-car bill at this time. I notice that there is over $1,000,000 that is not expended for the purpose of providing cars for the amputees. The bill in the beginning was discriminatory. It did not take in the double-arm amputees, and they have great trouble in getting about. It did not take in the blind. These two groups are always classed together in the ratings. That bill expires the 1st of July, but they are still waiting in the hospitals. There are several boys who have lost the use of one leg and are gradually losing what remains of the other one. What can the gentleman say to those men if we do not pass legislation for them? That is not before the gentleman's committee, I realize.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sure we are all most sympathetic and grateful to those to whom the gentlewoman refers, but there was no request of any kind before the Committee on Appropriations in that respect. I do not know what we can do in connection with this bill under the circumstances.

There is one more matter I want to mention, Mr. Chairman. There appeared before the committee representatives of private activities who were disturbed about what they conceived to be a change of policy in the Veterans' Administration as to the design of hospitals. They protested against what they understand to be a plan to have 14 new hospitals designed entirely by people on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration, thereby substituting Government architectural work for that of private enterprise.

The committee took the matter up with the Administrator and received the following assurances on the record from him:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is still an opportunity in respect to the 14 for private architects to obtain employment?

General GRAY. There is.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Have you or have you not built up an architectural staff on your pay roll—and if so, to what extent—with that in view?

General GRAY. To design hospitals?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

General GRAY. Not for that purpose. The staff has been built up for the purpose of two things: First, designing of these additions and betterments and alterations; and, second, to average the force incident to doing a lot of work in connection with the revision of these hospitals.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So far as the 14 hospitals are concerned, there is still opportunity for private architects to be employed, and they will be employed in any instance where they can convince you that it is more economical or more advantageous to the Government?

General GRAY. Than for the Government to do so?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

General GRAY. Check.

A final word as to surplus property, Mr. Chairman.

SURPLUS-PROPERTY DISPOSAL

The committee feels that the present situation in reference to surplus-property disposal is highly unsatisfactory. There still remains for disposal property of the value of $4,225,000,000. The property is deteriorating. The 1949 costs of operation are estimated to amount to over 58 percent in terms of realization. Net return to the Government appears to be approaching the vanishing point. There is no likelihood of completing the work with expedition unless some action is taken.

After consulting with members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, your committee has determined to recommend the winding up of the War Assets Administration.

Of the property to be disposed of, there is real estate to the extent of $2,685,000,000; there is aircraft and components to the extent of $873,000,000; and there is other personal property to the extent of $667,000,000.

The Members will find the proposed legislation beginning on page 17 of the bill.

Briefly, it embodies the following recommendations:

First. The abolishment of WAA as of August 31 with the transfer of real estate to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; of aircraft and components to the Department of the Air Force; of other personal property to the Bureau of Federal Supply; the liquidation of WAA being left in the hands of the Treasury Department.

Second. All priorities to terminate August 31 or some 2½ months after enactment of this bill.

Third. Property not declared surplus before date of enactment to be disposed of under the applicable permanent law.

Fourth. Heads of the three departments involved to have the right to dispose of personal property by donation or otherwise if in the Government interest.

Fifth. Any personal property to be transferable free to other Government agencies if for a public use.

Sixth. Monthly progress reports to be made to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House.

Seventh. Fifty millions dollars to be appropriated for allocation between the agencies in question by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

It is hoped that this proposal will commend itself to the Congress as a whole

with a view to the early utilization of the remaining property with the maximum return to the Government.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as you doubtless know, this is the second edition of the independent offices appropriation bill. Some 4 or 5 weeks ago we gave you the first edition and now we bring you the final edition, including the Veterans' Administration, the War Assets Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Maritime Commission, the Housing Expediter, and the Office of Defense Transportation.

There is quite a bit of money in this bill. Of course, the biggest, and I may say the most important item, even though they are all important, is the one dealing with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think in connection with the Veterans' Administration budget it would be interesting to the House to realize that the fund set up for hospitalization of veterans amounts to a little over 17 percent of the entire Veterans' Administration budget. Ordinarily we think of it as a much higher proportion than that, but actually it comes out about 17.7 percent.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That is good information, which the House ought to have.

The bill carries this year about $5,750,000,000. Last year it carried $6,250,000,000 for these very same agencies. That is a lot of money. It takes a good many heavy tax dollars to pay for the cost of this bill, but these are important agencies and certainly no one wants to slight any of them, and most assuredly the committee does not. I am sure I speak the sentiment of the entire House when I say we do not want to deny our veterans anything to which they are rightfully entitled.

If the Members will refer to the committee report, and I think the chairman has done an excellent job in preparing this report, you will see that it carries a cut of about $354,600,000 for the Veterans' Administration. In truth and in fact, that is a lot of money, but when you analyze it it is really not any cut to amount to anything, because the committee feels that when $50,000,000 is taken from pensions, which is a whole lot of money, after all, that is a debt we are going to pay. Last year the Veterans' Administration and your committee missed their guess on the amount of money needed to pay those pensions and benefits that are rightfully due the veterans. If we have missed our guess, we will give them a deficiency to cover immediately. So when all is said and done, there are no cuts that are going to hurt the Veterans' Administration. I might add that the committee has carried on without the slightest hesitancy the hospital construction program as originally outlined and passed by the Congress. The funds are here to carry out the united bed hospital program.

We gave to the hospital program more money than they had last year to the tune of about $78,000,000. I want to say that the committee has great faith and confidence in Dr. Magnuson, head of the hospital service.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the committee reserve any authority in the matter of the placing of these hospitals?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The location of the hospital?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Not the slightest. We do not try to influence that at all.

Mrs. BOLTON. Nobody has anything to say about it?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The gentlewoman will recall that we had quite a controversy on the floor of the House last year as to the location of one hospital because of the very high cost of the land, so we put a limitation there. But we have cleared up that difficulty, and I hope we do not have any more. There is nothing in this bill which attempts to direct or control the expenditure of funds as far as the allocation of any facility is concerned.

Mrs. BOLTON. Then there is always the possibility that there may be a good deal of pressure on the Veterans' Administration authority to place hospitals in places that might be convenient for some people?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I imagine that is true. That is the American system. But the Veterans' Administration has done a good job.

Mrs. BOLTON. That is perhaps the old American system of inefficiency which sometimes makes a very difficult situation for the veterans who become patients in ill-placed hospitals.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That may be so, but they have done a good job.

Mrs. BOLTON. They certainly have and I have the greatest admiration for the way they are doing it, sharing with you your confidence in Dr. Magnuson upon whom the unusually fine mantle of Dr. Hawley descended.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the location of the Veterans' Administration hospitals is controlled by the Federal Hospitalization Board, which is composed not only of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but representatives of other government agencies?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Several Government agencies comprise the Federal Hospitalization Board, and that is the Board that has the final say.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to say what a fine piece of work I think the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs has done, but I do feel that the appropriations for various projects of all kinds do not always reach the branches and departments of the Veterans' Administration for which they are intended. Is that not true?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I think that is problematical. What I mean by that is that when these officials of the Veterans' Administration make justifications before the Committee on Appropriations, we have no reason as a committee to not believe anything that they tell us. I think they try to allocate those funds the best tha' they can according to the way the bill is written and according to their presentations. I think they have done a pretty good job.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The committee ask very searching questions, does it not, just as the Committee on Veterans' Affairs does as to the needs and does not just take the written statement of the officials of the Veterans' Administration? They ask if they need anything more and where that money is needed?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I think we have a very fine group, I might say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, in the Veterans' Administration. I would like to compliment the lady and her committee. I think she has done an outstanding job for the veterans. I compliment her for her energy and good judgment and kindness and patience. She has done an outstanding job for the veterans of all wars that the United States has been engaged in.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is extremely gracious. I believe that his committee members, just as every member of our committee, want to do what is right, but I feel the Veterans' Administration often does not present its full case, and often money which the Congress believes is appropriated for one activity is used for another. In fact, I know that has been done.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. We give them the opportunity to do so. I understand what the gentlewoman is driving at. We give them the opportunity and we ask them off the record about different matters and so forth.

In my humble judgment, if I may continue, I believe that General Gray is one of the finest administrators in the entire Government set-up. He has the unlimited confidence of our committee. We like him, and we think he is going to do a whale of a good job—and he is doing that right now. Let me say this much about the veterans' hospital program.

Dr. Magnuson tells us—and we believed him, too; a great many of us have visited veterans' hospitals—there are no finer hospitals in America today, and that goes for all private hospitals, than are the veterans' hospitals. They have the finest technicians, they have every conceivable type of service, and when a veteran goes to one of those hospitals he is going to get the best attention that medical science can give him, because we are putting up the cash to get just that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman. I know the gentleman, just as we do, wishes to have the money to carry out the provisions of our authorizations. I feel very strongly that the reason the Veterans' Administration turned back some of the $3,000,000 Congressman MCCORMACK and I asked the subcommittee for and was granted was because they did not get that $3,000,000 until very recently. At least, that is what I have been told by officials of the Veterans' Administration. But, of course, not much of that money has been spent.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. If I may interrupt the gentlewoman, we went into that very carefully with General Gray. The general has a head full of good horse sense. He is two-fisted. He said, "If you will give me the money I am now asking for in this budget, I will do a good job, and I will not go around saying that I need any more money." I believe he will do that. We are going to give him a free rein. If he does not, we will take his future requests under consideration and see if we cannot do better if he needs it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman from New York quoted statistics submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. Did the Appropriations Committee question how those statistics were obtained? The reason I ask that is that statistics were presented to our committee, which were so far different from the figures submitted by the Bureau of the Budget it would make you wonder how the statistics were obtained.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. In reply to the gentleman's question, I recall that before the Committee on Appropriations went into consideration of this bill the gentleman from Texas, my distinguished friend and able soldier and veteran himself, asked me that very question, and I promised him I would go into it very carefully, either on the record or off the record. And we did it on the record. General Gray stated:

> This is my budget. I am standing on it, and if you give me this money I will do a good job and be satisfied.

The gentleman from California wanted to be a little more specific, and he said:

> Now, General, just putting it in our own language, will there be any back talk?

The General said:

> Put it on the record that this is all I want, and I will do a grand job.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. In the midst of all these flowers being thrown around to the Veterans' Bureau, I would like to see at least one little daisy thrown to Maj. Omar Clark, Assistant Administrator, who, through thick and thin, serves in the Veterans' Administration, and who I think is deserving of considerable praise.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is a great man and a good man and a fine soldier. He is doing an outstanding job.

I might say that General Gray has on his staff some fine people. They are great men and they are doing their dead level best for the veterans. Certainly one of the most distinguished men in the group is our friend Clark.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas a couple of questions in connection with the Maritime Commission appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. We are now jumping from the Veterans' Administration to the Maritime Commission.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman would like to proceed with the veterans' matter first——

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. No; you ask your question, and I will be delighted to answer it, if I can.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I desire to get the intent of the committee on these matters. There was some intimation sometime ago that the Maritime Commission might ask for some drydocks to engage in maintenance and repair of the Reserve fleet. Will the gentleman explain what action the committee took on that?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes; it is a moot question now. They were figuring on getting two or three or half a dozen drydocks from the Navy, but the Navy has withdrawn them. There is perhaps $750,000 in here for training personnel; and $350,000 for drydocks, or a total of $1,150,000.

It was denied and stricken from the bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The reason I asked the question was that I have a private shipyard in my own district, and there are many throughout the country who are entirely prepared to take care of this work.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The gentleman has nothing to worry about for a long time to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The second question relates to matter contained on page 586 of the hearings. I wonder if the committee gave any consideration to the possibility of saving some money in connection with the shipconstruction program by the purchase of available hulls that might be used?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Does the gentleman have reference to the two big boats out on the west coast?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes; the *Mariposa* and the *Monterey*.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. We went into that very carefully. They are two fine ships, incidentally, which, if they were to be built now, would cost from $27,000,000 to $28,000,000 each. They are very fine fast ships, and we have directed the Maritime Commission to get some firm bids to put them in first-class condition. We are very much interested in taking over those ships if we could make a deal and completing them out because we can save several million dollars by doing so.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That matter is contained on page 6 of the report?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few observations about the veterans, and then I will yield the floor to someone else. I have not covered very many of the agencies.

By and large this is a good bill, but I feel keenly disappointed in one item as far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned, and to be perfectly frank about it and fair to everyone I think it was unanimously agreed by the full committee that we were going to give to the veterans the protection that they are not now getting on the housing program for veterans. That is so very important not only to the veterans but to the taxpayers of this country.

The outside potential liability of the taxpayers of this country under the veterans' housing program alone is $20,000,000,000 and I think as of today we have already committed the taxpayers of this country to the tune of $3,300,000,000 for veterans' housing. The Veterans' Administration deny very strongly that they have. They say they have no jurisdiction, no law, no authority, to follow up these loans after they have advanced the $4,000; but in the next breath those people say that they are giving consideration to doing something about it. If they have no authority, how in the world can they give consideration to doing something about it? Frankly, I think my distinguished friend, General Gray, is inconsistent. I think he has been badly misled by his chief counsel, Mr. Odom. Mr. Odom might wake up a little bit.

Well, now, through some misunderstanding—I prefer to put it like that because I know the committee is not going to do anything it ought not to do——

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Will not the gentlewoman permit me to complete my statement, please? Then I will yield.

As the matter stands, the Veterans' Administration says they have no authority to follow them up. Whether it is real or imaginary or what not, there are a lot of complaints from the veterans. But the Veterans' Administration says the old rule of caveat emptor applies; in other words, let the buyer beware.

How in the world is a veteran going to be aware of some defect in material that only an expert can figure out? Even the builders cannot figure out these defects.

Another agency of Government has a slight finger in this thing. That is the Housing Expediter. He has not had any authority since the Patman Act was repealed, and during the life of the Patman Act he accumulated some 30,000 to 35,000 cases. These complaints all are now pending. Well, under our committee agreement it was my understanding that even though we gave him funds to get out and get him some lawyers and investigators to the tune of 260 employees, he wanted an additional 244. We denied him the 244 thinking that it

would be transferred over to the Veterans' Administration because Mr. Wood's authority will die as a matter of operation of law on March 1 of next year, as I understand. The Veterans' Administration is a permanent agency of Government and there is where that authority ought to be and the Veterans' Administration ought to give these boys that protection. Now, through some misunderstanding we agreed in the committee that we were going to transfer that to the Veterans' Administration in whatever language was necessary to give them the authority that they need, but, Lord knows, they do not need any more authority than they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the basic act gives them authority to make loans up to $4,000. Certainly that carries with it the inherent authority to protect the veteran and the taxpayers.

Let me ask the gentleman from California if I am correct in my understanding and if I am not I will offer the amendment under the 5-minute rule. Am I correct in assuming that it is the intention of the committee to write to the Veterans' Administration at the earliest possible moment demanding that it assume authority on this particular follow-up item for veterans' housing?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The understanding of the gentleman is correct. The chairman is not present, but I think I may speak for him and say that is his intention. It should be said further, in support of the gentleman from Texas, that the committee individually and collectively feels that the Veterans' Administration has that authority and, finally, if the gentleman will bear with me for 30 seconds longer, it should be said the gentleman is the one who succeeded in getting the action and the statement from the Veterans' Administration on this point.

The reason it was not included in the bill and action was not taken is due to two things: The fact it had arrived after the committee had finished its meetings and, finally, the fact that the Housing Expediter concludes his work by law on the 1st of April next year. It was felt by that time the Veterans' Administration would have assumed the burden or the obligation or the responsibility, I may say, which the gentleman from Texas feels lies at their door.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to state that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had exactly the same experience that the Subcommittee on Appropriations had that the Veterans' Administration promised it would have an efficient inspection made of the houses. Also, may I say to the gentleman that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported an amendment to the GI bill of rights, the so-called Legion Homestead Act, that would very much improve the construction of veterans' housing, the loan and inspections, and so forth, and I hope the gentleman will help us secure passage of that bill. Also, as chairwoman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am appointing a special subcommittee to inspect abuses in the construction of houses.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. May I ask the gentleman if he will give us the benefit of his interpretation of what the committee means by avocation or recreational, insofar as it pertains to flight training?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Generally, I will put it like this, and I think we are only echoing the sentiments of the country, certainly of the vast majority of the members of this committee. We feel that if a chap wants to take up twinkletoeing just for the purpose of twinkletoeing, certainly the taxpayers ought not to pay the bill; but if he has an earnest desire to learn to dance in order to make his living, certainly he ought to be able to choose that method of earning his living. When it comes to flight training, if he is anxious to become a pilot or a mechanic and earn his living as a mechanic or pilot and wants to pursue that occupation, certainly we should furnish the funds; and General Gray will, because we do not intend to limit that type of training.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to flight training, suppose he wants to learn to fly as a means of transportation; that being engaged in selling or in any other line of business he wants to learn to fly, or because he is a rancher, and he transacts his business 40 or 50 or more miles away from there, but just as a matter of transportation in his business he wants to fly his own plane.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I imagine that General Gray will say "Yes," and I would, too, that that is certainly part of his livelihood and an adjunct to his business, and he should have that opportunity.

Mr. CURTIS. So far as the gentleman is concerned, that is the intention of the committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I note with grave misgivings the reduction in the appropriation for the atomic-energy program.

I always hesitate to differ with any committee on any reduction in expenditures. My training and my practice for many years has been to cut to the bone, to the irreducible minimum. And if this were a routine program, or if the cut had been buttressed by evidence or had been predicated on some sound basis of computation, my disposition would be to go along with the committee.

But this program involves a matter of tremendous import, not only because of its intrinsic value and its prospect of future economic developments, but because of its immediate effect upon our international relations and its direct relation to the safety and welfare of the Nation itself.

If we had adopted this policy, Mr. Chairman, when we had before the committee the appropriations for the research which produced the atomic bomb, we would never have perfected the bomb. As a matter of fact, no one can say with certainty that we would have won the war. The practical application of nuclear fissure to present-day problems, including atomic warfare, would have been impossible had we not given our scientists a free reign and money enough to do the job. It was expensive; but it was the best investment of all our wartime appropriations. And we have no assurance that a similar latitude in research may not be just as necessary in this instance.

Of course, it may be said that we were at war when that appropriation was made, and that we are laboring under no such compulsion here this afternoon. Not only are we still technically at war, with no treaty of peace yet in sight, but as a matter of fact there is general agreement that we have been engaged in a cold war with Russia for the last 3 years, and the preponderance of editorial comment is to the effect that we have been losing the cold war. Even at best, the international situation is too unsettled and the security of the country too incontestably menaced to reduce the amount provided for this program without ample justification.

It may be that I have gone through the hearings on this item too hastily, but on a cursory examination of the record I have been unable to find any justification for even a tentative reduction, much less the drastic reduction which the committee recommends. It is evidently an arbitrary cut. But its inescapable effect will be to reduce the tempo of atomic-energy research activities at a time when speed is the essence of the problem.

The only tenable basis suggested for the major cut is the statement in the report that the Commission failed to supply the committee with information it requested. The information to which the report seems to refer—and the only information which the Commission apparently failed to submit—was a list of relative priorities of atomic-energy programs. From a reading of the response of the Commission, it is obviously impossible to prepare such a list, as the whole subject is in such a state of flux that there is no dependable data available from which a definite priority list could be compiled at this time. Aside from this one inquiry, the Commission seems to have submitted complete information on both its operations and its programs.

Precisely the same question arose when we had before us the estimates for the original atomic research. General Marshall refused to even tell us for what purpose the money was to be used.

When the committee insisted upon its right to refuse to appropriate the money

unless it knew the exact purpose for which the money was being spent, General Marshall bluntly closed the proposition by saying that it was a matter in which both Germany and America were conducting research and that the country which first cracked the problem would win the war. He said if the United States solved the problem first, the United States would win the war beyond the peradventure of a doubt, but if, on the other hand, Germany found the answer first, Germany would win the war in spite of anything that could be done. Subsequently developments corroborated General Marshall's views on the matter, and absolutely in the dark we authorized the expenditure of over $2,000,000,000 before the first bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

I must confess some of us spent agonizing hours when 2 years passed and it began to look as if the project was a failure and we had poured a nation's ransom down the drain pipe without any return whatever, but if we had followed the policy which the committee proposes to follow here today in shackling our scientists in their investigations, the results of which are comparatively assured, we would never have had the bomb, and it is possible we would not have won the war.

And it should not be overlooked that the development of a superweapon of warfare is only a collateral objective in this project. Along with war potentials are peace objectives even more revolutionary. If the dream of modern science is realized—as now seems possible—industry and transportation and every form of mechanical activity will be powered by an energy which will cost only a few pennies where we now spend millions of dollars, and the productive capacity and the health and happiness of the human race will be immeasurably advanced.

We should hestitate here before we assume the terrible responsibilities which may be involved curtailing atomic research. In this enterprise we are touching elbows with destiny; we are dealing with forces which affect the rise and fall of nations; forces which may contribute to the perpetuation of a golden era of civilization or which may bring about another visitation of the dark ages of medievalism.

Mr. Chairman, may I also call attention to another significant provision of the bill before us, which the subcommittee proposed to eliminate.

As will be noted, the bill carries a paragraph providing that no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

The subcommittee proposed to omit this provision although it has been carried in every general appropriation bill which has passed the House this session. The committee refused to accept the recommendation of the subcommittee and on motion retained it in the form in which it is here reported to the House. And the proponent of the motion to overrule the subcommittee gave as his reason for offering the motion that if it was stricken from the bill the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] would take it up on the floor. Ah, Mr. Chairman, I have not lived in vain. I count it as one of the treasured privileges of my service in the House to have had the opportunity of collaborating with my Republican brothers by prevailing upon them to carry out their promise to the people that they would continue the program begun by the Democratic administration which preceded them to eliminate every Communist from the Government. Sad to say, they have been very dilatory in carrying out this program. They have talked a great deal about communism, and about its prevalence throughout the woof and fabric of the Government, but they have sedulously refrained from doing anything about it There have been statements here on the floor to the effect that the State Department, for example, was honeycombed with communism. They have specifically charged that there were 12 known Communists in the Department of State. But they have taken no steps to remedy the situation.

Under a system which has long been in effect, every employee of the Department of State has been investigated by the FBI and the Secretary of State has said that every employee's record as certified by the FBI has been searchingly scrutinized and all about whom there has been reasonable doubt have been dismissed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the elimination of communism from the Government is not only the responsibility of the executive department. The House also has its responsibility. We have carried out that responsibility in preceding Congresses.

When it was charged that there were Communists in the employ of the Government the Committee on Appropriations submitted a resolution and in an investigation authorized by the House investigated the charges and saw that they were dismissed from the Government.

With that precedent in mind, when it was stated on the floor of the House that there were 12 Communists in the Govment, I immediately introduced a resolution providing for investigations under which any employee of the Government found to be a Communist could have been eliminated from the Government service, but up to this time no action has been taken on the resolution. And no other method of dealing with the problem has been suggested. In short, nothing has been done.

Then they brought in the Mundt bill, and were at last proposing to take drastic action. It was not just the measure we would have adopted but the Senate might have improved it. Now it has joined the other resolutions on the subject and has been pigeonholed and again after much talk nothing has been done.

The provisions included in all general appropriation bills offered another opportunity for the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress to take action against communism and Communists in the departments. But beginning with the conference report on the Labor and Federal Security bill agreed to here this afternoon, even that doubtful measure has been abandoned.

The failure to take any action to investigate charges that there are Communists in the executive departments of the Government, the failure to bring the Mundt bill out of the pigeonhole and the abandonment of this simple prohibition against the use of money appropriated in all the general appropriation bills in payment of Communists who advocate overthrow of the government—the evident softening of the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations and the House toward Communists and communism—might be taken on the face of it as a direct bid for the Communist vote next November.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I will not press my point of order, but I hold in my hand a copy of Cannon's Rules of Procedure written by the distinguished gentleman who is now addressing the House. One of the points upon which a gentleman's words may be taken down is to refer to proceedings of a committee not formally reported to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman cites a very eminent authority.

But it is not only necessary to have good tools; it is necessary to know how to handle them.

Mr. Chairman, the charge that there are Communists in the service of the Government demands prompt and urgent attention. Traitors in the citadel boring from the inside are more dangerous than any external foe. It is the method which Stalin has used in taking over every nation which he has exploited. Every country absorbed by Russia has been prepared for the coup by traitors and fifth columns who betrayed their country to the enemy. If these charges of infiltration in the Departments of our Government are true, prompt steps should be taken to ferret them out. If the charges are not true they ought to be investigated and exposed.

There has been some uncertainty in the last day or two as to whether Congress can adjourn by June 19. But in the last hour leaders of both Houses have expressed the personal opinion that there is yet a possibility that the work of the Congress can be concluded in time to meet the original schedule. If so, time is short and any action on this score should be taken promptly.

If there are people in the Departments who advocate overthrow of the Government by force and violence, give us an opportunity to take up the resolution now in the pigeonholes of the Committee on Appropriations, or bring up and perfect the Mundt bill or enact the appropriations bills with the provisions against

payment of Government funds to subversive employees. Let us have a showdown. Either take action or acknowledge that all such charges are campaign propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, in order that the House may have the truth concerning the subject matter with which the gentleman from Missouri has just dealt, let me call attention to exactly what happened.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the gentleman does not claim that he has a monopoly upon truth. I trust he does not intimate that the preceding speaker was not stating the truth. If so, I would ask to have his words taken down.

Mr. COUDERT. I think the preceding speaker was speaking under a misapprehension of the facts. I would like to state the facts.

Mr. CANNON. That is entirely different. From a parliamentary point of view, a question of the facts and a question of the truth are two different things.

Mr. COUDERT. That depends upon who the speaker is.

Now, the facts of the matter, Mr. Chairman, are simply these: This is a supplementary bill, the committee's original bill having been passed earlier in the session. Therefore, in the supplementary bill the committee merely referred to the anti-Communist provisions carried in the original bill, including them by reference in the bill presently before the House. Apparently, someone reading the bill and not entirely understanding it, suggested that it be made doubly clear, so the full committee incorporated the very words of the original bill, so that reference to the anti-Communist provision that has been carried in all appropriation bills, is doubly carried in this bill, in deference to those who apparently could not read clearly the bill as originally recommended by the subcommittee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. So that as I understand it, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is not the only Member of the House who wants to get rid of the Communists?

Mr. COUDERT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have more than 10 minutes on this particular bill, but I appreciate the allotment, in view of the fact that I know the time is short on both sides.

I think the Appropriations Committee has gradually become the censor of every committee in the House, in view of the fact that they are now writing legislation for every committee of the House, and modifying legislative policy which has been passed by the House in some instances, and in other instances is under contemplation in the respective committees.

I am going to confine my remarks strictly to the elimination of the War Assets Administration in this particular bill, which, of course, is legislation on an appropriation bill, which, under the rule, is permitted, and which interferes directly with the functions of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am a member, particularly of the subcommittee, the so-called Rizley subcommittee, which has that responsibility.

I want to give you just a few points as to what will happen if this bill is passed, as it will be passed, I am sure, in regard to the War Assets Administration, a subject which we have studied for 2 years now in my subcommittee.

As a member of the Expenditures Subcommittee To Investigate Disposal of Surplus Property since the beginning of the last Congress, I have had occasion to become very familiar with the operation of the disposal program. Our subcommittee has probed, investigated, and held hearings on every phase of these operations from Honolulu to Alaska. I am cognizant of the weaknesses of the Surplus Property Act as well as the mistakes which have been made in its administration. I am aware that legislation will ultimately be necessary to clean up the loose ends of this disposal program, and particularly, to carry forward disposals of real property.

The Senate has before it at this time proposed legislation, as has the Committee on Expenditures in the House. Elaborate hearings have been held on these bills.

In view of the consideration which had been given by appropriate committees, I was quite surprised when I read the surplus-property disposal portion of the bill, cited as the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1949, together with the accompanying report, and again found that the Committee on Appropriations had seen fit to usurp legislative functions of another committee. It is apparent that if such a practice continues, the remainder of the committees will be relieved of the bulk of their work. After reading the transcript of the hearings on this bill, I was further amazed that the committee, on the basis of testimony therein, felt sufficiently advised of the disposal program to propose legislation effecting such drastic changes.

I note with interest on page 14 of the committee report that consultation was had with members of the Committee on Expenditures. I challenge the veracity of that statement to the extent that the subcommittee charged with the responsibility of investigating surplus disposals was never consulted. And, it is my further belief that if such had been the case, no member thereof would have concurred in this claptrap, hot hodgepodge of words, which is neither legally nor practically sound. I am further of the opinion that the findings reflected in the Senate and House hearings on surplus disposal as well as legislation effecting same was never reviewed, and that this monstrosity of legislation, which purports to be the panacea that will end all surplus disposal problems, was born in complete ignorance and with total disregard of the legal and economic aspects of the situation.

I do not purport to be learned in either the writing or interpretation of law, but as a businessman and as a Congressman I think I have acquired a little more than the average layman's knowledge of certain phases of the law and the ability to apply the rules of common sense to what is the law. I would like to submit a few questions and matters for consideration on the legal aspects and practical aspects of the surplus-disposal phase of this bill.

First. The bill provides that the title to all real property, mortgages, and so forth, will be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I wonder if it has ever occurred to the members of the committee that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is required by law to pay taxes on all of the property that it owns. This will mean that the United States Government will be required to pay taxes, as any other private corporation, on approximately three and one-half to four billion dollars worth of realty. Was this considered in the $50,000,000 appropriation? It is my humble judgment that the members of the committee either did not know or did not consider it in any respect. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation had its fling in the disposal of surplus property, and I feel that it is unnecessary to do more than point out its record in that respect to question its ability to again be permitted to further muddle disposals.

Second. The language of the bill abolishes the War Assets Administration, but is totally silent on abolishing the War Assets Administrator, who, under the Reorganization Plan has functions distinctly apart and separate from those of the War Assets Administration. The bill neither abolishes the office nor the responsibilities of the War Assets Administrator, who under the Surplus Property Act has the power, and the power alone, to make regulations to effectuate the intent of the act. The net result will be, as a matter of law, that the War Assets Administrator, without funds, will be in charge of the Department of the Air Force, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Bureau of Federal Supply in their disposal of surplus property, and, at the same time, will supervise the Treasury Department in the liquidation of the affairs of the War Assets Administration. I realize this is not the intent of the proposed legislation, but such, in my opinion, will be the necessary legal effect.

Third. The act provides that property which has not been declared surplus under the Surplus Property Act at the time of the enactment of the bill will be disposed of in accordance with the terms of other existing law. This means that an owning agency with usable surplus property on its hands could not declare same to a disposal agency, but would have the burden of disposing of same under existing law. I am advised there is existing law which permits agencies to dispose of scrap and salvage generated from their own supplies, but I am unaware of

any existing law which would enable or permit them to dispose of usable surplus realty and personalty other than under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. If such be true, the import of the bill would have the effect of precluding future declarations of surplus and leave such surplus in the hands of the owning agencies without any authority whatsoever to dispose of it. I note in the committee report that it took into consideration the factors of obsolescence and deterioration. The only alternative that an agency with usable surplus in its hands will have, will be to wait until it deteriorates to the point of being no more than scrap or salvage and only then, can that agency dispose of it under existing law.

Fourth. No appropriation or provision was made for the added burden of disposal on the respective owning agencies, even if such law did exist. The appropriation is to be used by the War Assets Administration until August 31, and thereafter by the Treasury Department, the Department of the Air Force, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as allocated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Fifth. The bill provides that priorities and preferences contained in the Surplus Property Act, as amended, shall not continue beyond August 31, 1948. This does not necessarily present a legal question but one of common sense. The committee report states "that the mail of Congress has carried a running fire of protest from every section of the country." When the former owners of farm land, residential property, plants, abandoned airfields, camp sites, and business property are compelled to stand by and see their former property sold without regard to their being given a prior right to purchase, I shudder to think of the running fire of congressional mail with which we will be deluged. In the early phases of the war, the patriotic citizens of this country, voluntarily in some instances and in others by condemnation, gave up their home sites, their farms, their plants, hotels, office buildings, and other real property holdings, which represented a lifetime of earnings, in order that the war effort might go on. They were, in many instances, by intimation and by actual promise, told that when these properties were no longer needed for the war effort they could reacquire them. Many who have not as yet been able to reacquire their property anxiously desire to do so. Others have been able to reacquire their property under the priorities previously afforded by the Surplus Property Act. Are we at this time to discriminate against these former owners who have not been so fortunate? Are we to repudiate the moral obligation created by those who made verbal commitments at the time of acquisition? There may be those of you who can, with a clear conscience, vote in the affirmative on these provisions and face your constituents, but I, for one, cannot and will not do so.

Sixth. The bill provides for transfer of surplus from designated disposal agencies to other Government agencies without reimbursement. But what provision is there for a transfer between owning agencies who are precluded from future declarations of surplus and other agencies who could use the surplus which is no longer needed?

Outside of the legal aspects, there are factors too numerous to mention which mitigate against the workability of this proposed legislation. Undoubtedly, the possible life tenure of the War Assets Administration is now, or shortly will be, known to its employees. As a practical matter, how much constructive work do you think these employees will produce between now and August 31? Undoubtedly, these employees will spend a major portion of their time in attempting to locate new places of employment. It is true that the bill contains certain provisions for the transfer of personnel. Civil-service employees know from previous experience that wordage to this effect means little or nothing insofar as their rights are concerned, and the absorbing agency, which more often than not is faced with reduction of its own force, will utilize open positions for its own employees, and release those of the incoming agency. I predict that if this legislation is passed these War Assets employees, or at least a great portion of same, will be little more than pensioners for the next 2½ months, and, frankly, if I were faced with the same prospects, and with a family to support, I would possibly pursue the same path.

I wonder how many of you know that the War Assets Administration in the past fiscal year returned a net to the Treasury of approximately $300,000,000. I am advised that a net of $80,000,000 was anticipated for the next fiscal year. The amount of this appropriation is absurd, if the present agency were permitted to continue, and is even more absurd when you contemplate its distribution between four agencies in the light of the disposal problem which lies ahead.

It is my humble judgment that it will take 6 months from today to properly and effectively transfer the various functions from the War Assets Administration to the Department of the Air Force, Bureau of Federal Supply, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is my further judgment that the total appropriation would be absorbed in the payment of annual leave on discharged employees, cost of transfer of functions, protection, maintenance, and warehousing costs of property during the dormant period of transfer, and the further time lost in new agencies attempting to grasp a problem of disposal which they are not now, nor have they ever, been geared to handle. The cost of deterioration and depreciation of value alone would in all probability exceed the amount of the appropriation. This prediction is not based on an idle estimate, but one can only look to the disposal program and see where similar ramifications and trouble have arisen on each occasion when a new organization absorbed disposal functions, and God only knows what it will be when three agencies attempt to absorb it.

The committee has noted in its report the succession of agencies which have handled the disposal of surplus property, and by inference indicate that too many hands have spoiled the broth. Now, in order to provide the remedy of all remedies, they transfer—not to another agency, but to three other agencies, all subject to the control of still another Bureau. I can conceive of no greater mix-up of administration than can come from such a situation.

In conclusion, it is my humble judgment that this bill should be resubmitted in the light of these ramifications and further consideration be given to a permanent plan of surplus disposal when the present administration has reduced surplus stocks to such a point that they can be transferred with a minimum of expense and delay to disposals. It is my further belief that before such a plan is adopted that the committee should hear from the Bureau of the Budget, Department of the Air Force, Treasury Department, Bureau of Federal Supply, Army, Navy, members of the committee who are familiar with the disposal problems and a full hearing held before such a drastic step as that proposed in the bill, is taken. If the bill, as written, is adopted, it is my opinion that the committee's use of the term "ludicrous" could be best applied to its own cure-all remedy, which will in all probablity kill rather than cure the patient. I am getting a little fed up with the policy of plowing under the money crop because of the expense of harvest. If such is to be the policy then let us be truly economical and abandon the crop and avoid even the expense of plowing, which in this case would mean saving the $50,000,000 appropriated and abandonment of all surplus. This is, of course, absurd.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words in regard to the atomic energy appropriation this year.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman from California has just made what I think are some very serious charges and I hope some member of the Appropriations Committee will take the time and the trouble to explain to us Members of the House what they feel are the answers to those charges.

Mr. DURHAM. That is a question for some member of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the atomic energy program that was initiated under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, when we took over this project from the Army, has been subject to criticism, which is one thing I want to call to the attention of this House. This program has been, I may say, carried forward since the program was initiated and taken over by the Commission in what I believe to be a fair, just, reasonable, and progressive way in an effort to try to keep us in a preeminent position in regard to nuclear physics. This program is a very difficult one, one that requires something different from anything else that this House or this Congress has had before it. It is a matter of concern to most of us because of the fact that it is our No. 1 weapon today, and those of us who have followed

this program are proud of the fact that today we are still in a preeminent position. There can be criticism directed at the operations, the housing, and the cost, and all of the matters pertaining to it. It becomes very expensive because of the fact that the location of these plants was decided on in a hurry. In most of the places they were built in remote areas, and transportation, roads, housing, and everything else enters into this picture. It is something entirely different from anything else that faces American cities of the ordinary size. So, I do not believe it is fair to compare the operation of any of the public utilities, whatever they may be, with any of our city governments here in America, because most of those have been established over a period of years, and they have had management improvement in their development, whereas we have had to, you might say, nurse this whole program along.

Another thing, of course, that is of great concern to this Congress and also to the entire American people, is a matter that ordinarily we Members have very little to do with here in the House, but under this act we probably may have to enter into the matter of confirmation of the Commission in the next few weeks if we expect to have a commission in operation. Those terms of office will begin to expire the first of August. I am hopeful that the other body and this body can act in a fair and reasonable manner in the continuance of this Commission, because I have tried to, as best I could as a member of this committee, to evaluate their worth to the country and to this important project which is of such great importance to the American people and believe the Commission members have served to the best interests of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, it is earnestly hoped by many Members of this House that this Congress will not adjourn without providing adequate pay raises for all Federal employees. The general Federal employees, the postal employees, the per diem workers, including those governed by the Wage Board regulation, all have been particularly adversely affected by the rising cost of living, as most of them not only live in large metropolitan areas, but have not had pay increases in recent years at all commensurate with living costs.

In many lines of private employment efforts have been made to adjust salaries to living costs. Recently in one of our largest industrial plants immediate raises were given, with future increases tied to living-costs indexes. In this area salaries and earnings of those in Federal Government services previously formed a pattern for wages and income for private employment to follow and strive to attain. In recent years, however, particularly since the closing of the war, the converse has been true, and the income of Federal employees is lagging behind comparable services outside of the Government.

I have appeared before committees and previously expressed those thoughts on the floor, and am doing it again with the hope that constant urging by those of us who feel strongly that adequate pay increases should be given to the Government employees, might have some effect on preventing this Congress from adjourning and leaving many of those Federal employees economically unable to meet their budgets. We have been hearing a lot about "must" legislation to be passed before Congress adjourns. The Government is the employer, Congress effects salaries and makes appropriations in the matter of pay adjustments. The responsibility is here in this body. Let us meet it before adjournment.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I hate to rise and again accuse the Committee on Appropriations of this House of usurping the clear-cut jurisdiction of the standing committees of the House.

One of the main things that was attempted in the reorganization of Congress was to make clear the lines of jurisdiction of the well-established standing committees of the House. Recently we have seen this jurisdiction usurped by the Appropriations Committee on numbers of occasions, whether it be the Committee on Foreign Affairs or many other committees.

In this bill there are about 4 pages of purely legislative action usurping the jurisdiction of not one standing committee of the House but about three or four.

The Appropriations Committee usurp the clear jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments by writing a new surplus property disposal act. They usurp the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has spent many months trying to reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as a banking institution.

In that regard I may say that the other body spent at least 6 months of investigation trying to get the Reconstruction Finance Corporation back as a lending institution and clean out all of the extraneous tasks that had been thrust upon it during the war.

The House committee spent months trying to do that, too, and we wrote a new act streamlining the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and cutting it down in size and making it essentially a lending institution.

Now this bill comes in here and we find that instead of having one of the most important lending institutions of the country they are throwing it back into the junk business again. I simply cannot understand why the Committee on Appropriations should usurp the jurisdiction of these standing committees. It has also usurped the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services by giving the already overburdened Air Force the job of disposing of surplus aircraft and aircraft materials.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Under the present arrangement there is over a billion dollars worth of aircraft component parts still in the hands of agents for disposal. They are getting from 40 to 60 percent back for the Government. Under this bill, this material will go back to the Air Force, and the Air Force under existing law cannot sell it for anything except scrap or junk.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

PROVISION NOT THOUGHT OUT

This thing has not been clearly thought out, it has not been carefully investigated, and it is going to result in pyramiding millions of dollars of additional costs on the Government without saving one thin dime.

It is going to result in a loss, I think, of many millions of dollars worth of surplus property that could be readily sold if we allow the operation either under War Assets or as the President has recommended and the War Assets Administration has recommended, transferring this in toto to the Federal Works Agency.

MAKING THREE BUREAUS OUT OF ONE

Why the Committee on Appropriations should go to the country and say they are trying to save money, and yet make three bureaus grow where one grew before, I cannot possibly understand.

Here is a very important point. In the last Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill that passed this House only very recently we provided that all real property held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would be subject to all local taxes. I should like to read this paragraph of that bill, so you will know it is in the law:

Except that any real property of the Corporation—

That is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—

shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as any other real property is taxed.

There are $3,000,000,000 worth of surplus real property now being disposed of as rapidly as possible by the War Assets Administration, not now subject to local taxation, but which is being here made subject to all local taxation, even taxes for educational purposes.

If you have an Army camp in which not a single person is living, you are going to pay the full local taxation on that land that is merely being held while the war cost is being liquidated out of that camp.

I cannot understand any Committee on Appropriations that could possibly look into this thing that would want to start this sort of precedent and make over three billions of dollars worth of war property subject to all local taxation.

If you are going to do that, then you might start by passing laws to tax Federal buildings, such as post-office buildings, airplane landing strips, and everything else, because you are setting the pattern in this bill.

Another thing which I think is highly important is that you are going to confuse the RFC, which operates on borrowed capital as a lending institution in

the disposal of surplus property. Where does their borrowing and lending authority cease as to administrative expenses and where does the authority for the use of appropriations for sale of surplus property begin?

You are not going to save anything in personnel. You are going to have to transfer over the caretakers, the watchmen, and the guards, and the other people who are trying to keep this surplus in salable condition and in good repair to these three new sub-bureaus of these three agencies that you are going to make grow up. You are not going to have them be able to assimilate this large job without adding these new sub-bureaus. You will have three instead of one.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Recognizing the very truth of what the gentleman has said, included in the bill as far as personnel reduction is concerned, the bill does not provide for neither more nor less personnel, but recognizes the fact that this personnel would have to be transferred from these other agencies to take care of them.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is right. It confuses and confounds your attempts to simplify budgetary control by throwing a big monkey wrench right in the middle of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Of course, we would like to keep the record straight as far as the statement made by our distinguished friend from California is concerned. We are talking about the rights of employees and not the numbers of them. The gentleman from Oklahoma has just said that we are not going to save a dime. This appropriation for the War Assets Administration was reduced by $50,000,000, which is a considerable sum.

WILL REQUIRE MILLIONS MORE

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for bringing that point up because the gentleman will be back here next January, and he knows it, with a request for an appropriation for over $50,000,000 to repair the wreck and damage that this change and shifting and monkeying up an organization which is a going concern will cause.

Let me talk for a minute about this $50,000,000 that you have here; $30,000,000 will be required to give, under the law that Congress passed, 30 days' notice to employees and provide for their accumulated leaves of absence.

So whoever gets this job of administering surplus property next year is going to finally have after August 3, just this $20,000,000 to handle the vast task that has to be handled.

I can conceive of no greater disservice that has been done since the beginning of this Eightieth Congress than the bringing in of such a hasty, ill-considered, messed-up proposition as this. I do hope when the committee reads the bill for amendment we will at least be able to strike this legislative monstrosity from this section and replace it with the language which was in last year's bill and give them the $50,000,000 or whatever you want to give them. But let us have an orderly procedure.

Let us go ahead and follow the President and the War Assets Administration and transfer this thing in toto to one agency of Government, which would be the Federal Works Agency. This is no savings in this proposed Hydra-headed, three-way disposal set-up.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to point out that on page 14 of the report there are three items listed which total over $4,000,000,000, but they left out an item of leaseholds of $1,050,000,000 which is also inventory of war assets and which requires constant care and supervision. That has been left out. So that is 25 percent of their inventory.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is another illustration of the old adage that "Haste makes waste."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? It might save a little time to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and the gentleman from Oklahoma to read the bill, and they will see that the leaseholds and matters of that kind are in the bill and are transferred.

Mr. MONRONEY. Transferred to the RFC? I would like to ask the gentleman, or any member of the committee, just where real property leaves off in these war plants and personal property takes hold.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is a very good question, but I do not want to answer it on the gentleman's time, as your time is getting short.

Mr. MONRONEY. The laws of many States require that the machinery and equipment in these plants is a part of the real property. You are not going to find that the RFC will be alone in their confusion on what property they are to handle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield the gentleman one more minute, the last minute I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONRONEY. You are going to find that you are not going to be dealing in real estate alone, but in machine tools and equipment of all kinds as well as real estate in the RFC.

We are trying to streamline that organization, in the Committee on Banking and Currency, to get rid of these extraneous details.

When a motion is made to strike this language and reinsert the language in last year's appropriation bill and include the amount which the committee recommends, I hope the membership will vote for it. Let us stop this practice of stripping legislative committees, who are given jurisdiction by the House, and turning over to the all-powerful Appropriations Committee the job of legislating.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Where does this opposition come from, of the Government dealing in everything? I thought the Government was in everything long ago.

Mr. MONRONEY. They will be in a whole lot more things under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the conclusion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] that the time has arrived that the Appropriations Committee should cease usurping the functions of the regular legislative committees and writing legislation in the appropriations bills.

I am referring specifically to page 14, line 10, beginning with the word "Provided", wherein it is indicated that no part of the appropriation for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be expended for tuition, fees, or other charges or for subsistence allowance, for any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, and so forth.

This morning in the Veterans' Affairs Committee, we recommended for passage H. R. 6079. With this bill, State rights are still protected. The State authorizing agency still has authority; yet, at the same time, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may appear before any authorizing agency and point out and ask that a particular school be closed. To just write veterans' affairs legislation in an appropriation bill would make the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs a czar and could kill the hopes and aspirations of untold thousands of veterans. When the original GI bill of rights was written, there was a definite commitment that the veteran should be at least partly compensated for the years he had lost from his education which was dedicated to the service of his country and quite often against his will.

I implore you that this part of this bill should be stricken and that legislation as provided by the Veterans' Affairs Committee be enacted.

I ask that you adopt the Stefan amendment when offered.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 20 minutes, to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I take it that what we have heard is the argument of the War Assets Administration itself. There is nothing more permanent in government than a temporary agency. There is nothing more difficult to get rid of than an agency of Government created for some transitory function. Everyone here knows that.

It is always interesting to me to come on the floor with an appropriation bill and to listen to its discussion. A committee works for weeks and weeks, taking apart every individual item of a bill, asking that the requests be justified, asking that the figures be proven in detail.

Then the committee brings the bill to the floor for discussion. It is by that method, and by such questions as have been brought up today, regarding the items in this bill, that legislation is made.

I know no perfect bill. There is one point, which came up today, upon which there is proper question. I think that can be settled either here or in the other body. I do not think it as serious as the gentlemen do who have discussed it.

I have gained out of this session's membership on the Appropriations Committee a definite and real admiration and regard and respect for the men who serve on the Appropriations Committee, and especially for the men who serve as chairmen of the subcommittees. I regard most highly the chairman of the subcommittee which has brought this bill to the floor today. It has been a pleasure to serve with the members on the minority and on the majority sides.

There were things I wanted to discuss. They were too detailed to include in the report. They are matters which the committee had discussed, and upon which the committee had opinions, but if those opinions had been enlarged upon, in the report of the subcommittee, it would have required an unnecessarily long report.

For example, I refer to the care of patients in the paraplegic wards, referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. The gentleman from Virginia not only brought to the committee the question of the swimming pool, about which he has already asked the chairman, but he raised the question of the number of attendants to be assigned to a ward, for the care of men who could not care for themselves. Out of that has come not an item in this bill, nor in the report, but an understanding with the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration that henceforth, in listing attendants, in wards of that kind, we will cease the inclusion of men who cut the grass, or who take care of the hospitals and not of the patients, in the list of those who take care of patients.

Such details cannot be put in the report, nor in the bill, but they make the long hearings, and the interest of other Members, like the gentleman from Virginia, very much worth while.

With reference to the Maritime Commission, there was the same situation there. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] brought to the subcommittee a very important matter regarding the rebuilding of the ore boats on the Great Lakes. There are something over 300 ore boats operated on the Great Lakes. Most of the production of the iron mines is shipped to the mills in those boats. For a period of from 40 to 50 years there have been few replacements, few rebuildings. It has only been within the last few months that requests have been made for the rebuilding of these boats and it was the feeling of many witnesses, including the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, that the subcommittee should earmark funds for the rebuilding. The committee believed this was an important factor in national defense, but that first of all certain information was necessary, which the committee did not have. We do not know about the ownership of the boats. We do not know whether they could be rebuilt by the firms which own them or whether it would be necessary for the firms to have help from the Maritime Commission. If such help is needed, then we recommend an immediate and decisive opinion from the Maritime Commission.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. WEICHEL. I thank the gentleman for the reference he made to the ore fleet.

Mr. Chairman, there are some 312 cargo vessels that carry the ore that provides 90 percent of the steel production of the United States. The ore to supply these furnaces that make the steel can be carried only by ship, for there are no railroad facilities to carry this tremendous load. The amount of ore that is carried in the 5- to 8-month season each year, dependent on weather conditions, amounts to something like 92,000,000 tons. In addition to this there are about 22,000,000 tons of limestone that go into the making of the steel. Translated into terms of carloads of 100 tons each, this would be something a little less than a million carloads.

In this fleet of 312 ships, there are 40 or 50 over 50 years old. Seventy-five of them are over 40 years old. Only 25 of them are 10 years or less.

It was my purpose to call this to the attention of the committee as a matter of national security. The Maritime Commission should make some provision with reference to the trading in of these ships.

It was my intention therefore to ask of the gentleman from California that the present appropriation which $100,000,000 plus $103,000,000——

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There are approximately $203,000,000.

Mr. WEICHEL. $203,000,000. The Maritime Commission can secure all the information upon application. So I was wondering if by direction of the Appropriations Committee the Maritime Commission could give recogniton to this and investigate the matter of replacing this fleet, because in time of emergency it is too late.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I think his point is well taken and I think he does a favor not merely to the Congress but to the Nation, by bringing this matter to our attention.

There are two other agencies I want to talk about, the War Assets Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission. I shall reach them shortly. There is another Maritime Commission detail already mentioned by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. The subcommittee generally believes that it is a matter of economy, if boats are needed for national defense or for the eastern trade, to take boats that are partially built, that can be secured for less than the cost of building them today, that can advance the construction by anything from a year and a half to 2 years in time, and for which there is available in addition some $7,000,000 worth of property on the ground. I refer to the *Mariposa* and the *Monterey*, partially built and now offered the Commission at less than reproduction costs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the matter of smaller boats, brought to the attention of the subcommittee by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY]. That is a speedy and economical type of boat, which could be constructed as a trailer and passenger carrier, of 25 knots speed, a boat cheaply and quickly produced, and which could be converted overnight for the transportation of a task force if that became necessary. I thank the gentleman for bringing us that information, and it is my hope that this matter will be given immediate and favorable attention by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am led to believe then that the subcommittee felt favorably inclined toward the construction of these trailer-carrier ships?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is my feeling, and I believe it represents the feeling of the other members too.

Mr. BRADLEY. I will make a few remarks under the 5-minute rule on that subject.

Mr. SMATHERS. I hope the gentleman will explain the charge against the War Assets Administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We come now to the disposal of property. The question is whether you want ever to end a temporary agency set up for the disposal of surplus property. I doubt if many Members of the House realize that the War Assets Administration has been continuously fed with additional surplus property, often not property which had anything to do with the war. Furniture or fixtures of a government agency, or surplus items of any kind, which might have had no connection with the war, little by little have been fed into the War Assets Administration. It is necessary for this House to take positive action if we are to end the temporary agency we know as the War Assets Administration.

In spite of the fears certain gentlemen have expressed on the floor, the Appropriations Committee did not seize upon an idea and arbitrarily write it into a bill. It was obvious from the hearings, first, that a final date had to be set, not only from the standpoint of the Congress, but from the standpoint of the agency itself, because the testimony, and private conversations with the executives, showed that WAA was losing valuable men from the agency due to the fact that the agency was approaching the end of its life. That being the case, the committee inquired of the legislative committee, as it properly should, what the intention of the committee was. We were told by the chairman of the legislative committee and by the chairman of the subcommittee investigating property disposal, that these gentlemen were in agreement with the fact that a time limit should be set upon the agency and that they would support such an amendment in the appropriation bill.

So you have before the Congress the question. Do you wish to end this temporary agency at any time or do you wish

to perpetuate an agency which has not proven entirely economical nor entirely satisfactory?

The committee gave the real property to the RFC for disposal; all real property and all things that have to do with real property. Why did we take the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? Out of the sky? No. The property still in the hands of the War Assets Administration on August 31 of this year will be almost entirely large properties, which will be difficult to dispose of by any agency and very difficult to dispose of by the War Assets Administration. Many of these properties were built by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Many of them will have to be rebuilt or redesigned. Money will be needed. Further, under what is known as the push-button requirement of the Government at the present time—which is familiar to my friend from California—the Government now requires that some of those larger industrial plants be kept in condition where on 90 days' notice they can be returned to war production.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has given us a lot of conversation. The gentleman has said we should eliminate the agency.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But the work has not been done. The work of disposal is far from being done. I am not arguing that the agency should not be eliminated when the job is done, but they have a sales organization, and RFC has a lending organization, and they are specializing, and have added to the Government $380,000,000 in the last year.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I understand the gentleman's question. The answer is this, that the committee believes, and I think the House will concur, that if you want economic administration, and prompt disposal of this property, you will place it in the hands of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Certainly the House thought that at one time, because it was in the hands of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The subcommittee chose the RFC now because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has respect as an agency of Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was interested in the observations made by the gentleman, that the chairman of the full committee on expenditures and the chairman of the subcommittee were agreeable to this action being taken. Did I hear the gentleman correctly?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The full committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We discussed it with the chairman of the full committee, and with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. McCORMACK. The chairman of the full committee is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. And he was agreeable to this being done?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct, and the chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. RIZLEY.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. They were agreeable to this being done?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is most interesting to me.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thought it would be.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure it is.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am interested in knowing how the committee arrived at the conclusion that the War Assets Administration, which has dealt with this property for 2 years, and has a sales force, could not dispose of it better than the RFC, which has no sales force.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will see that it is possible for the RFC, if it so desires, to take over any part of the sales force which it may deem necessary in disposing of what is left on the 31st of August, remembering only that at that time there would be left largely plants which are difficult to dispose of, and which would require the help of some agency like the RFC.

Mr. SMATHERS. In other words, perhaps the RFC should take over all the personnel of the War Assets Administration and do the same job that the War Assets Administration is doing now.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am sure they will do it a lot more economically, a lot quicker, and more expeditiously, and I am sure, as I know the gentleman is, that they will not need so much personnel to do it.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Let me ask the gentleman from California if it was not the opinion and the thought of the subcommittee handling this matter that the President some months ago sent a message to Congress recommending to the Congress some legislation winding up War Assets immediately?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The difference between the President of the United States and the subcommittee is that the President of the United States recommended that WAA be wound up on June 30, and the subcommittee recommends that it be wound up on August 31.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, did the gentleman have the bill recommended by the President as of August 1?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It is a rather complicated bill. The principal difference is that it puts the property, for example, in the Federal Works Administration, and this bill puts it in the RFC. I do not think the point is as important as the gentleman would make it. I think the general feeling is that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is better equipped than an agency equipped only to rent office buildings and handle small property.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. Is it true that all this property transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be subject to taxation?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am not sure. What may interest the gentleman is that the counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with whom we discussed that point before bringing the bill to the floor, is not sure. If the counsel thinks it is, then we have two things to decide. First, I am not sure it would not be a good idea, because War Assets Administration has already spent money in lieu of taxes, believing that school districts and counties should not be deprived of their incomes. WAA has spent that in the past, and RFC probably should spend it in the future. If there is a point involved, then we may have to add whatever we need next year for that purpose.

Mr. DEANE. Is the gentleman prepared to state the value of the property that would be transferred?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Two billion eight hundred million dollars as of now, less what has been disposed of, by August 31, and some of it was disposed of today. This includes realty of all kinds, but not personal property.

The gentleman from California, to whom I yielded, was in error about the amount of aircraft. It is about $890,000,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is about $1,000,000,000?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes. Close to that figure.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And it will have to be sold as scrap?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No; not under this bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The Air Force has no right to sell any of its surplus property except as scrap or salvage.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. As I said before, the gentleman probably has not had time to read the bill carefully. The property is turned over to the Air Force under the terms of the existing act until it is disposed of. It could thus be sold as scrap, in my opinion. The point is worth looking into. I do not agree with the gentleman from California; but if the gentleman is right, then this ought to be corrected in the Senate.

There are two minor matters that I want to cover before I surrender the floor. During the hearings, representatives of the American Institute of Architects appeared before the subcommittee, asking that some provision be put into the bill, saying that no part of the money appropriated to the Veterans' Administration could be used in competition with the private practice of architecture. I use almost their exact words. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] also brought this matter repeatedly to the attention of the subcommittee. Speaking for myself, and feeling that this is also the opinion of the majority of the sub-

committee, I want to say that I support the idea that all work possible should be done for Veterans' Administration programs by private architects, but that I am not convinced that such a limitation either could or should be written into the bill. Some of this work must be done by the VA's own staff, and undoubtedly will always be done there. It may be said that the subcommittee does want all the work possible done by private architects, if we are to preserve the features of our form of government, and that the Administrator will be questioned on this point in future budget hearings.

Finally, and very briefly, I do not want any misunderstanding concerning the attitude of this subcommittee, as we discuss the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission. I am sure there is no misunderstanding. This Congress and this subcommittee wants that Commission to have all the money needed for experimental work, and for the production of the atomic bomb. I believe, strange as this statement may seem, that this is an agent for peace, until the world again approaches sanity. We also want the Commission to have money for medical, biological and agricultural research. But, like you, we want the Commission to impose on itself the same economy and the same efficiency that should be required of any agency spending the money of the American taxpayers. We do not like blank checks, and we do not like to find costs, where we can make reasonable comparisons, to be higher in the accounts of the AEC than in other agencies, or other businesses.

We also have tried to impress on the Commission that the Congress is in session more than half of each year. This appropriation is for the fiscal year 1949, from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949, yet Congress will be in session again, at the latest, January 3, 1949. The slight reduction in the appropriation request, made by this subcommittee, need not affect the work on the bomb, nor in the other fields I mentioned. It may encourage some slight economy in the housekeeping of the Commission, and in construction and maintenance costs, in its several communities. It may amuse you, Mr. Chairman, to have me conclude these comments with a little poem, on this subject, which I contrived, as I listened to the testimony of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have called it an Ode to the Appropriations Committee by the AEC, and I give full credit for the idea in the two first lines to one of the committee's investigators. I will have to take the responsibility for the other lines.

The word "Uranium" means the "sky,"
That's why our budget is so high;
For when we work with things atomic,
We never could be economic;
We deal with matters scientific
(Don't ask us to be too specific);
Mesons, protons, neutrons, fission;
Are just shop talk, not erudition;
Our testimony's vague, but calm,
Your job's the budget; ours, the bomb;
We walk on clouds (of radiation),
You save the cash; we'll save the Nation.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the paraplegic veterans in my district. There are about 1,400 paraplegics in the United States. These boys made the greatest sacrifice possible for their country. They are paralyzed, many of them, from the waist down. Some of them are quadraplegics, with both their legs and arms paralyzed so that they cannot serve themselves.

There are two matters touching these veterans that I desire to present to you. One is the question of proper attendants in the hospitals. At McGuire Hospital, the veterans' hospital in my district, located at Richmond, Va., we have 8 wards for paraplegics, and we have there 137 actively on the hospital rolls about 170 in all that receive their treatments at the hospital. These men in my judgment should have every care that this Nation can provide for them, because of the great sacrifices they made for the country during the war.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am interested to know that the gentleman has a hospital containing that type of patients in his district. I likewise have one in mine, with an equal number, about 280 altogether, either in-patients or out-patients. I am deeply interested in their welfare.

Mr. GARY. I realize that the situation that has arisen is an administrative problem. I am not offering any amendment to this bill today because of the assurances that have been given me by the members of the subcommittee of their interest in this problem and their belief that it can be worked out by the Veterans' Administration. I, too, believe that it can.

I think these men by all means should have an indoor swimming pool. I have here the testimony of Dr. Magnuson, in which he said:

Swimming is of great therapeutic aid. I have requested some things around these hospitals. Construction, apparently, is all appropriated for specifically and pretty well defined.

They have a swimming pool up at the Bronx, which is a therapeutic swimming pool donated by the people. It cost about $250,000. The pool ought to be put indoors so we can use it in the winter. It is a great therapeutic help as well as a recreational one.

I said that I did not think we should look to the public to erect these pools by voluntary contributions. It should be done by the Government. These boys should not be objects of charity. To that Dr. Magnuson replied, "I agree with you." I hope these problems can be worked out by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am very much concerned over the language used on page 14 in relation to the educational training under title 2 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The limitation seems to me to be very far reaching, and to give absolute authority to General Gray to determine what is avocational or recreational in character. Like other Members, I was concerned about the flight training and while I appreciate the objective that the committee has in mind, I am fearful that the delegation of power, which is extraordinary, could be very easily abused. Certainly it is a delegation almost without any limitation. I appreciate the fact that the subcommittee has in mind the elimination of unnecessary so-called training at the expense of the Government and the taxpayers, and I agree with the subcommittee in that respect. But that does not remove from my mind the disturbed feeling that I have as a result of the very general language and the broad delegation of power given to General Gray in the proviso or limitation on page 14 of the bill.

I wish I could have the confidence in General Gray that my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has. As he knows, we have a situation in Boston where the head of the Boston branch office made some very intolerant and bigoted statements which have been investigated. The evidence has been completely obtained and was turned over to General Gray, at least 3 months ago by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and myself. I was with her at the time. General Gray certainly has had plenty of time to act. I am very much concerned over this indecision, but it seems to me his honeymoon is about over, and that we ought to get some decision from him in connection with the administration of his office.

In relation to the observations I have just made, I want to say they are not personal with reference to General Gray. I want to have confidence in him. I want to have complete confidence in him and to respect him officially as I do as an individual. I want to respect him as an official, but I want to see a decision made. I do not want this vagueness and indefiniteness and this holding off and holding off. You and I have to make our decisions. We cannot put them off day after day. We have to make a decision on this bill today. I am very much disturbed about some of the indecision, and I hope now that his honeymoon is over, he will show that he is a man of decision in the administration of this agency of Government, just as he has been in other responsible positions that he has occupied.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I agree with the statement of the gentleman about General Gray, but, at the moment, who determines whether a course is avocational or recreational in character? At the moment, under existing authority, who determines that?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think on the State level there is considerable authority, and this violates this great principle of State's rights which we fought for and which my Republican friends have so strongly advocated, and which is being abdicated in this bill.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING EXPEDITER

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Housing Expediter: For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Office of the Housing Expediter, including personal services in the District of Columbia; attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with rent control; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed $5,000 for payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); and health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); $15,172,100: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts may be obligated during the period ending March 31, 1949: *Provided further*, That any employee of the Office of the Housing Expediter is authorized and empowered, when designated for the purpose by the Housing Expediter, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of the Housing Expediter.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 4, line 25, strike out "$15,172,100" and insert "$16,367,100."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment to this particular section not to restore the full amount of the budget estimate, which was $20,500,000, but, based upon assurances of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], to restore only the amount which was cut for additional positions sought to be created in the Office of the Housing Expediter to deal with his problems in national, regional, and area rent-control offices.

It will be noted from the committee's report at page 4 that the sum of $4,132,900 was included in the budget estimates in order to take care of liquidation expenses, assuming that the Office might be liquidated after April 1, 1949. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] in response to my question in the general debate, has assured us that that amount will not have to be absorbed by the agency and be deducted from the appropriation for operations in the period up to March 31, 1949, with a resulting impairment of its work. That still leaves the sum of $1,195,000 which has come off the budget estimates, for employees, and the committee will note in the second paragraph of the committee's report, "Funds for an additional 244 positions have been denied the Office of the Housing Expediter."

I come from a city district where rent control is of critical importance to the people in the area. The people are deeply concerned that rent-control administration shall not be impaired. I would like to point out to the Members of the House that with all the talk that has been going on about a big building program—and between 900,000 and 1,000,000 new units we expected to be built in the year 1948—the figures show that rental housing will constitute only about 15 percent of that total, whereas normally rental housing runs somewhere around one-third or more of new construction. Hence the housing shortage for moderate-income families who must rent, is still very much with us and is likely to continue to be for some time. People in my district are complaining bitterly about rent increases due to alleged hardship, which are granted landlords, they claim, without complete justification in the petitions and also failure of the Housing Expediter's office to give adequate service on complaints of tenants whose apartments are not being maintained, by painting and decoration and otherwise, even in accordance with the requirements on landlords of the Housing Expediter's office. Hence I ask the committee to support this amendment. The amount being spent for rent-control administration is not very great, considered country-wide. The whole staffing of the Housing Expediter's office is what counts. Considering all the jobs he has to do, if he does not have the help, his functions, including rent control, are bound to show the effects. It is well worth an additional million dollars in order to protect 16,000,000 tenants who live in rented accommodations in the United States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York probably does not realize the exact situation. I read to him from the report, on page 4, if he will turn to that page. The committee specifically says this:

No reduction has been made in the personnel requested for the operation of rent control.

The committee also states that this is for the 9 months' period requested by the Housing Expediter, and that it has nothing to do with rentals, of which the gentleman has already been assured.

The Housing Expediter had 44 people on the pay roll, doing this work, on April 1. In a deficiency appropriation, the agency was given funds to employ 314 more people; thus it has authority at the present time for 358 people in the bill now before the House, but it has only been able to fill, up to the present time, 60 positions. There are presently 298 unfilled positions in the Housing Expediter's office.

My feeling is that the gentleman from New York probably was not fully aware of the amount authorized and appropriated in the Deficiency Appropriation bill which recently went into effect.

Mr. JAVITS. How recently was that, may I ask the gentleman from California?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That was on May 10.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the gentleman whether the funds for the additional 244 positions, which have been denied, include any with respect to rent control?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No; none at all.

Mr. JAVITS. Those are all, then, for the supervision of the veterans' housing program?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The United States Maritime Commission shall not incur any obligations during the fiscal year 1949 from the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, or otherwise, in excess of the appropriations and limitations contained in this act: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein and in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948, shall be construed to affect the authority of the Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 603 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (1) to grant operating differential subsidies on a long-term basis and (2) to obligate the United States to make future payments in accordance with the terms of such operating-differential subsidy contracts, and all receipts which otherwise would be deposited to the credit of said fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Commission may make allowances to purchasers of vessels for cost of putting such vessels in class, such allowances to be determined on the basis of competitive bids, without regard to the provisions of the last paragraph of section 3 (d) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while I should like to make several complimentary remarks about the work of this subcommittee, the time allowed is just enough for me to commend the efforts of the Subcommittee on Appropriations to restore our coastwise commerce.

Practically all of the older people of this House can recall the days when we had an ample coastwise commerce, when it was possible to take trips up and down either coast and to get a short seagoing trip in that way. Those ships have completely disappeared. There is not a single ship now under the American flag operating in general coastwise commerce for either passengers or freight on either coast. There may be one or two lumber schooners on the west coast, that is all.

We have realized it is necessary to do something extreme to get this coastwise commerce back. As the charges for handling freight across the docks, the wharfage, the stevedoring, and matters incidental thereto have pushed rates up, coastwise ships cannot compete with trucks and certain other types of transportation.

The Pacific Coast Steamship Co. has, therefore, brought out proposals for two trailer-carrying ships—ships making 25 knots, each carrying 186 30-foot trucks and 348 passengers, which it wishes to construct for the run from Long Beach-Los Angeles harbor to San Francisco. Between those two ports we will have a tremendous traffic, because the Los Angeles area alone will exceed 4,000,000 by this fall and the Bay region will exceed two and a half million, I believe.

Mr. Chairman, no money is asked as a subsidy for these ships, not one single cent of gift from the Government. The present law authorizes the Government to lend 87½ percent for the construction of new ships at the discretion of the Maritime Commission, to be repaid in full with interest in some 20 years. I am glad to know that the subcommittee has made enough money available in this bill to cover commencing construction of these ships for service on the west coast. If this service should be successful it will undoubtedly extend and expand to both coasts. You will have ships operating again from Boston to Hampton Roads, from New York south, and between other ports on both coasts, whereas now you have absolutely none.

The Maritime Commission is in favor of the construction of these ships. The Navy Department is in favor of the construction of these ships. They will be very valuable auxiliaries in the event of war.

Here is one case in which the Government can do something toward reestablishing essential coastwise steamship service without having it cost the United States Government one single dollar. The Government will recover all that it advances with interest. I think this is a very peculiar and a very refreshing condition as we find an opportunity to do something beneficial without having it cost a lot of money to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the efforts of the committee in putting these funds in the bill and I hope the Maritime Commission will see fit to utilize a part of them for commencing construction of these two coastwise ships immediately.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune of March 14, 1948]

LOAN SOUGHT FOR NEW SHIPS ON PACIFIC RUN—H. F. ALEXANDER ASKS UNITED STATES FOR $20,000,000 FOR TWO NIGHT COASTWISE VESSELS

(By Walter Hamshar)

H. F. Alexander, president of the Pacific Coast Steamship Co., disclosed yesterday that he has applied to the Maritime Commission for a loan to construct two 18,000-ton ships specially designed to carry passengers, trucks, and trailers, and automobiles in an overnight service between San Francisco and Los Angeles.

The 25-knot vessels, which Mr. Alexander expects will set the pattern for future passenger carriers in coastwise service, will be started this year if Congress makes the funds available. Their construction is estimated at $20,000,000, Mr. Alexander said.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 there are no provisions for construction subsidies for domestic vessels but the commission may lend up to 87½ percent under a 21-year amortization plan. The 1948-49 Maritime Commission budget request, however, carries only $15,000,000 for all new construction so that other funds would have to be appropriated.

Plans for the vessels have been completed at a cost of $250,000 and submitted to the Commission and to the Navy with enthusiastic reaction from both groups, Mr. Alexander reported.

Plans also have been drawn for a $2,000,000 municipally constructed terminal in Long Beach, Calif., and work will begin on it as soon as the two vessels are under construction. Completion of the vessels is estimated to take about one and a half years.

The Burlington Railroad was reported interested in running its new streamline trains to the San Francisco steamship terminal so that passengers can make the overnight sea trip to Los Angeles.

If Congress were to act on the phase of the report by President Truman's Merchant Marine Committee, recommending a 50-percent subsidy for American passenger ship construction, Mr. Alexander said that this company might then be in a position to construct similar vessels for the coastal run between San Francisco and Seattle.

The outstanding feature of Mr. Alexander's projected ships is the provision for carrying 186 30-foot trucks or truck-trailers in garage-like main and upper decks and 46 passenger automobile in a lower deck. The ships will have luxurious accommodations for 348 passengers, all rooms with connecting bath, and there will be 30 de luxe suites. Public rooms will include a dining salon seating 228 and a night club and bar with a capacity of 154.

By loading and unloading from the stern, the ships can discharge their mobile cargo in a matter of minutes, instead of hours, Mr. Alexander pointed out. He added that the trip by ship will be a saving for truck companies operating all night over-the-road service. Seventy California trucking companies have indorsed the plan and, Mr. Alexander said, its workability has been proven by the Trailerships, Inc., New York-Albany service in converted landing ship tanks that was started last year as a guinea pig for the bigger venture. Mr. Alexander is chairman of the board of Trailerships.

In the event of a war the speedy vessels could be used immediately as carriers of tanks and other equipment and the tank crews could take over passenger quarters. The more than twenty-five knots speed of the 36,000-horsepower geared-steam turbines would assure protection from submarine attack.

The general characteristics of the vessels are 563 feet in length; breadth 90 feet, depth 36 feet; gross tonnage, 17,940; dead weight, 5,300 tons; double bottom; twin screw.

Mr. Alexander proposes that the vessels will sail from each of the terminals at 6 p. m., arriving at their destinations 364 nautical miles away at 9 a. m. Proposed fares would be $14 a person one way including berths; automobiles, $14 one way, and trailer and truck rates, $2.50 a linear foot.

Mr. Alexander operated one of the most popular steamship services on the Pacific coast, covering ports between Seattle and Los Angeles with the *H. F. Alexander*, one of the most palatial steamships ever constructed. The service folded in the 1930's.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Call-Bulletin of June 1, 1948]

ALEXANDER'S PLAN—PROGRAM TO REVIVE COASTWISE PASSENGER TRADE NEEDS GOVERNMENT COOPERATION

A hopeful portent for Pacific coast shipping can be seen in the recent announcements of H. F. Alexander, whose vessels occupied a prominent place in the maritime trade here in years gone by.

Alexander has plans for bringing back to life the old coastwise passenger trade, so familiar to San Franciscans who can hark back to those "good old days" of the runs between here and Los Angeles.

Already, he has on file with the Maritime Commission a request for a loan to assist in getting under way a project for construction of two fast, modern, 18,000-ton liners which would serve this port, Los Angeles, San Diego, and possibly Seattle.

Development of these schedules, he pointed out, would be contingent upon a 50-percent subsidy from the Government, to tide the operators over the rough spots necessarily involved in such an ambitious program as this.

Congress and the Maritime Commission would do well to look with favor upon the project, not only in the interests of the American shipping industry which, to date, is lagging behind the operations of foreign lines which enjoy subsidies from their own governments, but also in the interests of national defense.

It should be noted that these foreign governments which can and do aid the competitors of American operators are the very ones, in many instances, which have their hands out across the sea in supplication for American aid, a la the Marshall plan.

Thus we are, in effect, subsidizing foreign lines, with the aid of the American taxpayer.

Why not subsidize our own?

Restoration of coastwise operations along the lines which Alexander envisions would be a wholesome thing for the port of San Francisco and for west-coast business generally.

And as for the value of such operations to the defense of the Nation, we need look no further than the war record of such a vessel as the old *H. F. Alexander*, which, during World War I, left the coast to go into operation as a troop transport between Atlantic ports and France as the steamship *Great Northern*. On more than one occasion she is reported to have bettered the time of the famed *Leviathan*, then considered as pretty close to the last word in transoceanic travel.

Here is one instance of how American shipping has served the Nation in time of war; there are many others, in both world wars.

In the Second World War, unfortunately and almost disastrously, American shipping was forced to overcome the handicap of years of neglect between wars.

Similarly to neglect the American merchant marine now would be to impair the domestic economy and to invite the crises which follow upon such a manifest national weakness as a feeble merchant marine.

Hemming and hawing and trimming and compromising should have no place in our treatment of the American merchant marine. The case of Alexander is but one illustration of what American shipping is ready to do if it can get a halfway decent break from the American Government.

BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
Long Beach, Calif., April 14, 1948.

Mr. H. F. ALEXANDER,
President, Pacific Coast Steamship Co., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: You are authorized to present this letter to Federal authorities who are now concerned with Federal loan with which to build the two steamships proposed by your corporation to operate between Long Beach and San Francisco for passengers, trucks, trailers, and automobiles.

The board of harbor commissioners of the city of Long Beach believes that this proposed service is in the public's interest and will serve a great public convenience and necessity. We are solidly behind the inauguration of this service and bespeak for it great success.

Evidencing our earnestness, we are already on record before the Public Utilities Commission of California that we will develop and make available to our Long Beach harbor terminal facilities which may cost us as much as $2,000,000.

Yours truly,
BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
By W. R. MARTIN, *President.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Readjustment benefits: For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by titles II, III, and V, of the

Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, $1,979,027,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be expended for tuition, fees, or other charges, or for subsistence allowance, for any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, and which is determined by the Administrator to be avocational or recreational in character.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: Page 14, line 17, after the period, insert the following: "For the purpose of this proviso training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly in connection with his business or occupation shall not be considered avocational or recreational."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order to save the GI flight training and all of the legitimate benefits our veterans are entitled to in the veteran benefit laws that we passed. I have already had something to say about the flight training program at the outset of the debate on this appropriation bill. That makes it unnecessary for me to debate the merits of the program at this time. I merely wish to explain my amendment. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, and members of his committee will or should accept this amendment when they give it full consideration. I know of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH'S great service to our Nation in time of need and also of his great interest in the welfare of all of our veterans. He has told me personally that he is not opposed to legitimate flight training and he does not feel the bill as it reads would stop that activity. However, I feel that my amendment would be a safeguard. It would save the GI flight training program and make unnecessary the possible closing of many small airports over our country which would undoubtedly have to close if those in charge of the program carried out the instructions in the bill as now written. I need not tell you of my deep interest in civilian aviation. And I need not repeat what a great contribution was made by the civilian pilot training toward winning of the recent war. The bill states that no part of these funds can be used for any course which the Administrator decides is "avocational" or "recreational." This is aimed at certain recreational activities which we all feel should be eliminated but I fear it also would affect GI flight training. My amendment merely states that the administration shall not consider as "avocational" or "recreational" the teaching of veterans how to fly. It simply saves the GI flight training program but does not bind the hands of the Administrator in stopping the payment of taxpayers' money to teach ballroom dancing and some other activities which do not help the veteran and which the veterans themselves oppose.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for the subcommittee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the chairman for accepting my amendment.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. The gentleman's amendment would allow flight training at prescribed schools for those having a legitimate reason.

Mr. STEFAN. Without this amendment it could be possible to close many of the legitimate flight-training schools of the country.

Mr. CRAVENS. And this sets up procedure whether it is actual training or just joy riding?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman's amendment make it possible for doctors and ranchers and others who want to learn to fly in connection with their business or occupation to do so?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. I want to say in fairness to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], that he is absolutely opposed to the playground part of it, but that he never intended to eliminate legitimate training.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that goes for the entire subcommittee, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I will say to the gentleman that in some States, like in the State of Ohio, they have appropriated millions of dollars to carry on these flight-training programs.

Mr. STEFAN. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. And if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it will permit the State-supported schools to go ahead with this program?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, would the gentleman mind reading that amendment again so that we will get the full import of it?

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSS. Will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. STEFAN. The amendment merely precludes a veteran who is learning how to fly from the provision which mentions the words "avocational" and "recreational." It saves the GI flight program.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman who has offered the amendment who is to determine finally whether the course in flight training is for occupational or educational purposes?

Mr. STEFAN. The amendment is explanatory. The committee and the Congress give this directive to General Gray, the Administrator who will administer this entire program. He is the one who will determine. In the debate the gentleman has perhaps heard it indicated that the States also will have something to do with that in consultation with General Gray, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ROSS. I still cannot get clear who is going to make the final determination.

Mr. STEFAN. General Gray, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I can have the attention of those particularly interested in this amendment. I have heard it said that the amendment has been adopted. The amendment has not been adopted. I take this time in the hope that we can give further thought to the language of the amendment. As I recall from hearing it read at the desk, it refers to the veteran's business or occupation. In other words, he can take flight training in connection with his business or occupation. I do not think that is the goal we want to reach. The veteran taking training has no business, he is a student. He is taking training for something he might do or will do after he graduates. I do not think the language carries out the purpose of the gentleman who has offered the amendment. I think we have to be very careful to spell it out correctly, because any Member of the House who listened to the testimony of the representatives of the Veterans' Administration who appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs cannot help but come to a realization that the Veterans' Administration as now set up is definitely opposed to any kind of flight training. Unless this is tied down and it is made absolutely clear that we mean to permit these veterans who are legally entitled to training, when it is a recognized course of training, I am afraid we will not accomplish our purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This has been a very important element in connection with national defense.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It certainly has.

I think we must stop and realize that men may be taking training and education for future work as ranch managers or farm managers, and the flying of light planes is very helpful and very beneficial to them in their later work, but that is not their business or occupation as of today, and the language proposed will not help those men particularly in view of the fact that the Administration has so clearly indicated its opposition to the program.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Since legislative intent will largely govern the matter, does not the gentleman feel that the language of the amendment that was just adopted is a clear directive to the Veterans' Administration that Congress approves of flight training?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It should be. I do not think there can be any question but that under the law now we have said that the Veterans' Administration should not interfere with the course or curriculum at a college. Yet they are doing it. They are doing it in connection with flight training. They are doing it at the University of Chicago. When they say that a man cannot have flight training as an elective subject they are interfering with the course and the curriculum at that university, and they are doing it against the law at the present time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. My understanding of the amendment adopted is that if a veteran applies for flight training under the GI bill of rights because he wants to use it in the occupation or business he expects to follow, it is assumed that it is covered. If he wants to fly just for fun, it is not. Should not the amendment read instead of "for his business or occupation," "for the bussiness or occupation for which he is training" to cover the situation where a man has no occupation or business, but he is training for one? If it would be in order to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] I would suggest that the language be changed so that it applies to the business or occupation for which the veteran is training and not for his present business or occupation.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that the Chair announced that in the absence of any objection, the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to make that announcement, but the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] still claimed his time so the Chair did not complete the statement. The amendment, therefore, is still pending.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I accept that amendment to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. May I suggest that the gentleman's intention would be carried out by adding after the word "occupation" the words "in which he is now engaged or for which he is training." I suggest that might effect the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. STEFAN, be so modified and ask that the amendment as modified be read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut to the amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: After the word "occupation" in Mr. STEFAN's amendment insert the following: "in which he is now engaged or for which he is training."

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, if I may say so, I think that covers the situation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the chairman of the committee, I accept that amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment as modified.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, since the chairman of the committee accepts the amendment, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides that when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs believes that any educational institution, previously certified by an appropriate State agency, is not furnishing education or training commensurate with tuition charges, he shall file a written complaint with the State agency setting forth the reasons for his belief. Copy of the complaint is to be sent to the institution by registered mail, and thereafter the appropriate State agency shall set a date and place for a public hearing on the Administrator's complaint.

The State agency will conduct the hearing and serve one copy of its findings on each, the Administrator and the institution concerned. If the complaint is found to be justified the approval of the State agency of the institution in question must be withdrawn unless within 30 days from the date when such findings are mailed to the institution, the institution shall submit a proposal satisfactory to the State agency for the adjustment of its rates or the method or quality of training. The State agency shall fix a 30-day limit within which such adjustment shall be made or its approval withdrawn. On the other hand, if the State agency finds that the Administrator's complaint has not been sustained, the findings of the State agency as to the fairness and reasonableness of the tuition charges shall be conclusive upon the Administrator, and the Administrator shall report the decision forthwith to the Congress. It is provided that the hearing shall be conducted under rules established by the State agency.

ESTIMATE OF COST

The bill provides that a verbatim record of all such hearings shall be made, one copy to be supplied to the State agency and one copy to the Administrator, and the Administrator shall pay the cost of both such copies. The States would probably urge that further provision be made for defraying the cost of personnel and other expenses incident to the new procedure provided in the bill. However, no fixed estimate of cost can be furnished.

The report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on this bill follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington 25, D. C., May 4, 1948.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is in further reply to your letter of April 1, 1948, requesting a report by the Veterans' Administration on H. R. 6079, Eightieth Congress, a bill establishing a procedure by which the Administrator may assure veterans full educational and training opportunities commensurate with the tuition charges by educational and training institutions, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to provide a procedure under which the reasonableness and fairness of tuition charges by educational or training institutions for education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, would be determined, in certain cases, by the appropriate State agency, whose determination would be binding on the Veterans' Administration.

The accomplishment of this apparent purpose would be sought by amending paragraph 5 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, by adding thereto the following:

"(b) In the event the Administrator has reason to believe that any educational or training institution heretofore certified by an appropriate State agency is not furnishing education or training under this part commensurate with tuition which it charges, the Administrator shall file a written complaint with said State agency. A copy of the complaint shall be sent to the institution by registered mail. In such case the appropriate State agency shall set the date and place for public hearing on the Administrator's complaint. After such hearing, the State agency shall make its findings, one copy of which shall be served upon the Administrator and one copy upon the institution. If the State

agency finds that the Administrator's complaint is justified, it shall withdraw its approval from the institution unless, within 60 days from date when such findings are mailed to the institution, the institution shall submit a proposal satisfactory to the State agency for the adjustment of its rates or the method or quality of training; the State agency shall fix a reasonable time limit within which such adjustment shall be made or its approval withdrawn. *Provided,* That if the State agency shall find that the Administrator's complaint has not been sustained then its findings shall be conclusive upon the Administrator as to the fairness and reasonableness of such tuition charges.

"(c) Such public hearing shall be conducted under rules established by the State agency: *Provided, however,* That in all cases a verbatim record of the hearing shall be made, one copy of which shall be supplied to the State agency and one copy to the Administrator. The Administrator shall pay the cost of both such copies. The educational or training institution shall have access to the State agency copy or may secure copy at its own cost."

Paragraph 5 of part VIII, as amended, now provides for the payment of the customary cost of tuition and certain other expenses for eligible veterans pursuing courses, subject to a limitation that such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year unless the veteran elects to have customary charges paid in excess of such limitation, in which event, his period of eligibility shall be charged for the excess. The last proviso of paragraph 5 also provides that an institution may apply to the Administrator for adjustment of the tuition and if he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, he may provide for the payment of "such fair and reasonable compensation" (subject to the $500 limitation) as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction.

While the bill refers generally to tuition charged by an educational or training institution furnishing training under part VIII, it does not refer particularly to the special provisions of subparagraph 3 (b) of part VIII, as amended, which specifically authorize the Administrator to contract for and determine the reasonableness and fairness of the agreed cost of short, intensive postgraduate, or training courses of less than 30 weeks, and of subparagraph 3 (c) which contains similar specific authority as to correspondence courses. Neither does it mention particularly the specific authorization conferred on the Administrator by Public Law 377, Eightieth Congress, approved August 6, 1947, to contract for institutional on-farm courses on the basis of a finding by him that the agreed cost is "reasonable and fair." As drafted, therefore, the bill apparently would not repeal or modify these provisions of subparagraphs 3 (b) and 3 (c) and of Public Law 377, and apparently would not, as to cases to which those provisions apply, transfer the function of determining the reasonableness of tuition charges from the Administrator to the State agencies. For similar reasons, it is not clear that the bill is intended to affect the authority expressly given to the Administrator by the last proviso of paragraph 5, part VIII, relative to the adjustment of tuition charges where he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor.

The Veterans' Administration also makes determinations as to the reasonableness of charges by proprietary profit institutions for courses of 30 weeks or longer where the established rate exceeds $500 for a full-time course for an ordinary school year. Further, in certain circumstances, such a determination is made where the charges are at a rate which does not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year. This applies to profit institutions where the majority of enrollments consists of veterans in training under the act or under Public Law 16 and the institution subsequent to June 22, 1944, has established new rates or has increased rates in what appears to be an unreasonable amount for the service rendered to veterans, and the school or the rates or both are of such recent date that the rates cannot be "customary." The bill is apparently intended to preclude the Administrator from further determining, with finality, the reasonableness of tuition charges to veterans in the situations described in this paragraph. Instead, the bill would require, if the Administrator has reason to believe that the tuition rate is not reasonable for the training furnished, that he file a complaint with the State agency, which would then be authorized to determine the validity of the complaint and upon a finding that it is justified, to fix a reasonable rate which would be binding on the Administrator as well as the institution. If the State agency found the complaint unjustified its finding would also be binding on the Administrator as to the reasonableness of the tuition being charged.

It is noted that the application of the bill is limited to institutions "heretofore certified by an appropriate agency" and would not cover institutions certified after its enactment. It is also observed that while the bill provides for procedures and determinations by State agencies, State action would be required to implement these provisions by expanding the jurisdiction of the appropriate State agencies to authorize the performance of these functions. Since the proposed procedures would involve additional expense to the States, there exists no certainty that all States would elect to take the necessary action.

The bill would affect matters of vital importance to the administration of the educational program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended. It is therefore considered appropriate for the Veterans' Administration, as the present administering agency, to invite your committee's attention to the following serious considerations:

(a) The bill would preclude the Federal Government from authoritatively determining, in certain cases, whether Federal funds paid as tuition under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act are limited to amounts representing reasonable and fair charges and from refusing to make payments on the basis of its determination that such amounts are not reasonable and fair. Instead, the several State agencies would exercise this supervision over Federal expenditures without any responsibility for supplying any part of the funds expended.

(b) The bill would permit each State agency, acting independently of the Federal Government, and of other State agencies, to fix tuition charges in accordance with its own standards. This would undoubtedly result in wide variations among the States, in contrast to the more consistent results obtained by the application of uniform criteria by the Federal Government in determining the reasonableness of expenditures for this purpose. For institutions having branches in several States, there might even be material disparities in tuition charged for the same course.

(c) The bill provides no basis for determining the elements that should enter into the computation of a fair and reasonable tuition rate by the State agency. For this task and for the performance of duties incident to conducting hearings and making determinations, specially qualified personnel would be required. In the experience of the Veterans' Administration, the training of such personnel requires from 6 months to a year or more. It would probably be a considerable period after enactment of the bill before the States would be equipped to discharge their obligations thereunder.

(d) Procedures under the bill might, in many cases, involve long delays. No time limit is specified within which the State agency must hear a complaint received from the Administrator. After the hearing the State agency would require time for making its findings and in the event it found that the complaint was justified, the institution would have 60 days for proposing a satisfactory adjustment of rates and the State could then fix a further period, the length of which is not prescribed, within which the adjustment must be accomplished. Meanwhile, the situation would remain uncorrected except in the event of voluntary action by the institution.

(e) Hearings would be conducted by State agencies under their own rules of evidence and procedure. No independent audit is required and determinations might frequently consist of the resolution of conflicting opinions and of differing conclusions drawn from conflicting data. To some extent States would be passing on a matter as to which they are interested parties since they would have previously approved the training program concerned, if not the particular schedule of tuition fees.

(f) Without assuming any malfeasance on the part of any State agency, a possible result, at least temporarily, might be that the Veterans' Administration would be forced to pay the rates established by the State agency even though its own investigation established the fact that no training whatsoever is being given.

It may be expected that if the bill is enacted, many schools would promptly raise their tuition rates and the Veterans' Administration would be placed in the position of thereafter paying what it considered to be disproportionately high charges for the instruction furnished, and correspondingly the entitlement of veterans would be adversely affected by the necessity of meeting any increased charges above the $500 rate through an acceleration of their period of eligibility. The only recourse in such instances would lie in filing a complaint with the appropriate State agency, which action might be followed by indefinite delays and a binding determination by the State agency as to the amount of benefits to be furnished by the Federal Government in behalf of veterans.

It is not possible to estimate the effect of the bill, if enacted, on cost to the Government. From the standpoint of administrative cost the bill itself would require payment by the Veterans' Administration of the cost of copies of the record of hearings conducted by the State agencies. It may be anticipated that the States would also urge that further provision be made for defraying the cost of personnel and other expenses incident to the new procedure.

While it is not my policy to recommend to the Congress what its action should be on general legislation granting benefits to veterans, it is proper to state my position on a proposal which would so alter administrative procedures as to create what I consider to be a serious handicap to the efficient administration of existing benefits. Accordingly, for the reasons already stated, I am unable to recommend favorable consideration by your committee of H. R. 6079, Eightieth Congress.

Due to the urgent request of the committee for a report on this measure, there has not been sufficient time in which to ascertain from the Bureau of the Budget the relationship of the proposed legislation to the program of the President. A supplemental report will be furnished later in that connection.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I understood that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut had been accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the modification of the amendment was accepted.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, is this in the nature of a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a substitute amendment and was so announced by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. Ross: Strike out all after the word "allowance" in line 14, through 15, 16, and 17 on page 14, and add the following: "In any case where the veteran proposes to take a course in a school other than in an approved elementary or secondary school, or institution of higher learning, unless the veteran, in cases where the Administrator deems it advisable, receives counseling and advisement from the Veterans' Administration on the relationship of such course to his vocational or occupational objective before he elects to pursue such course under this part."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and imposes additional duties on the Administrator.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order for a brief statement?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. ROSS. Just for one brief observation. I think this is a limitation upon an appropriation bill, and for that reason I think it is germane.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this imposes new duties on the Administrator, and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. ROSS. It is to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman for that purpose at this time.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my rising is in support of an amendment to remove legislation on an appropriation bill, which would cripple and curtail the veterans' flight-training program.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has held extensive hearings on this subject, and the action taken by the Appropriations Committee is ill-considered, ill-advised, and hasty action. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House has held extensive hearings on this program. Enactment of this rider legislation would bring about a reversal of policy of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act—the GI bill of rights. When the GI bill of rights was originally enacted, the question was brought up as to whether or not the Veterans' Administration should approve schools and veterans' courses of training or whether the State educational authorities should set up and approve the training schools for ex-servicemen. It was resolved in favor of the State educational authorities.

Under the GI bill of rights, the State educational authorities have the matter of approving these schools. This principle should be continued. This system can, through cooperation of the Veterans' Administration, bring about elimination of the so-called abuses, and yet retain the good and beneficial phases of this veterans' educational program.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the overwhelming majority of them, are in favor of continuing veterans' flight-training instruction. I strongly feel that the veterans' flight-training program should be continued. Doubtless there have been some abuses, but results from the veterans' program have been great. Such courses as ballroom dancing, bartending, stock-market trading may well be eliminated, but the veterans' flight-training program should be continued. Such education and training has been and is beneficial for civil aviation and national defense. We should not cripple the program in this age of science and airpower—this, the air age of America.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the President's Air Commission recommended, in addition to a civil air force, the continuation of this veterans' training program?

Mr. EVINS. The President's Air Policy Commission has pointed out the importance of civil aviation training and the need for such training programs. Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, Chief of the Air Force, in a recent speech before members of the Civil Air Patrol, has also pointed out the great value and importance of civil aviation training and of the general benefits of flying knowledge among civilians in aid of our military air force.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DORN. Is it not a fact also that this present policy of the Commission is nonpartisan and that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is on that Commission and they recommend this as a vital part of the defense program, do they not?

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is correct. That is my information.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me. I hope he supports the amendment.

Mr. EVINS. I am in favor of any constructive amendment which will preserve the veterans' flight-training program. I think that the gentleman's amendment is directed to that end and is more preferable than the language in the bill as proposed.

It has been said that such training does not lead to vocations. The facts show the contrary to be true. Such courses lead to vocation of being pilots, border and coast patrolmen, radio engineers, flight-training instructors, mechanics, positions in communications, aid in farming and crop dusting, and aids in various other trades and professions for veterans.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, it seems that the efforts in economy always begin with the veterans. The ex-servicemen of our country, as has been well stated by the national representatives of veterans' organizations before our committee, are tired of being labeled and singled out as the villain by powerful antiveteran interests. Too much discredit and not enough credit has been given to the veterans' efforts to educate and rehabilitate them. Many veterans are permitted to study law but subsequently decide not to practice law. Other veterans study agriculture but later decide to follow some other calling than farming. These veterans are not criticized. Why then should a veteran not be permitted to take a course in aviation or flight training if that is his interest or educational or trade inclination? Certainly knowledge in aviation and flight training in this age of science and air power is of great importance to the well-being of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we keep faith with our veterans by voting to eliminate this restrictive language in the pending bill. The entire rider on the legislation should be eliminated if the flight training savings amendment is not approved.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. And this morning we reported out of the committee and recommended a bill which still leaves the sovereignty in the State's approving agency but allows the Administration to act as a prosecutor to pick out any school which a man wants. That will clarify the whole situation.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And is not this just another occasion of the Appropriations Committee usurping the powers and prerogatives of the Veterans' Committee?

Mr. EVINS. It is one of numerous instances and it should not be permitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to emphasize what I said in general debate that this language is approved by leading officials of the Veterans' Administration, by leading officials of the American Legion, by leading officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and by leading veterans on the floor of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska as modified by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN as modified by the amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: Page 14, line 17, after the period, insert: "For the purpose of this proviso training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly in connection with his business or occupation in which he is now engaged or for which he is training shall not be considered avocational or recreational."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: For hospital and domiciliary facilities, $202,000,000, to remain available until expended for the payment of obligations heretofore or herein authorized to be incurred under this head, and, in addition, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to incur obligations prior to July 1, 1950, in an amount not exceeding $43,000,000, for extending, with the approval of the President, any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1 and 2 of the act approved March 4, 1931 (38 U. S. C. 438j-k), or in section 101 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 693a): *Provided*, That the authority contained in the Third Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, and in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948, to incur obligations for the purposes of this appropriation is hereby extended to July 1, 1950: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 6.7 percent of the foregoing appropriation and contract authorizations shall be available for the employment in the District of Columbia and in the field of all necessary technical and clerical personnel for the preparation of plans and specifications for the projects as approved hereunder and in the supervision of the execution thereof, and for all travel expenses, field office equipment, and supplies in connection therewith, except that whenever the Veterans' Administration finds it necessary in the construction of any project to employ other Government agencies or persons outside the Federal service to perform such services not to exceed 10 percent of the cost of such projects may be expended for such services.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 15, line 25, before the period insert the following: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may select a site and construct a hospital thereon in Arlington County, Va."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask, does the fund proposed for hospital and domiciliary facilities include funds for making alterations that are necessary in existing hospitals as well as for new construction?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; it includes both.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I refer back to the colloquy that occurred during general debate with regard to the follow-through by the Veterans' Administration in the inspection of homes under the GI loans, and I make reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas with regard to General Gray's statement that he had money enough and could do a grand job. Do I understand that the additional expense of the follow-through inspection is included and that, as General Gray said, he could do this job, about which there was questionable authority, without additional appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The answer to the gentleman's question is this: The general has some funds for that purpose now. It was the opinion of the committee that he would need additional funds. Our first intention was to transfer those funds in this bill for the Housing Administrator to the Veterans' Administration for that purpose. Furthermore, we wanted the general to submit exactly the amount of money he would need when he got over on the Senate side, and the House would support that additional amount of funds.

Mr. MATHEWS. Then I can be sure if this authority is finally to be determined to be with the Administrator there are sufficient funds supplied to take care of the work?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. We will see to it that he gets those funds.

Mr. MATHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one further observation, and that is in reference to the flight training. There has been a good deal of talk that this flight training is a part of the national defense, and therefore it should be included in this program without limitation. I do not understand that to be the purpose of the GI bill. The purpose of that act is to rehabilitate a veteran of the last war in civilian occupations so that he can make a living, and not prepare him for the next one. That latter job, it seems to me, comes under the problem of national defense. I am in favor of that, but it should be put under the province of the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, and not under the Veterans' Administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Veterans' miscellaneous benefits: For the payment of burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by part VII of Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, $51,883,000, to remain available until expended.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: On page 16, after line 19, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: To enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of a suitably equipped automobile or other conveyance which is being purchased by a veteran of World War II, who is entitled to compensation for the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet; loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands; and permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than 20° in the better eye, under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, $3,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, neither the Veterans' Administration nor any other agency of the Government of the United States of America shall have any liability in connection with the operation, authorization, or license to operate, use, repair, maintenance, or replacement of such automobile or other conveyance: *Provided further*, Only one such payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance covered by the provisions of this act shall be made for the benefit of any one veteran and no veteran who has received an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, or Public Laws 161 and 271, Eightieth Congress, shall be entitled to the benefits of this act: *And provided further*, That the funds provided for this purpose in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947 (Public Law 663, 79th Cong.), the Emergency Appropriation Act of 1948 (Public Law 161, 80th Cong.), and the Supplemental Appropriation Act (Public Law 271, 80th Cong.), are hereby continued available until expended."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. While no doubt it deals with a situation for which many Members of the House would like to vote if brought before the House as a legislative bill, this would establish a precedent of offering legislation on an appropriation which would open the door wide to all sorts of legislative amendments on an appropriation bill, and therefore I am constrained to make the point of order.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to withhold the point of order, but if we start debating the merits of propositions like this we will usurp the prerogatives of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and therefore I must make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to be heard on the point of order. I still wish that the gentleman

would withdraw his point of order. I will say to the gentleman that the first authorization for cars for amputees was placed in an appropriation bill. There was an authorization in an appropriation bill last year for the extension of that provision. We have just recently in this very appropriation bill now before the House passed authorizations, and this House has said time and again that there was nothing it would not do for the disabled. This bill as it is now drawn has a great deal of legislation in an appropriation bill. The amputees are among the most pitifully disabled of any group of veterans. You have established a precedent on appropriation bills. I wish the gentleman would withdraw it. I have tried again and again to get legislation for this very thing. The Senate passed a bill last year that gave these men what I consider to be a rehabilitation right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that the gentlewoman talk to the point of order. If there is some legislation in the bill, it is protected by the rule under which the bill is being considered and points of order could not be made against it, as the gentlewoman knows. I am just as sympathetic with this proposition as is the gentlewoman. The gentlewoman is the very able and earnest chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and when the bill which her committee has reported and is on the calendar comes before the House, I will vote for that legislation. But it certainly violates the principles of the House to bring in legislation like this on an appropriation bill. If you start this you will open the door wide and there will be amendments offered which will take over the work of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and result in denying to it proper consideration of many matters. You will have all sorts of conflicting laws if committee consideration is destroyed and there will only be confusion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it has been done time and time again. Our committee reported out a larger bill than this amendment over a year ago. And it is on the calendar. It is now near the adjournment of the Congress and the time is short to secure the passage of this bill. I have asked repeatedly for a rule and for a suspension of the rules with no results.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentlewoman address herself to the point of order rather than the merits of the amendment?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel, Mr. Chairman, since the principle was established on this very provision, not taking in quite the same group, some years ago, that it should be followed here. I have watched the gentleman's work for the disabled for years and I know he would not willingly hurt the disabled. I feel he is acting under a sense of loyalty.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Of course, the gentlewoman knows that there is legislation in this appropriation bill. Why object to a little more?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. This is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. Consequently, the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

Effective August 31, 1948, the War Assets Administration shall cease to exist as an agency of the Government and its affairs, functions, and responsibilities shall thereafter be disposed of and liquidated in accordance with the following:

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to understand fully just what is being done in connection with this provision dealing with surplus-property disposal. I regret that I was unable to be here during the general debate, but by reason of my activities on some other committees it was impossible for me to be here.

I have a great respect for the distinguished gentlemen of the subcommittee. I doubt, however, whether they were possessed with sufficient facts to write an intelligent approach to the problem of liquidating war surpluses. For about 2 years now I have been quite closely identified with surplus-property activities. In a previous session of the Congress I was a member of a special committee which was known as the Slaughter committee to investigate the activities of the War Assets Administration, in connection with surplus property. During the Eightieth Congress, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I have been looking into the activities of surplus-property disposal.

One day toward the latter part of last week, although I do not remember the exact date, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] told me that the Committee on Appropriations was getting ready to legislate in connection with surplus property. Our conversation had more to do with the amount of the appropriation than it did with the transfer of these activities. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from California did not know at that time, or if he did, he did not tell me, to just what extent the Committee on Appropriations intended to go and to what agencies they intended to transfer this property.

At a later date last week the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], for whom I have the highest regard, found me here on the floor one day. He was busy, and I was, too. He said, "I understand you have talked to Mr. PHILLIPS." I said, "Very briefly." He said, "We are planning some legislation in connection with that." Perhaps I did not have any reason, but I thought that perhaps the distinguished gentleman of this subcommittee might call me or some member of our committee, and advise with us, or at least explain to us exactly the extent that they had gone in connection with this legislation.

I am not here particularly to pick any quarrel with them, but I want the House to know definitely what you are doing. When you started out with this War Assets program, there was somewhere between thirty-five and fifty billion dollars involved. There is a residue of real and personal property of something like $7,000,000,000 left to be administered. Approximately $5,000,000,000 worth of that property is real estate, including agricultural, industrial, and residential property. Certainly I did not know, and no one on the Committee on Appropriations told me prior to yesterday when I first saw this bill that this real estate was to be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. If they had, I would have had some argument with them at that time, because very frankly the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation thus far in connection with the disposition of surplus property have not been such as I believe the Members of Congress would give their unqualified approval to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want the Members of the House to know that if this real estate is transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, first, it becomes taxable.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman was not here when I said that is a point which is still a moot question. Counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not think as of this moment or is not sure as of this moment that it is taxable, and my reply to a previous question was that perhaps it should be taxable or that that was something that could be corrected in the Senate.

Mr. RIZLEY. In any event, it is taxable.

Mr. Chairman, today we are paying about $3,000,000 a year, I believe, on properties that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is now controlling. When this transfer is made there will be an additional tax bill of something like $4,000,000. That is point number one. In addition to that, under this bill the Committee on Appropriations completely eliminates all priorities in connection with the disposition of surplus property. As far as the residue of personal property is concerned, even though there is going to be a considerable hue and cry, I will go along with the committee on that. But I am not yet ready to say that we should repeal all of the provisions of the Surplus Property Act so far as priorities are concerned in connection with real estate. You have, for instance, about 450,000 acres of agricultural lands left. Those agricultural lands in the main were taken for auxiliary airfields and things of that character. They were used largely by the farmers at the time they were taken, and the farmers in most instances were told that they would have the right and privilege to come in as priority purchasers, and that they would

be able to get these lands back. There is legislation now pending before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make these lands available under veterans' preferences.

The legislation will probably not be passed at this session of the Congress, but the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, recommended a bill, offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] that would give veterans a priority as far as purchasing these agricultural lands is concerned.

In addition to that, there are a great many former owners of other properties that are involved here, who heretofore have had a preference and priority in the purchase of property that was taken from them during the war. There are many cases pending now in which those former owners think, and rightly so, I believe, that they should have the right to repurchase these properties taken from them for war purposes, and we recommended a special bill last week, sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] in which we authorized and directed in a specific case that a former owner be permitted to exercise priority of purchase.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. As a matter of fact, the Government took these lands for a specific purpose, and that was the only right it had to condemn them.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Now, if the Government sells it for any other purpose, it has not dealt fairly with the men from whom it took it?

Mr. RIZLEY. That is right. There are a great many things that could be said in connection with this. I have had but a brief time in which to analyze the bill.

The surplus property subsection, if it becomes law: First, the War Assets Administration will continue to function only until August 1, 1948. I am advised that if we go into this wholesale liquidation at once and notices are required to be given to employees and I am just as anxious to get rid of a lot of employees down there as anybody else—but it should be done in an orderly way. If you serve notice now, under existing law, on the 1st of July, that you will terminate employment of most of these people on the 1st of August, the accumulated time will cost you about $20,000,000. If you wait until the 31st of July to give 30 days' notice, it will cost close to $25,000,000.

Frankly, I think what this committee should have done is to continue the War Assets Administration until about December 31 of this year, and then let the new Congress work out some orderly disposal of the residue. I just do not think it should be done in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I wish to offer at the proper time, on page 17. Will that be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer it at any time.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], notwithstanding the assurances that were given by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] that he had assented to this particular method of eliminating the War Assets Administration. This is a big problem. You have got a bear by the tail on this thing. If you follow the recommendation of the subcommittee on this, you will get into plenty of trouble.

There is about $7,000,000,000 declared surplus at the present time to be disposed of, including leaseholds. There is probably that much more which should be declared which has not been declared and which cannot be declared surplus if this bill is passed.

That amount which cannot be declared surplus will have to be disposed of not as useable material but as scrap and as salvage. Keep that in mind. If you think this is economy, you will wake up as you did on the internal-revenue bill, when you cut off all the collectors of taxes and had to put them back again.

All right, title, and interest in notes, mortgages, and contracts of sale and leases are transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is a lending agency and not a sales agency.

Keep that in mind. Transfers to the Air Force, the RFC, the Bureau of Federal Supply in the Treasury Department, and I suppose the Army and the Navy; at least it allows them to retain such surplus property as they have. All of the material which is now in the hands of one disposal agency which, notwithstanding criticism, is functioning the most efficiently that it has ever functioned, is transferred to at least three separate agencies. Their present efficiency is the result, I think, of the two years' work we have done on our subcommittee forcing them to do the thing which they should have done before. This committee bill leaves no department of Government any freedom to declare property surplus. It must be disposed of as scrap even though it be useful material. There is no right to transfer that surplus from one agency to another agency if this section is carried through. Undeclared surpluses which may be used by different agencies cannot be so used because there will be no provision for one agency to transfer to any other agency of the Government. And as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], pointed out, it removes all priorities on the purchase of real property whether it be a factory, a warehouse, a piece of agricultural land, or a business building. The former owner will not have the right to come in and exercise his priority. If you think you had some letters on priority, wait until you pass this bill and you get the irritable former owners of this property on your necks.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. It is also my understanding that no provision is made for small business in relation to——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right; the gentleman has brought up the matter of small businesses or business facilities which have been acquired by the Government as a result of the war. They cannot be regained by the former small-business owners if you pass this bill.

There is only one way to correct this bill. That way is for this House to strike out the language beginning on page 17 and ending on page 22 and insert in lieu thereof language which I will offer in amendment at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: Strike out all language beginning with line 1, page 17, and continuing to and including line 22 on page 26, and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"War Assets Administration, salaries and expenses. War Assets Administration: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, the sum of $90,700,000 is provided for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will do as it says, strike out the surplus property disposal section of the bill and will insert practically the same condition as exists now. However, the amount of money which is appropriated by the Appropriations Committee, $50,000,000, is raised to $90,700,000, which is the minimum requirement of the Budget Bureau for a single agency operation of existing surplus property disposal and it is broken down as follows:

Care and handling of real property, $25,000,000.

Care and handling of personal property, $20,000,000.

Care and handling of aircraft components and electronics, $11,000,000.

Additional tax requirements, $2,500,000.

Sales, accounting, and administration costs, $31,000,000.

Let me point out that the War Assets Administration netted to the Government $280,000,000 over its operational expense in the past fiscal year. It is estimated that they will net to the Government $80,000,000 during the coming fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. You have got a big problem here that you do not realize. People who have studied this question are amazed at what is involved here. You are going to cost the taxpayers of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars by eliminating the War

Assets Administration in such a wholesale manner. Just imagine liquidating a bureau in about 70 days that has six or seven billion dollars' worth of property to dispose of; and remember that there is no additional appropriation made for the owner agencies, the agencies to which this material will be transferred to take care of the job that they have to do. The property is still here, the plans are here, the maintenance has to go on. The insurance has got to go on, the sales expense has to go on, the accounting has to go on. You have made no appropriation to these agencies which will receive a tremendous amount of property to take care of.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. If the bill now under consideration is passed, is it true that the former owners of the 280,000 acres of land lying in my district will be denied the right to purchase that land back if the Government ever disposes of it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is exactly right. No former owner will have the prior right to purchase the property taken from him by his Government by condemnation proceedings or acquisition.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is the RFC equipped to handle this?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The RFC is not equipped to handle it. The Ferguson committee report will show that the handling of real property by RFC has been one of the most deplorable messes in the history of governmental action.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the Army Air Force cannot sell or dispose of any equipment until it is classified as either scrap or salvage?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is right. There is a billion dollars of aircraft component parts that will have to be sold as scrap. Most of this material is in the hands of aircraft-disposal agencies, which will get from 40 to 60 percent recovery for the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman think it is conceivable that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will do a worse job in handling this property than the War Assets Administration?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It has done a worse job than the War Assets Administration during the past year and a half and every subcommittee member of the Committee on Executive Expenditures, both Republican and Democratic, will certify to that.

Mr. KEATING. I have a file 4 feet thick of miscarriages of justice by the War Assets Administration and so has every other Congressman in this body.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The War Assets Administration has not always been faultless, but a whole lot of that has been due to the fact that you have changed Administrators five or six times. Every time the Administrators were changed there was another 3 to 6 months delay in disposal of property. We have an administrator in there who is doing his job according to the instructions of the Subcommittee on Surplus Property. He is doing a good job, he is doing an efficient job, as efficient as is possible, and you should not disturb this particular situation at the present time, because if you do, you are going to have another 3 to 6 months' delay and waste in the disposal of this property and further deterioration and obsolescence of the property.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment is given careful consideration by the committee because I know it will save the Government and the taxpayers money if it passes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN for the Holifield amendment: Page 19, line 3, after the semicolon insert "as to the disposal of personal property but shall continue as to the disposal of real estate."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of the committee which wrote this bill, not the particular one we are considering, but the War Surplus Property Act, and I have never been proud of that piece of legislation.

When that bill was up for consideration by the House I remember very distinctly that several Members rose on both sides and said they were going to hold our committee responsible for the operation of that law. I also recall very distinctly that no member of the committee would assume that responsibility. It was one of those "must" bills. It was one of those bills which had to be written—a bill to cover an activity in which so many were interested; where so much pressure was brought, first by representatives of one group, then by legislators representing another group, that the final result, at least in my opinion, was a monstrosity.

I do not believe that very many of us on the committee thought it would work. It never has worked. It is my humble judgment, it has been maladministered. It has afforded an opportunity for fraud and discrimination, and I for one would like to see the Government get out of the surplus-property business.

The question before the Executive Expenditures Committee for 2 or 3 years was whether or not we should ged rid of all this surplus immediately or whether we should go on and keep it and try to get something out of it. Personally I did not care. I was almost willing that we should dump it into the ocean and get rid of it. I preferred that we turn it over to some selling agency and let them get rid of it, charging a fair commission. But too many groups wanted priority, an opportunity to get something for nothing. What we expected and predicted then has come to pass. The cost of trying to dispose of this property almost equals the amount we get out of it.

We have had hearing after hearing on the matter. I know a subcommittee of the Expenditures Committee has had the matter up for a year and a half. It was up in the last Congress. Our Democratic friends had it before then. We took over the special committees' work and we fussed and fooled along with it. The subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] has done a remarkably good job. Recent hearings have shown that the veterans who should have had priority on property that has been declared surplus, both personal and real, and I have in mind the real estate down at Parkview Heights, Knox, Ind., did not get it. They offered something like $25,000 profit to the people who bought it. Then they could not get it, they could not purchase it. The veterans were denied the opportunity to purchase it for $175,000, yet the Administration turned around and sold it to a private concern for $150,000. That was after the veterans were told that the price was not one hundred and fifty, not one hundred seventy-five, but was two hundred and fifteen, and that the veterans had to have the cash.

So I say that some time—and in my opinion that time is today—we should begin to plan to get rid of this stuff, and the quicker we do it the more money we will save. There was something in what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] said, and that is why I put in that substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. These people who conveyed this real estate to the Government, or from whom it was taken, should have the opportunity to purchase back, but let us not go along piling up administrative charges and storage from now until doomsday.

If I owned that property as an individual, I would be willing, gentlemen, to give it away rather than to pay the charges and bring about the iniquities that this Administration through this agency is forcing upon our people—veterans and the former owners.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Under the Surplus Property Act the owners of real estate have a priority in reacquiring.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and I preserve that by the substitute for the amendment.

Mr. WALTER. And unless the gentleman's amendment is adopted, then that preference will not exist.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right, and that is why it was put that way. Let the former owners of the real estate, those who have been given priority under the law that we have now, continue to have that priority, but let us get rid of this so-called surplus property.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. The gentleman's amendment will permit the educational institutions who have made claims for property to use it for historic monuments, and the States and counties that have asked for this property to continue to have the priorities that they have now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right, on real estate.

Mr. GOFF. On real estate alone.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. But, the bill as amended by the substitute will require someone to get rid of this stuff some day and that right soon.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My amendment as offered will preserve to the owners their right which they have under the Surplus Property Act. The change that the gentleman's amendment will make will be strictly regarding personal property; is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Real estate. This amendment will preserve the priority rights in the real estate; not in personal property.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But my amendment as offered will also preserve that right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In personal property?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, but the gentleman does not want it disposed of. He wants to continue this War Assets Administration, to have it keep on forever and ever and ever. Now, there comes a time when a man ought to sell something. As they say, there comes a time when they ought to bury us.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment preserves all the priorities as they pertain to real property?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. But not as to personal property.

Mr. SMATHERS. Not only the former owners, but the veterans and everybody else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. I am well aware of the contention of my distinguished friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER] and of some other members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, especially those Members who sat as members of the Subcommittee on Surplus Property. They believe that shifting the duty of disposing of this surplus property from the present to another agency of the Government will result in delay because it will be necessary, they think, to have a new administrative set-up.

That may be true to a certain extent, but, if we permit the present agency to continue to handle this property, we have no assurance that they will ever make a vigorous, determined effort to dispose of it in the immediate future.

If we consider past experience, we have every reason to believe that, like so many other agencies, it will continue on and on, be a long time dying, if ever it dies, and all of the time charges against the remaining property will be accumulating and the Government's final net return will grow less and less.

Moreover, there have been altogether too many instances of at least apparent fraud, favoritism, discrimination. We have had plenty of maladministration, as the hearings of our subcommittee and its reports have demonstrated, and we have no assurance that a future administration will be any more efficient or will in the next few years close the books on the Government's war surplus property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on all amendments to the bill and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 8 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to mention a situation with which I am familiar in my district. If the bill is passed in its present form, without the Holifield amendment or the Hoffman amendment, 2,500 former landowners will be deprived of the right to repurchase lands which were condemned by the United States Government. In the First Congressional District of Georgia there are 285,000 acres of land now held by the United States Army, known as Camp Stewart, Ga. When the war began, the Government went into that area and put into the road with little notice 2,500 families. They were forced to go out and seek other homes. We have been trying through the legislative processes of this Congress to compel the War Department to declare that land surplus and give it back to those people, or sell it back to them, but the Government has kept it for 3 years, using it for absolutely no purpose whatsoever.

Now, when the War Department comes around to the proposition of getting rid of this land, if this bill is passed without the Hoffman amendment or without the Holifield amendment every one of those people will be denied the right to purchase that land back, and a great corporation known as the Union Bag and Paper Co. will wind up owning every acre of this land.

There are three counties in my district involved in this proposition. One county was wiped out by this great condemnation proceeding. It is manifestly unfair for this Congress to deny those people who were put into the highways with their belongings and driven into other sections of the country, and who were paid the very minimum price for their land, the right to repurchase this land. If we pass this legislation without these amendments, that is exactly what will happen. I urge you to adopt one of these amendments, whichever may please you, in fairness to those people.

That is in my district, but there are comparable situations throughout the United States. These amendments are fair, to protect those former property owners.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I beg your indulgence for a minute to discuss these two amendments. First, the Hoffman amendment endeavors to correct one little facet of the grave error that has been made by this hastily considered legislation.

It does protect the land priorities of the former owners, but it goes no further than that. It leaves four pages of the most carelessly drawn legislation I have ever seen brought in here on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it worse than the reorganization bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sorry the gentleman does not like reorganization. Many do.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] strikes out all of the ill-considered legislation that is put in by the Committee on Appropriations.

The Holifield amendment will correct all of the deficiencies that are in this bill, including the novel local taxation feature that the Government will have to pay on $3,000,000,000 worth of real property. At the rate we have to pay in Oklahoma figuring that there is $3,000,000,000 worth of real property, that would amount to about $135,000,000 a year in taxes that the Government will be paying.

Yet they say that they are trying to save a little bit of money.

You could have looked all over the Government agencies and everyplace else to put this real property sale, and you could not have found a single agency that had to pay a tax except the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There is no doubt about this self-imposed tax liability. Here is the bill that was passed 3 weeks ago setting forth in line and detail that all real property held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation must pay a local tax. We transfer the right, title, and interest to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There can be no doubt about it. It is an open and shut matter.

So there are about $135,000,000 in local taxes that you are starting out to pay on surplus property, and do not make any mistake about it.

You will be here asking for money to pay local taxes on the entire assessed valuation of Bonneville Dam and all reclamation projects and TVA and then your war plants, Army camps, post offices, and so forth, once you set this precedent. This is the camel's nose under the tent. I hope you do not want to get started into this kind of a proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoffman amendment and am very sorry to disagree with the chairman of the committee that I cannot see his amendment at this time. Surplus-property administration has been

kicked from pillar to post in the Federal Government. I was very much surprised to see this provision in the appropriation bill. It was my understanding that we did not put legislative provisions in appropriation bills. The committee having to do with surplus property of which I am chairman has been having hearings on this matter. As a matter of fact, over the past year, we have had over 40,000 pages of testimony dealing with the disposal of surplus property. In 1944 you had the Surplus War Property Administration. It was then changed to the Surplus Property Board. Then we had the Surplus Property Administration, and then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Then we came down to the War Assets Administration. Every time we have changed from one agency to another we have slowed up the process of disposing of surplus property. That is what we are going to do here in this instance. It will lose the taxpayers' money. It will lose the Government money. There will be nothing saved by the adoption of this proposal as contained in this bill. I recognize that the President sent down some time ago a proposal that surplus property be liquidated and turned over to the Federal Works Agency on June 30. I did not agree with that proposal. I think the proper policy is to continue the War Assets Administration. We have some $74,000,000 worth of property in Hawaii. There are some 3,000 trucks there. Those trucks need to be put into the ECA program, and what we had better be doing is to coordinate the property that we have in surplus with the needs of ECA and begin to coordinate this problem and see that it meets some of the needs and some of the commitments of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF] is recognized.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has agreed to accept the Hoffman amendment, I will not use my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. I do not care to be heard on this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, the Surplus Property Act of 1944 is not as bad a piece of work as the gentleman from Michigan indicates. Those of you who were in the Seventy-eighth Congress will remember that this House worked hard on that piece of legislation. It was generally agreed, after our struggle with it, that the whole problem was so complicated that no matter how good a job we did legislatively there would still be a lot to object to in its administration. It is inherent in the disposition of billions of dollars' worth of war goods. However, I believe the record will justify the statement that the Surplus Property Act of 1944 has been administered more acceptably and has proved to be a better act than the one under which the surplus property of the First World War was disposed of. So we ought not be too critical.

However, if we do what the Appropriations Subcommittee asks us to do now, we are taking out of the hands of the Expenditures Subcommittee a technical piece of work that belongs to them. I hope that on the vote on the Holifield amendment the Members will not forget what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] told us. He is a specialist on this subject. He showed by his analysis of the subcommittee's recommendation that we would make a grave mistake if we should transfer this to a lending agency. The RFC was never established to do this sort of thing.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the officials of the RFC are the first to admit that they do not want this job, and do not feel they can handle this job.

Mr. HAYS. Exactly. The Committee on Banking and Currency has worked for weeks on the problem of getting the RFC into what it was designed to be—a lending agency. Here we propose to dump entirely new duties into their lap and require them to build a new organization for this purpose.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman's party turned it back to the RFC a little while back, did it not?

Mr. HAYS. We took no step in this direction, if I am correctly informed. We never anticipated that the RFC would administer thousands of acres of agricultural land, for example. Furthermore, until the gentleman from California can tell us unequivocally that taxes will not immediately become due on this land, we ought to hesitate from the standpoint of cost alone; because we are about to involve the United States Government in millions of dollars of tax liens and tax assessments, when we know under the present procedure that would not be the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is recognized.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of your committee, the situation in respect to the disposal of surplus property is highly unsatisfactory.

For 2 years this and that committee of the House has been wrestling with the problem, trying to work out a solution that would be more satisfactory. The War Assets Administration has been under fire from almost every direction during that period, and there still remains $4,225,000,000 worth of property to be disposed of.

The property is deteriorating. The 1949 costs are estimated at over 58 percent in terms of realization. The net return to the Government appears to be on its way to the vanishing point. I can see no likelihood, Mr. Chairman, of completing this job with any expedition, unless some action is taken now.

The action recommended may not be perfect. If it is not it can be ironed out when the bill goes to the Senate, but the action recommended is very simple.

It simply turns over all real estate to the RFC to do the job which it has done in the past. It simply turns over personal property to the Bureau of Federal Supply in the Treasury, which is accustomed to doing that kind of work and is in part doing it now. It simply turns over airplanes and component parts to the Department of the Air Force, which should be able to dispose of them if anyone can.

That in substance is all there is to the proposal. I believe it is a practical step in the direction of an early utilization of available property and of the maximum return to the Government.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Unless the Hoffman amendment is adopted and the Holifield amendment defeated, is it not a fact that more surplus property is constantly being fed to the War Assets Administration and that it will exceed $400,000,000 in property not connected with the war.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct. I rise in support of the Hoffman amendment and in opposition to the Holifield amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 4 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are all trying to arrive at the solution of the same problem. Let me reason with you for just a half minute. Bear in mind that the President of the United States has sent to the Congress a message suggesting that War Assets be wound up. When? The 30th of June this year.

I think myself that real estate should be transferred, as the President of the United States recommended, to the Public Buildings and Grounds Administration, the old-line governmental agency that deals in real estate. After all, the RFC is quite capable of handling this, because, bear in mind, that when it comes to dollar value the biggest part of this real estate is in plants, factories, and so forth; and the RFC itself built most of these factories and plants.

But let me say this further, and I think I can speak for the committee: If the House leaves the bill as it is now, and we go over to the Senate and it is suggested by the Senate that the RFC be eliminated from the picture and in its stead the Public Buildings and Grounds Administration be substituted—if the Senate takes that action, I think our committee will go along with them.

Frankly, this War Assets proposition has been a terrible headache to everybody. I think War Assets has done a fairly good job. I am not going to be too critical of them. I think a mistake was made by all of us in writing the original bill. I think that the procurement agencies, like Army, Navy, Air, and so forth, should have their own disposal agencies. Why? Because they bought this property. They know more about the value of it than anybody else.

There is about $900,000,000 worth of airplanes and airplane parts. Who knows more about the disposition of airplanes than the Air Force which bought them, procured them, and build them? It makes common horse sense to turn it

back to them and let them dispose of them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Under existing law the Air Force cannot sell that material except for scrap or salvage.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Let us be perfectly frank about it. This agency expires by operation of law in December of 1949.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. We have about 60 days before this act goes into effect. If there is any trouble about this thing—and I am not sure the gentleman is right on that point—but we can correct this thing some time soon.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does the gentleman mean to tell the House that there is a possibility of taking this matter up legislatively in the eight remaining legislative days?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I do not intimate that. I understand there is some possibility of coming back here between now and Christmas. But I am not sure that the gentleman is right in his point.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am quite sure the gentleman is not right because lines 16, 17, and 18 on page 17 provide that these agencies dispose of it exactly as the War Assets Administration disposed of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. According to existing law.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it makes sense to turn the property back to the Army Air Forces. It has very little dollars and cents value. It has been said that in the sale of electronic equipment and such material the return to the Government has been 40 to 60 percent. I wish that were true, but I am sorry to say that we are paying our agents 40 to 60 percent, and the net return to the Government is less than 15 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the Hoffman amendment is offered in the form of a substitute. If it is adopted, then there will be no vote on the Holifield amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. There will be a vote on the Holifield amendment as amended by the substitute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There will be a vote on the Holifield amendment as amended by the Hoffman amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the Hoffman substitute is adopted, of course that will wipe out the language of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the Hoffman substitute is adopted, there will be no vote on the Holifield amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not as to the language as written in the Holifield amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Then in order to get a vote on the Holifield amendment, the Hoffman amendment would have to be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOLIFIELD) there were—ayes 108, noes 57.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 17, line 1, strike out all of pages 17, 18, 19, and lines 1 to 22 on page 22, and insert:

"For administrative expenses in connection with the functions authorized to be administered by the War Assets Administration to be available for the same purposes as the appropriation for salaries and expenses, War Assets Administration, fiscal year 1948, $50,000,000, from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, to be allocated as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is, of course, that the gentleman's amendment tries to strike out language which has already been stricken from the bill and is, therefore, not in order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The language is perfected by the Hoffman substitute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposition encompassed in the Holified amendment involves a $90,000,000 appropriation. The language changed by the Hoffman substitute merely added one small section to one small segment of the bill.

My amendment leaves the amount as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations absolutely unchanged and merely strikes out the legislative language that is contained on pages 17 to 20. It is an entirely different proposition and has not been passed on by the House.

It will leave the amount that the Committee on Appropriations is recommending exactly the same but strikes out what I consider to be objectionable legislative changes and a dispersment of duties over three agencies instead of one. I believe the amendment is in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order against the amendment, in addition to it being legislation on an appropriation bill, in that it carries language "to be allocated as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine," which imposes additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] does not constitute legislation on an appropriation bill, and for that reason and other reasons, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Will the Chair rule on the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota that it imposes additional duties outside the scope of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair took that into consideration and that point of order is overruled.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 67, noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 23, after line 17, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 105. The last paragraph under the hearing 'Public Buildings Administration' in Public Law 491, Eightieth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'No part of the foregoing appropriations to the Federal Works Agency shall be used for the purpose of converting any existing coal heating units to oil or natural gas in any federally owned or rented buildings in or outside the District of Columbia where there is a fuel oil shortage.' "

Line 18, change the section number to read "section 106."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge support for this amendment since it is a definite effort to correct a clerical error in the passage of Public Law 491 at this session. When that bill, H. R. 5214, came before the House on February 4, I offered an amendment which is printed in the second column of page 1082 of the RECORD. In the statement I made at that time, I reported that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] had indicated that he would prefer that I should add to the original text of the amendment I had prepared the words, "in areas where there is a fuel-oil shortage." However, it appears in the RECORD that the word "when" was used instead of the word "where" and in Public Law 491, which was approved April 20, the erroneous word "when" also appears in title I, the last paragraph on page 9.

It is my understanding that this error has brought about some unfortunate results in parts of the South where it is expensive and uneconomical to bring coal from some distances to points where there is an ample supply of both heating oil and natural gas. Certainly, the clear purpose of the additional words suggested by the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. THOMAS] was to avoid just that sort of a condition. In my discussions of the problem of the committee's intention with reference to other appropriation bills I have attempted to make it clear that it was my purpose and I felt the purpose of the various subcommittees to emphasize the absolute necessity of eliminating conversions from coal-heating units to oil-heating units, or the installation of new oil-heating units unless it could be clearly demonstrated that such action was completely sound and economical, having in mind the facts with reference to the oil supply in this country.

I recognize that section 103 of this bill subjects all funds appropriated herein to the general provisions of titles I and II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, and consequently that this limitation as it was adopted in Public Law 491 would apply as to the funds we are appropriating today. But I do think, in fairness to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and in fairness to our colleagues from areas where ample supplies do exist, where heating by coal may be uneconomic and unwise, this explanation should be made, and I hope the committee amendment will be adopted unanimously.

Under permission which I shall seek in the House, I do want to furnish the Members with a report which was delivered to me this morning in a letter from Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency. I hope the letter and the data General Fleming has provided me will be a source of encouragement to you, as it is to me. In my judgment, it proves the wisdom of the insistence upon conservation of heating oils by the Federal Government in operating its own properties, whether owned directly or held under lease. It also proves the soundness of the recommendation to this effect made by the subcommittee of the Massachusetts delegation last December. The amount of fuel oil which will apparently be saved annually in terms of this report from General Fleming is 7,763,055 gallons. Added to the previous reports, the grand total of estimated annual savings appears to be 68,188,055 gallons. Certainly this has been a constructive effort, and the various agencies are to be commended. Nevertheless, I think the very success of this effort is a good argument for continued insistence by the Congress upon the policy practically every subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has approved.

General Fleming's letter and the report follow:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, June 8, 1948.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Your letter of May 24 addressed to Dr. John R. Steelman, inquiring as to the results obtained by the efforts of this Agency to cause the various Government departments and agencies to reduce their use of fuel oil by converting to coal has been referred to me for reply.

As a result of the meetings held in my office of representatives of the various Government departments and agencies regarding the surveys that were conducted by these organizations, a letter was addressed to each of them on February 5, 1948, which included the following request: "I will appreciate your advice by March 1 as to the number of plants which have been converted by that time, as well as the number that are in progress and the estimated saving of oil on an annual basis." There is attached hereto a statement combining the information contained in the replies received to my letter of February 5. It will be noted that the savings reported in this attachment are in addition to those which have previously been furnished.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, United States Army, Administrator.

ADVICE RECEIVED FROM AGENCIES OF CONVERSIONS, NOT PREVIOUSLY REPORTED, FROM OIL- TO COAL-BURNING EQUIPMENT

1. Letter from Coast Guard, dated February 16, 1948, reported that two projects which were underway for converting from coal to oil were halted as follows:

	Gallons per year
(a) Constitution Wharf, Boston, Mass	175,000
(b) St. George Base, Staten Island, N. Y	190,000

2. Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration, reported on February 25, 1948, the following conversions:

Buildings and estimated annual savings

	Gallons
301 Independence Ave., Washington, D. C	4,650
811 Vermont Ave., Washington, D. C	150,000
711 12th St., Washington, D. C	58,000
515 22d St., Washington, D. C	8,000
1201 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D. C	15,000
1624 H St., Washington, D. C	14,000
1626 K St., Washington, D. C	28,700
705 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va	34,000
Total	312,350

3. The Veterans' Administration advised on February 26, 1948, that they had canceled a contract calling for the conversion of one plant from coal to oil. This plant would have consumed 300,000 gallons of oil per year. Likewise reported was the fact that at four veterans' hospitals, which have facilities for burning oil or coal, orders have been issued to use coal exclusively except in emergencies or under peak load conditions. It is estimated that this action will save approximately 2,350,000 gallons of oil per year.

4. The Navy reported on February 28, 1948, that they would use coal instead of oil at the Naval Supply Depot and Shipyard Annex, Bayonne, N. J., at a saving of 30,000 barrels per year. They also reported by letter of March 10, 1948, that an installation at the Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, had been converted to coal and the annual saving in this case would be 35,000 barrels.

5. The Chief of Engineers, War Department, reported on March 1, 1948, that they had converted by that date plants at the Watervliet Arsenal, N. Y., and the Quartermaster Depot in Boston to the use of coal, and the Red River Ordnance, Tex., and Fort Baker Hospital, Calif., to the use of gas, at an estimated annual saving of 2,418,300 gallons of oil. They likewise reported that projects are being prepared for three other locations to be accomplished upon availability of funds, which conversions, it is estimated, will result in an annual saving of 1,823,000 gallons.

6. The Department of Agriculture reported on March 3, 1948, that they had by that date converted 11 plants, that they intended to convert 90 more as soon as practicable and that the estimated annual saving of oil amounted to 129,405 gallons.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 91, noes 21.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and Friday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes on each day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Excise Taxes on Radio Tubes and Bulbs Are a Hardship for the American Citizens.

AMENDING TITLE X OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6818) to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 1002 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting the following before the semicolon in clause (8) thereof: ", except that the State may, in determining the income and resources of an individual, disregard any payments, not in excess of $40, received in any calendar month by an individual for services performed by him."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when the Railroad Retirement Act was under consideration, I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I was unable to prepare my remarks in time for printing in the RECORD of yesterday and now ask unanimous consent that my remarks be extended in the permanent RECORD as of yesterday, June 8.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include an article from the New York Herald Tribune, the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, and a letter from the board of harbor commissioners, Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. DAWSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in connection with the bill, H. R. 6801, the foreign relief bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD at that point with reference to flight training and also to include a bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] which was reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs this morning.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders entered, I may address the House for 1 minute today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION, 1949

Mr. TIBBOTT submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOLCOTT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by Hon. RALPH A. GAMBLE before the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks at Atlantic City.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently made.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that it is difficult, in these closing and busy days, to completely cover the field of legislation which many of us feel is absolutely necessary. These difficulties are multiplied in the case of civil-rights legislation by the very real threat of a filibuster invariably invoked by southern Democrats at every attempt to affirm the civil rights and social welfare of 13,000,000 American citizens who are not getting a square deal.

Nonetheless, if men of good will keep trying, ultimate success is inevitable. The march of the time and the march of social progress will admit no other result.

Anti-poll-tax legislation has long since passed the House. It is now pending before the Senate, and, as I say, under the threat of a filibuster. The antilynching bill, for which I have been working and for which I testified some weeks ago, is on the House Calendar. FEPC legislation has not advanced even that far.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to take the bull by the horns, notwithstanding delaying tactics and threats of a filibuster, and put this long-deferred and long-needed legislation through. Further delay is un-American and unfair.

The great majority of enlightened people are against jimcrowism and second-class citizenship. It is nonsense to talk about democracy and to insist upon democratic principles throughout the world, and at the same time continue most undemocratic practices at home.

Mr. Speaker, you are well aware that legislation of this character would pass the House by substantial majorities. Filibustering can be stopped by proper application of the rules. It is time to meet these issues head on and to solve them.

It is clear that no adequate solution will be accomplished at this session. In my view, it is a matter of urgency that we dispose of it at the next meeting of Congress, and at the very beginning of the session. Since we know that delaying tactics will be used, a very early start is essential.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEFEVRE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE T-E-W BILL—FACTS OR WISHFUL THINKING?

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion one of the most important legislative proposals coming before us is the one pertaining to the Nation's housing problem.

Since 1945 the T-E-W bill, in one form or another, has been under consideration by Members of Congress. It has been known as the WE bill, the WET bill, the TWE bill, and T-E-W bill.

A bill with such a tenacious hold on life, as to be reborn in every session of Congress since 1945, must have its points of interest and most powerful support.

But a bill which likewise has failed to pass every session of Congress since 1945 must also possess some serious disadvantages which have been pointed out by a determined opposition.

In the main, the support for this housing bill comes chiefly from Government agencies and their employees, from welfare organizations and civic groups. Opposition to this bill comes from the entire building industry, including manufacturing, distribution, contracting, real estate, banking, mortgage, and other interests. In other words, the members of every major national organization in the United States representing those who have built homes or can be counted upon to build homes, whether labeled public or private, are opposed to the passage of the T-E-W housing bill, now pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The bill as passed by the Senate, S. 866, is an omnibus bill of 115 pages. It contains numerous provisions providing for huge expenditures of public funds and concentrating enormous power and influence affecting the future of housing procedures, in the hands of very few men. This fact justifies our serious thought and exhaustive analysis.

In my opinion, it would be far better to consider separately and on their merits, four distinct, although related, problems with a view to the immediate and urgent problem of overcoming the current housing shortage in those areas where it now exists. These problems are:

First. The overcoming of the present actual shortage of dwellings, which, according to current reports, varies in degree in different areas of the country.

Second. The improvement of home construction for all classes of people.

Third. The provision of housing, particularly rental housing, for the lower-income groups.

Fourth. The problem of slum clearance.

It is self-evident that thousands of persons who are urging immediate pas-

sage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, believe that it will provide an early solution of the housing shortage. Veterans, as a result, visualize the prompt construction of hundreds of thousands of homes, either for purchase or for rent, at cheaper prices than are now available. They are primarily concerned, as they have b en ever since VJ-day with acquiring a home now.

There are other supporters of this measure who want housing built for social reasons and who wish to spend billions of dollars at the expense of the taxpayers for slum clearance and for public housing for low-income groups. Without underestimating the desirability of these social objectives, we must look at the facts squarely and decide what we want most—housing for those who want it now and are able to pay for it, or housing for those who want it now and expect the taxpayer to pay for it.

In general it appears that those who do not build homes and those who do not know how to build homes but who want them, are supporters of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, whereas, those who do build homes and those who know how to build homes are opposed to the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

If we frankly admit that the outstanding reason for the passage of this omnibus legislation now is to secure the production of homes for veterans now, we must fairly consider these points:

First. Does the passage of the bill assure any one a home?

Second. Will the passage of this bill assure more homes for the American people?

Third. Will the homes created under this bill actually cost less money?

Fourth. Will the homes this bill aims to produce provide Americans with housing at lower rental costs?

Fifth. Does the average American really want to pay for these homes or does he really want something else?

Sixth. If the T-E-W bill is not passed is there any hope that housing requirements of the people will be met?

Let us consider point No. 1—Will the passage of the T-E-W bill assure anybody a home?

If it were possible to pass legislation that would make food, clothing, and shelter or homes available to everyone in the United States on demand, we, in Congress, would indeed hold the magic key to utopia. Of course, we know that no legislation can command the construction of homes. The best it can do is to encourage the construction of homes.

During the war we spent whatever it took to get whatever it was that we needed. For example, it is reported that it cost approximately $2,000,000,000 to produce our first atomic bomb. We continued to increase the prices we paid for planes, for tanks, for ammunition, and for ships. We did this because we wanted them immediately.

We encouraged everyone at home to build tanks, planes, guns, and ships by paying higher wages. This is another way of saying that by paying a price high enough to get the production we needed as fast as we needed it, we would get the results desired. But this was money taken from the American people and it is their money that we are continuing to spend, for we are still paying for over $250,000,000,000 worth of war planes, ships, tanks, and ammunition. This obligation continues to hang over our heads in the form of a national debt. This debt and the inescapable fact that we must use a large percentage of the income of every man and woman who pays taxes, have been major factors in the rise of prices and the cost of living.

One reason why a prewar $5,000 home costs approximately $10,000 today, was the wartime necessity of paying any price to produce in haste everything we required for a war emergency. It can hardly be said that such production was economic or low cost because it was mass-produced and initiated by Government.

What is there in the T-E-W bill that will stimulate home production?

This bill does not provide more materials. It does not provide for greater manpower or a greater labor force for construction. It merely offers further extension of credit and other monetary manipulations which are of doubtful value, because the interest rates may not be attractive to banks or mortgage companies. Certainly, judging from the known attitude of all segments of the building industry, most of the provisions of the bill are not attractive to them.

It may be pointed out that the extension of FHA title VI has been deemed helpful in encouraging construction of rental homes by private industry. Yet, as you all know, this renewal of title VI was passed by this House in bill H. R. 5854 and has been in the hands of the Senate since March 23, considerably before the T-E-W bill had been considered or acted upon in the Senate. Many people familiar with the practical aspects of housing construction, who have considered the length of time it takes to put a program into actual use throughout this vast country, have stated that FHA title VI is one of the few provisions of the T-E-W bill which would have any favorable effect upon home building during the years 1948 or 1949. Other beneficial provisions are amendments to existing legislation, such as FHA title II and FHA title I, class 3 loan provisions.

In this respect I hope that the Banking and Currency Committee will propose a modernization of titles I and II of the National Housing Act so that we can dispense with title VI at the earliest possible date.

The passage of the T-E-W bill will do nothing toward the construction of homes for veterans or anyone else during the year 1948 or 1949 that cannot be accomplished by the adoption of H. R. 5854, already passed by the House. This bill fails to meet the first fundamental test that it shall do something real now toward overcoming the present housing shortage.

Second. Will the passage of this bill produce more homes for the American people than would be produced without a bill which calls for an expenditure of over $9,000,000,000 from the Federal Treasury alone?

This second point entails a consideration of material supply and available manpower, as well as other factors. The most optimistic and best estimates of available materials and building labor indicate that approximately 1,000,000 homes could be successfully completed this year, provided we have the most favorable conditions. As it is the same building industry, the same building materials, and the same building labor that must be used in constructing homes of any type, whether labeled public or private housing, it seems apparent that the question before us is not a matter of building more homes but rather a question of who is to get the homes.

If we build 1,000,000 homes for those who want to pay for them, either by purchase or by rental from owners, no additional taxes will be required. Living costs will not be increased. The costs of these homes will reflect only individual budgets and not the added cost of a Government bureau. Each home so built will support the local government by paying its just and fair share of municipal taxes.

If the Government pays for the homes with tax money, then taxes will increase, living costs will increase, and homes will cost more because Government supervision and administration must be added to the cost. Local tax burdens will, therefore, be increased.

Should we deny a man a house because he has saved for it and can buy it?

Should we make lack of money, or lack of industry, or lack of thrift the main requirement for obtaining a new home?

If we build homes for those who can afford to buy, the home left vacant can be rented or sold. Under this plan there are two homes instead of just one.

It is said that we must build new homes for those who cannot afford them because their homes are unfit to live in. Under this plan we build one home, destroy another, and have no increase in the number of homes. This argument ignores the existence of housing which now supplies 95 percent of our requirements, including reasonably priced rental units. Many people, including myself, have never lived in a new house, and this condition is certain to continue. If we add to the supply of housing at this time, we create more homes which can be utilized by all income groups.

Shall we waste our available materials to build only one home where two can be maintained? We must face the fact that there is just so much of materials and manpower with which to do a housing job. On the basis of the present record full use is being made of the available supply. At the rate homes are being provided by private enterprise in this year of 1948, we will be building at a rate in excess of 1,000,000 homes per year before the record for 1948 is complete. In other words, at the present time, the question is, Shall we produce the greatest available supply of housing possible, now being created by private builders?

We will either have maximum production utilizing to the full the available resources of materials and labor or we will use the same materials and labor under a questionable Government program.

Every public-housing bill, whether labeled Taft-Ellender-Wagner, or otherwise, poses the same questions. This

measure cannot produce more homes for the American people than would be produced without the passage of this bill.

Third. Will the provisions of this bill actually make possible the production of lower-cost homes? Does public housing really cost less? At the outset, it is axiomatic that the economical building of all kinds of housing is essentially an industry problem. As a matter of self-interest, every builder, distributor, or manufacturer wants to improve his methods and lower his costs. This is the only way in which he can be successful and remain in business. It is unfortunate that current shortages and the pressing need for homes have temporarily obscured the great progress already made along these lines. A builder today must build as best he can with the labor and materials available and not entirely as he would like to build.

In times of material scarcity or high demand, Government housing tends to reduce the number of homes that can be built and actually increases the cost.

Public housing must compete for materials. In effect, it stock piles materials for its jobs while costs on private homes mount, awaiting materials for completion. This discourages private home buyers and builders alike. Consequently fewer homes are built when Government housing competes for materials.

This is what happened in 1946 when Government controls and regulations reduced home construction to a rate of 218 homes per hour, whereas in the last half of 1947 when the industry was free, it produced homes at the rate of 457 homes per hour, and for 4 months broke all records in home production. This trend is continuing this year. The record shows that the industry has produced 51,800 more homes in the first 4 months of this year than were produced in the same 4-month period in 1947.

On the basis of the record, it seems that Government-operated, or Government-manipulated housing programs do not work. On the basis of the record, Government does not produce housing as fast as does private industry.

Government rarely produces as good houses as private industry, either from the standpoint of quality or living conveniences.

Government, so far as is known from any available record, has never produced housing at less cost than private industry would require to produce the same housing unit.

Fourth, will the homes produced under the T-E-W bill provide American citizens with housing at a lower rental cost?

It may be possible for Government public housing to provide shelter units for the American people at a lower rental cost. But if we consult the record we find that according to FPHA testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1944, each unit of public housing cost the public $36.61 per month to maintain. This is the latest available figure on the rental cost of public housing.

Against this figure of $36.61 per month we find that the average median rent of all housing in the entire United States in 1947 was $29.33 per month. In other words, it costs approximately $7 per month more to maintain an occupant in public housing than it would cost to rent the average dwelling unit from private industry.

You all know the explanation. A portion of the rent of the occupants of public housing is paid for by the citizens who in addition must pay for their own rental of private housing.

Obviously, the average American would like to see everyone housed in a better home. It is quite possible that between 80 and 90 percent of American families would like to move into a better house, a more convenient house, or one located elsewhere, but it is questionable whether or not they would like to spend a larger proportion of their income for that privilege.

Fifth, in considering this entire subject of housing with all of its implications, we must ask the question, "Does the average American really want to pay for housing to be provided by the Government, or does he want something else more?"

A study of the record of how the American people spent their money in 1946—the latest year for which there is a breakdown—makes it appear unlikely that the average American citizen proposes to spend more for the house in which he lives. For example, Americans as a whole spent four times more for food than they did for housing, and one and one-half times more for clothing, and the same additional amount for operating their households, including such things as utilities, furniture, dishes, fuel, and other items incidental to occupying a house.

Obviously, the above broad categories include the absolute essentials. I will grant that food and clothing and cooking utilities, and water and fuel take precedence over housing.

Now let us take a look at the spending habits of American citizens with reference to less essential items. During the year 1946 Americans spent $12,600,000,000 on essential housing. They also spent other billions of dollars from choice rather than through necessity.

For example, in 1946 the American people spent twelve and one-tenth billions on liquor and tobacco. This is almost the same amount as was spent for housing. It is also interesting to note that the increase in the amount spent for liquor and tobacco between 1940 and 1946 was 124 percent. This is exactly the percentage increase in wages and salaries for the American people between 1940 and 1946.

On such items as jewelry; cosmetics; beauticians; turkish baths; personal care; travel by plane, bus, and train; recreation, including movies, horse and dog racing, and sports; the American people spent another $12,700,000,000, or $100,000,000 more than they spent for housing during the same period.

There is no reason in a free America, why the American people should not have spent this $24,800,000,000 on something besides the basic essentials of food, clothing, and housing. But these figures do indicate that the American people did have a choice in their spending, and that they decided to spend twice as much for items less essential than housing.

This is the way the American people spend their money in a free economy.

Is is now to be deemed the duty of Congress to siphon off somewhat over nine billions of the American people's dollars to be spent for slum clearance, farm, and public housing, because the Congress believes that it would be better for the average American, rather than to allow each citizen to spend his own money in his own way?

Sixth, if the T-E-W bill is not passed, is there any hope that our housing requirements will be met?

We have heard much about the housing shortage in the United States. But I ask you what you have heard about the housing overage? In New Orleans a leading newspaper recently carried 47 columns of houses offered for sale in the classified section. There are hundreds of towns in the United States where there is no housing shortage. There are growing numbers of towns and smaller cities in the United States where there is actually a housing overage—new homes but no buyers.

In my own district I have one area in particular where there presently exists a housing shortage. A recent communication from a close friend of mine in a position to know the local situation indicates that at the rate that construction of new houses is advancing, before the end of this year their housing shortage will be over. Outside of some of the larger metropolitan areas, I believe this is the prevailing situation throughout the country.

We have heard much about the outrageous prices of homes which are being built in this country. No one will deny that some of the prices quoted are outrageous. But again let us look at the record. A recent analysis of individual incomes throughout the Nation related to the prices of new homes, indicates that homes are being built for Americans in all income brackets except the lowest tenth—those receiving less than $1,000 per year—and the highest fifth—those receiving over $5,000 per year. Twenty percent of the homes built fit family incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 per year; 23 percent of the homes built are for family incomes between $2,000 and $3,000 per year; 25 percent fit family incomes between $3,000 and $4,000 per year; 18 percent of the homes built fit incomes between $4,000 and $5,000 per year. Only 14 percent of the homes built are for incomes in excess of $5,000 per year. Mark you, contrary to the popular impression, far less homes are being built for incomes in excess of $5,000 per year than for the other income brackets. This statement is based on the standard yardstick that a family can afford a house costing two and one-half times its annual income. (Based on Bureau of Labor Statistics, news release, March 2, 1948.)

Today the building industry is constructing houses at an unprecedented rate. It has almost recovered from the crippling effects of 4 years of wartime regulation and 20 months of bureaucratic peacetime control.

The presently free private building industry is rapidly putting an end to the actual shortage of housing. How are

we going to overcome the housing shortage? The first answer is to do it exactly as we are doing—build homes at the highest rate possible. Homes are now being built at a rate that probably cannot be rapidly or substantially increased. Now the T-E-W bill appears with its threat of again putting Government in housing. This is another way of saying that it threatens to interfere with, control, or regulate construction. Passage of this bill can do little but retard the construction industry, which if left alone, will have eliminated the housing shortage before the provisions of this bill can possibly be made effective on the construction sites. This bill will saddle on the American taxpayers a burden of upward of $9,000,000,000. It will force untried policies on the American public and the housing industry for which we will commit our Government for unknown billions of dollars more. Let us do first things first. Let us overcome the current housing shortage before we venture down the path of untried governmental experiments which thus far have failed to demonstrate that this method of controlled housing can serve our people more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I simply want to warn the House Members that the public-housing features of this bill are the first steps in socializing the building industry. One of the greatest stabilizing factors in our national life has been the opportunity of all families to have a real stake in their country by owning their own homes. Great Britain made the error and now admits that had private enterprise been left its full responsibility of building houses, a clossal burden on the taxpayer would have been saved. To quote in part, W. Craven-Ellis, a former member of the British Parliament:

> It is to be hoped that the United States of America will profit by Britain's unfortunate experience of totalitarianism as practiced by our Socialist Government. Individual initiative is being destroyed and a man finds that there are only a few minor things which he can do without first obtaining the permission of the bureaucracy.

Let us save America.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 1 minute.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION REGULATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, when I addressed the House on May 28 with reference to H. R. 6747, filed that afternoon with the unanimous support of the Massachusetts delegation in the House, I stated that I would comment further on the situation existing by reason of the regulations which had been adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in connection with their requirements as to sponsors' assurances with reference to project applications.

Last month, when Acting Administrator F. B. Lee was before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I concluded my examination with a definite request for a specific and detailed brief. That request was in the following terms:

> Mr. HESELTON. I am sorry that we do not make much progress toward my ideas, but I would like to have you let me know as soon as possible, and I will make this quite specific, whether you are going to insist: (1) on the Commonwealth of Massachusetts signing this by May 31; and (2) whether you have any other alternative as a result of these hearings and anything that has been said or that has come to your mind; and are you willing to explore the question which has been raised here as to just whether you are acting within the scope and intent of the Federal Airport Act. And furnish a specific and detailed brief as soon as possible, pointing out to this committee upon what provision of law you rely, what testimony in the hearings, and what phraseology in the committee reports on either side, or in the conference report, or in the debates, when any of this legislation was enacted, which gives you the right or imposes upon you the duty of going into these matters which I have described as, in my opinion, matters of local administration essentially, and matters of economic judgment by competent local authority.
>
> I would like to see that brief as closely written as possible, omitting nothing that you rely upon as the basis of your answer.

Mr. Lee stated:

> We shall be glad to furnish that.

This noon I received a letter from Mr. Lee, enclosing a copy of the brief. I include the letter, the brief, and the copy of part 550 of the regulations, which is incorporated by reference in the brief:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 9, 1948.

The Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HESELTON: Thank you for your letter of May 31, 1948, enclosing a copy of the transcript of hearings in connection with H. R. 6180. The legal brief requested by you discussing the basis on which the Administrator is authorized to promulgate regulations implementing section 11 (1) of the Federal Airport Act has just been completed by our general counsel's office. A copy is enclosed.

I am today also sending a copy of this legal brief to Congressman WOLVERTON, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committe.

If I can be of further service to you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

F. B. LEE,
Acting Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

BRIEF

I. PURPOSE OF BRIEF

The purpose of this brief is to set forth the legal basis for the action of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in promulgating part III (sponsors assurances), of appendix C (project application), which constitutes a portion of part 550 of the regulations. It is particularly concerned with paragraph 4 of part III, in which the sponsor agrees to operate the airport for the use and benefit of the public, on fair and reasonable terms, and without unjust discrimination.

II. THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT EXPRESSLY REQUIRES THAT, AS A CONDITION PRECEDENT TO THE PAYMENT OF A FEDERAL GRANT, THE ADMINISTRATOR RECEIVE WRITTEN ASSURANCES THAT THE AIDED AIRPORT WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC USE ON FAIR AND REASONABLE TERMS AND WITHOUT UNJUST DISCRIMINATION

Section 11 of the Federal Airport Act of 1946, contains the following provisions:

"SEC. 11. As a condition precedent to his approval of a project under this act, the Administrator shall receive assurances in writing, satisfactory to him, that—

"(1) the airport to which the project relates will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination;

* * * * *

"To insure compliance with this section, the Administrator shall prescribe such project sponsorship requirements, consistent with the terms of this act, as he may deem necessary. Among other steps to insure such compliance the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with public agencies, on behalf of the United States."

A commitment on the part of the United States, acting through the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to make a grant of public funds to aid in the construction or improvement of an approved airport project is formed by the Government's tender to the sponsor and the sponsor's acceptance of a written grant offer (act, sec. 12). Upon acceptance of such offer, a grant agreement is created which is a contractual obligation binding upon both contracting parties. The statute provides that as a condition precedent to approving a project application and issuing the necessary grant offer, the Administrator shall receive satisfactory written assurance that the airport will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination (act, sec. 11 (1)); and that "to insure such compliance" he is authorized to enter into contracts with public agencies on behalf of the United States (act, sec. 11).

Acting under express statutory mandate, the Administrator has promulgated regulations reasonably calculated to discharge this mandatory direction of Congress. As related to section 11 (1) of the act, the pertinent regulations comprise numbered paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 of part III of the Project Application, Appendix C, which constitutes a portion of part 550 of the regulations. See attached copy of part 550 of the regulations. Particular attention is invited to paragraph 4 of part III, which reads in part as follows:

"4. The sponsor agrees * * *

"(b) That it will not exercise or grant any right or privilege which would operate to prevent any person, firm, or corporation operating aircraft on the airport from:

* * * * *

"(2) Purchasing off the airport and having delivered on the airport without entrance fee, delivery fee, or other surcharge for delivery any parts, materials or supplies necessary for servicing, repair, or operation of its aircraft."

Some sort of contract is necessary in order that the Administrator may receive the necessary "assurances in writing." In the House conference report on the Federal Airport Act, being H. R. 1828, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, to accompany S. 2, we find the following comment with respect to section 11 of the act:

"Section 11 of the conference substitute retains that part of the corresponding House provision which authorized the Administrator to enter into contracts in order to insure compliance with the provisions of the section, but there has been omitted the language which would have provided that 'such contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance.' The omission of this language is not intended to indicate that the Administrator should not under any circumstances enter into contracts enforceable by decrees for specific performance, or that courts should refrain from issuing such decrees in appropriate cases. The only effect intended to be achieved by the elimination of this language was to avoid the adoption of a provision which might be construed as an attempt to change by statute the general law governing this type of equitable relief."

This extract from the conference report clearly shows that something more than a letter was considered necessary by Congress and that a binding contract was contemplated.

III. SPECIFIC ENUMERATION OF PRACTICES INCONSISTENT WITH SECTION 11 (1) IS ESSENTIAL TO ADMINISTERING THE ACT

It would serve no useful purpose for the Administrator to repeat in each grant offer the wording of section 11 (1) or for the sponsor to submit written assurances in similar general terms, since this would leave open the question of whether or not the terms of airport use by the public were fair and reasonable and without unjust discrimination. To comply with the mandate of the statute, therefore, the Administrator is forced to specify with definiteness those practices which he deems to be unfair, unreasonable, and discriminatory. Anything short of such a specification, such as an attempt to rely upon the general language of section 11 (1), probably would be legally unenforceable because of indefiniteness.

IV. SECTION 11 (1) IS APPLICABLE TO ALL PARTS OF THE AIRPORT, INCLUDING THE BUILDING AREAS

The term "airport" in the Federal Airport Act is defined in section 2 (a) (2) thereof to mean "any area of land or water which is used, or intended for use, for the landing and take-off of aircraft, and any appurtenant areas which are used, or intended for use, for airport buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way, together with all airport buildings and facilities located thereon." From this definition, it is clear that the requirements of fairness, reasonableness, and nondiscrimination apply to the entire area of the airport, including building areas, and gasoline storage and dispensing areas.

V. NO AID TO INTERPRETATION IS FURNISHED BY THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF SECTION 11

It would have been helpful had section 11 of the act been analyzed in the congressional debates, but such does not appear to have been the case. The only extended reference to section 11 is found in the House conference report on S. 2, which we have quoted under II, supra. It is pointed out that the only effect of the discussion of section 11 in the conference report for our purposes is to indicate Congress intended the Administrator to implement the requirements of section 11 by formal contracts with sponsors rather than by unenforceable written expressions of general intention.

Present section 11 (1) (at the time numbered section 7), was also briefly commented upon, without objection, in the hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, viz, in the printed hearings at page 26 (Mr. Hunter, CAA), at page 193 (Mr. Cookingham, American Municipal Association), and at page 343 (Mr. Schroeder, Minnesota Commission of Aeronautics). A substantially similar version of present section 11 (1), successively numbered 13 and also 15, was favorably commented upon by Senator MCCARRAN, as reported on page 79 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1945, and on page 8474 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 11, 1945; was referred to by Senator SALTONSTALL, as reported on page 8478 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 11, 1945; was referred to by Congressman LEA, as reported on page 2978 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1946; and was approved by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in its Report No. 224, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, to accompany S. 2, at page 6, where the committee report, referring to section 15 (as present sect. 11 was then numbered), reads:

"Section 15 provides for conditions governing project sponsorship. It is the judgment of your committee that the conditions set forth are necessary for the protection of the Government and for proper and efficient administration of the program."

VI. THE ADMINISTRATOR'S ACTION HAS BEEN WITHIN THE SCOPE OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

It is customary for statutes to lay down standards or to give rights of action in general language which requires either administrative or judicial interpretation to achieve exactitude. Under the authority of statutes prohibiting unjust discrimination the Interstate Commerce Commission has been authorized to take action to prohibit unjust discrimination by rail carriers subject to its jurisdiction. Similar provisions are found in the Federal Power Commission Act, being section 4 of chapter 285, act of June 10, 1920 (16 U. S. C. A., sec. 797 (h)):

"Necessary powers not enumerated; rules and regulations: (h) To perform any and all acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to issue such orders not inconsistent with this chapter as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter."

With the foregoing should be compared the corresponding language of section 11 of the Federal Airport Act:

"To insure compliance with this section, the Administrator shall prescribe such project sponsorship requirements, consistent with the terms of this act, as he may deem necessary."

In implementing the Federal Airport Act the Administrator has confined his regulations within channels harmonizing with the past practices of similar Federal regulatory agencies established by Congress. The words "fair and reasonable terms" and "unjust discrimination" have been used in many public-utility statutes to prevent too great a concentration of power or authority in any one person to the detriment of the general public. I quote from American Jurisprudence on this subject:

"Public-service commissions are generally given the power, under statutory or constitutional provisions, to fix and regulate public-utility rates, usually under the direction that such rates must be reasonable; and such provisions are usually considered as constitutional and as valid delegations of such power" (43 American Jurisprudence, Public Utilities, sec. 202, p. 707).

* * * * *

"The authority to make rules to carry out a policy declared by the lawmaker is administrative and not lesgislative [citing *U. S.* v. *Grimaud* (220 U. S. 506, 55 L. Ed. 563, 31 S. Ct. 480)], even though the lawmaker has provided that a violation of such rules shall be punished as a public offense [citing Grimaud case]. Such power is not the power to make law, but the power to carry into effect the will of the lawmaker as expressed by the statute, and its use by administrative officers is essential to the complete exercise of the powers of all the depatrments [citing *State* v. *Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.* (56 Fla. 617, 47 So. 969)]." (42 American Jurisprudence, Public Administrative law, sec. 49, pp. 354, 355.)

The same rule has been applied by the courts in construing State public utility statutes. Thus, subdivision 1 of article 6670, Vernon Sayles' Texas Civil Statutes, forbids unjust discrimination by railroads in Texas. Observed Judge Dunklin in *Ft. Worth and Denver City Railroad Company* v. *Frazier* (1917, Texas Civil Appeals, 191 S. W. 808 at 811):

"Subdivision 1 * * * denounces 'any undue or unreasonable preference to any particular person,' etc., as an unjust discrimination, but it does not define what would constitute such preference or advantage. That question is left to be determined by the general principles of the common law."

* * * * *

"The requirements of the Federal act [Interstate Commerce Act] that the same charges should be made for a like and contemporaneous service 'under substantially similar circumstances and conditions' was substantially the same as the duty imposed by the common-law rule."

A similar rule has been applied to the enunciation of regulations for the conservation of gasoline and oil and to insure the safety and purity of such products, including the right to make such supplementary rules and regulations as may be necessary to achieve the legislative purpose (*Thompson* v. *Consolidated Gas Utilities Corporation*, 300 U. S. 55, 81 L. Ed. 510, 57 S. Ct. 364).

The granting of exclusive rights and privileges has frequently been denied to the regulatory agency itself, even when no explicit prohibition of such grants is found in the governing statute. As expressed in the text of Forty-three American Journal section 43, page 600, citing *New England Express Co.* v. *Maine Railroad Co.* (57 Maine 188), and *Central New York Telephone and Telegraph Co.* v. *Averill* (199 New York 128, 92 N. E. 206):

"It has been frequently held that a public utility may not lawfully grant exclusive rights and privileges within the scope of its public duties, since such action not only violates its duty of impartial treatment, but also tends to monopoly."

The general rule is well summarized in 43 American Jur. section 38, page 597:

"Public utilities, for their security and convenience and in the interests of efficient service may adopt rules and regulations, if reasonable, lawful, and not unjustly or improperly discriminatory, and may enforce compliance therewith by refusing or discontinuing the service."

It is believed that the Administrator in promulgating the sponsor's assurance portion of the project application has acted in harmony with existing law and in accordance with the current practices of similar regulatory agencies established by Congress.

VII. CONCLUSION

From the foregoing discussion, it is my conclusion that it was the intent of Congress that the Administrator should determine what airport operation practices would make an airport unavailable for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination and therefore should be prohibited by contract. By the provisions of paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 of part III of Appendix C to part 550 of the Regulations, it is my opinion that the Administrator has reasonably complied with the congressional mandate.

ROBERT P. BOYLE,
Acting General Counsel.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION.

(The following text appeared in the March 18, 1948, issue of the Federal Register on pages 1398 to 1405, inclusive.)

TITLE 14—CIVIL AVIATION

CHAPTER II—ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Part 550—Federal aid to public agencies for development of public airports

Acting pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170; Pub. Law No. 377, 79th Cong.), I hereby repeal part 550 of the regulations of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics as published in the Federal Register of January 9, 1947 (12 F. R. 135), as amended, together with all appendices thereto, and adopt in lieu thereof a new part 550 of the regulations of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics as published herewith including the appendices referred to therein. This action shall become effective May 1, 1948.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions and the terms of the said new part 550, it is also hereby ordered, effective upon publication of this order in the Federal Register:

(1) That any sponsor of a project in the Federal-aid airport program may use any of the forms prescribed in said new part 550, as soon as they are published in the Federal Register, in lieu of the comparable forms now in effect;

(2) That any project sponsor which, as of the date of publication of this order, has

not accepted a grant offer on existing Form ACA 1632 (1–47), may substitute for the covenants pertaining to operation and maintenance of a sponsor's airport contained in the existing form of sponsor's assurance agreement, Form ACA 1642 (10–46), the covenants on this subject contained in part III of the project application form, Form ACA 1624 (3–12–48), which is published herewith as appendix C (which may be accomplished either by adopting a sponsor's assurance agreement containing the substitute covenants or amending an existing sponsor's assurance agreement to substitute such covenants, such revised or amended sponsor's assurance agreement to be incorporated in any grant offer that may be made to the sponsor, or by requesting that any such grant offer provide for and effect such substitution); and

(3) That any project sponsor which, as of the date of publication of this order, has accepted a grant offer incorporating a sponsor's assurance agreement on existing Form ACA 1642 (10–46), may make application to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for amendment of the grant agreement so formed, substituting for the covenants of such sponsor's assurance agreement pertaining to operation and maintenance of the sponsor's airport the covenants on this subject contained in part III of the project application form, Form ACA 1624 (3–12–48), which is published herewith as appendix C, which amendment will be executed by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics if he determines such action to be to the advantage of the United States.

This order shall become effective in part on May 1, 1948, and in part upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER, as provided herein.

NOTE.—The reporting and record-keeping requirements contained in this order have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to the Federal Reports Act of 1942: *Provided*, That any reporting or record-keeping requirements which may be imposed subsequently pursuant to provisions of this order are subject to approval of the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

F. B. LEE,
Acting Administrator
of Civil Aeronautics.

Sec.
550.1 Definitions.
550.2 Eligible sponsors.
550.3 Eligible airport development.
550.4 Project costs.
550.5 Procedure.
550.6 Agency and co-sponsorship.
550.7 Performance of construction work.
550.8 Accounting and audit.
550.9 Grant payments.
550.10 Memoranda and hearings.

Authority: Sections 550.1 to 550.10, inclusive, issued under 60 Statutes 170.

Section 550.1. Definitions. All terms in the regulations of this part which are defined in the Federal Airport Act and are not defined in this section shall have the meaning given to them in the act. As used in this part, unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms shall have the meaning indicated:

(a) "Act" means the Federal Airport Act of 1946 (Public Law No. 377, 79th Cong., 2d sess.; 60 Stat. 170) (Appendix A).

(b) "Administrator" means the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics or his duly authorized representative.

(c) "CAA" means the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the United States Department of Commerce.

(d) "Class 4 or larger airport" means an airport which, in the opinion of the Administrator, upon completion of the project proposed would meet generally the standards of table 3 of the Civil Aeronautics Administration Bulletin, "Airport Design," dated April 1, 1944, for a class 4 or larger airport (Appendix B).

(e) "District Airport Engineer" means the director of a district office of the Airports Branch of a CAA regional office or his duly authorized representative.

(f) "Joint project" means any project sponsored by two or more sponsors.

(g) "National Airport Plan" means a plan for the development of public airports in the United States, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, prepared and revised annually by the Administrator.

(h) "Program" means a program prepared by the Administrator listing proposed projects to be undertaken within the limits of currently available funds.

(i) "Project" means a project for the accomplishment of airport development with respect to a particular airport as set forth in a grant agreement or project application submitted in accordance with the regulations in this part.

(j) "Regional Administrator" means the director of a CAA regional office or his duly authorized representative.

(k) "Superintendent of Airports" means the director of the Airports Branch of a CCA regional office or his duly authorized representative.

SEC. 550.2. Eligible sponsors: To be eligible to submit a project application under the regulations of this part, a sponsor must meet the following requirements:

(a) A sponsor must be a "public agency" as said term is defined and used in the act and may not be the United States or any agency thereof unless the project is located in the Territory of Alaska, in the Territory of Hawaii, in Puerto Rico, or in a national park, national recreation area, national monument, or national forest.

(b) A sponsor (or the sponsors of a joint project, between them) must be legally, financially, and otherwise able and in a position: (1) to make all certifications, representations, and warranties contained in the Project Application Form, Form ACA 1624 (Appendix C); (2) to make, keep, and perform all assurances, agreements, and covenants contained in Parts III and IV of said form; and (3) to meet all other applicable requirements of the act and of the regulations of this part.

(c) A sponsor (or the sponsors of a joint project, between them) must have or be in a position to obtain sufficient funds to meet the requirements of section 550.5 (c) (1) and must have or be in a position to acquire property interests meeting the requirements of section 550.5 (c) (2).

Section 550.3. Eligible airport development—(a) Minimum requirements: Each proposed project shall include sufficient airport development to provide a safe, usable, and useful airport facility or add materially to the safety or utility of an existing airport: *Provided*, That the Administrator may approve a project which does not meet this requirement when special conditions so warrant and in so doing may prescribe such special conditions as he determines to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States. To be eligible for inclusion in a project, an item of airport development must meet the following minimum requirements:

1. The proposed airport development shall be within the scope of the latest revision of the National Airport plan.

2. The proposed airport development shall be in accordance with standards established or approved by the Administrator for the various types of development involved.

3. If the proposed airport development involves further development of an existing class 4 or larger airport, or the development of an airport which upon completion of the project will be a class 4 or larger airport, current congressional authorization for such development must have been granted pursuant to section 8 of the act.

4. Unless specifically authorized by the Administrator, the proposed airport development shall not include any work which the sponsor of the project or any other non-Federal public agency is obligated to accomplish by reason of any previous agreement with or commitment to the United States.

(b) Eligible types of airport development. The Administrator will approve only airport development which falls within one or more of the classifications set forth in the following subparagraphs.

1. Construction work. The following types of construction work shall be eligible for inclusion in a project:

(i) Preparation of an airport site or any portion thereof, including clearing, grubbing, filling and grading.

(ii) Dredging of seaplane anchorages and channels.

(iii) Drainage work either on or off an airport or airport site.

(iv) Construction, alteration, and repair of administration, terminal, and service buildings; airport control tower structures; shops for repair and maintenance of airport equipment, plant, and structures; seaplane ramps and docks; and any other buildings and structures necessary for the proper use, operation, management and maintenance of an airport as a public facility other than hangars and living quarters.

(v) Construction, alteration, and repair of runways, taxiways, aprons, and automobile-parking areas within the limits of an airport or airport site.

(vi) Construction, alteration, and repair of access roads and walks either on or off an airport or airport site.

(vii) Fencing, landscaping, seeding, and sodding of an airport or airport site.

(viii) Installation, alteration, and repair of airport markers and airport lighting facilities and equipment.

(ix) Construction, installation, and connection of utilities either on or off an airport or airport site.

(x) Removal, lowering, relocating, marking, and lighting of airport hazards.

(xi) Such other work as may be specifically approved by the Administrator.

(2) Land acquisition: The acquisition of land or of any interest therein, or of any easement through or other interest in air space, shall be eligible for inclusion in a project when such acquisition is necessary:

(i) To permit the accomplishment of other airport development, whether or not such development is to be accomplished as part of the Federal-aid airport program; or

(ii) To prevent or limit the establishment of airport hazards; or

(iii) To permit the removal, lowering, relocation, or marking and lighting of existing airport hazards; or

(iv) To permit proper use, operation, management, and maintenance of the airport as a public facility.

The term "acquisition of land" as used in this subparagraph shall include acquisition of lands already developed as a privately owned airport and of all structures, fixtures, and improvements thereon constituting a part of the realty.

Section 550.4. Project costs—(a) Eligibility: All project costs, as defined in section 2 (a) (6) of the act, shall be eligible for consideration as to their allowability except the following:

(1) Any cost of obtaining title to or the use of any lands or any interests in air space under section 16 of the act.

(2) That portion of the cost of rehabilitation or repair for which funds have been appropriated by the Congress under section 17 of the act.

(3) That portion of the cost of acquiring a privately owned existing airport which represents the cost of acquiring buildings which are subsequently to be used as hangars or living quarters at such airport.

(4) The costs of materials and supplies owned by the sponsor or furnished from a source of supply owned by the sponsor where (i) such materials and supplies were purchased for or appropriated to the project prior to the execution of the Grant agreement, or (ii) such costs are not supported by proper evidence of quantity and values.

(5) The purchase price of machinery, tools, or equipment purchased by a sponsor for use in accomplishing work under a project by sponsor's force account.[1]

(6) The costs of general area, urban, or State-wide planning of airports, as distinguished from the planning of a specific project.

(b) Allowability: In order to be an allowable project cost, for the purpose of computing the amount of a grant, each item of project costs paid or incurred must, in the opinion of the Administrator, meet the following conditions:

(1) It must have been a necessary cost incurred in accomplishing airport development in conformity with the approved plans and specifications for an approved project and with the terms and conditions of the Grant agreement entered into in connection with such project.

(2) It must be reasonable in amount (if not reasonable in amount, it shall be subject to partial disallowance in accordance with section 13 (3) of the act).

(3) It must have been incurred subsequent to the date of execution of the grant agreement, except that costs of land acquisition, field surveys, planning, and the preparation of plans and specifications, and administrative and incidental costs, shall be allowable though incurred prior to the execution of such Grant agreement: Provided, That no item of project cost shall be allowable if incurred prior to May 13, 1946.

(c) United States' share of project costs: The United States' share of the allowable project costs of a project shall be determined as provided in the following subparagraphs.

(1) Project costs other than land acquisition costs—(i) Class 3 or smaller airports: The United States share of the project costs (other than costs of land acquisition) of an approved project for the development of a class 3 or smaller airport, wherever located, shall be 50 percent of the allowable project costs of the project (other than costs of land acquisition), except that this share, in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands (individual and tribal) exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein shall be increased as provided in section 10 (b) of the act, and except that the United States share shall be 75 percent in the case of the Territory of Alaska, all as set forth in the following table:

United States percentage share of allowable project costs in States containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands

	Percentage
Arizona	60.55
California	54.07
Colorado	53.34
Idaho	56.30
Montana	53.52
Nevada	62.50
New Mexico	56.89
Oklahoma	51.39
Oregon	56.00
South Dakota	53.00
Utah	61.82
Washington	51.80
Wyoming	57.47

NOTE.—The percentages listed in this table will vary as changes occur with respect to the area of unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands in the several States, in which event such changed percentages will be used by the Administrator in determining the United States share of allowable projects costs other than costs of land acquisition.

(ii) Class 4 or larger airports: The United States share of the project costs (other than costs of land acquisition) of an approved project for the development of a class 4 or larger airport, wherever located, shall be computed as follows:

(a) For that portion of the total allowable project costs of such a project (other than costs of land acquisition) which when added to all such costs of other projects for development of the same airport, is $5,000,000 or less, the percentage used in determining the United States share of such costs shall be the percentage which would apply if the project were one for the development of a class 3 or smaller airport, as prescribed in subdivision (i) of this subparagraph;

(b) For each additional $1,000,000 or portion thereof over and above such $5,000,000 figure and up to and including $11,000,000, the percentage used in determining the United States share of such portion of the allowable project costs of such a project (other than costs of land acquisition) shall be 5 percent less than the percentage applicable to the next lower $1,000,000;

(c) For that portion of the allowable project costs of such a project (other than costs of land acquisition) above such $11,000,000 figure, the percentage used in determining the United States share of such portion shall be the same as the percentage applicable to allowable project costs between $10,000,000 and $11,000,000.

The application of this formula in the Territories, Puerto Rico, and States other than public-land States, is shown in the following table:

Increments of aggregate allowable project costs (other than land acquisition costs)	United States share in Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and States other than public land States			United States share in Alaska
	Percent	Federal share	Cumulative Federal share	
First $5,000,000	50	$2,500,000	$2,500,000	75
Next $1,000,000	45	450,000	2,950,000	70
Next $1,000,000	40	400,000	3,350,000	65
Next $1,000,000	35	350,000	3,700,000	60
Next $1,000,000	30	300,000	4,000,000	55
Next $1,000,000	25	250,000	4,250,000	50
Next $1,000,000	20	200,000	4,450,000	45
Portion exceeding $11,000,000	20			45

(2) Land acquisition costs: The United States share of the project costs of an approved project which represent costs of land acquisition shall be 25 percent of the allowable costs of such acquisition regardless of the size or location of the airport to be developed.

Section 550.5. Procedure—(a) Request for Federal aid: An eligible sponsor desiring to obtain Federal aid for the accomplishment of eligible airport development shall submit to the district airport engineer of the district in which the sponsor is located a request for Federal aid on Form ACA 1623 (appendix D). All such requests for Federal aid will serve as the basis and justification for inclusion of proposed projects in the program and will be considered as preliminary notices of intent on the part of sponsors to participate in the Federal-aid airport program.

(b) Tentative allocation of funds: If a proposed project is selected by the Administrator for inclusion in the program, the Administrator will make a tentative allocation of funds for such project and will transmit a notice of such allocation to the sponsor through the district airport engineer. Such tentative allocation will be subject to withdrawal upon failure of the sponsor to submit an acceptable project application pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section or to proceed with the project with due diligence.

(c) Project application: As soon as practicable after receipt of notice of tentative allocation for a proposed project, a sponsor shall prepare a project application on Form ACA (1624) (appendix C) and submit such application to the district airport engineer. A project application shall be executed by the sponsor without change in the language of the form unless prior approval for deviation therefrom has been obtained from the Administrator: *Provided*, That in the case of a joint project, each sponsor may execute only those provisions of the project application which are applicable to the particular sponsor.

(1) Funds: Each project application submitted by a sponsor which is to furnish all or any portion of the project funds not to be furnished by the United States, shall state that such sponsor has on hand, or show that it is in a position to obtain as and when needed, funds sufficient to pay all estimated costs of the proposed project which are not to be borne by the United States or by another sponsor: *Provided*, That if any of such funds are to be furnished to a sponsor, or used to pay project costs on behalf of a sponsor, by a State agency or any other public agency which is not itself to be a sponsor of the proposed project, evidence satisfactory to the Administrator that such funds will be so provided if the proposed project is approved may be submitted by the public agency which is to provide the funds rather than by the sponsor.

(2) Lands: Each project application submitted by a sponsor shall state all of the property interests which the sponsor then holds in (i) all lands[2] upon which any construction work is to be performed under the proposed project, and (ii) all lands[2] to be developed or used as part of or in connection with the airport as it will be upon completion of the proposed project. In addition, each project application shall contain a covenant on the part of the sponsor to acquire prior to the start of any construction work under the project, or if the lands in question are not needed for such construction, within a reasonable time, property interests satisfactory to the Administrator in all of the lands[2] in subdivisions (i) and (ii) above, in which it does not hold such property interests at the time its project application is submitted: *Provided*, That in the case of a joint project, the necessary property interests may be held or acquired by any one or combination of the sponsors, in which event, the project application of each individual sponsor may show only those property interests which that particular sponsor holds or is to acquire.

(3) Property interests: In general, the property interest which a sponsor or sponsors must have or agree to acquire in all lands to be used for landing area or building area purposes in order to meet the requirements of subparagraph (2) of this paragraph is either: (i) Title free and clear of any reversionary interest, lien, easement, lease, or other encumbrance which, in the opinion of the Administrator, would be of such a nature as to create an undue risk that its existence might deprive the sponsor or sponsors of possession or control of such lands, interfere with their use for public-airport purposes, or make it impossible for the sponsor (or any sponsor

[1] This is not to be construed as excluding the fair rental value of machinery, tools, or equipment owned by a sponsor as project costs eligible for consideration as to their allowability.

[2] As used herein, the term "lands" includes among other areas, landing areas, building areas, and areas required for "off-site" construction, access roads, drainage, protection of approaches, installation of air navigation facilities, or other airport purposes.

of a joint project) to carry out and perform any of the assurances, agreements, and covenants contained in parts III and IV of the project application form (appendix C); or (ii) a long-term leasehold estate granted to the sponsor or sponsors by another public agency having such title, on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Administrator. With respect to off-site areas, the minimum property interest which a sponsor or sponsors must have or agree to acquire in the lands comprising such areas, in order to meet the requirements of subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, is an easement or leasehold estate which, in the opinion of the Administrator, is sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that the sponsor or sponsors will not be deprived of its or their right to occupy and use lands for the purpose intended during whatever period of time such use may be necessary in order to meet the requirements of the regulations of this part.

(4) Survey map: Each project application containing any reference to lands held or to be acquired by a sponsor shall be accompanied by a survey map prepared by an engineer or a surveyor. Each such survey map shall clearly identify and show: (i) all lands which are to be developed or used as part of or in connection with the airport as it will be upon completion of the proposed project; (ii) all of such lands in which property interests have been acquired by the sponsor or sponsors; (iii) all of such lands in which property interests are to be acquired by the sponsor or sponsors prior to commencement of construction under the proposed project; and (iv) all prior and proposed acquisitions of property interests in any of such lands for which Federal aid is requested under the proposed project.

(5) Title evidence: All representations made in a project application as to property interests held by the sponsor shall be supported by evidence of title satisfactory to the Administrator. Such evidence may be in the form of a title certificate, title insurance policy, or opinion of a qualified attorney as the sponsor may elect, but shall include, as a minimum, an opinion, guaranty, or certification as to the State of the title by a qualified attorney or title company, indicating the records or documents examined in determining the status of the title and the period covered by the examination or search (which should be brought up approximately to the date of submission of the project application).

(6) Plans and specifications: Each project application shall incorporate by reference plans and specifications describing all items of airport development for which Federal aid is requested under the proposed project, which plans and specifications shall be submitted with the project application unless previously submitted or submitted with the project application of another sponsor of the proposed project. Such plans and specifications shall be prepared so as to provide for accomplishment of the proposed project in accordance with the provisions of the regulations of this part and with all applicable local laws and ordinances and regulations and shall be in final form: *Provided,* That in special cases the Administrator may authorize postponement of the submission of final plans and specifications until a later date to be specified in the grant agreement, if the sponsor has submitted preliminary plans and specifications prepared in sufficient detail to identify all items of airport development included in the project.

(d) Offer: Upon approval of a project the Administrator will make an offer on Form ACA 1632 (appendix E) to the sponsor or sponsors to pay the United States share of the allowable project costs of the project. Such offer will be transmitted to the sponsor or sponsors through the district airport engineer and will state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States. Such offer shall be subject to revision, amendment, modification, or withdrawal by the Administrator at his discretion at any time prior to acceptance thereof by the sponsor or sponsors.

(e) Amendment of offer: If, in the opinion of the sponsor or sponsors, the amount of the maximum obligation of the United States stated in an offer is insufficient to cover the United States share of the allowable project costs, the sponsor or sponsors may request a revised offer, transmitting such request to the Administrator through the district airport engineer.

(f) Acceptance of offer: An offer shall be accepted by the sponsor or sponsors within 60 days from the date thereof unless otherwise authorized by the Administrator. Such acceptance shall be made by execution of the offer in the manner prescribed therein, by an official of the sponsor who has been duly authorized to take such action by resolution or ordinance of the governing body of the sponsor. Said resolution or ordinance shall be adopted by the sponsor's governing body at a meeting held pursuant to all applicable local laws and ordinances and shall set forth at length the terms of the offer and shall specifically ratify and adopt all statements, representations, warranties, covenants, and agreements contained in the project application. A certified copy of such resolution or ordinance shall be attached to each executed copy of an accepted offer or grant agreement delivered to the Administrator.

(g) Grant agreement: An offer of the Administrator to pay a portion of the allowable project costs and an acceptance thereof by the sponsor or sponsors in accordance with paragraph (f) of this section shall constitute a grant agreement between the sponsor or sponsors and the United States. Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed with respect to a project in accordance with the requirements of the regulations of this part, the United States shall not pay or be obligated to pay any portion of the project costs which have been or may be incurred in carrying out the project.

(h) Amendment of grant agreement: When mutually agreed upon between the Administrator and the sponsor or sponsors of a project a grant agreement may be amended after execution thereof if—

(1) The amendment will not increase the maximum obligation of the United States under such grant agreement;

(2) The amendment provides only for airport development described in the current revision of the national airport plan; and

(3) The Administrator determines that such amendment is necessary to protect or advance the interests of the United States in civil aviation.

Upon agreement for amendment, the Administrator will issue to the sponsor or sponsors a supplementary agreement incorporating the amendments as approved. Such agreement shall be executed by the sponsor or sponsors in accordance with the regulations governing acceptance of an offer (paragraph (f) of this section).

Section 550.6. Agency and cosponsorship—(a) General: In the case of any project in which two or more public agencies desire to participate to any extent, either in accomplishing airport development under the project or in the maintenance and operation of the airport, the participating public agencies shall comply with the provisions of this section with respect to either co-sponsorship or agency: *Provided,* That a public agency which desires to participate in a project only by contributing funds to a sponsor need not become a sponsor of the project nor an agent of the sponsor as provided in this section, and any funds so contributed will be considered as funds of the sponsor for purposes of the act and the regulations of this part.

(b) Cosponsorship: Any two or more public agencies desiring to participate in a project may serve as sponsors of such a project if they meet all applicable requirements of the regulations of this part including the following:

(1) Each sponsor shall meet the eligibility requirements of section 550.2.

(2) The sponsors shall submit a single project application, executed by all of the sponsors, clearly indicating the certifications, representations, warranties, and obligations made or assumed by each individual sponsor: *Provided,* That if the sponsors so desire, each sponsor may submit a separate project application which does not meet all the requirements of the regulations in this part if, in the opinion of the Administrator, the project applications submitted by all sponsors collectively meet the requirements of the regulations of this part as applied to a project sponsored by a single sponsor.

(3) Each project application submitted by sponsors which are not willing to assume, jointly and severally, all of the obligations to the United States required to be assumed by a sponsor, shall be accompanied by a true copy of an agreement between the sponsors, satisfactory to the Administrator, which will be incorporated in and become a part of the executed grant agreement. Each such sponsors' agreement shall set forth:

(i) The responsibilities of each sponsor to the others with respect to the accomplishment of the development proposed and the subsequent operation and maintenance of the airport;

(ii) The obligations which each proposes to assume to the United States; and

(iii) The sponsor or sponsors which will accept, receipt for, and disburse grant payments.

If an offer is made to the sponsors of a joint project as provided in section 550.5 (d), such offer will contain a specific condition stating that the offer is made in accordance with the terms of the agreement between the sponsors, which agreement will be incorporated therein by reference, and that, by acceptance of the offer, each of the sponsors assumes only its respective obligations as agreed upon in said agreement between the sponsors.

(c) Agency: If a public agency so desires and such action is required or permitted under State and local laws, it may, with or without participating financially, serve as agent of the public agency which is to own and operate the airport and need not itself become a sponsor of the project. In all such cases, an agency agreement clearly outlining the terms and conditions of the agency and the authority vested in the agent to act for and on behalf of the sponsor shall have been entered into, which agreement must be satisfactory to the Administrator. Such agency agreement shall have been executed on behalf of the sponsor pursuant to authority granted by its governing body at a meeting held in accordance with all applicable State and local laws. A true copy of the agency agreement, together with a certified copy of the resolution or ordinance authorizing such agency, shall be submitted with the sponsor's project application. If an offer is made to a sponsor as provided in section 550.5 (d) where an agency relationship exists between such sponsor and some other public agency, such offer may be accepted by the agent in the name and on behalf of the sponsor only if such acceptance has been specifically and lawfully authorized by the governing body of the sponsor and such authority is specifically set forth in the agency agreement.

Section 550.7. Performance of construction work—(a) General: All construction work under any project shall be accomplished by contract unless the district airport engineer determines that the project, or any portion thereof, can be more effectively and economically accomplished through use of sponsor's force account. Such use of force account will

in no instance be approved for any one project in the continental United States in any one year if the estimated United States share of construction costs and related engineering costs of such project (not including costs incurred in the preparation of plans and specifications) exceeds $15,000.

(b) Letting of contracts: A sponsor shall comply with the following requirements in awarding construction contracts with respect to the performance of any work under a project:

(1) Unless some other method is approved by the Administrator for use on a particular project, all such contracts shall be awarded on the basis of public advertisement and open competitive bidding in the same manner as provided by local law for the letting of public contracts.

(2) No advertisement for bids on such a contract shall be issued until the Administrator has approved the plans and specifications and has furnished the sponsor a schedule of the minimum-wage rates which the contractor shall pay skilled and unskilled labor, as determined by the Secretary of Labor. Such minimum-wage rates shall be stated in the invitation for bids or incorporated therein by reference to a schedule of minimum-wage rates contained in the advertised specifications. Prior thereto, at a time specified by the district airport engineer, the sponsor shall submit to the district airport engineer a list of the various classes of labor to be employed in the proposed work, together with a suggested schedule of the minimum-wage rates for each such class.

(3) All bids shall remain sealed until publicly opened and read aloud at the time and place specified in the invitation for bids.

(4) No such contract shall be awarded except with the written concurrence of the District Airport Engineer as to the reasonableness of the contract prices and conformity of the contract to the sponsor's grant agreement with the United States. The sponsor shall submit to the District Airport Engineer after the opening of bids an abstract thereof and its recommendations for award on form ACA 1631 (appendix F). If the contract is to be awarded on a lump-sum basis and will involve more than one payment to the contractor, the sponsor shall also submit a detailed estimate of cost for the proposed contract on form ACA 1628 (appendix G). Ordinarily, such approval will not be given for acceptance of other than the lowest bid received. However, if the sponsor considers the lowest bidder unqualified, incapable, or not responsible, the next lowest bidder may be recommended for approval, giving full justification for the proposed action.

(c) Bonds: A sponsor shall require the contractor to furnish and maintain in full force and effect during construction a performance bond as security for the faithful performance of his contract and a payment bond as security for the payment of all persons performing work and furnishing materials in connection therewith. The surety on all bonds shall be either a corporation authorized by the sponsor to act as surety or two responsible individual sureties. Such bonds shall be on forms ACA 1638A (appendix H) and 1638B (appendix I) respectively, or shall contain the substance thereof, or a single bond may be furnished combining the substance of both. Each of such guaranties shall be in an amount not less than 50 percent of the contract price for the first million dollars or portion thereof and decreased thereafter by 5 percent for each additional million dollars or portion thereof.

(d) Contract requirements: All construction contracts let by a sponsor with respect to any project shall contain, in addition to such other provisions as may be necessary to insure accomplishment of the work involved in accordance with the sponsor's grant agreement, provisions requiring:

(1) That the contractor obtain the prior written consent of the sponsor to any proposed assignment of any interest in or part of the contract.

(2) That no convict labor be employed under the contract, and that in the employment of labor (except executive, administrative, or supervisory) preference be given, where they are qualified, to individuals who served in the military services of the United States as defined in section 101 (1) of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 and who have been honorably discharged from such service: *Provided*, That such preference shall apply only where such labor is available locally and qualified to perform work to which the employment relates.

(3) That the contractor pay all skilled and unskilled labor employed under the contract not less than minimum wage rates predetermined by the Secretary of Labor for such labor.

(4) That the contractor comply with the so-called "kick-back statute," Public Law 324, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 948) and all regulations issued pursuant thereto (see Appendix J).

(5) That the contractor permit the Administrator or his duly authorized representatives to inspect and review all work, materials, pay rolls, records of personnel, conditions of employment, invoices of materials, books of account, and other relevant data and records with respect to the contract.

(e) Notices to proceed. No sponsor shall permit any contractor or subcontractor to begin work under an approved project until the sponsor has issued to the contractor a written notice to proceed with such work. No such notice to proceed shall be issued until the sponsor has furnished the district airport engineer three conformed copies of the construction contract and has satisfied the regional administrator that the required property interests in all lands on which construction work will be performed under the project have been acquired by such sponsor or some other sponsor of the project.

(f) Change orders: No sponsor shall issue any change order under any of its construction contracts unless such change order has been approved in writing by the district airport engineer. Such change orders shall be on a form satisfactory to the district airport engineer and three copies thereof shall be submitted to the district airport engineer at the time approval is requested.

(g) Payments to the contractor: A sponsor may make partial payments to a contractor on the basis of an estimate of work performed and materials delivered to the site as often as may be agreed upon by the sponsor and the contractor. All payments made by a sponsor to a contractor shall be made on the basis of periodic cost estimates on Form ACA 1629 (appendix K). Three copies of each such periodic cost estimate shall be submitted by the sponsor to the District Airport Engineer.

(h) Force account work: Before undertaking any construction work by sponsor's force account, a sponsor shall obtain the written approval of the District Airport Engineer. In requesting such approval a sponsor shall submit to the District Airport Engineer the following:

(1) Adequate plans and specifications showing the nature and extent of the construction work to be accomplished by sponsor's force account;

(2) A schedule of the proposed construction and of the construction equipment available to the sponsor;

(3) Assurance that adequate supervisory, engineering, and inspection personnel will be provided;

(4) A detailed estimate of cost for such force account work on Form ACA 1628 (appendix G) broken down for each class of costs involved, such as labor, materials, rental of equipment, and other pertinent items of cost.

Whenever an application for grant payment involving sponsor's force account work is made by a sponsor pursuant to section 550.9, such application shall be accompanied by 3 copies of a Periodic Cost Estimate for such work on Form ACA 1629 (appendix K).

(1) Owner removal contracts: Contracts with the owners of buildings, pipe lines, power lines, or other structures or facilities for the removal or relocation thereof, are exempt from the requirements of this section (section 550.7) except that a sponsor shall obtain the approval of the District Airport Engineer before entering into any such contract.

Section 550.8. Accounting and audit—(a) Accounting procedure: Each sponsor shall establish and maintain an accounting system adequate to permit determination by the Administrator of the allowable costs of the project. Project costs shall be so segregated and grouped that the sponsor will be able to furnish, whenever required, cost data in the following cost classifications:

(1) Purchase price of land.
(2) Incidental costs of land acquisition.
(3) Costs of contract construction.
(4) Costs of force account construction.
(5) Engineering costs of plans and designs.
(6) Engineering costs of supervision and inspection.
(7) Other administrative costs.

(b) Project accounts and records—(1) Project accounts: All funds to be expended in payment of project costs (including funds of the sponsor and funds received from the United States or from other sources) shall be deposited in a bank, trust company, or public treasury satisfactory to the regional administrator and maintained therein in an account separate and distinct from all other funds, designated "Federal Airport Project (name of airport)": *Provided*, That no separate project account need be maintained for a project consisting of land acquisition only. No funds so deposited shall be withdrawn except in payment of project costs of the project or as reimbursement for funds advanced for such purpose by the sponsor or some other public agency.

(2) Cost evidence: A sponsor shall secure and retain in its files documentary evidence such as invoices, cost estimates, and pay rolls supporting each item of project costs.

(3) Payment evidence: A sponsor shall retain in its files evidence of all payments for items of project costs, includng vouchers, canceled checks or warrants, and receipts for cash payments.

(c) Audits: A sponsor shall permit authorized representatives of the Administrator to audit the project records and accounts to determine the allowability of project costs and the amount of Federal participation in the cost of the project. Progress audits may be made at any time during the life of a project, and will be made at either the 70- or 85-percent stage of completion if the estimated United States share of project costs is in excess of $250,000. A final audit will be made at the completion of a project and, if the sponsor so requests, an audit of all work completed will be made when further work on a project is suspended for an appreciable length of time.

SEC. 550.9 Grant payments—(a) General: Within 10 days after acceptance of an offer as provided in section 550.5 (f), a sponsor shall designate an official or officials or depository, authorized by law to receive public funds, to receive payments representing the United States share of the project costs. All such payments will be made to the official or officials or depository so designated.

(b) Land acquisition payments: If an approved project includes land acquisition as an item of airport development, the sponsor may, at any time after it has executed the grant agreement, make separate application to the Administrator as provided in paragraph (f) of this section, for payment of the

United States share of the allowable project costs of any such land acquisition, including any acquisition completed prior to execution of the grant agreement which is part of the airport development included in the project. Each such application shall contain or be supported by sufficient information to permit the Administrator to determine the allowability of the cost of the land acquisitions for which payment is requested, and unless previously submitted, each such application shall be accompanied by evidence of title as to all lands involved, meeting the requirements for title evidence stated in section 550.5 (c) (5).

(c) Partial grant payments for other project costs—(1) general: Partial grant payments for all allowable project costs other than costs of land acquisition will be made to a sponsor from time to time as the work on a project progresses and such costs are incurred, upon application therefor as provided in paragraph (f) of this section. In the absence of an agreement otherwise, a sponsor may apply for such partial payments on a monthly basis.

(2) Amount of partial grant payments: Except as otherwise provided in section 550.9, partial grant payments will be made in amounts sufficient to bring the aggregate amount of all partial payments and land acquisition payments to the estimated United States share of the project costs of the airport development accomplished under the project as of the date of the sponsor's latest application for such payment. No such payment will be made which would bring the aggregate amount of all partial payments and land acquisition payments for a project to more than 85 percent of the estimated United States share of the total estimated costs of all airport development included in the project, or 85 percent of the maximum obligation of the United States as stated in the grant agreement, whichever amount is lower. In determining the amount of a partial grant payment, the Regional Administrator will deduct both from the amount of project costs incurred and from the amount of the estimated total project costs, those project costs which he may deem of questionable allowability.

(d) Semifinal grant payments: Whenever construction work on a project is suspended for an appreciable length of time and the allowability of the project costs of all airport development completed has been determined on the basis of an audit and review of all such costs, a semifinal grant payment may be made in an amount, sufficient to bring the aggregate amount of all partial grant payments and land acquisition payments for the project to the United States share of all allowable project costs incurred even though such amount may be in excess of the 85 percent limitations specified in paragraph (c) (2) of this section, but in no event to an amount in excess of the maximum obligation of the United States as stated in the grant agreement.

(e) Final grant payment—(1) General: At such time as a project has been wholly completed in accordance with the terms of the grant agreement, an application for final grant payment may be filed as provided in paragraph (f) of this section. The Administrator will make final grant payment thereon only when he has determined that the following conditions have been met:

(i) A final inspection of all work at the project site has been conducted by the representatives of the Administrator, the sponsor, and the contractor;

(ii) A final audit of the project account has been completed by representatives of the Administrator;

(iii) The sponsor has furnished the Administrator the final "as constructed" plans.

(2) Amount of final grant payments: Based upon the final inspection, the final audit, the final "as constructed" plans, and the documents required by paragraph (f) of this section, the Administrator will determine the total amount of the allowable project costs of a project and pay the sponsor the United States share of such amount less the total amount of all prior grant payments: *Provided,* That the aggregate of all grant payments for a project shall not exceed the amount stated in the grant agreement for such project as the maximum obligation of the United States with respect thereto.

(f) Applications for grant payments: All applications for grant payments shall be made on Standard Voucher Form No. 1034 (appendix L) in triplicate, accompanied by three copies each of (1) an Application for Grant Payment on Form ACA 1625 (appendix M), (2) a Summary of Project Costs on Form ACA 1630 (appendix N), and (3) a Periodic Cost Estimate on Form 1629 (appendix K) for each contract or force account representing costs for which payment is requested.

(g) Excess grant payments: If upon final determination of the allowability of all project costs of a project, it is found that the total of grant payments made to the sponsor is in excess of the total United States share of allowable project costs of the project, such excess shall be returned promptly by the sponsor to the United States.

Section 550.10 Memoranda and hearings—(a) Memoranda: At any time prior to the issuance of a grant offer for a project by the Administrator, any public agency, person, association, firm, or corporation having a substantial interest in the disposition of the project application for such project, may file a memorandum in support thereof or in opposition thereto with the Administrator through the district airport engineer of the district in which the project is located. Such party may request a public hearing with respect to the location of the airport the development of which is proposed. If, in the opinion of the Administrator, the party filing the memorandum has a substantial interest in the matter, a public hearing will be held in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) Hearings: If a request for a public hearing is made and approved as set forth in paragraph (a) of this section, the time and place of the hearing will be set by the Administrator. The time will be set so as to avoid undue delay in disposing of the subject project application but so as to afford reasonable time for all parties concerned to prepare for the hearing. The place of hearing will be at a place convenient to the sponsor. The Administrator will give notice of time and place by mail to the party filing the memorandum, to the sponsor or sponsors, and to such other persons as the Administrator deems necessary.

(c) Procedure: Any public hearing under paragraph (b) of this section will be conducted on behalf of the Administrator by such examiner or examiners as the Administrator may designate. Such examiner or examiners shall decide the time to be consumed, the type of testimony to be heard, and all other matters with respect to the conduct of the hearing.

(d) Records: A hearing will be recorded in such form and manner as may be determined by the examiner or examiners and the record so made shall become a part of the record of the project application.

Type of costs	Total estimated cost	Estimated sponsor's share of cost		Estimated Federal share of cost	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1. Land costs (including costs of acquiring land and administrative costs incident thereto)					
2. Construction costs:					
(a) Cost of preparation of site		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
(b) Cost of paving runways, taxi ways, and aprons		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
(c) Lighting costs		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
(d) Building costs		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
(e) Other miscellaneous construction costs		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
Total construction costs		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
3. Engineering and supervision costs		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
4. Administrative costs		xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
5. Total of 2, 3, and 4 above					
6. Contingencies					
7. Total all estimated project costs			xxx		xxx

Form ACA-1624
(Rev. 3-12-48)

APPENDIX C—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

PROJECT APPLICATION

Part I—Project information

The _____ (herein called the sponsor hereby makes application to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics (herein called the "Administrator") for a grant of Federal funds pursuant to the Federal Airport Act of 1946 and the regulations issued thereunder, for the purpose of aiding in financing a project (herein called the project) for development of the_____ Airport (herein called the airport) located at latitude _____, longitude _____, in the _____ of the State of_____.

It is proposed that the project consist of the following described airport development:

_____

_____

_____

all as more particularly described in the survey map attached hereto as exhibit A and the plans and specifications (attached hereto as exhibit B) (separately submitted to the Administrator on _____),[1] which are made a part hereof.

The following is a summary of the estimated costs of the project:

_____

_____

Part II—Representations

In order to induce the United States to enter into a grant agreement with respect to the project, the sponsor hereby, represents and certifies as follows:

1. Legal authority: The sponsor has the legal power and authority: (1) to do all things necessary in order to undertake and carry out the project in conformity with the act and the regulations; (2) to accept, receive, and disburse grants of funds from the United States in aid of the project, on the terms and conditions stated in the act and the regulations; and (3) to carry out all of the provisions of parts III and IV of the project application.

[1] Strike whichever is inapplicable.

2. Funds: The sponsor now has on deposit, or is in a position to secure, $_____ for use in defraying the costs of the project. The present status of these funds is as follows:

---

3. Land: The sponsor holds the following property interests in the following tracts of land [2] which are to be developed or used as part of or in connection with the airport, all of which lands are identified on the survey map which is attached hereto as exhibit A:

---

4. Approvals of other agencies: The project has been approved by all non-Federal agencies whose approval is required, namely:

---

5. Defaults: The sponsor is not in default on any obligation to the United States or any agency of the United States Government relative to the development, operation, or maintenance of any airport, except as stated herewith:

---

6. Possible disabilities: There are no facts or circumstances (including the existence of effective or proposed leases, use agreements, or other legal instruments affecting use of the airport or the existence of pending litigation or other legal proceedings) which: (a) are known or by due diligence might be known; (b) in reasonable probability might make it impossible for the sponsor to carry out and complete the project or carry out the provisions of parts III and IV of this project application, either by limiting its legal or financial ability or otherwise; and (c) have not been brought to the attention of an authorized representative of the Administrator.

7. Future development: The sponsor intends ultimately to develop the airport as proposed in the current master plan lay-out for the airport, which plan has been mutually agreed upon by the sponsor and the Administrator; and intends to proceed with such further development when it is necessary and feasible. The sponsor further represents that pending such further development and to the extent of its ability to do so, it intends to acquire the lands and interests therein necessary for such development or to take such other action as will protect such proposed lands or interests from any development thereof inconsistent with the intended airport use.

Part III—Sponsor's assurances

In order to furnish the Administrator the sponsor's assurances required by the act and the regulations, the sponsor hereby covenants and agrees with the United States, as follows:

1. These covenants shall become effective upon acceptance by the sponsor of an offer of Federal aid for the project or any portion thereof, made by the Administrator, and shall constitute a part of the grant agreement thus formed. These covenants shall remain in full force and effect throughout the useful life of the facilities developed under the project but in any event not to exceed 20 years from the date of said acceptance of an offer of Federal aid for the project.

2. The sponsor will operate the airport as such for the use and benefit of the public. In furtherance of this covenant (but without limiting its general applicability and effect), the sponsor specifically agrees that it will keep the airport open to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical use without discrimination between such types, kinds, and classes: *Provided,* That the sponsor may establish such fair, equal, and nondiscriminatory conditions to be met by all users of the airport as may be necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the airport: *And provided further,* That the sponsor may prohibit any given type, kind, or class of aeronautical use of the airport if such action will best serve the aeronautical needs of the area served by the airport.

3. The sponsor will not exercise, grant, or permit any exclusive right for the use of the airport forbidden by section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended. In furtherance of this covenant (but without limiting its general applicability and effect), the sponsor specifically agrees that it will not either directly or indirectly exercise, or grant to any person, firm, or corporation, or permit any person, firm, or corporation to exercise any exclusive right for the use of the airport for commercial flight operations, including air carrier transportation, rental of aircraft, conduct of charter flights, operation of flight schools, or the carrying on of any other service or operation requiring the use of aircraft.

4. The sponsor agrees that it will operate the airport for the use and benefit of the public, on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination. In furtherance of this covenant (but without limiting its general applicability and effect), the sponsor specifically covenants and agrees:

(a) That in any agreement, contract, lease or other arrangement under which a right or privilege at the airport is granted to any person, firm, or corporation to render any service or furnish any parts, materials, or supplies (including the sale thereof) essential to the operation of aircraft at the airport, the sponsor will insert and enforce provisions requiring the contractor:

(1) To furnish good, prompt and efficient service [3] adequate to meet all the demands for its service [3] at the airport,

(2) To furnish said service [3] on a fair, equal and nondiscriminatory basis to all users thereof, and

(3) To charge fair, reasonable and nondiscriminatory prices for each unit of sale or service: [3] *Provided,* That the contractor may be allowed to make reasonable and nondiscriminatory discounts, rebates or other similar types of price reductions to volume purchasers.

(b) That it will not exercise or grant any right or privilege which would operate to prevent any person, firm, or corporation operating aircraft on the airport from:

(1) Performing any service [3] on its own aircraft with its own employees (including, but not limited to, maintenance and repair) that it may choose to perform,

(2) Purchasing off the airport and having delivered on the airport without entrance fee, delivery fee, or other surcharge for delivery any parts, materials, or supplies necessary for the servicing, repair, or operation of its aircraft: *Provided,* That the sponsor may make reasonable charges for the cost of any service (including charges for maintenance, operation, and depreciation of facilities and rights-of-way) furnished by the sponsor in connection with the delivery of any parts, materials, or supplies: *And provided further,* That in the case of aviation gasoline, and oil purchased off the airport and delivered to the airport, the sponsor may require the aviation gasoline and oil to be stored in specified places, limiting the amount delivered to the amount of storage space available, and if necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the airport, require persons furnishing their own aviation gasoline and oil to utilize such storage, dispensing and delivery system as the sponsor may designate.

(c) That if it exercises any of the rights or privileges set forth in subsection (a) of this paragraph it will be bound by and adhere to the conditions specified for contractors set forth in said subsection (a).

5. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prohibit the granting or exercise of an exclusive right for the furnishing of nonaviation products and supplies or any service of a nonaeronautical nature.

6. The sponsor will suitably operate and maintain the airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith which are necessary for airport purposes other than facilities owned or controlled by the United States, and will not permit any activity thereon which would interfere with its use for aeronautical purposes: *Provided,* That nothing contained herein shall be construed to require that the airport be operated and maintained for aeronautical uses during temporary periods when snow, flood, or other climatic conditions interfere substantially with such operation and maintenance. Essential facilities, including night-lighting systems, when installed, will be operated in such a manner as to assure their availability to all users of the airport.

7. To the extent of its financial ability, the sponsor will replace and repair all buildings, structures, and facilities developed under the project which are destroyed or damaged, replacing or restoring them to a condition comparable to that preceding the destruction or damage, if such buildings, structures, and facilities are determined by the Administrator to be necessary for the normal operation of the airport.

8. Insofar as is within its powers and reasonably possible, the sponsor will prevent the use of any land either within or outside the boundaries of the airport in any manner (including the construction, erection, alteration, or growth of any structure or other object thereon) which would create a hazard to the landing, taking-off, or maneuvering of aircraft at the airport, or otherwise limit the usefulness of the airport. This objective will be accomplished either by the adoption and enforcement of a zoning ordinance and regulations or by the acquisition of easements or other interests in lands or airspace, or by both such methods. With respect to land outside the boundaries of the airport, the sponsor will also remove or cause to be removed any growth, structure, or other object thereon which would be a hazard to the landing, taking-off, or maneuvering of aircraft at the airport, or if such removal is not feasible, will mark or light such growth, structure, or other object as an airport obstruction or cause it to be so marked or lighted. The airport approach standards to be followed in performing the covenants contained in this paragraph shall be those established by the Administrator in Office of Airports Drawing No. 672 dated September 1, 1946, unless otherwise authorized by the Administrator.

9. All facilities of the airport developed with Federal aid and all those usable for the landing and taking-off of aircraft will be available to the United States at all times, without charge, for use by military and naval aircraft in common with other aircraft, except that if the use by military and naval aircraft is substantial, a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining facilities so used, may be charged. The amount of use to be considered substantial and the charges to be made therefor shall be determined by the sponsor and the using agency.

10. The sponsor will furnish to any civil agency of the United States, without charge (except for light, heat, janitor service, and similar facilities and services at the reasonable cost thereof), such space in airport buildings as may be reasonably adequate for use in connection with any airport air traffic

[2] The separate tracts of land need only be identified here by the parcel numbers shown on the survey map.

[3] NOTE.—As used in these subsections the word "service" shall include furnishing of parts, materials, and supplies (including sale thereof) as well as furnishing of service.

control activities, weather-reporting activities, and communications activities related to airport air-traffic control, which are necessary to the safe and efficient operation of the airport and which such agency may deem it necessary to establish and maintain at the airport for such purpose.

11. After completion of the project and during the term of these covenants, the sponsor will maintain a current system of airport accounts and records, using a system of its own choice, sufficient to provide annual statements of income and expense. It will furnish the Administrator with such annual or special airport financial and operational reports as he may reasonably request. Such reports may be submitted to the Administrator on forms furnished by him, or may be submitted in such other manner as the sponsor elects, provided the essential data are furnished. The airport and all airport records and documents affecting the airport, including deeds, leases, operation and use agreements, regulations, and other instruments, will be available for inspection by any duly authorized representative of the Administrator upon reasonable request. The sponsor will furnish to the Administrator, upon request a true copy of any such document.

12. The sponsor will not enter into any transaction which will operate to deprive it of any of the rights and powers necessary to perform any or all of the covenants made herein, unless by such transaction the obligation to perform all such covenants is assumed by another public agency eligible under the act and the regulations to assume such obligations and having the power, authority, and financial resources to carry out all such obligations. If an arrangement is made for management or operation of the airport by any agency or person other than the sponsor or an employee of the sponsor, the sponsor will reserve sufficient powers and authority to insure that the airport will be operated and maintained in accordance with the act, the regulations, and these covenants.

13. The sponsor will maintain a master plan (lay-out) of the airport having the current approval of the Administrator. Such plan shall show building areas, approach areas, and landing areas, indicating present and future proposed development. The sponsor will conform to such master plan (lay-out) in making any future improvements or changes at the airport which, if made contrary to the master plan (lay-out), might adversely affect the safety, utility, or efficiency of the airport.

14. (a) The sponsor will acquire within a reasonable time but in any event prior to the start of any construction work under the project, the following property interests in the following tracts of land [4] on which such construction work is to be performed, all of which lands are identified on the survey map which is attached hereto and identified as exhibit A:

(b) The sponsor will acquire within a reasonable time and if feasible prior to the completion of all construction work under the project, the following property interests in the following tracts of land [4] which are to be developed or used as part of or in connection with the airport as it will be upon completion of the project, all of which lands are identified on the survey map which is attached hereto and identified as exhibit A:

15. Unless the context otherwise requires, all terms used in these covenants which are defined in the act and the regulations shall have the meaning assigned to them therein.

Part IV—Project agreement

If the project or any portion thereof is approved by the Administrator and an offer of Federal aid for such approved project is accepted by the sponsor, it is understood and agreed that all airport development included in such project will be accomplished in accordance with the act and the regulations, the plans and specifications for such development, as approved by the Administrator, and the grant agreement with respect to the project.

In witness whereof, the sponsor has caused this project application to be duly executed in its name, this _____ day of _____ 19_____.

_____
(Name of sponsor)

By _____
_____
(Title)

Opinion of sponsor's attorney

I hereby certify that all statements of law made in this project application and all legal conclusions upon which the representations and convenants contained herein are based, are in my opinion true and correct.

_____ _____
(Date) (Title)

[F. R. Doc. 48-2327; Filed, Mar. 17, 1948; 8:46 a. m.]

[4] The separate tracts of land need only be identified here by the parcel numbers shown on the survey map.

I have not had the opportunity this afternoon to make a careful study of the brief, but I am particularly impressed with the heading of section 5 of the brief. I call that heading to your attention, and I want to emphasize it by repeating it. The heading is: "No aid to interpretation is furnished by the legislative history of section 11."

In the course of my discussion of this subject with the witnesses from the Civil Aeronautics Administration before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I repeatedly asked for advice as to what there was in the legislative history of the Federal Airport Act to justify the promulgation of these regulations which clearly have a vital and, I think, a probable disastrous effect upon the development of a sound and economic system of air transportation in this country. Of course, I shall study the brief carefully and shall ask that others study it. I hope to be able to provide my colleagues, through this material, with the basis upon which they can act, if necessary, to protect the rights of their States and communities, should the Civil Aeronautics Administration persist in carrying out these practices. I recognize that it may be impossible for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to take any action on H. R. 6747 prior to adjournment. I also recognize the undoubted fact, if such action could be taken by the committee, it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for the resolution to be enacted into law prior to adjournment. Therefore, since hearings will probably not be available, I am taking this means of accomplishing two purposes. First, in behalf of the Massachusetts delegation and of our colleagues from other States, who will be concerned inevitably, I want the basic material available through the RECORD. Second, I insist that this clear admission that the legislative history of section 11 furnishes no aid to interpretation means, also, that it raises, at least, the very important question as to whether it furnishes, also, no support to the conclusion of the acting general counsel and to the course of action undertaken by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I shall urge that, in view of the prospective adjournment, the Civil Aeronautics Administration defer any final decision adverse to any State or community, where such State or community has lodged a protest, until the proper committees in both bodies and Congress itself have the opportunity to reexamine the whole matter carefully.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOGGS of Delaware, for 1 day, June 10, 1948, on account of illness in his family.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee has examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3628. An act to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; and

H. R. 5065. An act to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 8, 1948:

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; and

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

On June 9, 1948:

H. R. 3628. An act to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; and

H. R. 5065. An act to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1634. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Federal home-loan banks for the fiscal years ended June

30, 1945 and 1946 (H. Doc. No. 706); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1635. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1636. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Kanosh Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1637. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of eligible organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the committee on Armed Services.

1638. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1639. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 653. Resolution providing for an additional employee in the House Press Gallery; without amendment (Rept. No. 2267). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6049. A bill to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 2269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6334. A bill to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6802. A bill to strengthen the United Nations and promote international cooperation for peace; without amendment (Rept. No. 2291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4367. A bill authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2292). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5252. A bill to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2293). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORAND: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6808. A bill to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6079. A bill establishing a procedure by which the Administrator may assure veterans full educational and training opportunities commensurate with the tuition charges by educational and training institutions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6570. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn; without amendment (Rept. No. 2271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu; without amendment (Rep. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki; without amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5336. A bill for the relief of Leon Moore; without amendment (Rept. No. 2278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 644. Resolution for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Freda Wahler; without amendment (Rept. No. 2281). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3066. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4103. A bill for the relief of Charles M. Davis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4128. A bill for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others; with amendments (Rept. No. 2284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann; with amendments (Rept. No. 2285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4601. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Atlas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Dimitri Petrou; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5145. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 2288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5339. A bill for the relief of John Keith; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5423. A bill for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6851. A bill to provide for the election of the Governor of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6852. A bill to amend section 2883 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 6853. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 6854. A bill to provide emergency aid for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public facilities damaged or destroyed by certain catastrophes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 6855. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 6856. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6857. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to protect certain employees who have attained the age of 40 years from loss of employment for reasons of age

alone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 6858. A bill to amend the sporting-goods section of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt children's sleds from the manufacturers' excise tax of 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 6859. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6860. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6861. A bill for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a post office at Roodhouse Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 6862. A bill to provide an appropriation for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at Bunker Hill, Ill.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VORYS:

H. Con. Res. 211. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 5,000 copies of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the structure of the United Nations and the relations of the United States to the United Nations, for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 654. Resolution to provide additional funds for the conduct of the investigation continued by House Resolution 153; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6863. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. David R. Wolverton, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6864. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Yannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6865. A bill for the relief of Lula Hickey Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 6866. A bill for the relief of the McCormick Engineering Co. and John E. Price, an individual doing business as the Okeechobee Construction Co; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2079. By the SPEAKER: Petition of livestock feeders and farmers of the Northwest, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the extension of the farm parity program for 5 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2080. Also, petition of William Buller and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of a peacetime draft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2081. Also, petition of James Francis and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to increase the wages of Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2082. Also, petition of Les McGinnis and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the passage of legislation for the pay-raise bill before Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2083. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, approving the recognition of the state of Israel by the Government of the United States and urging the lifting of the embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, every day we are reminded how fragile is the thread of our lives and how suddenly we may be summoned away from the things that engross us here.

May the uncertainty of life make us the more anxious to do good while we have opportunity, for the sake of the record that has eternal implications far beyond the next election.

Since we shall be judged for every idle word, let us speak carefully, with a deep respect for the truth that cannot be twisted.

Bless each Member of this body, as Thou seest their needs—those who are prevented by duty elsewhere from joining in this prayer and those who appear to be so adequate for their tasks but who need Thy help like the rest of us.

Reveal Thy love to all of us and grant us Thy peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 9, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 5, 1948, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2256) relating to the Meat Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 231) to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3433) to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6457. An act to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations;

H. R. 6818. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting; and

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida;

S. 263. An act to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes;

S. 424. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins and others;

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census;

S. 692. An act to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business;

S. 873. An act for the relief of Warren H. McKenney;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West;

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes;

S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush and others," approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036);

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen;

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946;

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army;

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174);

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels;

S. 1861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service;

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.;

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.;

S. 2152. An act to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks;

S. 2288. An act to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction;

S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft;

S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances;

S. 2479. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States;

S. 2496. An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described;

S. 2553. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.;

S. 2592. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings;

S. 2593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.;

S. 2643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939; and

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the consideration of the unfinished business and all votes thereon, Senate Resolution 239, reaffirming the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and indicating certain objectives to be pursued, be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after Senate Resolution 239 has become the unfinished business, it be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing at Order No. 1485, H. R. 2245, where the call of the calendar was concluded the last time the calendar was considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the orders just entered, I wish to announce that there will not be a night session of the Senate tonight.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement under which the time from now until 3 o'clock will be in the control of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The pending question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], as modified.

To whom do the Senators wish to yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest, if it is agreeable to the two Senators in charge of the time, that a quorum call be had, and that the time required be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I feel obliged to object to charging the time of a quorum call to both sides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The matter is entirely up to the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from South Dakota and I can arrange for a proper division of the time. I think there should be a quorum call.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator believe we will have enough time with the quorum call?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we probably will have enough time. I am having the Senator in mind.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall not object.

Mr. GURNEY. I am perfectly willing that the time shall be charged to both sides.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand, I will have 15 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska cannot yield. The time is in charge of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Kentucky.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested, the time to be charged equally to both sides. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bricker	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. To whom do they yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes of the time under my control to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I likewise yield 15 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty minutes of time will be allotted to the Senator from West Virginia.

DEATH OF DR. JOSHUA LOTH LIEBMAN, RABBI, TEMPLE ISRAEL, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Today the Chaplain in the first line of his prayer in opening the session of the Senate said:

> Every day we are reminded how fragile is the thread of our lives.

On May 19 Dr. Joshua Loth Liebman, of Temple Israel, Boston, Mass., acted as Chaplain of the Senate. He was a great American, a fine churchman, and an inspiring orator.

In this morning's newspaper we read of his untimely death following a sudden heart attack. Like every other citizen of Massachusetts, I regret his sudden passing. He gave constant cheer and comfort to the host of his friends and to hundreds of thousands of others who knew him through his writings. I was proud to count myself one of his friends.

In Massachusetts, during the war, a Committee on Racial and Religious Understanding was formed. As a member of that committee, his advice was always sound, practical, and full of confidence in the fulfillment of better understandings among us all as citizens. He was always exceedingly helpful to me when I was in the office of Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I am deeply sorry to hear of his passing, but proud that I knew a great American and a fine churchman.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE— INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, we now move into the closing hours of this debate. A limitation of time has been placed upon the discussion. It is my purpose to devote the time available to me to what I consider to be the clear points at issue in this cause. At the beginning of my remarks I wish to remove—certainly for myself—certain questions which have been discussed throughout this extended debate.

In the first place, I want it clearly understood that I advocate, have always advocated, and will continue to advocate, the maintenance of a strong and adequate armed force for this country. Nor should there be dragged into this discussion the subject of peace or war. We shall pray and work for peace. We shall guard against war. But the strength of this country must be kept always at a level to meet any exigency which may arise in the event that those who protest for peace may forget their protestations and march to war.

Nor is there any question about the power of this Government to enact legislation to draft men into the armed services and to compel and enforce service under government. But there is a question of policy. The power exists; but the exercise of that power, as in all subjects of government, determines the wisdom of the course of government.

I have no quarrel with anyone over the numbers which the services want, in particular the Army. I do not attempt to say what number of men are needed. It is the Army which complains and asks for this enforced service of men. The Navy and the Air Corps do not complain. They find that through voluntary enlistments of the young men of the country they can secure sufficient numbers to meet their needs.

However, I do raise the question of the necessity of the draft. I raise the question of its justification. In discussing this subject, while I differ on this one point with the chairman and the other members of the Armed Services Committee, I want it clearly understood that in the position I take upon this subject I do not for one moment disparage their efforts, or speak in less admiration for the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who has so valiantly and ably fought for the bill which his committee has recommended. That is his duty, regardless of his own feelings about the bill. He has met that duty ably.

I served with the chairman, the Senator from South Dakota, on the Military Affairs Committee from January 1943 throughout the war. I know of his interest in the affairs of the armed services. I do not doubt for one moment that the committee has recommended what it feels may be needed. However, because of my service with the Military Affairs Committee, and because of the history of the volunteer plan in our services, I have some familiarity with the question.

In the fall of 1945, after the victory over Japan, and after the armed conflict had ended, I served on a subcommittee under the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], now on the floor and who was then chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, dealing with the subject of voluntary enlistments. It will be recalled that at that time there were in the Army millions of men in Europe, in Japan, and in the islands of the Pacific, as well as in camps in this country. Those men were selected by draft or selective service during a time of war. They went willingly. They served bravely and nobly. They brought victory to this country.

When the war ended a great thought became predominant—the thought that this country should have in its armed services men who voluntarily enlisted there. That has been the history of the United States. Never before in peacetime has Congress been called upon to enact legislation which would compel men to serve in any branch of government, military or civil.

There is a great difference between a time of war and a time of peace with respect to compulsory service. There are many differences, which need not be pointed out because they are too obvious. When we face armed conflict with an enemy, it is essential that every man, regardless of his age or occupation, be called upon in an ordered fashion to do his part; and the laws of the land may compel him to do his full part in the prosecution of the war. But it has been the history of this country of freedom, and it has been a part of the traditions of this land, that our Government is founded upon the liberty of the individual. This is a free country. We cleave to certain basic principles as fundamental to the life of America. We must keep them if we are to remain basically strong.

With that thought in mind, in the fall of 1945 the Congress moved toward the ending of enforced service and the beginning of voluntary service, as it has always existed in the peaceful years of this country. I speak to the point of the lack of necessity for the draft because I believe that had the Army done its full part it would have succeeded, and if it will do its full part to meet the problem of filling its ranks through the voluntary system it will now succeed. The Navy has done it. The Air Corps has done it. But the Army asks for a draft.

The military authorities have never looked with favor upon a volunteer system. From the very beginning in the autumn of 1945, when the existing voluntary plan was advanced, some of the Members of the Senate who dealt with the subject will recall that the high military authorities at that time opposed the voluntary enlistment bill. When the hearings were then held, we were told by the representatives of the military that if a voluntary enlistment bill were passed, the most that could be hoped for in the way of volunteers would be 300,000 men.

The bill was passed. Congress had seen the country emerge from a war. Congress was not forgetful of the basic principles which had made our country great through freedom, and Congress insisted that the ranks be filled with volunteers, and then we would see whether a draft was necessary. So the law was passed.

What occurred? We had had the opinion, not of one, but of several of the high authorities of the military, that the greatest number of men who would enlist in the Army would be 300,000. The Army then was aiming at having 1,070,000 men by July 1, 1946. What happened to the prediction of the military authorities? As a matter of fact, the bill was passed on October 12, 1945, by the Senate, and later was passed by the House; and by January 1, more than 600,000

men had enlisted. By February 1, approximately 800,000 had enlisted. The number of volunteers grew and grew, until we had a great army of volunteers, sufficient to enable the young men who had been drafted and thus compelled to leave their homes, their work, their schools, and their families, to return to this country. Yes; the volunteer system was working well.

It worked particularly well until the spring of 1947. Then the committee learned that a new rule had been put into effect by the Army. The Army had raised the passing mark in what is known as the classification test from 59 to 70. Some of us had wondered why the enlistments suddenly dropped off about that time. The military authorities did not report to the committee, in the first place, the change in the passing mark in the classification test. The members of the committee learned of it through other sources. Those representing the military were requested to come before the committee and explain the situation.

Mr. President, let us see what their explanation was. I hold in my hand a report of the hearings held in April 1946. I wish to be entirely fair to the representative of the War Department who came before us at that time. He holds a very high position in that Department; he is known as G–1, that is to say, the chief of personnel—General Paul. He is still G–1, I am advised, in the Department. I read now some of the questions asked him, and his replies:

Senator REVERCOMB. General Paul, the classification test has been given throughout the war; hasn't it?

General PAUL. Yes, sir.

Senator REVERCOMB. And the passing mark was 59?

General PAUL. That is correct.

Senator REVERCOMB. And that was raised while we were in this program of taking in volunteers?

General PAUL. Also correct.

Senator REVERCOMB. Will not the raising of that passing mark definitely prevent a certain number of men from volunteering who desire to volunteer to the armed services?

General PAUL. We hope it will.

Senator REVERCOMB. It was done for that purpose?

General PAUL. Yes, sir. We are getting more of the lower grade men than we can use in the Army.

That was the reason he gave at that time.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of argument about the necessity of raising the standards. In other words, the Army, when it first testified about this volunteer bill, was not favorable to it. The Army opposed the passage of the bill. I wish to be fair, but the evidence here absolutely convicts the Army of opposition ab initio. From the very beginning, the Army has been against a volunteer system. The Army wanted to make its own selections from the men of the country. This evidence proves that, and that conclusion is inescapable.

After opposing the bill, and after seeing it passed subsequently, and after months of enlistments, and seeing those enlistments increase and increase, the Army raised the passing mark from 59 to 70—for what purpose? General Paul says and admits that the purpose was so that the Army would not get so many volunteers. He added, "Because we wanted men of a higher grade."

The recent war was fought on the basis of a passing grade of 59 in the classification test. Our country's Army prior to the war was smaller than the Army asked for today. It was based upon a 59 mark for entrance. I cannot escape the conclusion that the Army has deliberately set about to scuttle the volunteer system so that it may have what it wishes to have—an absolute and unlimited power of selection.

Mr. President, if we were to give to any group of persons in this country—for example, the doctors or the lawyers or the engineers associations—or a civil organization, the power to draft the young men they would wish to have enter their profession, I suppose their natural inclination would be to pick and command the cream of America, the top-flight men. But that is not according to the traditions of our country; that is not according to the principles of real freedom. We have permitted the young men of our country to make their own selections. Not until it becomes utterly necessary in time of national defense to compel all men to stand guard and to fight for their country, do we lay aside that principle. What would happen if we gave to some other branch of the Government the power to draft or select on any basis the men it wished to have?

No, Mr. President; if we are to establish in this country a policy of permitting one branch of our Government's organization, whether it be military or civil, to say, "We are going to denude this country of just those we want," I say we shall have set up a standard that will destroy every vestige of real and natural freedom. Of course there should be a classification test; but it seems to me that in that test the passing mark which has formed the basis for the selection of our armed forces which fought the war and won the war, and on the basis of which a great Army has been maintained, has been proven well worth while.

What has happened since that time? Did the Army stop after changing the passing grade to 70? No; that was not the case. Sometime between the spring of 1946 and today the Army again raised the passing grade, this time to 80. That is the way it is going. Can the Army expect to get the men it wants by the volunteer system, by a continuous raising of the passing mark? Certainly it cannot. If the volunteer system met the 80 mark, is there any reason to believe that it would not be raised to 90?

I say to you, Mr. President, that the record in this case convicts the Army of absolutely scuttling and destroying the volunteer system; and then they come to Congress and ask that they be permitted to draft and select the men.

I want an Army, as I have said of the proper size. I really think it requires more technical men today than before, but certainly there is no need for better equipped or more intelligent men with a higher mental ratio today than there was, let us say, at the end of the war, since the weapons are the same, in large measure.

That was testified to before the committee of the House. The question was asked of General Dahlquist, who is the second in command of the Personnel Division. He is assistant or deputy, as I understand, to General Paul. The following question was asked:

Well, has the military in general changed in any way since World War II; that is, so far as mechanization, electronics, and so forth?

The General answered:

I do not believe to any perceptible percentage. It is about the same. That is, we are getting more gadgets, and so forth, but gadgets do not necessarily require higher intelligence.

Yet with the assistant to the Chief of Personnel stating that there is no need for a higher degree of intelligence, a raise was made of at least 10 points over the 70 point and 21 points over the passing mark at the end of the war. I bring these matters before the Senate. I have followed this subject and I am convinced in my own judgment that a draft would not be necessary if the Army would go ahead and attempt to get men to volunteer. It would have just as great a success as the Navy; it would have just as great a success as the air arm of our forces.

General Eisenhower made a statement upon this point which I think is quite interesting. I want to read it into the RECORD at this point. It is what General Eisenhower said on April 7 before the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

I quote his words:

My memory is sometimes tricky, but I thought I had directed, before I left the Chief of Staff, to drop, for the ground forces at least, the figure back to 70, and I thought there is where it was, so we could fill up certain places where we could do this.

In other words, General Eisenhower, after he was no longer Chief of Staff, came back and said that from his best recollection he believed the order had been given to drop it back to 70. Mr. President, do you believe for one moment that General Eisenhower, who is a great military leader, whose thoughts are molded in a life and a career of magnificent military experience, do you think for a moment he would tell the Congress that a passing mark of 70 was sufficient if it were not? I say that if the Congress is going to succumb to the insistence of the Army that they have the power of drafting, it will represent a reversal of the very ideas expressed by the Congress in the fall of 1945. I cannot accept it.

I want a strong force; I do not argue against that. As I say, the other branches of the service have been able to get strong forces—the Marines, the Navy, the Air Force. But the Army never has really wanted voluntary enlistments. They testify they spent much to get enlistments, and have advertised for them. Mr. President, I have had called to my attention, and I want to call to the attention of the Senate two advertisements, signed "Your Army and Air Force serve the Nation and mankind in war and peace. United States Army and United States Air Force Recruiting Service." The first advertisement shows a picture of some tanks in

action on a desert land. The large wording on it reads:

Ready, Aim * * * Fry!

The first paragraph is:

It's so hot canned goods blow up. Big guns die young—of the heat. Cigarette lighters go dry as fast as you can fill them. That's the Arizona desert, in summer * * *

The advertisement then goes on to pay tribute to the ability of the soldier, yet an advertisement is published asking young men to enlist for "Ready, aim * * * fry." I do not know what kind of advertising that is.

I hold another advertisement published and signed by the United States Army and the United States Air Force Recruiting Service. It shows the picture of a soldier in uniform behind a machine gun, in a background of green foliage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from West Virginia will expire in 1 minute.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall read the first paragraph:

The dripping black was endless nightmare. Malaria stalked on unseen wings. And close—too close—murder, incorporated—waited in evil silence—waited for the telltale slap of mosquitoes, for the click of rifle bolt.

After saying that in the opening paragraph, to persuade young men to enlist, if you please, the advertisement speaks of the valor of American men. What sort of stuff is that? What inducement to enlistment is in that opening paragraph? It would drive men from the service.

I am sorry my time has ended. This is a fateful bill. It is the first time such a thing has been done to the American people. It is unnecessary for me to stand here today and say that if it were required for the maintenance of our armed services I perhaps would violate that tradition and say, "Go ahead." But I cannot in my heart subscribe, when I am firmly convinced against it, to a bill which I know is not needed, when I know the requirement can be met by volunteers, whatever figures may be used by the War Department.

Oh, it is the beginning of a new, a fateful and bad cause. It is not only the taking of men into the armed services, into the Army; it is the beginning of a great break-down of principle and tradition in this country. If we can select and give power to a branch of our Government to go forth and select whomever they want and make any test they want, we are going to give the same power and recognize the same right perhaps in someone else to take a man and say where he may work in peacetime, where he may live, and what he must do. There is the danger, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has agreed with me to allocate 15 minutes of his time to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

COMPOSITION OF NATIONAL GUARD UNITS

SEC. . No civilian or military officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government shall issue any order, regulations, instructions, or request, or take any other action, relating to the composition of the National Guard or the Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, which would have the effect of depriving a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or influencing its exercise, of the right to reject applicants for appointment or enlistment in its units of the National Guard or the Air National Guard who do not meet the qualifications for appointment or enlistment prescribed by such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee if he would be willing to accept my amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. I am not authorized by the committee to accept it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, Mr. President, I should like to say that the substance of my amendment is to prevent any executive orders being issued against the National Guard in the States of the Union. Fortunately, on the Armed Services Committee there are seven former governors of States, all of whom are familiar with the National Guard and all of whom have been, at one time or another, the commander in chief of the National Guard in their respective States. The Senators to whom I refer are the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and myself.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services this question: Should there be any executive orders issued with respect to the National Guard by any branch of the executive department, or by anyone outside of the War Department itself, would the Senator be willing to call a meeting of the committee?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, certainly, if there should be any request by any member of the committee for a meeting on this problem, or on any other problem, I would do my level best to call such a meeting.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if he anticipates any change in the status of the National Guard through any rules or regulations that might be promulgated by the White House?

Mr. GURNEY. I have been assured repeatedly that the armed forces will operate under the standards set forth in the Gillem report, which is a part of the record, stating on page 652 of the hearings.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for those statements. Before asking for a vote on my amendment I should like to say a few words in connection with the bill.

I voted for the reduction in the life of the law from 5 to 2 years. I felt that the Army and the Navy would be better off with a 2-year period than with a 5-year period, because the Armed Services Committee could keep watch on what might happen. Should there be any Executive orders issued or anything to disrupt the status quo, the Armed Services Committee would be in better position to be of assistance in the matter. As a member of that committee I shall insist on the present status of the Army which General Eisenhower stated was in the best interest of the country. I repeat, it was for that reason that I voted to reduce the period from 5 to 2 years, and it was for that reason I voted for the Morse amendment.

I am also very happy to say that on yesterday I supported the Kem amendment, known as the military justice amendment, which for the first time, in my judgment, puts democracy into the Army, for the better treatment of enlisted men. I realize we must have an army to preserve peace and stop communism. We cannot do it with money alone.

Mr. President, I have supported the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, first, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and then as a member of the Armed Services Committee, since I came to the Senate in 1941. In view of the fact that I voted to put military justice into the Army and to reduce the term of the law from 5 to 2 years, and in view of the fact that we defeated all the antisegregation amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], it will be my purpose to vote for the final passage of the bill.

To keep the record straight, Mr. President, I have offered this amendment. However, in view of what the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has stated, that he anticipates no difficulty, but that he will call a meeting of the committee if something should occur that required such meeting, not only at my request, but at the request of any other member of the committee, and in view of the fact that there are seven former governors on the committee, I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. The record here will speak for itself. I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is an amendment pending. No amendments will be voted upon until the hour of 3 o'clock has arrived.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I want to speak primarily on the amendment which has just been presented by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. I wish to say, first, that the service rendered by the Senator from South Carolina in connection with this and other problems is deeply appreciated.

He has at all times done his utmost to assist in necessary legislation to keep our Nation strong. I fear the results that might come from the adoption of his amendment, in the first place, because it deals to some extent with the race problem. I feel that that is not germane to the bill, and I apply to it the same remarks which I made with respect to the amendment offered a few days ago on the antisegregation question. But, primarily, I am fearful that should the Senator's amendment be adopted it would, because of its wording, block the standards necessary for Federal recognition of the National Guard, such as the training, equipment, and efficiency in the operation of the National Guard in the States. I feel that the adoption of his amendment might have that effect. I know that it is not the purpose of the Senator from South Carolina in any way to affect those necessary standards.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was never my intention to affect the standards, because I believe in high standards for the National Guard, as does the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I want to thank him for the generous remarks he made about me. He has stated to me that he believes in States' rights and that the governors of the States should be supreme commanders in chief of the National Guard during peace.

Mr. GURNEY. Certainly I believe that as much control of the National Guard as is possible should be left with the governors of the States until the Guard is called upon to perform Federal service in a time of emergency.

Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, it has been said of Andrew Jackson that he resigned from the Senate in his first term because he was never able to finish a speech. Apparently on every occasion when he was making a speech he became so indignant over his subject that he gave the speech up as a bad job. Mr. President, without thought of resigning from the Senate, for there is no greater work in the world, I share what I conceive to have been Mr. Jackson's indignation and resentment concerning a prevailing public problem.

Not a very long time from now we shall have to cast a vote which will determine whether the bill presented by the committee is to pass and whether the young men drafted into the service of their country will serve for 18 months or for 2 years.

Mr. President, in the several brief and very precious minutes allotted to me I wish to accomplish, if I can, two purposes, the first of which is to prove, as I hope I can, the present absolute need for 2-year service within the proposed draft act; and, second—and I am distressed that business keeps him elsewhere at the moment—that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whose amendment for 18 months' draft service will soon be voted on, used arguments last night and several days ago which, in my considered opinion, are not deserving of serious consideration by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I hold the person and the brain of the Senator from Oregon in high and affectionate regard. He knows this. He knows, moreover, that both of us as friends and from the same section of America, reserve the right to question on a particular issue the judgment and knowledge of the other. I shall exercise that right at this time.

The Senator from Oregon has spoken on the subject of the length of the draft on two occasions during this week. If he was right on one occasion, he was completely and alarmingly wrong on the other. In changing positions in two short days' time his testimony is subject to serious doubt and searching inquiry by every Member of the Senate who is deeply concerned about the problem of how best to maintain and preserve America's security.

The Senator from Oregon told us last night, both feelingly and at length, that it was the will of the American people that a draft period of service be limited to 18 months. He attempted to prove this. I quote his argument, but only in part. On page 7580 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9 I find this paragraph, the Senator from Oregon speaking:

> I have some evidence in support of that judgment on my part, and that evidence takes a variety of forms. It is based upon many conversations as I have gone about this land. It is based upon audience reactions in open-forum discussions on military manpower legislation; it is based on a great mass of correspondence and telegrams I have received on the subject.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I have deliberately, in my many public discussions in this country, raised the question of military manpower legislation. I have sought to provoke discussion among my audiences in order to learn the attitude of the members of the audiences on the question of military manpower. I have talked to a very good cross section of the American people in those audiences—labor audiences, businessmen's audiences, general audiences. All I can say to my colleagues in the Senate on that subject is that on the basis of those many observations I am satisfied that my proposal for 18 months represents the will of public opinion as of tonight.

There is much more the Senator from Oregon said last night in support of his contention that an 18 months' training period was sufficient. We must not forget that that was last night. But, Mr. President, what did the Senator from Oregon have to say on the same subject on Monday of this week? I quote from page 7277 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, the following statement by the Senator from Oregon:

> I want the RECORD to emphasize tonight that I believe 12 months' training will provide the basic training necessary for a future Army in case of an international incident which might cause us to mobilize all of our manpower at a very rapid rate.

And again:

> But I am satisfied from the hearings and from the record made before the Armed Services Committee that 12 months' service under the draft law will give these men the basic training they need for future service in the Army. If following the 12 months' period they go into the various branches of the Reserve I think the final bill, with my amendment in it, will then give us the national security we need and will accomplish in the main all we seek to accomplish by the pending measure on the 24 months' basis.

Mr. President, these contradictions did not confuse me as an American, as one who has served his country in the armed services, or as a Senator, because I heard and read them both word for word, and studied them, too. But other Senators may not have been so fortunate. They might have missed either the explanation that was given on Monday, that 12 months was sufficiently long, or they might have missed the explanation running more than an hour last night that 18 months was totally sufficient.

The Senator from Oregon last night justified in the most conclusive way, if we may give credence to his testimony, that 24 months was the very least period of training to be expected and required of young men to be drafted under the law. The Senator last night said that he knew the draft, unfortunate as the circumstances were, was an imperative necessity. He thought—not I, the present speaker, but the Senator from Oregon thought, as he stated in his own words—that a war with Russia was possible in the foreseeable, in the near, future. He thought, and said so, that Americans were living in a dream world of false security. He said so, and he went on to add, that we needed, and had to do it soon, the strengthening of our security and our defenses if we were to keep America strong.

In these remarks, Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon justified totally, not an 18 months' draft service, but the committee recommendation of 24 months or an even longer period.

Mr. President, his 18 months' proposal, in my opinion—admittedly I may be very wrong—would fail of achieving its objective for three very strong reasons, which I think anyone who has ever been exposed to service and training conditions in the Army, or to shell fire, will agree are concretely correct.

An 18 months' training period would provide for our armed services a period too short in which a man could be properly taught, first, to defend himself, and then to work as part of a unit, and then if necessary—which is the only reason for an Army or Navy or an Air Force—to fight, and to wage war.

The second weakness in the proposal of 18 months as made by the Senator from Oregon, in my opinion, would be that it would be unnecessarily expensive and extravagant and a misuse of the dollars of the American taxpayers. In my considered opinion, the Senator from Oregon was contradictory in that he spoke of the need for conserving the assets of the Nation, and then recommended that we throw dollars away by misuse, through the application of an 18 months' training period.

The third weakness, in my judgment is that an 18 months' training period in the face of the uncertainties in the mind of the Senator from Oregon about the future, would have men in all the branches leaving their respective units

at just about the time they would be qualified and prepared to defend the country from any aggressor on any front. In my mind, this would be, in the light of the facts as we think we know them to be, a monstrous misuse of manpower.

As one who has had considerable service in the field, first, of trying to keep himself alive, and, secondly in the field of trying to keep other people alive, I think I can make a reasonable contribution in a couple of minutes in justification of a 24 months' period.

The two major statements I wish to make I never heard made by those who propose either a 12 or an 18 months' period. We do not have an army primarily in order to train men and put them back into civilian life. The primary purpose of an army is to have an organization composed of personnel which can fight if it has to fight.

What is the first job in organizing an army? It is to teach a man to take care of himself. How long does that take the ordinary, average American? About 6 months. That is what we call basic training.

Then comes something of which the Senator from Oregon, apparently, is totally unaware. An army does not fight with just trained individuals. An army consisting of prima donnas or undisciplined individuals is foredoomed to failure. After a man is trained to take care of himself, he is put into a fighting unit, and I ask the Senate please to believe me when I say that it takes longer to train a unit how to fight as a unit than it does to train an individual how to protect himself as an individual.

A unit is a concert, a synthesis, a coordinated group of individuals who eventually learn how to live and to fight and to perspire by instinct in close company with their fellows. There is no mention made of the realities of the situation by the Senator from Oregon. How long does that unit training take? I do not know where he may be now, but one of the very best fighting generals, divisionwise, in the last war said to me yesterday at lunch in answer to my question: "Senator, assuming that the basic training was of the best, I can prepare a division to go into combat and rest assured that our casualties will be held to a minimum in about 8 months' time."

Let us take 6 months' basic training and take 8 months' per unit training on top of that, and where are we? That is 14 months. We have a proposal for 18 months in all; 14 from 18 leaves 4. And then what have we? We have what we have always been trying to get, a man who is qualified to defend his country—for what length of time? For four short months.

If it goes the other way, and the committee amendment is approved, as I prayerfully hope it will be, the most this country's armed forces can get out of our American youth, the finest manhood in the world, is 10 months of real, or war, potential service.

It seems to me the Senate has assumed a responsibility in consonance with which it must do something automatically. We have gotten down to brass tacks in this legislation and said to the armed services, "You are entitled to have so many thousands of men." Once that has been agreed upon, if it is agreed upon, then we automatically assume the responsibility for providing the mechanism which will make it possible for the military services to bring their personnel up to whatever ceilings may have been approved by the Congress and the President.

We cannot run away from that responsibility. It would be ironic, it would be futile, it would be senseless. We would be selling out our own people if we should fail to provide a period of time within the draft law in which a man first could learn how to defend himself; secondly, could learn how to work with other men; and thirdly, could give a period of his precious life to the defense and military needs of his Government, his country, his Nation, which makes everything so totally possible for all of us.

Now we are faced—I wish I could say it better—with this situation: A young man comes into the Army. He volunteers—for what? If he is not a technician or a specialist, he volunteers for 36 months. If he is a specialist it is assumed he does not need a certain amount of basic training and the period for which he volunteers is 2 years. We are going to pass a draft law, I believe and hope, because I think the country requires it at this particular time, and one of the reasons we are going to pass it is that we hope it will increase the flow of volunteers. But when the young men volunteer they volunteer for 3 years, or 2 years as a minimum, and then if we cannot, on the basis of the patriotism existing in the hearts of the young men of our country, secure a sufficient number of volunteers so that we may fulfill our obligations due to the commitments we have made on a world-wide front, we are going to draft them. We are going to say, if the 18 months' proposal prevails, to the young man who thinks it is not his particular duty to volunteer for service in the armed forces, "We are going to put you into the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, but only for 18 months. We are going to put you there only for half the time that we expect a young man who has his head up in the air and who volunteers to serve his country." What kind of intelligent, good sense does this make?

On the basis of minimizing expense, on the basis of a proper utilization of manpower, on the basis of trying not to make ourselves look silly in the eyes of foreigners who understand military strategy and preparedness and needs as much, and sometimes more, I think, than we do, I believe there is absolutely no justification for the 18 months' proposal other than as a popularity contest. The American people should be told that, "If we vote for 18 months, or 12 months, we are voting to shoot the heads off some young men who will not be qualified and prepared if the need arises to take care of themselves and their country." I will not be a party, Mr. President, to fooling the uninformed in this country about what will happen to too many of their sons if we authorize a draft period which will not permit a man to be fully prepared for whatever might come.

Mr. President, more as an American, than as a man who sits proudly in the seat I occupy, do I deny any validity in the position taken on Monday in a feeling sort of way, by the Senator from Oregon for a 12 months' period of service and on Wednesday for an 18 months' period. I reject both suggestions because they are not based on any justification in fact or in reality.

I hope the proposal of the committee will prevail by an overwhelming majority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk three amendments, and I offer amendment No. 1 for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Nebraska that there can be no immediate consideration of his amendment, as an amendment is pending.

Mr. WHERRY. I submit all three amendments at this time. If amendment No. 1 should be adopted there will be no need for having a vote on amendments Nos. 2 and 3. If amendment No. 1 fails of adoption, I should like to have a vote on amendments Nos. 2 and 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire to have the amendments read by the clerk, or does he waive reading of the amendments and wish to have them printed and lie on the table?

Mr. WHERRY. I waive the reading of the amendments, and to save time, I ask that they may be printed and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the amendments were received and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my first amendment would strike out section 18, which is entitled "Utilization of Industry." I shall not read the section, but will say that a reading of the first paragraph of section 18, on page 63, from line 9 to line 21, inclusive, will give Senators a clear understanding of what is involved by my amendment. The remainder of the section provides for carrying out that which is provided in the first paragraph, and the penalties for failure to do so. The section covers 2½ pages of the bill, and ends on page 66. If Senators desire to know the general provisions of the section they can find them set forth on page 63 from line 9 to line 21. The language contained within those lines will show at a glance what is involved.

Mr. President, I ask that the section be stricken because it is my contention that it is absolutely unnecessary at this time. I believe that before I conclude my statement, in the 15 minutes allotted to me, Senators who hear it will agree with me. Of course I realize that the position I take will be somewhat unpopular. The theory is that if we draft men we should draft industry, and, academically, that is a sound theory, and I have advocated it many times.

I ask that the section be stricken for another reason. The section is identical with the section which was adopted in the Selective Service Act of 1940. It was the first step. It was not sufficient

for the purposes it meant to serve then, because its provisions did not cover what was intended to be covered. It would be necessary to broaden the provisions, and if the provisions were broadened it would mean the institution in this country of controls from beginning to the end.

The reason I am interested in this amendment is that it will have an impact upon the small business of the country. Small business has already arrived at the point where some men engaged in it are turning the keys in their doors and locking up. They cannot obtain allocations of materials. If the bill goes into effect, without my amendment, it will mean that there will be initiated WPB's and OPA's and all sorts of controls in order to get so-called allocations so that businesses may keep their doors open.

Mr. President, I realize that it is difficult to obtain a favorable vote on an amendment when the one proposing the amendment is speaking to only 10 or 12 Senators. I suppose all Senators have made up their minds, but as one interested in small business I feel a statement of my position at least should be in the RECORD, and I trust Senators will give the utmost consideration to my amendment No. 1 when it comes to a vote.

I must express for the RECORD at this time my strong personal convictions that the type of control set up in section 18 of this bill is the first step down the road toward reimposition of even broader controls over industry.

I think I can make it plain that this feeling is not one which is groundless. It is one which industry itself has expressed as recently as 10 days ago in joint hearings held by the Steel Subcommittee and Oil Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committe. At those hearings David F. Austin, vice president of the United States Steel Corp. of Delaware, told the joint subcommittees that as allocation programs cut deeper and deeper into available steel supplies the problems of distributing the remaining steel become even more complex. He went on to state that it will become progressively worse than it is now.

While it is true that Mr. Austin was talking about voluntary allocation programs, what he had to say applies equally, or with even more force, to mandatory procurement programs, particularly when such programs are to be piled on top of voluntary programs. Here is what Mr. Austin had to say:

> Certainly as you drain off the top requirements—

Listen, Senators:

> Certainly as you drain off the top requirements for the Marshall-plan countries, and bring in a new defense program, and demand today is already in excess of supply, then it must be true, sir, that the total left for our civilian economy must be becoming smaller.

In backing up this statement, Adam Hazlett, vice president of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., in answer to what was going to happen to the ultimate consumer and the small fabricator, said:

> It is inevitable that he is going to suffer.

While these men come from big operations, yet they are the steel-producing concerns of the country, and they are the ones upon whom small business, as well as big business, rely. Those statements are undisputed in the testimony. What is true in steel, our basic industrial commodity, must inevitably be true in other industrial commodities. Therefore, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the seriousness of the implications of section 18 of this bill.

It gives authority to the President to force a manufacturer, plant, or mine to accept an order for articles or materials exclusively for the use of the armed forces. Obviously the small businessman will be hurt most when available supplies for civilian manufacture are sharply curtailed due to military procurement. Of course, that would have to happen any way.

Even if the cuts to civilian manufacturers are applied proportionately straight across the board, the little fellow who is getting 100 tons of steel per quarter, for example, is in far worse shape if he is cut 50 percent than the big fellow who is getting 100,000 tons a quarter. The difference between the two is that in one case it is the death knell to the small business, and in the other, although his business may be seriously curtailed, he is still operating.

In Blair, Nebr., there is a small manufacturing plant which fabricates disk harrows. Today the operator of that plant cannot get steel, except in the gray market. He is paying the difference between 4 and 11 cents to get the steel, and the price of steel is so high that he cannot fabricate the product and meet the competitive price. He has 121 employees. Eighty percent of them are veterans of World War II. The provision of the bill to which I have referred will make things worse for him instead of better.

I am aware that it is a popular argument to state that we are drafting men, and therefore must draft industry. In theory that is correct. However, the reason that we find it necessary to draft men is that the armed services have failed, through voluntary methods, to build up a sufficiently large force, in their opinion, adequately to defend our country. That is the situation with respect to drafting men. Whether we condemn the failure or condone it, that is the problem. That is why we are passing a draft bill. Thus, the draft of men has been called into effect on the theory that voluntary methods of enlistment have been a failure. The voluntary system has failed. Therefore, if we are to stop the threat, we must draft men.

On the other hand, there is no testimony from the armed services that their procurement through normal voluntary channels of placing orders with American industry has failed. That is the difference. In the one case there has been a failure. In the other case, there is no evidence that normal military procurement has failed. In other words, the normal methods of procurement of military materials have not broken down. To the contrary, the situation has proved to be perfectly satisfactory. Thus I cannot see that the argument is a proper one that section 18 is necessary, inasmuch as industry has shown that it can fill military procurement needs without legislative compulsion. There is all the difference in the world between the justification presented with respect to men and that presented with respect to materials.

There was contained in section 9 of the Selective Service Act of 1940 language similar to that which is contained in section 18 of the bill now being considered. I am informed that the Navy used the provisions of section 9 of the Selective Service Act of 1940 only twice in the period of 1940 to 1942. This was during the days when we were headed toward war and the early period of our actual entrance into the war. I realize that there were more stringent powers passed which superseded section 9 of the Selective Service Act of 1940. That is what is going to happen again. That fits exactly into the argument which I am making here now—namely, that once we start a system of compulsory acceptance of Government orders, we broaden out into the whole field of priority control, preference ratings—WPB's, OPA's, and all the rest of the problems of a police-state system. One leads to the other.

Further, this section imposes mandatory requirements for acceptance of Government-placed orders only. It does not allow the man with whom a prime contract is placed to compel his subcontractors to accept subcontracts necessary to fulfill the prime contract, and it does not afford the small-business man any protection in this mandatory acceptance setup.

I cannot help but feel that there are real dangers in the powers contained in this section of the bill. I know that it has been stated that the powers contained herein will be used very sparingly, but we have had experience with such claims before.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot yield. I have only 15 minutes. I shall be glad to answer questions in the Senator's time.

In my opinion, if the power is necessary it is necessary only because great difficulty is being experienced, or will be experienced, in purchasing military supplies for the armed services. That is the only justification. There is an anticipation that the program will fall down, and that some time in the future there will be need for such a provision. The need has not been justified up to this time. It has been said that the provision will be used only sparingly. That is what we are told, but we know what that means. If it will be used only sparingly, then why is it necessary at all?

The argument may be made that this section can be used as a club or a threat and therefore the powers will not be exercised but will still serve a valuable function as a threat. I cannot agree with this type of thinking. Until it is demonstrated that the powers contained in this section are necessary, I think the dangers inherent in the exercise of the

powers far outweigh the advantages, if any.

Let us look at an example of what could happen. Suppose the armed services find it necessary to procure steel drums. It has come to the attention of the Steel Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee that integrated steel drum manufacturers—that is, those who produce the steel with which the drums are made as well as the drums themselves—are reported to be operating at between 95 and 100 percent of capacity. We have been informed that due to lack of steel the independent steel drum manufacturers are operating at approximately 60 percent of capacity. It would be natural for a procurement officer looking for steel drums for the armed services to feel that those who had 40 percent idle capacity would be the persons with whom orders should be placed. However, if the independent manufacturer were forced to take an order under the present language of section 18 of this bill for the idle 40 percent of his capacity, and then went to the steel producers and asked for 40 percent additional steel with which to fill this Government order, those producers would be under no compulsion to give him steel and he would thus be compelled to drop most of his civilian business if he had entered into a contract. There is a certain percentage of idle capacity. The same thing is true of the independent petroleum refiners. A certain percentage of the refinery capacity is idle. If they took a contract they would have to take it out of their civilian quota if they performed; and without the priority given the prime contractor, the subcontractor could not perform, and his capacity would be idle.

I do not see how anyone who has been close to the steel problem can deny the fact that if we give priority to the high level, we must extend it to the next level, or there will be an impact upon small business which will be a great deal worse than that which was experienced in World War II, and worse than we are now experiencing in peacetime. This would be ruinous to the independent manufacturer.

I do not say that this is the way that this section of the bill would be administered. I do say that it is a possibility that this example and others which we could not even conceive of at this time could happen. I say further that when we give Government controls over a man's business and over what he must make, no matter how limited these controls may be, it is impossible to predict what will happen in the operation of such controls.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska has one more minute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield five more minutes to me?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I say further that some of the most ridiculous and unforeseen occurrences in this country's economic history happened during a mandatory allocation and price-control period.

If these powers are more broadly used than is now contemplated, it is quite obvious that persons forced to take orders for military goods will demand from Congress the right to force others to furnish the materials necessary for production of those military goods. Recent history demonstrates that. Thus I question seriously whether our economy can long remain part free and part controlled—no matter how small that control may seem to be.

Forced acceptance of orders for military procurement, the ERP program, and the voluntary programs for a few key industries will cut so deeply into available supplies of basic industrial commodities that other phases of our civilian and domestic economy will be greatly disrupted. Small business will be the first to suffer. I do not think that the time is far off.

No Member of the Senate has fought harder to keep controls off the backs of the American people than has the junior Senator from Nebraska. I am against them for the reason that the complexities of our economy are too great for a group of so-called Government experts to be able to solve in an equitable fashion.

Even during the war, with the compulsions of patriotism and national self-preservation, we found controls almost impossible to administer and to enforce. But if we decide here today that in one phase of our economy, namely, the military procurement program, we must force industry to take orders, I cannot help but reiterate that we are taking the fateful first step toward reimposition of even broader controls over all industry.

I should like to say to the Senate that I have been informed by the Department of the Army that this section was not even in the proposed draft legislation which the Army sent to Congress, and that the Army has never been asked for an opinion on this section of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield in the Senator's time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no time.

Mr. WHERRY. I have only 3 minutes left out of the 5 which have been yielded to me, and I have more yet to say.

Will the Senator from South Dakota yield me 5 minutes more?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to know who said that the Army had not been consulted about this section.

Mr. WHERRY. I reluctantly give the name; the name is William Draper, Under Secretary of the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all I can say is that he is talking through his hat, because this matter was discussed in detail with Defense Secretary Forrestal and Army Secretary Royall.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I repeat that this matter has not been discussed with the Army, and no reference to it can be found in the report. I can not find it anywhere in the report. This provision was not in the proposed draft bill when it was sent here by the armed forces.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; this is far from anything the Army sent here. The committee wrote the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The proposition is advanced that we need military procurement because this bill is a draft bill and the Army has asked for it. The implication is that the Army wants this procurement. But the Army has not asked for it. The Armed Services Committee has written this provision into the bill.

Just this morning, before the Small Business Committee, we had testimony on this very subject. Let me read some of the colloquy. I read now the testimony of Rear Adm. J. D. Boyle, United States Navy, Office of Material. Mr. Dickey was asking the questions. I read from the questions and answers which were had in the committee just 2 hours ago:

Mr. DICKEY. Do you feel that any broader priorities assistance is needed than that?—

Referring to the present voluntary allocation programs of the Department of Commerce.

Admiral BOYLE. No; I think our feeling is at this time that industry has been cooperating splendidly in giving us our reasonable requirements, whether in steel or in oil or in any other thing which is short. The steel industry has voluntarily provided the Navy with very reasonable proportions of its steel.

That testimony was given only 2 hours ago.

I quote now from testimony given by Brig. Gen. J. K. Christmas, Chief of the Procurement Group, Logistics Division, General Staff, United States Army, also given before the Senate Small Business Committee this morning, only 2 hours ago:

Mr. DICKEY. When your suppliers have been unable to get material, you haven't had any difficulty, if it is important, in getting it, have you?

General CHRISTMAS. I wouldn't say "difficulty." We eventually got it, sir.

Mr. DICKEY. I mean it hasn't held up your procurement schedules.

General CHRISTMAS. No, sir; it has not.

Mr. DICKEY. Do you anticipate that it would?

General CHRISTMAS. There was a recent case, as the Colonel says, as to stoves and refrigerators, where we are still having some trouble. But I can't say it is final.

Then we have the reverse of the situation, where a man hoped, perhaps, that his Government contract would be a means of getting some material over and above the material he was normally getting for his commercial business. That is a very human failing, but we don't like to get our leg pulled. So we screen the requests before we go to bat for them.

Mr. DICKEY. I am thinking particularly, General, of vital ordnance matériel. I mean you haven't had any real difficulty in getting matériel, have you?

General CHRISTMAS. We have not.

Mr. DICKEY. Would you anticipate that you would?

General CHRISTMAS. No; I don't think so. I think that American business thinks enough of its National Military Establishment to help them out.

Mr. President, here is further testimony, obtained within the last 2 hours,

and showing that this section of the bill is not needed. This is the testimony of Brig. Gen. Aaron Kessler, Director of the Procurement and Industrial Planning Headquarters, United States Army, before the Senate Small Business Committee on today, June 10. We all know General Kessler. The questions were asked by Mr. Dickey:

Mr. DICKEY. General Kessler, have you had any difficulty in getting American industry to enter into Air Force contracts?

General KESSLER. I think for the most part it has been just the opposite. They have been clamoring for it.

I think in this respect it must be considered that the Air Force procurement is specialized; that food, clothing, and all those other materials are purchased for the Air Force by the Army. All procurement is specialized, in the aircraft field. As shown by the Finletter and Brewster reports, there has been a great scarcity of work within the aviation field. So our problem in that respect has been nil.

Mr. DICKEY. As far as the future is concerned, do you anticipate that it will be necessary to force industry to take orders?

General KESSLER. We conceive of no case now where that is going to be necessary.

Mr. President, I do not have before me a verbatim transcript of the testimony of the representative of the Atomic Energy Commission, because that testimony was given too late this morning to be available now. But I have been told by the director of the staff of the Small Business Committee that the report given by the representative of the Atomic Energy Commission is practically the same as the three reports I have just mentioned.

So, Mr. President, there has been no testimony that this procurement section of the bill is necessary. If we strike it out, it will not hurt the draft one iota. If we leave it in, it will be the first step—that cannot be denied—to the establishment of controls in this country. If this section is left in the bill, it will cause upon subcontractors in small business a serious impact which they simply will not be able to stand.

Mr. President, I ask that the section be deleted. I am sorry that more Members of the Senate have not heard the argument. I should like to have them know what the testimony has been within just the past 2 hours.

I suppose my amendment will not carry; but I should like to have the RECORD show that I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate.

If the amendment fails, then I shall submit amendments 2 and 3.

Amendment No. 2 provides only that if a contractor gets a contract and relays it to subcontractors, it will be necessary to make a showing that the supply of material is scarce before a priority for the material they need will be issued. Certainly, all Senators can go along with that amendment, even if they do not wish to remove the entire section from the bill.

The third amendment declares as a policy that the procurement agencies shall give small business their just share of business, in proportion to what they do. I believe the Senator from Georgia saw that declaration of principle. I believe there will be no objection to writing it into the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I believe the third amendment is the long one.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say that I believe the committee will be definitely opposed to that one, because to my mind it would begin the policy of establishing priorities, and that is not the intention of section 18, as it came from the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I take it that the committee is not in favor of any of these amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. No. I would not say that the committee is in favor of them. The committee voted section 18 into the bill.

If the Senator asks me the question personally——

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator this question: As chairman of the committee, would the Senator say that the committee would accept any one of the three amendments?

Mr. GURNEY. No; they would not.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, the amendments will have to be voted upon.

Mr. RUSSELL and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Out of the time to be allotted by the Senator from Kentucky, I am authorized to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am somewhat overcome by the fervor of the argument which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, but as he presented his case I thought I noticed several grave conflicts between his contentions.

In the first place, the Senator has denounced this provision, and has said it will wreck all industry and all business in the United States; and then the Senator proceeded to say that it was in effect during World War II, but was used only twice, and for that reason it is unnecessary to insert this authority in the bill. I submit that is a conflict which is impossible of reconciliation.

Mr. President, I join heartily in what the Senator has said about the problems of small business in this country. I desire to do everything within my power to help small business. But all of the Senator's complaints may be laid to the undoubted fact that there is a great shortage of steel and other essential materials. The elimination of this provision will not in anywise affect or alleviate that condition or increase the supplies going to small business. This shortage is largely caused by the shipments to foreign countries under the Marshall plan. They will be aggravated by military requirements created by this bill. The Senator's complaint is really directed against the effect of the Marshall plan and against increasing our procurement of military supplies. I deeply regret these shortages and the difficulties he has described, but they are a part of the great contribution we are undertaking to make to the stability of the world and the cause of peace. These provisions of the bill have nothing to do with the shortage of steel and other scarce commodities.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yielded to the Senator from Georgia when I had only a few minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from South Dakota will yield more time to me, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GURNEY. Again I am authorized to yield further time out of the time to be allotted by the Senator from Kentucky, and I yield a total of 15 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this provision of the bill provides for a mandatory distribution. I wish to have the distribution settled on a voluntary basis. But this bill sets up controls; and when that is done small-business men will fade out of the picture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no controls whatever are provided in section 18 of the bill, except over contracts which are necessary in order to equip the men who will be called to the colors by this bill, if it is enacted into law. There is to be absolutely no control over the allocation of materials or over industry in this country, other than to compel industry to fill the orders for equipment needed for the men who will be in the service. I submit again that the Senator's argument is more an argument against the shipments being made under the Marshall plan and the increase of the National Defense Establishment provided in the pending bill, than it is against this very mild provision.

Mr. President, the Senator argues that industry is opposed to the amendment. I should not question that argument, though nothing to that effect has been called to my attention. I answer that there are in this Nation tens of thousands of young men who are opposed to the Draft Act, and who do not wish to be called to service for 2 years against their will. Their wishes are not to be recognized if we pass the bill. Why should we accede to the objections of those who are operating the industries of the country, who can be only mildly inconvenienced by the adoption of the proposal submitted by the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The three military forces say they will make procurements under voluntary allocations, and that they do not need these controls.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has quoted from some of his witnesses. I sat in the Armed Services Committee and I heard the Secretary for Air testify that in the production of jet planes there was exceedingly great difficulty experienced in obtaining the great tubes which are necessary to propel such planes.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator show me in the record or in the report

when the Secretary for Air has asked for the inclusion in the bill of section 18?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. It was in executive session, unfortunately. He was testifying in closed sessions and I do not contend he specifically requested this power.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, but we do not have the record here.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am telling the Senator about it now. The Senator from South Dakota will confirm the statement.

Mr. WHERRY. But I hear about it now for the first time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am enlightening the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, the Senator is enlightening me. When I called the matter to the attention of the military forces, the procurement agencies that make procurements, they all came in and testified it was unnecessary. There is not a place in the record on which the Senator is submitting his case to the Senate showing that the Secretary of Defense came forward and asked for these allocations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not deny that.

Mr. WHERRY. The answer to the Senator's argument is that it is possible to obtain everything he is asking for without allocations, on a voluntary basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am undertaking to show that that is not a fact, because the Secretary for Air testified that the Air Forces were in need of engines to propel jet planes, and that when they approached those who are capable of manufacturing them, including a great electrical concern manufacturing refrigerators, they were told, "We will sell you all the refrigerators you want, but we will not change our production over from the production of refrigerators in order to produce the tubes which you need in the manufacture of jet planes."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 30 seconds?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 30 seconds.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know Brig. Gen. Aaron Kessler, director of procurement and industrial planning, at the headquarters of the United States Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not now recall meeting the gentleman the Senator names.

Mr. WHERRY. He was appointed by the man the Senator is talking about, to handle procurement. Within the past 2 hours, General Kessler has stated the provision in the bill is unnecessary, and that they do not even anticipate it will be needed.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is certainly in conflict with the statement made by the Secretary of Air. I care not what may be said by the procurement agencies of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force with respect to this proposition. It is a fundamentally fair provision of law. It can hurt no one who is willing to cooperate. If the spirit of cooperation, which the Senator says is so widespread, wells in the hearts of all those who can produce materials for the armed services, there will never be a time when the provision will be applied.

The Senator said it was in the Draft Act of 1940. It did appear in that bill. If the Senator will go back to 1917, he will find that the same provision was in the Draft Act of 1917. It was used a number of times in 1917 and 1918. It was tested in any number of cases which were determined by the Federal courts. So when 1940 came along the same provision was incorporated in the draft law of that year. It was not used very often, and I predict it will not be, in the future, because, Mr. President, those who are conducting the vast industries of this country know that under the pending bill they must conform to Government orders and produce the matériel which is necessary in order to arm the boys who will be taken by the draft.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 30 seconds?

Mr. RUSSELL. My time is very limited, but I yield. I desire to be most generous.

Mr. WHERRY. It was in the act, as the Senator has said and as I have said. The point is, this is a broader provision. Under the Second War Powers Act, although it was in operation 2 years, the provision was used only twice. It appeared in the Second War Powers Act. It was the initial step. The War Powers Act broadened it out.

Mr. RUSSELL. It had absolutely no relation whatever to the War Powers Act. It had no connection whatever with it, because the War Powers Act covered the allocation of raw material. The War Powers Act had nothing to do with compelling industries to fabricate the finished products.

Mr. WHERRY. The Second War Powers Act was the result of the experience of 2 years of the operation of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. We could not have fought World War II without the War Powers Act. For my part, I think war is a national emergency. I think it imposes responsibility upon the man who owns the plant, upon the man who has the dollar, just as it does on the boy who must shoulder a gun and go forth and risk his life and perhaps shed his blood in the defense of his country.

Mr. WHERRY. I am ready to take such action when necessary, but it is not necessary now.

Mr. RUSSELL. For my part, I shall not even by remote action make it appear that I think a lathe is more important than a boy, that I think an industrial plant is sacred, when we are laying hands on a million young men and taking them into the service through the enactment of the pending legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator 100 percent in that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator believes in it, he will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. That has nothing to do with the enactment of this provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will withdraw his amendment if he agrees with that statement.

Mr. President, a similar provision in the law has been most helpful in times past. In World War II, I recall one evening I was talking to Secretary of War Patterson. He said, "When your amendment was put into the draft act, I did not pay a great deal of attention to it, but as we ran into our difficulties in procuring the arms with which to equip the men, when we had American soldiers drilling with broomsticks, when we had two-horse wagons covered with cardboard to look like a tank, and when we were having great difficulty in procuring the necessary supplies, we had that law on the books, as a shotgun behind the door. When we placed an order with a great industry and told them, 'You will have to stop making automobiles and begin manufacturing tanks, or change from the production of one commodity to making another which the Army and Navy need,' they unhesitatingly complied, because they knew the shotgun was behind the door."

There is nothing in the provision embodied in section 18 that can possibly injure any industry in the United States. Neither this provision nor any other provision of law Congress might enact will cure the shortage of steel and other vital elements and metals and commodities. That shortage exists. It will continue to exist during the life of the Marshall plan, and during the time this great new enlargement of our Military Establishment is in progress.

Certainly, Mr. President, the Senate of the United States will not say to the boys who are to be drafted into the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps under the pending bill: "We took out of the law the only thing in it indicating that anyone besides the men themselves would be required to make a sacrifice to protect our institutions of government."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to enable me to make one more statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Summing up the entire argument of the Senator, if the situation is as bad as he says, then he ought to be asking for the powers which were in force during the war itself. It is not that bad. There is no need of taking the first step that will lead to a second step. That is my position in a nutshell. I have a difference of opinion with the Senator from Georgia. I respect his judgment, and if the situation is as bad as he thinks it is, we ought to do exactly what the Senator is asking for. Until that time comes, it is my feeling that the provision is unnecessary, in the light of statements made by the procurement officers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have great respect for the Senator, and I gladly accord him his views, but I may say that if his position is correct we are in no danger at all, and we should not even pass the law authorizing the drafting of men.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no; I am not saying a word about drafting men. I am talking only about the provision which applies to procurement. I think it has no place in the draft bill, upon the justification shown. I agree that in drafting men the case was made by the Army that they could not get voluntary enlistments. In this matter, the situation is different. Industry has provided all the instrumentalities asked for. There is therefore no need of imposing upon them this provision at the present time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was it not brought out in the hearings that Secretary Patterson said that the amendment was never used in the last World War, but that it was helpful?

Mr. RUSSELL. That was brought out in the hearings, but I apprehend that it was in executive session, because the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said that he had culled through the record and could not find anything of the kind. More than half the testimony was taken in executive session, and it was not printed.

Mr. President, if there is an emergency or a national crisis so grave as to warrant our passing this bill, which is in conflict with what has been heretofore recognized as the American principle that we will take a million human beings through compulsion and refuse to see that the Government of the United States shall have the power to procure guns and equipment with which to furnish the men drafted into the Army. Twice we have seen the United States in time of war—once before the war started—enact selective-service laws. Practically the same provision as this has been in every draft law ever enacted, except the one enacted in 1861 or 1862, in the War Between the States. We should not dampen the morale of the young men who are soon to be drafted into the Army by taking action in the Senate of the United States to strike down the only provision in the bill which indicates that those engaged in industry or other civilian pursuits who are not subject to the draft will be required to make any sacrifice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They cannot be considered until the conclusion of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CAIN. May I ask that the amendments be read?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 10 (a) (3), to follow the period in line 8, page 44, it is proposed to insert the following: "The Director shall not be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States."

In section 10 (b) (2), on page 45, to follow the word "system" on line 13, it is proposed to insert the following: "who shall not be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Senate bill 2655 provides, beginning on page 43, for a selective-service system which would process into the armed services the total number of men authorized by the legislation. I note, Mr. President, on page 46 of the bill, that there are to be created and established within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and other civilian agencies. It is also provided that one or more local boards shall be situated in every county in the United States, and that no member of any local or appeal board shall be a member of the armed services.

So far, so good. I think the merit and substance of a selective-service system is found in its civilian qualities. There is considerable contradiction within the proposed legislation, which I, regretfully, have had an opportunity to discuss only briefly with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. The bill provides, as the last Selective Service Act did, that the National Selective Service Director may or may not be a member of the armed services. There is no prohibition against any one of the 48 State directors being members of the armed services.

In discussing the matter very quickly this morning the Senator from South Dakota thought there was considerable virtue and reason to consider the advisability of differentiating conclusively and completely between selective service, a civilian organization, on the one hand, and the armed services, a military organization, on the other. They perform two distinctly different tasks. Selective service will determine who from among the populace of America are to serve their country under the terms of the draft. Selective service selects them, processes them, and turns them over to the Army, Navy, or the Air Force. From my point of view, until such time as a man has been selected, processed, and turned over to the armed services, they have little, if any, concern with him.

One last word, Mr. President. I am rightfully concerned about appeals within the Selective Service System. A young man does not want to be drafted and if he thinks he has a good case, he appeals. The appeal goes to an appeal board. An appeal may be taken from the appeal-board decision. Who decides on the appeal? By virtue of the legislation, the President of the United States. Under this legislation, as occurred during the last war, the President, being a very busy man, knows nothing of any single instance in which an appeal is being taken. He delegates all his authority in the matter, in the most natural way and for the most natural reasons, to the National Director of Selective Service. Who has he been? A very distinguished individual, but having the background of a professional soldier. Likewise a number of professional soldiers have been directors of State selective-service agencies.

I feel, Mr. President, that every consideration should be given in the future to making a clear distinction between these two dissimilar services, because, among the things we want to treasure and keep precious is to make certain that an appeal by a civilian should be judged by a civilian. It has been construed that an appeal from an appeal would be judged by the President, but, in fact, that has never happened. I should be extraordinarily pleased, having no pride of authorship of this idea, which is concurred in by many persons, if the Senator from South Dakota, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, might find it possible to accept this amendment for the purpose of taking it to conference and having further and more serious consideration given to its merits.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to myself. First, I wish to say that I did talk with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], I did say that his amendment had considerable merit and we had quite a bit of discussion regarding it in the committee. I think the committee came to the conclusion that Selective Service System which operated under the 1940 act clear through the war was well established and understood by the people, and although it is now in a board called the Selective Service Record Board, this bill would transfer it back to the system which we knew during the war. Therefore I could not accept the amendment for the committee. Certainly I should have no objection if the Senate should vote to send it to conference, as the Senator from Washington suggests.

Mr. President, during the remarks made at the opening of the session this afternoon the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] offered portions of advertisements appearing in some of the leading magazines. I do not know the month, but I believe that for the RECORD it would be best that the complete advertising appear; namely, all of the printing on each page offered as exhibits. I therefore ask that the matter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READY, AIM—FRY

It's so hot, canned goods blow up. Big guns die young—of the heat. Cigarette lighters go dry as fast as you fill them.

That's the Arizona desert, in summer, where the mercury touches 125° and the sand is overcrisp. And where the Army's Task Force "Furnace" sought new ways to whip an old enemy: Heat.

It tested food rations for desert troop use, feather-light uniforms, air-conditioned combat boots, guns and rolling stock, even a portable ice-cream making unit.

Task Force "Furnace" studied solar radiation, too. In the sun, for example, metal equipment heats up to 150 degrees—hot enough to sear bare flesh. The answer: Special gloves.

These tests in the desert are typical of the Regular Army's continuing research under all kinds of conditions. They're proving which equipment is good and which isn't and what should be done about it. Above all, they are finding out what the individual soldier needs to stay comfortable and to work efficiently anywhere on earth, in any climate.

The able young men of Task Force "Furnace" are representatives of America's peacetime Regular Army. The finest technical training is theirs, and full opportunities for advancement. They are paid at the highest rate in the history of America's armed forces.

For the young man who wants to get ahead, the Army offers adventure, huge educational opportunities, and a splendid lifetime career. Isn't that what you're looking for? Get the facts today at your nearest United States Army and United States Air Force recruiting station.

HE SOLD PEACE TO AN UNBELIEVER

The dripping black was endless nightmare. Malaria stalked on unseen wings. And close—too close—murder, incorporated, waited in evil silence—waited for the telltale slap of mosquito, for the click of rifle bolt.

It took guts to stay still in that stillness. It took guts, too, to charge through hellfire and grenade a gun nest into oblivion. But the American infantryman has been generously endowed with courage ever since he stood on the bridge at Concord. You must admit that, for a man who hates war, he has done right well.

He does not fight for conquest or for loot. He has had little thought or time for glory. Yes, whenever the need arose, he bested every enemy he ever met. He sold peace to people who believed in war—because he proved that the soldier who believes in peace is a better man than the soldier who believes in war.

What's the answer, then? Let's say it's because the American is free to think and do and believe as he pleases. Freedom is his birthright. Perhaps that's why he's ready to fight for it. Maybe that's the reason he's the world's fightingest soldier.

Today, as always, the American infantryman works for peace. It was not enough that he helped win the victory. Now he's out to make it stick.

There's a great tradition in the infantry and this service offers much to the young man who wants to get ahead—good pay, food, clothing, shelter, medical care, travel, and educational opportunity. Get all the details from your nearest United States Army and United States Air Force recruiting station.

Listen to "Sound Off," "Voice of the Army," and "Proudly We Hail" on your radio.

United States Army and United States Air Force Recruiting Service.

Your Army and Air Force serve the Nation and mankind in war and peace.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, let me say, in connection with the recruiting program of the Army, that all the information has not yet been given on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of the bill. The ground force of the Army takes care of all the recruiting, not only for itself, but also for the Air Corps. If my memory of the figures is correct, in the last month they recruited 29,000. The Air Force needed 9,000 to bring it up to its necessary strength during that month. The Army itself could keep only 20,000 of this number for the ground forces, making them short in that particular month. An additional 20,000 would cover those who had received their discharge.

Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] wishes to offer an amendment. If so, I am authorized to yield from the time of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the amendment I propose is a very simple one. It merely provides that following the word "and" on page 7, line 6, there be inserted the words, "in case an adequate number of qualified volunteers are not on active service."

The section as it stands calls for the drafting of the medical and dental professions and allied specialist categories. The proposed amendment would provide merely that in case a sufficient number of qualified volunteers are not on active service it will not be necessary to draft.

In the last war the medical and dental professions volunteered to such a satisfactory degree that it was not necessary for the armed forces to require that they be conscripted. I am satisfied that in the present situation the medical profession, the dental profession, and the other professions which will be involved, will be very glad to cooperate with the Army in furnishing an adequate number of volunteers.

I therefore ask, Mr. President, that the amendment be accepted.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. We cannot accept an amendment now, for there is a unanimous consent agreement, and the Senate must first act on the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

Will the Senator restate his amendment which is proposed to be added after the word "and" in line 6, page 7?

Mr. MURRAY. The following language is proposed to be inserted, "in case an adequate number of qualified volunteers are not on active service." I have discussed the proposed amendment with the experts, and they have advised me that this language is sufficient to accomplish the purpose in mind.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say that I have talked with a number of the members of the committee, and they all agree that the proposed language can be accepted because it is in accord with the policy of the bill as stated in the bill. I refer specifically to the section which is now in the bill on page 59, which provides that no disturbance shall be made in present laws that allow voluntary enlistments of all kinds in all branches of the armed services.

Our committee believed that that section allowed doctors to volunteer. I am glad to have the provision restated in the section to which the Senator proposes to add the amendment. There is no objection at all, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. I am offering the amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Florida. I think that by adding the amendment in this particular place and section of the bill which applies to doctors it is brought forcibly to the attention of the country that the members of these professions do have the right to volunteer, and they will be inducted only in case an adequate number is not then in the armed forces.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In whose time is the Senator from Florida to speak?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to make an inquiry.

Mr. GURNEY. In the time of the Senator from Kentucky. The Senator from Florida is yielded 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. I have three amendments which I should like to call to the attention of the able Senator from South Dakota and of other Members of the Senate, and which I desire to offer on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, but I understand that they cannot be brought up until after the disposition of the O'Daniel amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If it is preferred, I shall present them later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. On page 8 of the bill it is provided that—

> No doctor of medicine or dental surgery * * * shall hereafter be ordered to active duty for more than 1 month in any calendar year (except for purposes of training), if the local board within the jurisdiction of which he resides has determined that the health of the community in which he resides will be unduly jeopardized as a result of his induction or service on active duty.

That does not prescribe any standard of need, and it is generally recognized that there should be 1 doctor for each 1,500 residents of a community, and 1 dentist for each 3,000 residents. I wonder if the able Senator from South Dakota might find it possible to allow an amendment on page 8, line 15, before the period, in the following language: "or if, in the case of a doctor of medicine, there will be less than one such doctor for each 1,500 residents of that community after his induction or entry upon active duty, or if, in the case of a doctor, of dental surgery, there will be less than one such doctor for each 3,000 residents of that community after his induction or entry upon active duty."

I am sorry I have not had a chance to show the Senator a copy, and he can consider the amendment later if he would like to do so, rather than from just hearing it read.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The committee feels that it has put a provision in the bill so that the necessary doctors would not be taken away from any civilian community. Specifying by percentages and so on would disrupt the necessity for keeping certain specialists in the community.

The committee further felt that we should not get down to the point of setting forth the number of doctors per thousand of population in each community all over the land.

With that statement, I am sure I could not, for the committee accept, the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. I shall offer the amendment and ask for its consideration at the proper time.

Now, if I may have the attention of the Senator, I wish to propose an amendment on page 23, line 23, after the period, to insert the following:

> No person who is engaged in any activity which is determined by a local board, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, to be (1) directly related to the maintenance of health, (2) an educational activity, or (3) scientific research, shall be inducted for training and service under this act, unless

the President has determined that the armed forces are unable to obtain by enlistment or voluntary entry upon active duty a sufficient number of persons possessing the same qualifications to meet the requirements of the armed forces for persons possessing such qualifications.

I am merely raising the point of the deferment of these three necessary classes of our citizens, unless the President should find that their call to duty was imperative because others of similar qualifications could not be obtained in the regular way provided by the bill. Would the Senator care to comment upon the principles of deferment, without such an amendment in the bill, of these important classes of people?

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The committee considered that matter quite carefully, not 1 day, but 3 or 4, and came to the conclusion that it was simply impossible, first, to define exactly what scientists are; second, to define exactly the kind of a scientist who might be needed for the armed services. The committee feels that it has covered that point clearly, not only in the body of the bill in the section the Senator proposes to amend, but also in the preamble to the bill.

I further call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that in the Unification Act there is spelled out the duty of the National Resources Board, a part of the national defense establishment, to recommend the kind of scientists needed and the way they and all other classes of manpower shall be used. There is complete authority there for the President to get the proper recommendations so that proper deferment will be given for scientists of all kinds.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very glad to have that statement. As I have said before, I prefer to have as many of these matters as possible handled administratively, rather than by Congress trying to write the details into law. But I appreciate the statement of the Senator from South Dakota, in charge of the bill, that it is the sense of those in authority in this matter that the question should be handled administratively, to the end that the health and the educational and research facilities of our country may not be impaired, because they are all essential to the maintenance of a secure Republic.

The third amendment, Mr. President, if I may call it to the attention of the Senator from South Dakota, is to insert at the proper place the following:

SEC. —. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the President to provide through existing departments and agencies of the Federal Government and through cooperative arrangements with State and local governmental agencies (1) for the furnishing to registrants who are found, by reason of correctible physical deficiencies or illiteracy, to be unacceptable to the armed forces for training and service of such medical or dental services or educational opportunities as may be necessary to make them acceptable to the armed forces for training and service under this act; (2) for the physical and mental examination of all male persons between the ages of 16 and 19 and for the furnishing to such persons of all medical and dental services and educational opportunities which may be required to enable them to meet the standards of physical and mental fitness for training and service in the armed forces of the United States; and (3) for the award to high-school graduates having scholastic ability and requiring financial aid of such number of scholarships in colleges, universities, technical schools, and other institutions of higher learning as may be required to provide for the training of a sufficient number of professional, scientific, and technical personnel to meet the requirements for such personnel in time of war or national emergency.

Mr. President, in the last war, as Senators are aware, large numbers of men of eligible selective-service age were rejected because of mental or physical deficiencies. That meant in many instances that men with families had to go to war, and many of them lost their lives and left orphans and widows because some single men were illiterate or physically incapable of performing their duty to their country.

Mr. President, can the Congress declare a policy of selective service without at the same time carrying on a contemporaneous policy of trying to fit men of eligible age groups for mental and physical qualifications to meet the required standards?

I am very earnestly raising the question, first: Should not men in the eligible age groups who cannot meet the standards because of physical deficiencies which are correctible have Government aid in the correction of those physical defects so they can perform their duty to their country? All the amendment provides is that the Government shall directly or through cooperative programs with the States try to give such men the physical services that may be necessary to fit them to perform their duty to their country and to make it possible for them to perform their relative duty to those who are in the same age category.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator from South Dakota allow me some more time? I do not want to trespass upon the time of any other Senator, but I should like to have three more minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Kentucky has time he could yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. The second proposal in my amendment is to provide for the physical and mental examination of those who are between the ages of 16 and 19; in other words, the group that is just coming into eligibility, and yet who are known, because of mental or physical deficiencies, to be unfit to meet the qualifications of eligibility.

I say, Mr. President, that the Federal Government, in fairness to the fit as well as in fairness to the country, should aid those boys to qualify themselves to meet their country's call in case of an emergency.

The third proposal is for the Government to aid in the bestowal of scholarships and fellowships to worthy high-school groups to provide the training which the technical classes might require for adequate service to the country.

Mr. President, I believe the three amendments I have discussed are worthy of consideration, and I shall propose them as soon as they may be proposed.

May I send the amendments to the desk and offer them? Are they acceptable now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received and will lie on the table until they are reached.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] submitted an amendment which covers some 47 pages. The purpose of that amendment, as was stated by the Senator from Missouri on yesterday is "to correct the Articles of War to the end that the Army system of justice may be improved in certain important particulars." Such a purpose is praiseworthy and the Senator from Missouri is to be congratulated for the attention which he has devoted to this subject.

Mr. President, I am in full accord with the purpose of the amendment. I supported the amendment yesterday but I have given considerable thought to it since that time, and after having reflected upon it, I believe, as was said by the chairman of the committee yesterday, that an amendment so far-reaching as this should receive greater and more careful consideration. I understand that the amendment was not even considered by the committee. The amendment, of course, refers only to the Army. It does not embrace the Navy or the Air Force. I beileve that what the amendment seeks to effect, the correction of the injustices which now exist, should cover all our armed forces. Such correction and such coverage are necessary. So I believe that the amendment should go back to the committee for full and complete coverage of all branches of our military, naval, and air forces.

The chairman of the committee said yesterday:

It seems only logical to me that the problem of the revision of codes for the fundamental control of the Military Establishment of such consequence that it cannot be lightly considered by the Congress. Further, it certainly must not be hastily tacked onto a bill of such great importance as the manpower bill.

I repeat, the amendment covers some 47 pages. I know that the committee has been giving thought to the subject, although they have not given any consideration to this particular amendment. I am confident that the committee itself recognizes the existence of many injustices in our courts-martial procedures, and I am confident also that at the next session of the Congress the committee will recommend legislation which will affect all branches of the armed services rather than just one branch and improve our systems of justice for all our fighting men.

In view of that, Mr. President, and as I repeat, in view of the far-reaching effect of the amendment, I now desire to file a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Kem amendment was adopted yesterday afternoon, and having done that I now inquire whether or not that motion may be voted upon at the hour of 3 o'clock with the pending amendments and the vote on final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion will be filed. There are other matters, amendments, which have priority of action at 3 o'clock, but in due course after 3 o'clock the Senator from Pennsylvania can call up his motion for a vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. On two previous occasions, Mr. President, in the debate on the bill I have made some remarks with reference to my amendment. My amendment would change the effective date of the pending bill by changing section 20. Section 20 in the bill reads as follows:

> This act shall become effective immediately.

Under my amendment section 20 would read as follows:

> This act shall become effective on the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations and individuals 100 percent of all profits and earnings in excess of average annual profits and earnings of such corporations and individuals for the 3-year period immediately preceding such date.

Mr. President, that amendment is intended to put into effect a policy of drafting war profits at the same time we draft boys for the armed services. My amendment does not in any way affect or change any of the provisions of the bill as amended and as it will be passed.

I wish it were possible for me to offer an amendment which would completely include a tax measure of the kind I have described, but that is impossible owing to the fact that tax measures must originate in the House of Representatives and not in the Senate.

I presented my case before the Armed Services Committee, and my amendment was not included in the bill there. I was therefore forced, in order to be consistent, to bring the matter to the floor of the Senate.

Of course it is clearly evident, and has been admitted by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that my amendment is completely germane to the bill. The only objection offered by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee is that his committee did not feel that the bill should include this amendment, so I bring it before the full membership of the Senate.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that the policy which I should like to have adopted by the Congress and by the Government is not a punitive measure to punish or whip the so-called big, bad corporations about which we hear so much. I have no quarrel with them. My amendment is broad enough to include large corporations and small corporations, and all individual citizens alike.

It has been stated to me by some that unless the large, greedy corporations could make excess profits out of war operations and the manufacture of material for war, they would go on a sit-down strike. I do not share that belief in any degree. I believe that most businessmen are patriotic and inherently honest, and that they cannot remain in business long if they are not strictly honest. Of course, there are some exceptions; but as a rule businessmen are just as patriotic as any other class of citizens. If my amendment is adopted and the Congress of the United States enacts a tax law to tax all excess profits over and above normal profits made by corporations engaged in the manufacture of war material or any other service connected with the war effort, those in control of such corporations will continue to be patriotic, and continue to operate and produce to the limit of their ability. Most of them will be perfectly satisfied with the tax bills enacted by Congress, or at least they will comply with them.

Corporations and individuals do not establish the tax policy of our Nation. That policy is formulated and made effective by the Congress. If we fail to do our duty, if we fail to limit profits during war emergency to those made before the war emergency starts, then the makers of war materials have the lawful right to make all the profit they can. They are not to be blamed. The blame must rest solely upon the Congress if the manufacturers make more profit than they should make. I wish to make that perfectly clear, because I believe in the profit system of private enterprise. That is what has supported our great democratic form of government for more than 160 years, and made it one of the greatest forms of government ever established on the face of the globe.

My amendment would permit corporations and individuals to make as much profit during wartime or war emergency as they make during normal times. They should be satisfied with that. If we come to a serious emergency when our boys must be drafted, as we contemplate doing in the bill before us; if we contemplate an emergency so serious that we must draft the youth of the Nation to go forth to battle and sacrifice their business careers, and perhaps lose their lives, no one should expect to make excess war profits out of such an emergency.

I believe that the citizens of this country are fully sold on the idea that we should have legislation of this nature. But unless a measure of this kind is adopted simultaneously with the enactment of the draft bill, it will never be adopted. We rush in and draft the boys, get them into the Army and the war gets started; but somehow or other we never get around to drafting the excess dollars made off the blood of those boys spilled in war. I make this statement as a positive fact, because I have had some experience in the United States Senate, having served here since before the last war started. When it got well under way, about January 8, 1942, I proposed on the floor of the Senate that we adopt a tax measure, taxing all excess profits 100 percent. That was not done. When we get into the fever of war again it will not be done. The only time it will be done, if it is ever done, is when we are not in war and can calmly consider questions of this nature, as we now have the opportunity to do.

As I stated last night, the only excuse that has ever been given to me for not adopting this amendment and establishing an excess war profits tax is that it would delay the drafting of the boys. That is not a reason, Mr. President. That is an excuse. Why have we not the time to enact such a tax bill? Are not Senators and Representatives on the public pay roll? Do we not have the remainder of this year to enact legislation? Is there any reason why we should adjourn and go home, still drawing our salaries, and leave this legislation unenacted? We are paid for enacting legislation. We have plenty of time to do it, and there is no reason on earth why we should not at the present time draft the war profits at the same time we draft the boys.

Last night about midnight I promised to give some statistics showing the huge profits made by some corporations during the last war. I gave some statistics then, but did not have enough time, due to the lateness of the hour, to give all I had before me at that time. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks today there be printed an article entitled "Who Made the Money in This War?" by former Representative John M. Coffee, of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also wish to have printed at the conclusion of my present speech an article which I received this morning, printed in a monthly letter published by the National City Bank of New York in June of this year. The article is entitled "The 100 Largest Manufacturing Corporations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed as requested.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the article to which I refer, which will be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, gives the record of sales and net income and other information about the 100 largest manufacturing corporations. It is interesting to note that in 1940, just before the war started, the net worth of those 100 largest manufacturing corporations was $18,701,000,000. After paying taxes, dividends, and all expenses, the net worth of those 100 largest manufacturing corporations increased to $42,584,000,000.

If my amendment had been in effect at that time, approximately $23,883,000,000 would have accrued to the benefit of reducing our public debt through taxation, and the corporations would still have their facilities. They would still have made normal profits. They still would have paid normal peacetime dividends. In addition, the increase in value of the assets of those corporations

was estimated to be $16,500,000,000. Mr. President, these 100 largest corporations represent only a relatively small percentage of the business done in America. My proposal would apply to all corporations and individuals making profits during the emergency which necessitates drafting boys into the armed forces, in excess of profits made preceding the emergency.

Mr. President, I wish to place no brakes on business. I do not in any way criticize businessmen for making profits. They made those profits legitimately, and they are entitled to them. But if at the beginning of World War II we had adopted a 100-percent excess profits tax, we would not have had runaway prices, because merchants would not have charged exorbitant prices to housewives and others simply to make excess profits which they would have to pass on to the Government. Prices would have remained normal. They would not have advanced as much as they did. Inflation would have been retarded and we would have needed no price controls and in addition, we would not have had the colossal $250,000,000,000 debt which is on the shoulders of the citizens of this Nation at the present time. No; I do not desire to destroy the profit system, Mr. President, I desire to keep the profit system. But I say that when we enter into an emergency which requires calling the youth of this Nation from the schools, to go into the Army, and perhaps to die there, that is a serious emergency, and no one should expect to make more than the normal profits which otherwise would be made.

Mr. President, my proposal is a very conservative one. There is nothing at all radical about it. I would say it is approved by 95 percent of the thinking people of the United States. It is one on which I have heard other Senators and other public officials express their approval and say it should be done. But as Mark Twain said about the weather, everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it. Here we have an opportunity in the Senate and in the Congress to do something about this matter.

Mr. President, I have said that I believe in retaining the profit system. In the monthly news letter of the National City Bank of New York, there is an interesting article entitled "What! The Profit Motive!" I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the article quotes from the New York Herald Tribune of May 24, in which appeared a dispatch from that newspaper's Moscow Bureau. I read the dispatch:

Moscow, May 23.—Following a recent warning against factories operating at a loss, it was reported today that a number of Soviet plants are now earning impressive profits.

For the first 4 months of 1948 the Stalin automobile plant made 11,000,000 rubles profit. The first state ballbearing plant earned 8,000,000 rubles, and the Electrostal plant nearly 4,000,000 rubles.

These profits were listed in the Agitators Handbook, which is issued to Communist agitators and propagandists to guide them in their work. Communist agitators are now able to use this material in other factories to strive for profits.

So, Mr. President, our great American system of private enterprise and profit incentive, which have made this country great, but which have been opposed and criticized by the communistic country of Soviet Russia, are now being embraced, at least in part, by Russia, according to this article. The very philosophy we have practiced in the United States for 160 years is now being followed, at least in part, by Soviet Russia, for Russia is permitting its plants and other industries to make profits, instead of operating at a loss. Of course the plants in Russia are operated by the Government, which means a system considerably different from ours, nevertheless according to this dispatch we are now told that the profit incentive system in state-owned factories has now been adopted in Russia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Then, Mr. President, I close by saying that I hope my amendment will be adopted.

EXHIBIT A

WHO MADE THE MONEY IN THIS WAR?

(By Representative John M. Coffee)

When the full bill for participation in the war is presented to the American people, it is expected to total $336,000,000,000. That is almost 11 times the cost of World War I. It is the equivalent of taking $2,551 from the pocket of every man, woman, and child in this country.

That, in dollars and cents, is the price we have paid for victory. It does not take into account the cost in human lives—259,637 killed, 35,328 missing, 651,934 wounded. It does not include the suffering, the sacrifice, and ultimate waste of war.

There is another side to the ledger, the credit side. For there are those in the United States, as in other countries, who have made an enormous profit from the war.

In the years that preceded World War II a series of congressional investigations uncovered startling evidence of World War I profiteering. Public opinion was shocked and outraged, even though only a meager trickle of the sordid details ever reached it. Evidence was produced, for example, that—

British, French, German, and American industrialists made a profit from every soldier killed on either side.

Four years of war profits created 22,000 new millionaires in this country.

During the 4 war years—1915–18—United States industry made a profit, after taxes, of $28,500,000,000. Net earnings of United States corporations in those 4 years were as high as in the preceding 10 years.

By 1926, according to a Federal Trade Commission report, 59 percent of the Nation's material was in the hands of 1 percent of the population; 31 percent was owned by 12 percent of the people; the vast majority (87 percent) owned less than 10 percent of the Nation's wealth.

About 30 percent of the national wealth was owned by corporations. Some 70 percent of all corporate stock was owned by only 1 percent of the stockholders.

Thus, as the Nation increased in wealth, its people as a whole became poorer. More economic power passed into the hands of fewer men. War had accelerated this process.

Just after Pearl Harbor the late President Roosevelt pledged that there would be no profiteering from this war. It was precisely to prevent the excesses of World War I that Congress imposed heavy war taxes (in some cases four times the prewar level) and applied a surplus-profits tax to all corporate earnings.

The extent to which this noble purpose was fulfilled has just been revealed in separate studies made by Government and private agencies. Here are some of their conclusions:

Net profits (about $56,000,000,000) made by United States corporations during World War II, far exceeded those recorded in any similar period in history.

During this war the number of billion-dollar companies in the United States increased by 11, making a total of 43.

Despite high war and excess-profits taxes, net profits after taxes of industry (1940–45) averaged 250 percent above prewar levels.

Since Pearl Harbor (1942–45) profits after taxes averaged 300 percent above prewar levels.

But even this picture is not complete, because it is an over-all picture. It includes all corporations, large and small alike, and many of the small ones went out of business during the war years or only just broke even. This means that if we consider only those corporations and industries which recorded a profit, the size of their earnings will stagger us even more.

Take a look at these percentage increases in 1944 earnings, compiled by the OPA. Compare with average prewar (1936–39) earnings in the same industries.

	Percent
Motor-vehicle parts	896
Iron, steel, and byproducts	252
Lumber and timber byproducts	1,064
Electrical machinery	434
Communications equipment	521
Industrial electrical equipment	399
Other electrical products	772
Nonelectrical machinery	360
Engines and turbines	2,431
Transportation equipment	658
Aircraft and parts	1,686
Railroad equipment	318
Food and kindred products	150
Meat products	271
Apparel	280
Textile-mill products	522
Petroleum and coal products	159
Rubber products	698
Bituminous and other soft coal	1,148

And here is how the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program summed up the situation:

"The Planning Division of the War Production Board has estimated that net profits, after renegotiation and taxes, of the war industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, and rubber) for the four war years will be about $16,000,000,000. Since the proportion of civilian business in these industries had been very small, almost all these profits may be regarded as coming from Government business. Such profits are about twice the prewar average of such industries."

The Senate committee also investigated the relative earnings of the 100 United States corporations which had the largest volume of war business. They discovered that, after all deductions for wartime taxes in 1942, 3 companies made more than 10 times their average prewar net profit; 19 earned more than 3 times prewar profits; 24 others between 1 and 3 times normal profits. Of the remainder, 12 companies which had shown average deficits during the prewar base period, earned in 1942 a net profit of between one and eighteen million dollars.

Many of us have criticized organized labor for striking in wartime and believe even now that labor demands for increased wages are unreasonable. Unions have been accused of being unpatriotic. But let's look at their side of the picture.

The cost of living, as every housewife knows, has gone up tremendously during the war years. A large part of the increased wages has gone simply to pay for that inflation. The unions, according to their own research bureaus and the evidence of Gov-

ernment agencies, know that the corporations have been making these fantastic profits.

A study, called Five Years of War Profits, published by the Research Bureau of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO), reveals further facts on the earnings of big corporations. It may be assumed that the unions base their decisions to strike or not to strike on these revelations. The study claims that 200 great steel corporations earned more than $2,000,000,000 in open and concealed profits during the war. From 1940 to 1945 the industry averaged a profit, after taxes of $245,000,000 per year. Total reported profits in the steel industry, after taxes, for comparative periods are:

1936–39	$576,000,000
1940–44	$1,225,000,000
Increase (percent)	113

The United Auto Workers Union has released a study of 26 aircraft companies and their earnings during comparative years. The percentage increase in this industry is even more staggering.

1936–39	$20,554,274
1941–44	$173,598,422
Increase (percent)	745

If you have ever wondered how to make ends meet after you've paid your taxes, and how an extra few dollars a week would help that household budget, you'll be interested in these statistics on some of the aircraft industries. All these are profits after taxes and include postwar and contingency reserves.

	1936–39 average	1941–44 average	Percent increase
Bell Aircraft	$32,493	$3,845,404	11,743
Bellanca Aircraft	6,153	323,336	5,155
Bendix Aviation	2,480,661	17,883,326	621
Boeing Airplane	−840,038	7,294,040	
Consolidated Vultee	823,702	16,957,763	1,959
Curtiss-Wright	2,954,566	[1]25,351,791	758
Glenn L. Martin	2,083,787	13,569,776	551
Wright Aeronautical	2,544,172	[1]11,517,484	353

[1] Average for 3 years.

While making these profits, however, most companies were not generous with their stockholders. Dividend payments have by no means kept pace with the sharp advance in net profits. If they had, distribution of wealth would have been a little wider. The fact is that corporations paid out a much smaller proportion of their profits in dividends during the war than ever before. Prior to 1940, dividend payments were often two-thirds of net profits; since then they have averaged less than half. While the net income of incorporated business increased 134 percent between 1939 and 1944, dividends in the same period increased only 18 percent.

Reason? The conservative financial magazine Business Week of August 11, 1945, attributes it to the belief that high dividends at a time when war business alone was furnishing most corporate profits would invite public criticism.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that management had at its disposal a working capital 88 percent greater than in 1938. The figure in dollars had jumped from twenty-five billion in 1939 to forty-seven billion in 1945. One result was that corporations had to raise very little new capital for wartime expansion. At the same time, losses in enemy countries were written off or provided for through reserves. Investment in new plants was kept below depreciation charges, written off against taxes, charged to current operating expenses, or financed directly by the Federal Government.

And thus corporations have piled up $31,000,000,000 in undistributed profits and reserves during the war. They have also paid off a billion dollars in long-term debts.

A break-down of assets in the 200 great steel companies, as published by the United Steelworkers of America, further clarifies the situation.

	January 1940	January 1945	Increase
			Percent
Total assets	$4,860,000,000	$6,000,000,000	22
Dividend payments	419,000,000	765,000,000	82
Working capital	1,200,000,000	2,000,000,000	68
General reserves	103,000,000	395,000,000	288
Undistributed profits	585,000,000	1,000,000,000	81
Total financial resources	689,000,000	1,600,000,000	131
Funded debt	903,000,000	652,000,000	−28
Excess working capital over funded debt	308,000,000	1,393,000,000	363

The above figures give you a picture of the steel industry only. Others, of course, have fared as well. The 11 corporations that graduated into the billionaire class during the war make a total of 43 companies with assets of more than a billion dollars. Forty-third on this list is the Ford Motor Co., with total assets of a mere $1,021,325,159. But Ford is exclusively a family holding, while the others are owned by numerous stockholders.

According to a United Press survey, some of the giants and their assets are:

Metropolitan Life, almost $7,000,000,000.

Bell Telephone, more than $6,000,000,000.

Prudential, more than $5,000,000,000.

Chase National Bank, more than $5,000,000,000.

Pennsylvania Railroad, almost $3,000,000,000.

Standard Oil of New Jersey, $2,400,000,000.

General Motors, $2,100,000,000.

American industry enters the postwar world with a greatly expanded plan and with tools and equipment far surpassing anything it had in the past. According to a report issued by the War Production Board, more than $25,000,000,000 worth of new plants and equipment were added to the industrial capacity in this country between 1940 and 1944. The Government contributed directly more than two-thirds of the total investment involved.

At the end of 1939 there were 934,000 machine tools in place in this country; by 1944 the number had risen to 1,400,000, an increase of nearly 50 percent. General Motors had 75,000 machine tools in 1940; in October 1943 it reported 143,774 machine tools in place.

Even after industry has financed its own transition to a peacetime production, equal at least to the prewar level of 1941, it will have on hand a fund, estimated by United States Department of Commerce economists in 1944 as between ten and twenty billion dollars left over for plant and other expansion.

It will also get from the Government a flat 10-percent rebate on wartime payments of excess-profits tax as a sort of severance pay to compensate it for the cessation of war contracts. This sum alone amounts to about $2,840,000,000, and is equal to more than half the total net corporate earnings in the banner year of 1937.

In addition, under the carry-back and carry-forward provisions of the excess-profits tax, United States corporations have accumulated with the Government a sort of unemployment insurance. Should the profits of any company in the next 10 years drop below its so-called normal profit level, it is entitled to a cash refund from the United States Treasury to make good these losses. That refund cannot be greater than the total income and excess-profits tax paid during the war. Theoretically, industry has thus a reserve fund of $62,000,000,000 to offset reconversion losses.

The steel companies, for example, face reconversion with savings (net working capital) of $2,000,000,000. Their flat 10 percent rebate from the Treasury will amount to about $200,000,000 more. If they fail to show a cent of profit in 1946, the Treasury must give them a rebate of $149,000,000. This last rebate guarantees them 29 percent more profits than they averaged during the years of peace.

Nowhere in the world, in any period of history, have comparable material gains been registered by industry. The war presumably has wiped out German and Japanese industry. Principal industries in Allied countries have suffered so heavily that it will take them a decade or more to regain even prewar production.

American business today is in the position of completely dominating world trade. It has become so strongly entrenched through its war profits that for many years it need fear no real competition anywhere on the globe.

Congress has not yet passed a comprehensive full-employment bill for the American people. But the tax-reduction bill has been rushed through in record time. Principal provision of this bill eliminates the excess-profits tax as of January 1, 1946. The total cut in taxes is almost $6,000,000,000, apportioned as follows between individuals and corporations:

Individuals	$2,784,000,000
Corporations	3,136,000,000

The reduction in individual income taxes is overwhelmingly in favor of the larger income groups. The little man gets $1 a year more to spend; the millionaire gets $44,218 more.

The 900 largest corporations in this country will get a tax reduction averaging $2,000,000 each in 1946. This amounts to a benefit twice that of the rest of the 18,000 corporations which have admitted excess profits. There is no gain whatever for the 261,000 smaller corporations that were never able to report excess profits.

At the same time it was revealed that the deficit in the national budget for 1946 is estimated at $30,000,000,000.

All this, then, must go into the balance in which we weigh our victory. On one side we have the total cost of war: $336,000,000,000 in cash, plus the dead, the wounded, the missing; on the other the outright profits made by large corporations—some $56,000,000,000 in cash, plus the power to dominate the lives of our people and the peoples of the world.

EXHIBIT B

THE 100 LARGEST MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS

With a view to giving some general idea of the difference between the balance-sheet valuation of fixed assets and present-day replacement costs, an analysis has been made of the statements of the 100 largest manufacturing corporations, measured by the total assets reported at the end of the 1947 calendar or nearest fiscal year, as given in the accompanying list. There are, of course, other ways of measuring size, such as total volume of sales, capital funds, number of employees, etc.

100 largest manufacturing corporations, based on total assets reported at the end of 1947

[In millions of dollars]

Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	575
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co	202
Aluminum Co. of America	430
American Can Co	250
American Cyanamid Co	207
American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp	153
American Smelting & Refining Co	256
American Sugar Refining Co	133

100 largest manufacturing corporations, based on total assets reported at the end of 1947— Continued

[In millions of dollars]

American Tobacco Co	647
American Viscose Corp	201
American Woolen Co	118
Anaconda Copper Mining Co	637
Armco Steel Corp	249
Armour & Co	421
Atlantic Refining Co	330
Bendix Aviation Corp	123
Bethlehem Steel Corp	949
Borden Co	222
Borg-Warner Corp	151
Burlington Mills Corp	125
Caterpillar Tractor Co	122
Celanese Corp. of America	212
Chrysler Corp	487
Cities Service Co	900
Coca-Cola Co	192
Continental Can Co	207
Continental Oil Co	209
Corn Products Refining Co	146
Crane Co	129
Curtiss-Wright Corp	166
Deere & Co	229
Distillers Corp.-Seagrams	267
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co	1,438
Eastman Kodak Co	360
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	324
General American Transportation Corp.	132
General Electric Co	1,027
General Foods Corp	207
General Motors Corp	2,473
B. F. Goodrich Co	247
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co	408
Gulf Oil Corp	929
Hearst Consolidated Publications	161
Inland Steel Co	244
International Business Machines Corp.	184
International Harvester Co	620
International Paper Co	279
Johns-Manville Corp	115
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	341
Kennecott Copper Corp	541
Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co	366
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp	116
Monsanto Chemical Co	199
Nash-Kelvinator Corp	138
National Biscuit Co	154
National Dairy Products Corp	277
National Distillers Products Corp	210
National Lead Co	163
National Steel Corp	292
Ohio Oil Co	164
Owens-Illinois Glass Co	162
Phelps Dodge Corp	251
Phillips Petroleum Co	439
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co	207
Procter & Gamble Co	242
Pullman, Inc	197
Pure Oil Co	245
Radio Corp. of America	216
Republic Steel Corp	455
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co	458
Reynolds Metals Co	112
St. Regis Paper Co	133
Schenley Distillers Corp	318
Shell Union Oil Corp	534
Sinclair Oil Corp	591
Skelly Oil Co	129
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	1,262
Standard Brands, Inc	135
Standard Oil Co. of California	876
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	1,268
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	2,996
Standard Oil Co. of Ohio	189
Sun Oil Co	242
Swift & Co	437
Texas Co	1,115
Tide Water Associated Oil Co	263
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp	649
Union Oil Co. of California	272
United Aircraft Corp	160
United Fruit Co	419
United States Gypsum Co	132
United States Rubber Co	348
United States Steel Corp	2,163
Walker-Gooderham & Worts	134
Western Electric Co	771
Westinghouse Electric Corp	602
Weyerhaeuser Timber Co	195
Wheeling Steel Corp	158
Wilson & Co	140
Youngstown Sheet & Tube	260

The above list excludes a number of large companies whose statements are not yet available for the 1947 calendar or nearest fiscal year, or for the years going back to 1940, including American Car & Foundry Co., Crown Zellerbach Corp., Dow Chemical Co., Ford Motor Co., General Mills, Inc., Philip Morris & Co., Ltd., Publicker Industries, Inc., Remington Rand, Inc., Singer Manufacturing Co., and J. P. Stevens & Co.

These companies, which include the largest organizations in numerous major industries, had total assets aggregating $41,600,000,000 at the end of 1947 and comprise a substantial portion of the total production and employment of all manufacturing corporations. Their total number of employees in 1947, based upon the year-end or annual averages, approximated 4,000,000. This represented an average investment in assets of $10,000 per employee. The capital stock was owned by more than 5,000,000 registered shareholders, a considerably larger number than the total of employees. While the total number of shareholders of the group includes duplications to the extent that many individual and institutional shareholders own stock in more than one of these companies, many a registered shareholder is a financial institution or nominee holding in trust stock for numerous beneficiaries.

Although no means are available for an accurate estimate of how present-day costs of plant and equipment of a large group of companies such as this compare with the book values at which they are carried on the balance sheets, an adjustment of the latter figures by changes in the index of industrial building costs compiled by the Engineering News-Record should afford a useful approximation.

This widely used index, based upon labor and material costs, obviously would not measure accurately the change in costs of all the diversified assets used in all types of industries represented. Book valuations of fixed assets vary also with the dates, in some cases running back many years, at which they were originally acquired, as well as the rates at which they have been amortized. Valuations often are affected by adjustments in connection with purchase and sale of plants, disposal of Government war surplus, reappraisals, recapitalizations, reorganizations, and mergers. Corresponding reductions in capital and surplus account of many companies have resulted from writing down fixed assets as well as intangibles.

The Engineering News-Record and similar indexes, however, trace the rising trend of costs, and the effect if all fixed assets should be replaced at prevailing prices. They indicate the competitive conditions under which a new company would start in business.

100 largest manufacturing corporations

[In millions of dollars]

Sales and net income	1940	1945	1947
Total sales and revenues	20,600	39,900	50,600
Net income after taxes	1,875	1,943	3,730
Dividends (preferred and common) paid	1,197	1,208	1,668
Net income per sales dollar—cents	9.1	4.9	7.4
Dividends paid per sales dollar—cents	5.8	3.0	3.3

100 largest manufacturing corporations— Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Sales and net income	1940	1945	1947
Plant and equipment, net worth, and rate of return, based upon reported balance-sheet book values of plant and equipment:			
Plant and equipment, 1940 total	24,448	24,448	24,448
Additions, 1941–45	----	3,748	3,748
Additions, 1946–47	----	----	6,225
Total to date	24,448	28,196	34,421
Less: Reserve for depreciation	11,701	16,145	17,745
Net total to date	12,747	12,051	16,676
Net worth end of year	18,701	22,227	26,093
Rate of return—net income to net worth—percent	10.0	8.7	14.3
Plant and equipment, net worth, and rate of return, adjusted to approximate replacement costs of plant and equipment: [1]			
Plant and equipment, 1940 total	24,448	28,440	38,386
Additions, 1941–45	----	3,990	5,386
Additions, 1946–47	----	----	7,140
Total to date	24,448	32,430	50,912
Less: Reserve for depreciation	11,701	16,145	17,745
Net total to date	12,747	16,285	33,167
Net worth end of year	18,701	26,461	42,584
Rate of return—net income to net worth—percent	10.0	7.3	8.8

[1] Plant and equipment adjusted by changes since 1940 in the Engineering News-Record Index of Building Costs (1913=100) from 208.2 in December 1940 to 242.2 in December 1945 and to 326.9 in December 1947, applied to the total plant and equipment in December 1940, plus the additions during 1941–45 at an assumed average cost of 227.5, plus the additions during 1946–47 at an assumed average cost of 285.0.

Total sales and other revenues of these companies, including estimated or preliminary figures for a few companies on which complete operating details are not available, increased from approximately $20,600,000,000 in 1940 to $39,000,000,000 in 1945 and $50,600,000,000 in 1947.

Net income after taxes totaled approximately $1,900,000,000 in both 1940 and 1945, but rose sharply to $3,700,000,000 in 1947. The average margin of profit, which together with return on net worth is the most widely used measure of earnings, declined from 9.1 cents per dollar of sales in 1940 to 4.9 cents in 1945, and rose to 7.4 cents in 1947. As pointed out earlier this year when presenting our annual tabulations of corporate earnings, the large dollar total of net income last year was due chiefly to the enormous expansion in volume of business and not to an unusual widening of profit margins, which in most cases (with some important exceptions) were actually narrower than in former years of active business.

Upon the book net worth totaling $26,100,000,000 at the end of 1947, the net income represented an average return of 14.3 percent, compared with 8.7 in 1945 and 10.0 in 1940. In this comparison, however, the kinds of dollars are different—net income is expressed in current dollars, but net worth is based largely on prewar dollars of much greater purchasing power.

If plant and equipment, carried at $34,400,000,000 (before depreciation) at the end of 1947, had been adjusted to 1947 costs, by applying the changes since 1940 in the general index of building costs, the valuation would be lifted by $16,500,000,000 to $50,900,000,000 and book net worth would be lifted by an equal amount. Upon this enlarged base, the reported net income in 1947 represents an average return of 8.8 percent, actually lower than in 1940. The apparent gain arises from the undervaluation of assets.

EARNINGS AND NEW CAPITAL

It should be emphasized that this attempt to adjust for changes in replacement costs should not be taken too literally, but is illustrative of the upward price trends and the problems they have created. This matter of replacement costs is but one of the many factors to be considered in judging earnings. It is not an argument for companies to write up the book value of their assets to current costs as a new basis for computing earnings, since no one knows what the trend of prices may be in the future or at what dates the various assets will have to be replaced. By the same token, however, there is an obvious danger in ignoring replacement costs in determining wage rates and pricing policies.

The 1947 earnings of many companies have been criticized, in some quarters, as excessive; yet often the same companies, having made vast expenditures from their own and borrowed money for expansion of plant capacity, have been criticized, in the same quarters, for not spending still more in order to meet the apparently insatiable domestic and foreign demand for their products, and also for not increasing wage rates further. The retained earnings of prior years, though designated on the balance sheet as "surplus" are not in the form of cash but already have been invested in fixed and working assets.

For this group of large corporations, the payments of wages and salaries have in fact increased much more proportionately than have dividends paid to the shareholders owning the business. Total pay rolls in 1940 approximated $5,500,000,000 and were about 4½ times the dividend payments, while by 1947 total pay rolls had expanded to $12,600,000,000 and were 7½ times dividends.

Average annual compensation per employee rose from $1,800 in 1940 to $3,100 in 1947, an increase of 72 percent, which was more than the rise during the same period in the Bureau of Labor index of consumer prices, amounting to 59 percent.

As the dollar total of dividend payments increased only 39 percent from 1940 to 1947, despite an increase of the same percentage in shareholders' equity from retained earnings and new stock issues, the shareholders as a group lost ground in terms of the purchasing power of their income.

If business is to continue its long-term growth trend, to produce more goods at reasonable prices for the American people and to provide more jobs at high wages, then good earnings are essential to build and attract the new capital needed. Business is being called on to raise capital for financing the expansion of facilities for increased output of steel, greater petroleum production and refining, growth of public utilities, mechanization of coal mines, supermarkets to lower food-distribution costs, and so on.

Under present conditions, retained earnings are relied upon as the chief source of new capital. Sale of new preferred or common stock is limited by a generally unreceptive market for new equity securities. Borrowing has the effect of increasing the debt ratio, and if carried too far runs against the credit-control policies of the monetary authorities. Even if funds are raised in part from these alternative sources, the maintenance of good earnings is still required to justify the loan or investment.

EXHIBIT C

WHAT! THE PROFIT MOTIVE!

In the New York Herald Tribune of May 24 there appears the following dispatch from that newspaper's Moscow bureau:

"Moscow, May 23.—Following a recent warning against factories operating at a loss, it was reported today that a number of Soviet plants are now earning impressive profits.

"For the first 4 months of 1948 the Stalin automobile plant made 11,000,000 rubles profit. The first state ball-bearing plant earned 8,000,000 rubles and the Electrostal plant nearly 4,000,000 rubles.

"These profits were listed in the Agitators Handbook, which is issued to Communist agitators and propagandists to guide them in their work. Communist agitators are now able to use this material in other factories to strive for profits."

What heresy is this, in the country that—we are told—has abolished the profit motive and where production for use and not for profit is supposedly the guiding incentive Yet here an official organ of the Soviet Government annnounces with evident satisfaction that, following warnings, certain Soviet plants that previously operated at a loss are now reporting impressive profits. What is more, these examples are to be used to incite other factories to strive for profits.

This all seems very confusing in view of what we have had dinned into our ears from collectivist sources as to the iniquities of profits. Apparently the profit motive and production for profit are not so easily dispensed with as Socialist and Communist literature would have us believe.

To be sure, profits under the collectivist system go to the state, and under the capitalist system to those individuals whose enterprise, capacity, and savings have created the industries. But the fact is, as the above quotation only goes to show, that profits there must be, whether the regime be capitalist or Communist, if capital is to be had for progress and development, unless industry is financed by forced labor or by taxes upon the people. While the Soviet Goverment continues to exploit both these latter sources, the drive for profits is recognition that even state-owned enterprises must make money if they are not to be a drag on the economy. As regards individual incentives, the Soviets early in the game discovered the need for providing the inducement of personal gain to stimulate effort, as demonstrated by the widespread use of production-bonus systems among the workers and the great disparity in incomes between those in responsible positions and the mass of the people.

Though the Socialists make great play of the fact that profits under socialism accrue to the public authorities rather than remain in private hands, the really important thing is not who gets the profits in the first instance, but rather the relative success of the two systems in producing and distributing an abundance and variety of goods and services which the mass of the people can use and which contributes to advancing their material welfare. By this test free-enterprise capitalism wins in a walk over any other system the world has ever known.

To most Americans there will appear a still more vital consideration—the preservation under our system of the freedom and dignity of the individual as guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky has 12 minutes.

The Senator from South Dakota has 15 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes at the present time, and I may have to use the other 2 minutes. But for the moment I shall attempt to limit myself to 10 minutes, and I hope I shall be able to stay within that limitation in saying what I have to say.

Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss the pending amendment, other than to say I shall vote against it, because I do not believe it is practicable at this stage of our military situation, when we are required to draw men into the Army in order to bring it up to its requirements. We cannot consider ourselves in a state of war, to the extent that the drafting of industry and profits would be justified. If we were actually in war, there might be a different approach to the subject, but I do not wish to go into that matter now. I shall content myself with merely stating that I shall vote against the amendment.

I shall vote for the motion entered by the Senator from Pennsylvania to reconsider the vote by which the Kem amendment, so-called, was adopted yesterday. I recognize that there may be need for a modification and revision of our courts-martial procedure, but at the same time I think the subject is so complex and important that a committee—the Committee on Armed Services—should give it detailed and careful consideration. I do not believe we are justified in accepting a bill drawn by or sponsored by the American Bar Association, regardless of however much respect I have for that association and for its sincerity. I have no doubt that the association itself did not consider that the Senate would adopt its proposal without giving it more discussion and consideration regarding its effect than could be possible during the hasty consideration of the amendment on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I shall vote to reconsider the vote on the amendment; and if the vote on the amendment is reconsidered, I shall vote against the amendment, as I did yesterday on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am supporting the pending legislation. I confess that I am not happy over it, because I am unhappy over the world situation which apparently makes the enactment of this proposed legislation necessary.

All of us are familiar with what has happened in the world during the past 3 years since the end of the war or the end of the fighting in the war, which technically has not yet ended, of course. All of us are familiar with the requirements—unprecedented, in a way, in time of peace—because of the unsettled conditions in the world and our obligations in regard to those unsettled conditions. There is always an aftermath of a war. There is no way by which the human mind can predict the course of history following a great upheaval, such as was involved in World War II. All of us shouted with joy at the end of hostilities, at the creation of the United Nations, and at all the efforts of the nations, apparently in good faith, to bring about the settlement of international disputes and controversies by peaceful means, without war or the threat of war. In view of that optimistic and hopeful situation, probably we were too precipitate in demobilizing our own forces. But we, along with all the other tired and weary, war-worn peoples of the world, welcomed any opportunity to bring back our boys from wherever they were, in the solemn belief that never again within our generation would it be necessary to engage in military conflict.

But, Mr. President, our hopes have been disappointed. Peace has not come

to the world, although I hope it will ultimately come; and I believe that with a proper amount of tolerance and understanding and patience on the part of all governments and all peoples, we can ultimately iron out our differences, level off the frictions that beset mankind, and enter upon a period of peace. We have not entered upon it yet.

I am not voting for the pending legislation merely because I believe a war is imminent between us and any other nation. Nobody can ever predict whether war is immediately imminent or not. When nations are tense and there is friction and not only governments but their peoples are to some extent standing on tiptoe or sitting on the edges of their seats, anxious about what may happen in the immediate future, it is always possible that some episode or some incident may, without being heralded, bring on hostilities and war. I should most profoundly regret any such episode or incident that might unexpectedly, because of the tension and friction, bring on overnight conflict. We cannot overlook the possibility of such things; we cannot steel ourselves against the obligation we would incur if such a situation should develop.

I am not voting for the bill merely because I think we may have war in the immediate future. I profoundly hope we shall not have it in the immediate future or in the distant future. But I am not willing to avoid it or to seem to avoid it merely because of the fear of it, or in such a way as to give any indications to any possible enemy of ours that under no circumstances would be willing to assert our rights and our position, and protect and defend them under all conditions.

I am voting for the pending legislation in the main because I believe it is necessary in order to bring our armed services up to the required strength for present purposes without regard to the possibility of armed conflict. There are now needed in the Army to bring it up to requirements approximately 350,000 new men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 10 minutes is up. He has 2 minutes more at his disposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the shortest 10 minutes I ever had, but I realize that time flies.

We need to have for the Army 350,000 men in order to bring it up to the required standards fixed by Congress, and there will be 554,000 men who will be discharged, whose places must be filled in order to keep our armed forces up to the requirement. That makes 903,000 men that, during the remainder of 1948 and the year of 1949, we must bring into the Army of the United States or into the armed services.

We have, I think, been rather generous in our attitude of waiting to see if they could be obtained by voluntary enlistments. They have not been obtained. In my judgment they will not be obtained. Therefore we cannot wait, we cannot stand back and halt and incur the justified criticism of the American people if we fail to do our duty at this time. We in Washington are in the habit of consulting our fears. But my contact with the American people from one end of the land to the other has convinced me, as I have often said here, that in the matter of maintaining our institutions, maintaining our strength, and being ready for any emergency, the American people are on the whole and on the average about 6 months ahead of the Congress of the United States. I think they are about that far ahead of us now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, first; after which I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to reiterate briefly what the Senator from Kentucky has said with respect to his conception of the real import of this bill. It strikes me, Mr. President, there has been too much war talk in connection with the debates that have been held upon this measure. It is my understanding that the primary and basic reason for the enactment of a measure of this character is to bring up our peacetime Army, Navy, and Air Force to a point where we can safely take care of our own national obligations as well as to insure that we do not default in the international commitments we have made.

It is a certainty, Mr. President, that we are not going to bring our troops out of Germany; it is a certainty we are not going to bring those doing police duty out of Japan, or any other place until we know definitely that those conquered countries are able to take care of themselves without the possibility of an aggressor challenging us again, such as that which caused us to enter the late world war.

That, to me, is the basic reason for this enactment of the pending measure. We have tried with the most favorable legislation to bring into the Army recruits through the volunteer system. That has failed, primarily because 61,000,000 people are employed at the present time in this country. So long as people are gainfully employed, it will be difficult for us to obtain recruits through the volunteer system into the United States Army, even though our Army is the highest paid in all the history of time.

Mr. President, if the volunteers come in as a result of the enactment of the pending bill, or through any other cause, we may ultimately be able to do away with the draft measure, but for the immediate future, our security, safety, and our honor depend upon military manpower. I shall support this bill; however, I repeat what I said before, this is not a war measure, it is a peacetime measure, nothing else.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, at this time, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and myself, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, to be considered at the proper time and in the proper order, under the rule. I understand it may be offered now and sent to the desk, and that it will be called up in its proper order when we reach the hour of 3 o'clock and begin the consideration of pending amendments.

I may say that the amendment simply does this, Mr. President: It meets the great objections made about which I spoke earlier today of the Army's raising the classification test, of the Army's destroying utterly the enlistment system through that. I can best explain the amendment by reading it. It is brief. On page 66, it is proposed to strike out line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 20. The foregoing provisions of this act shall not become effective before the expiration of 6 months after the date of enactment thereof during which time diligent efforts shall be made to obtain voluntary enlistments to meet the personnel needs of the armed forces, and in determining the eligibility of enlistees in the Army the classification test shall not exceed 59; and the voluntary enlistment period shall be for not less than 2 years. If upon the expiration of such 6 months the President determines that the needs have been met by voluntary enlistments this act shall not become effective.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I requested time in which to make a brief statement regarding any further extension of this legislation or any further compulsory military training program in the event that the President of the United States, or any future President, should seek to impose upon the armed services the views of the miscalled Civil Rights Committee by Executive order. I was unable to obtain the necessary time, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that a brief statement outlining my views on the question be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have resolved the grave doubts which I have entertained about this bill in favor of supporting it. It is not an altogether satisfactory measure. It would be wiser even now to also adopt a plan for universal military training. I do not believe that the people of this country can or will endure for any considerable time the burden of a military budget of $20,000,000,000 each year. We are to pay a frightful price for our failure to enact a universal military training program 3 years ago.

Not only is this bill very expensive in monetary cost but in the 2-year toll it will take from the lives of many young men. The universal military training program of 6 months' active duty and proper requirements for reserve training would have been infinitely cheaper in dollars as well as in interrupted lives.

This bill is better than nothing. It gives us a large Regular Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, but at the staggering cost of nearly $3,600 per year for each man in

service. Those who have refused to consider a UMT bill and those who prevent it from being included in this measure face a fearful responsibility.

My reluctance to support this bill is due to its lack of any safeguards for the simple and fundamental rights of the men to be inducted. It is unnecessary to say again that I am unalterably opposed to the threatened executive action to abolish any form of segregation in the armed services. If the 5-year life of this measure had not been reduced to 2 years I would have opposed its passage. I could not take the risk of having either the present Executive or most of those who seek to succeed him in the Presidency yield to the threats and demands of the Randolphs and Walter Whites and other representatives of minority groups that he issue an order for the abolition of any distinction between the races in the units comprising the armed services. The fact that this bill has only a 2-year life should cause any President to pause before taking such drastic action. This is undoubtedly true if whoever occupies the White House is at all sincere in his belief that a selective service law is necessary. They may well consider whether an extension of this legislation can be secured without the support of Senators who are opposed to the complete intermingling of the races in the armed services.

Mr. President, the people of the part of this Nation from which I come cannot tolerate the program for the armed services blueprinted in the report of the President's commission on civil rights. We of the South have learned through bitter experience to expect nothing but abuse and ridicule from the rest of the country. We know that Southerners in public life are dubbed "Claghorns." Reformers and politicians outside the South have unusual programs for reforming our lives and social order. They wax bitter when we do not welcome their unsought advice. The alleged intellectuals sneeringly refer to the Southern States as the Bible belt. I know insult is intended, but I have always accepted this as a compliment.

But, Mr. President, there is one thing of which we of the South may well be proud. No critic, however vicious and false his abuse, has ever questioned the courage and fighting power of the southern white man in our armed forces. No one has ever questioned our readiness or our ability to defend our common country. I am proud of the record of the soldiers of the South in every war in which we have ever been engaged. I am proud of their devotion to duty and their acceptance of discipline. I do not propose meekly to acquiesce in having intolerable conditions thrust upon them which will cause them to mar the record of their patriotic service.

I know that in an unsegregated Army the scapegoat of every racial clash will be a southern white boy. We have seen in the past where cowardly liars have even undertaken to blame the South and southern people for racial clashes or race riots occurring in cities far above the line of Mason-Dixon.

I believe in a strong national defense. I and most southern Senators have supported every measure to strengthen our defenses since I have been a Member of the Senate. As for the future, I speak now only for myself. I shall vote for this bill. If in the 2 years of its existence the revolutionary recommendations of the civil rights commission are put into effect by Executive order and I am permitted by the grace of Providence and the will of the people of Georgia to be in this body at the expiration date, I shall oppose to the limit of my ability any extension of this law. The adoption of the recommendations of that report will destroy this Nation. Rather than be debased from within by the political conniving of those in authority we will take our chances of defending ourselves with the National Guard and volunteers serving in military units where the races may live and die with their own kind. It will profit us nothing to support ways and means of maintaining vast and expensive armies overseas if political termites are to destroy the foundations of the last citadel of individual rights and liberties here at home.

If we must die and be destroyed, let us die as free men in possession of our rights, with the Constitution still available for use as a shroud. This statement is not a threat, Mr. President. It is made only that those who may contemplate such drastic steps may understand just what their action will entail. If in the future any responsibility for the failure to continue this law or to enact similar legislation should be laid at my door, I am willing to shoulder it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of our difficulties is that quite often in debate we are unable to obtain the facts upon which arguments are predicated. The assertion has been frequently made that the Army was laggard in getting voluntary enlistments and that the Air Force and the Navy were not laggard. It has been stated that if the Army would show greater diligence it could bring the Army up to full strength without resort to the draft.

I have received figures with regard to the subject. Let me tell the Senate that the reason the Army has not been as successful in getting voluntary enlistments as have the Navy and Air Force is because the Army is larger than either the Air Force or the Navy. It has received more voluntary enlistments than has either the Air Force or the Navy. Indeed, all of the Air Force enlistments were made by the Army Recruiting Service. The Army Air Force has no enlistment personnel. The Army's personnel enlists for both the Air Corps and the Army. So, therefore, all the filling up of the Air Corps has been done by the Army.

What are the facts? In the month of April the Army got 20,923 recruits and reenlistments. Nine thousand and sixty-seven were for the Air Force. There was a total of 29,900.

The Navy had only 14,896 enlistments and reenlistments. So we see that the Army is getting twice as many recruits as is the Navy or the Air Force.

We should be fair about this. Even with those enlistments the Army cannot build up its strength to the desired figure. This bill increases the size of the Army by 350,000 men. It is perfectly plain, on the face of the figures I have stated, that the only way in the world we can get men is through the medium of the draft, unless we want to condemn the country to a smaller armed service than that which we have authorized in the law.

Finally, let me say a word for the infantryman, the fellow who carries a gun. He is not in a branch of the service which is as glamorous as is the Navy or the Air Corps, but in one decisive battle in Europe, where the foot soldiers made up 2 out of every 8 of the troops engaged, 8 out of every 10 casualties in that great battle occurred among that small group of infantrymen. That is the group which the Army needs to fill up the ranks, for they are the men who go forth and do the hard work. Unfortunately, and sadly, they largely make up the row after row of white crosses when the fighting is over.

We must have a draft act in order to fulfill the requirements of the armed services. I am hopeful that at this late hour we may give to those who have advised us about this question the consideration which their testimony warrants. They are such men as General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Denfeld, General MacArthur, General Clay. Are we going to set ourselves up as witnesses, claiming to know more about the length of time required to train a soldier, about the duties involved, than those men who have been so eminently successful in their own life work, to wit, the armed services of the country?

I am appealing to Senators that before we go home we put this country in an adequate state of defense.

The duty of a citizen, and particularly a Member of Congress, is twofold: First, to support such measures as are likely to keep the country at peace insofar as that is possible; secondly, if it is impossible to keep the country at peace, to have it adequately prepared for the catastrophe of war.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call attention to certain language in that section of the bill which relates to priority of employment. On page 35 the language is this:

> Any person who is restored to a position * * * shall not be laid off or discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

My inquiry is, could the language be interpreted to mean that one returning from service would be given priority over a veteran of World War II or employee of longer seniority in times of unemployment when lay-offs are necessary?

Mr. GURNEY. The answer is "No." If lay-offs are necessary due to reduction in force, seasonal work, and so forth, necessary lay-offs are protected.

Mr. President, there is only a minute remaining. I want to say that I appreciate very much the attention which has been given the bill during its 5 days of consideration. I sincerely hope that no amendment will be finally adopted that will take the heart out of the bill.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, what we are about to do is not easy. It is not easy for Americans who love peace to enact into law a bill to increase our armed forces and to draft young men from peacetime lives into the military service of the United States. We do it

not because we like to; we do it because we believe sincerely and earnestly that we have to do it. Conditions in the world today are such that we must take this unusual step. We do it, not in the interest of preparing ourselves for a war, but in the interest of preparing ourselves to preserve the peace. God has given us the opportunity of leadership at this time for the preservation of the peace. We must be realistic enough, we must be courageous enough, to take the measures necessary for us to exercise that leadership. This is not a bill for war; it is a bill to help us to keep the peace.

I desire to address myself in these final 2 minutes to two proposals in the form of amendments to the bill. One is a proposal to reduce the term of service from 24 months to 18 months.

Why do we need these additions to the armed forces of the United States? It appeared in the hearings before the committee that the mobile striking force of the United States today is less than 54,000 troops. All the rest of our military force is on a far-flung line from the northern climes to the tropic seas, where we are trying to preserve the peace until democratic institutions and freemen operating them can carry on in a peaceful manner.

Mr. President, in the last two world wars time was on our side. We anticipated what actually did happen, namely, that someone else would be attacked before we were attacked. If war should come again—and God grant that it may not—we shall be the first to be attacked. There will be no delay; there will be no long period of time in which we can prepare ourselves. Therefore we must be ready with a mobile striking force of 250,000 men. We need in that mobile striking force the best manhood America has; we need in it men who can serve the full 24 months for they with our other forces can ward off the attack; and after the attack, strike back, and give us time to mobilize our all-out effort.

I hope the amendments offered by my distinguished friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] will not prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired. All time for debate has expired. Under the order of the Senate, the first vote is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

After the word "effective", eliminate the word "immediately" and substitute the following: "On the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations and individuals 100 percent of all profits and earnings in excess of average annual profits and earnings of such corporations and individuals for the 3-year period immediately preceding such date."

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bricker	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] which has been stated by the clerk. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No debate is in order.

Mr. O'DANIEL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. For the benefit of Senators who were not present when the amendment was stated, may the clerk please state the amendment again?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 15, after the word "effective", it is proposed to strike out the word "immediately" and insert "On the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations and individuals 100 percent of all profits and earnings in excess of average annual profits and earnings of such corporations and individuals for the 3-year period immediately preceding such date."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 81, as follows:

YEAS—8

Dworshak	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Ecton	Langer	Taylor
Kem	Murray	

NAYS—81

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bricker	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Holland	Russell
Buck	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Lucas	Stewart
Chavez	McCarran	Taft
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McFarland	Thye
Donnell	McGrath	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Malone	Vandenberg
Feazel	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	Lodge	Watkins
Capehart	Magnuson	
Jenner	Wagner	

So Mr. O'DANIEL'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate the next amendment to be voted upon is the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which the clerk will report.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the word "twenty-four" and insert the word "eighteen."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is this a reconsideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reconsideration has been ordered. This is a vote upon the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. On the amendment itself?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. So a vote "yea" is for the 18-month period, and a vote "nay" is for the 24-month period?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 66, as follows:

YEAS—22

Butler	Langer	Taylor
Chavez	McCarthy	Tobey
Cooper	Malone	Wherry
Dworshak	Moore	Wiley
Ecton	Morse	Williams
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb	
Johnston, S. C.	Taft	

NAYS—66

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Ives	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stennis
Donnell	McCarran	Stewart
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Feazel	McKellar	Tydings
Flanders	McMahon	Umstead
Fulbright	Martin	Vandenberg
George	Maybank	White
Green	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—8

Bushfield	Jenner	Wagner
Capehart	Lodge	Watkins
Cordon	Magnuson	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I now call up my motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Earlier in the day I submitted an amendment which was read by the clerk, and was to be called up, I believe, following the amendment just disposed of. In view of the statements made by the chairman of the committee, I do not intend to ask for the yeas and nays, but I should like to have a voice vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment can be called up after the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania is disposed of.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. A vote of "nay" is a vote in favor of the amendment. A vote of "yea" is a vote against the amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot interpret what is in the minds of Senators when they vote on a motion to reconsider. The net effect probably would be what the Senator indicates.

Mr. KEM. Will the Chair indicate the effect of a "yea" vote?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can only say that a "yea" vote is a vote to reconsider. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—39

Baldwin	Gurney	Murray
Barkley	Hatch	Myers
Bridges	Hayden	O'Conor
Byrd	Hill	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Connally	Knowland	Reed
Cordon	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Downey	McCarran	Robertson, Wyo.
Ellender	McClellan	Russell
Feazel	McFarland	Saltonstall
Fulbright	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
George	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Green	McMahon	Tydings

NAYS—50

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Smith
Ball	Hoey	Sparkman
Brewster	Holland	Stennis
Bricker	Ives	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Butler	Kem	Thye
Cain	Langer	Tobey
Capper	McCarthy	Umstead
Cooper	Malone	Vandenberg
Donnell	Martin	Wherry
Dworshak	Maybank	White
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ecton	Moore	Williams
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
Flanders	O'Daniel	Young
Hawkes	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	Lodge	Watkins
Capehart	Magnuson	
Jenner	Wagner	

So Mr. MYERS' motion to reconsider was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls up the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Carolina, which the clerk will state for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

COMPOSITION OF NATIONAL GUARD UNITS

SEC. . No civilian or military officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government shall issue any order, regulations, instructions, or request, or take any other action, relating to the composition of the National Guard or the Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, which would have the effect of depriving a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or influencing its exercise, of the right to reject applicants for appointment or enlistment in its units of the National Guard or the Air National Guard who do not meet the qualifications for appointment or enlistment prescribed by such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A division is requested.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which strikes out section 18, and I request a record vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska calls up his amendment striking out section 18 of the bill, which will suffice as a statement of the purpose of the amendment.

On this amendment the yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call up my second amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 63, line 18, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

No order shall be placed pursuant to the provisions of this section unless the head of the Government agency through whom such order is placed has certified to the President that he is unable, by the use of normal procurement methods, to obtain the articles or materials ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call up my third amendment, which I have at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 63, at the end of line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted

a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. On this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—65

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McMahon	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Tobey
Ecton	Martin	Umstead
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Feazel	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young
Hawkes	O'Conor	

NAYS—23

Baldwin	Gurney	McKellar
Barkley	Hatch	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Byrd	Holland	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Lucas	Tydings
Eastland	McClellan	White
Flanders	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—8

Bushfield	Lodge	Wagner
Capehart	Magnuson	Watkins
Jenner	Reed	

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment on page 63, at the end of line 21, was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call up the amendment I submitted on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and myself. I ask that it be read. I also ask, after that, for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, it is proposed to strike out line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

SEC. 20. This act shall not become effective unless, following the expiration of 6 months after the date of its enactment, the President finds and declares that diligent efforts have been made to fulfill the personnel requirements of the armed forces through voluntary enlistments, and that such efforts have been unsuccessful. The Secretary of the Army is directed to accept enlistments for 2-year periods. No applicant for enlistment in the Army shall be required to obtain a score of more than 59 on the classification test in order to meet the requirements for enlistment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia has asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—20

Bricker	Kem	Taylor
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McCarthy	Wherry
Butler	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Moore	Wilson
Ecton	Murray	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb	

NAYS—69

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bridges	Hill	Reed
Byrd	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Ives	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Smith
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Cordon	Lucas	Stennis
Donnell	McCarran	Stewart
Downey	McClellan	Taft
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Feazel	McKellar	Tobey
Ferguson	McMahon	Tydings
Flanders	Martin	Umstead
Fulbright	Maybank	Vandenberg
George	Millikin	White
Green	Morse	Wiley

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	Lodge	Watkins
Capehart	Magnuson	
Jenner	Wagner	

So the amendment offered by Mr. REVERCOMB, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I call up at this time the amendment which I offer for myself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 6, after the word "and" it is proposed to insert the words "in case an adequate number of qualified volunteers are not on active service."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER.] [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question, Shall it pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. With reference to making changes in numbers, and so forth, is it necessary to get authority?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can be done at any time.

Mr. GURNEY. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with reference to the Kem amendment the clerk be given permission to make the necessary changes from "Act" to "Title," and to make other necessary changes in numbers, and so forth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Is it too late to call up an amendment? Having discussed one which was offered earlier today, I was of the opinion that it would be automatically called up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair regrets that the bill having been read the third time, it would require unanimous consent to call up the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 10 (a) (3), to follow the period in line 8, page 44, it is proposed to insert "The Director shall not be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States."

In section 10 (b) (2), page 45, to follow the word "system" on line 13, it is proposed to insert "who shall not be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments which will be considered en bloc. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REVERCOMB (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] who has been called away from the city and is absent by leave of the Senate. If the Senator from Indiana were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who is also necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—78

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Buck	Holland	Reed
Byrd	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kem	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kilgore	Smith
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stennis
Downey	McCarran	Stewart
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taft
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Feazel	McKellar	Tobey
Ferguson	McMahon	Tydings
Flanders	Malone	Umstead
Fulbright	Martin	Vandenberg
George	Maybank	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Morse	Williams

NAYS—10

Bricker	Langer	Wilson
Brooks	Moore	Young
Butler	Taylor	
Chavez	Wherry	

NOT VOTING—8

Bushfield	Lodge	Wagner
Capehart	Magnuson	Watkins
Jenner	Revercomb	

So the bill (S. 2655) was passed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as it passed the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order of the Senate, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 239, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 239) reaffirming the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and indicating certain objectives to be pursued.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order of the Senate, the resolution will be temporarily laid aside and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Prior to the call of the calendar, certain privileged matters will be given immediate attention.

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the Senate (S. 1266) to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "1964" and insert "1064."

Mr. BUCK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1442) to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, which were, on page 1, line 12, to strike out "and", where it appears the first time, and insert "except for", and on page 2, line 10, strike out "and", where it appears the first time, and insert "except for."

Mr. BUCK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF OWNERS OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES ABUTTING EASTERN AVENUE IN THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2040) for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia, which were, on page 2, in line 1 of the schedule at the bottom of the page, to strike out "$3,961.00" and insert "$5,105.00"; on the same page 2, in line 2 of the schedule at the bottom of the page, strike out "3,600.00" and insert "5,064.00"; on the same page 2, in line 3 of the schedule at the bottom of the page, strike out "3,020.00" and insert "4,932.00"; on the same page 2, in line 4 of the schedule at the bottom of the page, strike out "2,620.00" and insert "3,120.00"; and on the same page 2, in line 12 of the schedule at the bottom of the page, strike out "29,527.33" and insert "34,547.33."

Mr. BUCK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

REGULATION OF BUSINESS OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 612) to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments, which were, on page 6, line 9, after "or" insert "equipment"; on the same page 6, line 14, after "or", insert "equipment"; and on page 11, line 1, strike out "may" and insert "shall."

Mr. BUCK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ELIGIBILITY FOR PROMOTION OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1082) to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion, which was on page 3, to strike out lines 9 to 14, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 5. The rate of compensation of any employee in the postal service whose services are utilized in a dual capacity shall not be reduced as a result of employment in such capacity: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the rural delivery service.

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

YOUTH ATHLETIC AND SPORTS PROGRAMS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1302) to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes," which were, on page 1, line 5, after "for", to insert "disassembling" and on page 2, line 13, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 295) to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended, which was, on page 2, line 9, after "Army", insert "and only with the consent of the individual concerned."

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES B. WALSH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1281) for the relief of James B. Walsh, which were, on page 1, line 5, strike out "$21,899.67" and insert "$7,500"; on the same page 1, line 5, strike out "James B." and insert "James R.", and amend the title so as to read "An act for the relief of James R. Walsh."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF OCEAN STATIONS BY COAST GUARD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Coast Guard is authorized to operate and maintain floating ocean stations for the purpose of providing search and rescue, communication, and air-navigation facilities, and meteorological services in such ocean areas as are regularly traversed by aircraft of the United States: *Provided*, That, prior to the establishment of any station the Secretary of National Defense shall certify as to the need for such station.

Mr. BREWSTER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCFARLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6500, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4 and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, and 26, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the basic annual rates of compensation for the following positions shall be: Two assistant superintendents of press gallery at $2,400 each, and messenger for service to press correspondents at $1,920 in lieu of assistant superintendent of press gallery $2,400 and two messengers for service to press correspondents at $1,920 each; and two assistant superintendents of radio press gallery at $2,400 each in lieu of assistant superintendent of radio press gallery $2,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

MILTON R. YOUNG,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HARVE TIBBOTT,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Airport Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION AND FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and the Federal home loan banks, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1945 and 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1955. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1591); and

H. R. 6188. A bill to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1585).

By Mr. WILEY:

From the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution accepting the invitation to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda; without amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

From the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 4566. A bill for the relief of William Nally; without amendment (Rept. No. 1587).

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution welcoming the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States for its conference in Detroit, Mich., in May 1949; without amendment.

By Mr. MOORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1988. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; with amendments (Rept. No. 1592); and

S. 2217. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1586).

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2755. A bill to amend the act of June 11, 1946, as amended, with an amendment (Rept. No. 1588).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2730. A bill to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1589).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 3934. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid-treatment centers, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1590).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Claude P. Stephens, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1948

Mr. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent to submit a report of the Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, 1948, and I request that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1948

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939 (Public, No. 183, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1948 Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Senators: Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, ex-officio member, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Hon. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, appointed by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate; Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY, appointed by Senator WHITT; Hon. TOM STEWART, appointed by Senator WHITE.

Representatives: Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL, ex officio member, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK, appointed by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Speaker of the House; Hon. AIME J. FORAND, appointed by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Speaker of the House; Hon. EDWARD T. MILLER, appointed by Representative WEICHEL; Hon. MITCHELL JENKINS, appointed by Representative WEICHEL; Hon. EMORY H. PRICE, appointed by Representative WEICHEL.

On Friday, May 14, 1948, the following Members left Washington, D. C., via the Pennsylvania Railroad, on the Colonial at 10 a. m.—Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY, Hon. AIME J. FORAND, Hon. EDWARD T. MILLER, and Hon. EMORY H. PRICE. They were accompanied by Rear Admiral Merlin O'Neill, Acting Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, Rear Admiral Ellis Reed-Hill, engineer in chief, United States Coast Guard, Commodore Raymond T. McElligott, and Capt. Alfred C. Richmond. After arrival in New London, Conn., late in the afternoon, the Board was joined by the Honorable RAYMOND E. BALDWIN. The Honorable ANTONI N. SADLAK and Commander Samuel F. Gray, Chief of the Public Information Division, United States Coast Guard, joined the party Saturday morning.

This, the eleventh visit of the Board, marked the seventy-second anniversary of the Academy as a national institution. Originally established as a school for prospective officers of the old Revenue Cutter Service in 1876 in New Bedford, Mass., the school was moved in 1900 to Baltimore, Md. It was again moved in 1910 to New London, Conn., and located on the site of old Fort Trumbull. The present physical plant at New London was authorized by congressional appropriation in 1929, and the permanent buildings completed in 1932. The Academy is accredited by the Association of American Universities and awards the degree of bachelor of science. In 1941 the facilities at the Academy were expanded to meet the increased needs of the service. The temporary buildings then erected, while not all in use at the present time, are in good repair and available if again required.

The Coast Guard is a military service and constitutes at all times a branch of the armed forces of the United States, operating under the Treasury Department in time of peace and as part of the Navy, subject to the Secretary of the Navy, in time of war, or when the President shall so direct.

Because of the wide variety of services rendered by the Coast Guard, it is most important that the officers get a well-rounded training; the Board is of the opinion that such training is being given to the prospective officers at the Coast Guard Academy.

The peacetime duties of the Coast Guard, which are wide in scope and varied in nature, are indicated by some of the recent and outstanding cases of service rendered during the past winter season. On patrol day in and day out, Coast Guard cutters perform the arduous duties of ocean-weather station, assisting the Weather Bureau to gather weather information used by transoceanic aircraft and ships in both the Atlantic and Pacific. For these cutters, rescue is an important auxiliary duty, and the well-known gallant rescue of passengers and crew members of the *Bermuda Sky Queen* by the cutter *Bibb*, and the assistance rendered by the same vessel to the coast of Maine last fall during the forest fire in that area are but typical of them all.

The Northeast section of the United States relied on the Coast Guard for the continuance of navigation in its icebound harbors; Coast Guard ice breakers along the New England coast, on the Connecticut River, on the Hudson, the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays, including the Potomac, opened channels to shipping, thus insuring delivery of oil and other heavy goods. Coast Guard assistance along the Mississippi River, flood-relief plans and rescues on the west coast, shows that the Coast Guard provides daily service to numerous craft.

Ice breaking this spring on the Great Lakes opened the shipping season weeks ahead of the yearly schedule. The value of ships and cargo assisted by the Coast Guard in similar operations on the Great Lakes last year amounted to approximately $700,000,000.

International Ice Patrol, maintenance of over 36,000 aids to navigation, search and rescue, and merchant marine inspection functions all provide a great service by the Coast Guard for the safe operation of our maritime units and are responsible for preventing many accidents.

Most of the peacetime duties of the Coast Guard have an important military implication in wartime.

The discipline of the Academy is military in nature. While the curriculum is based on marine and engineering subjects, it also includes general college subjects, such as languages, literature, history, government, science and law. In view of the increased Coast Guard activities relating to the merchant marine, special emphasis has been given to maritime law and economics. During the war years the prescribed course was reduced to 3 years. However, after the war the full course was resumed, and the present graduating class is the first to complete the 4-year course.

The program arranged by Rear Adm. Wilfrid N. Derby, Superintendent of the Academy, was carried out. On arrival at the Academy, full military honors were rendered the party. Following this, the Board was entertained at dinner at the Norwich Inn, attended by the senior officers of the Academy. After dinner, service motion pictures were shown, illustrating Academy life, general service duties, and those taken during the Cadet cruise aboard the Coast Guard cutters *Campbell* and *Eagle* during the summer of 1947.

The official meeting of the Board was held at 9 a. m. Saturday morning in the Academic Board room. Present at this meeting were Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY, Hon. AIME J. FORAND, Hon. EDWARD T. MILLER, Hon. EMORY H. PRICE, Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK, and Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., who, though not a member of the Board, represented Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL, who was unable to attend.

At this meeting Hon. AIME J. FORAND, Representative from Rhode Island, was unanimously elected chairman. Commodore Raymond T. McElligott, United States Coast Guard, acted as official secretary and recorder.

The Superintendent of the Academy was invited to appear before the Board and submitted his report, a copy of which is attached hereto. The Superintendent went into considerable detail explaining this report and replying to questions of the Board. It is noted that the Superintendent has reiterated recommendations which have received the approval of previous Boards of Visitors. Owing to current extremely high costs, others have been omitted or deferred.

The Superintendent and other officers and personnel connected with the administration of the Academy and the Coast Guard were excused and the Board met in closed session with the Cadet Battalion Commander Wayne E. Caldwell and his executive officer and president of the graduating class, Robert Walker Durfey. Their comments, reflecting as they did the viewpoint of the cadet corps as to cadet morale, adequacy of instruction, and their concept of a service career, were impressive and of material assistance to the Board.

The cadet officers were excused and upon the return of the Coast Guard officers to the meeting, the chaplain of the Academy, Capt. Edward B. Harp, Jr., ChC, USN, was invited to appear before the Board, to discuss the morale, social, and religious aspects of cadet life at the Academy. The Board was highly impressed by the sincerity of Chaplain Harp and is of the opinion that these phases of cadet life are well rounded at the present time.

In order to have further time for consideration of the report of the Superintendent, and the other matters presented at this meeting, the Board recessed at 11:45 a. m. to meet in Washington at the call of the chairman.

At 12:15 p. m. the party reviewed the cadet battalion, after which luncheon was served for the Board, each member being seated in the cadet mess hall with cadets from his State or district. After luncheon, the entire physical plant was inspected and the Board visited and inspected the Coast Guard training ship *Eagle*.

The *Eagle* is a three-masted 1,800-ton bark having a steel hull and an auxiliary Diesel motor for propulsion. Originally named the *Horst-Wessel*, she was built by Blohm & Voss in Germany for the German Navy as one of three sailing training vessels. Acquired by the United States through reparations from Germany in 1946, she was assigned to the Coast Guard. Her length over all is 295 feet, her masts tower 150 feet above the waterline and she carries an immense spread of sail totaling 21,350 square feet. She is

square-rigged on the fore and mainmasts. Her mizzenmast, of course, is fore-and-aft rigged. She draws 17 feet of water when loaded. Under full sail she develops about 8 knots; with auxiliary propulsion, she can make 10½ knots. There are two full length steel decks (wood covered) and a partial lower deck. In addition there are forecastle and poop decks with a steel deck house aft. Six water-tight bulkheads extend well above the water line to furnish reserve buoyancy. Two hundred cadets can be accommodated comfortably.

The Board's visit found the *Eagle* being readied for the coming cadet cruise. The shrouds and stays which support her tall masts, and the maze of running rigging were being overhauled or renewed.

It was pointed out that the *Eagle* is a modern vessel in many respects, having a modern gyro compass, the latest communications equipment, radio direction finder, radar, loran, a modern economical Diesel and auxiliary plant with which the vessel can cruise at a speed of better than 10 knots. Her broad deck spaces and large quarters permit holding classes and enable instructors to work with large groups of cadets in seamanship and navigation activities. Except for the lack of large caliber guns and a steam engineering plant, this vessel can supply the necessary paraphernalia, plus sail, that is needed for training in practical professional subjects. Therefore, when cruising in conjunction with a modern steam-powered cutter, a complete course of instruction can be obtained through the use of both ships.

Working together the two ships will engage in simulated convoy and escort problems; practice fueling at sea; transfer personnel and material from ship to ship by means of the breeches buoy; maneuver on zigzag courses, and with the aid of Coast Guard planes carry out search and rescue problems, etc.

Sailing from New London, Conn., on June 7, 1948, the Cadet Practice Squadron will visit Ponta Delgada, Azores; London, England; Santa Cruz, Canary Islands; Hamilton, Bermuda; and then return to New London on August 14. This year the *Campbell* and the *Eagle* will make the 9,115-mile cruise, spending 50 days at sea and 18 days in port. First- and third-class cadets will make this cruise.

This is the first time that the cadet cruise will have Europe in its itinerary since 1937, when the practice squadron visited London, Antwerp, Stockholm, Oslo, and the Madeira Islands.

On July 24, second-class cadets will begin 3 weeks' aviation training at Elizabeth City Air Station, after which they will sail on a short cruise.

The new fourth class will enter the Academy in July. After a preliminary term of 6 weeks, these new cadets will also make a short cruise of 3 weeks duration.

Members of the first, second, and third classes will have 3 weeks annual leave and 1 week on the rifle range before the fall term begins on September 13.

With honors again rendered, the party left the Academy at 5 p. m. and entrained for Washington, arriving at 11:45 p. m. that evening.

At the call of the chairman, the Board resumed its meeting at 11 a. m. Thursday, June 3, 1948, in the office of the chairman, 1120 House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Those present were: Hon. Aime J. Forand, chairman; Hon. Antoni N. Sadlak, Hon. Edward T. Miller, Hon. Emory H. Price, Rear Adm. Raymond T. McElligott, USCG, secretary.

Following a general discussion of the report of the Superintendent and other matters that were brought before the former meeting of the Board, the Board adopted the following recommendations submitted in the Superintendent's report:

1. WATER-FRONT DEVELOPMENT

(a) That prompt steps be taken to improve the water-front area east of the railroad tracks to provide additional playing fields for baseball, soccer, and football.

(b) That action on completion of construction of the boathouse on Jacob's Rock be deferred until such time as materials are more readily available, and cost of construction be not so high as at the present time.

2. SCIENCE WING, SATTERLEE HALL

That steps be taken as soon as practicable to convert the lecture hall in McAllister Hall to provide space for a drafting room, and additional facilities for physics and chemistry, in lieu of erection of an additional wing to Satterlee Hall as originally recommended.

3. CHAPEL AND MEMORIAL BUILDING

Legislation has been passed authorizing the chapel and memorial building. Plans for obtaining funds and construction sketches and plans should be expedited.

4. ENTRANCE GATE

Plans for changing of location of this entrance gate should be coordinated with the plans for the construction of the new chapel, but due to the dangerous traffic situation existing, it is recommended that work should be undertaken at an early date.

5. COAST GUARD BAND

That necessary legislation be submitted authorizing the Coast Guard Band as has been done in the case of other service bands.

6. ADDITIONAL LIBRARIAN

That early action be taken to provide an additional fully qualified civil-service librarian to assist the one civil-service librarian now in charge.

It is noted that the 1947 Board of Visitors recommended that the Coast Guard continue its efforts to publicize the advantages of an education at the Academy and a career in the Coast Guard. Notwithstanding an advanced date, 1,222 young men from all parts of the United States and its possessions applied to take the annual competitive entrance examinations for the Academy this year. Of that number, 840 applicants met the scholastic and preliminary physical standards and were eligible to compete for cadetships in the examinations held in 54 different cities February 16–17, 1948. Much of the success of this year's cadet appointment competition is due to the publicity work of the recruiting staffs, and to the cooperation of a number of Members of Congress who informed the press in their districts of the opportunity for Academy appointments.

The Board is very favorably impressed by the harmony, loyalty, and industry of the staff of the Academy; the morale, serious purpose, and appreciation by the cadet corps of the splendid educational facilities afforded them. Their grasp of their future mission as officers of the United States Coast Guard is most gratifying. There appears to be little need for a change in the curriculum and the Board noted with satisfaction that methods of instruction are subject to constant study and progressive improvement.

At the first meeting of the 1948 Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, Commodore Raymond T. McElligott, United States Coast Guard,, acted as official secretary and recorder. At this subsequent meeting of the Board, the welcome news was received that Commodore McElligott had been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate in the rank of rear admiral. In recognition of the splendid services rendered by Admiral McElligott the Board unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas Rear Adm. Raymond T. McElligott has rendered valuable services to this Board in his capacity as official secretary and recorder, and has given unstintingly of his time and of his active interest and knowledge of the Coast Guard Academy during the deliberations of this Board; and

"Whereas Rear Adm. Raymond T. McElligott, United States Coast Guard, has been confirmed as a permanent rear admiral of the Coast Guard: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the members of the 1948 Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy wish to express their high sense of appreciation for the valuable services Rear Admiral McElligott has rendered in connection with the Board; and be it further

"Resolved, That this Board extends its appreciation to the Senate of the United States for its action in confirming the nomination of Rear Adm. McElligott; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Board extends to Rear Adm. McElligott most hearty congratulations on his promotion; and be it further

"Resolved, That this expression of appreciation and congratulation be included as a part of the official report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the commandant of the Coast Guard for inclusion in the record of Rear Admiral McElligott.

"WALLACE H. WHITE, Senator; RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Senator; CHARLES W. TOBEY, Senator; TOM STEWART, Senator (I was not present on trip but am advised report is correct); AIME J. FORAND, Member of Congress, Chairman; ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Member of Congress; ANTONI N. SADLAK, Member of Congress; EMORY H. PRICE, Member of Congress; EDWARD T. MILLER, Member of Congress; MITCHELL JENKINS, Member of Congress.

MAY 12, 1948.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS

HISTORY

The cadet system of the United States Coast Guard was established in 1876 aboard the training ship *Dobbin*. Later the school was maintained at Baltimore. In 1910 it moved to Fort Trumbull, New London, and in 1932 to its present site. The cadets are organized as a battalion and live under a strict military routine.

FUNCTION

The purpose of the Academy is to prepare young men for commissions as ensigns in the Coast Guard. The 4-year course, of college level, is designed to provide a sound engineering education, with adequate attention to fundamental mathematical, scientific, and engineering knowledge to enable graduates to continue postgraduate work in advanced studies at leading universities. General studies are included in the curriculum to the extent generally approved by civilian engineering schools. The physical, social, and moral aspects of a well-rounded education are given much attention. In addition to providing a sound engineering education, the Academy gives training courses in professional subjects of particular importance to a Coast Guard officer.

PROCUREMENT OF CADETS

Competitive entrance examinations for cadets are held throughout the country in February, the successful candidates entering the Academy early in July. The entrance examinations are prepared by the Educational Testing Service (formerly College Entrance Examination Board) and are intended to select the best material from high-school graduates as determined by scholastic achievement, academic aptitude, physical soundness, and personal character. Extensive publicity is given to the examinations

in order to attract a sufficient number of candidates to assure a good final selection. Prewar the number of applicants was about 2,000, but this number fell to 736 in 1947 and 835 in 1948. Of 750 candidates who completed the 1948 examinations, the highest 150 who are physically qualified will enter the academy in July.

CURRICULUM

The cadets are under instruction for approximately 11 months a year and in a leave status for 1 month. Upon arrival in July the entering class immediately begins studies in mathematics, science, and English with special attention being given to any weaknesses in previous schooling which may handicap a cadet during the first semester which begins the middle of September. The second semester begins in February and ends in May. During the summer term, from June to mid-September, the cadets take cruises on the practice ships and get aviation indoctrination at a Coast Guard aviation station. The regular 3 weeks leave is granted to cadets during the summer term. Upon graduation each cadet is awarded the degree of Bachelor of Science; if physically qualified he is also given a commission as ensign in the Coast Guard. During the academic terms, each cadet spends 3 hours a week in practical work.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

A carefully supervised course of physical training is provided for each cadet. The object of the training is to develop sound and rugged bodies and to give each cadet some practice in the most common competitive sports. Intramural sports include boxing, wrestling, basketball, softball, rowing, and swimming. Intercollegiate competition is generally confined to small New England colleges and includes all the generally popular sports.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The social development of cadets is fostered mainly by monthly formal dances and by frequent informal dances. Within the limitations imposed by the military routine, cadets are encouraged to enjoy normal social contacts with townspeople and students at Connecticut College.

RELIGIOUS TRAINING

All cadets, unless excused by their parents, are required to attend services of their own choosing once a week. A naval chaplain attached to the Academy holds Protestant services at Connecticut College Chapel each Sunday and a naval chaplain from the Coast Guard training station at Groton holds Roman Catholic services at the Academy. Cadets have the option of attending services in New London churches.

SUMMER CRUISE

About 55 cadets of the first class and about 115 cadets of the third class will spend 2 months on the training bark (sail-powered with auxiliary engine) *Eagle* and on the modern cutter *Campbell*. The cruise will include stops at the Azores, England, Canary Islands, and Bermuda. Upon the return of these vessels to New London in mid-August, the second and fourth classes will go aboard for a 3-week coasting cruise.

NUMBER OF CADETS

As of May 14, 1948, the total number of cadets is 314. In July this number will be increased to about 400 by the entering class of 150 cadets. During the past 2 years, there was an abnormally large number of voluntary resignations which may be attributed to reaction against military discipline, opportunities for education offered by the GI bill of rights, absence of original real intent to make a career in the Coast Guard, and the lowered relative attractiveness of service pay with the rising industrial pay scales. The following table shows the extent of attrition of classes by voluntary or required resignations:

Class	Entry	Voluntary	Required	Total	Remaining
1948	157	73	32	105	52
1949	145	61	27	88	57
1950	147	42	19	61	86
1951	149	22	8	30	119

The officers of the Academy seek to lower this rate of attrition; prewar experience indicates that attrition may under favorable circumstances be reduced to about 40 percent of the entering cadets.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE

A 40-bed hospital provides excellent physical facilities. The personnel of three medical officers, two dental officers, and six nurses has heretofore provided most satisfactory service. The continuation of this personnel on a satisfactory scale by the Public Health Service is now in some doubt. The hospital provides for cadets and other personnel of the Academy, personnel of the Groton Training Station, Coast Guard units near New London, and dependents, a total of perhaps 2,500.

INSTRUCTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Instructors fall into three groups: about 30 regular Coast Guard line officers, 5 commissioned professors, and 6 civil-service instructors. About 17 officers are on the administrative staff. To a considerable extent the 30 commissioned instructors and the 17 commissioned administrators listed above perform both duties, and the figures are intended only to indicate their principal duty. This staff provides for the operation of the Academy and the training ship *Eagle* and also for the instruction of cadets during every month of the year. The number of instructors is barely enough and does not provide adequately for leave, sickness, or time for instructors to take courses to improve their own knowledge by outside study.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Most of the services required for the administration and operation of the Academy are performed by enlisted men of appropriate ratings. The complement is 200 enlisted men including 29 men in the band and 14 in the hospital. Both these organizations perform many duties for the service generally although their more important duties are concerned with Academy requirements.

Enlisted men rotate between this assignment and duty at sea. Duty at shore stations including the Academy provides desirable rotation from some of the very arduous assignments. Enlisted men for these duties have many advantages over civil-service labor; they may be employed at any time on any duty which they are qualified to perform without restriction of civil-service regulations as to hours and kind of employment. The extreme shortage in this type of personnel last year has been corrected and now the complement is just adequate.

CIVIL-SERVICE LABOR

Janitor service in the buildings, gardener and labor services in the maintenance of the grounds are performed by civil-service labor. A few civil-service workmen skilled in trades with no comparable service rating are also employed. For most duties enlisted personnel are to be preferred because of flexibility of use and availability for night and weekend duties and security watches.

FINANCE

The Academy has no separate budget but operates on allotments of funds from various general-service appropriations. For the last full fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, the overall cost of all Coast Guard expenditures for operating costs was $1,364,586.48, as tabulated below:

Pay of personnel:		
Military pay rolls (officers, cadets, enlisted men, including mustering-out pay, commuted rations, and travel)	$944,492.31	
Civilian instructors	20,843.04	
Other civil-service employees	109,689.50	
		1,075,024.85
Materials:		
Food (enlisted men only)	33,353.45	
Fuel, water, and utilities	81,079.03	
Supplies (including new equipment)	87,745.36	
		202,177.84
Repairs:		
Vessels	28,059.34	
Buildings and grounds, including capital improvements	51,170.01	
		79,229.53
Services and contingent items not included above		8,154.44
Total operating expense chargeable to Coast Guard appropriations		1,364,586.48
Not included:		
Conversion cost of *Eagle* (nonrecurring capital charge)		179,852.73
Clothing (completely repaid by sales to personnel)		31,038.66
Pay (Public Health Service personnel)		56,575.66
Pay (Navy chaplain) (estimated)		6,500.00

PHYSICAL PLANT

For convenient consideration the physical plant can be grouped in three main groupings:

Permanent buildings,

Temporary buildings,

Waterfront plant, including floating equipment.

The permanent buildings were built in 1931 and 1932 with important additions to several buildings and one major new building in 1941 and 1942. The original planned maximum capacity (2 cadets per room in the barracks) was 208 in 104 rooms. With the additions in 1942 there are now 155 rooms. By assigning 3 cadets to some rooms, total capacity is now rated at 400 cadets.

The permanent buildings are, in general, well designed and have been well kept up. Cost of maintenance and repairs will probably increase; a failure of the main power line requiring considerable expense for replacement occurred recently; plumbing and other installed equipment is increasingly subject to failure with age.

The temporary buildings were built in 1942 for a special war purpose, training of about 5,000 Reserve and women's Reserve officers. The rated capacity is about 1,000 men. The barracks and mess hall buildings (5 in all) are not now in use. Three have been recommended for removal to reduce fire hazard. Two are recommended for retention for possible future use. Other temporary buildings, field house, reserve administration building, reserve classroom building, and auditorium are being used and fill needs which will require permanent buildings when these temporary buildings can no longer be economically maintained. Although well designed and more attractive in appearance than temporary buildings usually are, maintenance costs will probably be high, dictating eventual replacement with permanent constructions when conditions permit.

Floating equipment, in active use during the war years for the Reserve officers training program, and not now required has been declared surplus and all sold and removed except for the *Atlantic* which is awaiting action on bids recently opened in Washington. Rearrangement of schedules permitting greater number of hours of use of equipment has permitted instruction in rowing and sailing for a larger number of cadets with the same number of boats as prewar. Deferred maintenance of this equipment resulting from shortage of personnel last year is being made up now. The *Eagle*, a German-built three-masted bark obtained under reparations will make her second summer training cruise which will be to Europe this year.

No major construction was done last year. (A modern greenhouse purchased the previous year was erected.) A cross-connection between the two steam plants was completed. During the past severe winter plant No. 1 carried the entire heating load, with a material saving in operating personnel required. Fencing of the northeast area of the reservation has been contracted and work will be completed early this summer. Improvement of the Engineering building, including particularly installation of 1,650 pounds per square inch test boiler, is complete except for items of wiring and piping. Many smaller items of equipment needed to keep laboratories, armory, and shops up to date have been installed.

Some deferred maintenance has been made up, such as interior and exterior painting, replastering and waterproofing, although many items still remain. Emergency repairs, resulting from failure of original installations were more frequent and costly than in previous years. This trend will probably continue as buildings grow older.

Interior rearrangements in several places at relatively minor costs were made in connection with relocation of activities in a program of centralization for improved efficiency.

The Academy's urgent needs are being met in this program of utilizing present facilities by better planned use of space in the permanent buildings and the temporary buildings now in use.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Repeating the procedure followed last year, the following recommendations, which have received the approval of previous Boards of Visitors, are renewed as a matter of record although it is realized that under present conditions of uncertainty no immediate action is to be expected.

1. Water-front development

(a) That the waterfront area east of the railroad tracks be bulkheaded and filled to provide additional playing fields for baseball, soccer, and football.

(b) That the boathouse on Jacob's Rock, on which construction was stopped at the beginning of the war, be completed as planned when materials are available.

2. Satterlee Hall, science wing

In lieu of this recommendation, it is now recommended that the lecture hall in McAllister Hall be converted to meet this requirement. After much study a practicable conversion has been planned. Cost will be materially less; the possibility of meeting this very necessary requirement at an early date warrants acceptance of a slightly less desirable arrangement.

3. Chapel and memorial building

In this past year legislation authorizing the chapel has passed. Plans for obtaining funds and construction sketches and plans are being prepared. Present plans contemplate locating the chapel entirely on present reservation although acquisition of additional land about 100 feet deep south of the present reservation might be desirable.

4. Entrance gate

Correction of dangerous traffic situation is still needed. Plans should be coordinated with the plans for the construction of the new chapel but work should be undertaken at an early date.

NEW RECOMMENDATIONS

That the size, rating structure, and allowances of the Coast Guard Band established in 1926 and stationed at the Academy since that time be determined by legislation as has been done in the case of other service bands. The present authorized strength of 29 and rating structure is the minimum needed to maintain the standards of performance and the reputation the band has built up since its establishment. There is no other band authorized for the Coast Guard. Although the band should be designated as the Coast Guard Band and available as at present for assignment to any suitable duty generally in the Coast Guard and for appropriate official functions in this vicinity, the band should remain stationed at the Academy.

That an additional fully qualified civil-service librarian be authorized to assist the one civil-service librarian now in charge. This recommendation has been made for several years by the Academy Advisory Committee, a committee of distinguished educators who have maintained close contact with the Academy educational program since 1933.

W. N. DERBY,
Rear Admiral, USCG, Superintendent.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2844. A bill for the relief of David Townsend; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER (for Mr. BUSHFIELD):

S. 2845. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Raymond Vasseur a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2846. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to Southern Counties Gas Co. of California a perpetual easement for a natural gas line over lands within Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2847. A bill for the relief of Miss Teresa Rosanio; and

S. 2848. A bill for the relief of Kurt Emil Walter Hannemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2849. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2850. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; and

S. 2851. A bill to authorize temporary increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose pay is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "FINAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES DE SOTO EXPEDITION COMMISSION"

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 1,000 copies of the Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission (H. Doc. 71, 76th Cong.) for the use of the Senate document room.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTER OF PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 258), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to establish the policy to be followed in prescribing the tolls that shall be levied for the use of the Panama Canal; and

Whereas there have been substantial changes in economic conditions since Congress last established such policy, including the effect of such tolls upon American shipping: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation of the financial operation of the Panama Canal with particular reference to the proper accounting and allocation of costs attributable to—

(a) the transit of the Canal by commercial, governmental, and military vessels of United States and foreign nations;

(b) military activities of the United States in and connected with the Canal Zone;

(c) United States civil government including but not limited to sanitation, public schools, playgrounds, hospitals, etc.

and to recommend to the Congress concerning what elements of cost should be properly used in the future as the basis of a policy to be followed in establishing and levying tolls for the use of the Panama Canal for transit purposes.

The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than March 15, 1949.

The committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States whether the Congress is in session, has recessed or is adjourned; to hold such hearings as it deems necessary; to employ such consultants, specialists, clerks, or other assistants; to travel and authorize its assistants to travel; to utilize such transportation, housing, or other facilities as any governmental agency may make available; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $15,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, requested to defer until after submission of the committee's report, any change in tolls currently levied for the use of the Panama Canal.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LUCAS (for Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MAGNUSON to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7510) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6759) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. COOPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 6457. An act to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6818. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

THEODORE G. BILBO

[Mr. STENNIS, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute prepared by him to the life, character, and public service of Theodore G. Bilbo, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE BY BERNARD BARUCH IN SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an article written by Bernard Baruch and published in the Saturday Evening Post of June 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BETWEEN TWO WORLDS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FERGUSON

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Between Two Worlds," delivered by Senator FERGUSON at the centennial celebration of Muhlenberg College, June 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN PALESTINE—LONDON LETTER BY HAROLD J. LASKI

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the London letter of Harold J. Laski, dated June 1, 1948, regarding British policy in Palestine, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY MAY GET THE ATOMIC BOMB—ARTICLE BY HANSON W. BALDWIN

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Military May Get the Atomic Bomb," written by Hanson W. Baldwin, and published in the New York Times of June 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DRAFT AND THE GUARD—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Draft and the Guard," published in the Chicago Tribune of June 8, 1948; which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 231) to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes." and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the year 1948 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of one of the Nation's outstanding educational institutions; the University of Mississippi, affectionately known throughout the South as Ole Miss.

Its long record of educational achievement is one of which the people of Mississippi are exceedingly proud. Ole Miss has contributed a wealth of trained leadership to our State and our Nation. The contribution that has been made to the cultural development of our State has been invaluable.

The superior quality of the faculty of the university has been a source of strength down through the years. There has been a tradition of great leadership that began during the first decade of the school's operation, when Augustus Baldwyn Longstreet, the distinguished Georgian, and Frederick A. P. Barnard, the founder of Barnard College, were among the first chancelors.

In its first 100 years the University of Mississippi has achieved a splendid record of accomplishments, despite the almost intolerable handicap of the War Between the States and its immediate aftermath, and the economic hardship that has been the lot of our State throughout most of the period since that time. Today Ole Miss is looking forward to another century of continuing progress; to new contributions toward the betterment of our civilization.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record a brief sketch of the history of the University of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

The University of Mississippi was located at Oxford in northern Mississippi instead of at Mississippi City on the Gulf coast by the narrow margin of one vote in the Mississippi Legislature at a special meeting on January 26, 1841. Convening in joint session of both houses of the legislature, the senators and representatives voted 58 to 57 on the sixth ballot to pick the northern town as the university site.

Eighty students and four faculty members opened the first session in 1848 with George Frederick Holmes as president. During the administration of Chancelor Frederick A. P. Barnard, academic work was interrupted by the enlistment of large numbers of students in the historic University Greys, a gallant military company of 135 men formed on the university campus. At the outbreak of the Civil War the faculty resigned and the doors of the institution were closed until the fall of 1865.

During the Civil War, the buildings were occupied alternately by Confederate and Federal troops. After the Battle of Shiloh, 1,500 Confederate wounded were hospitalized in campus buildings, and more than 700 lie in the university cemetery. The personnel of the student body, wealthy in ante bellum days, changed to a class of students whose parents had lost their entire wealth during the war. They, like today's veterans of World War II, came with a determination born of necessity.

The university has advanced steadily during the century of its existence. Focal point of campus academic pursuits is the porticoed Lyceum Building, the university's first physical plant which was placed in use in 1848. It was followed in 1853 by the chapel, and in 1857 by the old Physics-Astronomy Building, part of which now serves as the chancelor's residence. On October 7, 1947, the old Physics-Astronomy Building was dedicated by Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey as McCain Hall, for training naval ROTC students, in honor of the late Admiral John Sidney McCain.

Today, the university has more than a dozen buildings devoted to classroom and technical training, and administrative work as well as 5 co-ed dormitories, and 18 dormitories for men. Auxiliary buildings, including the library, Fulton Chapel, cafeteria, gymnasium, a 26,000-capacity football stadium, field house, and student-union building total 14. Twenty locally owned sorority and fraternity houses have been built on the campus during the past 12 years. The university owns 40 faculty residences and 4 faculty apartment houses. A veterans' village, built of war-surplus materials from Army camps, houses 400 families.

This year's expansion includes 4 new dormitories for men, renovation of Ricks Hall for women, the addition of 50 classrooms, construction of an auxiliary cafeteria, a new laundry, a recreation center, and permanent quarters for the naval ROTC.

Women students, first admitted in 1882, are represented by 8 national social sororities, and men have 16 national social fraternities.

The university offers instruction in a college of liberal arts, founded in 1848; school of law, 1854; school of engineering, 1900; school of education, 1903; school of medicine, 1903; school of pharmacy, 1908; school of commerce and business administration, 1917; and graduate school, 1927. A senior unit of Infantry ROTC was established in 1936 and a senior Air Force unit in 1946. The naval ROTC program was organized in September 1945 under the wartime V–12 program.

The two-word nickname, "Ole Miss," is better known in many parts of the country than the official title of the University of Mississippi. Origin of the nickname dates back to the fall of 1896 when students sought a proper name for a yearbook for the university. The name suggests the ante bellum slave who knew the wife of his owner by no other title than Ole Miss, and their mistress' daughter as Young Miss. The student yearbook appears today under the same title, but the term "Ole Miss" has long since been used to apply to the whole university.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 10, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida;

S. 263. An act to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes;

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census;

S. 692. An act to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business;

S. 873. An act for the relief of Warren H. McKenney;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West;

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the code of laws of the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes", approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes;

S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036);

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage Housing project at Middletown, R. I.;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen;

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946;

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army;

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174);

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels;

S. 1861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service;

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.;

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.;

S. 2152. An act to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks;

S. 2288. An act to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction;

S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircrafts, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft;

S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances;

S. 2479. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States;

S. 2496. An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described;

S. 2553. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.;

S. 2592. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings;

S. 2593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.;

S. 2643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939;

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

DEATH OF HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I feel it my painful duty to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, died today.

Secretary Schwellenbach was an honored, able, and respected Member of this body. He was a conscientious and distinguished judge on the Federal bench. For the last 3 years he has been Secretary of Labor in the Cabinet of the President. I am sure that I express the feeling of all Senators when I say that no more conscientious public servant has been in Washington for many years. Whether in the Senate, on the bench, or at the head of a department, Mr. Schwellenbach was a hard-working, honest, sincere, and capable public servant. It is a real pity that he has been cut off in the prime of life by his untimely death, because in that fact the public has lost a diligent, trustworthy, and outstanding public servant.

I am sure I express the feeling of all Senators when I say we deeply regret the untimely passing of Secretary Schwellenbach, and appreciate the services he has rendered in every capacity in public life, and also pay tribute to his sterling qualities as a private citizen.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution pertaining to the death of Secretary Schwellenbach, and ask for it immediate consideration. I might say that in my remarks and in the resolution the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is absent in the State of Washington on account of the presence there of the President of the United States, joins and shares in the sentiment expressed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 257) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, late Secretary of Labor.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 10:30 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel it advisable to announce that the funeral of Secretary Schwellenbach will be at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. Any Senators who feel they can attend I am sure will wish to know the hour of the service.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement regarding the death of Secretary Schwellenbach which I should like to have appear in the RECORD at this point, as well as a number of statements by others along the same line.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY, OF MONTANA, ON THE DEATH OF SECRETARY SCHWELLENBACH

Judge Schwellenbach was one of the great men in our public life, and one of the quietest and most modest.

He came to prominence and power the hard way, through work and without any golden spoon. He was born in Wisconsin and moved with his family at an early age to Spokane, Wash.

His father died when he was quite young and at the age of 8 he was selling newspapers to help support his family. He went through school and then worked his way through the University of Washington, where he earned his law degree in 1917. He was a great debater and organized a Woodrow Wilson Club on the campus.

He served in the infantry in the First World War and went into law practice soon thereafter.

For more than a decade he was a practicing lawyer in the Northwest, gaining prestige by his political prowess as well as his great legal ability.

He was elected a United States Senator in 1934 and came to Washington the following year with a bright and aggressive group of liberal Democrats who came to be known as the Young Turks, of whom I was one. This group had strong leanings toward liberal and labor causes and he was one of the most forthright and outspoken of the group, another member of which is now the President of the United States. He supported liberal relief expenditures during the depression, anti-lynching legislation, the utilities holding company bill, reciprocal trade agreements, the Wage-Hour and the Wagner Labor Acts and expansion of old-age pensions. He was an active member of Senator Hugo L. Black's lobby investigating committee.

We entered the Senate together in 1935 and it was my pleasure to work with him on a very personal basis throughout his service in this body. He was one of the hardest working, conscientious, and sincere Members of the Senate. In 1945, when he returned to Washington as Secretary of Labor, we resumed that warm personal friendship. At that time I was chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and worked very closely with him on the common problems of that committee and his Department.

President Roosevelt in May 1940 appointed him Federal district judge of the eastern district of Washington, but despite the fact that some might have regarded this as a reward to the faithful, Schwellenbach stayed in the Senate for a few months and opposed the administration on the issue of peacetime conscription, which he warned could be extended to break down freedom in this country. He served illustriously for years on the bench, and he preferred judicial life and labor to any other occupation.

But 6 weeks after Harry S. Truman was sworn in as President, he announced the appointment of Lew Schwellenbach as Secretary of Labor. His first order directed Labor Department employees to execute the laws as they stood, because his experience in the Senate and on the bench convinced him there was a tendency in the executive branch to interpret the law in the way an administrative officer thinks it should be instead of following the law as written by Congress.

At the outset he also warned both labor and management that industrial peace and creation of jobs were a joint responsibility.

Secretary Schwellenbach in his 3 years of service had probably more large-size headaches than any other member of the Cabinet. He inherited the inevitable disruptions of labor-management relations that followed the end of the war. He handled the great labor disputes of 1946 with humbleness and dignity. He never sought to coerce or cajole either side. The record of his success is remarkable and the failures—those instances in which strikes did occur—cannot be blamed on any lack of understanding or effort on his part.

His administrative achievements were considerable. He reorganized the formless Conciliation Service. He brought labor and management consultants directly into the operation of this and other bureaus of the Department. He reestablished the tradition of free collective bargaining—a tradition and a practice which had largely been forgotten during the war years when compulsory mediation and arbitration of labor disputes had been accepted by this Nation as a necessary evil.

Secretary Schwellenbach led in the administration's effort to build up our national program of social and labor legislation, so that we as a people may keep up with the fast-running tides of economic and social change. He was the leader in the administration's drive for raising the Federal minimum wage, expanding the coverage of the Social Security Act, promoting legislation to deal with discrimination in the economic field and perhaps most important of all defending the rule of reason in the Government's function with relation to labor-management activities.

He recommended veto of the Taft-Hartley bill to President Truman, and it is reported widely that his advice to the President prevailed over the first advice of other members of the Cabinet.

The Secretary of Labor also established a program to help labor make its views heard in international affairs. He stimulated the many activities of the Department which deal with foreign labor problems and has obtained labor representation on many of the international bodies which deal with problems affecting American labor. He took an active part in the affairs of the International Labor Organization and has consulted with America's leaders of labor on the problems developing in the course of our efforts to further international understanding. For he realized that one of the basic problems of world peace is to bring peoples of various countries closer together. That job is more important probably even than bringing governments more closely together.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The White House issued this statement by the President:

"I have heard with deepest grief of the death of Lewis Schwellenbach. He was my warm personal friend. He was a great Senator, a great judge, and a great Secretary of Labor."

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Secretary of State Marshall said:

"Secretary Schwellenbach's death comes as a great shock and a great sorrow to his friends and as a national bereavement to the Government and the people of the United States."

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM GREEN

President William Green of the American Federation of Labor today issued the following statement:

"I learned with deep regret of the sudden death of Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach. Throughout his public career, Secretary Schwellenbach evinced keen sympathy with the cause of the underprivileged and warm support for the interests of American workers.

"As Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach strove courageously to bring about better relations between management and labor. His efforts to prevent the passage of anti-labor legislation and to advance social-justice legislation were thwarted by a reactionary Congress which retaliated by amputating the scope and authority of the Department of Labor.

"Mr. Schwellenbach fought a good fight, although a losing one. His loss will be mourned by the American workers whose welfare he so stanchly defended."

CIO OFFICERS LAUD CAREER OF LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

President Philip Murray and Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey of the CIO today voiced grief over the death of Secretary of Labor Lewis Schwellenbach:

Mr. Murray's statement:

"The Nation has suffered a severe loss in the passing of Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach. In the Senate of the United States, on the Federal bench, and in his position as Secretary of Labor, he rendered brilliant, self-sacrificing service to his Nation and to the people.

"His conduct and administration of the affairs of the Department of Labor won for him the respect and admiration of organized labor. I had the honor to know him personally and I know, as millions of others know, that our country has suffered a great loss. In expressing these sentiments I bespeak the thoughts of millions of organized workers throughout the United States."

Mr. Carey's statement:

"Workers throughout the Nation will be grieved by the death of Lewis Schwellenbach. He was a fine public servant, as a Senator, as a judge, as head of the Department of Labor. Throughout his entire career, Lewis Schwellenbach was always loyal to a deep sense of humanitarianism. He wanted to see our country always better for its people. He cherished our finest democratic ideals; and he toiled unceasingly for the improvement of our people and our institutions.

"As one who knew Lewis Schwellenbach and worked with him for many years, I mourn his loss. The Department of Labor will miss his wise and able leadership. And members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations will feel the lack of his sage advice and friendly spirit."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR J. HOWARD M'GRATH, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

In the death of Lewis B. Schwellenbach the country has lost a great Secretary of Labor and a stanch fighter for the welfare of the workingman. He has served with distinction and uncommon ability as a lawyer, legislator, jurist, and a member of the Cabinet. During these troubled postwar years, his leadership, his patience and understanding, and his great ability have made immeasurable contributions toward true industrial peace and toward safeguarding the rights of the plain people of America. Those who have served with Secretary Schwellenbach in the fight for a better democracy have lost a leader and companion who will never be replaced.

But the devotion to duty which shortened his life's span will inspire us with renewed determination to achieve the better America and the better world we sought together.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to add my own testimony of tribute to what has already been said about the departed Secretary of Labor, Hon. Lewis M. Schwellenbach. I do not know of a man whom I have had the privilege of calling my friend, whom I deem a more faithful, a more honest and sincere public servant, than "Lew" Schwellenbach. Throughout his whole career he was a man of humane sentiments and of large human sympathy. Whether as a law professor, whether as a Senator, whether as a judge on the bench or as Secretary

of Labor, he not only tried to do his duty, but he also tried to have due regard for the welfare and the well-being of the men, women, and children of the country.

He was a devoted family man, a loyal and beloved friend, an eminent lawyer, judge, Senator. He was a faithful, able, and selfless public servant.

The Nation is vastly poorer this day since "Lew" Schwellenbach has passed from our midst.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, Lewis B. Schwellenbach might have remained on the Federal bench for many years. There, at least by comparison, the life he lived was serene. Instead, he chose to accept perhaps the most difficult assignment which faced any official of our domestic executive departments.

No situation existed, when the war suddenly ended, which presented such difficult and complex problems as the relations of management and labor. For 5 years the necessarily directive powers exercised by the War Labor Board had supplanted collective bargaining. Conflict between the economic forces of industry and workers was inevitable. There were many grievances and dissatisfactions which had smouldered throughout the crucial days of the war.

The President looked for a man to do this job. He found him in the man with whom he had entered the United States Senate in 1935. Lew Schwellenbach did not hesitate when asked to assume the vast responsibilities which then—as well as now—faced the Secretary of the United States Department of Labor.

He was the right man for the job, for he possessed those qualities and a varied experience which the job called for. His rise to prominence and distinction was not along a path of roses. As a boy he sold newspapers to help his widowed mother support the family. He worked his way through high school and college. He had barely obtained his degree in law before he temporarily abandoned his profession to serve his country as a private in World War I.

In the 25 years that have passed since Lewis Schwellenbach hung out his shingle, as lawyer, judge, and Senator he has fought for the betterment of all the people. As an attorney, he fought for public ownership of public utilities. As advocate of workingmen, he fought for the legal rights of strikers to picket to redress the wrongs to which they had been subjected. As a Member of this body he helped to prepare, and supported throughout, the social legislation which marked the first two terms of the Roosevelt administration. Many of us remember with respect and admiration the courage, resourcefulness, and tenacity with which he initiated and defended some of those measures.

Though assured of renomination, Lew Schwellenbach left the Senate in 1940 to accept an appointment to the Federal bench in his home State of Washington, where he served with distinction for 5 years. It is but another example of his courage that he forsook the calm of the court for the arena of battle when his sense of duty called.

As Secretary of Labor, he administered the laws of his Department as they were written, without fanciful interpretations to change their intent. He was just where judicial conduct was appropriate. With equal conviction, he also was an eloquent pleader for labor in those situations which called for the exercise of the duties of his office. As a friend, I mourn him. As a former colleague, I pay homage to his memory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join in tribute to "Lew" Schwellenbach. When I entered the Senate I soon found myself in happy association with him. He was my friend and always the steadfast and helpful friend.

In this body he was ever on the side of the plain people fighting their battles, working indefatigably to advance their welfare and their security, to promote their progress and their happiness. He was always the stalwart champion of their cause.

As a lawyer, legislator, jurist, and Cabinet member, "Lew" Schwellenbach served our country with devotion and distinction. As the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has suggested his services to the American people hastened his life to an untimely end. So long as men struggle for freedom and a better democracy his memory will be cherished. Those of us who were privileged to know him and work with him will never cease to miss him. There was no finer, braver, manlier man.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, while the call of the calendar is interrupted, I wish to take this opportunity for just a brief moment to join with those Senators who have risen to speak of the passing of our former colleague, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach. I was impressed by what was said by the Senator from Utah concerning Judge Schwellenbach, as he was then known, giving up his office to return to Washington.

It happens, Mr. President, that I know from close and intimate association with Senator Schwellenbach, when he was a Member of this body, that he was in ill health and that that was one of the reasons for his retiring to accept a position on the bench in the State of Washington.

I visited him in his home subsequently. I found him completely restored to health, living a happy life, doing the work he loved to do, among people whom he loved so much.

When President Truman asked Judge Schwellenbach to become Secretary of Labor, I know that his response to the call was, as was said by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], simply his response to the call of duty. He came back to Washington to undertake the strenuous duties of the office of Secretary of Labor, knowing full well that his health might again be impaired as it had been previously. But he put duty, responsibility, and loyalty above his personal health. Perhaps this day he paid the supreme sacrifice of loyalty to country by his death, which so unfortunately occurred this morning.

I know, Mr. President, that among his outstanding characteristics perhaps there was no greater trait than his absolute and firm belief in the principles of democracy. He believed not passively, but actively and vigorously, in the rights of all people to govern themselves.

"Lew" Schwellenbach was a true Democrat. I can pay him no greater tribute than to say that wherever freedom was imperiled, wherever the rights and liberties of free citizens were encroached upon, there was always a stout and courageous defender in our former colleague, Senator Schwellenbach.

With his devoted wife and all his friends and associates, I join in the expression of sorrow and sadness at his passing.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CORDON presented the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5770) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19, 25, 29, and 30, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$4,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$52,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$174,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$19,584,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$193,584,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$12,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following: "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$505,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$172,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$2,114,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$12,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$2,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$17,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following "23,042,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$23,042,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$7,658,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$14,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$42,457,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 12, 15, and 34.

GUY CORDON,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GORDON CANFIELD,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOE B. BATES,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon what has been done on the subject of typewriters? I notice in the conference report the statement:

> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 15 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment—

Which is that—

> notwithstanding the foregoing paragraphs, in the event the Director of the Bureau of Federal Supply is unable to furnish any such agency with suitable typewriters out of stock on hand, he may purchase typewriters for the account of such agency—

And so forth. I should like to know what was done about it.

Mr. CORDON. The bill provides first for the inventorying of all surplus typewriters in all the departments of the Government, the allocation of such surplus typewriters by the Director of the Bureau of Supply, and in cases where there are not adequate surplus typewriters, for the purchase, by the Director, of typewriters of such and such a make at a price of not to exceed 90 percent of the lowest list price of the manufacturer, plus the tax, which, of course, is simply canceled.

Mr. McMAHON. Once again one product in the whole range of everything the Government buys has been singled out and a selling price set upon it. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. Well, a ceiling price has been set.

Mr. McMAHON. That has not been done with respect to automobiles. It has not been done with respect to anything else the Government buys, except typewriters.

Mr. CORDON. Not by law.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. In connection with the percentage of the list price permitted, did the committee take into consideration the fact that some of the discounts allowed by the companies are not on the same level? It seems to me, from the way the bill is now drafted that there will be a differentiation between the different typewriter manufacturers. Can the Senator advise me on that point?

Mr. CORDON. The measure does not attempt to set a uniform price on the machines which the manufacturers make. It sets a percentage of the list net price of a manufacturer.

Mr. BALDWIN. What was the reason for the conference singling out this one particular product among all other products procured for the Government? Why should it be picked out of all the other items the Government has to buy and this particular qualification attached to it?

Mr. CORDON. I cannot read the minds of those who considered the matter. The Senator from Oregon is satisfied that this particular method of pricing is sound in view of the vast number of typewriters which must be purchased, and the very small number of manufacturers of typewriters, and the known facts with reference to the discounts in the sales of the various makes of typewriters.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to know that, so far as I am personally concerned, representing a State in which about 80 percent of the typewriters of the country are made, I intend, and I am sure my colleague will join me in the intention, to see if we cannot eliminate this discrimination in any future bill providing for the purchase of typewriters.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to associate myself with my colleague from Connecticut in what he has said. It seems to me that here is a discrimination against a particular item of manufacture which, in my opinion, is highly unjustified. We from Connecticut on not only this occasion but on many others have tried to eliminate the discrimination, and I think it should be eliminated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the bill carry an appropriation for the purchase of typewriters?

Mr. CORDON. It does.

Mr. AIKEN. The Government already owns practically three typewriters for every employee qualified to use them. What is the purpose of the item in the bill?

Mr. CORDON. The bill provides for the inventorying of all typewriters in any department of the Government before any purchase is made.

Mr. AIKEN. Does it require the use of the surplus typewriters?

Mr. CORDON. It does.

Mr. AIKEN. That is a perfectly legitimate purpose, because today the Government has more typewriters than there are employees qualified to use them.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. In answer to the observation made by the Senator from Vermont I desire the RECORD to show

that I do not want the Government to purchase one single typewriter it does not need whether made in Connecticut or Vermont or Kalamazoo. But my point is that when it does purchase typewriters it should purchase them on the same basis that it purchases any other item the Government buys.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Relative to the question of surplus typewriters, I should appreciate very much if the Senator, should he know where such typewriters could be obtained, would let me know about it, so we can give the various postmasters in the little towns a typewriter apiece. Some of the typewriters used in small post offices are 30 years old. The postmasters in many of the towns have written to the Post Office Department asking for new typewriters, and were told the Department did not have money with which to buy any. So if the Senator will let me know where surplus Government typewriters can be obtained I shall be glad to attempt to locate them.

Mr. CORDON. The inventories taken indicate that there is a vast number of surplus typewriters, and the Senator may locate them through the Director of the Bureau of Supply.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to say further that the typewriter manufacturers and makers in Connecticut do not want the Government to have any more typewriters than it needs. If the Government does not need any, it should not buy them. On the other hand, when it does get around to buying typewriters it should buy them on the same basis as it buys all other things it needs. Typewriters should not be discriminated against as they are in the bill.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that there is a great deal of misunderstanding respecting the surplus of typewriters. I want to say for the RECORD that if a young woman or a young man who is being paid three or four thousand dollars a year by the Government has to use a decrepit typewriter, which does not function, it means the loss of a great deal more money than if a new and perfect typewriter were bought for the use of the operator and the old one were turned in as part payment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5770, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 8, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 to the bill (H. R. 5770) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 15 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing paragraphs, in the event the Director of the Bureau of Federal Supply is unable to furnish any such agency with suitable typewriters out of stock on hand, he may purchase typewriters for the account of such agency: *Provided*, That the price paid during any quarter of the fiscal year for such typewriters shall not exceed 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government of the United States, or any agency thereof, and purchasers of typewriters for educational instruction purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 34 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of said amendment, strike out the word "same" and insert "said."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 15 and 34.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION AT NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted the following conference report, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 2 of the House engrossed amendment, lines 15 and 16, strike out "one hundred and fifteen duplex houses (two hundred and thirty family units)" and insert in lieu thereof "housing facilities for two hundred and thirty families."

On page 2 of the House engrossed amendment, line 20, strike out "Jersey City" and insert in lieu thereof "Lake Denmark."

On page 8 of the House engrossed amendment, line 23, after the word "unit", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That in any case in which the construction at any station of family quarters having a net floor area in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet is prohibited by the provisions of the foregoing proviso, an equal number of family quarters having a net floor area not in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet may be constructed at such station and any funds saved as a result of the construction of such smaller family quarters or as a result of the succeeding proviso may be utilized to construct family quarters having a net floor area not in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet at any Navy station scheduled for retention in the permanent Military Establishment."

On page 10 of the House engrossed amendment, line 6, strike out "$91,949,950" and insert in lieu thereof "$92,932,600."

On page 10 of the House engrossed amendment, line 8, strike out "$116,532,953" and insert in lieu thereof "$116,756,900."

And the House agree to the same.

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEORGE J. BATES,
L. C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
LANSDALE G. SASSCER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked whether or not there will be a night session. I announced at the beginning of the session that there would be no night session tonight. The unfinished business now is the United Nations resolution, which will be presented tomorrow. It is our intention, if it meets with the approval of Members of the Senate, to begin the session tomorrow at 10:30 a. m. We have a big day ahead of us, and we feel that if we do not have a night session tonight, we can probably gain 30 minutes tomorrow. I may also say that there will be sessions on Friday and Saturday.

It is our intention, when consideration of the United Nations resolution has been concluded, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, to make the reciprocal trade agreements bill the unfinished business.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has the Senator considered the possibility of a Saturday night session?

Mr. WHERRY. There is no intention to have a session on Saturday night.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the purpose to complete the call of the calendar tonight?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. What about the 35 bills which have been reported and which are on the calendar, but not in the folders?

Mr. WHERRY. We shall take care of the bills on the calendar. There are some reports which are not available. We shall have to ask the indulgence of Senators. It is intended to have a call of the calendar next week, to give Senators an opportunity to obtain consideration of bills.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the Senate, the clerk will state the first business on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine was announced as first in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I regret the

passing over of House bill 2245, Calendar No. 1485. I regret exceedingly that that bill could not have been considered this afternoon. After the overwhelming victory in the House and the overwhelming vote in that body, and the report of the Senate Committee on Finance, we could perhaps have disposed of the bill this afternoon.

I am particularly interested in that bill because the Representative from my district originally introduced it in the House. It passed the House by an overwhelming vote. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Finance, which has reported it. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio if he believes that we shall be able to reach the bill on the must list, which I read in the newspapers.

Mr. TAFT. It depends on whether we recess on the 19th or not.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, if we do not recess on the 19th——

Mr. TAFT. There is no disposition on the part of our committee to hold up that bill. On the other hand, there are bills of national importance which have been given priority. As soon as we finish what we have planned for consideration, we shall consider that bill among other bills.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly the bill of my distinguished friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory is not important. I believe that the oleomargarine bill is important. It is important to every housewife in the United States. It is important to the cotton farmers. It is important to the soybean farmers, and to other industries, as well as to the railroads and the people generally.

I hope some attention will be given the bill before the 19th of this month, so that it may be brought up and voted upon on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair reminds Senators that the Senate is proceeding under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MAYBANK. I quite understand that, Mr. President.

STAMP COMMEMORATING DEDICATION OF PALOMAR MOUNTAIN OBSERVATORY

The bill (S. 2616) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate bill is similar to House bill 6368, Calendar 1642. Is there objection to substituting the House bill for the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6368) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2616 will be indefinitely postponed.

STATUE OF GEN. JOSE GERVASIO ARTIGAS

The bill (S. 2591) to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States the bronze statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, as a gift from the people of Uruguay, and erect the same on a suitable site to be selected by the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in a public park or other federally owned property in the District of Columbia. Such statue shall not be erected until the plans and specifications for the pedestal and landscaping have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. The preparation of the plans and specifications for the pedestal and landscaping and the erection of the statue shall be under the supervision of the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including the design and construction of a suitable pedestal for such statue, the landscaping of the adjacent area, and the necessary plans therefor.

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE POTSDAM AGREEMENT AND VIOLATIONS THEREOF BY SOVIET RUSSIA

The resolution (S. Res. 213) calling on the President for information concerning the Potsdam agreement and violations thereof by Soviet Russia was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair states to the Senate that the notation on the calendar about an adverse report on the resolution is merely the necessary phraseology under the circumstances. The report is not adverse. The report is a complete compliance with the request of the resolution, so that there is no further need for the resolution.

With the consent and agreement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] the resolution will be indefinitely postponed.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

CREDIT FOR RETIREMENT PURPOSES TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H. R. 5112) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF MATURITY DATE OF CERTAIN BRIDGE BONDS

The bill (H. R. 3402) to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr., was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILSON. Let the bill go over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me ask what Senator objected to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILSON. I did.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the Senator from Iowa will withhold his objection until the Senator from Nevada can explain the bill.

Mr. WILSON. I shall be happy to have the Senator from Nevada explain the bill, but after the explanation is made, I shall insist that the bill be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 1490, House bill 3402. It is my understanding now that the objection which was made will not be renewed. I therefore ask for immediate consideration of the bill, if it is agreeable to the Senator who made the objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I now withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 1940, House bill 3402. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARKANSAS-MISSISSIPPI BRIDGE COMMISSION

The bill (H. R. 3915) to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE, FISH, AND GAME

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2721) to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, in line 1, to strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army"; and in line 5, after the word "Government", to strike out "and shall operate and maintain pool levels" and insert "and, to the maximum extent possible without causing damage to levee and drainage districts, adjacent railroads and highways, farm lands, and dam structures, shall generally operate and maintain pool levels."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PROHIBITION OF IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1447) to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds

under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, in line 6, after the word "amended", to strike out "(1) by inserting '(a)' immediately following 'SEC. 241.', (2) by striking out 'section' whenever it appears thereafter and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection', and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections" and insert "to read as follows."

On pages 2 and 3, to strike out:

(b) Each special permit issued under subsection (a) shall prescribe such requirements as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary for the transportation of wild animals and birds under humane and healthful conditions. It shall be unlawful for any person, including any importer and any master or person in charge of any vessel or other conveyance, knowingly to cause or permit any wild animal or bird to be transported to the United States, or any Territory or District thereof, under inhumane or unhealthful conditions or in violation of such requirements. When the Secretary shall determine that any wild animal or bird has been imported in violation of this subsection he may suspend the issuance of further permits to the importer thereof for such time as the Secretary shall deem proper. In any criminal prosecution for violation of this subsection and in any administrative proceeding for the suspension of the issuance of further permits—

(1) the condition of any vessel or conveyance, or the enclosures in which wild animals or birds are confined therein, upon its arrival in the United States, or any Territory or District thereof, shall constitute relevant evidence in determining whether the provisions of this subsection have been violated; and

(2) the presence in such vessel or conveyance at such time of a substantial ratio of dead, crippled, diseased, or starving wild animals or birds shall be deemed prima facie evidence of the violation of the provisions of this subsection.

(c) Upon the arrival in any State, Territory, or District of the United States, of any vessel or other conveyance bearing wild animals or birds, any representative of any humane agency authorized by the law of such State, Territory, or District to investigate humane conditions of animal or bird life therein may (1) enter such vessel or conveyance with the consent of the master or person in charge thereof; (2) assist the customs officers of the United States in determining the health conditions of such wild animals and birds, and whether they have been accorded humane treatment while in transit; and (3) treat or procure treatment for sick and injured animals and birds and remove from such vessel or conveyance those which are beyond recovery.

And insert:

SEC. 241. (a) The importation into the United States or any Territory or district thereof, of the mongoose, the so-called flying foxes or fruit bats, the English sparrow, the starling, and such other birds and animals as the Secretary of the Interior may from time to time declare to be injurious to the interests of agriculture or horticulture, is hereby prohibited; and all such birds and animals shall, upon arrival at any port of the United States, be destroyed or returned at the expense of the owner. Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the importation of natural-history specimens for museums or scientific collections, or of certain cage birds, such as domesticated canaries, parrots, or such other birds as the Secretary of the Interior may designate. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this subsection and subsection (b).

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such requirements and issue such permits as he may deem necessary for the transportation of wild animals and birds under humane and healthful conditions, and it shall be unlawful for any person, including any importer, knowingly to cause or permit any wild animal or bird to be transported to the United States, or any Territory or district thereof, under inhumane or unhealthful conditions or in violation of such requirements. In any criminal prosecution for violation of this subsection and in any administrative proceeding for the suspension of the issuance of further permits—

(1) the condition of any vessel or conveyance, or the enclosures in which wild animals or birds are confined therein, upon its arrival in the United States, or any Territory or district thereof, shall constitute relevant evidence in determining whether the provisions of this subsection have been violated; and

(2) the presence in such vessel or conveyance at such time of a substantial ratio of dead, crippled, diseased, or starving wild animals or birds shall be deemed prima facie evidence of the violation of the provisions of this subsection.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 241 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 391), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 241. (a) The importation into the United States or any Territory or district thereof, of the mongoose, the so-called flying foxes or fruit bats, the English sparrow, the starling, and such other birds and animals as the Secretary of the Interior may from time to time declare to be injurious to the interests of agriculture or horticulture, is hereby prohibited; and all such birds and animals shall, upon arrival at any port of the United States, be destroyed or returned at the expense of the owner. Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the importation of natural-history specimens for museums or scientific collections, or of certain cage birds, such as domesticated canaries, parrots, or such other birds as the Secretary of the Interior may designate. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this subsection and subsection (b).

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such requirements and issue such permits as he may deem necessary for the transportation of wild animals and birds under humane and healthful conditions, and it shall be unlawful for any person, including any importer, knowingly to cause or permit any wild animal or bird to be transported to the United States, or any Territory or district thereof, under inhumane or unhealthful conditions or in violation of such requirements. In any criminal prosecution for violation of this subsection and in any administrative proceeding for the suspension of the issuance of further permits—

"(1) the condition of any vessel or conveyance, or the enclosures in which wild animals or birds are confined therein, upon its arrival in the United States, or any Territory or district thereof, shall constitute relevant evidence in determining whether the provisions of this subsection have been violated; and

"(2) the presence in such vessel or conveyance at such time of a substantial ratio of dead, crippled, diseased, or starving wild animals or birds shall be deemed prima facie evidence of the violation of the provisions of this subsection."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STOPPAGE OF WORK ON CERTAIN COMBATANT VESSELS

The bill (S. 2400) to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso of title III of the Second Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" (60 Stat. 227), in the discretion of the President shall not apply to the following vessels: *Kentucky* (BB66), *Hawaii* (CB3), *Wagner* (DE539) *Vandiver* (DE540), *Castle* (DD720), *Woodrow R. Thompson* (DD721), *Lansdale* (DD766), *Seymour D. Owens* (DD767), *Hoel* (DD768), *Abner Read* (DD769), *Seaman* (DD791), *Unicorn* (SS436), and *Walrus* (SS437).

EXTENSION OF FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC., TO MILITARY DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS

The bill (S. 2621) authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to the extent and under such terms and conditons as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., the provisions of the act of May 27, 1930 (ch. 340, 46 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 744a–h); the act of June 23, 1934 (ch. 736, 48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744i–n); and Executive Order 6917, dated December 11, 1934, shall apply to the industrial employment and training of prisoners convicted by general courts martial and confined in any institution under the jurisdiction of any department or agency comprising the National Military Establishment.

SEC. 2. Transfer by any department or agency comprising the National Military Establishment to Federal Prison Industries, Inc., without exchange of funds is authorized of any property or equipment suitable for use in carrying out the functions and performing the duties covered by any agreement entered into under section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. In addition to the members of the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., authorized by section 2 of the act of June 23, 1934 (ch. 736, 48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744j), the President shall appoint an additional member of the Board as a representative of the Secretary of Defense. Such additional member shall serve at the will of the President and without compensation.

SEC. 4. For its own use in the industrial employment and training of prisoners and not for transfer or disposition, transfers of surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 may be made to Federal Prison Industries, Inc., without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

PREVENTION OF RETROACTIVE CHECKAGE OF RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEN AND WARRANT OFFICERS

The bill (H. R. 5344) to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as

amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE FILES OF THE FBI

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on the 20th of May, during the debate on Senate bill 1004, a measure "to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to grant specific authority to the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the character, associations, and loyalty of persons nominated for appointment," I made a statement in discussing the matter with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] which implied that the FBI office kept files on all important persons in public life.

My statement was called to the attention of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover; and under date of May 22, he wrote me a letter on the subject, which I have asked his permission to publish in the RECORD in order to clarify the position of the FBI with regard to this important question. I have just received, from Mr. Hoover, a letter saying that he will be glad to have his letter published. Since the letter is short I shall read it:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C. May 22, 1948.

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your remarks on the floor on May 20 in connection with debates on Senate bill 1004 have been called to my attention, particularly that portion wherein you stated you called the FBI office and inquired whether a special investigation was made of the members appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission and you were told: "No, there was not. We keep files on all important persons, * * *"

Following your reference to the maintenance of files on all important persons, several other Senators picked this up and I have no doubt that the old charge will now be revived that the FBI maintains files on prominent persons.

As you stated, you did call the Bureau about noon on April 2, 1947, and inquired of one of my assistants whether the FBI had investigated the members of the Commission. You were correctly advised that we had not and this fact was later developed by both Senator HICKENLOOPER and you. Senator HICKENLOOPER was advised and I am sure you were, that we had merely checked our files and furnished any information therein to the President upon the President's request. Obviously, information does come into the Bureau in connection with official matters on individuals who are not the specific subjects of investigations and in such instances, this information is maintained in the files. However, it would be most incorrect to state that the FBI keeps files on all important persons.

Later in the debate, innuendoes by others indicated that the FBI maintained files on Congressmen. This is certainly incorrect except insofar as files containing correspondence with various Members of Congress are concerned.

I did want to drop you this personal note in order that if the question should come up at any future time on the types of files maintained in the Bureau, you will have the facts.

With best wishes and kind regards,
Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Mr. President, I am happy to publish this letter in order to make clear the position of the FBI on this question.

HEADSTONES FOR UNMARKED GRAVES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4272) to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, after the word "cemeteries", to strike out: "The Secretary of the Army is also authorized and directed to furnish appropriate memorial markers at the request of the next of kin for all members of the armed forces of the United States dying in service on or after September 3, 1939, and whose bodies have not been recovered. These memorial markers may be placed in a national cemetery at appropriate places designated by the Secretary at the request of the next of kin or may be delivered to the next of kin to be placed in some cemetery of his choice. In the event same is to be placed in a cemetery other than a national cemetery, no expense will be borne by the Government other than the cost of the memorial marker and the shipping costs" and insert "The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized and directed to compile a list of the names of all members of the armed forces of the United States who died while serving in such forces in the overseas theaters of operations on or after September 3, 1939, and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea. Upon the compilation of such list of names and other appropriate data, the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Secretary of the Army are authorized and directed to provide for the inscribing of each such name and pertinent data with respect to the individual on the wall of a chapel or other appropriate memorial erected by the American Battle Monuments Commission or by the Department of the Army. In determining the particular chapel or other memorial on the wall of which any particular name shall be inscribed, the Commission and the Secretary shall follow the general rule of having the name inscribed upon the wall of that chapel or other memorial which is appropriate in view of the circumstances under which the deceased died in the service of his country."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAYMENTS TO SURVIVING BROTHERS OF DECEASED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H. R. 5758) to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DELEGATION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY POWERS

The bill (H. R. 4032) to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE TO OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLA., OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out: "That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for public recreational purposes, and subject to the further limitations and restrictions, hereinafter enumerated, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., extending 1 mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Fla., except for a strip of land 600 feet wide (300 feet east and 300 feet west from center line of road leading to radar site "Dick"), extending from Highway 98 to the mean low water level of the Gulf of Mexico, and 2 miles west from said bridge, and to that part of Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass (consisting of two small islands), said property being under the jurisdiction of the War Department" and insert "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, subject to the limitations and conditions hereinafter enumerated and such others as he may prescribe, to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all or any part of that portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., extending 1 mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Fla., except for a strip of land 600 feet wide (300 feet east and 300 feet west from center line of road leading to radar site "Dick"), extending from Highway 98 to the mean low water level of the Gulf of Mexico, and 2 miles west from said bridge, and to all or any part of that portion of said Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass (consisting of two small islands), said property being under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. Such conveyance shall be made upon payment by said county of a sum which shall be equal to the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is

offered for sale without regard to its former character or use, as determined by the Secretary, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said island, prior to its conveyance to the United States, as the Secretary shall determine to be fair and equitable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 17, after the word "Dick", to insert "the fence erected at the westerly limit to be maintained by Okaloosa County and the fence erected around radar site 'Dick' to be maintained by the Department of the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 4, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Army"; and in line 9, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "or" and insert "the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RANK OF ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

The bill (S. 2770) to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the officer of the Corps of Engineers assigned to duty as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of civil works, including river and harbor and flood-control improvements, shall, while assigned to such duty, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier general: *Provided*, That this position shall not be charged against the authorized strength of general officers of the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That the pay and allowances, mileage and travel allowances, of the officer holding such position shall be paid from the appropriations for the work or works upon which he is engaged.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT OF 1916

The bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think the bill is rather important. I do not like to object, but I should like an explanation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, at this time I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. REVERCOMB] and my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Public Lands, the distinguished Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for the long and faithful work in developing this bill. Mr. President, this bill, H. R. 5888, as amended by the Committee on Public Works, amends the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916, as amended, for the purpose of authorizing annual appropriations to the States for the construction of roads for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951. The principal provisions of the bill are as follows:

First, an annual appropriation of $400,000,000 for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 is authorized. No change is made in the formula for apportioning the shares of the States, nor in the distribution of the amount allocated to each State for use on the three types of systems, the Federal-aid primary system, the secondary system, and the urban system. The bill takes note of present-day needs in road building, and chiefly because of the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] we have provided that if a State chooses to use any part of its allocation for the primary system, or the interstate system, a network of some 38,000 miles which has been designated by the Federal and State road departments as most important to communication and defense needs, the Federal Government may pay 60 percent of the cost against 40 percent paid by the State. It is hoped that this provision may initiate the completion of a network of high-type roads.

It should be noted, however, that this provision does not require any increase in the appropriation. It is simply a division of the authorization to expedite work upon the interstate system.

A second change is the provision which permits the full application of funds which a State may not be able to match, to the construction of primary roads traversing a national forest area. This provision will assist States with large nontaxable areas, hasten road construction through national-forest areas, and assist in the development and use of their resources.

Again it must be noted that this change requires no increase in the total amount of authorization.

Third, the Commissioner is directed to inform the Congress by April 1, 1949, of the condition of what is known as the strategic network of highways in this country, upon the theory that those roads which are necessary for national defense should have their condition made known to the Congress.

The House bill has been amended with respect to other appropriations. The $25,000,000 authorized by the House for the construction of forest highways is reduced to $20,000,000 and the $12,500,000 for the construction of development trails within the forests, is increased to $20,000,000. The amount authorized for the construction of forest highways may be obligated by the Commissioner of Public Roads as funds are now obligated for the Federal highways system by agreement upon specific projects. The sum of $12,500,000 is authorized for parkways and roads between our national parks, and $10,000,000 for roads and trails within national parks representing increases respectively of $2,500,000 and $5,750,000. These amounts cannot be contractually obligated, however, by action of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

The same amount previously authorized for Indian-reservation roads, namely, $6,000,000, is authorized.

A change in the existing law is made with respect to the allotment of funds for administrative research and investigational expense. Heretofore 2½ percent of the funds actually appropriated could be used for administrative expenses. By reason of the fact a long period of time is required to use the funds on specific projects, and because of increases in salaries, and other administrative expenses, we have increased the percentage of funds that may be used for administrative expense from 2½ to 3¾ percent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky will be permitted to exceed the 5-minute limit.

Mr. COOPER. I call attention to the report of the committee urging the Commission to develop standards which will expedite the building of farm-to-market roads. This was urged by the American Farm Bureau and Farm Grange. In comparing the bill agreed to by Senate Committee on Public Works with the bill passed by the House, the Senate will note these changes:

The House authorized appropriations for three fiscal years, 1950, 1951, and 1952. The Committee on Public Works makes authorization only for two fiscal years, 1950 and 1951.

Some $300,000,000 of the $1,500,000,000 authorized in 1944, has not yet been programmed by the States, and actual contracts are far behind. There is an inequality of progress in the programs of the various States. It was believed that it would be wise to review this program again in 2 years rather than 3 years.

Second, the bill reduces the annual authorization from $500,000,000 to $400,000,000. This action was taken because the facts show that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the States have not been able to obligate more than $400,000,000 a year of the $1,500,000,000 authorized in 1944 and have not actually contracted or spent over $900,000,000 of the billion and a half dollars. It it believed that in the next 3 years $400,000,000 will be as much as can be efficiently used.

I should like to point out, so that the Senate will know and that there may be no misunderstanding, that there is no authorization for the fiscal year 1949. There have been some inquiries on this subject. The President asked for authorizations for 1950 and 1951 only. The Commissioner of Public Roads made rec-

ommendations only for those years. The Association of State Highway Officials asked for appropriations only for those years. Following these recommendations, we did not authorize the appropriations for this fiscal year. None is needed, because there is a large volume of funds previously authorized which have not actually been programed by the States, and upon which contracts have not actually been let. This carry-over of funds from previous years will be available, and to insure that there will be no lapse in the road program of any State the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized immediately to apportion the amount authorized for 1950, so that it may become available to the States for programing. There will be no hiatus in the program of road construction.

An amendment will be offered which will clarify the situation. This amendment was developed as the result of conferences with the Commissioner, highway officials of New Jersey, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. In the method of allocating these funds the appropriation brought about a situation in several States, my own State of New Jersey, California, Texas, and the District of Columbia. If the amendment which I shall offer is not accepted, it is possible that there will be a break in the continuity of construction which those States are carrying on, because up to date they have used their full allocation and, therefore, they have no leeway.

I have asked the Senator from Kentucky if he will accept an amendment to allow the States to continue their construction during the coming year. I should like to ask the clerk to read the amendment, and I shall ask for its inclusion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair inquire whether there is objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 359), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

The amendments were on page 1, line 6, to strike out "postwar"; on line 10 to strike out "$500,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000"; on page 2, line 2, after "1951", to strike out "and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952;" in line 10, after "(58 Stat. 838)" to strike out "except that for the purposes of this act and all subsequent acts continuing the postwar construction and reconstruction of highways in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, (1) the term 'secondary and feeder roads' and the term 'principal secondary and feeder roads', wherever used in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, shall include county and township roads; and (2) in selecting county and township roads on which funds are to be expended, the State highway departments shall cooperate with township trustees and other appropriate local road officials."

On page 3, beginning in line 3, to strike out:

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for three fiscal years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall elapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if covered by formal agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of a specific project as provided by this act.

And insert:

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for one fiscal year after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any sums apportioned to any State under section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944, shall be available for expenditure in that State for three fiscal years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act.

On page 4, beginning in line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,500,000 for forest development roads and trails for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, subject to the proviso in section 9 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 respecting the apportionment for forest highways in Alaska.

And insert:

SEC. 2. (a) Following the approval of this act, when funds heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas are expended for any project on the National System of Interstate Highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, the Federal share payable on account of any such project may be 60 percent of the cost thereof plus a percentage of the remainder of such cost as now authorized by section 5 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

(b) The Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby directed to cooperate with the State highway departments in a study of the status of improvement of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944; to invite the cooperation and suggestions of the Secretary of Defense and the National Security Resources Board as to their indicated or potential needs for improved highways for the national defense; and to supplement, not later than April 1, 1949, the report dated February 1, 1941, entitled "Highways for the National Defense" (77th Cong., 1st sess.), to reflect current conditions and deficiencies.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, subject to the provision of section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 respecting the apportionment for forest highways in Alaska; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That immediately upon the passage of this act the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, shall be apportioned by the Federal Works Administrator for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, according to the area and value of the land owned by the Government within the national forests therein which the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to determine and certify to him from such information, sources, and departments as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem most accurate, and hereafter, on or before January 1 next preceding the commencement of each succeeding fiscal year the Federal Works Administrator shall make like apportionment of the appropriation authorized for such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Public Roads may incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under the apportionment of such authorizations, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made pursuant to authorizations heretofore, herein, and hereafter enacted for forest highways shall be considered available to the Commissioner of Public Roads for the purpose of discharging the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment: *Provided further*, That appropriations for forest highways shall be administered in conformity with regulations jointly approved by the Federal Works Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Public Roads shall transfer to the Chief of the Forest Service from appropriations for forest highways such amounts as may be needed to cover necessary administrative expenses of the Forest Service in connection with the forest-highway program: *And provided further*, That if, as to any State wherein such forest highways are located, it is not found feasible to expend all of the funds apportioned under section 1 of this act for the purposes for which such funds were so apportioned, the Commissioner of Public Roads in his discretion, and upon application in writing by the State highway department of such State, may agree with such State to pay, from the funds apportioned under section 1 of this act to such State and within the time such funds are available for expenditure, any or all of the funds which are not covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvements of specific projects as provided by this act, for payment up to the full cost of the construction of such forest highways across national forest lands within such State.

(b) The authorization in section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, is hereby canceled.

(c) Hereafter, construction work on forest-development roads and trails, pursuant to the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, estimated to cost $10,000 or more per mile, exclusive of bridges, shall be advertised and let to contract. If such estimated cost is less than $10,000 per mile, or if, after proper advertising, no acceptable bid is received, or the bids are deemed excessive, the work may be done by the Secretary of Agriculture on his own account.

On page 8, line 16, to strike out "3" and insert "4"; in line 24, to strike out "$4,250,000" and insert "$10,000,000"; in line 25, after the figures "1950", insert "and";

On page 9, lines 1 and 2, strike out "and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952"; in line 9, to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$12,500,000"; in line 10, after "1950", to insert "and"; in line 11, after "1951" to strike out "and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952"; in line 19, after "1950", insert "and";

On page 10, line 1, to strike out "4" and insert "5";

On the same page, after line 4, to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 6. The first paragraph of section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 21), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That so much, not to exceed 3¾ percent, of all moneys appropriated or authorized to be appropriated for expenditure under the provisions of this act, as the Federal Works Administrator may deem necessary for administering the provisions of this act and for carrying on necessary highway research and investigational studies independently or in cooperation with the State highway departments and other research agencies, and for publishing the results thereof, shall be deducted therefrom for such purposes when the apportionment is made and the amount so deducted shall be available until expended from appropriations made under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That should the apportionment of the amounts authorized for the third postwar fiscal year be made in accordance with section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 before the approval of this act, a revised apportionment may be made and the increased amount authorized by this section deducted for administration, research, and investigational studies."

And on page 11, line 1, to strike out "5" and insert "7."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] offers an amendment which the clerk will state:

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after "1944," it is proposed to add a colon and to insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the authorization for the fiscal year 1950 shall be apportioned among the States as soon as practicable after July 1, 1948, but not later than September 1, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military services, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will withhold his objection for a moment, I should like to explain the bill so that it may be clear. Next to the legislation providing for a 70-group air force, this is perhaps the most important measure recommended by the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board, as it is entirely fundamental to the future of our air transport and our commercial development. While the bombing raids were the most spectacular feature of air operations during the last war, it is very true that the most significant development was the use of air for transportation both of cargo and personnel. I believe approximately 15,000 DC–3's and approximately 5,000 DC–4's served, both of which types were developed by private enterprise. Several of the aircraft companies and air lines, seeking in the good old-fashioned American way to carry on, have undertaken the development of new types and have literally lost their shirts. It cost between $25,000,000 and $40,000,000 for the development of a prototype, and after investing such sums they lost practically everything they had.

So it was considered by the Joint Congressional Policy Board and the President's Board, and by all Government agencies concerned, both military and civilian, that in the future we can no longer rely upon private enterprise for this development. So they recommended this method of meeting this problem.

I may say that in the revolutionary development of jet transport, the British have now developed an eight-engine jet transport which is 2 years along in development. We have no comparable plane, and will be at a very serious disadvantage, both for military and civilian use, in the not distant future.

It is absolutely imperative for the normal development of our air progress, both for military transport of cargo and personnel and for commercial development, that this authorization be made before the end of this session, in order that the matter may be studied, and we may not lose further time in this development. This bill has the support of everyone concerned in the Senate and in the House, in the Government agencies, and in all private agencies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have already explained to the Senator from Maine that I was going to ask that this bill go over today in order that I might have an opportunity to study it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

POWERS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATOR

The bill (S. 2466) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word regarding this bill also. It merely provides for the evolution of our air waves activity in recognition of radar and other aids. Formerly there was simply an airport, and we needed little besides, but now we must have air waves, we must have radar facilities, and it is essential that authority shall exist in the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the development both in regard to the civil airways and also for our defense against overseas approach.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the request of a Senator who has not had an opportunity to look into the bill, I ask to have it go over in order that he may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR PENSIONERS

The bill (S. 2670) to amend section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 854), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"No member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve on active duty or on active duty for training shall be entitled to draw any pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, retainer pay, or retirement pay from the Government of the United States, by virtue of prior military and naval service, while receiving any pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses for periods of active duty or active duty for training: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as prohibiting the enlistment or appointment in the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve of any person who may be drawing such pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation: *Provided further*, That personnel mentioned in this section who perform active duty or active duty for training shall, for the periods of such duty, be entitled to receive either (1) the compensation for such duty, including any travel or other expenses incident thereto, or (2) the pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, retainer pay or retirement pay, but not both; and unless they specifically request the latter, they shall receive the former for the periods of such duty."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, a member of a reserve component of the Army of the United States or of the Air Force of the United States, who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States, may elect, with reference to periods of active duty or drill, training, instruction, or other duty for which he shall be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.), to receive either (1) the compensation for such duty and when authorized by law shall include travel or other expenses incident thereto, and subsistence and quarters, or commutation thereof, or (2) such pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, but not both; and unless he specifically requests the latter

he shall receive the former for such periods of duty.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of this act shall be effective from July 1, 1947.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE NAVY MEDICAL SERVICES CORPS

The bill (S. 2366) to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restrictions on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is the same as Calendar No. 1612, House bill 5983. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill and its consideration?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5983) to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2366 will be indefinitely postponed.

TRANSFER TO ALASKA OF THE ARMY VESSEL "HYGIENE"

The bill (H. R. 3833) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title of the Army vessel *Hygiene* was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSSESSION OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2028) to amend the law relating to the possession, carrying, and acquisition of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932 (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., secs. 22-3201 to 22-3203, 22-3205 to 22-3216; Supp. V, sec. 22-3204) is hereby amended by adding the following sections:

"SEC. 18. (a) As used in this section, the term 'dangerous article' means (1) any weapon such as a pistol, machine gun, sawed-off shotgun, blackjack, slung shot, sand club, sandbag, or metal knuckles, or (2) any instrument, attachment, or appliance for causing the firing of any firearms to be silent or intended to lessen or muffle the noise of the firing of any firearms.

"(b) A dangerous article unlawfully owned, possessed, or carried, is hereby declared to be a nuisance.

"(c) When a police officer, in the course of a lawful arrest or lawful search, discovers a dangerous article which he reasonably believes is a nuisance under subsection (b) he shall take it into his possession and surrender it to the property clerk of the Metropolitan Police Department.

"(d) (1) Within 30 days after the date of such surrender, any person may file in the office of the property clerk of the Metropolitan Police Department a written claim for possession of such dangerous article. Upon the expiration of such period, the property clerk shall notify each such claimant, by registered mail addressed to the address shown on the claim, of the time and place of a hearing to determine which claimant, if any, is entitled to possession of such dangerous article. Such hearing shall be held within 60 days after the date of such surrender.

"(2) At the hearings the property clerk shall hear and receive evidence with respect to the claims filed under paragraph (1). Thereafter he shall determine which claimant, if any, is entitled to possession of such dangerous article and shall reduce his decision to writing. The property clerk shall send a true copy of such written decision to each claimant by registered mail addressed to the last known address of such claimant.

"(3) Any claimant may, within 30 days after the day on which the copy of such decision was mailed to such claimant, file an appeal in the municipal court for the District of Columbia. If the claimant files an appeal, he shall at the same time give written notice thereof to the property clerk. If the decision of the property clerk is so appealed, the property clerk shall not dispose of the dangerous article while such appeal is pending and, if a final judgment is entered by such court, he shall dispose of such dangerous article in accordance with the judgment of such court. The municipal court for the District of Columbia is authorized to determine which claimant, if any, is entitled to possession of the dangerous article and to enter a judgment ordering a public disposition of such dangerous article consistent with subsection (f).

"(4) If there is no such appeal, or if such appeal is dismissed or withdrawn, the property clerk shall dispose of such dangerous article in accordance with subsection (f).

"(5) The property clerk shall make no disposition of a dangerous article under this section, whether in accordance with his own decision or in accordance with the judgment of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, until the Unitel States attorney for the District of Columbia certifies to him that such dangerous article will not be needed as evidence.

"(e) A person claiming a dangerous article shall be entitled to its possession only if (1) he shows on satisfactory evidence that he is the owner of the dangerous article or is the accredited representative of the owner, and that the ownership is lawful; and (2) he shows on satisfactory evidence that at the time the dangerous article was taken into possession by a police officer it was not unlawfully owned and was not unlawfully possessed or carried with the knowledge or consent of the claimant; and the receipt of possession by him will not cause the article to be a nuisance. A representative is accredited if he has a power of attorney from the owner.

"(f) If a person claiming a dangerous article is entitled to its possession as determined under subsection (d), possession of such dangerous article shall be given to such person. If no person so claiming is entitled to its possession as determined under subsection (d), or if there be no claimant, such dangerous article shall be destroyed.

"(g) The property clerk shall not be liable in changes for any action performed in good faith under this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes."

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY AND POST-GRADUATE SCHOOL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 239) relating to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and post graduate school, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That there shall be appointed on or before the last day of every year a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 2. Each Board shall be constituted as follows:

(a) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee;

(b) Three other members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(c) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee;

(d) Four other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(e) Nine persons to be appointed by the President. The first Board to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall, with respect to the nine Presidential appointees, consist of three persons appointed to serve for a period of 1 year, three persons appointed to serve for a period of 2 years, and three persons appointed to serve for a period of 3 years. Three Presidential appointees shall be appointed to each subsequent Board to serve for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 3. In case of the death or resignation of a member of a Board during the term for which such member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Such successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member who died or resigned.

SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed once annually in April, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, make such other visits on matters pertaining to the duties of the Board, or for purposes of consulting with the respective Superintendents of the Academies, as the Board or its members may determine to be desirable.

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of each Board to inquire into the state of morale and discipline, curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy concerned which the Board may decide to consider.

(b) Each Board shall, within 60 days after the meeting designated as the annual visit, submit a written annual report to the President regarding its action as such Board, together with its views and recommendations pertaining to the Academy concerned. Any report based on a visit other than the annual visit shall be submitted by the originator or originators thereof to the President within 60 days after approval of said report by at least a majority of the members of the Board.

(c) Each Board is authorized to call into consultation upon prior approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, such advisers as it may deem necessary or advisable to effectuate the duties imposed upon it by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Each member of each Board shall receive not more than $5 per day and be

reimbursed under Government travel regulations for actual expenses of travel while performing duties as a member of either Board.

(b) Advisers called for consultation by either Board in connection with the business of the Board shall be compensated in the same manner as members of the Boards in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 7. That part of the act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," which relates to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy (39 Stat. 608), and reads as follows: "From and after the passage of this act there shall be appointed every year, in the following manner, a Board of Visitors, to visit the academy, the date of the annual visit of the board aforesaid to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy: Seven persons shall be appointed by the President and four Senators and five Members of the House of Representatives shall be designated as visitors by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, in the month of January of each year. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio members of said Board.

"Each member of said board shall receive while engaged upon duties as a member of the board not to exceed $5 a day and actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. (a) So much of the provision of the act of August 9, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," which provides as follows: "*Provided*, That the act approved May 28, 1908, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows: That hereafter the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy shall consist of five members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and seven members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen thereof; the members so appointed shall visit the Military Academy annually at such time as the chairmen of said committees shall appoint, and the members from each of said committees may visit said Academy together or separately as the said committees may elect during the session of Congress; and the superintendent of the Academy and the members of the Board of Visitors shall be notified of such date by the chairmen of the said committees. The expenses of the members of the Board shall be their actual expenses while engaged upon their duties as members of said Board not to exceed $5 per day and their actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes" is hereby repealed.

(b) The act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 597), is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes."

LANDING OF HALIBUT IN ALASKAN PORTS

The bill (H. R. 6110) to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 843) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let us have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 1610, House bill 6759, a companion bill, be substituted for Senate bill 843 and considered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

FRUIT GROWERS OF DELAWARE

The bill (H. R. 2684) for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELSIE L. ROSENOW

The bill (H. R. 1726) for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DORIS E. SNYDER

The bill (S. 165) for the relief of Doris S. Snyder was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doris E. Snyder, of Dayton, Ohio, the sum of $4,737. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Doris E. Snyder against the United States for compensation for the loss of personal property owned by her which was destroyed and lost in the burning and sinking of the Argentine ship, steamship *Rio de la Plata*, on August 17, 1944, aboard which she was accompanying her husband, Capt. Wesley E. Snyder, under War Department orders: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ANNIE L. TAYLOR AND WILLIAM BENJAMIN TAYLOR

The bill (H. R. 1781) for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATURALIZATION OF RICHARD KIM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 108) to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Richard Kim, who served as a member of the armed forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8. The Secretary of State is directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The bill (S. 2517) to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, when Calendar No. 1521, Senate bill 2517, was reached on the Calendar, I objected, but I was under a misapprehension and thought it was another bill. I ask that the bill may be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) In any case in which an officer or employee to whom this act applies died prior to March 1, 1948, and had to his credit on the date of his death sufficient accumulated and current accrued annual leave to cover the administrative work days during the period between the date of death and March 1, 1948, such death shall be deemed for the purposes of this subsection to have occurred subsequent to February 28, 1948."

AIRPORT MAILS

The bill (H. R. 2588), an act requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of the city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM R. STIGALL, DECEASED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1717) for the relief of William R. Stigall, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the tnird time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the death of said William R. Stigall (Army serial No. 15041820), sustained on September 5, 1941, between Little Rock and Benton, Ark., as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or

received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MRS. MYRTLE HOVDE

The bill (H. R. 633) for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARCHIE HAMILTON AND DELBERT HAMILTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1715) for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$1,672"; and on line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$1,696.35", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,672 to Archie Hamilton and the sum $1,696.35 to Delbert Hamilton, of Owensboro, Ky., in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle near Owensboro, Ky., on November 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp., of Detroit, Mich., was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ELBERT SPIVEY

The bill (H. R. 1855) for the relief of Elbert Spivey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMELINE LARTIGUE

The bill (H. R. 3352) for the relief of Emeline Lartigue was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MAE H. FITZGERALD

The bill (H. R. 3159) for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARDY H. BRYANT

The bill (H. R. 2479) for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARENCE S. OSIKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3260) for the relief of Clarence S. Osika, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,738.60" and insert "$9,879.85."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OPERATION OF IRRIGATION AND POWER SYSTEMS BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3218) to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment to add a section at the end of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 2. The term "unusual or emergency conditions," as used in this act, shall be construed to mean canal bank failures, generator failures, damage to transmission lines; or other physical failures or damage, or acts of God, or of the public enemy, fires, floods, drought, epidemics, strikes, or freight embargoes, or conditions, causing or threatening to cause interruption in water or power service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NONREIMBURSABLE ALLOCATIONS ON CARLSBAD RECLAMATION PROJECT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2286) to provide for nonreimbursable allocations on the Carlsbad Federal reclamation project, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to add a section at the end of the bill to be known as section 2, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to determine and to report to the President and the Congress those portions of the costs of construction heretofore completed or to be undertaken hereafter on the Carlsbad project, New Mexico, which may properly be allocated to (a) flood control, (b) general salinity control, (c) silt control, and (d) recreational purposes. Such determination and report shall cover also rehabilitation of the project, which rehabilitation is hereby authorized, and all costs allocated as aforesaid, together with the annual operation and maintenance costs thereafter attributable to the same purposes shall, after transmittal to the President and the Congress of the report provided for herein, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. The Secretary of the Interior shall credit the aggregate of the construction costs so allocated against repayment by the project, applying such credit to amounts already returned or to be expended in the future as may be appropriate and the Secretary is authorized to enter into such amendatory contract or contracts as he deems appropriate and consistent with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective upon the expiration of 90 calendar days from the receipt of the affected States, as that term is defined in section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), of the proposed report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Carlsbad project, New Mexico: *Provided*, That no views or recommendations submitted by an affected State set forth specific objections to the plans or proposals covered by such report. In the event views of recommendations submitted by an affected State set forth specific objections to such plans or proposals, then the authorization granted by this act shall not be effective.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The bill (S. 2638) to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Calendar No. 1616, House bill 6028 covers exactly the same subject. I move that the House bill be considered instead of the Senate bill, and that all after the enacting clause be stricken out, and the Senate bill as reported be substituted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in marking up the Interior Department appropriation bill, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has found a number of items for the reimbursement of schools. The language as written into that bill grants authorization to do this, but there is a provision that tuition shall be collected from the parents involved. That seems to me a sounder principle than is provided in the bill now before the Senate, which charges the whole cost to the cost of the project, and the employees contribute nothing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it was our theory that the children themselves should be put upon an equal basis with the employees of those who were doing construction work for the Government and the people who live in the vicinity. The bill which we have before us is limited entirely to the construction period and requires a report from the Secretary of the Interior every year as to how he is using his authority. We had some fear that there might be excessive expenditures on a construction job which really ought to be upon a temporary basis.

Coming again to the Senator's point, we do not believe that parents who are Government workers and who find themselves on a construction job of that kind, should be treated any differently than the parents who live there locally. They are all enjoying the same school facilities. The reason the local district is in the condition it is arises from the fact that a large project has been undertaken and a great number of people have been dumped into a school district all at once, and the school district is not able to

handle itself taxwise in order to meet the expenses.

Mr. BALL. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that I am familiar with the problem. I think the employees should contribute something in this case. Moreover, as I read the bill, there is no limitation. The Secretary or the chief of the bureau is there to negotiate one deal with one school district and a different deal with another. It seems to me there should be a uniform policy. I suggest the bill go over at this call of the calendar.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As to the uniform policy, the Senator will find the situations very different on different projects. For example, I know of one project in my own State where the coming in of the Federal Government, with all its employees, put a very heavy burden on the school district, but the school district was nevertheless in a position to assume it, and did assume it. In another place we would find a kind of a halfway situation. In another place we would find it impractical for the school district to do anything. So I doubt very much whether we can have a uniform rule.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to consider the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask if consideration was given in committee to the question of legislation of this kind in connection with the appropriation bill?

Mr. BALL. I will say that we have more legislation in the appropriation bill than in most of the bills on the calendar, but I am in a way interested in the type of legislation we secure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill passed. It affects only two or three sections in the Republican River Valley. I am not sure which is the proper way to handle the matter. I do agree with the Senator from Minnesota. We are attempting to have collections of this character made on a State-wide basis. The collections should be made either from the contractor or the bureau. The schools should be given the right to collect the tuition. I agree that there are certain places where it is difficult to make the policy uniform. But the rivers and harbors officials and the Army engineers do the same thing. We must have a general policy. Until such a policy is adopted, I should like very much if the Senator from Minnesota would permit us to have the bill passed. Something might happen to the general over-all bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. If Federal money is used for the purpose the Senator has in mind, could not the Federal Government dictate the policies of the schools?

Mr. WHERRY. No, it would not do so at all. If the Senator from Arkansas has any fear respecting the Government dictating the curriculums of the schools, I would say he need have no such fear. What we propose to do is to permit the schools to collect from the contractors who are on the jobs the money necessary to educate the boys and the girls who are temporarily dislocated and whose parents follow the contractors on the jobs. It is entirely different from the principle of Federal aid to education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is Federal money that the contractor would use for the purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. It is not the same thing as Federal aid to education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the contractor might dictate the policies.

Mr. WHERRY. He is independent, and would not be dictated to respecting the school policy nor would he dictate the policy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands objection has been made to the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded, and the regular order is the call of the next bill on the calendar. The Chair would like to suggest that we are operating under the 5-minute rule. Unless it is enforced, and we have the cooperation of Senators, the call of the calendar will require 4 or 5 hours.

EXTENSION OF LEASES OF CERTAIN LAND IN HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 6229) to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUE OF LAND PATENT IN COUNTY OF KAUAI, HAWAII

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6252) to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Lots" to insert "117."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC-LAND LAWS TO ISLANDS IN RED RIVER, OKLA.

The bill (H. R. 5071) to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR GRAZING AND RELATED PURPOSES

The bill (H. R. 6073) to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF PELICAN ROCK TO DEL NORTE COUNTY, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 4874) to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENLARGEMENT OF GETTYSBURG NATIONAL CEMETERY

The bill (H. R. 4688) to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JURISDICTION OF IOWA OVER OFFENSES BY OR AGAINST INDIANS ON THE SAC AND FOX INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (S. 1820) to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation in that State to the same extent as its courts have jurisdiction generally over offenses committed within said State outside of any Indian reservation: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall deprive the courts of the United States of jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations.

JURISDICTION OF NEW YORK STATE COURTS OVER OFFENSES COMMITTED ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1683) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "the courts of"; in line 4, after the word "Indians", to strike out "and other persons"; and in line 6, after the word "State", to strike out "shall."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of New York shall have jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations within the State of New York to the same extent as the courts of the State have jurisdiction over offenses committed elsewhere within the State as defined by the laws of the State.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 543) to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO FLORENCE A. W. ARENS

The bill (H. R. 5147) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN PERSONS EMPLOYED IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The bill (H. R. 2273) to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2076) to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CAIN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' DISUSED HOUSES

The bill (S. 2736) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5710, Calendar No. 1549, which is a companion bill to Senate bill 2736, and I should like to offer an amendment to the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What is the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is about to consider House bill 5710, Calendar No. 1549, a bill identical with Senate bill 2736, Calendar No. 1547.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Senate bill 2736 and House bill 5710 are identical bills, the purpose of which is to dispose of temporary veterans' disused houses to educational institutions. The present law requires that the buildings in question be demolished, torn down, and removed by July 25, 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. AIKEN. I may explain why I asked that the bill be passed over, as well as why I shall ask to have passed over another bill which would authorize the Army, Navy, and Air Force to give away property for educational and other public purposes. I shall ask that both bills go over. It is because there is pending legislation on the calendar which has been worked out over a course of weeks by the Armed Services, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller's Office, and other interested parties, which provides that the surplus property of Government shall be disposed of through a single agency. If we let each agency dispose of its own surplus within this country we are going to have educational institutions, public bodies, and others soliciting goods and facilities and equipment from the different departments, and we are going to have those departments yielding and giving away Government property which may be required by some other agency of the Government. Certainly it ought to be handled through a single agency. If this is a special case, I shall be glad to listen to the explanation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the property in question is not surplus property. It is temporary war housing. The law requires that the housing, in the absence of having been disposed of by statute, must be torn down by July 25, 1949. There are more than 100,000 individual units of such housing presently situated on educational campuses throughout America; and if we do not find a means of conveying title to such property to the educational institutions, the Federal Government will incur the cost of destroying them.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator believe that the Federal Works Administration, which I assume has been responsible for providing a good many facilities on college campuses, should be the agency to dispose of them?

Mr. CAIN. The Federal Works Agency has, so far as the Banking and Currency Committee knows, absolutely nothing to do with the veterans' reuse housing program and facilities.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the calendar is to be called again, probably by the middle of next week. I ask to have the bill go over, so that we can ascertain just what the effect of it would be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask only one consideration of the Senator from Vermont. I feel that his request is reasonable, but I refer the Senator to the report on the subject of this housing. I think we would be making a mistake if we were to let the Congress recess without determining the actual disposition of such housing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only one doubt on the question, and that is that all the temporary war housing, if it is allowed to remain in an indefinite status, will turn into the worst kind of slums in time. That may not apply to housing on the campuses of educational institutions, such housing consisting of Quonset huts and other things. It seems to me almost better to extend the date for 2 or 3 years, and still retain the provision with respect to tearing down the housing sooner or later.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Ohio—because we share the same interest in economy—that perhaps he does not know what the present proposal would mean. These are temporary structures which, if allowed to remain under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government for any considerable length of time, will involve repairs and maintenance, which must be provided, not by the colleges in question, but out of Federal funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas calls for the regular order. The regular order is the next bill, which the clerk will state.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the objection may be withheld for a moment, the Senator from Washington objected to the consideration of Calendar 1546, Senate bill 2076, because it had some relationship to the following bill, which is being passed over. Senate bill 2076, Calendar 1546, is a bill which I introduced, transferring to Howard University certain halls which were built for colored residents and to house colored employees during the war. The bill is endorsed by the Housing Administration and by all the agencies of the Government which have anything to do with the subject. Those two halls were advertised for sale, and all bids received upon them, with one exception, were so low that they could not be considered. One bid was high enough to represent the appraised value, but it turned out that the bidder was unable to complete the contract and purchase the property. Howard University needs these two halls very badly; and if they can be transferred to Howard University, it will undoubtedly save the Government considerable expense in the necessity for appropriations hereafter for housing facilities in connection with Howard University. I hope the Senator from Washington will let that bill go through.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to state why I objected to the bill. The Committees on Banking and Currency of both Houses having agreed with the substance of what the Senator has just said, namely, the desirability of transferring Slowe and Carver Halls to Howard University, Senate bill 2076 was prepared; and after the Senator from Washington conferred with Mr. McGREGOR, the author of the House bill, he agreed to accept as an amendment to that bill the bill to which the Senator from Kentucky refers. We thought that that was the most effective, efficient, and probably the only way in which we could get legislation enacted at this session of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under those circumstances I shall not insist that the bill be acted upon at this moment; but, regardless of what may happen, I hope that this legislation may be passed.

Mr. CAIN. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that both committees, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House as well as the Senate committee, voted unanimously in support of the Senator's present contention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT CORPORATION TO OPERATE CAFETERIAS, ETC.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2779) to create a Government corporation to operate cafeterias and conduct certain other activities in Government buildings and on Government property was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Over.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will withhold his objection so that I may make an explanation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. A year ago, shortly after the beginning of the first session of this Congress, there was a strike in a

good many Government cafeterias. That and other situations highlighted the desire to make some investigation of how those cafeterias were operated. As a result, a subcommittee of the Civil Service Committee conducted extensive hearings on the question extending over a period of nearly a year. As a result of those hearings we came to the conclusion that the GSI, the Government Services Incorporated, which was handling this matter, was a District of Columbia corporation which had a sort of tenuous relationship to the Government. It had a contract by virtue of which half the profits were to be paid to the Government, but its relationship, so far as its use of public buildings was concerned, so far as the supply and furnishing of equipment and other facilities was concerned, and so far as the deduction of certain items in its accounting for costs was concerned, was an extremely difficult question to determine.

This corporation has been fairly well operated, and I have no criticism of those who have operated it; but the General Accounting Office has been in continuous dispute with the officers of the corporation and its management over certain important items as they relate to Government costs and as they relate to the contract to pay half the profits to the Government.

As a result of those hearings we concluded that the best thing to do was to form a Government corporation. I may say that Government Services, Inc., which is a District of Columbia corporation, began to operate outside the District. It extended its activities down to the Tennessee Valley, where it took over Fontana Village and other operations of that kind; and at one time it submitted a bid for the operation of concessions in Yosemite National Park in California. Under those circumstances it seemed to the committee that something ought to be done to bring this organization into line and under some kind of control. The management of the corporation has consistently opposed any efforts to work out the problem.

If this objection is persisted in I intend to make a motion at the proper time that the bill be considered by the Senate when we can really debate it and thresh it out.

The bill represents an effort to place this operation on an orderly and proper basis, so that the interests of the Government will be protected. I hope that Senators who objected to this measure will withdraw their objections.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BALL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

LESTER L. ELDER AND MRS. ESTHER E. ELDER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3500) for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$1,183.49" and insert "$808.49."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

W. A. KNOX AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 636) for the relief of W. A. Knox, W. L. M. Knox, and Frank C. Morris, operating as Knox Lumber Sales Co., of Thompson, Ga., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL CHARTER OF CHOCTAW, OKLAHOMA & GULF RAILROAD CO.

The bill (H. R. 5891) to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

The bill (S. 2171) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar 1613, House bill 5416, is a similar bill. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interest of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the text of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Be it enacted, etc., That those provisions of the order of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 6, 1948, which are based on certain recommendations contained in the "Report on Conditions Found to Exist on the Fort Hall Irrigation Project and the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho," dated February 26, 1941, and which are described in the said order as made pursuant to the authority contained in the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), are hereby approved pursuant to the provisions of such act.

SEC. 2. When water for the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is available in excess of the present maximum duty of 3 acre-feet per acre per annum, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to increase the water duty to 3½ acre-feet without additional charge for those lands with respect to which such an increase is recommended in the report referred to in section 1 of this act, however in no case to exceed the actual needs of such lands as set out in said report

SEC. 3. The Little Indian unit, containing one thousand one hundred and eighty-six and thirty-three one-hundredths acres of irrigable land in townships 2 and 3 south, ranges 36 and 37 east, Boise meridian, within the boundaries of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, is hereby made a part of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project; and the lands therein shall have the benefit of, and be subject to, all existing legislation applicable to said project to the same extent as other lands of like ownership and character within the project. The Indian-owned irrigable land in the unit shall be charged with its proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this act. The non-Indian-owned irrigable land of the unit shall be entitled to receive only natural-flow water until a full project water right is acquired for said land through the execution by the owner of a contract, or contracts, providing for the repayment to the United States of like per-acre costs as are charged against the Indian-owned land in the unit. Said charges, as to Indian and non-Indian lands, shall be a first lien against the lands, under the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210).

SEC. 4. The net irrigable area of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is hereby established as forty-seven thousand forty-four and sixty-three one-hundredths acres of land, more or less. This area includes the forty-six thousand eight hundred and three and seventy-two one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, shown as the irrigable area of the project by the maps and plats in the report referred to in section 1 of this act, and the two hundred and forty and ninety-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, included in eight additional tracts of land described as follows: (a) An irregular shaped area in the northeast corner of the east half southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 36, township 5 south, range 33 east, Boise meridian, containing one and seventy one-hundredths acres; (b) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the west half of section 35, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty-eight and seventeen one-hundredths acres; (c) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the south half of section 14, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing forty acres; (d) a portion of the northwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing thirty-three and forty-two one-hundredths acres; (e) Fairview Park in the east half southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter and west half southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres; (f) the east half northeast quarter northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty acres; (g) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Pocatello Lateral in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ninety-seven and sixty-two one-hundredths acres; and (h) the southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres. The above-described tracts of land, together with such lands in the portion of the village of Alameda lying between the Pocatello Lateral and the Oregon Short Line Railroad right-of-way in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, as (notwithstanding their

inclusion in the irrigable acreage shown by the maps and plats hereinabove mentioned) have no water right at present, shall be entitled to receive, or to continue to receive, water through pumping operations or by gravity flow, provided the respective owners thereof, within five years from the date of the enactment of this act, enter into contracts whereby they agree (1) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project construction costs of $18.12 per acre, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this act, for such of their lands as do not now have a project water right; (2) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, for such of their lands as are not now covered by contracts for the repayment of such costs; and (3) to install, maintain, and operate, at their own expense, pumping machinery to lift the water from the project canals or laterals for the irrigation of such of their lands as cannot be supplied by gravity flow. The noninclusion of the Fort Hall town site within the net irrigable area of the project as hereby established shall not prevent the obtaining of water rights therefor in accordance with the act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1025).

SEC. 5. There is excluded from the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project by the designation of the project area in section 4 of this act the nine thousand six hundred and seventy acres of tribal, allotted, and non-Indian-owned lands located between Fort Hall and Gibson, Idaho, heretofore authorized to be included in the project by the act of March 3, 1927 (ch. 371, 44 Stat. 1398). The construction costs apportioned to the tribal lands so excluded are hereby canceled and the water rights are made available for project use. The water rights for the lands of the several allottees and non-Indian owners within the area so excluded shall not be impaired or affected by reason of such exclusion, but water shall be delivered only at the head of the laterals serving these lands. The respective owners of such lands may make their water rights available for project use, whereupon the construction costs assessed or assessable against their lands with respect to the water rights thus made available shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior. Allottees of lands within the excluded area, or their heirs or devisees, may donate or sell their lands to the tribe or may exchange their lands for assignments of tribal lands within the project area. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, $8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior, in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, of one hundred and eighty acres of non-Indian-owned land, with water rights and improvements appurtenant thereto, described as the north half southeast quarter southwest quarter section 13, township 4 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, and south half northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter section 7, township 4 south, range 35 east, Boise meridian, located within the area excluded from the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project by section 4 of this act.

SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,995 to compensate the following-named landowners, or their heirs, for work accomplished or for future work necessary in filling, leveling, and otherwise preparing for irrigation the abandoned portion of the old Fort Hall Main Canal within their holdings, in not to exceed the following amounts: Frank E. DeKay, $401; Henry Jensen, $633; Theodore H. Gathe, $654; A. E. Albert, $106; Ezra D. Wilson, $127; J. M. Bistline, $378; Ambrose H. McGuire, $424; Ellen Griffith, $412; C. M. Allen, $116; Olive A. Granden, $184; William Webster, $28; Hiram Faulkner, $114; Williamette Blakeslee, $298; Frank Parker, $99; and Henrietta C. Blakeslee, $21.

SEC. 7. Pending the construction of a siphon to provide gravity-flow water to ninety-six and six-tenths acres of irrigable lands in the southwest quarter section 27 and east half section 28, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, which lands have been irrigated by pumping operations over a period of years, the Secretary of the Interior may accept the conveyance by the landowners of the pumping equipment for use of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project and may operate such equipment as a part of said project in order to provide water for the irrigation of such lands; the acceptance of such conveyance being subject to the owners of the lands executing releases to the United States of any and all claims whatsoever due to the pumping operations carried on by such landowners.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to revise and reform, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in all the circumstances affecting the interests of the United States and the contractors, existing contracts between the United States and the Idaho Irrigation District, the Progressive Irrigation District, and the Snake River Valley Irrigation District in Idaho, which contracts provide for certain payments by the districts to the United States for the benefit of works of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project.

SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for refunds to Indians, or their heirs, the sum of $1,419.55, representing irrigation assessments of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project erroneously made and collected, as follows: Andrew F. Cutler, $153.80; Alice Sorrell Johns, $168.95; Nettie Stinson LaVatta, $146.62; Earl Edmund Cutler, $159.20; Charles Faulkner, $145.25; Josephine LaVatta Rumas, $155.20; May Phyllis LaVatta Brower, $29.90; Leonard I. Cutler, $135.85; Effie Diggie Houtz, $122.75; Lucy Yandell Spencer, $25; Charles Gerard Cutler, $121.53; and Hattie Sorrell Siler Tillotson, $55.50.

SEC. 10. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the relocating, rehabilitating, cleaning, and extending of irrigation systems serving the lands irrigated from Ross Fork, Bannock, and Lincoln Creeks, which lands are outside of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, including the construction of a storage reservoir on Bannock Creek. The costs of any work benefiting Indian lands performed pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned on a per acre basis and collected under laws applicable to Indian irrigable lands on the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project. Operation and maintenance charges against such lands shall likewise be subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations, as apply to Indian lands on the Fort Hall project. Any unpaid charges against such lands shall be subject to a first lien as provided in the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210). No expenditure shall be made under this authorization which will benefit lands in non-Indian ownership unless the owners thereof execute contracts providing for the repayment of their proportionate per acre share of the costs of the work assessable against their lands.

SEC. 11. In order to prevent the acccumulation of delinquent project assessments or other charges against the non-Indian-owned lands of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause liquidation of all delinquent assessments or charges by taking such action as may be necessary, including the foreclosure of the Government's lien covering any such delinquent charges or by initiating such other procedure as may be legally available, which action may be taken by him at any time when in his judgment the best interests of the project would be served thereby.

SEC. 12. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2171 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1844) to authorize an appropriation for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public-school buildings and facilities at Winnebago, Nebr., was announced as next in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1554, Senate bill 1844, for just a moment. That is a bill to which the Senator from Arkansas objected. I have explained to the Senator, and I am perfectly willing to explain to the Senate, that the money involved is not a Federal subsidy, but every cent of the money is recouped by the Federal Government from the local school district.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar 1554, Senate bill 1844?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I objected, not on the ground that I object to Federal assistance to education, but I had thought this was piecemeal Federal aid, that special districts were picked out and given Federal money as before, under the Federal aid bill which the Senate passed some time ago, but which apparently is to be killed in the House. I understand the money supplied is to be repaid by the districts, in which there are Indians. With that understanding I do not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1844) to authorize an appropriation for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public-school buildings and facilities at Winnebago, Nebr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed

for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $215,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the school board of school district No. 17, Thurston County, at Winnebago, Nebr., for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public-school buildings and facilities at Winnebago, Nebr.: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so authorized shall be subject to the express conditions that the school maintained by the said district in the said buildings and facilities shall be available to all Indian children of the district on the same terms, except as to payment of tuition, as other children of said school district: *And provided further*, That any amount expended hereunder shall be recouped by the United States within a period of 30 years, commencing with the date of occupancy of the building or buildings, through reducing the annual Federal payments for the education of Indian pupils enrolled in public or high school of the district involved and in computing the amount of recoupment, interest at 3 percent per annum shall be included on any unrecouped balances.

CONVEYANCES OF OREGON SHORT LINE RAILROAD AND UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD

The bill (S. 2371) validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances; was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that certain conveyance made by Oregon Short Line Railroad Company, a corporation of Utah, to the Colorado Milling and Elevator Company, a corporation of Colorado, dated September 30, 1927, and recorded April 25, 1932, at 9:02 antemeridian in book 68 of deeds at page 42, records of Bannock County, Idaho, and covering the following-described land located in Bannock County, Idaho, to wit: A tract of land one hundred feet wide and one hundred and forty feet long in northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 26, township 6 south, range 34 east, of Boise meridian, and more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the present northeasterly corner of right-of-way of Oregon Short Line Railroad Company opposite and west of block 329 of townsite of Pocatello, said corner bearing south thirty-three degrees forty-two minutes twenty seconds east three thousand four hundred and sixty-one and three-tenths feet from northwest corner of said section 26; thence south eight degrees forty-one minutes east along present easterly right-of-way boundary of said railroad company, one hundred and forty feet; thence south eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes west one hundred feet; thence north eight degrees forty-one minutes west one hundred and forty feet to point in the present northerly right-of-way boundary of said railroad company; thence north eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes east along said northerly right-of-way boundary one hundred feet to point of beginning, and containing in all thirty-two one-hundredths of an acre, more or less; and that certain conveyance made by the Union Pacific Railroad Company, a corporation of Utah, to the Colorado Milling and Elevator Company, a corporation of Colorado, dated April 28, 1941, and recorded May 29, 1941, at 2:14 postmeridian in book 84 of deeds at page 183, records of Bannock County, Idaho, and covering the following-described land located in Bannock County, Idaho, to wit: A trace of land one hundred feet wide and one hundred and forty feet long in northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 26, township 6 south, range 34 east, of Boise meridian and more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the present northeasterly corner of right-of-way of Oregon Short Line Railroad Company opposite and west of block 329 of townsite of Pocatello, said corner being southeasterly corner of that certain tract of land conveyed by Oregon Short Line Railroad Company to the Colorado Milling and Elevator Company by quit-claim deed dated September 30, 1927, and recorded April 25, 1932, in book 68 at page 42 of deeds, records of Bannock County; thence south eight degrees forty-one minutes east along said right-of-way boundary one hundred and forty feet; thence south eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes west one hundred feet; thence north eight degrees forty-one minutes west one hundred and forty feet; thence north eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes east one hundred feet to point of beginning, and containing thirty-two one-hundredths of an acre, more or less; which said lands heretofore formed part of the right-of-way, station grounds, and yards of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Company and the Union Pacific Railroad Company granted by the United States of America to the Utah and Northern Railway Company, predecessor of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Company and the Union Pacific Railroad Company, by act of Congress dated September 1, 1888, or by any other act of Congress are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed and all title and all rights of reverter or forfeiture of the United States of America in or to the lands described in said conveyances, as provided in the Act of September 1, 1888 (25 Statutes 452), or otherwise, is hereby waived, relinquished, and disclaimed.

NURSERIES AND NURSERY SCHOOLS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHILDREN

The bill (H. R. 5808) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6096) to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for production of products from agricultural commodities was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the request of several Senators, I have been asked to request that this bill be passed over, in order that an amendment agreeable to all parties may be worked out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under objection, the bill will be passed over.

INCREASE OF INTEREST RATE ON TITLE I FARM TENANT ACT LOANS

The bill (H. R. 6114) to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN LANGLADE COUNTY, WIS., TO UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 6113) to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJUSTMENT OF TITLES TO LANDS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The bill (S. 2418) to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), is hereby amended by striking out the words "within 10 years."

LIQUIDATION OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS RESERVED TO UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4856) to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes; which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, at the end of the bill, to insert "Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to supersede or modify in any way the provisions of section 9 of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe that under existing law the United States is required to dispose of certain mineral rights which it had withheld in the sale of land which had been acquired through the Resettlement Administration and by other means. Under present law, the Government is required to dispose of the mineral rights before a certain date. I think that date has already passed. This bill will provide an extension of the time, so that the Government may hold on to those rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. HELEN E. SCOFIELD

The bill (H. R. 3641) for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF FEES, EXPENSES, AND COSTS OF JURORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 19) relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, in line 12, after the words "courts

of", to strike out "Hawaii, Puerto Rico"; on page 2, in line 3, after the word "Columbia", to insert "the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, and the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico"; and in line 11, after the word "same", to strike out "$4" and insert "$5", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act fixing the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts, including the District Court of Hawaii, the District Court of Porto Rico (now 'Puerto Rico'), and the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia (now 'District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia')", approved April 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 323), as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 600), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Jurors in the United States courts, except in the United States district courts of Alaska, and the Canal Zone, and except in the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and including the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, and the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, shall receive the following and no other compensation, except in cases otherwise expressly provided by law: For actual attendance at the place of trial or hearing of any court or courts, and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from such place of trial or hearing, either at the beginning and end of service or at any time during the same, $5 per day during such attendance: *Provided,* That whenever a juror is required to attend court thirty or more days in hearing a single case, he may be paid, in the discretion and upon the certification of the trial judge, a per diem of up to and not exceeding $10 for each and every day in excess of 30 days he is required to hear such case.

"For the distance necessarily traveled by the shortest practicable route from their place of residence in going to and returning from the place of trial or hearing at the beginning and at the end of the term of service, 5 cents per mile: *Provided,* That for additional necessary daily transportation expenses, the cost of travel by common carrier shall be allowed not to exceed $2 per day, or if it is not practicable to travel by common carrier a rate of 5 cents per mile shall be allowed but not to exceed $2 per day, or if daily travel appears impracticable subsistence of $2 per day shall be allowed: *Provided further,* That whenever in any case the jury is ordered to be kept together and not to separate, the cost of subsistence during such period shall be paid by the marshal upon the order of the court in lieu of the foregoing allowance for subsistence, and such sum may, in the discretion of the court, be taxed as costs."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFERENCE TO COURT OF CLAIMS OF BILL FOR RELIEF OF AMERICAN ELEVATOR & MACHINE CO.

The resolution (S. Res. 251) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill, S. 2208, for the relief of the American Elevator & Machine Co., with the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of section 151 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., sec. 257), for such action as the court may take in accordance therewith.

MRS. CARRIE M. LEE

The bill (H. R. 2062) for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARE AND CUSTODY OF CERTAIN INSANE PERSONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 850) to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, in line 7, after the word "Whenever", to insert "after arrest and"; on page 2, in line 18, after the word "upon", to insert "due"; on page 3, in line 2, after the word "proceeding" and the period, to insert "A finding by the judge that the accused is mentally competent to stand trial shall in no way prejudice the accused in a plea of insanity as a defense to the crime charged; such finding shall not be introduced in evidence on that issue nor otherwise be brought to the notice of the jury"; and on page 6, beginning in line 23, to strike out "SEC. 2. Sections 4851, 4852, and 4855 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (24 U. S. C. 211, 211a, and 211b), and sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 23, 1874 (18 Stat. 251), as amended (24 U. S. C. 212, 213, and 214), are hereby repealed insofar as they are in conflict herewith", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish a hospital for defective delinquents," approved May 13, 1930 (46 Stat. 270, 18 U. S. C. 871–880), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

"SEC. 12. Whenever after arrest and prior to the imposition of sentence or prior to the expiration of any period of probation the United States Attorney has reasonable cause to believe that a person charged with an offense against the United States may be presently insane or otherwise so mentally incompetent as to be unable to understand the proceedings against him or properly to assist in his own defense, he shall file a motion for a judicial determination of such mental competency of the accused, setting forth the grounds for such belief with the trial court in which proceedings are pending. Upon such a motion or upon a similar motion in behalf of the accused, or upon its own motion, the court shall cause the accused, whether or not previously admitted to bail, to be examined as to his mental condition by at least one qualified psychiatrist, who shall report to the court. For the purpose of the examination the court may order the accused committed for such reasonable period as the court may determine to a suitable hospital or other facility to be designated by the court. If the report of the psychiatrist indicates a state of present insanity or such mental incompetency in the accused, the court shall hold a hearing, upon due notice, at which evidence as to the mental condition of the accused may be submitted, including that of the reporting psychiatrist, and make a finding with respect thereto. No statement made by the accused in the course of any examination into his sanity or mental competency provided for by this section, whether the examination shall be with or without the consent of the accused, shall be admitted in evidence against the accused on the issue of guilt in any criminal proceeding. A finding by the judge that the accused is mentally competent to stand trial shall in no way prejudice the accused in a plea of insanity as a defense to the crime charged; such finding shall not be introduced in evidence on that issue nor otherwise be brought to the notice of the jury.

"SEC. 13. Whenever the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall certify that a person convicted of an offense against the United States has been examined by the board of examiners established pursuant to the act of May 13, 1930 (18 U. S. C. 876–879), and that there is probable cause to believe that such person was mentally incompetent at the time of his trial, provided the issue of mental competency was not raised and determined before or during said trial, the Attorney General shall transmit the report of the board of examiners and the certificate of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to the clerk of the district court wherein the conviction was had. Whereupon the court shall hold a hearing to determine the mental competency of the accused in accordance with the provisions of section 12 above, and with all the powers therein granted. In such hearing the certificate of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall be prima facie evidence of the facts and conclusions certified therein. If the court shall find that the accused was mentally incompetent at the time of his trial, the court shall vacate the judgment of conviction and grant a new trial.

"SEC. 14. Whenever the trial court shall determine in accordance with sections 12 and 13 of this act that an accused is or was mentally incompetent, the court may commit the accused to the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, until the accused shall be mentally competent to stand trial or until the pending charges against him are disposed of according to law. And if the court after hearing as provided in the preceding sections 12 and 13, shall determine that the conditions specified in the following section 15 exist, the commitment shall be governed by section 16 as herein provided.

"SEC. 15. Whenever the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall certify that a prisoner whose sentence is about to expire has been examined by the board of examiners established pursuant to the act of May 13, 1930 (18 U. S. C. 876–879), and that in the judgment of the Director and the board of examiners the prisoner is insane or mentally incompetent, and that if released he will probably endanger the safety of the officers, the property, or other interests of the United States, and that suitable arrangements for the custody and care of the prisoner are not otherwise available, the Attorney General shall transmit the certificate to the clerk of the court for the district in which the prisoner is confined. Whereupon the court may in its discretion cause the prisoner to be examined by a qualified psychiatrist designated by the court and one selected by the prisoner, and shall, after notice, hold a hearing to determine whether the conditions specified above exist. At such hearing the designated psychiatrist or psychiatrists may submit his or their reports, and the report of the board of examiners and other institutional records relating to the prisoner's mental condition shall be admissible in evidence. All of the psychiatrists and members of the board who have examined the prisoner may be called as witnesses, and be available for further questioning by the court and cross-examination by the prisoner or on behalf of the Government. If upon such hearing the court shall determine that the conditions specified above exist, the court may commit the prisoner to the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative.

"SEC. 16. Whenever a person shall be committed pursuant to section 15 of this act, his commitment shall run until the sanity or mental competency of the person shall be restored, or until the mental condition of the person is so improved that if he be released he will not endanger the safety of the officers, the property, or other interest of the United States, or until suitable arrangements have been made for the custody and care of the prisoner by the State of his residence, whichever event shall first occur. Whereupon the

Attorney General or his authorized representative shall file with the court which made said commitment a certificate stating the termination of the commitment and the ground therefor: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall preclude a prisoner committed under the authority of section 15 hereof from establishing his eligibility for release under the provisions of this section by a writ of habeas corpus. The Attorney General or his authorized representative shall have authority at any time to transfer a prisoner committed to his custody under the authority of section 14 or section 15 hereof to the proper authorities of the State of his residence.

"SEC. 17. The Attorney General may authorize the use of any unexpended balance of the appropriation for 'support of United States prisoners,' for carrying out the purposes of this act or in payment of any expenses incidental thereto and not provided for by other specific appropriations.

"SEC. 18. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFERENCE TO COURT OF CLAIMS OF BILL FOR RELIEF OF MR. AND MRS. LEM MOTLOW

The resolution (S. Res. 252) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill, S. 890, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lem Motlow, with the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims in pursuance of section 151 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., sec. 257), for such action as the court may take in accordance therewith.

ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN PRODUCERS OF RAW CANE SUGAR IN PUERTO RICO AND HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 5174) to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this bill relates to the practice by which the Commodity Credit Corporation paid uniform prices for sugar to producers in Puerto Rico and Hawaii, based on the Cuban sugar prices, with allowances for freight charges. The practice was, at the end of the Cuban sugar crop purchases, to average the price, and apply that price to the purchases which had been made in Puerto Rico and Hawaii, making the adjustments on the crop of the next crop year. In so doing, it happened that there were four companies—three in Puerto Rico and one in Hawaii—which ceased to exist as companies in the next crop year. Therefore, it was impossible to pay them the adjustment on their crop, because they no longer produced and no longer sold. In the case of the Hawaiian company, it was sold to another firm. In the case of the Puerto Rican companies, they went out of business.

This measure simply permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay over to the assigns and successors of those four companies the amounts which are lawfully due to them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How much is involved?

Mr. FLANDERS. Approximately $200,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

The bill (S. 826) to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 60 of an act, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended by the act of June 22, 1938 (52 Stat. 840, 869), is hereby amended by striking out all of subdivision (a) of said section and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) (1) A preference is a transfer, as defined in this act, of any of the property of a debtor to or for the benefit of a creditor for or on account of an antecedent debt, made or suffered by such debtor while insolvent and within four months before the filing by or against him of the original petition initiating a proceeding under this act, the effect of which transfer will be to enable such creditor to obtain a greater percentage of his debt than some other creditor of the same class: *Provided, however,* That this section shall have no application to proceedings under chapter IX of this act.

"(2) For the purposes of subdivisions (a) and (b) of this section, and subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), a transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered at the time when it became so far perfected that no creditor obtaining under applicable law by legal or equitable proceedings on a simple contract a lien on such property, without a special priority (whether or not such a creditor exists), could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein, and if such transfer is not so perfected prior to the filing of the original petition initiating a proceeding under this act, it shall be deemed to have been made immediately before the filing of such original petition: *Provided, however,* That where real property is transferred for or on account of an antecedent debt, the transfer shall be deemed to have been made at the time when it became so far perfected that no bona fide purchaser from the debtor could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein.

"(3) A transfer, wholly or in part, for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration shall, to the extent of such consideration and interest thereon and the other obligations of the transferor connected therewith, be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer, unless the applicable law requires the transfer to be perfected by recording, delivery, or otherwise, in order that no creditor described in paragraph (2) could acquire, after such perfection, any rights in the property so transferred superior to the rights of the transferee therein. A transfer to secure a future loan, if such loan is actually made, or a transfer which becomes security for a future loan, shall have the same effect as a transfer for or on account of a new and contemporaneous consideration. If any requirement specified in this paragraph (3) exists, the time of the transfer shall be determined by the following rules:

"I. Where (A) the applicable law specifies a stated period of time of not more than 30 days after the transfer within which recording, delivery, or some other act is required, and compliance therewith is had within such stated period of time; or where (B) the applicable law specifies no such stated period of time or where such stated period of time is more than 30 days, and compliance therewith is had within 30 days after the transfer, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of the transfer.

"II. Where compliance with the law applicable to the transfer is not had in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph I, the transfer shall be deemed to be made or suffered at the time of compliance therewith, and if such compliance is not had prior to the filing of the original petition initiating a proceeding under this act, such transfer shall be deemed to have been made or suffered immediately before the filing of such original petition."

LEASES FOR OFFICE SPACE BY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The bill (S. 2774) to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years was announced as next in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, we have in the Finance Committee House bill 6730. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of that bill, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and without objection, the House bill will be considered.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6730) to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate bill 2774 will be indefinitely postponed.

ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN EXPENSES INCURRED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BENEFICIARIES

The bill (S. 2806) to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, we have in the Finance Committee House bill 5134. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of that bill, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and, without objection, the House bill will be considered.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5134) to amend Public Law No. 432,

Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2806 will be indefinitely postponed.

TEMPORARY FREE IMPORTATION OF LEAD

The bill (H. R. 6489) to provide for the temporary free importation of lead was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN DISABILITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 595) to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 90 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 2, in line 1, after the words "equal to," to strike out "90" and insert "80."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this bill was introduced for the purpose of increasing the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred by veterans in active service during peacetime to 90 percent of the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred by veterans in active service during wartime. I regret very much that the Finance Committee reported the bill with an amendment providing for only 80 percent, which is the effect of the amendment which has just been agreed to. As a matter of fact, Congress itself, in 1946, as I recall, passed a bill raising the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in peacetime to 90 percent of those received for disabilities incurred in wartime; but unfortunately that increase was stated in terms of dollars and cents. Thereafter, in the same Congress a bill was passed increasing the rates of compensation to be received for wartime-incurred disabilities, and that wiped out the increase which had been given for peacetime-incurred disabilities, so that veterans suffering from peacetime-incurred disabilities thereafter drew only 75 percent of the rates of compensation received by veterans for wartime-incurred disabilities.

It seems to me indeed regrettable that the committee did not allow the rate to go to the full 90 percent. That would have cost only about $3,000,000 additional. There are some 12,587 persons as I recall in that category.

I do not know whether the boys who are to be drafted under the bill passed today will be considered peacetime veterans when they come out of the service or wartime veterans. If peacetime veterans, we are taking them in on the proposition they will be given only 75 percent of the wartime disability rates for any disability they may incur, even though the disability may be exactly the same and may have been incurred under exactly the same circumstances as a disability incurred during active duty in wartime.

I wish very much the committee had not proposed the amendment. I do not want to jeopardize the passage of the bill.

I certainly should like to see the amendment defeated and the bill allowed to pass so as to give veterans with disabilities incurred during peacetime service 90 percent of the disability rates that are awarded to wartime veterans.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to say, first, that the committee believes a distinction should be preserved between wartime-connected disabilities and peacetime-connected disabilities. The House had a bill calling for the 90-percent rate, which is reduced to 80 percent. I refer to House bill 1335, which is on the House Calendar. We are hopeful the House may act on it.

Therefore, the Senate Finance Committee considered that it was preserving a proper differential, and at the same time was doing something that had a chance of being enacted at this session, if it reported the bill with an amendment providing for 80 percent, so as to conform to the percentage provided in the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment having been agreed to, if there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective the first day of the first month following the passage of this act, paragraph II of part II of Veterans Regulation No. I (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"II. For the purposes of part II, paragraph I (a) hereof, if the disability results from injury or disease, the compensation shall be equal to 80 percent of the compensation now or hereafter payable for the disability, had it been incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service during a period of war service as provided in part I of this regulation."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war."

COOPERATIVE FOR AMERICAN REMITTANCES TO EUROPE, INC.

The bill (H. R. 4830) for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator making the objection will withhold it, I desire to offer an explanation of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is withheld.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I desire to explain that the purpose of the bill is to authorize repayment of import duties on chocolate paid by the corporation. The Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc., is a complely nonprofit relief organization, commonly known as CARE, a relief organization that I know many Members of the Senate have used in sending packages to people in Europe. It began by the use of surplus property.

All that is involved in the bill is the duty of 5 cents a pound on imported chocolate, which is not required under the present law, but which at the time, through a misunderstanding, they paid. They are entitled to the refund, but under the law technically they could not get it. The Treasury refused to make a recommendation disallowing it, on that ground. That is, the Treasury cannot do that, but it did not say the refund should not be made. As I say, CARE is entirely a relief organization. Payment of the duties in question simply lessen their ability to send packages, and persons sending the packages—and I know, having seen a good many of them—simply have to make up the difference. I hope with this explanation the Senator may withdraw his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I withdraw the objection.

There being no objection the bill (H. R. 4830) for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittance to Europe, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAMPA CHAPTER, NO. 113, UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY

The bill (H. R. 2634) for the relief of the Tampa Chapter No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES B. FEATHERSTONE

The bill (H. R. 2922) for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVIEW OF JUDGMENTS OF CONVICTIONS IN CRIMINAL CASES

The bill (S. 20) to regulate the review of judgments of convictions in certain criminal cases was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no circuit or district judge of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the validity of imprisonment of a prisoner held in custody pursuant to a conviction of a court of any State, or to release such prisoner in any habeas corpus proceeding, unless it shall appear that the petitioner has no adequate remedy by habeas corpus, writ of error coram nobis, or otherwise in the courts of the State. Where a prisoner in custody pursuant to a conviction of a court of any State, claiming the right to be released on the ground that the judgment has been obtained in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States, who has no adequate remedy in a State court by habeas corpus, writ of error coram nobis, or otherwise files a petition for writ of habeas corpus before any circuit or district judge of the United States, such

judge shall determine whether there is reasonable ground for the issuance of the writ, and, if so, shall issue the writ and shall cause a court of three judges to be constituted as provided by section 266 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U. S. C. 380a), who shall constitute a special court for the hearing of such petition. The decision of such court shall be reviewable by the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of certiorari. If the judge to whom application for writ is made shall determine that there is no reasonable ground for issuing it, he shall dismiss the petition from which action an appeal shall lie to the circuit court of appeals for the circuit, upon the filing of the certificate required by the act of March 10, 1908 (ch. 76), entitled "An act restricting in certain cases the right of appeal to the Supreme Court in habeas corpus proceedings, as amended" (35 Stat. 40, 28 U. S. C. 466). The phrase "no adequate remedy" as used in this section means absence of State corrective process or existence of exceptional circumstances rendering such process unavailable to protect the rights of the prisoner.

SEC. 2. Any prisoner in custody pursuant to a judgment of conviction of a court of the United States, claiming the right to be released on the ground that the judgment has been obtained in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or that the court was without jurisdiction, or that the sentence was in excess of the maximum prescribed by law or otherwise open to collateral attack, may apply by motion, formally or informally, to the court in which the judgment was rendered to vacate or set aside the judgment, notwithstanding the expiration of the term at which such judgment was entered. Such court shall thereupon cause notice of the motion to be served upon the United States attorney and grant a prompt hearing thereon and find the facts with respect to the issues raised thereon. If the court finds that the judgment was rendered without jurisdiction, or that the sentence imposed was in excess of the maximum prescribed by law or otherwise open to collateral attack, or that there were errors in the sentence which should be corrected, or that there has been such a denial or infringement of the constitutional rights of the prisoner as to render the judgment vulnerable to collateral attack, the court shall vacate and set the judgment aside and shall discharge the prisoner or resentence him or grant a new trial or correct the sentence as may appear appropriate. An appeal from an order granting or denying the motion shall lie to the circuit court of appeals. No circuit or district judge of the United States shall entertain an application for writ of habeas corpus in behalf of any prisoner who is authorized to apply for relief by motion pursuant to the provisions of this section, unless it appears that it has not been or will not be practicable to determine his rights to discharge from custody on such a motion because of his inability to be present at the hearing on such motion, or for other reasons. Where the prisoner has sought relief on such a motion, if the circuit or district judge concludes that it has not been practicable to determined the prisoner's rights on such motion, the findings, order, or judgment on the motion shall not be asserted as a defense to the prisoner's application for relief on habeas corpus. The term "circuit judge" as used herein shall be deemed to include the judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDINGS IN FEDERAL COURTS

The bill (S. 21) to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. WILEY. I ask that the bill go over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, I requested an explanation of Calendar No. 1578, Senate bill 21, regulating habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States. I did not think it should pass without being explained. After a conference, I may say I have no desire for an explanation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 1578, Senate bill 21?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no circuit or district judge shall entertain any application for a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the detention of any person pursuant to a judgment of any court of the United States or of any State, if it appears that the legality of such detention has been determined by a judge or court of the United States on a prior application for a writ of habeas corpus and the petition presents no new ground not theretofore presented and determined. A new ground within the meaning of this section includes a subsequent decision of an appellate court or the enactment or repeal of a statute. The judge who determines an application for writ of habeas corpus may, however, grant a rehearing at any time, and, if the judge dies, goes out of office, or becomes disabled, a rehearing may be granted by his successor, or by the judge designated to hear the matter in the event of his disability. The term "circuit judge" as used herein shall be deemed to include the judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. On a hearing of an application for a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the legality of the detention of a person pursuant to a judgment of any court of the United States or of any State, the certificate of the judge who presided at the trial resulting in the judgment of conviction, setting forth the facts occurring at the trial, shall be admissible in evidence. Copies of the certificate shall be filed with the court in which the application is pending and in the court in which the trial took place.

SEC. 3. On an application for a writ of habeas corpus, evidence may be taken orally or by deposition, and, in the discretion of the judge, by affidavit. If the evidence is presented in whole or in part by affidavit, any party shall have the right to propound written interrogatories to the affiants, or to file answering affidavits.

SEC. 4. On an application for a writ of habeas corpus documentary evidence and the transcript, if any, of the oral testimony introduced on any previous similar application by or in behalf of the same petitioner, shall be admissible in evidence.

SEC. 5. The allegations of a return to the writ of habeas corpus or of an answer to an order to show cause in a habeas corpus proceeding, if not traversed, shall be accepted as true except to the extent that the judge shall find from the evidence that they are not true.

SEC. 6. On an application for a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the detention of any person pursuant to a judgment of a court of the United States, the respondent shall promptly file with the court certified copies of the indictment, plea or petitioner and the judgment, or such of them as may be material to the questions raised, if the petitioner fails to attach them to his petition, and same shall be attached to the return to the writ, or to the answer to the order to show cause.

SEC. 7. If on any application for a writ of habeas corpus an order has been made permitting the petitioner to prosecute the application in forma pauperis, the clerk of any court of the United States shall furnish to the petitioner without cost certified copies of such documents or parts of the record on file in his office as may be required by order of the judge before whom the application is pending.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 784) to provide maternity leave for Government employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS and other Senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6116) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill (S. 29) to authorize payment of claims, based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

The bill (S. 2772) to provide that all employees of the Veterans Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

The bill (S. 2807) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for certain investigation reports in connection with insurance claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

The bill (S. 2773) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, could I make an explanation?

Mr. LANGER. It does not make any difference whether the Senator offers an explanation or not. I am against it, anyway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3889) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2279) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

The bill (S. 2192) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to agents of carriers subject to part I of such act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

The bill (S. 2829) to amend the Canal Zone Code and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

The bill (S. 2401) to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

The bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over on objection.

ELIMINATION AND RETIREMENT OF REGULAR ARMY AND REGULAR AIR FORCE OFFICERS

The bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill is passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may inquire, does the Senator wish to object to all the bills en bloc?

Mr. LANGER. I may say that after we had worked for 2 years on the bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees, a member of my own committee objected to it. So long as we cannot take care of poor, defenseless women, I shall object to every bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator objects en bloc to all subsequent bills, there is no sense in calling the calendar, the Chair would think.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may, I ask the distinguished Senator to withhold his objection long enough to inquire whether it would be possible to take up but one bill, Calendar 1591, House bill 2744.

Mr. LANGER. No objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1591, House bill 2744, and that it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

In section 105, on page 4, line 13, after the word "list", insert "shall be furnished written notice of the pendency of any proceedings for his removal, shall be afforded reasonable time for the preparation of his defense,";

In section 107 (b), on page 6, line 20, after the word "be", to strike out "in the grade and with the seniority which he would have attained by operation of law if he had not been removed therefrom" and insert "in a grade determined by the following schedule: Officers with less than 3 years of service for promotion purposes shall be appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; those with 3 or more, but less than 7 years of such service, shall be appointed in the grade of first lieutenant; those with 7 or more, but less than 14 years of such service, shall be appointed in the grade of captain; those with 14 or more, but less than 21 years of such service, shall be appointed in the grade of major; those with 21 or more, but less than 28 years of such service, shall be appointed in the grade of lieutenant colonel: *Provided*, That (a) those with more than 28 years of service for promotion purposes who are under 60 years of age shall be appointed to the active list in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel and—

"(A) shall until June 30, 1953, be eligible for selection to the permanent grade of colonel; and

"(B) if not selected and promoted to the grade of colonel or retired under any other provision of law on or before June 30, 1953, shall on such date be retired in the highest grade to which he is entitled under any provision of law; or

"(C) if promoted to the grade of colonel on the active list prior to such date, shall be retired under the laws applicable to the elimination and retirement of permanent colonels; and

"(b) Those with more than 28 years of service for promotion purposes who are 60 years of age or over shall be advanced on the retired list to the grade of colonel, and shall be entitled to receive the retired pay to which they would have been entitled if they had not been removed from the active list under the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), but had been retired while serving in the permanent grade of colonel at the completion of 28 years of service for promotion purposes. Each officer restored to the active list, and appointed in a grade as prescribed in this section, shall have his name placed on the appropriate promotion list among the officers of his grade in the same seniority standing as would have existed had such officer been continued on the active list. For promotion purposes and initial grade determination each officer so restored to the active list shall, upon appointment, have credited to him all service which he would have had if he had not been removed from the active list pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606)";

On page 9, following line 15, to insert:

(d) Each officer of the Regular Army heretofore removed from the active list pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), who on the date of such removal was (a) eligible for voluntary retirement under any provision of law then in effect, or (b) shall be determined by retiring board action to have been eligible for retirement for disability on such date, shall upon application therefor be placed upon the retired list in the grade and with the retired pay and other benefits to which he would have been entitled if he had been so retired: *Provided*, That no officer restored to the active list pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be retired pursuant to the provisions of this subsection.

In section 109 on page 10, line 15, after the word "repealed", insert *"Provided*, That all rights and benefits accrued under such laws prior to the date of enactment of this title shall hereafter remain in full force and effect."

On page 12, line 9, after the word "year", insert, *"Provided further*, That for the purpoose of determining years of service credited for longevity pay in the case of a general officer, such service shall be that which would be credited to such general officer if he were on the promotion list and serving in the grade of colonel."

In section 203 (a), on page 12, line 15, after the word "Army", strike out "or" and insert "or of any Reserve component of the Army of the United States, and each commissioned officer of";

In line 17, after the word "Force", insert "or of any Reserve component of the Air Force of the United States";

In line 18, after the word "retired" insert "or granted retirement pay."

In line 21, after the word "grade", insert "in which he served", and after the word "satisfactorily", strike out "held by him" and insert "for not less than 6 months while serving on active duty."

On page 13, in line 2, after the word "grade", insert the proviso, *"Provided*, That retired pay of such highest grade shall be without credit for service on the retired list."

On page 14, in line 6, after the word "him", insert "while serving on active duty"; in line 11, after the word "grade", insert "at the time of retirement: *And provided further,*"; in line 16, after the word "pay", strike out "immediately upon his retirement" and insert "effective upon the enactment of this title or upon his retirement, whichever is later"; in line 21, after the word "amended", insert "each female dietitian or physical therapist appointed pursuant to the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1072), each

female officer appointed pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324), and each member of the Army Nurse Corps or Women's Medical Specialist Corps appointed pursuant to Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (61 Stat. 41)."

On page 15, in line 6, after the word "the", strike out "Nurse Corps"; in line 9, after the word "satisfactorily", insert "on active duty."

In line 22, after the word "him", insert "while serving on active duty."

On page 16, in line 3, after the word "law", insert "for his length of service at the time of retirement";

In line 9, after the word "pay", strike out "immediately upon his retirement" and insert: "effective upon the enactment of this act or upon his retirement, whichever is later.

"(f) Each commissioned officer of the Regular Army or of any Reserve component of the Army of the United States, and each commissioned officer of the Regular Air Force or of any Reserve component of the Air Force of the United States, retired or granted retirement pay under any provision of law on or after August 7, 1947, but not later than January 1, 1957, while serving on active duty in a temporary grade not higher than that of major general shall be advanced on the applicable officers' retired list to such grade, and shall receive retired or retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law, computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such higher grade: *Provided*, That computation on the basis of pay of such highest grade shall be made without benefit of longevity credit for retired-list service. No officer shall be ordered to active duty or promoted to any higher temporary grade solely for the purpose of entitling him to retirement in advanced grade pursuant to this subsection";

On page 17, after line 4, strike out:

SEC. 204. (a) Members of the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force heretofore retired who were called to active duty during World War II and who are entitled under subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of section 203 of this title, to advancement on the retired list by reason of having held a higher temporary rank or grade shall have their retired rank or grade and retired pay status changed to grant any increase benefits provided by that section.

(b) Members of the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force retired during World War II but not recalled to active duty and who are entitled under subsections (a), (c), (d), and (e) of section 203 of this title, to advancement on the retired list by reason of having held a higher temporary rank or grade shall have their retired rank or grade and retired pay status changed to grant any increased benefits provided by that section.

(c) No person recalled to active duty after retirement shall be entitled, by the enactment of this title, to be recalled in any rank or grade higher than that to which he or she would otherwise be entitled;

And insert:

SEC. 204. Enlisted men and warrant officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force hereafter advanced to commissioned rank or grade on the retired list pursuant to section 203 (c) or 203 (e) of this title, shall, if application therefor is made to the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force within 3 months from the date of approval of this title or within 3 months after the date of the advancement to commissioned rank or grade on the retired list, whichever is the later, and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, be restored to their former retired enlisted, or warrant officer status, as the case may be, and shall thereafter be deemed to be enlisted or warrant officer personnel, as appropriate, for all purposes;

On page 18, line 21, after the word "law", insert "No back pay or allowances prior to the date of enactment of this title shall accrue to any person by reason of the enactment thereof";

In title 3, section 302 (a), on page 20, in line 18, strike out "satisfactorily"; in line 19, after the word "performed", insert satisfactory", and after the word "service", insert "as defined in this section";

On page 21, in line 2, strike out "or"; in line 3, after the word "thereof", insert "or the United States Coast Guard, including the Reserve components thereof"; in line 7, after the word "pay", strike out:

If he fulfills any of the requirements enumerated below:

(1) If he has completed no satisfactory Federal service in any of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 3 years of active Federal service subsequent to that date.

(2) If he has completed some service, but less than 5 years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 3 years of active Federal service, at least 2 years of which must have been served subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(3) If he has completed 5 years, but less than 10 years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 4 years of active Federal service, at least 18 months of which must have been served subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(4) If he has completed 10 years but less than 15 years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 4 years of active Federal service, at least 1 year of which must have been served subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(5) If he has completed 15 years, but less than 20 years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 4 years of active Federal service, at least 6 months of which must have been served subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

(6) If he has completed 20 or more years of satisfactory Federal service in any or all of said services prior to the date of enactment of this title, he must have completed not less than 4 years of active Federal service;

On page 22, line 23, after the word "this", strike out "subsection" and insert "section";

On page 23, in line 1, strike out "of the service to which application is made for retirement"; in line 10, after the word "component", insert the proviso:

Provided further, That no person who was a member of a Reserve component on or before August 15, 1945, shall be eligible for retirement benefits under this title unless he performed active Federal service during any portion of either of the two periods beginning April 6, 1917, and ending November 11, 1918, and beginning September 9, 1940, and ending December 31, 1946.

(b) Subsequent to the enactment of this act, a year of satisfactory Federal service, for the purposes of this section only, shall consist of any year in which a person is credited with a minimum of 50 points, which points shall be credited on the following basis:

(1) One point for each day of active Federal service;

(2) One point for each drill or period of equivalent instruction, such drills and periods of equivalent instruction to be restricted to those prescribed and authorized by the Secretary of the respective service for the year concerned, and to conform to the requirements prescribed by other provisions of law;

(3) Fifteen points for membership in a Reserve component for each year of Federal service other than active Federal service.

(c) Each year of service as a member of a Reserve component prior to the enactment of this act shall be deemed to be a year of satisfactory Federal service for the purposes of this section, subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of section 306 of this act.

On page 24, in line 12, strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)"; in line 16, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)"; in line 24, after the word "equal", strike out "to"; in line 25, strike out "(i)";

On page 25, in line 5, after the word "the", strike out "sum of the number of years of his active Federal service; plus", and insert "number of years and any fraction thereof (on the basis of 360 days per year) which shall consist of the sum of the following:

"(i) All periods of active Federal service;

"(ii) One day for each point credited pursuant to subparagraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b) of section 302 of this act, but no more than 60 days shall be credited on this basis in any 1 year for the purposes of this section:"; following line 13, strike out "(ii) one-half of 1 percent of such active duty annual base and longevity pay multiplied by a number equal to the sum of the number of years of his Federal service other than active Federal service:";

In line 20, after the word "further", strike out "That in computing the number of years of Federal service for the purposes of computing retirement pay under provisions of this title, a fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or less shall be disregarded and a fraction of more than 6 months counted as 1 year"; in line 25, insert "That for each year of Federal service, other than active Federal service, performed as a member of a Reserve component prior to the date of enactment of this act and credited in accordance with subsection (c) of section 302 of this title, such member shall be credited with 50 days for each of such years, for the purposes of this section";

On page 26, section 304, line 7, strike out "SEC. 304. After the effective date of this title, any member of a Reserve component of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, or the United States Navy, or Marine Corps who, when it has been so determined by the Secretary of the Army with respect to personnel of the Army, by the Secretary of the Navy with respect to personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and by the Secretary of the Air Force

with respect to personnel of the Air Force, fails to conform to such standards and qualifications as may be prescribed by law or regulations, may at any time, by order of the cognizant Secretary, be placed in an inactive status for the purpose of this title: *Provided*, That such inactive status" and insert: "As soon as may be practicable after the effective date of this title, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy shall, by regulations not inconsistent with this or any other act, prescribe (a) appropriate standards and qualifications for the retention or promotion of members of Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, and the United States Navy and the Marine Corps, respectively, and (b) appropriate and equitable procedures under which the compliance by each member of each such Reserve component with such standards and qualifications shall be determined periodically. Whenever any member of any such Reserve component thereafter shall fail to conform to the standards and qualifications so prescribed he shall be transferred to an inactive Reserve status if qualified for such status, retired without pay if qualified for such retirement, or his appointment or enlistment shall be terminated. Such action";

On page 27, line 12, after the word "not", strike out "effect" and insert "affect"; in line 14, before the word "such", insert "such action shall have been taken with respect to"; in line 15, before the word *"Provided"* strike out "was placed in an inactive status";

On page 28, in line 3, after the word "Reserve", insert "No period of service otherwise creditable in determining the eligibility of any person to receive, or the amount of, any annuity, pension, or old-age benefit payable under any provision of law on account of civilian employment, in the Federal Government or otherwise, shall be excluded in such determination because such period of service may be included, in whole or in part, in determining the eligibility of such person to receive, or the amount of, any retired pay payable under this title";

In line 24, after the word "title", strike out the word "includes" and insert "shall consist of";

On page 29, in line 10, after the word "Corps", insert "and the Enlisted Reserve Corps prior to the enactment of Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress, approved March 25, 1948";

In line 13, strike out the words "the Enlisted Reserve Corps" and insert "the Organized Reserve Corps";

On page 30, in line 11, after the word "component", change the period to a semicolon and insert "and"; in line 12, insert "(16) the Coast Guard Reserve"; in line 24, after the word "in", strike out word "the" and insert "an"; in line 25, after the word "or", strike out "the" and insert "an"; on page 31, in line 4, after the word "Naval", insert "and"; in line 5, after the word "Corps", strike out "Reserve" and insert "Marine Corps Reserves"; after line 6, strike out "Sec. 307. On and after the effective date of this title, any member of a Reserve component of the Army of the United States or the Air Force of the United States, or any member of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve, who satisfactorily performs not less than a designated minimum percentage of all drills or other inactive duty training, or both, during any year, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the cognizant service, shall, for the purpose of determining his eligibility for retirement only, be credited with active Federal service at the rate of 30 days for each year of such satisfactory performance of such drills or other inactive duty training: *Provided*, That said credit of 30 days' active Federal service shall be in addition to any annual active duty or field training: *Provided further*, That right to perform such drills or other inactive duty training and accrue credit therefor shall not be contingent upon the performance of any active Federal service"; in line 24, after the word "Sec.", strike out "308" and insert "307";

On page 32, in line 6, after the word "Sec.", strike out "309" and insert "308";

In line 9, after the word "and", strike out "in the discretion" and insert "by the direction";

On page 33, line 1, strike out "SEC. 309. (a) The Secretary of the Army with respect to personnel of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy with respect to personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to personnel of the Air Force shall certify and submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for payment, the names of all persons entitled to receive retired pay under the provisions of this title, along with a statement as to the amount of such pay to which said persons are entitled. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall, thereafter, disburse such pay to said persons from appropriations made to the Veterans' Administration for that purpose"; in line 13, after the word "Sec.", strike out "310" and insert: "SEC. 309. Service as a member of a Reserve component shall be subject to the requirements of the military services and appropriations available therefor from time to time. No person shall be ordered to active Federal Service for the sole purpose of qualifying for retirement benefits under this title"; in line 19, after the word "Sec.", strike out "311" and insert "310"; in line 22, after the word "Sec.", strike out "312" and insert "311"; on page 34, line 8, after the word "Sec.", strike out "313", and insert "312. The provisions of this title shall become effective for each of the services concerned when directed by the cognizant Secretary, but not later than the first day of the seventh month following the date of enactment.

"SEC. 313. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is objecting to all remaining bills on the calendar because several Senators, including one of the members of his committee, objected to the present consideration of S. 784. I am the member of the committee referred to. I have served on that committee for 2 years with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] during which time this bill has been considered. The bill is now upon the calendar, yet there is still no report from the Budget Bureau as to the costs, which, as every Senator is aware, is the customary procedure. What I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota is, if he is half as interested in getting the bill passed as he appears to be, why he has not, within the past 2 years, obtained for the members of the committee the views of the Bureau of the Budget concerning the bill?

Instead of following this customary procedure the chairman of the committee [Mr. LANGER] relied upon the views of the committee staff for a cost estimate.

To confirm this I shall read from the committee report:

> The committee took recourse to information supplied by its own actuary and advisers appointed by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, past experience has shown me as a member of the committee that their estimates are unreliable. One officer, referred to the chief of staff, is a former registered lobbyist of the American Federation of Labor. He is now drawing a salary as a member of the committee staff of $10,000 a year. At the time he was hired he was registered as a lobbyist with the Secretary of the Senate under the Lobbying Act.

The actuary mentioned in the report as assisting in making the estimates has had 10 years' previous experience with the Government as an astronomer in the Naval Observatory, following which he was employed by the Government as an actuary.

In my opinion, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service should have access to the best actuarial experience in the country. A man needs to have more than a knowledge of the stars.

Since the proper procedure was not followed, I asked the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to hold this bill over until I could procure some further pertinent facts. Until these facts are obtained, I shall continue to object to this bill being considered under the calendar rule.

There is nothing unusual in the procedure I followed in asking for the bill to go over.

My objection to the present consideration of this bill is not based upon its merits, but merely represents my policy to follow correct procedure.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR JOHN H. OVERTON—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY COMMISSION COUNCIL OF BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Commission Council of the City of Baton Rouge, La., expressing its sincere and deep sorrow on the death of the late Senator John H. Overton.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Honorable John H. Overton, senior Senator from Louisiana, died in office on the 13th day of May, 1948; and

Whereas Senator Overton served his State honorably and well for the past 16 years in the Senate of the United States, in which distinguished body he held the position of chairman of the Flood Control Committee for the past 12 years and was also an outstanding member of the Appropriations Committee and of other committees of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas Senator Overton devoted the greater part of his brilliant Senate service to flood control and river and harbor improvement, and was acknowledged to be the outstanding authority on flood-control matters in the Senate of the United States; and as a result of his outstanding leadership in that field, flood-control projects in Louisiana and throughout the entire Nation stand as living monuments to his memory; and

Whereas the entire lower Mississippi Valley, including the State of Louisiana, has prospered greatly as a result of the legislation written and sponsored by Senator Overton, particularly the Overton flood-control bill; and

Whereas the city of Baton Rouge, the capital city of Louisiana, located on the great Mississippi River, is especially aware of the tremendous loss to Louisiana and the Nation in the passing of Senator John H. Overton: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commission Council of the City of Baton Rouge, That the city of Baton Rouge hereby expresses its sincere and deep sorrow on the death of a truly great and faithful public servant, and extends to his family its profound sympathy upon their great personal loss, which is shared so fully by the State and Nation which he served.

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY

A true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Commission Council of the City of Baton Rouge, La., on the 26th day of May, 1948. All members present and voting "Aye."

[SEAL] GEO. F. BROGDON, *Secretary.*

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, at this time of the day I regret to have to address the Senate upon a subject which I think is fully as important as the one which impelled the President pro tempore of the Senate to make an address before the Appropriations Committee yesterday for the purpose of protesting what he properly described as a most reckless cut in the appropriations for ERP. I feel fully as strongly regarding the reduction which has been proposed in the budget of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Senate Appropriations Committee will soon consider the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission for the coming fiscal year.

On the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee, the House has passed a supply bill slashing $48,000,000 from the Commission's proposed budget.

In recommending this cut, the House Appropriations Committee suggested that it could be accomplished by an adjustment in certain phases of the research and development program. This suggestion for an adjustment simply means cutting down expenditures for research and development.

With all due respect to the House Appropriations Committee, I believe that the proposed budget slash may be nothing less than calamitous for the entire atomic energy project, which is one of the four main pillars of our national defense.

The fact is that the research and development program is a bedrock of the atomic energy project, both for military purposes and for peacetime purposes. It is impossible to separate the two phases of atomic energy research into separate compartments. They are inseparable. The same research project which advances the peacetime uses of atomic energy may also be invaluable from the military standpoint.

In my judgment, a pinch-penny policy on atomic energy at this time may cost us several times the amount saved at some later date in terms of military expenditures.

The budget recommendations submitted by the Commission represented its best judgments checked by the scientists, technicians, industrialists, and mining experts who have had experience in this field. The history of this whole undertaking clearly shows the impossibility of drawing up a priority list of items and stating categorically just how far each one shall be pursued.

This is a field in which we are endeavoring to advance into the unknown. Indeed, the safety of the country lies in the length of the steps taken into the unknown. The Commission very rightly refuses to pretend to be clairvoyant, because in the field of research, it is impossible to be clairvoyant.

Take, for example, the aspect which necessarily concerns us most—that of the military applications of atomic energy. The military aspects of national security are not capable of being stated in narrow or categorical terms. They are completely involved in the over-all security of the country. The military interest in the atomic energy program goes far beyond specific types of atomic bombs. It is indeed impossible to point to any segment of the atomic energy program and say, for instance, that an experiment is of no interest to the Military Establishment. In fact, it might be said that the basic military interest in the atomic energy program is that it be the broadest and healthiest possible program.

In considering the atomic energy appropriation, it is important to bear in mind the differences between the wartime program and the present program. The mission of the Manhattan project was essentially to produce in wartime a weapon which would have a decisive effect in a war already under way. The mission of the Atomic Energy Commission, as regards military applications, is to contribute to the maximum possible extent to the military strength of this Nation. The job of the Manhattan project was to gather together the accumulated science and technology of a number of years and out of this untried knowledge to produce a bomb. It is a tribute to the efficiency of the project that it actually used up about all the nuclear science of this country then available.

The job of the Atomic Energy Commission is to create new science and technology to add to the accomplishment of the Manhattan project and to prepare the country for a number of eventualities, not all of which are necessarily known today, at the same time that it carries on and expands short-range production of military items. The Commission must be simultaneously visionary and hard-headed. It must build new plants, as was done during the war, with a clear realization—even the hope—that those plants will be made obsolete—by us—before they have lasted out their full lives.

To cite a specific example: Presumably, one of the areas of research and development in which it is believed a cut-back is possible is that of reactor development. It is unnecessary to go into details of restricted data to realize the enormous advantage which will accrue to the military security of this country when we are able to propel ships, and submarines, and aircraft with nuclear engines. No one can now say when these engines will be ready. We know only that they are not impossible to develop, and certainly we want every effort made to develop them as soon as possible. It is all very well to say, "Keep specific projects on nuclear propulsion on ships and aircraft," but it must be remembered that many reactor problems are common to the entire reactor field and that a solution found in one place is likely to solve problems in other places—from aircraft engines to stationary power plants.

To use a mundane analogy advanced by Commissioner Strauss at the House hearings, asking the Commission to advance a list of priorities is like asking a family with a half-dozen children to determine in advance on which children the family's savings for education should be spent.

Listen to the warning of the Chairman of the Commission at the hearings:

> In this particular program cutting out any one section of research and development might prove to be a very tragic and catastrophic mistake. We do not know whether our advice is all-wise, but we do say that it represents the best judgment we were able to secure. And the sort of thing could happen—we do not say it will—but the sort of thing could happen that almost happened before; and Dr. Bacher, a distinguished physicist and a member of this Commission, can give you an illustration from the experience in the atomic energy development involving a section of research which was almost thrown out. It is the thing which gives us concern about the various segments of this program. At one juncture of the atomic energy development, it was essential that this research and development was completed, otherwise the whole investment could have been wasted as a result of what would have taken place.

It may sound reassuring to be told that the proposed reductions are to be absorbed without affecting the military phases of our atomic energy program. But, Mr. President, let us not pretend that the cut suggested will not affect the

rate of speed at which the atomic energy program moves forward. Are we prepared to accept responsibility which may some day return to haunt us, responsibility for putting on the brakes at a time when all the signals call for full speed ahead? No, Mr. President, the United States cannot afford the luxury of trifling with one of the Nation's most precious assets and the bedrock of its security.

Mr. President, I close by reading this one line from the House committee report:

> The committee also believes that an adjustment can be made in the item for research in the nonweapon, nonbiology, and nonmedical phases of the research and development program.

In other words, they proposed to slash $48,000,000 from the budget for the purpose of depriving the Commission of money for the development of peacetime power. We can all draw our own conclusions from that statement in the report.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, the late Secretary of Labor.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WEICHEL, Mr. HAND, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BLAND, and Mr. HART were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. LANDIS, Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri, and Mr. KELLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1249. An act authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes;

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws;

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes;

S. 2215. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3433. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes.

THE MILITARY STRENGTH OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the speech which I intended to make on House bill 2744, which was passed by the Senate this afternoon.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR MAYBANK IN RE H. R. 2744

We have before us today in H. R. 2744 a bill which could well mark the turning point in our military strength. There has been much discussion in the Armed Services Committee, on the floor of the Senate, and throughout the Nation generally, that the real military strength of our country lies in a well-trained and well-organized National Guard and Reserve. While this bill is divided into three titles, each of which differs in its purpose, title III is a most important step in implementing the various statements of opinion concerning our need to improve our Reserve structure.

Before discussing this important title, I would like to dwell briefly on the provisions of title I. This title establishes a permanent and workable method of eliminating substandard officers from the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force. At the present time the services are operating under temporary wartime legislation which expires on June 30 of this year. Failure to enact title I of this bill would mean that the services would revert to an archaic and cumbersome method of getting rid of their inefficient and undesirable officer personnel. There will be no increased cost to the Government as a result of enactment of this title, and it is believed that it is a very worthy and necessary part of the bill.

The prime purpose of title II is to place the Army and the Air Force on a par with the Navy insofar as certain retirement benefits are concerned. Under existing law the Navy is permitted to retire their personnel, both Regular and Reserve alike, in the highest temporary rank in which they served satisfactorily during wartime. This principle was approved by the Congress on the theory that an officer who served satisfactorily in a position of higher responsibility and rank during wartime should, when retired, be rewarded for such service by being retired in the higher rank. The Army and Air Force do not have authority similar to that enjoyed by naval personnel and this title places them on a basis of exact equality with the Navy.

The additional costs to the Government occasioned by this title are cumulative over a period of years, starting with an initial cost of $1,000,000 in 1949 and rising to a maximum cost of approximately $17,500,000 in 1968. It is expected that by 1988 the costs of this title will have disappeared completely.

Title III of the bill establishes a new principle for the members of the Reserves and the National Guard, in that it creates a longevity retirement system for members of the Reserve based on service rendered during both periods of war and peace. In the past, members of the Reserves have served conscientiously and faithfully over various extended periods of years and have never received retirement benefits for such service. It is a fact that there are within our Reserves today individuals who have been called to active duty for the Mexican border troubles, who served during World War I and for many years during World War II. The reason they served was because they remained active in the Reserves during the periods of peace and were thus immediately available to augment the Regular military forces when we were confronted with periods of national emergency.

It is recognized throughout our country that the Reserves have always had to bear the brunt of combat service, but this title is not aimed solely at rewarding these men for past service. On the contrary, its primary purpose is to establish a long-range program which will induce personnel to stay in and render progressive and valuable service to the various Reserve components over long periods of time.

Standards have been written into this bill which are very high and exacting. In order to qualify, a reservist must apply himself throughout the years by faithful attendance at drills, completion of correspondence courses, attendance at camps and by periods of active Federal service. Further, the bill contains a directive to the Secretaries of the various branches of the armed services to establish standards and procedures for the promotion and elimination of members of the Reserves, and specifies that failure to meet these standards will result in their separation from the Reserve and disqualify them for any benefits under this title. These standards must of necessity include physical fitness and, of course, professional qualifications.

It is believed that the inducements held out under this title will result in a great many reservists competitively trying to qualify for the benefits of the title. However, the normal attrition that will take place in the Reserves will, in the opinion of the services and actuaries who considered this bill, result in only approximately 8 percent of the officers and 1 percent of the enlisted personnel qualifying. It should be clearly pointed out that insofar as benefits and procedures are concerned, officers and enlisted men are treated exactly on the same basis. Briefly stated, any officer or enlisted man who acquires to his credit 20 years of active Federal service will be qualified to receive a pension starting when he reaches 60 years of age. A year of active service is defined as a year in which hs has attained a maximum of 50 points as defined in the bill. Such points are earned as discussed earlier, that is, by attendance at drills, camps, completion of correspondence courses, etc. If the man accumulates 20 years of satisfactory service his points are then converted into days and those days divided by 360, which gives his total number of years of active Federal service. He will then be entitled to receive 2½ percent of the pay of the highest rank which he held during this period of service, starting when he becomes 60 years of age.

It will be noted that these provisions clearly reward those who serve the most, and

eliminate completely those who render no service. In this respect it differs markedly from the bill as it passed the House. Unintentionally perhaps, but legally, under the House version of the bill, it would have been possible for a large number of persons to have qualified for retirement without giving service to these Reserves. When the Senate Armed Services committee considered this bill, outside actuaries were utilized to calculate the costs of title III in the form that it passed the House of Representatives. It was estimated by these actuaries that the ultimate maximum costs would be reached about the year 2000 and would be in the neighborhoood of $400,000,000 annually. After study, the services and the Reserve associations concurred in these figures. It was deemed that these costs were prohibitive, and further, that irrespective of the amount of money involved, the bill did not insure the development of the type of Reserve needed as an integral part of our military structure. Therefore, over a period of several months many different plans were considered and eventually the plan presently before the Senate was agreed upon by the services, the Reserves, and the committee.

The same actuaries who made the original estimates were making further studies of the alternate plans as they were developed, and it is pertinent to note that the highest maximum cost of title III in the form in which it is presented today will be reached in approximately the year 1963 and will be in the vicinity of $18,000,000 per year. Thereafter, that figure should be the annual cost of the title. This is in marked contrast to the former figure of $400,000,000. But here again, it is felt that the most important change in the House version was that which required a high degree of service in order for a man to qualify.

I could explain the bill in considerably more detail, but I suspect that it would perhaps be best to conclude my remarks and make myself available to questions from any of my interested colleagues. However, in closing, I would like to reiterate: First, that the objective of title III is to assist in the development and maintenance of a strong and trained Reserve. Second, that the cost of the title is very small when compared to the benefits received through the increased strength of our military structure. Particularly is this true as it should result in permitting the reduction of the size and cost of our Regular Establishment. Third, the bill has the unanimous endorsement of the military services, the various Reserve associations, and the National Guard associations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am about to move——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the call of the calendar from the point at which objection was made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not until the Senator from North Dakota withdraws his objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have left the Chamber since the announcement was made that the call of the calendar had been concluded. That would require that there be a quorum, call, because I would want all the Senators to be present in case any Senator should want to object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if that is the situation, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no option in the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If any Senator has gone home with that understanding of the situation, I would be the last man in the Senate to upset it. Therefore, I shall not press my request.

THE TEACHER SHORTAGE—LETTER FROM DELIA W. KUHN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a letter which I have received from Mrs. Delia W. Kuhn, chairman of the education committee of the Alice Deal Home and School Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE C. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Some of the members of the education committee of Alice Deal are very much concerned about S. 1537, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948, which reaches the floor of the Senate this week. They have asked me to pass on the following information to you, in case you should be planning to speak about the act or offer an amendment.

As you know, all Federal and District employees, except District teachers, are now covered by pending legislation providing cost-of-living increases.

SALARY SCALE OF DISTRICT TEACHERS

1. District teachers' average salary of $3,298 ranks twenty-fifth in the scale of teachers' salaries in cities over 100,000 population in the United States. Detroit is highest with $4,133.

2. In maximum salary possible for teachers with a masters degree, District teachers rank fourteenth.

3. In maximum salary possible for teachers with a bachelor degree, District teachers rank twenty-seventh.

4. In percentage of increase granted last year, District teachers rank sixty-sixth, according to a survey of 90 large cities made by the National Education Association.

5. In 44 cities teachers receive annual increments of over $100 and as high as $375. The annual increment of District teachers is $100.

6. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington's cost-of-living index is the highest in the Nation.

SICK LEAVE

1. District teachers are granted no paid sick leave. Ten days' leave was recommended by Superintendent Corning, and this proposal sent to the Commissioners early in May. There it remains.

THE TEACHER SHORTAGE

1. There are 529 temporary (student) teachers in the District. Only 18 of these in divisions 1–9 (white schools) took the qualifying examination this spring to teach in District junior and senior high schools. Only 43 in divisions 10–13 (colored schools) took the examination.

2. With 249 temporary elementary school teachers, only 21 are graduating this spring in this field from Wilson Teachers' College, and 46 from Miner.

3. At least six teachers have left the District to teach in Montgomery County, where increments and maximum salaries are higher—$4,800 with an A. B. and $5,300 with an M. A.

4. In the past there were normally 200–300 applicants for teaching positions in the white schools alone.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The effect of S. 1537, if District teachers are excluded from it, will be to make the salaries of some school janitors higher than those of some District teachers.

2. If teachers are excluded from S. 1537 and a sales tax is enacted for the District, teachers will, in effect, take a salary cut.

3. I understand that, while teachers are not included in the Classification Act of 1923 (which 1537 amends), they have been brought under it in the past and can again be brought under it by an amendment to S. 1537.

As chairman of the Alice Deal education committee, I have taken the liberty of bringing these facts to your attention, in the belief that they will interest you in your double role of president of the Home and School Association and of United States Senator.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

DELIA W. KUHN,
Chairman, Education Committee, Alice Deal Home and School Association.

HOUSING UNLIMITED—EDITORIAL FROM THE OREGON DAILY JOURNAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an excellent editorial entitled "Housing Unlimited," from the June 4 issue of the Oregon Daily Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING UNLIMITED

Representatives of the Portland housing authority, city, county, and State governments, and disaster agencies have agreed to inform the Federal Government that 5,000 stopgap housing units are needed immediately to care for Vanport flood victims.

That's fine. So are plans for remodeling dormitories, bringing in trailers and Army tents to take care of the emergency.

There is no agreement, however, between various housing committees on plans for permanent housing for these displaced persons, victims of the worst flood disaster in the Oregon country. And unless Portland wants to foster a long-range trailer camp and slum housing problem, doing itself as well as the flood victims a very bad turn indeed, an effort should be made to reach immediate agreement on a permanent housing program, then place all the facilities of the community behind the project.

It is obvious that flood victims cannot live in makeshift quarters for long, or double up forever with big-hearted townspeople who have thown open their homes to them. Thus emergency housing is imperative. But it is equally obvious that emergency housing, unless backstopped by permanent housing is equally meaningless when it comes to meeting the long-range housing needs of the area.

Remember, 6,600 public housing units were wiped out at Vanport.

Remember, too, that the other 6,000 units of public housing are filled, or are so nearly filled that they offer no relief. Likewise, the 5,800 units of public housing at Vancouver. Thus the long-range housing needs of the area, acute before the floods came, are doubly acute now. This is another war housing emergency all over again.

Remember also that the people left homeless in the Vanport disaster must have low-rental housing. The GIs attending Vanport College couldn't buy a new house at today's prices if the area were full of them. Neither could many other stranded persons.

The discussion, already begun, of letting private industry do Portland's housing job—desirable as that is in theory—therefore becomes purely academic. In sober truth, Portland must have literally thousands of subsidized low-rental housing units. It must have them as quickly as suitable sites can be found, and as quickly as they can be built. In the next 6 to 10 months, if possible; and the only agency that can provide that kind of housing that quickly is the Federal Government.

Let's get all housing groups together and go after the stopgap housing. And right now. We must have it. But let's recognize it as stopgap and get going right now on a permanent housing program—not another Vanport, but something better and with more local control. Meanwhile, let's not become involved in time-wasting, lofty arguments about who's going to build what and where, lest slums grow up in our midst.

SUPERSONIC FLIGHT

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, according to a press account which I hold in my hand, Air Secretary Symington disclosed today that the Air Force has succeeded in developing and flying an airplane faster than the speed of sound.

This is a remarkable achievement, and one which I think deserves to be brought to the attention of the Senate, particularly on this day, when all of us have had our attention directed so forcibly toward thoughts of national defense.

It is also fitting, I think, that I call attention to the fact that a West Virginian was the first pilot to fly in this supersonic airplane at a speed faster than sound. He is Capt. Charles E. Yeager, of Hamlin, Lincoln County, W. Va. Captain Yeager's wife, Elise, and two children, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hal Yeager, reside in Hamlin. This young man compiled a great war record, and has gone on to become one of the truly brave and fearless fliers of our time.

At this time I also want to pay tribute to another fine West Virginia boy, who also was engaged in the hazardous flying which led to supersonic flight faster than sound. That young man was Howard C. Lilly, whose parents reside near the city of Beckley, W. Va.

Just a few weeks ago, Mr. Howard Lilly gave his life at the Muroc Air Base in testing one of the experimental jet planes of the Navy. Lilly was 30 years old, a civilian, and was rated one of the best test pilots of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics.

I pay tribute to Captain Yeager and to the memory of Howard Lilly, both great fliers, great Americans, and both from my home State of West Virginia.

I ask, Mr. President, that this press account be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLIES FASTER THAN SOUND

The Air Force's XS–1 rocket plane has flown "much faster than the speed of sound many times," Air Secretary Symington announced today. The speed of sound is about 760 miles an hour at sea level. Air experts called the supersonic flight the greatest aviation achievement since the Wright brothers' flight.

The original supersonic flight was made last October at the Muroc (Calif.) Air Force base. Subsequent test flights all have been made there.

Capt. Charles E. Yeager, 25-year-old pilot, became the first human in history to fly faster than sound.

Undoubtedly the plane was flying at a high altitude. The speed of sound decreases with increased height. For example, the speed of sound at 40,000 feet is 660 miles per hour.

Mr. Symington said he could not reveal details because they might give other nations the benefit of our Air Force research. He did not claim any records, but the plane obviously shattered unofficially all existing world speed records.

The XS–1 is a small, straight-winged plane with a needle nose and a stubby, fat body. It is powered by four rocket motors, and is the Air Force's first rocket fighter.

Mr. Symington was asked if other planes had gone faster than the speed of sound. "Not in level flight, but possibly in a dive," he said.

The plane that pierced the hitherto impenetrable supersonic wall was conceived in 1945. A year later, it was ready to fly. Under full power, the XS–1 will stay aloft only about 2½ minutes and probably will fly little more than 100 miles from take-off to landing.

It is the most rugged plane ever built, designed to withstand the tremendous forces that exert themselves in the supersonic realm.

From the XS–1 and its contemporaries, science is getting the knowledge to build supersonic aircraft that will wage future wars far out of sight and hearing of earth-bound folk. While the XS–1 is designed for 80,000-foot altitude, one of its successors is being designed reportedly for 200,000 feet. The present power plant of the XS–1 is supposed to push it a "mere" 1,000 miles an hour at 60,000 feet—more than 1½ times the speed of sound at that altitude.

The fuel is alcohol and liquid oxygen, forced into burners by gaseous nitrogen. If the nitrogen system is replaced by a turbine pump, as planned, the Air Force believes the XS–1 may reach its design speed and stay aloft 4.2 minutes.

Should anything go wrong in the cockpit, the pilot can push a button and be thrown free of the ship, to parachute to safety.

Capt. Yeager enlisted in the Air Corps in 1941 as soon as he was graduated from high school at Hamlin, W. Va. He shot down 13 German planes during 15 months with the Eighth Air Force in Europe. Since the war, he has served almost 2 years as a test pilot at Wright-Patterson Air Base, Dayton, Ohio, and at Muroc.

During his European service, Capt. Yeager flew P–51 Mustangs on 64 combat missions totaling 270 combat hours. He won the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Silver Star with one oak leaf cluster, the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and the Air Medal with six clusters.

LUXURY TAX ON BABY CREAM

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, irritation seems to be the common lot of mankind, and at this time I should like to read into the RECORD a letter I have received from one of my constituents, in all seriousness. The letter follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 1, 1948.*

The Honorable RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Senator from Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The other day I went to the drug store to buy some baby cream for Louis, our year-old son, whose little bottom had gotten all red and irritated. I was charged 47 cents for a jar which holds about 2 ounces. That price is high enough to pay for this product but when I have to give 10 additional cents for a luxury tax for a baby item, that is when I get my dander up.

Since when has it been considered a luxury for the baby to have a sore bottom? It is hard enough trying to raise a family and give America the healthy future sons, daughters, and voters she needs without these additional burdens such as luxury taxes on essential baby items.

I realize that the Government is sustained through taxes and I am willing to give my share, but luxury tax on the essentials of a baby's well-being is going too far. I'm sure there must be many other sources from which this additional money can be obtained and which would feel the pinch much less than the already overburdened budget of today's young parents. What do you think?

Respectfully yours,

(Mrs.) LOUIS W. MINGIONE.

Mr. President, I replied that I thought my correspondent was exactly right. I respectfully call the letter to the attention of the Finance Committee.

PURCHASES FOR THE ARMED SERVICES UNDER UNIFICATION LAW

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, during the consideration of Senate bill 2655, which was passed this afternoon, some comments were made as to the fact that unification of the armed services was not working as it should. I agree. Yet some progress has been made. For instance, in May of last year common items purchased amounted to 18 percent. The volume is now 64 percent.

For the RECORD I offer a letter I have received from the Secretary of Defense, setting forth certain data, and I ask that the letter be printed in full at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, June 4, 1948.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: Last week you asked me for information concerning the volume of purchases by the National Military Establishment which have been brought under coordinated control. You expressed particular interest in a comparison of what the current volume will be, on the basis of purchase assignments presently in effect, as compared with the situation 1 year ago, before passage by Congress of the National Security Act.

As you know, the Munitions Board has been extremely active in assigning procurement responsibility for given items to a single service. Specifically, under purchase assignments in effect on May 1, 1948, more than 64 percent of the total dollar value of purchases by the National Military Establishment will be carried out under single service assignments of this sort. This figure of 64 percent compares with a figure of 18 percent on May 1, 1947.

Similarly, under present assignments, joint purchases account for 12.3 percent today, as compared with 1.1 percent a year ago.

Other types of collaborative purchase assignments presently in effect account for a total of 5.9 percent of total purchases.

In other words, total coordinated purchases, under assignments on May 1, 1948, will account for approximately 84 percent of total purchases. This figure compares with a figure of 38 percent as of May 1, 1947.

A more detailed statement on this subject, which my office requested the Munitions Board to prepare, is attached for your information.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

MAY 25, 1948.

COMPARISON OF PROCUREMENT BEFORE AND AFTER UNIFICATION

1. In response to your memorandum of May 15, 1948, regarding military procurement, the following tabulation is presented for your information.

Comparison of purchase volume on the basis of purchase assignments in effect on May 1, 1947, and on May 1, 1948

	Before unification purchase assignments in effect May 1, 1947		After unification purchase assignments in effect May 1, 1948		Change in percent
	Dollar value (millions)	Percent	Dollar value (millions)	Percent	
Single service	558	18.3	1,971	64.6	+46.3
Joint	32	1.1	408	13.4	+12.3
Collaborative	558	18.2	182	5.9	−12.3
Uncoordinated	1,903	62.4	490	16.1	−46.3
Total	3,051	100.0	3,051	100.0	

2. The following factors should be considered in analyzing the above tabulation:

(a) Fiscal year 1948 appropriation data were utilized as the basis of projecting the probable distribution of procurement data for purchase assignments in effect on May 1, 1948, and on May 1, 1947.

(b) In view of the above it is to be noted that the column for May 1, 1947, represents the percentages and dollar values had the purchase assignments in effect on May 1, 1947, been in effect for the entire fiscal year 1948. The column for May 1, 1948, represents the percentages and dollar values had the purchase assignments in effect on May 1, 1948, been in effect for the entire fiscal year 1948.

(c) No allowance was made for lag between the date of purchase assignment and the actual implementation of purchase asignment.

(d) Projections for future expenditures will not ordinarily follow the same relative distribution because of shifting of requirements; so that interpretation of future trends must be made on a tentative basis.

3. It is to be noted that the trend has been toward increased single service and joint procurement and decreased collaborative and uncoordinated procurement.

PATRICK W. TIMBERLAKE,
Major General, USAF.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] of January 26, 1948, to reconsider the vote by which House bill 1049, to repeal certain acts of Congress known as Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota, was passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not like to interpose an objection, but the Senator from Texas has been compelled to leave the Chamber, and I shall have to object to unanimous consent at this time. I should not object under other circumstances.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORP.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it has come to my attention from certain sources that criticism has been hurled at the International Latex Corp. for certain of the advertisements they have carried in the public press, and particularly some dealing with British policy in Palestine.

I wish to say for myself that I think the International Latex Corp. has set a good example in carrying as advertisements of a commercial character material that is in the public interest. This is a liberal and progressive private enterprise, performing a very valuable public service by using its commercial advertisements to convey messages to the public which contribute to a better understanding by the public of important issues.

Mr. President, when there are so many reactionary newspapers which are strangling rather than progressing matters of liberal character, and when there are so many private corporations which use their commercial power for a selfish rather than a public interest, it seems to me that International Latex Corp. is to be commended instead of being condemned for using its advertising space to give some vital message to the public for its consideration. The public does not have to believe what is said in that space. The corporation makes no effort to force its views upon the public. But instead of putting something of purely commercial character in their advertising space I think they have set a good example by using the space to give a message with some meat in it to the public at large. Would that many other corporation executives would exhibit the keen public interest and the progressive and humanitarian point of view which Mr. A. N. Spanel, president of International Latex Corp., has so long shown in his public service.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I should like the RECORD to show that the call of the calendar is concluded and that the pending business is Senate Resolution 239 respecting the United Nations.

I now move that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, June 11, 1948, at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 10 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Leo J. Callanan, of Massachusetts.
Carlos J. Warner, of Ohio.

Ray L. Thurston, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

George T. Colman, of Wisconsin, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ellis M. Goodwin, of New Jersey.
Howard P. Jones, of New York.
S. Shepard Jones, of Maryland.
Edwin M. J. Kretzmann, of Rhode Island.
George S. Roper, of Virginia.
Harold R. Spiegel, of Michigan.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles H. Abbott, of Virginia.
Elmer H. Harrelson, of Oklahoma.
Henry L. T. Koren, of New Jersey.
Eugene I. Padberg, Jr., of Missouri.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edward T. Barnard, of New York.
Jules E. Bernard, of New York.
William T. Carpenter, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Miss Eileen R. Donovan, of Massachusetts.
George Hubert Maness, of Oklahoma.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, invisible and everlasting, come to us in the common ways of life. Forgive our faltering faith and preserve us from discord and confusion and from every foolish way.

As we have tested the burdens of life, help us, our Father, to throw out the challenge and build upon big things with big hope and big decisions. Bound together with cords of understanding, make us strong in bearing our responsibilities; unite the hearts and minds of our citizens for the good and the perpetuity of free government with honor and respect of the rights of one another; thus life becomes a joyous benefaction. In the name of our Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho;

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston

Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws;

S. 2201. An act supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1938; and

S. 2215. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2798) entitled "An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SPARKMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6628. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCFARLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6355) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 11 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 9 to the above-entitled bill.

OUR EXPORT-CONTROL POLICY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article in yesterday's Washington newspapers regarding the interest of some of the Members of the House in our present export policies, especially with respect to Russia.

I think that I should inform the House that this is a subject which already has been under careful consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Extensive hearings have been held over the course of the past few months. A further hearing already had been scheduled for next Tuesday, June 15. At this time officials of the Department of Commerce had promised us they would supply the figures on current shipments and the reasons underlying the continued granting of licenses for exports to eastern Europe.

We should be very happy to have any information or questions which the Members of the House may have. I hope that all Members of the House who are vitally interested in this matter will feel free to come before our committee next Tuesday and bring to our attention the specific items they may have in mind.

For 3 days last March the committee in public hearings reviewed the export-control policies initiated at the beginning of that month. We were asked by Assistant Secretary of Commerce David K. Bruce for a month's delay on any action, during which time he stated the situation would be cleared up. We were assured by him on April 6 that this had been done. We reported to the House on April 14 that the situation under the conditions and changes proposed by him seemed acceptable.

Subsequently, following information received by the committee concerning delay in instituting these revised policies, we again, on May 18, conducted public hearings to determine why the proposals had not been put into effect.

In an all-day hearing on May 27, the committee was unsuccessful in developing from Acting Assistant Secretary Thomas C. Blaisdell just what standards or tests were being used by his Department in determining what should be exported or held here at home. Specific attention was given to exports to Russia.

The specific question was asked Mr. Blaisdell, in connection with a sentence in the Secretary's Third Quarterly Report on Export Control and Allocation Powers, whether this meant "that if the U. S. S. R. furnishes some kind of information, or if countries under the present domination of the U. S. S. R. furnish certain kinds of information, this country is going to issue export licenses of steel to those countries."

Mr. Blaisdell answered:

You interpret the statement correctly. If the information were supplied, we would apply the principles which have been operative right along—that if this information were adequate and the justification regarded as sufficient, we would issue licenses, the presumption being that we are receiving from the Soviet Union and from the other countries involved an adequate return for what we were sending them; in other words, that it was a real two-sided trade between the countries, where the United States was benefiting to the extent that the Soviet Union was benefiting from what we were sending them.

The committee requested Mr. Blaisdell to furnish it with what is being shipped, to what countries, and the reasons for permitting this. He agreed to do so and is scheduled to appear next Tuesday to supply such information.

This inquiry by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be thorough and searching.

CLASSIFICATION OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3433) to amend an act entitled "An act to classify the officers and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, strike out line 2 and insert:

"SEC. 3. This act shall take effect 180 days after funds have been appropriated and made available for the additional personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, and that in the remarks I will make on the displaced-persons bill I may include a letter and a memorandum from the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

CONGRESS COMES THROUGH

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the President addresssed some very unkind remarks regarding the Congress. I do not think that we ought to sink to his level in this matter. But, I believe we have an answer to the charge that this has been the worst Congress in the history of the country. There has come to my desk an article that will

be published in the June issue of Fortune magazine entitled "Congress Comes Through—Although Divided From the White House by the Gulf of Party Politics, the Eightieth Congress Has Set a Record Hard To Beat."

That is the answer to the President's charge. Mr. Speaker, the President is hot under the collar. He should return to Washington and cool off on that porch he recently added to the White House. The President has sunk to a new low.

The article referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS COMES THROUGH—ALTHOUGH DIVIDED FROM THE WHITE HOUSE BY THE GULF OF PARTY POLITICS, THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS HAS SET A RECORD HARD TO BEAT

The Eightieth Congress of the United States never did more useful work than after midnight, Saturday, March 13. In the Senate Chamber the galleries were crowded; at the foot of every aisle the guards stood with their backs to the floor itself and facing the intent spectators; in the press section the correspondents bent over the tally sheets, which look so much like laundry lists. The clerk was calling the roll on Senate bill No. 2202—the European recovery program. When the last "yea" was recorded the bill had passed, 69 to 17.

At that moment HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, addressed the Chair. "Mr. President," he said, "we have passed a bill of unprecedented scope and complexity. We have done so at a time of political change in America—which added special difficulties. We have passed the bill in a democratic manner, giving everyone a chance to be heard, and embodying * * * many worth-while ideas prepared by Senators and by other citizens."

The Senate had just enacted into legislative form the most important United States policy since James Monroe promulgated the Monroe Doctrine. The speed, the thoughtfulness, and the care with which the Eightieth Congress moved to approve this far-sighted, generous legislation was not the first proof, but it was the decisive proof that representative government was functioning effectively in the United States. Not since the First Congress, which implemented the Constitution, has any Congress dispatched more important public business with more thorough thought and care, and, on its own unbossed judgment, more rightly than the Eightieth Congress. In its two sessions and its first 209 legislative workdays the Eightieth Congress passed 508 public laws, 262 private bills, and appropriated $31,789,648,075.

The record of the Eightieth Congress has major historical importance. At a time of grave crisis, and political division between executive and legislative branches, the Eightieth Congress has acted with intelligent decision. It has restored faith in government by discussion at a time when that has seemed to many to be a losing proposition. The proof of this record rests not only in the enlightened action that Congress took in respect to foreign policy but in its very real accomplishments in domestic policy. The American community, acting through its Congress, not only made progress in meeting the thorniest issue in American life—the balance of power between capital and labor—but it refused steadfastly to be driven into extreme measures by hysteria or panic. The Congress, like the people who elected it, has acted in the last 2 years with great good sense.

The record of the Eightieth Congress also has major political importance. The Republican Party, after 16 years in opposition as the minority, could claim that as a congressional majority it had served the Nation with responsibility and had demonstrated capacity for leadership. In so doing it had performed a useful service in giving new impetus to the American system of party government and party responsibility.

WHEN THE DEMOCRATS DESPAIRED

The country had not always been so confident in the wisdom of the representative system at a time when executive and legislature represented different parties. The Republican victory of 1946 left many, who were not necessarily partisan, apprehensive about the next 2 years. The division between White House and Congress, they said, foretold disaster. It was a Democrat, Senator JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who proposed an ingenious if unprecedented method of avoiding the expected paralysis of government. He suggested that his own party leader, the President, appoint a Republican Secretary of State and then resign so that both branches of the Government might pass into Republican hands.

This proposal was not seriously entertained but it was widely debated by the newspaper columnists. They shared the Senator's misgivings about the future. On November 7, 2 days after the election, the erudite Walter Lippmann wrote: "It takes a long time under our system of government to change over. * * * The decay of the Democratic administration, which began at least 18 months ago, is far advanced. But the Republican Party is far from being ready to take over." A seasoned Washington reporter, Marquis Childs, some days later wrote, "While the Republicans are rejoicing over their extraordinary victory, congressional leaders here in Washington know that it poses a problem for them. The GOP majority in the House will be top-heavy with newcomers. * * * Bossing this majority will be no easy task."

The job was not to boss the new majority, but to organize it. The Republican Party had been in the minority so long that no member of the new majority had ever served as a committee chairman; none had ever been a majority leader. The Longworths and the Cannons of slightly tarnished memory were dead; political charts drawn in the era of normalcy were of little or no use in the atomic era when the issues that the Eightieth Congress had to face transcended party politics.

CONGRESS HAD CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS

Yet the new Congress assembled with every show of confidence. The leaders, even if inexperienced in the mechanics of leadership, fully appreciated their responsibilities. They knew that the emphasis in the American Government, as a result of the election, had passed from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to that narrow area known in Washington as the Hill. There, in December, a full 2 weeks before the new Congress was to assemble, twin centers of power began to operate. One was the rococo, red-plush, and crystal-hung office of the new Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts; the other was located in the bare, business-like room 335, in the Senate office building, formerly the minority headquarters. There Senator TAFT and other Republican leaders of the Senate laid their plans.

It was in room 335 that the Senate majority determined to initiate the coming session with decisive action. The decision was to enforce political morality on the Senate itself; this was to be done by refusing to seat Theodore Bilbo, Senator-elect of Mississippi, who, as a Senate investigation had clearly proved, had been guilty of accepting bribes. The ineffable, intolerant, wizened little man, who in his long Senate service had taken pride in his racial prejudices, finally heard the news in a Senate lobby, crept away without farewells to turn the lock in his office door for the last time, to go home to Mississippi—a lonely, forgotten figure who was already dying of cancer of the mouth.

The initial issue settled, the Senate went to work. The first session was not one of uninterrupted harmony; even the Republicans complained, at times, of "confusion" and delay. A Democrat, Senator MCGRATH of Rhode Island, sneered: "The Senate must be a very great body. It moves so slowly." Some 13 months later Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., was to boast: "We did these things, let us well remember, in spite of the dire forebodings that our Government would be paralyzed because the President was a Democrat and the Congress was Republican." Political division had not paralyzed the national will; by the middle of 1948 the Nation found itself, in the face of a grave overseas crisis, confident and sure.

THE CRITICAL TEST IN FOREIGN POLICY

In facing the most difficult and recurring problem of foreign policy, the Eightieth Congress accurately reflected the attitude of the electors. The ordinary Congressman came to Washington in 1947 hoping, like most Americans, that the issues left unsettled by war would settle themselves; that somehow the United States might enjoy a period of peace and relaxation. The measure of the Eightieth Congress is the way it met the challenge of aggressive communism. The Congress not only granted every request made by the administration for dollars to implement our foreign policy, but both through criticism and by taking the initiative made important corrections and additions to that policy.

The first test came early. Only 66 days after both Houses assembled, the leaders received an urgent summons to the White House. There the President and his new Secretary of State, General Marshall, broke the bad news: Britain, already bankrupted by war and commitments far beyond her ability, had to abandon support of Greece and Turkey. Congress would have to provide money to sustain both countries.

The reaction to this demand was typical of an attitude that Congress was to maintain. The leadership accepted the necessity for action but not necessarily the terms or time limits laid down; moreover, it reserved its right to question the methods by which policy was implemented. This constant criticism by Congress prodded the administration into more imaginative action. At the time of the Truman-doctrine speech the watchwords were "containment" and "relief"; at the time of the European recovery program the administrators of policy were talking of "reconstruction" and "restoration." In a year and a half the United States moved from the defensive to the offensive in foreign policy. The contribution of Congress to this shift in emphasis was substantial.

On the first issue, in fact, Senator VANDENBERG undertook a necessary correction in United States policy. The President, in urging aid to Greece and Turkey, had overlooked any reference to the United Nations. The omission ran counter to all previous official statements of United States policy, which made reference to the UN a prerequisite of action. It not only provided a new opening for Mr. Wallace and his fellow travelers but aroused misgivings abroad. At VANDENBERG'S insistence, a clause was added to the bill providing that aid should be terminated whenever the Security Council or the General Assembly should decide that its continuation was "unnecessary or undesirable."

TO SEE IS TO BE CONVINCED

When Congress adjourned in the summer of 1947 the United States had already extended aid abroad to the extent of $13,000,000,000 and no end seemed in sight. The rank and file in both Houses were questioning the wisdom of further spending. Members of Congress were eager to undertake their own investigation of conditions abroad; that summer over 200 Members went overseas. Although some of the trips were old-fashioned junkets, most were not, and seldom has the taxpayer's money been better spent. The education of the individual Congressman was highly original but effective. Few of the travelers were satisfied with

official briefings; one committee even forbade its members to take dinner jackets lest they be diverted by too much official entertainment. The South Dakota ex-schoolteacher, KARL MUNDT, penetrated behind the iron curtain—into Bulgaria and Rumania. He came home determined that the Voice of America, almost stilled by the Seventy-ninth Congress, must be heard again in those countries. An ex-marine, Congressman JACKSON of California, went so far forward in Greece that he found himself under mortar fire of the Greek guerrillas. A dozen or more Congressmen talked across the table with the French and Italian Communist leaders, Thorez and Togliatti, and thus had an opportunity personally to measure their ability.

These journeys took place during a formative period in the evolution of United States foreign policy; and what the Congressmen saw and heard helped in its development. The European nations, in response to Secretary Marshall's Harvard speech of June 5, 1947, were meeting in Paris to see what they could do collectively to rebuild their economies. At home the administration had initiated a series of studies to see to what extent the United States could aid without depleting its own resources. In Europe, traveling Congressmen were to make their own appraisals. At the instance of Speaker MARTIN, one committee under CHRISTIAN HERTER, of Massachusetts, was charged with making a special study of foreign aid. In November, even before the administration had detailed its blueprint of the European recovery program, the Herter committee had come to the independent conclusion that the United States must take Europe off relief and put it back to work.

A BREACH IS AVERTED

By Christmas there was general agreement in the administration, in Congress, and in the country at large that a European recovery program was necessary. The differences to be worked out concerned how much Congress should appropriate and how the plan should be administered. A breach threatened over the mechanics of aid. The Secretary of State saw ERP as an extension of State Department operations and announced his adamant opposition to the idea of "two Secretaries of State." In neither House could this position be sustained since Congress had no confidence in the State Department as an operating body or in its personnel as managers. A stubborn refusal to arbitrate could have wrecked the program. On his own initiative, Senator VANDENBERG called in the Brookings Institution to make an independent report on the management of foreign aid. The formula that the Institution suggested was accepted and written into the law as the Economic Cooperation Administration. The European recovery program became law on April 3, 1948, 15 days before the critical Italian election. It was an act of prudent, generous, internation dealing without precedent in history, passed without major dissension and with unparalleled speed.

The Congress took the initiative in another phase of foreign policy: China. The problem was complicated by the personal attitude of General Marshall. His own failure to fulfill an impossible assignment in China, a coalition between the Communists and the Kuomintang, inhibited him from taking a rational or objective view of the struggle for power there. A Congress that had provided aid to fight Communists in Greece and Turkey became increasingly critical of our China policy. It could not see the difference between Communists in Greece and Communists in China. Largely at the urgent insistence of Speaker MARTIN, aid to the Nationalist Government of China became part of United States policy and was included as a part of the European recovery program. Certainly in meeting the challenge of foreign policy the Eightieth Congress had proved its ability to work without partisanship in the national interest.

THE REVISION OF LABOR POLICY

The major postwar domestic issue before Congress was labor. In the depression, when the balance between labor and management had been weighted against labor, Congress had redressed it by the Wagner Act. By 1946 the balance had swung overwhelmingly in favor of labor. A series of paralyzing postwar strikes had delivered dangerous shocks to the economy. The 113-day strike at General Motors, the steel impasse, and the coal tie-ups had proved that the existing machinery was inadequate. Even the President, friendly as he was to labor, had been exasperated by union tactics, and in the brief railway strike of 1946 had proposed the desperate remedy of drafting strikers into the Army. This Draconian measure was blocked in the Senate by a Republican, Senator TAFT. But later TAFT and the Republican leaders were to make reform of the labor laws a campaign issue in the 1946 elections.

When the Eightieth Congress assembled, the Republicans appeared to have little chance to redeem this election promise. Nearly everyone wanted a new labor law; most people were sure that no satisfactory measure could be drawn and passed. The difficulties were formidable because the Republicans did not have the necessary two-thirds majority. Since the administration—and the unions—wanted no real reform, support of some Democrats was necessary if the anticipated Presidential veto was to be overridden. There were also important differences within the Republican Party itself to be overcome, still further differences in approach and concept between the House and Senate. The House was for much more drastic action; it put its views into a bill that forbade industry-wide bargaining and abolished the NLRB. It was in the Senate that statesmanship asserted itself.

There the de facto leader of the majority, TAFT, had put himself into an exposed and politically dangerous post as chairman of the Labor Committee in order to force through a new labor policy. Undoubtedly his own inclinations were to write a more stringent bill than that which emerged from the committee. But within the committee there were Senators like MORSE of Oregon and PEPPER of Florida who were opposed to fundamental reforms. The balance was finally achieved through the astute and skillful negotiation of a freshman Senator from New York, IRVING M. IVES. As chairman of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Industrial and Labor Conditions he had as much practical experience in the arbitration of labor disputes as anyone in the country. The end result was the Taft-Hartley Act, the bill that critics said could not be written.

The President vetoed the bill, using in his message extreme terms that echoed the most extreme criticism of the left wing of the CIO. He was overridden and the bill he so bitterly assailed as "dangerous" and "unworkable" was to be invoked by him less than a year later to bring John L. Lewis to heel. The unions continue to make an issue of the Taft-Hartley Act by calling it a "slave-labor bill" but the truth was that it rescinded few of the basic rights granted by the earlier Wagner Act and curtailed only those privileges that many felt had degenerated into abuses.

Perhaps the most enduring contribution to good government that the Eightieth Congress made was the Lodge-Brown bill. This established a commission, under the chairmanship of former President Hoover, to study the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. Congress itself had tried without success over a number of years to reorganize the Government. The Government branches proliferated, growing like some tropical plant until the pattern of administration became more and more tangled. The new commission was authorized to draft disinterested authorities in administration and business practice to study government operations. The commission was also instructed to make its report not to the Eightieth but the Eighty-first Congress. This wise provision put the commission's findings above and beyond current political debate. It meant that the commission's recommendations would be received by the next Congress and the next President and could become a true charter for businesslike management of the Nation's affairs.

The controversies of the Eightieth Congress turned largely on the coming struggle for the Presidency. Although the White House and the Hill worked together on foreign policy the divisions on domestic policy were bitter. In the last 2 years Mr. Truman has vetoed 125 bills. The longest and bitterest of the quarrels between President and Congress resulted from Republican determination to reduce taxes and incidentally to fulfill a politically profitable promise. In the 1947 session Mr. Truman twice vetoed Republican tax bills and had his veto sustained.

Mr. Truman's opposition to tax reduction was anchored in his repeated assertion that tax reduction was in itself inflationary. As the political storm rose, his anchor chain slipped and the politician in Mr. Truman overcame the economist. He himself proposed tax reduction—of a kind. Every taxpayer was to receive for himself and each dependent a flat $40 credit to be paid for by an increased tax on corporation profits. Mr. Truman knew in advance, of course, his proposal had no chance for acceptance. His political gesture provoked a political reaction. Old HAROLD KNUTSON, whose bills the President had twice vetoed, exclaimed: "My God! I didn't know inflation had gone that far. Tom Pendergast paid only $2 a vote and now Truman proposes to pay $40." In the end, 82 Democrats in the House and 27 in the Senate voted with the Republicans to override Mr. Truman's third veto of a Republican tax bill.

THERE WERE DEBITS ON THE LEDGER

The record of the Eightieth Congress has some entries on the debit side. One of its major failures, in a moral sense, was the refusal to grapple with the problem of displaced persons. The Stratton bill, which would have admitted 400,000 refugees above the current immigration quotas, was kept on ice even though the bill was endorsed by all sections of the American community. At the time of the Geneva conference on world trade a militant group within the majority forced the wool bill through both Houses. This would have imposed a special tariff on imported wool in favor of the domestic product at a time when the United States was fighting for a more liberal world-trade policy. On the question of trade policy there had been no bipartisan agreement, it is true, but the ill-timed performance reflected on the United States ability to deliver on the broad general principles for which it was fighting. The veto rectified a congressional error.

The one field in which Congress failed to live up to past standards of performance was in the useful exercise of its particular power of investigation. An investigation into the activities of Hughes Aircraft, initiated by Senator BREWSTER, provided spectacular headlines but failed to justify the original accusation that Hughes Aircraft had misused governmental funds. It was redeemed in part by the fact that the committee later uncovered a wartime scoundrel in the person of Maj. Gen. Benny Meyers of the Air Force, who had betrayed his uniform and his country. On the House side the Committee on Un-American Activities, which could have been of distinguished service, undermined the usefulness of much of its work by its questionable tactics. It persisted in trying

to establish guilt by association and consistently failed to distinguish between trial and accusation.

In the final trial balance it seemed likely, however, that these debits would be outweighed by the credits achieved in the areas of foreign and domestic policy.

NOT ONE LEADER BUT A COALITION

The credit balance in the Eightieth Congress was achieved in spite of some peculiar and difficult problems of leadership. These problems were an embarrassing consequence of the sweeping Republican victory in 1946, which increased the prospects for a presidential victory and therefore intensified intraparty rivalries. At one point a Republican Senator was to say of himself and his colleagues, "We are all candidates here * * *." The Republican majority was led not by one parliamentary leader but by a loose and cooperative coalition of leaders.

In the field of foreign relations, Senator VANDENBERG's influence was paramount, but his chief Senate aide was HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., whose prestige and power in the important Committee on Foreign Relations were rising rapidly. On the House side, the hard-working JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, and the conscientious CHRISTIAN HERTER were largely responsible for the skillful piloting of ERP in its final stages.

In domestic policy the most vigorous partisan of the Republican position in the Senate was ROBERT A. TAFT, who through his command of the policy committee was the actual leader in the upper House. But the most skillful Republican legislator was probably the wise and witty MILLIKIN, of Colorado, a man of shrewd judgment and long vision. He was a man better understood and appreciated on the floor and in the cloakroom than in the galleries. Behind the scenes he was most frequently the moderator of party disputes, the author of many skillful compromises that preserved party responsibility.

The Speaker of the House, JOE MARTIN, enjoyed a very special position. He was the unchallenged leader of the Republican majority in the lower House but he was no boss in the Longworth-Cannon tradition. In Congress no other Republican in recent years has enjoyed so much real affection and respect, on both sides of the aisle, as little JOE MARTIN. He ruled his majority by reason of his great powers of persuasion, his popularity, and his shrewd sense of political timing.

In the sense that this coalition of leaders had acted with general unanimity on the major issues, the Republicans could claim that the majority record in the Eightieth Congress was truly a collective achievement. They took full party responsibility for what Congress had done. They could claim that by every constitutional test Congress lived up to the high definition of its purposes as "representative government * * * which means leadership as well as responsiveness and accountability."

BRITISH POLICY TOWARD ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mr. Bevin told the House of Commons, according to a report in the New York Herald Tribune today, that the attack on Jerusalem by the Arab Legion does not "oblige the British Government to review their obligations to the Transjordan Government." The obligations referred to are contained in a treaty of alliance made as recently as March 15, 1948. Reports which I consider to be reliable, show that as recently as February 1948 the British were recruiting men from their own troops for the Arab Legion and, second, that as recently as the middle of May 1948 the British were shipping to the Arab Legion war materials to a port bordering Palestine; those facts certainly are the best interpretation of Mr. Bevin's statement.

After all the talk of war on the Jews by the Arab states it turns out that the only force capable of waging such a war effectively is the Arab Legion, officered, trained, financed, and operated by the British; and that the first objective of this force was the city of Jerusalem containing the holiest shrines of Christians, Jews, and Moslems.

It will be of interest to the Members to consider the facts in order to see how destructive and misguided has been this British policy in Palestine. Walter Lippmann, in a recent syndicated column, truly called Transjordan's Arab Legion "a British satellite army."

BRITAIN AND TRANSJORDAN'S ARAB LEGION—THEIR CLOSE RELATIONSHIP

The Arab Legion has been, since its inception, a purely British creation. It originated with a desert patrol of 100 men formed by British officers in 1920, before Transjordan came into existence as a separate entity. It has always been under British command. Its strength in 1939 was approximately 1,600, and during the war years, it was rapidly expanded by the British until, by the end of 1947, it had reached its present strength of approximately 10,000. Even its Arab composition is not that of a purely Transjordian national force. Large numbers of mercenaries from all over the Middle East have been recruited into it, including Bedouins from various tribes, Circassians, Palestine Arabs, Druses, Armenians, and so forth.

By the act of the mandatory power, Great Britain, a unilateral act the propriety of which has been much questioned, Transjordan was declared independent in January 1946. In March 1946 a treaty was signed, the military clauses of which retained British control of the Arab Legion and British training, equipment, and finance for the Legion. The new treaty of alliance signed between Britain and Transjordan on March 15, 1948, essentially retains this position. A military alliance is set out in the annex to the treaty, which provides for mutual assistance in case of hostilities, British bases in Transjordan, an Anglo-Transjordan Joint Defense Board, the provision of British "arms, ammunition, equipment, and aircraft and other war material," financial assistance, and the provision by the British Government of "any British service personnel whose services are required to insure the efficiency of the military units" of the Transjordan forces.

The financial subsidy for the upkeep of the Arab Legion has been continued at the rate of approximately £2,500,000 per annum. The provision of certain auxiliary services, training, facilities and equipment, either "on loan" or at nominal cost, is a further form of indirect financial subsidy. The Kingdom of Transjordan is totally incapable of supporting a force such as the Arab Legion from its own resources. It has a population of some 400,000—most of whom are nomads and seminomads—and the total annual budget is less than $6,000,000. The Transjordan contribution to the defense budget in 1947–48 was estimated at £289,852.

Before the end of the mandate, British personnel serving with the Arab Legion are calculated at about 225, consisting of about 40 officers in key positions of command, and the rest of British noncoms mainly in the technical services, such as signal and repair, and most of these officers and noncoms were members of the regular British forces, seconded to the Arab Legion. A British army circular, according to my reports isued in February 1948, to British Middle East forces calls for further personnel in the British forces in Palestine to volunteer for service with the Arab Legion. Both officers and enlisted men are called for and specialists in ordnance, radio communication, range-finding instruments, and armoring are requested. Some of those serving in the Arab Legion may have been taken on as private individuals, and the legal position of certain others appears to be unclear.

The commander in chief of the Arab Legion, Brigadier Glubb Pasha, is a captain on the British Army reserve list. In 1930 he was British political officer in the tribal areas of Iraq and was appointed as deputy commander in chief to the then commander in chief, Peake Pasha, another British officer. He remained listed, however, right till the end of the mandate, on the staff list of the Palestine Government as assistant inspector general of police, seconded to the Transjordan Government. What his official position is since May 15, the end of Britain's Palestine mandate, is unclear. The second senior British officer of the legion is Col. R. J. C. Broadhurst, who was also listed in the staff list of the Palestine Government as superintendent of police. Broadhurst has the further title of military counsel to King Abdullah.

ORGANIZATION AND EQUIPMENT OF ARAB LEGION

The Arab Legion is organized as follows:

(a) A mechanized brigade consisting of 3 battalions.

(b) About 15 infantry garrison companies and 2 security companies.

(c) A training center near Amman, the recruits in which form about 20 to 25 percent of the total strength. A dispatch from Eric Gibbs, Time and Life correspondent in Jerusalem, dated May 2, speaks of "additional reserves now called up and being trained at Amman by British officers recently arrived from the army in Palestine."

The mechanized brigade is reported to be equipped with heavy staghound armored cars, bren carriers, 25-pounder and 6-pounder artillery, 3.7-inch pack howitzers, piat antitank guns, and 3-inch mortars. The whole of their equipment is standard British Army equipment—Enfield rifles, machine guns and submachine guns, and 2-inch mortars.

During the last 3 months of the British mandate in Palestine, special efforts were

made by the British Army to build up the arms, equipment, and military supplies of the Arab Legion. During March, it is reported, a quantity of mines, artillery stores, antitank rifles and mortars were specially brought over for the Arab Legion from the Suez Canal Zone in Egypt. The following supplies were reported as amongst those whose transfer from the British forces in Palestine to the Arab Legion had been approved: 60 armored cars; 3,500 mortar bombs, HB; 4,500 mortar bombs, smoke; 100,000 rounds .300 ammunition; 900,000 gallons of military-type 70 petrol.

It is reported that a general directive issued by British GHQ Jerusalem ordered the building up of Arab Legion military supplies sufficient for a minimum period of 8 months.

Certain shipments of supplies for the Arab Legion by the British are reported to have been made in May shortly before the British ended their Palestine mandate from Suez to Aqaba, a port bordering Palestine, including petrol, Oerlikon guns and ammunition.

ARAB LEGION OPERATIONS IN PALESTINE

Assurances given by both Mr. Bevin in the House of Commons and Sir Alexander Cadogan at the United Nations to the effect that the Arab Legion would be entirely withdrawn from Palestine before the end of the mandate were not complied with. On the contrary, in the last few weeks of the mandate, it became obvious that the Arab Legion was carrying out certain preliminary moves, particularly in the Ramallah-Jericho-Jerusalem-Hebron area, as a prelude to more full-scale invasion. These moves were accompanied by visits paid by Brigadier Glubb Pasha to the mayors and Arab notable of Hebron, Beersheba, and Gaza, which were generally interpreted at the time as laying the ground for the establishment by the Arab Legion of a corridor to the Mediterranean through Hebron, Beersheba, and Gaza.

On May 19, a dispatch in the New York Herald Tribune reported the presence of Brigadier Glubb Pasha on the Jerusalem front.

Britain's action the other day in pulling out 21 officers in Palestine in service with the Arab Legion, when American protests grew loud only reflects the fact that they were in Palestine and actually serving with the Arab Legion, while it was attacking Jerusalem.

SUMMARY

It is quite clear that British personnel made the Arab Legion such an effective fighting force which has been so destructive in Jerusalem. The close relationship between Great Britain and the Arab Legion is tragic indeed. A truce now arranged between Arabs and Jews will give the British Government an opportunity to atone for its part in the Palestine conflict so far. It seems by now clear that just as the British supported the Arab Legion when it moved into Jerusalem, so they can call it off and bring peace to the Holy Land.

THE LATE LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce the death of the Secretary of Labor, Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach. He passed away this morning at 4:40 at Walter Reed Hospital.

Secretary Schwellenbach was born in Superior, Wis. He grew up in the State of Washington. He came up the hard way. His early years were spent in Spokane, receiving his education in the local public schools there. As a young boy, he sold newspapers on the streets of that city. He subsequently worked his way through the University of Washington Law School, being admitted to the bar in 1919. During World War I he served as a private in the Twelfth Infantry. After his admission to the bar, he was engaged in the private practice of law in the city of Seattle until 1934. In that year he was elected to the United States Senate. He served with honor and distinction. He was appointed, by President Roosevelt in 1940, Federal district judge for the eastern district of Washington. He remained on the bench until his appointment as Secretary of Labor July 1945.

Judge Schwellenbach, as he was affectionately known to his many friends, was one of the outstanding trial lawyers in the State of Washington. His distinguished service on the Federal bench drew the commendation of members of the bar throughout the Pacific Northwest. He was a man possessed of the highest judicial qualities. He became Secretary of Labor during one of the most critical periods of our Nation's history. Few men in public life have had to undertake a more difficult task. He was a conscientious man, devoting all of his strength and energy to the job assigned to him. Unquestionably, the arduous duties of this Cabinet position shortened his life and brought about his untimely passing.

Lewis Schwellenbach was a distinguished public servant, a man of sterling integrity and principle. He served his Nation well. The people of my State mourn his loss as do the people of our country as a whole. I personally have lost a good and staunch friend. We join in extending our deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and family.

THE LATE LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, while we were not of the same political persuasion, Judge Schwellenbach was raised in my district and at the time of his death was registered in Spokane, Wash. I happen to know that he liked his position there as a judge. I know that he was happy. I have talked to members of the legal profession, and they all loved Judge Schwellenbach. He was a remarkably fine judge. Many reports of his courage and his administration of justice as it should be administered have come out of his short term there as a judge. His loyalty to his own party and to President Truman forced him to accept the position of Secretary of Labor. Whether we agree with what he did there or not, he carried out that job laboriously, so much so that it undermined his health. I cannot help but say that in the passing of Judge and Secretary Schwellenbach we have lost a fine friend and brother and American.

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to adress the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress has not done badly. It has given the country 2 years of balanced budget; it has passed a tax-cut bill over the veto, as it did a labor bill giving the President the only control he has over John L. Lewis.

Now "High Tax Harry" like a nasty little gamin has dipped his hands into mud and dirt and plastered it all over our new buggy—and danced out of reach of the whip. Might well be there will be some Congress-tanned Missouri jackass hide on the Christmas market—come November.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEVENGER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have had much amazement in this House in the years I have served here, but the most amazing performance I have ever witnessed has come from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] just now. He is a gentle type, a fine type of citizen usually, but when he allows his partisanship, and it must be his hate, to take him to the point that he uses the language that he just did, applying it to any President or any man in public life, I express my deep regret and my real sorrow.

AMATEUR STANDING

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 seconds and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, according to newspaper headlines, the President is still trying to mimic his New Deal predecessor by trying to purge Members of Congress. It is such a pathetic spectacle to watch an amateur trying to imitate the champ.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL D. KEARNS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Member of this body, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS, who represents the Twenty-eighth District in Pennsylvania, is this day receiving a degree of doctor of music from his school, the Chicago Musical College. I know his colleagues in the House of Representatives join in congratulating him. The letter notifying him of the award of the degree is as follows:

CHICAGO MUSICAL COLLEGE,
Chicago, Ill., May 14, 1948.

The Honorable CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEARNS: It is with much pleasure that I wish to inform you that Chicago Musical College would like to confer upon you the honorary degree of doctor of music at our coming commencement exercises on June 10. The faculty wants to honor you as an important graduate of the college and for your continued interest in music during your political career. Will you please inform me if you can be with us on June 10, so that we can make the proper arrangements.

There will be an informal luncheon at 1 at that same day. The commencement concert and exercises will take place at 8 in the evening at Orchestra Hall, and there will be a little party afterwards.

With cordial greetings, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RUDOLPH GANZ, *President.*

THE LATE THOMAS L. OWENS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, THOMAS L. OWENS, is a grim reminder to all of us that the work of a Congressman is no easy task.

TOM OWENS was a man of strong convictions and of intense purposes. He never did anything in halves. He put himself wholeheartedly into his work regardless of time or effort. On many occasions I have discussed with him legislation that was before the House for consideration. He was always alert and well informed on all aspects of the most complicated bills before the House, and was a reliable source of advice and counsel on such issues. He had a fine sense of humor and was pleasant and in lighter moments we enjoyed many laughs together. TOM OWENS also had a deep, conscientious, and religious side which permeated his being. He had a difficult district to represent, and he tried hard to meet the many demands of his nearly 1,000,000 constituents in one of the largest congressional districts in the Nation. We shall miss TOM OWENS. He made a fine record which should be a source of pride to his family and should stand as a monument to the service he rendered the Nation.

THE RUSSIAN SITUATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the practical situation that we are up against on this question of sending goods to Russia is the fact that Russia is recognized as a friendly nation, and we carry on diplomatic relations through our Ambassadors. Furthermore, as a friendly Nation we buy gold from Russia. If we are going to buy Russian gold by the millions of dollars and by the hundreds of millions of dollars and transfer our dollar credit to Russia in payment for the gold delivered to us, are you then going to say to Russia that she cannot buy goods in this country? How would Russia dispose of the dollars? Why does not the proper committee take up the question of repealing the gold buying clause and stop the purchase of gold from Russia and discontinue putting American dollars in Russia's hand and go at this thing in a practical manner instead of flim-flamming and defrauding the public in this country by trying to lead them to believe that we are going to stop shipping goods to Russia while at the same time we buy Russian gold. All the time we are asked to put up dollars for people to fight Russia, while on the other hand we ship goods to Russia and buy her gold and give her the dollars to buy substance from us. This two way street of fighting Russia with one hand and feeding her with our other hand is enough to confuse our people.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WHAT WE HAVE DONE FOR OTHER COUNTRIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some of the Members may have seen or read in yesterday's Saturday Evening Post the article A Few Kind Words for Uncle Sam, by Bernard Baruch. The heading is "Believing." We are so much maligned abroad because we never really have told the world what we have done for our friends in war and peace. A celebrated American here tells the full and powerful story of our achievement. It is extremely timely, and the people of other countries, as well as the people of our own country, should know about this. I am very much interested, Mr. Speaker, in noting that the beginning of the story shows a picture of veterans who are at Walter Reed Hospital and Bethesda Naval Hospital—amputees that you have all seen, here at the Capital as well as elsewhere. Obviously, Mr. Baruch feels that they who have paid the greatest price in giving the most for other countries and the United States are these amputees.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is trying to secure the passage of a bill to provide cars for amputees as a matter of rehabilitation would only cost an additional $900,000 in the first year to help these boys who are still in the hospital. The bill which now covers them is going to expire. Only a veteran can secure a car—before his discharge from the service he is not allowed a car. The bill also includes veterans who were not covered in the bill when it was originally passed. The bill was discriminatory then, leaving out certain ones of the amputee groups. These amputees, who have paid so great a price, cannot understand why cars are sent abroad when this debt is not paid to them in the matter of rehabilitation, and these automobiles are a true rehabilitation measure—some doctors have said the best rehabilitation measure that has been passed.

Mr. Bernard Baruch has taken a great deal of interest in the rehabilitation of our veterans, especially the amputees. The public also is vitally interested in them. I believe more enthusiasm has been expressed by the public at the passage of that bill than for any other piece of legislation for our disabled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Public Printer that a manuscript of my remarks entitled "Proposal for Financing of Federal Water Power Projects" will cost $195.25. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend those remarks in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RAISE IN PAY FOR POSTAL CLERKS AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this Congress take action on the bills reported out by the Civil Service and Post Office Committee increasing the salaries of postal employees and other Federal employees. I do not think there should be any further cut in the recommendations made by the committee. I am including herewith a letter from my district indi-

cating the urgent need of this class of employees. The laborer is worthy of his hire.

MILWAUKEE POST OFFICE CLERKS' UNION, LOCAL NO. 3, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,
June 5, 1948.

Congressman CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you please urge immediate action on the post office bill, H. R. 1949? The cost of living has gone way beyond our reach and day by day we feel the need of an increase in salary more. It has been over 2½ years since our last increase in pay, and then it was brought only up to the 1940 cost-of-living level.

Most of us are cashing in our bonds and haven't any reserve left in the bank, and we are forced to live under substandard conditions. On our present wages it is impossible to provide the necessities for four children, wife, and myself as I have to do.

To give you an idea of conditions I want to quote a few facts. In our Milwaukee office about 20 clerks resigned the other day when they heard that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee could not agree on a salary increase, and it is impossible to get anyone to work for $1.04 an hour, study schemes, and work night hours. At the present time we could use about 200 more clerks. Just the other day I found out from the Checker Cab Co. that they now have 56 postal employees working for them; others are employed elsewhere or have their wives working. Working these additional hours not only impairs one's health but also breaks up family ties.

Can't something be done before you recess on June 18? And we hope the increase will be retroactive as of January 1, 1948.

Very truly yours,
CARL F. SONNENBERG,
Vice Chairman, Legislative Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter appearing in the Boston Post.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an article from the South Carolina Weekly, and in the other an article from the Charlotte Observer.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, one on forestry and one on soil conservation.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two instances, in one to include a syndicated column by Miss Dorothy Thompson and in the other an editorial from the Brighton Pittsburgh Post.

Mr. HAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the statement he made today before the Joint Committee on Labor Relations.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include my statement in reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES] regarding the split-income provision which he discussed in connection with the previous tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

TRUCE IN PALESTINE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there obection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I know we are all happy to know that a truce has been ordered in the Middle East and that the opposing participants in that unfortunate conflict have agreed to the truce.

In the days ahead, while we work and pray that permanent peace will follow this truce, let us not overlook the outrages that have been recently perpetrated against our country. I refer to the following instances, first, the mining with British mines of neutral waters against our ships; second, the stopping of American ships and the removal of American citizens without warrant or right in law by an allegedly friendly nation; and, lastly, the shelling only yesterday of the American consulate and Navy compound in Jerusalem. Bear in mind, that shelling was done with British shells that came from British mortars. Like it or not, American funds to Britain make it possible for Britain to finance Arab aggression.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

PAY RAISE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, about Christmas time each year there appears in the papers a little notice that there are a certain number of shopping days until Christmas.

I want to call your attention to the fact that there are only nine more days in which the Federal employees may shop for a justified increase in salaries. It seems particularly appropriate to me that we ought to be thinking about these Federal employees just before we take up the question of displaced persons from Europe. I certainly hope that the leadership of this House will give us the privilege of considering an increase for Federal employees before all the shopping days are gone.

ROSE COHEN

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I desire to call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 649) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Rose Cohen, widow of Maurice G. Cohen, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and additional amount, not to exceed $250, toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Maurice G. Cohen.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A SENATORIAL ATTACK

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to extend my profound sympathy to the members of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, because I have never known them to be so insulted as they were yesterday by their alleged leader at the other end of the Capitol. It was amusing to me to hear them get up here and resent what President Truman said, but do not resent the vicious attack made on them right here under the dome of the Capitol.

You remind me of the Negro down at home who had two mules that he said were "so much apart that he could not tell 'em alike." He said he beat one of them almost to death because the other one kicked at him.

You may be beating the wrong man now, but of course you cannot call names under the rules of the House. I have never known a man to change so completely from an intense nationalist to an unlimited internationalist. He reminds me of Mr. Wingo's snake railroad of which he said:

> It wiggled in and wobbled out,
> And left the people all in doubt
> Whether in its zig-zag track
> It was going west or coming back.

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on the 28th of April of this year the House by a most astounding majority passed the oleomargarine ransom-removing bill by a vote of 260 to 106; responsive to and obedient to the demands and the plaintive cries of the American people. The bill even now reposes at the other end of the Capitol. We are now talking about adjournment. If that bill fails to get consideration at the other end of the Capitol it will be the responsibility of the leadership of that body; and should we adjourn without taking due action our skirts, of course, will be clear.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I do not yield.

We have a responsibility to the 600,000 soybean farmers of the great States of Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, and parts of the great West, who wonder today what the leadership is thinking about in the other body by not removing from them the necessity of paying tribute to someone else in this country to make a living. The answer is clear.

I want to conclude this short statement with this little story: Two little boys tried to confound the oracle at Delphi. They caught a bird and put it in their hands and they reasoned among themselves, "We will go to the oracle and ask the oracle what we have in our hands. If the oracle says a bird, we will ask him, 'alive or dead?' If he says dead, we will turn the bird loose and he will be fooled. If the oracle says 'alive,' we will crush the bird." They went to the oracle and asked him what they had in their hands. The oracle said "a bird." They asked, "Dead or alive?" The oracle responded, "The answer is with you."

The American people can only get the answer at the other end of the Capitol from the leadership responsible for the present indecision.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to violate the rules in any way in talking about anyone on the other side of the Capitol because I realize they have problems of their own. I just wondered if we have not some other legislative problem in America besides this oleo business.

Ever since the House passed that oleo bill, whenever I sneeze or any time I cough, or move my head, somebody thinks I am angry at somebody about that oleo business. I do say, though, that any time 26 oleo manufacturers in this country can stampede this House into doing what they did it is time that we all stopped, looked, and listened.

There is another question coming up here tomorrow. Another group has taken it upon itself to tell the agricultural people of this Nation what we need to do in regard to the peanut program. If we are going to legislate just because some group has five or ten millions to throw around, indeed, we most assuredly had better stop, look, and listen.

The President criticizes the Congress for not passing a long-range agricultural program but he cannot even administer the short-range one. His Agricultural Department is now bushing the potato farmers of my State out of thousands of dollars. The present Agricultural Department cannot even operate a short-range agricultural program. It has been so demonstrated time after time.

That is all I have to say on the subject at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6500) "making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4 and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, and 26, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the basic annual rates of compensation for the following positions shall be: Two assistant superintendents of press gallery at $2,400 each, and messenger for service to press correspondents $1,920 in lieu of assistant superintendent of press gallery $2,400 and two messengers for service to press correspondents at $1,920 each; and two assistant superintendents of radio press gallery at $2,400 each in lieu of assistant superintendent of radio press gallery $2,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HARVE TIBBOTT,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MILTON R. YOUNG,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment Nos. 1, 2, and 3 relate to the Senate. The House recedes.

Amendment Nos. 4 and 5 strike out provision, proposed by the Senate, for increases in certain salaries in the offices of Senators.

Amendment Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 relate to the Senate. The House recedes.

Amendment Nos. 14 and 15 appropriate $180,000 for the Office of the Legislative Counsel as proposed by the Senate instead of $160,000 as proposed by the House, and sets the amount thereof to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate at $100,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $80,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 16 and 17 appropriate $543,990 for the Capitol Buildings as proposed by the Senate, instead of $536,000 as proposed by the House, of which $52,900 is to be immediately available as proposed by the Senate instead of $49,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 18 and 19 appropriate $558,620 for the Senate Office Building as proposed by the Senate instead of $523,200 as proposed by the House, and continue available certain unobligated balances as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates $2,474,571 for salaries, Library proper, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21 appropriates $675,000 for salaries, Copyright Office, instead of $650,000 as proposed by the House and $713,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22 appropriates $400,400 for salaries and expenses, distribution of printed cards, Library of Congress, as proposed by the Senate instead of $376,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23 appropriates $700,000 for general expenses, Office of the Superintendent of Documents, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 24, 25, and 26 strike from the bill language, proposed by the House, to forbid employment of members of labor organizations the officers of which are not in compliance with the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

HARVE TIBBOTT,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to state that the members of our subcommittee as well as all Members of the House are happy over the advancement of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], to the position of judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Mr. Speaker, this is the bill appropriating funds for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1949, and I do not believe it necessary for me to take more than just a few seconds to comment on the conference report. The bill as it came back from the Senate made very little change in money in the House bill. Many of the amendments pertain to appropriations for the Senate and in accord with custom of many years standing we have receded on them with the exception of one or two where the Senate withdrew.

The Senate amended only three items under the Library of Congress. The amount involved in those three is small as carried in the report. Because some Members of the House have evidenced interest in continuation by the Library of the publication known as the United States Quarterly Book List, I might say that the report recommends the amount of $24,571 requested for that purpose. We also allowed a small increase over and above the House figure for the Copyright Office to more adequately handle its business. The Senate added $200,000 for the Superintendent of Documents and we have agreed on one-half of that figure.

Over all, there was very little at issue in the bill and, as I mentioned, many of the changes pertain to Senate items. I think that about covers the report briefly and that I need not take further time to go into minute details.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, following the passage of the legislative appropriation bill in both the House and Senate, but immediately preceding the meeting of the committee of conference, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] was appointed by the President of the United States to the bench of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

And I am certain it was a matter of gratification to every Member of the House—to all of whom he had endeared himself during his useful service here—that he was paid the compliment of being confirmed immediately upon presentation of his name to the Senate.

It is a matter of regret that Mr. JOHNSON leaves the House and especially that he is retiring as chairman of the subcommittee on the legislative appropriation bill, in which capacity he has served so ably and so effectively.

But, he is particularly qualified for a position on the bench. He is an eminent lawyer. He has had for many years a wide and lucrative practice. He has to an exceptional degree the judicial turn of mind. We are sorry to see him go but we congratulate him upon this well-deserved appointment and we wish for him continued success in his new field and in his new jurisdiction.

Fortunately he is succeeded as chairman of the subcommittee by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT]. Mr. TIBBOTT succeeds to the chairmanship after distinguished service on the committee and the subcommittee. He is not only one of the most useful members of the Committee on Appropriations but is one of the most useful Members of the House. I have sometimes wondered why he was willing to stay in the House and devote his time and attention to public matters when he could secure greater financial returns elsewhere.

He is president of a national bank, and has important business interests, and no doubt serves here at personal financial sacrifice.

We are fortunate in having the advantage of his counsel and cooperation on this bill. He brings to the House and to the Committee on Appropriations and to this particular bill—the housekeeping bill of the Congress—the business experience, capacity and ability in business affairs so much in demand in the management of the supply bills of the House.

The United States Government is, in effect, a huge business corporation. It is the biggest business in the world. And contrary to the impression the average citizen sometimes gets in reading the newspapers, the principal problems which come before the House are not political problems. They are business problems, economic problems, problems of the very character which the new chairman of the subcommittee is particularly qualified to handle.

His capacity in that respect was demonstrated yesterday when he was in charge of the House managers in the conference on the pending bill for the first time and secured a concession I have never known to be secured before in any conference between the two Houses which I have attended.

It is customary—and properly so—for each body to manage its own domestic affairs and to determine its own housekeeping appropriations. That custom has been held inviolate for many years. The House and the Senate respectively handle their own housekeeping expenditures. But yesterday in the conference on the pending bill, for the first time, so far as I am aware, in the history of conferences between the two bodies, the new chairman the gentleman from Pennsylvania, prevailed upon the other body to modify its own amendments.

He assumes office under a happy augury, and we can look forward to a businesslike administration of the fiscal affairs of the House under his chairmanship. That is especially true of the bill now before us. Naturally there is always some difference of opinion on any bill of this character, but I believe the bill reported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] is in general as good a bill as can be written under the circumstances, and trust it will have the approval of the House.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his kind words. Without his able assistance we would not have been able to do many of the things that are done in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE LATE THOMAS L. OWENS

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, although the solemnity of my topic is so exalted as to challenge one's powers of expression it is with deep regret that I returned to Washington, after a brief visit to my people, sadly to find that my dear, good colleague, TOM OWENS, had left this world for the Great Beyond.

Tom, as I always called him, and I usually concurred with one another along all lines of endeavor and both being new Members this brought us that much closer together.

In spite of the fact that we all knew Tom to be an exceptionally hard worker, despite the knowledge that he had been hovering between life and death for a number of days, we all had a fervent prayer on our lips and hope that the Almighty God in His wisdom would see fit to grant him a new lease on life and return him to health so that he would be able to carry on his great contribution of happiness by his ardent labor for those less fortunate than himself.

Although he has gone in body, his spirit has inscribed indelibly on our hearts and minds something more beautiful in life to aim for always.

His name and image shall be enshrined in the archives and annals of history as one who has given his life for his fellow man as Tom, beyond all reasonable doubt, would have lived on had he not overtaxed his mind and body by meritorious works which shall never die.

To his family, I want to say that these are the most difficult words I have had to say since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 637 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6396) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the

reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill (H. R. 6396) it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table bill S. 2242, and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 6396 as passed.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 6396, the so-called displaced-persons bill. The rule is an open rule, providing for 3 hours of general debate.

This displaced-persons bill has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary as a result of many months of study on some 20 different pieces of legislation which were introduced by various Members of the House. The subcommittee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Maine, Mr. FRANK FELLOWS, not only held extensive hearings, but went into exhaustive research on the entire matter. I think the subcommittee and the whole Committee on the Judiciary are deserving of a real vote of gratitude from this House. They have taken an extremely difficult, complicated, and controversial subject and, in my opinion, at least, have produced a piece of legislation which is admirable in every respect. In my opinion it is infinitely better than the bill dealing with the same subject matter which is now on the Speaker's desk, having come over from the other body. I am naturally hopeful that this bill will become the final legislation approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman explain just how the number of admissions has been staggered under the House bill? The 200,000 displaced persons would not all come in in 1 year?

Mr. HERTER. The bill provides for the admission of 200,000 over a period of 2 years. The bill expires at the expiration of 2 years.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. Did I correctly understand that the gentleman expresses a preference for the so-called Fellows bill over the bill passed by the other body?

Mr. HERTER. I expressed a very strong personal preference in favor of the Fellows bill.

Mr. DEVITT. I wish to join with the gentleman in that sentiment.

Mr. HERTER. I appreciate the gentleman's statement very much.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The bill that the Senate passed, however, does have this feature, does it not? It makes some provision for the class of people known as expellees, whereas the Fellows bill presently does not, is that correct?

Mr. HERTER. I think that is correct, but I dould not want to be quoted on that, because I have not studied all the provisions of the Senate bill carefully enough.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LATHAM. Does the bill provide for mortgaging future quotas?

Mr. HERTER. Yes; the bill provides for mortgaging future quotas, only up to 50 percent of those quotas.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is an admirable report on this bill, and that it will be explained in great detail during the 3 hours of general debate, I feel it is necessary to go into the specific provisions of the bill at this time. I am very glad now to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for over 2 years the American people have urged and pleaded that something be done for the unfortunate displaced persons. Naturally I am pleased that the bill now before us is less drastic than the bill passed by the other body and will relieve some of the unfortunate displaced persons of the conditions under which they have been obliged to live and exist for the past 3 years. However, the bill under consideration is restrictive in many particulars and, in fact, if the unfortunate persons covered by the bill were criminals, the committee could not have put in more restraining limitations and requirements. But taking everything into consideration and in view of the prejudice that has been created in the minds of the people who have not had time to familiarize themselves with the hardships of these displaced persons, I really do not blame the committee for including and embodying these restrictive safeguards with respect to these unfortunates.

Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Committee on Immigration for 24 years, having served from 1907 to 1931, and helped to pass many of the restrictive immigration laws, so I know something about immigration and what it has done, not to the country, but for the country. We have in this country a few publicists and lobbyists who have been poisoning the minds of the American people against immigration for many years. Well, I have read history and gone back to 1800, a hundred and fifty years ago, when this country had a population of about three or four million people. A commission was appointed at that time in Pennsylvania which made a report on its findings. It reported in part as follows:

> We view with alarm the ever-increased undesirables coming to our shores that are filling our penal institutions and our poorhouses and overcrowding our maritime borders.

That was the report made 150 years ago, when nearly all the people who were then coming to the United States from Great Britain, Scotland, Wales, and a few from Norway. Notwithstanding that report, we permitted immigrants to continue to come, and we know that it was due to the immigrants that we permitted to reach our shores that our Nation has become the greatest in the world. Those immigrants started to work our lands, which at that time were selling at a dollar or $2 an acre. Now they are worth $300 or $400 an acre. They have worked our mines. They have worked our forests. They have built up our Nation and made it the greatest manufacturing Nation in the world, so that today we are supplying nearly half of the world, if not more, with food and the necessities of life, machinery, and other manufactured products.

During the First World War there were professional immigration restrictionists whom, I remember very well, endeavored to make the country believe that it was not safe, in view of the large number of immigrants in our midst. What was the result? During the First World War, as well as in the last war, those men, both the first and second generations, have clearly demonstrated that they were patriotic, that they were law abiding, that they loved our country, and they did everything asked of them. They gave the country their full support and cooperation, so that there is no man who can truthfully and honestly charge that they have not proved their worth and their loyalty.

In view of that fact, I feel we should disregard some of the poisonous propaganda on the part of the professional restrictionists who, for personal and selfish reasons, have created in the minds of otherwise well-meaning people and danger in the admission of immigrants in the past, and to the few in number that are permitted to enter now.

In years gone by, through untrue propaganda eminating from these misguided restrictionists, it has been charged that most of these immigrants remained in New York. It is true that many of these people did remain in New York and it is because of this factor that New York became the greatest city in the world. We never hear any complaints from the citizens of that State against them, but the objections and opposition invariably comes from gentlemen and States where they have no immigration and do not actually know the value and benefits accrued from the useful activities of these immigrants.

Of late, the only opposition is coming from a few organizations that have been fed propaganda by these professional immigration restrictionists who make their living by sending out this poisonous information. On the other hand, nearly every church, civic, and labor organization is in favor of admitting, without these many restrictions, these suffering men, women, and children.

Of course, under the provisions of this bill, very few immigrants outside of these displaced persons will be able to be admitted to the United States as the quotas of all countries, outside of Great Britain, Germany, France, and a few other of the larger countries, are very small and few of their nationals will be permitted to enter after the enactment of this bill.

In many of the small countries the quota is only 100, 150, or 200. Naturally, with the 50-percent reduction in the quotas very few will be admitted to the United States for many, many years to come.

Personally, I am hopeful that within a short time these displaced people will be permitted to land and prove again as the old immigrants did that they are deserving, that they will be helpful, that they will cooperate the same as those immigrants who came before them and that their entry will not in any way affect our standard of living as has been unjustifiably charged, or affect the wages of American workingmen. I hope also that we will liberalize some of the restrictive provisions that are contained in this bill.

Furthermore, this bill means, of course, a saving of about a $100,000,000 a year to our Government. As it is we have been obliged to foot the bill of those who have been kept in the occupied zones for these 3 years or over in displaced-persons camps. It will aid by permitting these 200,000 to come into the United States in the next 2 years. Our maintenance expense will be reduced, as I say, and it will be a saving in money to the United States of approximately $100,000,000.

It is claimed by some that these immigrants will take the jobs of American laborers. I have heard that story for 40 years. These fears have not yet been realized in the case of the older immigrants. If anything they aid the American worker because invariably they take the hardest, most undesirable jobs that the American wage earner is not desirous of occupying. The American workers have thus been benefited. Let me say further that notwithstanding the great immigration that took place in the last hundred years, or even 50 years, our country did fairly well. We have increased our production and they have helped us do it, to a point where, as I have stated, we became the greatest, the richest, and the most powerful Nation in the world. Many of these immigrants who came before are relatives of those who will be admitted under this bill. I am sure they will demonstrate their worth and prove beneficial and helpful to our Nation.

The only point that I wish to call to the committee's attention—and I hope the members will bear with me—is that the bill as drafted applies to those displaced persons who were in the displaced-persons camps prior to 1947. Unfortunately in April 1948, this year, a small country known as Czechoslovakia, that gained its independence and became a free nation as the result of the First World War and under the guidance and leadership of then President Wilson, now has refugees and displaced persons of its own. Within a short space of time that country, small though it was, set an example to the world of what could be accomplished in a few years after they were liberated from the shackles of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. They became the outstanding democratic little nation of the world and set an example to other nations. Naturally that did not last very long. In 1940 they were sold down the river at Munich. But even then they continued their efforts to retain their freedom, liberty, and form of government, which was a democratic form of government. All of the leaders over there who followed the footsteps of that great Czechoslovakian, Masaryk, were hopeful that they could remain free, but, unfortunately, because we have rescinded the promised loan to Czechoslovakia, and because our State Department has failed to extend to them the aid and cooperation it had accorded other nations, the Communists have taken over the reins of government, which is to be regretted because under the leadership of President Benes, Czechoslovakia was endeavoring to aid the world in bringing about an understanding between the eastern and western European countries.

Due to the change that has taken place, many of the leaders who have striven to retain a democratic form of government in Czechoslovakia were obliged to flee to Germany and other countries. Unfortunately, under this bill they cannot be considered as displaced persons. There are between 2,000 or 3,000 who will be discriminated against under the provisions of this bill and will be excluded because the bill was drafted before they lost their freedom and independence. I hope the committee will agree to an amendment that will permit these people the same privileges we accord the others, because this is the only country they can come to and enjoy the blessings of liberty. They will then be able to continue to aid those who remain behind to obtain freedom and independence, as they have enjoyed it during the 26 years that we aided them in attaining their democratic form of government.

I called attention to another situation about 2 years ago and have introduced a bill on it. That is, that we should accord the privilege to those soldiers of Poland and other countries who cannot return to their countries because they do not feel safe in returning to their native countries. We should permit them to enlist in our army. They are experienced soldiers and they can demonstrate again their worth, their ability, and their desire the same as their forebears, the same as Kosciusko and Pulaski, who helped to bring freedom to our own Nation. Men of that stock, I feel, deserve to receive consideration and we should permit them to be admitted into our army and give them citizenship, not right away but after they have served in our armed forces for 5 years probably and demonstrated their fitness and that they are in every way deserving of becoming American citizens.

With those two amendments to the bill I believe we will have a much better measure, a more humane bill. Notwithstanding the fact that the bill is not perfect I shall support it and I hope that you gentlemen and the committee will agree to broaden it by adopting these two amendments. When a bill comes in here and the committee is opposed to any amendments, I realize how difficult it is to succeed in securing the adoption of any amendments.

As I stated before, churches of all denominations in the United States, civic and labor organizations, have striven for 2 years to set an example for others by permitting the entry of these escaped people into the United States. Most of the outstanding, fairminded writers and publicists have gone on record in support of this legislation.

At this point I desire to include in my remarks an article appearing in the Washington Star of June 7 carrying the statement of Earl G. Harrison, former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, as follows:

SENATE DP MEASURE CALLED BOOBY TRAP AND DISCRIMINATORY

Earl G. Harrison denounced the Senate bill to admit 200,000 displaced Europeans to the United States as a booby trap * * * a sorry mess, ill-befitting a great democracy.

Mr. Harrison issued a statement attacking the bill as inadequate in his capacity as chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. He was Federal Immigration Commissioner in 1942–44.

"It has been deliberately designed to exclude DP's, not admit them," he said of the bill. "Among other things it discriminates on grounds of religion, nationality, and occupation." He said it was particularly unfair to Jews.

CHANGES URGED

Mr. Harrison urged that House Republican leaders undo the "monstrosity of Senate action." He continued:

"An analysis of the provisions * * * revealed the tortuous and devious methods adopted to abandon the displaced persons. * * * This is what the bill really means:

"Fifty percent of the DP's must come from countries 'annexed by a foreign power'—Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and eastern Poland. On its face, this is rank discrimination, because these people are nowhere half of the total DP population. But the underlying discrimination is in favor of the Balts who are predominantly Protestant, and it, therefore, is against Jews and Catholics.

"Fifty percent of the displaced persons must be farmers or their dependents. Since farmers are but a small minority of the occupation of DP's, the discrimination of this cause is obvious.

RIDER TO BILL ASSAILED

"A special rider to the bill, permitting Sudetens and other Europeans of German ethnic origin to enter the United States under the regular German quota, underlines the racist character of the bill. That the Volksdeutsche, the insidious Nazi fifth column, should be handed special privileges over the victims of Nazi oppression is a mockery of American justice.

"To make doubly certain that few, if any, victims of Nazi oppression can enter, an amendment to change the date of eligibility from December 22, 1945, to April 21, 1947, was defeated. This was done with the full knowledge that most of the Jews arrived in the occupied zones a few months after the December 1945 date. Thus, less than 10,000 DP's out of a total of a million can qualify for admission under this bill."

I also desire to insert an article by Carleton Kent, appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times, which I am sure will be enlightening to the membership and to the country, as follows:

PADLOCKS ON THE GOLDEN DOOR

(By Carleton Kent)

When the Statue of Liberty was dedicated in 1886, it was so impressive that the following rather sweeping inscription was deemed right for its base:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Subsequently, for one reason and another, the expansiveness thus expressed was trimmed down considerably by various immigration quotas.

Last week the United States Senate put what was left of this nobility of purpose into a deep freezer by the grim restrictions it wrote into a bill to admit 200,000 of Europe's wretched, homeless, tempest-tossed displaced persons in the next 2 years.

The conditions attached to this offer so overlap that it almost can be said "the golden door" is open only to displaced persons who are Christian farmers with wealthy sponsors in this country.

Only those who entered Allied occupation zones by December 22, 1945, are eligible. The Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons says this rules out 18 percent of all DP's—the Jews who suffered most in central Europe.

Fifty percent of all those admitted must come from "countries annexed by a foreign power." This is meant to apply to the Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Critics of the bill say this is discrimination against both Jews and Catholics, for most Balts are Protestant.

Another qualification, laid like shingling over the others, seems designedly anti-Semitic. It provides that half the DP's admitted must have an agricultural background in their country of origin. This again rules out many Jews, whom persecution forced to develop their skills and trades in the ghettos of Europe's cities.

Overlaying these are still more restrictions. The DP's have to show that they "will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment," or becoming a public charge. These are guarantees also required in the present Immigration Act. They mean the DP's, as well as quota immigrants, must have well-to-do American sponsors; and not take competitive jobs.

Furthermore, they cannot come into the United States unless they can show they will have "safe and sanitary housing" here—a proof which it is impossible to give in a country already without any housing vacancies; unless it be in the back rooms of the wealthy sponsor's mansion.

Today I received a telegram signed by many outstanding organizations urging the passage of the bill before us. In order not to encumber the RECORD I shall not include the names of all the organizations who signed the telegram. It is as follows:

NEW YORK, *June 10, 1948.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We are highly gratified that the House has agreed to consider the Fellows bill for the admission of displaced persons. We look to you for active support and leadership in securing its passage in substantially the present form because we believe that the displaced-persons bill passed by the Senate is inadequate and discriminatory. Over 125 national organizations have earnestly supported adequate legislation for the solution of this crucial international problem.

Friends Committee on National Legislation, League of Women Voters, National Federation of Business and Professional Womens Club, National Womens Trade Union League, Northern Baptist Convention, United Council of Church Women, Americans for Democratic Action, American Civil Liberties Union, Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, Division of Social Education and Action of the Presbyterian Church, Womens Division of Christian Service Methodist Church.

Mr. Speaker, without further taking up the time of the House, I shall conclude in saying that the church, civic, and other patriotic organizations that are so much interested in this humane bill will appreciate whatever action we will take in aiding these unfortunate, suffering displaced persons.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and to record my support of the DP bill, which the rule concerns. The bill, in my opinion, represents a sound and reasonable approach to the grave, humane, and political problems posed by the plight of these unfortunate persons. I hope that the House will pass the bill and so make an invaluable contribution toward the solution of this pressing world problem. I trust further that this example will indeed lead quickly to a complete and satisfactory disposition of the problem on a world-wide basis.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter and a memorandum from the State Department.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have studied H. R. 6396 very carefully; in fact, I have gone into great detail in studying the effect of it. When the bill is brought up for amendment, I intend to offer an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the words "opinions, or", by inserting the following: "the person who has fled as a direct result of persecution or fear of persecution developing from the overthrow of the government of his country of origin since April 21, 1947."

On page 4, line 10, after the words "United States", strike out the words "prior to March 15, 1948," and replace with following: "prior to the effective date of this act."

This amendment refers to some 10,000 to 12,000 Czechoslovak refugees, who fled their country after the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia to the American zone in Germany or Austria, as well as to the British or French zones in Germany or Austria in the second half of February 1948, up to this date.

These refugees are people of democratic beliefs who were in danger of being arrested or liquidated by the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia because of their democratic attitude. Among them are 36 members of parliament, former ministers, officers, soldiers, airmen, professors and students, technical experts, skilled workers, and so forth. They are all martyrs of democracy and victims of their democratic convictions and western tendencies. During the war they fought in the Czechoslovak Army and in the RAF in Great Britain and some were in the underground at home against German totalitarianism. Many of them would have been put on trials and sentenced to death or to long-term prison. They escaped from the country through well-guarded frontiers, endangering their families; many of their family members were taken as hostages and were put on trial. Those who were seized trying to escape are in prisons and some of them were condemned to death or long-term prisons.

The situation of the Czechoslovak refugees in the American zone in Germany or Austria is a desperate one. The refugees escaped without money, they have no spares, no clothes to change, have not the status of displaced persons, and are not included in the help of the IRO. There are such cases as that of the chief prosecutor, Dr. Drabek, who prosecuted the German war criminals—as the notorious K. H. Frank—and after escaping with his family was put in a German concentration camp.

Some American ladies and the American Red Cross are trying to help but until now very little was done. The refugees do not get even the German rations of 1,200 calories, children have no milk, and some babies already died of undernourishment in the camps. There is no sanitary or medical equipment.

The refugees—

As Mr. Harold W. Melahn, from the editorial staff of Columbia Journal of International Affairs put in his letter to a Czechoslovak diplomat—

would willingly bear the temporary troubles if they knew that western organizations and governments were seriously preparing to help them. I believe that any aid would have incalculable value in restoring morale and would give added courage to the freedom-loving Czechoslovaks who have forsaken families and homeland rather than to submit to tyranny.

Help given to the refugees would encourage the majority of the Czechs and Slovaks at home; that means, the majority of the nation that is opposing communism and totalitarianism. The Czechoslovak Communist-dominated Government set up a very successful propaganda telling by means of radio and newspapers that the traitors who escaped the country are living in misery, and that those whom they served, the western democracies, would not lift a finger to help them.

Free Czechoslovaks all over the world, and especially Americans of Czech and Slovak descent, are trying to help those refugees by organizing relief funds. But this kind of help can be only a temporary solution. If we cannot find a solution of this problem, it would be a very poor sign of working democracy.

The morale of those refugees is very high. They are valuable citizens and could be very useful to any country that would adopt them. They want to work and fight for democracy and freedom.

The bill discussed is intended to help some 24 percent of the total number of the displaced persons. It would be of great importance if the great democracy of the United States of America could help at least 25 percent of the Czechoslovak refugees so as to encourage the other democratic countries to do the same for the remaining 75 percent. We could not expect help from other countries if the leading democracy would not be able to extend any help to the martyrs of democracy. The immigration laws of the United States do not allow the entry to this country of those political refugees, even the most prominent ones, who do not have the reentry permit to another state.

The Czechoslovak mass emigration is an exceptional case which needs a solution. There was no mass emigration from any other country after the World War II, where the democracy was overthrown by Communist minority.

The Czechs and Slovaks in exile have many relatives in this country; the American population of Czech and Slovak descent numbers over 1,000,000 people, and they would be willing to support their relatives and the unfortunate people from their country of origin to a great extent.

If Czechoslovak refugees could not benefit by the bill, they, as well as the democratic people in Czechoslovakia, would lose all hope and faith; and all the democratic people all over the world who fight for democracy and freedom would lose theirs in a living democracy.

The Czechoslovaks fled their country, encouraged by the solemn declaration of the three western great powers condemning the Communist coup, in the hope that they, as martyrs of democracy, really would find full practical support and a free country to live in until Czechoslovakia would be again a democratic country.

The Czechoslovak one-party elections, held on May 30, 1948, showed clearly that the Czechoslovaks did not lose their faith in democracy and in the efficiency of democratic methods. The courage of 1,600,000 voters, who either voted with clear ballots or abstained from the elections—which was both described by the Communist rulers in Czechoslovakia as treasonable activity—and exposed themselves to persecution, the voting being practically not secret. Many of those courageous Czechoslovaks will increase the number of the refugees in the next weeks.

The Czechoslovak refugees are expecting action from the leading democratic Nation. The action by the United States Congress would show to other countries the practical way, how to solve this urgent problem of democracy. Even if only some 25 percent of the Czechoslovak refugees could find a new home in the United States and if, according to the bill, some 3,000 Czechoslovak refugees would be admitted to the United States—the remaining 7,000 to 9,000 could be more easily admitted to other democratic countries.

It would be a terrible disappointment to the democratic Czechoslovaks, who were fighting in the Allied army and air force, who were for many years in German concentration camps, if they could not be eligible displaced persons and if they had the only choice to return to their country to death or long-term prisons. They cannot do it, of course. But where should they go if the doors would be closed to them to democratic countries? Even those refugees who got temporary visitors' visas to the United States or disclosed their resolution not to return to their country—resigned diplomats, students, and so forth—because of a certainty of persecution, are threatened by the immigration laws to be deported from the United States. They have no legal possibility to live even temporarily in the United States.

There is a great probability that the Czechoslovak refugees would become registered in the nearest future by the IRO. If it would be so, there is no reason why the date of April 21, 1947, should be applied against them. The Czechslovak emigration is after World War II the only mass emigration of genuine political refugees from a country. When the bill was prepared, the problem did not yet exist, but since it became the most urgent problem of our time. The fate of Czechoslovakia, the death of Masaryk, and so forth, aroused world opinion and were a reminder and a lesson to democracies.

The most decisive question in solving the displaced-persons and the refugee problem should be, if those persons are really in danger for their democratic beliefs and convictions, if they are really homeless because they cannot go back to their country of origin. The Czechoslovak refugees are really belonging to this category. They are truthfully displaced and cannot return home.

JUNE 8, 1948.

The Honorable KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. STEFAN: I understand that you propose to offer an amendment to the Fellows bill (H. R. 6396) for the benefit of recent Czechoslovak refugees. Pursuant to your request, I am enclosing a memorandum setting forth the views of the Department of State on this amendment. I am authorized to state that the Department of the Army concurs in the views of the Department of State in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. SALTZMAN,
Assistant Secretary of State.

JUNE 8, 1948.

MEMORANDUM ON THE CZECHOSLOVAK REFUGEES BY STATE DEPARTMENT

Following the Communist seizure of power in Czechoslovakia, many Czechoslovak citizens found it necessary to flee from their homeland in order to escape punishment and retaliation at the hands of the Communist government. Over 8,000 of these refugees have entered the western zones of Germany and Austria. They include former members of the government, journalists, professional and businessmen, and other citizens whose acts in defense of the democratic traditions of Czechoslovakia and opposition to the methods of the Communists in seizing control marked them either for punishment or for the loss of their civil and economic rights.

It has always been the objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support democratic movements in their opposition to totalitarian governments and to give refuge to individuals whose lives or security is directly threatened. These Czechoslovak refugees have demonstrated by reason of their flight that they are stanch supporters of the democratic cause who preferred to flee rather than to remain in Czechoslovakia. They were neither persuaded or coerced to support the Communist government.

Many of these refugees now wish to come to the United States where they may contribute to our national democratic life. Under the existing legislation, many years would be required for them to fulfill the requirements of immigration and wait their turns under the quota system. This means they would have to remain in camps in the western zones of Germany and Austria for an indefinite period with no facilities for supporting themselves.

The Czechoslovak refugees from Communist rule are in a similar position as the displaced persons who were uprooted by the Nazis, or who fled from persecution in Poland. The Czechoslovak case is unique in that the people involved voluntarily fled from Czechoslovakia because of the strength of their democratic convictions and the depth of their democratic commitments.

Other countries of western Europe have already admitted 3,000 of these new refugees. It is in the interest of the United States Government to help as many of these refugees as it is possible to do. Accordingly, the Department of State strongly supports the proposed amendment to give a status similar to that of displaced persons to a fixed number of Czechoslovak refugees in order to permit their entry into the United States. It is understood that only those who are bona fide refugees from Czechoslovakia after February 1948 will be considered.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in taking up this legislation it is very important that the House bear in mind the fact that we are attempting to deal with a specific problem. The Committee on the Judiciary labored over this legislation for many months. At the outset the opinions of the various members of the committee were so opposed that it looked for a long while as if there would be no legislation at all.

While it may be a fine thing to make it possible to bring to this country those people about whom our distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] just spoke, we ought not to encourage the peoples of the world who do not for the moment agree with their forms of government to believe that they can turn to the United States as a haven. It seems to me it is more important for these people to remain in the countries whence they fled, in order to combat the totalitarian system of government they have opposed.

If we open this bill to amendments, it seems to me we might well wind up with no legislation at all. For that reason, I urge the Members of the House to support this bill as it was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary without any amendments whatsoever.

May I point out some basic statistics that I think should be in the minds of the Members when they consider this legislation?

There are a little more than a million displaced persons in three countries. Eight hundred and fifty thousand of them are in Germany, 148,000 in Austria, and the rest in Italy. About 65 percent are Catholic, 20 percent Jewish, and 15 percent Protestant. Twenty-one percent of the displaced persons are children up to the age of 18; 66 percent are between the ages of 18 and 44, and only 13 percent are above the age of 44. We have almost 60 percent of the displaced persons in Germany in the American zone. Those statistics were before the committee when this legislation was written, and the provisions in the bill with respect to screening the people who will come to our country under this law are so restrictive that I do not think anybody can possibly complain about the type of person who will come to the United States. It is important to consider one thing more. It is costing about $130,000,000 a year to maintain these camps. Naturally we want to get this

load off our backs. Every time representatives of our Government discuss with representatives of other governments the possibility of moving people, we are confronted with the plea: What is the United States going to do to help solve this problem? It is therefore important that we act on this bill as written.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I am in favor of, and will heartily support, the DP legislation. However, there is one aspect of the bill that I think should be called to the attention of the House, and that is the definition of a displaced person. There is a large class of people, most of whom are now in Germany, who are designated as expellees. They have been expelled from these surrounding countries. There are about ten or fifteen million of these expellees. About 1,300,000 people technically are displaced persons, but these expellees are also refugees and are really displaced persons. The reason they are not classified as displaced persons is because the IRO constitution provides that nobody expelled from these countries who are of German ethnic origin may be so classified. As a result, there is nobody of German ethnic origin who may be classified under the technical description as a displaced person. I do not think the bill as passed by the House should have racial discrimination in it. If it does, we will be guilty of the same thing we have accused others of. So I have an amendment to offer to make it possible to permit otherwise properly qualified expellees who are really displaced persons to be considered also. When the time comes, I intend to offer that amendment. The International Red Cross has gone on record as stating that these expellees are in the same class as displaced persons. They are really displaced persons, and would really be so classified were it not for the discriminatory provision of the IRO constitution, which we should not perpetuate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to put myself in opposition to what seems to be the prevailing sentiment of this body. We will probably adopt the bill which the rule is intended to make in order.

I can understand why so many of us, for sentimental reasons, should find it agreeable to go along. We all sympathize with people in distress and would like to help solve their problems. But if you should canvass the group that has visited these camps in Germany, you would find 80 percent of the whole number dissatisfied with the bill. You are simply bringing into this country a horde of people who will immediately upon coming here identify themselves with those who are creating so much disturbance and causing so much trouble at the present time. You augment the group that comes down here occasionally under the false belief that they are high-pressuring Congress in passing legislation. I have been in some of these camps, and I say to you that while there are undoubtedly many who would be acceptable and suitable as immigrants to this country as a whole, these camps are hotbeds of revolutionists who, if they came here, would join those who now are gnawing away night and day like termites at the foundation of our constitutional government. You are simply aggravating the trouble that is already on our hands. I am prepared to concede that the Fellows bill is very much of an improvement over bills that have heretofore been insisted upon, but even the Fellows bill promises no solution of the problem. In these camps you will find few willing to be sent to any other country than the United States. Many were questioned in different camps that I visited, and not one did I find who was willing to go to any other country than the United States. They are the least desirable people of the whole of Europe. They do not want to work and will not work. Russia has conditioned the most of them to do her work wherever they may go. We have done nothing to counteract communistic propaganda amongst them. If we are to take any of them it should be upon a selective basis. We should make sure that we are getting people who can be assimilated—people who will become good and loyal citizens. If the membership of this body were advised as to the true situation, there would be few votes for the Fellows bill or any other bill providing for wholesale admission of these unfortunate and discontented people. You should remember that these camps have been stuffed with so-called displaced persons with the view of having them admitted to the United States. If you would read the report of the skilled investigator of the other body, which was suppressed, you would be shocked, and it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for you to go along. However, I shall not quarrel with what is done or try to influence anyone to oppose the bill. It is a troublesome problem that I would like to see solved, but would prefer to see the whole problem dealt with at one and the same time rather than by piecemeal as we are here doing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to put into the RECORD a letter I received from one of our educators in a high school in the anthracite coal area from which I come. I shall not take the time to read the whole letter, but I shall insert it in the RECORD.

I want to bring to your attention the asinine and ridiculous methods in which the Army is trying to recruit its volunteers. If such methods continue certainly we need not be surprised that the Army is not successful in obtaining men.

At the outset let me say also that I do not agree in every detail with the contents of this letter. I have an open mind as far as the proposed selective-service bill is concerned. I voted for selective service when it came before the House last time, and I still have an open mind. I heartily disagree, however, with some of the discriminatory provisions in the current bill, and when the bill comes up for consideration I will take the floor to oppose them.

This supervising principal writes the following letter:

FREELAND, PA., *June 5, 1948.*

Representative IVOR D. FENTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FENTON: I am writing to you, one of the Members of Congress from our State.

I am a supervising principal of schools. During World War II our teacher in physical training, our art teacher, our band teacher, and others were taken by selective service into military service. Now I see from what I have been reading that the same thing is to be repeated in peacetime. Our schools even now are understaffed and teachers are to be taken out of these understaffed schools to spend 2 years in military service. This is hard to see and certainly a very unfair thing to do. Certainly the service of these men in the schools would be of infinitely greater value in the schools than wasting their time in military service. I still hear those who were in the service in the last war speak of wasting their time and now that there is no real emergency it would not be for the good of the national welfare to take any teachers out of the classrooms for military service.

We are opposed to the reviving of selective service in peacetime. Just a few weeks ago one of our boys was brought home from France to be buried here in our cemetery. Now more of our boys are to be called up to go to foreign soil to be killed in defense of foreign soil.

Why not give voluntary enlistments a fair trial? The brass hats at Washington do not want to get the men through enlistments. They want them forced in and twice as many men as they can use. That has been the practice of the military to ask for about twice as many men as they need. Recently our Chief of Staff said that voluntary enlistments should be our first effort in peacetime. But it does not look as though our first effort has been well spent. We had a recruiting man from the Navy in our high school to show films on the Navy. After he left six or seven of our seniors enlisted in the Navy. Then a few weeks later I had an Army officer come in with an Army film. He showed a film on the battle of San Pietro, one of the bloodiest battles of the entire Italian campaign. After he finished showing this film, I ask him, "Do you expect any of our boys to enlist in the Army after seeing a film of that character?" Well, he said that that was all they could send him from Philadelphia. Well, I said that it would have been far better not to show any film on the Army than to show a film like that. From this action I have made the observation that the Army is not trying to get the men through voluntary enlistments. They want them forced in by the draft which is un-American and especially so in peacetime.

I spoke to many men during the last 2 or 3 months and invariably they are opposed to any drafting of men in peacetime. We would like Congress to make decisions in peacetime and not the military. Why have the military dictate? This Nation does not want selective service in peacetime. We ask you to put it off until such a time that there is a real emergency and not just an imagined one.

We are going to have the confidence that Congress will do the right thing but only if they do it without listening to the military. We ask you to oppose the draft measure. Thank you.

Yours respectfully,

N. P. LUCKENBILL.

I happen to be one of the first persons to have seen the film of the Battle of San Pietro when I was over in Florence, Italy, in 1944, when as a member of the Military Affairs Committee I went to Italy for an investigating trip. It is one of the most gruesome pictures imaginable and it would just simply put the fear of God into the heart of any young boy of 17 or 18 who saw it. It is no wonder that the recruiting officer who handled the Army's program was unable to secure any recruits.

I regret that the Army resorts to such methods as this to recruit its manpower.

I recall the Army's attempt to put over legislation in drafting nurses several years ago but which, while it passed the House, never got to the floor of the Senate.

At that time, even though they had many thousands of applications from nurses, it took the Army months to process an application. It was the most ridiculous procedure imaginable. Yet, within 2 or 3 months after it passed the House the Army would not even take any more nurses' applications because they had secured and had more than enough nurses. As a matter of fact they soon started to discharge nurses from the service.

I am convinced that if the Army boys would get down to the business of recruitment by using practical methods and cutting out such foolish requirements as high I. Q. tests and showing pictures as referred to previously, maybe we would not need the proposed draft.

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include the letter referred to.)

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Displaced Persons and the International Refugee Organization, and I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia that one of the other members of the committee was the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] who has about a hundred foreign-born in his district. He signed the unanimous report together with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PFEIFER], and myself.

We found that the DP's were useful citizens, that they were completely anti-Communist. If they are not then they could immediately go back to where they came from which is largely in the Communist territory. We found them to be as able and fine a group of people as you could find anywhere, that they were not loafers.

I hope the debate on the coming bill will expose some of these slanders against the DP's.

I want also to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Maine who put together this bill covering a most delicate and difficult subject. The bill should pass the House as written. I say to the friends of the bill that if you try to amend it you may kill it.

This problem of the DP's is a world problem. After the war originally there were eight to nine million displaced persons in Germany. Now there are about a million. The Russian forces kicked most of them out of the way in their zone and made them go back to where they came from—there are no DP camps in the Soviet zone—but General Eisenhower stood for more humane methods. A million of the DP's said they did not want to go back where they came from because they were against the government and were in fear of persecution—or in fear of religious persecution.

The issue of the displaced persons is the great moral issue of Europe. The Russians said to send them all back where they came from; it made no difference whether they legitimately feared for their lives due to political or religious persecution when they got there or not. We said, "No; that is not humane, that is not in accordance with our principles; we will not do it, we will take care of them, and we will find them a safe haven." The resolution of that moral issue is the basis of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the opening of the doors of this country to everyone who wants to come to America from some foreign country. If we do that, we are going to rue the day we permit it, and I shall not be a party to any such proposal. Of course, everyone in these other countries thinks this is the only spot left where there is freedom, liberty, and independence. We want to keep it that way.

If the bill as introduced by the gentleman from Maine permits these displaced persons to come into the United States under the quota system and if they are to be properly screened so that we know that they are proper people to come into our country and remain here, then I should not oppose the bill. It must not be in an increase of our quota system. However, I want the people of America to know that so far as my vote is concerned I am not going to throw the doors wide open and permit America to be the dumping place for all humanity. That would mean a haven for Communists and every other person who would be unacceptable to our citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people in this country at the present time who are communistically inclined. They want to make a Communist country out of the United States. They would break down our system of government, destroy our Constitution. So far as I am concerned, I would be in favor of cleaning all of them out and sending them back to whatever country they may think is better than America. Pay their transportation and wish them well in other lands. To those people in this country now who think they can make America a haven by patterning its form of government after that of some foreign country, I say to them go over to that country if that is the kind of country they want to live in, and let us alone. Leave us to our form of government under our Constitution, which I swore to protect and defend to the death, and that I will do. God being my helper.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HERTER Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, I accept this time not merely to express my support of Mr. FELLOWS' bill both in form and in principle, but also to devote a few minutes to a sympathetic consideration of the feelings of those many citizens of America who oppose it.

The great volume of mail from my district has largely supported the Stratton bill and now supports this bill; for the feelings and convictions of these people I have great respect. I nevertheless tried to tell them, during the last session, that while I shared their concern over the problem of the displaced persons, I did not think the Stratton bill was well considered—if for no deeper reason, than because I did not think it could get itself reported from committee, or through the House.

At the same time, I was concerned because of a seeming lack of enthusiastic interest on the part of our Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, for which committee, and particularly for its chairman, I have a deep and affectionate regard. I did not permit myself to criticize them; the primary responsibility was theirs, not mine; but I did venture to suggest even then that we might try the experiment of taking 100,000, in 1 year, without destroying any of the foundations of our Republic.

My confidence in the committee was this year rewarded by this bill, which reflects credit alike upon them and on the generous spirit of the chairman, and also upon his native down east canniness. We are admittedly fishing in deep waters; but if anyone could devise a net calculated to catch the food-fish, without bringing in too many sharks or toad fish, he has devised it now.

I believe this bill should be passed. However, I am at this minute concerned with the feelings of those thousands, perhaps millions, of our people who presently feel differently about it. I know many of them personally; I know by old experience the organizations which have decided to oppose any further admissions of immigrants, at least at this time. They are dependable, devoted, patriotic Americans, proud of their long American lineage, jealous of anything which might harm their country either in its security, its prosperity, or even in its comfort and high standards of living.

These fellow citizens of ours have permitted themselves to become alarmed about this bill, or any bill of the sort. They will persist in this attitude, and no doubt criticize the Congress for any degree of liberality it may see fit to display in the matter.

I wish I could say to them all: My friends, be not dismayed. Remember, there is always the possibility that the men you chose to represent you in the Congress still share to some extent your own devotion to America and its best interests. So far as I can observe, they

have suffered no "sea change" by their service here in Washington; as a matter of fact, they continue to represent their constituencies with what sometimes appears to be an almost painful fidelity. But down here, face to face with stubborn facts which may be more clearly apparent now than they were before, they do exactly what you would do under like circumstances; which is, adjust themselves as best they may to the realities of the matter, vote their honest best judgment, and then hope for the best.

It must be very easy for many hardheaded, practical, intelligently selfish but completely well-intending citizens to think that we could well afford to leave these displaced persons where they are, but what would these same people say if they found themselves faced as we do with the necessity of voting millions upon millions of our hard-come-by tax dollars to support them in idleness and frustration over there? This dilemma neither they nor we could escape.

This seems to be one case when the arguments of common sense join with the persuasions of mercy and brotherhood to a common conclusion, that we had better attack this problem and get it solved, trusting something to God and the great heart of America, to make the solution work.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I heard with considerable misgivings the statement made by our distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], that these DP's are the scum of the earth, and no nation would take them. That statement is most unfortunate, and utterly unfair. The careful screening set up by the bill will keep out any undesirables. Of course, the record shows, in the first place, that quite a number of these DP's have been taken by other nations. I shall put into the RECORD later more detailed statistics in that regard. But, in general, Britain has already taken over 50,000; Belgium has taken over 27,000; France more than 20,000; Canada has taken upward of 50,000, and many other countries have taken numerous of these DP's. Surely, if they were as bad as the gentleman indicated, those countries would hesitate to embrace within their borders people of this character.

Now, what are the records of these DP's as explained to us by a long line of distinguished witnesses, including General Marshall, General Hilldring, Judge Patterson, Attorney General Clark, and many others, with reference to work, with reference to health, with reference to crime, and with reference to political ideology? Let us take the situation just briefly as to work: General Hilldring testified as follows:

> I think that the displaced persons have established a remarkable record for themselves in their attitude toward work. This has become particularly evident after stabilization of the conditions during the past year.

Generals Mark Clark and Lucius Clay have indicated that there was and is little or no crime amongst the DP's. The International Refugee Organization says their health is more than satisfactory.

On the other hand, however, the fact that displaced persons refuse to be sent back to Communist-dominated countries shows their attitude toward that philosophy. The attitude of displaced persons toward communism has been further shown by several incidents illustrative of their feeling toward Soviet propagandists. In numerous camps the displaced persons themselves detected Communist agents and in several instances the rather rough treatment accorded them resulted in the necessity of intervention by law-enforcement officers.

Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, United States Army, in charge of the United States military forces field contacts with displaced persons, testifying before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization on July 2, 1947, had this to say about their political attitude:

> If I were asked to point out the community which I considered the least susceptible to and the most thoroughly indoctrinated against nazism, fascism, and communism, I would not take you to the isolated 100-percent American small town in the Middle West. I would take you to a DP center in our zone of Germany. The vast majority of the people of the United States definitely dislike those "isms," but have not had a great deal of intimate contact with them. The DP who describes his being rounded up at night, torn from his family, and brought to Germany to labor, the DP who shows you the tattooed concentration-camp number on his arm, is certainly actively indoctrinated against any form of nazism or fascism.
>
> As for communism, the very fact that they are ready to accept any fate rather than be sent back to Communist-dominated countries shows their attitude toward the ism. Further, if I may say so, I have had a wide opportunity to be among them, and I know their attitude. These DP's do not take democracy for granted. They are willing to work for it. They have seen these isms.
>
> They can recognize them, and violently oppose them.

The committee wishes to emphasize at this point that several specific provisions of H. R. 6396 are designed to enable consular officers abroad and immigration authorities in this country to prevent from entering the United States any and all undesirable elements, such as persons with bad moral records, persons afflicted with diseases making them inadmissible, or persons whose presence in this country may endanger its public safety—Communists and members or former members of movements or groups which during the war rendered aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. It is the consensus of the committee that in the administration of the act those safety measures should be strictly adhered to and meticulously enforced.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 231) to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense," and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this matter has been cleared by the gentleman from Michigan, but I think in justice to the gentleman he should make a brief statement for the RECORD as to what the resolution contains.

Mr. DONDERO. This resolution has been passed by the Senate. It provides for not to exceed $10,000,000 for flood sufferers in Portland, Oreg., and in that valley.

Mr. McCORMACK. I feel that this is meritorious legislation, but I thought a brief statement for the RECORD would be in order in connection with the bill. It is a sound thing to do. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 303 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940 (Public Law 849, 76th Cong.), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That moneys derived from the rental and operation of such property and funds from the reserve account established by the Administrator pursuant to this section 303, not exceeding in the aggregate $10,000,000, shall be available and may be used by the Administrator for expenses found necessary in the provision of stopgap emergency housing in the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area for persons and families displaced as the result of the destruction of the temporary housing at Vanport in Multnomah County, Oreg., and other persons and families in such area rendered homeless as a result of the present flood, and in providing such stopgap emergency housing the Administrator may act without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as I have expressed on the floor a number of times since the great disaster overtook the people in the Columbia River area by reason of the devastating floods of the Columbia, emergency legislation is necessary to give some relief and consideration to the thousands of people in distress. This is the greatest flood in all our history. It has caused over $100,000,000 in property damage, taken a toll of many

lives, and has left literally thousands of our people without homes. In my own particular district in Oregon 18,700 residents in the Vanport area, a war-housing project, owned by the Government, have been left homeless. Their homes have been completely destroyed and cannot be repaired. Sixty percent of them are veterans, many of whom are taking educational courses under the GI bill of rights. They are now sheltered in school buildings, churches, private homes, and other makeshift places to give them emergency shelter until homes can be provided.

This resolution, House Resolution 423, which I introduced in the House, and Senate Joint Resolution 231, which passed the other body early this morning only reaches one portion of the emergency needs. This resolution will give authority to use funds which are now available under Public Law 849 of the Seventy-sixth Congress for stopgap housing for the homeless residents of the Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., area for persons and families displaced as the result of the destruction of the temporary housing at Vanport as well as other persons and families in such areas rendered homeless as a result of the present flood.

The Administrator will, in all likelihood, secure trailer houses, prefabricated houses if available, and use Federal housing units which are available to provide this stopgap housing. The Administrator now has available a number of trailer houses but is without funds with which to condition them to provide facilities such as water, sewage, light, and so forth, and the releasing of these funds will provide the necessary revenues for that purpose. The resolution limits the aggregate sum to be utilized to $10,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary before we adjourn to enact other legislation which will provide other relief for these stricken people who have lost all of their personal effects, as well as to provide relief for farmers and others whose farm homes, machinery, stock feed, crops, and farm material have been destroyed. Likewise it will be necessary to provide funds in addition to those now available to reconstruct and repair dikes and highways and restore Federal public buildings and facilities as well as to provide grants or other aids and loans to municipalities and local governmental agencies to assist them in restoring necessary facilities such as sewerage and water systems in such hardship cases where funds cannot be otherwise obtained by these local agencies. I am glad that this resolution meets with the full approval of all the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Oregon Journal on June 7, 1948, as follows:

NEW CRESTS DUE; LOSS UP $3,000,000

A new flood crest—29.7 feet at Portland—Sunday swept down the Columbia River past the Willamette toward the sea, leaving behind an additional $3,000,000 or more damage and sodden dikes that must be strengthened against the prospect of a new rise.

In snowfields that feed the upper Columbia and tributary streams the hot sun Sunday and today was making what may be the third wave of flood. Elmer Fisher, weather bureau forecaster, scanned reports of slight rises in river and stream levels.

He said floodwaters in the Portland area will continue to recede slowly until Wednesday, then begin to rise. Thursday and Friday he expects them to hover at 29.5 feet. He is not ready to predict what will happen after that.

He said much will depend on how rapidly the sun continues to melt the snowfields. Temperatures as high as 90 degrees were expected over much of the inland region today.

Up to noon today, however, the heat appeared to have caused surprisingly little run-off in mountain streams, Fisher reported.

OLD CREST LIKELY TO BE RECORD

Last Tuesday's crests of 29.95 feet at Portland and 30.2 feet at Vancouver are highest of the flood so far.

The Sunday crest passed Portland at 29.7 feet late in the day, the harbor patrol and Weather Bureau reported. No readings were available at Vancouver but the crest was estimated to be about 30 feet.

At noon today the Willamette at Portland stood at 29.5-plus feet, 11.6 above flood stage. The Columbia at Vancouver stood at 29.9 at 10 a. m.

Fisher said he expects the rivers to fall about 0.3 of a foot before they begin the new rise portended now in the upper reaches of the river.

COLUMBIA RISES AGAIN IN CANADA

The Snake River at Lewiston was falling slowly today, Fisher said, but the Clearwater was up 0.4 foot this morning. He expects the Snake below Lewiston to begin rising slowly Tuesday and continue rising through Wednesday.

The Columbia in Canada was reported on the rise. Between Grand Coulee and Pasco the water was continuing to creep up. At Umatilla it was nearly stationary at 29.1 feet.

Fisher today predicted that "we will have high waters with us for quite a while—for 3 weeks, anyway."

Said Col. O. E. Walsh, Portland district engineer:

"We have been planning on this for some time. The Corps of Engineers has every hope that the dikes will hold. At the high stage Sunday night in many places the amount of seepage dropped off. All boils are well controlled, and as of the present time very few news ones are developing. The Corps of Engineers looks for a long, steady fight for 2 weeks or more."

The Corps of Engineers at noon reported all dikes holding. Crews are working on them constantly. The main dike at Clatskanie, near where a break in the Johns drainage district dike early Sunday covered rich mint and berry lands with 15 feet of water, held through the dangerous early morning high tide.

THREE-MILLION-DOLLAR LOSS IN NINE AREAS

Mayor Art Steele of Clatskanie estimated damage of the nine dike districts at $3,000,000.

The area will be in fresh danger Tuesday. A high tide of about 9.2 feet is expected at 3:30 a. m.

Into the constant fight to save the dikes the Corps of Engineers today threw a fresh field staff of 26 officers. The officers, including five lieutenant colonels, flew in late Sunday from Fort Belvoir, Va.

After early morning briefings they were sent out to help direct the work of a force of an estimated 6,000 men. The Corps of Engineers said it has 85 officers, 2,600 enlisted men, and 3,000 to 4,000 civilians at work on the levees.

Since the flood began about 125,000 tons of sand has been poured into an estimated 2½ million sacks to bolster the dikes. There is no estimate on the amount of gravel used.

Still unevacuated at last report were the six members of the Nestor Lehto family who refused to evacuate their home in the Johns area as the dike broke. The Corps of Engineers said the family is marooned. The family has three boats. An Army DUKW is standing by.

TWO REMOVED FROM FLOODED SECTOR

Mrs. Emma Svenden, a woman in her seventies, and another householder who had refused to leave, were evacuated Sunday morning, the engineers said.

A small slide on Marine Drive Sunday was at first thought to have closed the road, but today the Corps of Engineers said one-way traffic was maintained at all times. Trucks continued to haul dirt and bags to crews strengthening the dike along Marine Drive beyond the slide.

The sheriff's office said the slide was caused by heavy trucks turning on Northeast Campbell Road.

The Sunday crest took no known new toll of life. No more bodies had been recovered from flooded Vanport City at 12:30 p. m. today. To date only the bodies of two children have been found. Salvage of personal property from intact Vanport City apartments is proceeding.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the disaster which struck the Columbia Basin area in the past 2 weeks has resulted in damages estimated at more than $75,000,000. More than 50,000 people have been made homeless and more than 5,000 homes have been either completely destroyed or made untenable for occupancy by the floodwaters which have inundated entire communities such as Vanport, Oreg. It is obvious that such disasters cannot be made to await the pleasure of Congress and that the losses due to one such disaster are far costlier than the expense of adequate preventive measures. This emergency is ample evidence for the need to carry the national flood-control program forward as rapidly as possible, for it is impossible to calculate at this time how great the extent of the damage will be ultimately to crops, soils, forests, industry, and other important natural resources. The latter cannot quickly be repaired; the loss could be prevented, however, by an adequate national flood-control program. The resolution just passed by the House, however, is separate from any such long-range program. It is a simple relief measure, providing funds for stopgap emergency housing in the stricken Vanport, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area. A state of emergency exists there, and it is gratifying to see this House act in emergency fashion in dealing with the need of those stricken by the disaster.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], the members of that

committee and the Congress for the prompt manner in which this emergency legislation has been handled.

I am certain passage of this bill will be cheering news to the 48,000 people of Oregon and Washington who have been made homeless by the great Columbia River floods and will be especially joyously received by the members of those 6,000 families whose homes were completely and utterly destroyed by the floodwaters.

These people have no place to go except into the most temporary of emergency housing. This bill will provide most of these families livable homes until something of a permanent housing program can be adopted.

On behalf of these people, as well as myself, I thank you all for the speed with which you have enacted this legislation.

I have conferred with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] who has an identical resolution in the House to Senate Joint Resolution 231 and find that it is his intention and understanding that the language on page 2 of this resolution referring to "Vanport in Multnomah County, Oreg., and other persons and families in such area rendered homeless as a result of the present flood" does mean all of those so made homeless in the lower regions of the river below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg. This means that people below Vancouver and Portland also will share in the housing to be provided by this legislation.

I thank you for the prompt manner in which you have met this emergency.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill which makes available the sum of $10,000,000 for the relief of those people whose housing was destroyed by the disastrous floods of the Columbia River is exceedingly meritorious and absolutely necessary. It is imperative that we take every emergency step possible to alleviate suffering and to quickly repair the extensive damage which has been done. Thousands of persons have been made homeless, roads and bridges have been washed out, property damage will run into millions of dollars, and the threat of epidemic prevails where sanitary facilities were destroyed. The Red Cross and other agencies are doing a heroic job of supplying emergency assistance. But that is not enough. The States of Washington and Oregon, together with local communities, will do and are doing what they can. The Federal Government must also help. This bill affords one means of assistance. The Representatives of the two States affected are searching for and devising other means. They will be found and made available.

The Federal assistance should be given on a nonpartisan basis, where there is human suffering and need partisan politics should not enter into the picture. I regret very much that our President has seen fit to inject politics into the Columbia River disaster. He blames the present Congress for failure to provide adequate funds for flood-control projects which he intimates would have prevented the recent disaster. Does he fail to realize that any flood-control project which would have had any effect upon last week's flood would have had to have been initiated several years ago when his party was in control of Congress? His statement in this respect is as unfounded as his statement yesterday criticizing the present Congress for failure to appropriate sufficient funds for power and reclamation projects in the State of Washington. Does he forget that in 1947 Congress appropriated more funds for Columbia Basin than any other Congress ever did? Has he forgotten so soon that the present House of Representatives appropriated $45,000,000 for this project—approximately twice as much as was appropriated by any Congress controlled by his party? Apparently, he has also forgottten his "stop" order of 1946 which prohibited and held up the use of funds appropriated by the 1946 Congress for Department of the Interior. The ill effects of that order in retarding reclamation and power projects is clearly indicated in the testimony before the House Appropriations Committee in the 1947 hearings. It is quite evident that the President is not in a defensible position when he recklessly criticizes the present Congress. I trust that with respect to the flood emergency in the Columbia River area he will come foward, not with unfounded criticisms, but with helpful suggestions and offers of positive assistance. Let us not play politics with suffering and need.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of social security.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, it appears certain now that the forgotten people in this country are those who have reached the age of 65. During the past several years many bills have been introduced to liberalize the social security coverage, to lower the age limitation, to increase the benefits, and to secure coverage of groups not included, but the Congress has left this important work undone. As a result, for some time to come the aged will have to continue on even less than a starvation level, because the high cost of living makes the benefits inadequate to supply even the food necessary to sustain life.

The President, on two occasions, has recommended to this Congress that the social security law be extended and liberalized, and only recently he made five specific suggestions for improvements, as follows:

First, more adequate benefits under old-age and survivors' insurance; second, extended coverage for old-age and survivors' insurance; third, extended coverage for unemployment insurance; fourth, insurance against loss of earnings due to illness and disability; fifth, improved public assistance to the needy. It is difficult for the people in need of assistance to appreciate the reason for inaction. I know many of them are embittered. There is scarcely a time when I am home in my district that one or more of these people do not come to me and ask why Congress has done nothing to increase their benefits. They complain, and justly so, that it is not right for a man and his wife to be able to maintain themselves only through the aid of friends or relatives. And it is not just the old people themselves who are complaining about this. Many who have talked with me are younger and independent, but they are concerned with the situation and heartily in favor of improving the law.

Statistics show that many more people now live beyond the age of 65 than in the past, and unless something is done to assure greater old-age benefits, increased numbers of dependent old people will be living in poverty. This is a national problem and should be dealt with immediately. I do not know how it can be done properly at this late hour, but at least the responsibility for the welfare of these people is in the hands of Congress. I believe it is a dereliction of duty to depart from Washington this year without carrying out the recommendations as made by the President. The American people will hold the Congress responsible for failure to act in this matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes and include in my remarks certain tables and quotations, and that such tables appear in the form submitted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REVENUE REVISION BILL OF 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 656, Rept. No. 2300), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6712) to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committtee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be sub-

ject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

COMMISSION TO DETERMINE CLAIMS OF MOTOR CARRIERS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 657, Rept. No. 2301), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1260, to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include five clippings.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6396) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6396, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of the rule a general explanation of this bill has been made. Suffice it to say that this bill is the successor of the Stratton bill. Personally, I could not support the Stratton bill as written, and I know very few of even the proponents of the Stratton bill who would support all of its provisions today. Conditions have changed, and the hearings have convinced the committee that this compromise Fellows bill is the best bill having any chance of passing the House now.

Extensive hearings were held by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the able gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] is chairman. Unlimited work has been done. The subcommittee has presented to the House today a bill which is the result of that work and study. That bill can best be explained by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]. I shall support the Fellows bill as it is. It is not perfect. It will not solve the displaced persons camps problems completely. I preferred that the IRO deal with this whole problem. I wanted to close these camps. This bill will not do that. It is another case of the United States leading the way. We are promised that other nations will join us to the end that these persons be cared for. If this bill passes the House, and I certainly believe it will, the DP bill passed by the Senate and now on the Speaker's desk will be substituted for the House bill. The two bills will then be considered by the conferees, representing both bodies. In the final analysis, the vote that counts is the vote on the conference report. Those who want this type of legislation certainly will support this bill if they want any legislation to be passed at this session. Those who want a modified form of the Stratton bill will support this bill for the same reason. Those opposed to any DP legislation will vote against any bill. It seems to me that it is common sense to pass this bill as quickly as possible, so that something may be worked out which meets with the approval of both bodies. Time is of the essence. If the conference report, when it comes back, meets the desires of the House, then we can record our final decision.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Maine, author of the bill, who will have charge of the time and the conduct of the bill on the floor.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a much-discussed question. Newspapers, magazines and radio have debated for more than a year the problem of displaced persons in Europe. There is a difference of opinion among good men as to the wisdom and necessity for any legislation.

Committees of the Congress have visited the camps and there have been some excellent reports filed and printed. I recommend for your reading the report from your Judiciary Committee on this bill, H. R. 6396.

Let me say that the House Committee on Judiciary boasts that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] is one of its membership. If the newspaper dispatches are to be credited and he is to be retired from this House, this Congress and the country is to suffer irreparable loss. The committee loses an able lawyer and conscientious legislator; his district loses a Representative of ability and integrity; and the House membership loses a respected and loved colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this question of displaced persons should be settled, and a majority, at least, of your committee feels that same way. I believe it should be settled, if it can be, without injuring or destroying our traditional quota system of immigration. This is accomplished by the terms of H. R. 6396. The 200,000 who will be brought in under this bill will be charged to the quotas, after first being carefully selected and screened. H. R. 6396 supplements and restricts the immigration system of laws. The people brought in under this bill are not in addition to but in place of those who would come in under the immigration laws and the President's directive of December 22, 1945. Those brought in under this statute—if it becomes a law—will be a better class of immigrant than we will receive if it does not become a law.

In answer to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], my distinguished friend, who says we are going to get the scum if we pass this law, let me say that if we do not pass this law we are going to get the same people over a period of time without the restrictions of this law. And when the gentleman speaks of scum, I can only answer him by reading what Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, of the United States Army in charge of the United States military forces, field contact section, said. He testified as follows:

If I were asked to point out the community which I considered the least susceptible to, and the most thoroughly indoctrinated against, nazism, fascism, and communism, I would not take you to the isolated 100 percent American small town in the Middle West. I would take you to a DP center in our zone of Germany. The vast majority of the people of the United States definitely dislike those isms but have not had a great deal of intimate contact with them. The DP who describes his being rounded up at night, torn from his family, and brought to Germany to labor; the DP who shows you the tattooed concentration camp number on his arm, is certainly actively indoctrinated against any form of nazism or fascism.

At the risk of being somewhat boring—I have been waiting around here for 3 days, and I felt that I was a sort of a DP myself, as far as this program was concerned—I am going to give you, briefly, a history of the immigration laws, if you will bear with me.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF IMMIGRATION INTO THE UNITED STATES—LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

It may be well at this time to bring to the attention of the House, very briefly, certain high lights of the history of immigration to the United States. This history is clearly divided into four parts:

First. The colonial period, extending from the first settlement of the North American Colonies to 1783;

Second. The period of free immigration, 1783–1830, during which no attempt was made by any governmental agency to regulate the entry of people;

Third. The period of State control, 1830–82, during which the States, especially those on the Atlantic seaboard, legislated concerning immigration matters, each in its own way and according to its own interests and views;

Fourth. The period of Federal control, beginning about 1882 and likely to continue indefinitely.

No record was kept of arriving immigrants until 1820. The population of this country at different periods, however, indicates the growth of the immigration movement prior to that date; as is well known, the peopling of the continent was from the beginning due to immigration rather than to the natural increase of those already in the country.

In 1640 the population of the Colonies was 25,000 and in 1689 about 200,000.

In 1743 the million mark was passed. When the First Census was taken, in 1790, the population, exclusive of Vermont and the territory northwest of the Ohio, was almost four million. It is estimated that from 1790 to 1820 about 250,000 immigrants entered the country.

During the first decade for which official records were kept, 1821–30, 143,439 immigrants were admitted. After that the volume of immigration increased greatly. The peak was reached in 1907, when 1,285,349 immigrants entered; 1914 ranks next, with 1,218,480. The quota acts, especially the Quota Act of 1924, the depression of 1929, and the outbreak of war in 1939 stemmed the flow; fewer immigrants entered in the decade 1931–40 than in any corresponding period during the preceding century, and present indications are that the total for the current decade, 1941–50, will be as low or even lower. The number of immigrants admitted in 1933—23,068—was the lowest since 1831, in which year the number was 22,633.

The decade where the figure of immigrants admitted to our country reached the peak was 1901–1910; the figure was 8,795,386. The passage of our first Immigration Act of 1917 curtailed the immigration 50 percent, because in the decade 1921–30 we admitted 4,107,209 immigrants, but the two succeeding decades show a rapid and sharp decrease in immigration. The decade 1931–40 shows the figure of 528,431, and in the years of 1941 until July 1, 1947, we admitted 426,965.

In 1921 the United States made a drastic change in its immigration policy. Up to that time practically any person who was in good physical and mental health, not illiterate, of good moral character, and not racially ineligible for naturalization could enter the country. After the war a reaction against immigration set in which led to a widespread demand for restriction. It was largely due to fear that the country would be swamped with immigrants desiring to escape the distress in Europe and to come to the American land of promise. Congress accordingly in May 1921 enacted a law restricting the number of immigrants who might enter. Because it assigned to each European country a definite quota, the act is known as the Quota Act. Though meant as an emergency measure, the Quota Act remained in force about 3 years, from June 3, 1921 to June 30, 1924. In 1924 Congress enacted a permanent act, the Immigration Act of 1924, which went into effect July 1, and which, together with the act of February 5, 1917, the basic immigration act, now controls immigration.

All aliens entering the United States today are classed either as immigrants or nonimmigrants, according to whether they come for permanent residence or for temporary stay merely. Immigrants in turn are classed as nonquota and quota immigrants, depending on whether they are entitled under the law to enter outside the quota or must come under the quota. Since 1921 the United States has allowed only a definite number of immigrants to enter each year from each European country and from certain Asiatic and African countries. This number is what is known as the quota for that country. Only persons born in such country may be counted under its quota; birthplace, not citizenship and not residence, decides under what quota an alien belongs.

Our annual quotas under the 1921 act were 357,893, and the present quotas, established by the act of 1924, number 153,929.

What is the problem, Mr. Chairman?

The difficult human problem of displaced persons is a direct aftermath of the war. It involves those who were displaced from their countries of origin during the war or because of conditions resulting from the war.

The displaced persons in Europe, as defined in subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the bill H. R. 6396, constitutes a part of the remainder of the now disbanded armed forces of Poland and Yugoslavia who fought on the side of the United Nations against the Axis but because of changes in the political and economic system which have taken place in those countries are unwilling or unable to be repatriated; the remainder of the forced laborers, prisoners of war, and concentration-camp victims of the Germans; those who fled before the occupation armies of the Communist distatorship; and those who fled from their homelands in legitimate fear of political or religious persecution.

It is estimated that there were more than 8,000,000 refugees and displaced persons in western Europe on VE-day. The western allied armies repatriated to their countries of origin over 7,000,000 persons. For the most part, they were western Europeans—French, Belgian, Dutch—and citizens of prewar U. S. S. R.

A substantial but diminishing number of Polish citizens and a small number of others have gone back to eastern Europe during 1945, 1946, and early in 1947.

The displaced persons are primarily natives of the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—of Poland, both east of the Curzon line, which is now under Soviet control, and from present-day Poland, which is under Communist domination; or from Yugoslavia, also under Communist domination; or from the Polish and Soviet Ukraine.

Another group of displaced persons includes the remainder of the Jewish population of Germany and Austria and Jewish people primarily from Poland, Hungary, and Rumania who fled into Germany and Austria after the close of hostilities.

Over 75 percent of the displaced persons now in Germany, Austria, and Italy were there before the close of hostilities; the remainder are mostly Jewish displaced persons who entered since that time.

On January 1, 1947, slightly more than 1,000,000 displaced persons remained in Germany, Austria, and Italy, as follows:

In camp	794,735
Out of camp	242,669
Total	1,037,404

On January 1, 1948, the corresponding figures were as follows:

In camp	611,071
Out of camp	225,918
Total	836,989

Under the provisions of H. R. 6396, displaced persons residing both in and out of camps would be equally entitled to allocation of a share of the opportunities to immigrate into the United States. The committee was aware of the fact that thousands of displaced persons, showing commendable initiative and resourcefulness, chose to go out and try to become self-sustaining in the German and Austrian economies. To encourage them to continue and others to follow their example, assurances were given them by military and civil authorities that their absence from the camps would not militate against them in their desire for resettlement.

II. More than any other country, the United States has been confronted by the problem of displaced persons because of our position as occupying power in Germany and Austria, and formerly in Italy. Great Britain and France, to a lesser degree, have been confronted with the same problem; but, as shown by the following table, the number of displaced persons in the United States zones of occupation in Germany and Austria by far exceeds the corresponding numbers of displaced persons in the British and French zones.

Displaced persons in the three western zones of Germany and Austria and in Italy, as of Jan. 1, 1948

Country	United States zone			British zone			French zone			Italy, in camp
	In camp	Out of camp	Total	In camp	Out of camp	Total	In camp	Out of camp	Total	
Germany	[1] 322,693	143,769	466,462	[2] 181,128	[3] 15,549	196,677	24,966	9,422	34,388	
Austria	34,487	16,907	51,394	12,984	32,633	45,617	5,318	7,638	12,956	
Italy (not allocated by zones)										[4] 18,579 [5] 10,916
Total	357,180	160,676	517,856	194,112	48,182	242,294	30,284	17,160	47,344	20,495

[1] Not including 14,535 displaced persons (mainly Poles and Balts) employed by U. S. Army in civilian labor service units.

[2] Excludes 13,000 Yugoslavs from out of camp in Italy transferred to British zone, Germany, in March 1947 (estimated).

[3] This figure consists of 9,366 Poles and 6,183 Yugoslavs making up the Civil Mixed Watchmen's Service and other labor service groups (estimated).

[4] Jewish: 7,000 in "Hachsharoth" and 11,579 in IRO camps.

[5] Yugoslavs, Poles, Ukrainians, and other nationalities in IRO camps.

Displaced persons in the 3 western zones of Germany and Austria and in Italy, as of Jan. 1, 1948

Country	Total		Total
	In camp	Out of camp	
Germany	528,787	168,740	697,527
Austria	52,495	57,178	109,967
Italy	29,495	(6)	29,495
Total	611,071	225,918	[6]836,989

[6] There are an estimated 100,000 DP's out of camp in Italy eligible for IRO assistance. No out-of-camp figure for Italy is shown here, as no registration of these people has taken place.

THE UNITED STATES VIEWPOINT ON REPATRIATION

As VE-day approached it was generally assumed that as soon as the fighting was over and transportation became available practically all of the displaced persons would be eager to return to their former homes to participate in the reconstruction of their devastated countries. The Western World had not, however, reckoned sufficiently with political and social upheaval and the redrawing of national boundaries which had taken place in Europe during the war.

Hundreds of thousands of people felt that they no longer had a country. They were in fundamental disagreement with the Communist type of new government in power in their old countries and the new pattern of sovietized economies. They felt that there was no safety and no hope for them to exist in those areas, much less to rebuild their lives there. Others, particularly the Jews, were stunned by the extermination of 6,000,000 Jews and by the result of some of Hitler's indoctrinations in the countries where they formerly lived.

There is a sharp divergence of viewpoint between the United States Government and the Soviet Government and its satellites as to what course should be pursued with regard to forced repatriation. The Soviet viewpoint has been vigorously presented before every possible forum—the control councils in Germany and Austria, the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Council of Foreign Ministers, and so forth.

The viewpoint of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its satellites is that those persons born in areas now subject to the Soviet governmental authority or the Communist-dominated satellite countries are under obligation to return to such territory. They demand that the United States, British, and French armies of occupation forcibly repatriate the displaced persons.

The American viewpoint is that it is against American tradition to compel these persons to return against their will to areas under governments whose political and economic systems they are unwilling to accept.

While opposing the idea of forcible repatriation, the United States army of occupation and the armies of other western occupying powers have assisted voluntary repatriation in every possible way. Repatriation has been carried out by the occupying armies and UNRRA up to June 30, 1947, when the new International Refugee Organization assumed the responsibility for the care and maintenance, housing, repatriation, and resettlement of displaced persons.

ALTERNATIVES OTHER THAN REPATRIATION

According to the Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall, who testified before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary on July 16, 1947, there were three alternatives left after the elimination of forcible repatriation of displaced persons. General Marshall described them as follows:

1. To abandon the displaced persons to the German economy: There is, quite naturally, a fierce resentment between the displaced persons and Germans. The displaced persons know that the Germans are responsible for their present plight. The Germans regard the displaced persons as an uncomfortable burden and a constant source of annoyance. To turn them back to the Germans would be to perpetuate grave tensions and an ever-present threat of internal conflict. It would increase the present difficulties of our occupation and prolong the necessity for it. It would not lessen the international tension over the displaced persons. Further, from an economic standpoint, this alternative is impracticable. The western zones of Germany are already overcrowded with the millions of Germans and people of German stock who have fled or have been transferred into Germany since the end of the war. If we should in addition throw these displaced persons into the German economy, we would have to continue our contributions to their support, though indirectly, as an alternative to their starvation.

2. To continue indefinitely the segregation and maintenance of the displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy with a prolonged contribution from the American taxpayer for their support through the International Refugee Organization: Quite apart from the dollars-and-cents burden that this country would thus saddle itself with, I feel profoundly that it is an alternative we should not adopt. So far these people have done well in making the best of their situation. They have been active in such work as it is possible for us to find for them and, indeed, for them to find for themselves. They have created much which is excellent in the life of their small communities. But men and women cannot be cut off indefinitely from any opportunity to help themselves or to plan for their own lives and the lives of their children without an inevitable deterioration. That deterioration would have disastrous effects on these people. That demoralization also would have disastrous effects on the larger problem of the reconstruction of the Europe that will alone make possible a peaceful world. The fundamental American tradition as to all people under our governmental authority is the opportunity to help oneself. To continue to hold these people where there is no opportunity to help themselves, and without hope of such opportunity, is contrary to that American tradition.

3. Resettlement of displaced persons in the various countries of the world who will be willing to receive them.

RESETTLEMENT AND FAIR SHARE

The International Refugee Organization has been negotiating with several nations to receive some of its charges but has met only with limited success.

A special subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported in October 1947 that "what it has learned about resettlement was not all affirmative," and that "prospects for further accomplishments are indefinite."

The subcommittee went on, stating:

The fact is—and one may as well be blunt about it—that the International Rerfugee Organization (as well as its predecessor, the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees) has been in the position of a seller in a buyer's market. The human resources for resettlement are vast. The opportunities are limited. The governments agreeing to admit displaced persons have been in the stronger bargaining position. The result has been that resettlement is the secondary, almost the incidental, aspect of the agreements in force. The primary objective has been that of the receiving governments to obtain people for the respective economic needs of their countries.

How can this question be solved? Why is this legislation necessary? There is the question of money—the question of expense. We are appropriating anywhere from $71,000,000 to $72,000,000 a year for our share—we have heard that before—and if you add to that what the Army spends, which figures are not available although the total has been given here as $100,000,000 a year, that makes a billion dollars which we will spend in the next 10 years and there is no end in sight then. So, as a matter of dollars and cents we have the possibility of expending a billion dollars within the next 10-year period. If there is any future to it, and we do not know that there is any future, it is there and it will always be there. This situation is a cancer in the central part of Europe.

We have camps located in the devastated areas which we are trying to rehabilitate. There are some 600 camps, and in our own zone there are 536,000 people altogether, in the 600 camps some 836,000 people. Here is a great army of occupation which is taking manpower to police and make records of these people in the camps. As General Clay has said, "It is my problem," and he said, "My No. 1 problem." So you will find that manpower is being wasted in handling this situation.

Again, the rehabilitation and political organization of Germany now being undertaken demands that this problem be disposed of. Finally, there is the humanitarian aspect to this problem, which is wide and deep.

Will the pending legislation solve this problem? It is, in any case, a step in the right direction. When you read the testimony of Generals Marshall, Hilldring, and Clay, and that of the refugee organization officials, you will find that this legislation will give them a powerful instrument to help negotiate with countries other agreements under which they will take the remainder of the displaced persons. I heard the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] say that this will not solve it. I suppose he means there is no definite assurance that this

will do it. Of course, that was true with ERP. We are to appropriate $17,000,000,000. We do not say it will do it, but we hope it will.

Let me refer to a part of the statute which was offered as an amendment to the act which adopted the IRO Charter. I think it was a good amendment. Then you can see what these boys are up against, sitting around the table over there trying to solve the question:

Provided, however, That this authority (to accept membership for the United States in the IRO) is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person, and acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

It is only fair to assume that after the passage of this legislation two important steps will be taken by our administration. First, necessary action for a strict enforcement of the provisions of this act; and, second, an international conference will be called and an international agreement for a pro rata distribution of all displaced persons will be made as soon as possible.

MERITS OF THIS LEGISLATION

First. It does not destroy the principle of national origin as expressed in our quota system. We are getting the same number of immigrants but we will be getting them faster for 2 years. Why should we do that? Because we are paying for their support in the camps and we can make them earn their living over here.

Second. We do not want them to settle in congested metropolitan areas and this is why we provide for a proper distribution of new immigrants in this country through the cooperation of the Coordinator with Governors of the several States and with voluntary organizations.

Third. While no proportion as to race, nationality, religion, and so forth, has been provided for in the President's directive of December 22, 1945, many complaints were heard that such-and-such a race or religion has been favored or that such-and-such a race or religion has been discriminated against. Under this bill a strict rule of proportions is being provided for.

Fourth. The bill does not waive any of the safeguards against subversives, immoral types, sick persons, and so forth, provided for in the immigration laws but this legislation adds additional safeguards such as subsection (c) of section 2 and the language contained in lines 12 to 15 on page 7. It also provides for special penalties in section 10 which we do not have in our existing immigration laws. Moreover, within the last few days, the President signed a law passed by this Congress—Gossett bill—which grants the Attorney General additional powers for exclusion of persons who might engage in subversive activities detrimental to the United States. In other words, whatever safeguards we have in our existing immigration laws are being supplemented by additional safeguards contained in H. R. 6396.

It is safe to say that by mortgaging the future quotas as provided herein we will get under this bill the same number of immigrants but we will be getting a better type of new residents.

Your committee feels that family groups of immigrants should not be broken when admitting these people to our shores. The same qualities that contribute to the best in family life—restraint, responsibility, and consideration for others—are necessary to the making of a good citizen. Further, these people who have suffered much should not now have the further unhappiness occasioned by separation from those dear because of ties of blood.

While entertaining an honest desire to solve rather than disregard a very real problem, we were unwilling to destroy the basis of our time-tested immigration laws.

It is the consensus of the committee that in the administration of the act those safety measures and all other provisions should be strictly adhered to and meticulously enforced by our consular officers abroad and our immigration authorities in this country. Much opposition to any bill on this matter may be anticipated from those both inside and outside of Congress who have knowledge of occasions when these authorities have disregarded both the letter and the intent of the law at the behest of those in high places or on their own responsibility and for reasons or considerations undisclosed.

Opposition to any legislation on this matter is based on several arugments:

First. Our present immigration system and basic policy should not be liberalized. This bill would admit these unfortunate people under our quota system, and the 200,000 would come in not in addition to but in the place of immigrants ordinarily admissible.

Second. Objection is raised that some one nationality or group will constitute the bulk of admissions. To insure perfect fairness to the end that prejudice shall operate neither against nor in favor of any group, this bill establishes a system of proportionate admissions, so the number of any group admitted shall bear the same relation to the whole as that group bears to the total number of displaced persons.

Third. To those who say our first duty as to jobs and housing is to our own veterans, I would say I wholeheartedly agree. Provisions of the bill require evidence by a State official that necessary housing and jobs are available before admission of these immigrants.

Fourth. Opponents suggest undesirables may get in. Careful screening is provided for to eliminate possibility that those with bad moral records, those afflicted with disease or those who might endanger our public safety may be kept out. Specific provisions bar Communists and members of movements which during the war rendered aid and comfort to our enemies.

Fifth. For those who lack confidence in the persons who will have administration of the law, we have provided that violation of or conspiracy to violate its provisions constitutes a felony punishable by fine up to $10,000 and imprisonment up to 10 years.

Enactment will establish our over-all program for admission of displaced persons, superseding the President's directive of December 22, 1945.

FEARS FOR OUR SAFETY AND SECURITY AS A NATION

It was more than 300 years ago this spring—to be exact, it was 305 years ago—that the confederacy to be known as the United Colonies of New England was formed. Jamestown, Va., was settled 36 years previous, and it is said that the attempt at popular government there owed a great deal to an English aristocrat, Sir Edwin Sandys, who, to quote, "saw the need for a change in the management of affairs as a prelude to securing better colonists, a wider range of agriculture and industry, and the introduction of schools, inns, and comfortable homes."

Much of that sounds familiar. We are still concerned about industry and agriculture, homes, and schools. The matter of securing better colonists—or immigrants—remains a problem. There are two schools of thought as to whether we need colonists—or immigrants—but general agreement that if we are to have them at all, we want good ones.

I am in agreement with those in or outside of Congress who deplore the fact that in the past persons have taken advantage of the privilege offered them under our immigration laws, and entered our country to stir up strife. St. Benedict, 1,400 years ago, expressed the feeling when he said:

If any pilgrim monk come from distant parts, if with wish as a guest to dwell in the monastery, and will be content with the customs which he finds in the place, and do not perchance by his lavishness disturb the monastery, but is simply content with what he finds: he shall be received, for as long a time as he desires. If, indeed, he find fault with anything, or expose it, reasonably, and with the humility of charity, the abbot shall discuss it prudently, lest perchance God had sent for this very thing. But, if he have been found gossipy and contumacious in the time of his sojourn as guest, not only ought he not to be joined to the body of the monastery, but also it shall be said to him, honestly, that he must depart. If he does not go, let two stout monks, in the name of God, explain the matter to him.

No race and no group is the repository of all virtue or all vice. We whose very system of Government is based on the proposition that it is the individual that is important rather than the class should be the last to take any position contrary to that concept.

So far as admission to this country for residence or naturalization is concerned, I am one of those persons who might be termed a conservative, perhaps a reactionary, in my thinking. I would not be called a liberal. I believe an applicant for naturalization should be required to declare it as his intention in good faith

to become a citizen of the United States and to reside here permanently, and, if required, to bear arms in support and defense of the United States.

If this great country of ours is not worth fighting for, in the opinion of an alien, citizenship in it should not be granted to him. To conscientious objectors I would say that no freedom is restrained by such a provision. Aliens have no right to citizenship. Citizenship is offered on certain conditions as a privilege. They may take it or leave it. We want no part of qualified allegiance. We have no gradations of citizenship. Why should we have grades or degrees of allegiance?

Whenever these matters are under discussion there immediately come to my mind the histories of two native-born white Americans: one first saw the light of day in Massachusetts, the other in Kansas. Each has acted as chairman of the Communist Party. According to House Report No. 209 it was Kansas-born Earl Browder who read to 2,000 applicants for Communist Party memberhsip in the New York district in 1935 the following solemn pledge: "I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism."

On the other side of the picture I see what was to me pleasantly surprising, as it may be to you.

Before the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization frequently appears what we would term a Japanese-American, although I dislike cataloging any group as hyphenated Americans. This young man, 1 of 5 boys in a large family born in Utah to Japanese parents, with each of his brothers, was the recipient of a Purple Heart. They were members of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regiment Combat Team of the United States Army, which saw desperate fighting in Italy. Immediately after Pearl Harbor, the property in the West owned by this family was taken, and the mother was interned behind barbed wire. Notwithstanding this, the mother encouraged her sons in their desire to enlist, which all 5 did. One boy was killed in action. One is still in the hospital. All were wounded. They were but 5 of 33,300 sons of Japanese parents who served in the United States armed services during the Second World War—part in the Pacific and part in Europe. Thirty-one thousand saw overseas service. After 120 days of fighting, what started out as a team of a little over 3,000 men had total casualties of 9,486. During its rescue of the Texas battalion of 189 white Americans in the Vosges Mountains of northeast France in October 1944, 200 Japanese-Americans were killed, and more than 1,500 casualties suffered. They were a much decorated group.

The following is the creed written by one of these boys, Mike Masaoka. It is one we might well adopt ourselves, except for the first sentence:

I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future. She has granted me liberties and opportunities such as no individual enjoys in this world today. She has given me an education befitting kings. She has entrusted me with the responsibilities of the franchise. She has permitted me to build a home, to earn a livelihood, to worship, think, speak, and act as I please—as a freeman equal to every other man.

Although some individuals may discriminate against me, I shall never become bitter or lose faith, for I know that such persons are not representative of the majority of the American people. True, I shall do all in my power to discourage such practices, but I shall do it in the American way; aboveboard, in the open, through courts of law, by education, by proving myself to be worthy of equal treatment and consideration. I am firm in my belief that American sportsmanship and attitude of fair play will judge citizenship and patriotism on the basis of action and achievement, and not on the basis of physical characteristics.

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have rereceived innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places; to support her Constitution; to obey her laws; to respect her flag; to defend her against all enemies, foreign and domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

He is Japanese-American.

Those who would pounce on this emergency to liberalize our immigration policy will not like this bill. Those who honestly desire this country to share responsibility in eliminating the DP camps and finding homes for these people are being given what I feel is the most generous bill there is any possibility that Congress would pass.

I believe the bill to be eminently fair, reasonably generous, possible of passage, and a solution to a problem both heartbreaking and expensive.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. COX. I should like to exercise the privilege of complimenting the gentleman upon the high quality of his oration.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. When the gentleman said that the quotas included the Polish Army, what Polish Army is in the displaced-person camps?

Mr. FELLOWS. The estimates in some places have gone as high as 200,000. The best authority I could get yesterday was at least 50,000 of former Polish soldiers.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman also includes the Baltic States, and those of Poland east of the Curzon line. Where are any displaced persons that ever came from that territory, when Russia grabbed all of that 10,000,000 people and moved them into Siberia, out of which developed the Polish Army in Iran, which fought under Tabrook and is today in England? Where do the displaced persons come in from that east line?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not know that I said they came from east of the Curzon line. The bill in the other body placed them there. I am talking about the displaced-person camps.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] has again expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], who has given us a most statesmanlike and most illuminating speech in support of the bill. I yield to no one in my admiration for the equitable way the gentleman has handled this bill.

The pending bill is not a perfect bill. It does, however, approximate justice to the displaced persons and its passage will offer an advantage to our national economy.

It permits the entrance of 200,000 displaced persons—instead of the 400,000 provided for by the so-called Stratton bill—100,000 are to be admitted each year for 2 years. It is a compromise bill. Be it remembered, however, that most of our Anglo-Saxon civilization is based on compromise. It is a half loaf but better than no loaf at all.

The bill is in no wise discriminatory, and I emphasize one of its most praiseworthy provisions which reads as follows:

Visas issued pursuant to this act shall be made available to each element or group among the displaced persons as such elements or groups were segregated or designated for the purpose of being cared for by the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948, in the proportion that the number of displaced persons in such element or group bears to the total number of displaced persons, it being the purpose of this provision to insure that no discrimination in favor of or against any such element or group among the displaced persons shall occur.

In true American fashion, this provision utterly precludes any discrimination because of race, religion, or national origin in the issuance of visas.

For convenience sake we have grouped these homeless, driven people under one phrase, "displaced persons" and then shortened that to DP's. Perhaps that is why we have fallen into the callous error of thinking of them as a massed, faceless group. We must not lose sight of the fact that each displaced person is a living being, a man, woman, or child with eyes and ears and hands and heart, even as you and I. Each one is an integral part of human destiny. Each one of them could have been you, but for the grace of God, or a brother or father or child. If that is sentimentality, then I proudly embrace that accusation. We are dealing with human beings, not with inanimate sticks of furniture that can be indefinitely stored away until they rot. This fruitful, resourceful, God-fearing land of ours should, indeed, make room for some of them. This bill does just that.

Six hundred thousand in United States military controlled camps now are a United States responsibility. The total cost to the War Department is above $73,000,000 which is paid for by the American taxpayer. With indirect charges the cost is above $100,000,000. If we pass this bill, we shall save those sums and then, also the United States blazes the trail for the other nations to follow.

Testimony was developed before the committee, especially by General Marshall, General Hildring, former Secretary of War Patterson, that the problem would dissipate itself were we to pass legislation of the kind offered here today. Two hundred thousand is close to 24 percent of the total number of 835,000 displaced persons now in the camps in Italy, Germany, and Austria. In his report on resettlement submitted to the International Refugee Organization in January of 1947, Mr. Tuck, its directing head, stated that mass resettlement programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, contemplated the number of 234,453 displaced persons to emigrate to the 12 countries which were listed as having selection missions operating in the field: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, France, the Netherlands, Peru, the United Kingdom, Venezuela, Union of South Africa, and Switzerland. Several other countries, among which are Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Morocco, and Tunisia have also indicated their willingness to accept immigrants. If we take 200,000 great impetus will be given to the other nations to take their fair share.

I emphasize, if we do not pass the bill we shall still have to pay $73,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year for the maintenance of these camps.

Mr. CELLER. The DP's are natives in general of Poland, Russia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and so forth, where communism holds sway. They dread going back to their native lands where they might be purged.

Well, such countries as Yugoslavia, the displaced persons we are now taking care of. It would be brutal for us to send those who have a democratic ideology back to a land which has a Communist ideology and where those persons who have western ways of thinking, democratic ways of thinking, have already preached against communism or would preach against communism, would find their lives placed in jeopardy. We seek to help those.

There are four ways of approach to the problem:

First. Forcible repatriation which means, of course, sending many back to Communist-dominated countries from whence they fled, there to await an uncertain fate.

Second. Closing the camps and turning these victims of the Germans back to the Germans and the German economy. The misery that would follow such a course is plain to see.

Third. The indefinite separate maintenance in Germany, Austria, and Italy. That is the course we are presently following with its consequent waste of human lives and money.

Fourth. Their resettlement in other countries, including the United States. That is the course of the Fellows bill.

I pay tribute to the patience, wisdom, and practical sense of my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], who has so ably guided the destiny of this bill.

It has been argued in the most perverted, unfeeling, and nonfactual fashion that the admission of 200,000 unfortunates would affect our housing, jobs, and would bring into this country undesirable Communists. Let us look at these threats a little more dispassionately. Since 1940, the total immigration permitted by our laws fell short by 914,762 persons. If within the immigration laws, as they exist today, we had admitted the 914,762 persons since 1940, there would have been no outcry. It would have been accepted as the normal trend of events. But, now, when we ask for less than 25 percent of that number in the name of humanity and suffering, we are given fantastic examples of impossible logic.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the basic difference between the Fellows bill and the bill passed by the other body?

Mr. CELLER. There are many basic differences. The Fellows bill endeavors and succeeds, I am sure, in eliminating racial or religious discrimination in the issuance of visas. Unfortunately, the bill in the other Chamber deliberately seeks to discriminate on the ground of race and religion. The language embodied in this bill may seem to be innocuous, but upon careful scrutiny you will find that there is no innocence whatsoever in the bill which has emanated from the councils of the other body. It would be a travesty of justice and a flying in the face of the American tradition were we to embrace the discriminatory provisions of that bill.

In numerous other ways the bill passed by the other body is very unrealistic and unjust. But more as to this later.

It was eloquently brought to our attention by many members of distinguished welfare agencies that they would pledge their aid and assistance in the resettlement of these 200,000 displaced persons in the far-flung regions of the United States, covering many States. Among those organizations were the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Lutheran Council, the Catholic Rural Life Conference, the United Service for New Americans (Jewish), the Northern Baptist Convention, the Southern Baptist Convention, and numerous others. We have great confidence in these national organizations, knowing that they will carry out their pledges and see to it that most of these DP's will be resettled properly so that there will be no disturbance in our national economy and no aggravation of our housing shortage.

We know, for instance, that there are over 7,000 communities in the United States with a population of little over 1,000. If each such community were to take an equal share, the total number of new residents would be 15 additional persons in each community, or 5 families per year. How would that complicate the job and housing problem of the community.

Both the American Federation of Labor and the CIO have testified in favor of the bill, urging its passage without fearing that the admission of these unfortunates threaten the economic security of the United States or take away jobs from American workmen. Both organizations have pointed out existing shortages in agricultural workers, construction workers, engineers, and medical personnel. An UNRRA survey of 228,000 displaced persons revealed that 60,000 were farmers, 18,000 construction workers, 18,000 skilled in mechanical and industrial trades. There were 4,000 engineers, 3,000 physicians and dentists, 4,000 nurses, and 2,000 other workers. We need them all. In general IRO estimate one-third are skilled workers, one-fourth agricultural workers, one-tenth professionals, and the balance unskilled.

The American Legion through its national executive committee has relaxed its former opposition and now approves this emergency humanitarian legislation.

As to the Communist threat, I quote from the testimony of Secretary of State Marshall who urged immediate passage of the more liberal Stratton bill:

> There is a sharp divergence of viewpoint between the Soviet Government and our own as to what course should be pursued. The Soviet viewpoint is that these persons born in areas now subject to the Soviet governmental authority are Russian subjects and under obligation to return to such territory. They demand that we forcibly repatriate the DP's. Our view is that it is against American tradition for us to compel these persons to return against their will to those governments whose political and economic systems they are unwilling to accept.

I quote, as well, from the report of the gentleman from Kentucky, Representative FRANK L. CHELF, Democratic member of the Fulton special subcommittee, which was designated by the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to investigate the displaced-persons problem. He states in his written report most emphatically:

> As a result of a very thorough, complete, and painstaking investigation into this particular angle of the problem, I am completely convinced that the displaced persons are no more communistic in their views than any loyal, red-blooded American living in the United States today.

One further thought: As of June 30, 1946, the war-reported deaths in the armed forces from all causes were 396,228. Were this number spared the tragedy of death would we have said that our economy could not absorb them? Is not the horrible implication clear to all who opposed the admission of 200,000 that we should be glad that we have that much more room? Follow that kind of logic to its honest conclusion. If it is the absorptive capacity of the United States we are concerned with, then, let us begin a crusade for static population, or better yet, race suicide. How rigid and ingrown can we be and still boast of our vitality and growing economy?

The Fulton subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported after an exhaustive on-the-scene study of the DP's in Europe, "they are democratic and profoundly interested in settled lives in an individual economy."

I could go on and on and give you excerpts from the testimony of very distinguished witnesses, although I shall not take the time to do so, from Gen. Mark Clark, Gen. Lucius Clay, Lieutenant Colonel Sage, Attorney General Tom Clark, and former Secretary of War Patterson, all to the effect that the charges that these DP's are Communists are utterly and willfully unfounded.

How could it be otherwise? As of December 31, 1946, there were 278,868 Polish natives in the DP camps; 180,838 Baltic natives; 193,332 Jews; and 39,494 Yugoslavians. All are those who fled totalitarian rule, who linger on in hardship and despair, rather than submit to the kind of governments now imposed upon the Slavic and Baltic peoples.

Under the rule I started to answer the assertion made by the gentleman from Georgia about the word "scum," that these people were the scum of the earth. I started to indicate in the rebuttal that from the point of view of work and health and crime and political ideology it was unfortunate indeed that the gentleman used that term. I started to read from the testimony of General Hilldring, who was the direct representative of General Eisenhower on the subject of displaced persons. To continue his testimony as to the desire of these DP's to work, I read:

All responsible reports agree that the average displaced person, far from being lazy, inefficient, and irresponsible, is eager to rebuild his life through hard, constructive work, and is ready and able to accept responsibility.

As to the health of these DP's, listen to this testimony:

According to information submitted by the International Refugee Organization to the special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the health conditions in the displaced-persons camps are higher than satisfactory. In all zones combined the rate of tuberculosis is 0.3 per thousand, while the tuberculosis rate among the German people is 2.5 per thousand. The rate of venereal diseases for displaced persons is 0.4 as against 1.8 per thousand for the German population. The International Refugee Organization stressed further that the death rate among the displaced persons is 6.2 per thousand, compared with 12.6 per thousand in Great Britain in 1939.

The relatively low average age of the displaced persons help to explain the rather high birth rate among the displaced persons, which is 39.9 per thousand, compared with 14.9 per thousand for Great Britain 1939. The special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee submits that as a result of the high birth rate and the low death rate the net annual increase due to excess of births over deaths among the camp population is 20,000.

That is the best kind of testimony we can give anyone as to the health of these DP's.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CHELF. I am afraid the gentleman's figure of 20,000-per-year increase may be in error. From direct personal contact with the IRO and those who had charge of the DP camps last fall, we found out the birth rate was approximately 1,200 per month as against a death rate of some 200. So there would be an increase of only 1,000 per month, or 12,000 per year, making a total of 36,000 altogether for a period of 3 years.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman may be correct. In any event, if it is 12,000 a year, it is higher than the situation that is presented in surrounding countries and augurs well for the health of these displaced persons. I was reading from the report which was prepared by the experts of the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. These experts speak of 20,000 births per annum.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In my district, as I know there must be in the gentleman's district and many others throughout the land, there are many citizens who have relatives across the sea and who naturally are concerned for them and whose relatives have been jeopardized by the ravages of war. Does the gentleman feel that the passage of this bill will assist these citizens in getting many of these relatives over here?

Mr. CELLER. There is no reason why relatives and dear ones cannot come over. There is a pledge of quotas to the extent of 50 percent for a certain number of years to come, but within that 50 percent, preference under present statutes must be given to the dear ones of those here. So I see no danger whatsoever in that regard.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am very glad to have the gentleman's testimony.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. I would like to tell the gentleman from New York that a year ago the Committee on Un-American Activities appointed a special committee to study Communist methods in Europe in the countries that have gone behind the iron curtain. Today we have about 15 or 20 of the people who are described as being from displaced-persons camps. In every case we questioned them very closely on the number of Communists in those camps. In every case they told us there was some Communist infiltration, but the great majority of those people in the displaced-persons camps were people like themselves who are afraid of communism and who are running from communism. In other words, they pointed out that the people in the displaced-persons camps were the cream of the crop in Europe, such as artists, scholars, politicians—that is good politicians—and people who believe in democracy. May I tell the gentleman something further, if he will yield to me for just a half-minute longer, regarding the observation that the scum of Europe is in these camps. I have been making a deep study of illegal immigration in the United States for more than a year now. Many of the scum of Europe and the rest of the world are here in America and are here illegally and are coming in almost every day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] for his observation and for his support of the instant bill. Referring to the displaced persons, I share with him the desire to see that all of those who are illegally here are sent back to the countries whence they came because they should have no place here at all. May I say further with reference to displaced persons, and those who might fear that the Communists might infiltrate, that there is careful screening provided by the bill. First you have the military. There is a complete military dossier on every one of the displaced persons. Secondly you have a screening by the State Department officials, and then thirdly a screening by the immigration officials. Then there is the final screening by the Coordinator who sets up a staff here and in the displaced-persons camps. If there could be an escape, as it were, from that screening of anyone who is undesirable, I do not know how it is possible. It seems to be utterly impossible. I do not think we need have any fears on the score that anybody will come in who is not physically and mentally and politically desirable.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his outstanding talk on this legislation with reference to displaced persons. Also the outstanding talk by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]. I congratulate the committee for screening the displaced persons so that they will come in and be assigned to different occupations, such as farming, mechanics, and other skilled and unskilled work. And also that there will be arrangements made before admission to this country, that they will have proper provision and housing before they will be assigned to certain localities.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman.

Just one last word, and I shall conclude. Attempts may be made to offer amendments to admit certain classes of Europeans who may be suffering for one reason or another. Among them, Volksdeutsche, Czechs, Italians, and Poles of Ander's army. I think it would be deleterious for the final outcome of this bill. We have yet to pass this bill, and remember then we must have a conference with the other body. If we load up this bill with amendments that would admit so many diverse kinds of people, our bargaining power with the Senate is affected. We have a specific problem here, the problem of the displaced persons in DP camps. If we are going to reach out and try to help so many others who are not displaced persons, and who are all over Europe and who do not come within the definition of "displaced persons," we are going to have a great deal of difficulty, a great deal of labor to get

finally any kind of a bill. And then the problem of DP camps will still remain with us. To my mind, it is unfair for us to extend a sort of engraved invitation to so many people in various parts of Europe who may be in some kind of plight, who may be in some kind of difficulty because of circumstances beyond their control. I want to help them, but I do not think we should try to help them within the four squares of this bill. We weaken the bill if we attempt such a process. I would hope, therefore, that those who contemplate offering such amendments will think twice before doing so.

Historically, immigration has always been the main source of our unskilled labor and we are badly in need of this same unskilled labor today. When immigration was cut off in the early twenties we siphoned off labor from the farms. This practice continued through the war years. The farms are no longer the source of skilled labor. Farms are badly in need of labor themselves. We also need tailors, bricklayers, domestics, labor to dig our tunnels, build our railroads, our bridges, roads, and subways. With the expansion of education, we shall have fewer and fewer people to handle the tasks and projects which require unskilled workers. Numbers of the DP's are specially skilled like nurses, dentists, physicians, tailors, jewelers, locksmiths, radio workers, riggers, printers, masons, bricklayers, all of which are in short supply. The shortage in unskilled labor is equally obvious. The effective operation of our economy demands a ready supply of both skilled and unskilled workers. The DP's can help in both these categories. Would it be preferable to draft labor battalions or to maintain the freedom and mobility of labor? An inflexible immigration program means, eventually, the first. The present labor shortage requires the temporary relaxation of our rigid immigration policy.

I emphasize these DP immigrants will not take jobs from natives. Half the immigrants are women and children in the first place and they are consumers as are the men. They are all consumers of goods and services and thus in turn create jobs.

There is an idea prevalent in some quarters there is a limited amount of work, a lump of work, to be done in this country and that if strangers are allowed to nibble at the lump there is less for the native. All economists of note dispute this theory, that there is just a lump of work and no more. That lump expands and contracts dependent upon many factors.

In the past, the greatest periods of prosperity were the periods of greatest immigration.

I add a wire just received:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1948.*

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We are highly gratified that the House has agreed to consider the Fellows bill for the admission of displaced persons. We look to you for active support and leadership in securing its passage in substantially the present form because we believe that the displaced-persons bill passed by the Senate is inadequate and discriminatory. Over 125 national organizations have earnestly supported adequate legislation for the solution of this crucial international problem.

Friends Committee on National Legislation; Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches; National Council Jewish Women; League of Women Voters; Jewish War Veterans; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; National Women's Trade Union League; Northern Baptist Convention; United Council of Church Women; Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace; Americans for Democratic Action; American Civil Liberties Union; National Jewish Welfare Board; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society; Division of Social Education and Action of the Presbyterian Church; Women's Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has again expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the merits of the measure before us, I should like to pause to pay my respects and a well-deserved tribute to the gentleman from Maine, the chairman and the members of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

When they originally undertook the task of hearing witnesses and attempting to frame legislation in connection with the distressing problem of the displaced persons, it looked like an almost hopeless objective to try to achieve any degree of unanimity among the members of the committee or later the Members of this body. Weeks of hearings were held, covering 693 printed pages. Patiently the chairman sought to reconcile the conflicting viewpoints. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] made a distinct contribution when he brought back from Europe his own views after visiting scores of DP camps and interviewing hundreds of those there interned.

Of course it has been necessary to make concessions on one side or the other to varying viewpoints. Unquestionably, the bill as written is not precisely in the form which perhaps any one Member would prescribe, if charged singly with the task of writing such legislation. It does, however, strike a fair balance. It is the best approach yet offered combining a method of discharging our international responsibility to meet a distressing and heart-rending world problem with adequate safeguards which will protect our own economy and command widespread support for such legislation, not only among the Members of Congress, but among the people of this country.

To the gentleman from Maine and the members of his subcommittee we all owe a deep debt of gratitude for the painstaking, efficient, intelligent, and devoted manner in which they have undertaken their task, resulting in the report of this legislation from the Committee on the Judiciary with only two or three dissenting votes.

In that connection we should not overlook the diligent and able assistance rendered by the earnest and expert clerk of the subcommittee, Mr. Walter Besterman, who has in the drafting of this measure again demonstrated the high quality of performance which those of us who deal intimately with him have become accustomed to observe.

The American people, by and large, expect and have a right to expect that any legislation which we pass on this subject shall contain appropriate safeguards to insure that our own economy be not unduly disrupted by permitting these people to come to our shores and that our own people be not thrown out of work or, with the existing shortage of housing, out of their homes, by any action which we take. We must not displace already placed persons in order to place displaced persons.

The issue before us is a humanitarian, economic, political, and social problem, all rolled up into one.

How, it is reasonable and proper for us to ask, are these safeguards effected by the legislation before us?

In the first place, from a purely dollars and cents standpoint, our Government is now supporting, at the expense of the taxpayers, a very large share of the cost of maintenance of the camps housing these people overseas in Germany, Austria, and Italy. This is represented, not only by our direct contribution to the International Relief Organization, but also by our large appropriations to the Army for their work in these camps as well as the additional sums which we have advanced to other countries as their share of this international burden. The action now contemplated on our part should lead to increased efforts by other countries to accept additional numbers of these unfortunates. Indeed, very large numbers have already been given refuge in other countries. This action should lead to a definite saving to the American taxpayers of many millions of dollars each year. Those who come to this and other countries, instead of being supported at Government expense as now, will go to work gladly and willingly to take care of themselves. In other words, humanitarianism will yield direct financial dividends.

True, there are two other methods of effecting an equivalent economy—first, to cut off any contribution to the maintenance of these camps and allow these people to perish of hunger or starvation. Another is to force them to return to the countries of their origin, resulting, no doubt, in a like fate or at least the most savage reprisals. In my judgment, the American people will reject these alternatives as completely out of harmony with our inclinations or our traditions.

In order not to cause American citizens to be deprived of employment by reason of the introduction of a limited additional number of immigrants at this time it has been provided in section 5 (a) of the bill that a first preference in consideration shall be given to those with certain professions or skills. These include farm laborers, physicians, dentists,

nurses, household, construction, and clothing workers and aliens with unusual educational or scientific qualifications. These are for the most part those occupations where there now exists a need in many parts of our country for such workers.

Then it is provided in the next succeeding section 6 that before any of those who are to come to this country under the provisions of this act shall be allowed to take up their residence in a particular State, the Governor of that State must certify to the fact that housing and employment exist and that a settlement opportunity is presented there for a certain number of this, that, or the other type of worker. This does not mean that the Chief Executive of the State must pass upon each particular case. The Governor of Iowa may certify, for instance, that 500 farm laborers are needed, or the Governor of New York, that 1,000 household or clothing workers may advantageously be fitted into the economy of that State.

In addition, provision is made for the filing of a bond, indemnifying the State against any such immigrant becoming a public charge.

The fact of the matter is, therefore, that these provisions set up safeguards over our own economy which are not existent under our general immigration law. The same is true of the other provisions of this bill which I shall discuss in a moment. This measure, if properly administered, should result in bringing to this country a better type of future citizen under conditions more favorable to his assimilation, than has at any time existed under any immigration measure placed on our statute books.

What are the other provisions of this law which particularly commend it to our favorable consideration?

A second preference, junior to that arising by reason of occupation, is given to aliens who are blood relatives of citizens of this country. Certainly that is a humanitarian and wise provision. Those of us who were spared the distress of having a close relative suffer as these poor people have done at the hands of their aggressors, can scarcely comprehend, I suppose, the heartaches endured by American citizens, themselves living in comfort, when they realized the indescribable suffering of their own flesh and blood. To what more noble purpose could we possibly direct our legislative energies than toward assisting our own people to discharge the family responsibility which they feel and yearn to fulfill in bringing once more a ray of light and hope into the lives and hearts of their kinfolk who have known nothing but darkness and despair.

It has been said, I feel sure, with a high degree of recklessness and under a complete misapprehension as to the facts, that the passage of this legislation will deluge this country with Communists, Fascists, or others who will subvert our institutions and seek to overthrow those ideals and principles which have made our country great. No doubt those advancing this contention do so in good faith. This has been said in effect on many occasions by those whose loyalty to our country is without question, indeed, whose very loyalty has prompted their opposition on this ground.

A careful review of the unbiased evidence in the case, disclosed in the voluminous hearings before the committee, buttressed by the findings of those who have studied the situation, is to the effect that, with very few exceptions, those in these DP camps are the most vehement opponents of any form of totalitarianism to be found anywhere on the face of the globe. They have been persecuted, branded, tortured by the Communists and by the Fascists and in many tragic instances by both. They hate communism. They hate fascism. They passionately yearn for freedom. These people bear on their bodies and in their hearts the scars of a slave existence which gives them an appreciation of the meaning of becoming an American, which those of us blessed with the privilege of birth and life in freedom will probably never be able fully to understand.

As to the small minority, which no doubt exists, consisting of those who would not make desirable United States citizens, this bill provides that no person who is or has been a member of any movement hostile to this country or its form of government can be considered for admission under the provisions of this legislation.

Another feature which commends this bill is its utter freedom from any element of discrimination. Some of the measures introduced on this subject are open to that objection. The attention of the Members, however, is called to section 3 (a) (2) providing that visas issued under the act shall be made available in the various camps and other areas to each element or group of nationals or religious faiths, in exact proportion to the numbers there situated. Not only is there an absence of discrimination, there is an express prohibition against it.

A nation dedicated to religious freedom cannot do otherwise. Roughly, displaced persons consist of 62 percent Roman Catholic, 23 percent Jewish, and 15 percent Protestant. Approximately, in those proportions, they will be admitted.

In nationality the same holds true; 31 percent are Polish, 21 percent Balts, 14 percent Ukrainian, and so on. In those proportions, admission will follow.

In order to take care of those who can properly be classified as displaced persons who are already in this country, it is provided in section 4 that up to a limit of 15,000 shall be permitted to remain here permanently with the same quota provisions as relate to those overseas.

As to the administration of this bill, it provided in section 8 for a Coordinator for the Resettlement of Displaced Persons. His duties are to oversee the administration of the act, including a thorough screening of all applicants, to make semiannually reports to the Congress, to assist in the settlement of the displaced persons in the various states and to hasten the cooperation of other nations through the International Refugee Organization in the solution of this distressing problem, so as to expedite the closing of the camps and termination of this emergency situation.

Finally, the date mentioned in the bill, April 21, 1947, deserves comment. In order to qualify as a displaced person one must have entered Italy, Germany or Austria prior to this date. Some feel that the date should be sometime in the fall of 1945 at approximately the time the war ended. The fact remains, however, that very large numbers of these persecuted people fled from their native lands following the war after suffering most cruel experiences. They are entitled equally to our consideration and will equally yield dividends in good citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, under the carefully worded provisions of this bill, we need have no fear in this great Nation over the effects of admitting 200,000 of these homeless and suffering people within our gates. No other nation in the world has amalgamated so many blood strains as ours. Therein, to no small degree, lies our strength.

Nor does the jurisdiction of our conscience stop at the water's edge. Failure to act, and to act now, will leave a scar upon the hearts of all those who feel that the unnecessary degradation of human beings anywhere imperils human security and dignity everywhere. We will live more comfortably with ourselves when we have passed this measure.

We are dealing not in statistical abstractions but with human souls whose suffering and persecution have given them a compelling claim upon humanity. If we drop an iron curtain on this side of these helpless victims of chaos, true, we will injure them. But they will not be the only ones to lose. We, too, will lose in the respect both of our friends and of ourselves.

By furnishing this asylum to a handful of the world's tyrannized and oppressed, we will enrich our own Nation and discharge an international obligation from which neither our own conscience nor our position of world leadership permits escape.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is unnecessary for me to review in any detail the necessity for action on the part of Congress to pass legislation for the admission of displaced persons. We regard ourselves as the leading democratic country in the world. The American people pride themselves in the assistance they have given and still are giving to the people of the war-devastated countries. It would be less than fair to the American people if this body, which should be representative of public opinion, failed to act on this matter. It will be difficult indeed for our representatives in world councils to support our claims for humanitarian motives and democratic objectives if we fail to pass this legislation.

At the same time, it is absurd for us to contend that we would suffer great harm from the admission of displaced persons. If we will be perfectly truthful with ourselves we will discover that exactly the reverse is true. Many of the displaced persons possess skills urgently needed in American industry. I will not presume to cover all aspects of this matter, but I do wish to call particular attention to the need of skilled tailors in the men's clothing industry. Through long personal acquaintance in the industry, I believe I can speak with some authority.

This country has traditionally depended on European immigration for many of its tailors. During the war years when immigration was virtually shut off, the clothing industry encountered a growing shortage of skilled needleworkers. At the present time over 6,000 tailors are needed in the New York area alone and an equal or greater number could be used in the rest of the country. To take a specific example, the Hickey-Freeman Co., which manufactures men's clothing, has been trying since last August to bring in 300 immigrant tailors and has to date succeeded in getting 24.

Mr. Harry A. Cobrin, the executive secretary of the Clothing Manufacturers Association, which represents 90 percent of the output of the entire mens' and boys' tailored clothing industry recently made the following statement:

The employers in the industry are confronted with a serious labor shortage which threatens their production. This shortage results from (a) curtailment of immigrant labor commencing shortly after World War I, which was the principal source of labor supply; (b) decreasing numbers of workers entering the tailoring trades; and (c) impossibility to manufacture tailored clothing exclusively by machines.

Because of the nature of tailored clothing there is an emphasis on hand or needle work in the manufacturing process. Consequently, the introduction of new methods of manufacturing and new machinery does not obviate the need for skilled-hand workers. The industry has attempted to eliminate the serious bottleneck resulting from this shortage by engaging in overtime operations. This practice has not sufficed. The only solution is to acquire an additional number of hand tailors.

Some evidence of the position in which the industry finds itself is reflected by the extremely advanced average age of its employees: the average age of all the production workers in the industry is 46.4 years; the average age of the hand tailor in the industry is over 51 years. By reason of the advanced age of the hand tailors, their ranks are being rapidly reduced by death and disability.

Industry conferences and appeals to the immigration authorities to relax even on a temporary basis the strict quotas, so that skilled tailors could be obtained has failed because only Congress has the authority to modify our immigration practices.

The hopes of the industry for the past 2 years have been pinned on the Stratton bill which would have allowed the admission of 400,000 displaced persons. This bill—the Fellows bill—reduces this number to 200,000 to be charged against future immigration quotas. Because it appears to be the only chance for action on this matter in the Eightieth Congress, I am in support of the Fellows bill.

I notice in the Judiciary Committee report on page 16 that the skilled occupations of these displaced persons are listed. Those who possess tailoring skill head the list with 6,458 persons. Many other skilled workers are listed who are equally in demand for other industries.

I have been in correspondence with Mr. Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and he has further verified the need for additional workers in the industry. He has assured me of the full and active cooperation of his union in securing DP tailors for the clothing industry.

I wish to commend the committee on giving a priority in section 5 (a) to clothing and garment workers. I wish to also commend them for their provision which allows blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted aliens, a special priority.

The clothing industry can easily absorb all the available skilled tailors in the displaced-persons camps of Europe, to the benefit of the clothing industry and the clothing consumers of the United States. I am sure that other industries can also absorb their quota of people who are skilled in other equally important trades.

We must remember that America was built on wave after wave of immigration from Europe. American stock is composed of many races and religions and therein lies its strength and the secret of its virility. All of these people have contributed to the inventive and productive total which has made America the foremost Nation in the world.

We owe a tremendous debt to the victims of Nazi persecution. If we pay that debt by extending a haven to 200,000 or more of these victims, I am sure that in the long run the bread which we cast on the waters will be returned to us many fold.

Too many of us have forgotten that the basis of so much of our strength, was found in our willingness to accept European immigrants to our shores.

We have forgotten the famous inscription found on the Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable FRANK FELLOWS, of Maine. There is not a more able, a more sincere legislator in this body than he is. I have a feeling that deep down in his heart he does not like this bill very much better than I do.

I want to state in the beginning that those of us who are opposed to this bill are not opposed to immigrants or to immigration. We are proud of the strong immigrant blood that went into the building of this country. But times have changed and so have the immigrants.

THE BEST INTEREST OF AMERICA IS THE SOLE CRITERION BY WHICH TO JUDGE DP LEGISLATION

One's attitude toward DP legislation should not be determined on the basis of votes, or of expediency, but solely on the ground of what is for the best interest of this Nation. The most ardent proponents of DP legislation agree to this yardstick and criterion, but refuse to apply it.

AMERICA ALREADY HAS THE LARGEST ALIEN POPULATION OF ANY NATION IN THE WORLD

According to the 1940 census, about 35,000,000 of our then 140,000,000 inhabitants were of recent immigrant origin. Eleven million five hundred thousand people were listed as of foreign birth, and over 23,000,000 people had at least one foreign-born parent. The 1940 census lists six cities of more than 500,000 population in this country where less than 40 percent of the white population were of native parentage. There were 11 cities of between 100,000 and 500,000 population where less than 40 percent of the white population were of native parentage. Since 1940, unofficial figures show our population has grown almost 13,000,000. Ten and one-half millions of these are due to the excess of births over deaths. This leaves nearly two and one-half million people who have come here through immigration. We naturalized more than 110,000 aliens serving in our armed forces; we welcomed more than 100,000 alien war brides. We have permitted visitors to come, and many to stay. Ministers and professors, and other classes, have come, over and above quota restrictions. In 1940, 1,047 newspapers in this country were published in 38 foreign languages. Even now, the ratio of foreign-born to native-born voters in many Northeastern States is approximately one to three. Our assimilation machinery is already clogged. The melting pot has not melted. New York City, into which most of the DP's have come, and will continue to come, is screaming its head off about the influx of Puerto Ricans. Already, almost one-fourth million Puerto Ricans have flocked into New York City. They have had to set up Puerto Rican aid societies. They are trying to stem the tide of this influx of Americans from the terribly overcrowded islands of Puerto Rico. More DP's from Europe will greatly aggravate this situation.

WHAT'S BEHIND THE DP BILLS—WHO SUPPORTS THEM AND WHY—DP'S FURNISH BIGGEST LOBBY—WHERE DID THE MONEY COME FROM?

Of those lobbying in Washington, the biggest spenders are shown to be the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. This lobby admits spending more than $385,000 in 1947. For more than

2 years they have maintained a large staff in the city of Washington. In addition to their Washington lobby they have set up committees in every State in the Union. Their propaganda has been clever, well organized, and misleading. Does anyone know who has furnished this money, and why they have been so generous? We submit that most of the money has been spent not for love of America, or to promote American interests.

WHO ARE THE DP'S?

Although allied military authorities successfully repatriated more than 7,000,000 so-called DP's soon after the war, some 800,000 have simply refused to go home, and remain uninvited guests in our DP camps. Most of these 800,000 have flocked into our camps since the shooting stopped. Many of them came from behind the iron curtain. Many of them came because the food was better and more plentiful. Many of them came to use the camps for black-market operations. Many others came as a means of getting to America. The cream has been skimmed off the camps time and again. While a few good people of the unemployable type remain, most of these DP's are the refuse of Europe. Our camps are literally filled with bums, criminals, subversives, revolutionists, crackpots, and human wreckage.

THAT DP'S HAVE NO PLACE TO GO IS A FALLACIOUS ARGUMENT

Voluminous hearings before our committee fail to reveal that any of the 7,000,000 who submitted to repatriation were liquidated upon their return home. The DP's could go home if they would. They could remain in Europe in areas where now located. Again, there are many places in the world other than America in which they might be settled. A famous Columbia University professor of geography, in an article appearing in the November issue of the American Magaine for 1945, entitled "New Lands for Europe's Uprooted Millions," points out that 71,000,000 Europeans were uprooted by the swirling tides of war. He then enumerates places in which 83,000,000 Europeans could be settled under healthy and prosperous conditions, this without settling one such person in the United States of America. Area No. 10, designated by Professor Renner, is described as being "the best area available in Africa in the Kenya highlands."

Here—

He says—

are 200,000 square miles awaiting European settlement. The climate is like that of southern California in spring and summer. Cotton, corn, rubber, millet, and livestock grow well. At least 6,000,000 Europeans could be accommodated there.

Arthur Caldwell, Australian commissioner of immigration, recently stated:

If we could get 200,000 adult and junior workers here tomorrow, Australia would get them all work within a week.

Robert Prigent, while Minister of Population in France, stated:

Unless we import 3,000,000 workers within the next 10 years, France cannot survive.

I have here newspaper headlines saying:

South America seeks 7,000,000 immigrants within 10 years.

Recently, Guatemala offered to take 50,000 DP's upon conditions that they settle in rural areas. But IRO would have none of it. In other words, it is not a question of no place to go; it is simply a matter of, "We want to go to America."

DP LEGISLATION WOULD REWARD THE LEAST DESERVING AND THE LEAST DESIRABLE

Bear in mind that at least 50,000,000 people were displaced by war. In our zones of Europe are many thousands of White Russians who would like to come to America. At least 10,000,000 Germans were forcibly uprooted from behind the iron curtain and thrown into our zones of Germany. Many of them do not even speak German. They were driven from substantial homes in which their families had lived for generations. None of these Germans, or White Russians, are classified as DP's. Most of them are more deserving and more desirable, and are of better stock than the persons remaining, after 2 years, in the DP camps. Americans are far more considerate of their herds of livestock than we are of our children in this matter of DP importation.

MANY TROJAN HORSES IN DP CAMPS

There can be no doubt but many of those registered as DP's awaiting passage to America have been schooled in subversive activities, and seek entry here to serve foreign ideologies. Even the sincere DP's have no concept of, or love for, democracy, but would be an unconscionable burden upon American institutions. If we are to add to our tide of immigration, let us get the best, not the worst.

ARGUMENT THAT "WE NEED THEM" IS ABSURDLY FALSE

Proponents of DP legislation have never answered or attempted to answer this proposition: If a DP would be useful to us, would he not be more useful in the rehabilitation of Europe? Why send American dollars and men abroad to help Marshall plan countries, and at the same time bring any useful DP to America? In a recent speech, President Truman cried out, "Our housing shortage is almost a fatal one." To bring more displaced persons here would greatly aggravate all of the social, political, and economic problems with which we must now struggle. My files, and your files, are filled with letters from distressed veterans who have no place to live; veterans who gave up homes and jobs to serve their country in time of war. Proponents of DP legislation would add to their distress, and to their problems. Any DP that we need is more badly needed elsewhere.

TO CRY OUT THAT WE HAVE A MORAL OBLIGATION TO CARE FOR THOSE LEFT IN DP CAMPS IS A PERVERSION OF CHRISTIAN IDEALS AND AN INSULT TO AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE

Not only did we spend $360,000,000,000 in the recent war, and suffer 1,000,000 casualties, but we have spent, or obligated ourselves to spend, since the shooting stopped, more than $31,000,000,000. All of this was done, and is being done, without asking for territory or reparation in return. We have been more than good samaritans. To argue that we must now further open our overcrowded homes and burden our institutions with those who would be liabilities to us is to surrender the very things for which the war was fought. These proposals are a sin against our present and our future generations. We are now asked to simply add to the long list of crimes committed in the name of Christian charity.

THE CLAIM THAT DP'S WILL BE CAREFULLY SCREENED IS ABSURDLY FALSE

Since December 1945 we have been admitting DP's under a Presidential directive which set aside 90 percent of the nonpreference quota for those in DP camps. While this directive calls for careful screening, a little research reveals that the screening has been a joke. Many criminals and Communists have been coming in with DP credentials. The screening under these proposed bills would doubtless be worse than under the Presidential directive. The screening would obviously be far more superficial than under normal immigration procedure.

WHY WEAKEN AMERICA AT A TIME WHEN STRENGTH IS NEEDED?

We are told on every hand that America should be strong and unified. By no stretch of the imagination could the DP's add to our strength and unity; quite the reverse is obviously true.

To enact DP legislation will be to lose another battle in the cold war—to inject more poison into the national bloodstream. We should not become less selective and less restrictive in matters of immigration at a time when our every interest demands that we be more restrictive and more selective. Congress should refuse these selfish, destructive appeals to American generosity and American gullibility.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Regarding the housing situation, I want to read some testimony given by the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, Mr. Foley, during the course of the hearings on the Stratton bill. He said:

In view of this circumstance, considering the present housing demand, the National Housing Administrator nevertheless advised me "it is the view of the National Housing Agency that the enactment of H. R. 2910 could have only a relatively small effect on the over-all housing shortage, and it has no objection to its enactment."

That comes from Mr. Foley, the National Housing Administrator.

Mr. GOSSETT. He is another Charlie McCarthy insofar as this bill goes. There are four or five warehouses in your home city of Detroit that are filled now with displaced persons.

Again, they say that these people will go to the farms. In 1946 1 percent of them went to the farms. We got to raising Cain about that, and the Immigration Service went to work and

tried their best to get up some statistics on DP's as agricultural workers for the following year, and the best they could do was 6 percent, and probably 5 percent of those just passed over some farm and then went back into the slums of New York City or Chicago.

You have 10,000,000 good German folks in our occupied zone who are more distressed and more in need than any person in the displaced-persons camps. They were driven out from behind the iron curtain as a result of the Yalta and other agreements. Some did not even speak German. You have 300,000 Russians, only a few of whom are in the displaced persons camps. You have 100,000 who came into our camps in 1946 and 1947 from behind the iron curtain, and probably 50 percent of them are Communists. They tell you they will be screened. Listen, that is one of the most laughable things I ever heard of. The President issued a directive in December 1945, written by Samuel Rosenman, in which he set up 90 percent of the nonpreference quotas for DP's. It had some safeguards in it.

It says:

Visas shall be distributed fairly among persons of all faiths, creeds, and nationalities. I desire that special attention be devoted to orphaned children, to whom it is hoped the majority of visas will be issued.

So how many orphaned children have come in? About 400.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. I think that is an important point. On December 22, 1945, a declaration was made by the President that one-half of all quotas should be used to bring in orphans. When we had hearings in Detroit, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and another Member served on that committee, the State Department testified that they went all through Europe and had to beat the bushes to find 600 orphans. Yet any fool knows there were 2,000,000 of them. But that is what the State Department has been doing. Someone within the State Department has jumbled up the whole affair as far as DP's are concerned.

Mr. GOSSETT. And they are going to continue to jumble it up. If this bill is passed, it is going to be a license to the State Department and the Immigration Service to do just about what they want to do. They are going to go over there, and the DP's that can put on the most pressure are the ones that are coming over, and they will be the least deserving and the least desirable. This is another abject surrender to minority group pressure, and it is going to be a major defeat in the cold war, because we are going to get folks that cannot be assimilated. Ninety percent of them will be charges on the social, political, and economic life of this country, and troublemakers.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not true that the bill also provides that a man and wife may bring in their children, and those children may come in outside the quota?

Mr. GOSSETT. As soon as he becomes a naturalized citizen he can do that.

Mr. FELLOWS. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Ohio has not read the bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes, I have.

Mr. FELLOWS. The children do not come in outside the quota.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. They come in as special immigrants under special privileges.

Mr. FELLOWS. Is the gentleman talking about orphans or the children of these immigrants?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am talking about the children.

Mr. FELLOWS. Then the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. GOSSETT. The wives could come in.

There has been a great deal of sentimentality about this bill. I am a sentimentalist, but my sentimentality has been tempered by realism. The golden door to which reference has been made is our door. It is a blood-stained door. No human being has any moral or legal right to come in through that door except at our request or with our permission. Here is a little poem which is an antidote to the recitation which proponents quote from the Statue of Liberty. I want to conclude my remarks with this poem, which is entitled "Unguarded Gates":

UNGUARDED GATES

O Liberty, white Goddess! is it well
To leave the gate unguarded? On thy breast
Fold Sorrow's children, soothe the hurts of fate,
Lift the downtrodden, but with hand of steel
Stay those who to thy sacred portals come
To waste the gifts of freedom. Have a care
Lest from thy brow the clustered stars be torn,
And trampled in the dust. For so of old
The thronging Goth and Vandal trampled Rome
And where the temples of the Caesers stood
The lean wolf unmolested made her lair.

—*Thomas Bailey Aldrich.*

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe this displaced persons bill is the best compromise that can be obtained at this time, if the displaced persons problem is to be considered at this session of Congress. I compliment FRANK FELLOWS, chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, as well as the Judiciary Committee itself, for coming up with a really practical answer. I would like to see the bill amended in many respects, but I think we in the House should accept the judgment of the committee which has studied this problem as the best compromise at present available.

You say, "Well, FULTON, aren't you just taking it pretty much on a matter of the word of the committee?" The answer to that is "No." Because I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs consisting of PFEIFFER, of New York, CHELF, of Kentucky, and JAVITS, of New York, which went to Europe last summer and for months inspected the displaced-persons camps. In fact, we went all over Europe, and I believe we on our subcommittee saw more displaced persons than any person now living, even the people working with the International Refugee Organization. We visited large camps and small camps. We went out and saw individuals and tracked down all these things that my learned colleague spoke about. When we went into the camps, we would spend a half a day or a day tracking down some of the comments of certain Congressmen who went into a camp where they had 4,500 people in Germany and spent 5 to 10 minutes there. When we finished that particular checking, we had put the camp through a fine-tooth comb and found out what they were doing. We found out about the real democracy in these camps, and we checked and found no communism among the residents. We admired their excellent rehabilitation work and resettlement work. We consulted with the Army, and occupation and IRO officials, on the handling of these camps, and we made a thorough job of it. We prepared a comprehensive report on displaced persons, which is 88 printed pages long, and I have yet to find in any respect that it has been contradicted, although the complete printing has been exhausted by requests. In fact, the Army has complimented it as being true and factual. The International Refugee Organization has also stated it is an entirely objective and complete examination of the subject. The State Department has commented on the factual truth of the document, as well as the encyclopedic character of it. Now let me completely dispute and disprove what the previous speaker, the gentleman from Texas, said on one positive to show that he is wrong on other things. I do not have time in 4 minutes to dispute many of his figures and statements nor the high sounding phrases about the Statue of Liberty.

When I used to be coach of the Harvard debating team when I went to school there, we could always tell when a gentleman got on thin ice, when he brought in either patriotism to an extreme degree or took down the light on the Statute of Liberty. I just heard that here.

May I point out to you in our subcommittee's report the statements as to the figures on the admission of unaccompanied children, pages 78, 79, and 80. There have been 1,157 unaccompanied children admitted to the United States for the fiscal years 1946–47 and the ensuing 2 months. The distribution is as follows: 122 in July, 47 in August, 74 in September, 84 in October, etc., and the whole list is itemized specifically by months. So the gentleman is completely in error as to his figures on this one point. Why is he not in error on the others? You read further, and you will find what your committee for the care of European children has done for these children, and the 2,500 unaccompanied children that still remain in Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, in answer to my good friend and colleague on the committee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], insofar as Charlie McCarthy testifying before our Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, I would like to point out to you, in all fairness, I am sure he does not mean, in any sense of the word, that General Marshall is a Charlie McCarthy, or that Judge Patterson, former Secretary of War, is a Charlie McCarthy, or that Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor, or Mr. Murray, of the CIO, the Honorable Tom Clark, Attorney General, or many of the other outstanding church and professional men and women throughout the length and breadth of this Nation are Charlie McCarthys who testified before the committee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield briefly.

Mr. FULTON. And he did not mean, did he, that Jerry Sage, the colonel who was captured and in prison camps and now in charge of the displaced persons for the Army, testified as a Charlie McCarthy?

Mr. CHELF. I am sure he did not, because he was one of our outstanding heroes in World War II. Jerry served in a concentration camp with many of these displaced persons that he later had the opportunity of supervising from the American occupation standpoint.

Now, something has been said by the gentleman from Texas about the labor situation. For the benefit of the House, I would like to read a quotation from the record as to just what the labor situation is in the country. This was on June 6, 1947, 1 year and 4 days ago today. This was Mr. Green testifying.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Green, in your opinion, if the 400,000 are brought in, say all this year, in order to relieve the misery and suffering and want and privation and starvation, would this then affect the employment problem?

Mr. GREEN. No; I do not think it would affect it in the least.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, if the 400,000 were brought in this year, all at one time rather than to be spread out over 4 years?

Mr. GREEN. You ask my opinon on that?

Mr. CHELF. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREEN. It is my opinion that we could absorb 400,000 in a year without affecting the employment problem as it is now. But this bill provides for 100,000 a year for 4 years.

Of course, bear in mind that was in relation to the then existing H. R. 2910, the Stratton bill, which sought to admit 400,000 displaced persons in the United States.

Now, there has been something said about displaced persons on a farm in Germany. I do not know anything about this particular farm, but I do know this, that out of over 200 displaced persons' camps which the Fulton subcommittee inspected—we saw many farms and personally talked with hundreds of farmers. To me it was absolutely amazing to discover that there was such a large percentage of these unfortunates who had a fairly decent command of the English language. Frankly, I sincerely welcomed the opportunity to be able to see for myself to just what extent a farm could be operated without any farm machinery or other necessary farm implements. As you know I represent a farming or agricultural section, and I wanted to know the answer. I wanted to have a look-see insofar as the farm problem was concerned. In one of these camps particularly we found that there was a young DP in charge of some 225 young boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 18 years. They had taken over an old 300-acre farm which was formerly used as a German air base. On this old airfield they had plowed, they had planted, and they had harvested crops consisting chiefly of wheat, potatoes, hay, and many vegetables so sorely needed to augment their inadequate diet. Such energy and industry upon their part helped to raise their daily calories from 1,500 and 1,600 up to slightly over the 2,000 per day, which is the bare minimum that a human body requires.

I might add that these DP farmers had chickens, and they had hogs, and they had cattle, and they were doing a pretty fine job for a bunch of homeless and stateless kids.

Now, let us get back to the other question which has been raised by the opposition—the housing problem. Frankly, I am deeply interested in the farm situation as such will be affected by this bill; and bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, this bill does not provide for the bringing in of 400,000. It is the result of one long year of hard work by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization. We have gotten together and we believe we have a fair, honest, equitable approach in the form of a 200,000 compromise on the 400,000 requested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON].

I have just received this morning from the Census Bureau of the Department of Agriculture a statement to the effect that the number of tenants in the United States in 1940 was 2,397,622 tenant farmers; but in 1945, Mr. Chairman—and the Members representing farm districts should listen to this—there were only 1,897,306, or a dead loss of 500,316. According to this release by our own Department of Agriculture here in Washington we badly need additional tenant farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I may say at the outset that I yield to no man insofar as my Americanism is concerned. There is no Member, man or woman, of this body that loves these United States any more than I; and let me say to you one thing sincerely and from the bottom of my heart: If I thought for one minute that any one of these people that we seek to alllow to enter this country as an immigrant was a Communist I would be the last man to take the floor of this House and speak in the interest of this bill.

Let us analyze the situation. We have heard all of the charges and condemnations hurled at the DP's—but I am going to enumerate six indictments which have been drawn by opponents of this bill.

First, that they are Communists.

Second, that they are all Jews.

Third, that they are all black marketeers.

Fourth, that they are lazy, that they will not work, and they cannot work.

Fifth, that they are illiterate, unclean, unkempt, and unshaven.

Sixth, that they are all criminals, a bunch of hoodlums.

I was really surprised to hear my good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], make the statement which in so many words said that these people were the scum of the earth. I resent that implied criticism of my good friends, Democrats and Republicans, who were on the Herter committee and who made a grand study of the European economic problem—and a beautiful job they did, believe you me, a magnificent job. However, I resent anybody saying after having gone into only a couple of displaced-persons' camps, and having made only a cursory study that they can give you a full report on the existing conditions in those camps. The Fulton subcommittee personally visited over 200 displaced-persons' camps and we interviewed over 4,000 individual DP's of all types and kinds, and of all nationalities. My good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] represents a fine Polish district and I have no quarrel with him, but let me say that the Poles are treated fairly in this bill. Somebody has made the statement that this bill ought to bring in the 18,000 who served in the Polish Army and who are now located in free England. Well, there are 40,000 Poles who are good, fine, clean, honorable people who would make fine United States citizens now in the DP camps, and they would be taken into consideration under the provisions of this bill. They have a sanctuary in England, but what we are trying to do is liquidate a problem that now exists, a cancerous sore, which is a blight on the free, respectable Christian people of the world. A problem which could very well be the seeds of world war III.

But, Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it, we are not going to cure the troubles of the world by pouring out millions and billions for the rehabilitation or the reconstruction of factories, bridges, churches, and all of the material things of Europe.

If you do not spend some time, some effort and give some consideration to the displaced persons, those poor people who are without hope, who have suffered untold privation and personal indignities and who are languishing in these camps over there, you are sidestepping the problem and will never be able to solve it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I am sorry but I cannot yield until I have completed my statement.

Insofar as the Polish situation is concerned let us break it down by nationality. Of the total number of people in the DP camps 31 percent are Polish, 23 percent Jewish, 20 percent Balts, 14 percent Ukrainians, while there are 7 percent Yugoslavs in the DP camps, with 7 percent White Russians, Rumanians, Czechoslovakians and stateless people. These are the hard, cold figures.

I knew you were entitled to the facts and I am trying to give them to you. Let me say that I have no axe to grind. There are not 50 foreign-born people in the 300,000 constituents I have the honor to represent. I want to say further that there are not 100 first generation-born in my good district. My people back home are the salt of the earth; good, clean, honest Americans. Let me say to you they are just as kind, just as sympathetic, just as generous, and just as understanding as all of the Americans throughout the United States. They have a heart as big as a watermelon, a Texas watermelon if you please.

I mentioned a while ago that the chief criticism of this legislation—the chief worry of those who are against this bill, was that the DP's are Communists. Now, let us analyze this situation. It has been stated here that they are Communists. But let me say to you quite frankly that all of these good people from Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries are those poor devils who were conquered and who were taken over at bayonet point by the Germans. Many of their loved ones, their wives and their children were slaughtered like pigs before their very eyes. Their homes, and their possessions were sacked and burned. In addition they were subjected to unconscionable personal indignities by maniacal perverts and sadists and those who were then physically able, were marched off to German concentration camps at the point of a gun and tattooed like branded cattle. When the Russians marched back from Stalingrad and the same territory was reconquered, do you think these poor miserable human beings were released from the hell of the German concentration camps? No. What happened to them? The Russian hierarchy and their army ably assisted by the Russian NKVD took these same, poor, pathetic unfortunates, these poor homeless people, these people the opponents of this bill call crumbs and the hard core, were driven like cattle before the Russian hierarchy and charged with being pro-Nazis, collaborators, and sympathizers and instead of being released, merciful God, they were tattooed on the other arm and slapped into a Russian concentration camp. Is it any wonder my colleagues why these poor DP's hate, loathe, despise, abhor, and detest communism and all Germany. Those who escaped are in our DP camps.

I am not telling you what I heard over the radio; I am not telling you what I read in the newspapers; I am telling you what I saw over there. Thank heaven I had an opportunity to go. At the outset I was against the Stratton bill. I was against any of this sort of legislation and I prepared to issue a press release condemning the whole business. I could have gone home, I could have got on the highest hilltop and beat the biggest bass drum I could find and shout, "Keep the bums out, keep all of them out," but, no, I did not do that. I said to myself: "I am one member of six on the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the great Judiciary Committee of the most outstanding deliberative body in the world." I will tell you what I finally concluded. I had no busines to judge this problem from strictly a local standpoint, because we six men were not representing an average of 300,000 people back in our immediate congressional district. We were representing 23,333,333 people, because 6 men divided into 140,000,000 people numerically presented each of us with the representation of 23,333,333 citizens of these United States. I did not want to be placed in the attitude of deciding an issue, or rendering a decision in a case, before I had heard the evidence and the argument of counsel. No judge will do that; no fair minded, unbiased, unprejudiced American would ever do that. I think we have eliminated the Communist angle.

Now, let us talk about the Jews. There are only 23 percent of them Jewish. So they are not all Jews, and what is more, 90 percent of the Jews want to go to Palestine. You spoke about black marketeering. You say they are lazy, they are illiterate, they will not work. Let me tell you one thing right now, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a class of people in all of my life who with so little, did so much. Oh, yes; there was some black marketeering. But we are to blame. The Congress is to blame, everybody that has these poor, miserable unfortunates under their control is to blame because we have denied them a medium of exchange. They are not allowed to have the American dollar, they are not allowed to have the French franc, they are not allowed to have the German mark, they are not allowed to have the Russian ruble. They have no medium of exchange, so the only thing they can use as money is a wee bit of candy, chewing gum, or some American cigarettes.

In one of these camps I saw this beautiful, exquisite work being done by young girls and women. They were teaching sewing in these camps. I said to the DP lady in charge, "How do you get the material to make this lovely pillow case?" She said, "We have none." I said, "How did you get this particular yarn and linen?" She said, "Well, they call it the black market." I said, "But how d- you get it?" She said, "We use three American packs of cigarettes to get the yarn and materials to go into this work and we buy it from the Germans here." I said, "What do you do with it after it is finished?" She said, "We sell it to the wives of your GI soldiers over here." I said, "How much do you get for it?" She said, "Five packs of cigarettes." I said, "How long does it take to make that article?" She said, "Ten days." I replied: "In other words, the cost is three packages of cigarettes; wages of two packages of cigarettes, and 10 days to make this article. Who gets the extra two packs? The individual who made it?" "No," she answered. "The extra two packs of cigarettes, which is our profit, goes back into the till." To do what? She explained that it was to purchase additional yarn to make another beautiful tablecloth, towel, or pillowcase. You see what I mean? That is why the black market is a misnomer, and they say these DP's cannot and will not work. Did you ever see such beautiful, magnificent and exquisite workmanship in your life as I hold before you? Yes, this album was made of bits of scrap metal from airplanes left from the war. Here is another one. You talk about not being willing to do a job. Look at this. This hand-carved cigarette box was made in one of these DP camps. Are they the lazy, illiterate crumbs, the scum of the earth that nobody wants? This plate or card tray, my friends, was made out of some bits of war wreckage; from some of the planes shot down overseas right near the air base where this DP camp was located. Did you ever see a better job than that? What did they do it with? With their hands, because they had absolutely no machinery to do the job with.

I submit to you again, I am giving you the facts as I saw them. If I thought they were bums, if I thought they were safeblowers, if I thought they were criminals or black marketeers, if I thought they were lazy or Communists, I would be the last man on this floor to come and ask you as my colleagues to consider the plight of these 200,000 homeless people.

I believe that I have answered the charges that have been made up to this point. Now, you have four solutions to this problem, let us make no mistake about that.

No. 1. Forcibly repatriate these people, push them back into Russia. All of their homes are now dominated by Russia. All you have to do is to lift up the corner of the iron curtain; yes, push it up and drop them in, and you will have no further worry about any DP's who are so sentenced. They will be liquidated and therefore the problem solved in the Russian manner.

No. 2. No. 2 is to close the camps and throw these poor, miserable, unfortunate people out on a starving German economy, where they are getting about 1,000 calories a day. It takes 2,000 calories to live a decent existence. You and I and the rest of us here in America have three, four, and five thousand calories a day. What's more, the DP's hate the Germans and they simply could not and would not live there as a matter of choice.

No. 3. To keep these camps permanently operated; and as my good friend the gentleman from Maine, FRANK FELLOWS, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Immigration, pointed out, it would cost us in the neighborhood of $75,000,000 a year. I am going to say, FRANK, that I agree with you thoroughly when you take into consideration the fact that the Army spends a considerable sum in addition to the $75,000,000 appropriated by Congress. Really, the United States of America is paying practically every dollar of the bill, and if we keep the DP's there for 10 years it will cost us around $2,000,000,000.

Yes, my friends, what is last but not least, we have to make up our minds, as to whether or not we will allow orderly immigration into the United States of America so as to set an example for the receiving nations under the PC-IRO. There perhaps are a few misfits among the DP's just as there are among people in other countries of the world. You have some who are lazy, some who will not work, of course. I do not propose to

say to you that all of these 200,000 DP's are top notch, clean as a pin, and desirable as prospective citizens. But I am happy to report to you that the vast majority were clean, orderly, law-abiding and that America would be proud to have them as citizens. There were flowers blooming in profusion in and about their camps. They had their own churches, with beautiful lecterns and pulpits. There were home-made candles brought in to decorate their churches. Every conceivable foot of ground around the camps had been planted into some sort of a garden in order to get vegetables for additional food.

One of the most pathetic things I have ever seen was when I went in one of the DP camps and they took me to a warehouse and showed me that 1,200 women in that camp had 30 dresses and 25 coats; 1,500 men in that camp had 56 pair of pants in stock. There was a big bundle there. I said to the camp leader: "What is in that bundle?" He said, "Shoes." I stated, "Thank goodness you do have shoes at least for the winter." He replied: "No. Just look." I found that there were 1,000 pairs of shoes, but all for the right foot. Some of the bungling of UNRRA was again coming to light.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. The gentleman has raised an interesting question. We would like to know what happened to the $70,000,000 it has cost.

Mr. CHELF. What $70,000,000?

Mr. ELLIS. The gentleman said we were paying out $70,000,000 per annum on these camps. What has become of it if they do not have clothes?

Mr. CHELF. This is the situation. They have no materials for these people to work on. They are doing the best they can. It takes the bulk of the money appropriated by us for the supervision, for the food, medical supplies, and so forth. Although the diet is strictly inadequate, there is no doubt about the DP's getting a little bit better food allocation than the German population.

In conclusion let me repeat, at the beginning of this movement to allow immigration to these DP's I had my doubts, in fact, I was a "doubting Thomas"; however, I have had an opportunity personally to thrust my hand into the wound in the side of the problem, likewise to see the tattoos indicative of slavery and to feel the scars of the bayonets in the hands of these heart-rending, pathetic, miserable unfortunates of our DP camps in Europe. As a result, like St. Paul on the road to Damascus—I suddenly saw the light.

I sincerely trust that this great American Congress who today sit as a jury, find for the defendants.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I said earlier today that this was the great moral issue of Europe, and the vigor and sincerity with which my colleague from Kentucky has spoken are attributable to his sharing in that feeling, I know. If it needed any illustration, is it not shameful that the House of Representatives of the United States should be arguing in terms of apology for the fact that 23 percent, and only 23 percent of these DP's are Jewish—and that my friend and colleague from Kentucky should even have to answer such a point—which he did indeed so ably in the course of debate. Have we anything to apologize for in that this unhappy and unfortunate handful of Jews in Europe, the remainder of the 6,000,000 who were exterminated, now have some 170,000 of their number left in the DP camps and as DP's entitled to IRO care? Is it not shameful that Members have to stand up in this House and answer for that fact? These Jewish DP's are human beings. If they are able and capable of being citizens of the United States, and are entitled to admission here because they are constructive and useful, why should they not be admitted? Have we forgotten that every one of us is a descendant of immigrants, and that the descendants of Jewish immigrants, and I am one myself, have done some great and magnificent things for our beloved country?

Would anyone say that Bernard Baruch is not a credit to the United States, or Justices Cardozo and Brandeis? Is it not shameful, I say again, and does it not illustrate what I said before, that this is a great moral issue; that there should be any need to comment on the fact that 23 percent or 24 percent or any percent of the DP's are Jewish? I am proud of the fact that I am Jewish. I think every one of these displaced persons should be proud of the fact that he is Jewish. Indeed, every person should be proud of his own great heritage of culture and faith, whatever it be. I think we should take that argument completely out of this debate about the whole bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree 100 percent with everything the gentleman has said. It should never have been necessary for such comment to take place on this floor.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I would like to say the same thing. I compliment the gentleman for the statement that he is making. I think that racial discrimination has no place in this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that I made that point. It was well worth the time it took, even though it might have taken all of my time.

The point has been made here about the orphan children. Only about eleven hundred orphan children have been admitted in 1946 and 1947 because they, too, are subject to the nationality quotas and the quotas have kept down their numbers, just as the quotas have kept down the numbers of all other immigrants and DP's who are seeking to be admitted into the United States. Twenty-five hundred more unaccompanied children in the displaced persons camps, our subcommittee was informed, seek admission through the United States Committee for the Care of European Children who cannot get in largely because the quotas will not let them in.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman will recall that in 1945 the committee called on the displaced persons camp in Oswego and the committee recommended admitting those people. Those were Jewish people. There was a camp in Mexico that had fifteen hundred people. Eighty percent of them were orphans. They are still in Mexico. Yet on June 30, 1946, 1,548 quota numbers of Polish descent were bypassed by the State Department. Why did not the State Department allow these orphans to come in?

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that under the Fellows bill which is before us these numbers from the 200,000 will be allocated among the DP's, according to the elements which are in the camps, and that the greatest element in the camps, 31 percent, is Polish.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point I would like to make. All we, the people of the United States, are called on to do by this bill is to do our share. I think a very important point in respect to these displaced persons is to inquire whether we are doing our share. Right now the maximum admissions from among the displaced persons in the occupied areas who come in under the President's directive and under the quota laws is about 17,000 a year, while Great Britain is taking at a rate of about 60,000 DP's a year, and their population is something like 30 percent of our own. Canada, sparsely populated Canada, with one-tenth of our population, is taking 15,000 DP's this year; Australia with a small population of about 6,000,000 is scheduled to take about 7,500 DP's this year; and the great United States with 140,000,000 population, when we are at the peak of full employment, is taking a total of just about 17,000 DP's a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation under discussion here in the House today, and I offer my sincere congratulations to the able chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee for not only reporting a fine piece of legislation, but for the able and statesmanlike manner in which he presented the measure to the House in his opening remarks.

Admission of a carefully selected and adequately screened number of displaced persons, sometimes callously referred to as DP's, is in the way of being a national obligation on the part of the United States. We have accepted a great measure of world leadership, a leadership which is not only physical and financial in nature, but which also implies a moral responsibility on our part toward those less fortunate throughout the world.

The admission of some thousands of decent, hard-working, God fearing immigrants is in the best American spirit, and the act is one of ennoblement in the best American tradition of generosity and

kindness. Passage of this legislation will be a bright page in the American story.

And what, Mr. Chairman, is the American story? It is a story written in terms of human virtue, of sacrifice, of national and international nobility. It is a saga of courage, devotion to principle and in its lesser expressions a story of circuses, hot dogs, picnics, the Fourth of July, political rallies, Horatio Alger, air-conditioning, and steel-concrete construction. America is all things to all men, and the portrayal of it has defied and will continue to defy the greatest of writers.

But what is of the greatest importance today is that the American story has been largely written by foreign-born hands. It is of more than passing moment that the soil of America has been enriched by the blood, the sweat, and the tears of a great many immigrants to this bright new world, men and women of character, courage, and foresight, who dreamed a dream of a new empire in which human dignity and freedom were to be the twin cornerstones of greatness. Our national history can be spelled out in terms of human sacrifice by the foreign-born, to whom no obstacle was too great to overcome on the trail from Ellis Island.

Certainly, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] so ably put it, this measure should and must be determined upon its merits as legislation, rather than upon any consideration of racial or religious question. There are none of us upon the floor of this House, to the best of my knowledge, who trace a straight and distinguished lineage from Pocohontas, so it is only fair to state that we are all in one way or another indebted to our immigrant forefathers for whatever privileges, rights, or prerogatives we now enjoy in our treasured citizenship. My own family came here from England three generations ago, and joined with other immigrants of other lands, other creeds, and other faiths in the greatest construction job the world has ever known—the building of a new Nation and the drafting of a new concept of the relationships between men and government. To those men and women of character, determination, and faith, we, who are the repositories of their courage and their foresight, owe a great debt of eternal gratitude. They gave us, among other things, the American spirit of independence, the urge to creative and individual effort, the tradition of free enterprise under law, which we, on the majority side of the aisle, at least, cherish and do our best to nurture.

I think that I am qualified to speak with some degree of authority on the question of the foreign-born and their merit as citizens. I was born and raised in South Dakota, which great State is not only ably represented in this great body, but which also numbers thousands of foreign-born among its fine citizens. I well know the industry, the thrift, and the conscientious devotion to God and their new country which these immigrants brought with them to their new homes on the plains and the prairies of our Middle West.

This is a good bargain that we propose to make with our national purse, our national conscience, and our great traditions. If we take 200,000 men and women who refused to live in slavery, who defied the menials who aspired to mastery, we take into our midst human beings who know what the mailed fist and the heel of despotism really mean. My only regret over this legislation is the fact that we cannot trade 200,000 Communists and Fascist Americans for the people we expect to receive. The displaced persons are no unfeeling clods of the earth prepared to accept any tyrant's abuse in return for a blow and a crust of bread, but sentient mortals with souls, hearts, and brains who ask only the privilege of a new existence in which a human life is something more than a fleck of rust on the mortal coil.

I trust and expect that this measure will overwhelmingly pass this House today, and that in passing it the membership will not dwell overlong on what a good bargain the displaced persons have made with America but rather on the thought that we have made an excellent bargain with our own sense of justice and with our great national heritage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORSKI].

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] for the splendid job he did on this bill. At all times during the consideration of the bill he was available and open to any suggestion that would in any way improve the bill. I talked to him on several occasions, and I know every other Member had the same opportunity.

This is a problem which we must solve. There are 835,000 persons in the displaced-persons camps. As the leading nation of this world, we are looked upon to do something in this matter. If we take 200,000 of these displaced persons, we can say to the other nations that we have done our share and we can ask them to do their share. We will then solve this problem.

There has been a great deal said about dislocating our economy, and so on. I do not think taking 200,000 of these people into our country over a period of 2 years would affect our economy at all. In addition to that, I remember the testimony of General Marshall and Judge Patterson. They both urged the passage of this bill. Judge Patterson said that these people would make good citizens. I am satisfied that both General Marshall and Judge Patterson had about as much information about conditions in the displaced-persons camps as any of us have. They had first-hand, up-to-date information, and knew the true conditions that existed there, and they were and are constantly informed on the situation in these camps.

Some people would lead you to believe that if we take these men in here we would have to feed, care, and provide for them. Judge Patterson said that these people are consumers, too, as well as workers; that they will contribute their share toward our economy; they buy food, clothes, furniture, and everything else that every other American citizen buys.

I think all of you know that about all that the average man who works for a living gets out of life is a living. He does not leave very much after he has gone. He usually spends all he earned to rear and support his family.

There has been some talk here about Communists in the camps. I think the testimony will bear out the fact that Russia had their men in these camps spreading their propaganda. Naturally, we must bear this in mind, that people living in these displaced-persons camps are not living under normal family conditions. They are waiting and hoping for the day when they can reestablish themselves and live a good decent Christian life, to earn a respectable living; they, too, have hopes and ambitions to work, earn, and save, and get ahead. So you will probably find things not perfect there; but if they were given the same opportunity to live as we live here they would make just as good men and women—good, peaceful, religious, and law-abiding people.

I urge the approval of this bill and will work for its passage. I believe it will pass and I believe that the Members here, the same as I, have received letters and telegrams from prominent men and religious and civic organizations, all urging the passage of this bill. I am sure we want to do our share to adjust this postwar problem and I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is the least we can do. It is one of the problems that must be solved. If we take the 200,000 people that this bill provides for, we will be doing our share and I know the other countries will follow.

We must bear in mind that these people in the displaced-persons camps are there because they cannot return to their former homes on account of their political beliefs. They are not Communists. They are believers in democracy. If it was not for the political regimes in their respective countries they could, and would, return to their former places of residence but they cannot do that without taking the risk of being liquidated or imprisoned. All of them have spendidly aided our cause in the last war, they value and appreciate freedom and democracy, they would be an asset to our country, they would aid our economy. They know and are familiar with the brutality and cruelties of nazism, fascism, and bolshevism, and they do not want any part of that kind of government. I very strongly urge the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, nations can be, and have been, conquered by immigration more fatally than by invading armies.

All of us have been bemoaning and much concerned about the infiltration or migration, if you please, of Communists into European countries to the end that the home government in many countries have completely capitulated to the rule of communism.

With our people engrossed in domestic problems and concerned with conditions

throughout the world, it has become easy for an alert minority to whip up propaganda to alter our immigration laws in such a fashion as to do incalculable harm to the Nation.

We have a fast-growing country. Our population is increasing rapidly.

In 1946 our Census Bureau decided that a let-up was due and made a tentative estimate of some 2,000,000 babies for 1947. Actually, the United States stork made a record of 3,910,000 flights last year, as confused population experts revised their charts and theories.

Right now our population is 145,340,000. Looking 27 years ahead, to 1975, it is reasonable to assume that the United States will have at least 170,000,000 inhabitants.

It is not only necessary for us to catch up with our 5 years of lost production for domestic use during the war but we must also keep pace with our rapidly increasing population. This will tax our production facilities for several years to come.

I served on the Immigration and Naturalization Committee for 4 years, and there I was able to observe the tremendous forces, alien and international in nature, bringing constant pressure on the Congress to open wide our gates to immigration. The same confusion, the same distortion of facts, the same withholding of facts, the same flood of misrepresentation obtained that always prevails when the administration is promoting some sinister political scheme contrary to public interest.

It was made evident that the detention camps in Europe were a desirable source of propaganda to prey upon our people, and those whose objective is to break down the immigration laws of this country saw to it that the problem of displaced persons was not solved satisfactorily. Their one objective was to get countless thousands of European immigrants into the United States, and it appears they are succeeding to a very great extent.

The United States since the war has admitted more aliens than all other nations combined. We have always admitted more, and, further, we have paid the expenses of the detention camps all over the world.

About 2 years ago, President Truman assigned 8 or 10 ships for the exclusive use of immigrants coming to this country and sent a commission to Europe to expedite their travel and admittance. Since then tens of thousands have entered monthly.

Let us look at the record. For the fiscal year 1946, 312,190 aliens of all classes—quota, nonquota, and nonimmigrant—were admitted. In 1947, 513,597 immigrants, quota and nonquota, of all classes were admitted. The figures for the first 6 months of 1948 are not complete but it is reasonable to assume that the number of aliens to be admitted this year will exceed 700,000.

Here we have 1,500,000 in 3 years. It is safe to say that these immigrants occupy 500,000 living units, and we do not have houses for veterans.

We do not have accurate figures on aliens in this country through illegal entry, but the number is estimated by competent authorities to be between 500,000 and 1,000,000 annually.

They have hundreds of schemes to get into this country. For example, a Greek ship arrived in New York early last year with a crew of 242 and left with a crew of 80.

In 1944, more than 33,500 would-be immigrants were apprehended by our border patrol. In 1946, the number was 100,785. If the current rate of apprehension is maintained for the rest of this year the number will exceed 200,000. These figures give an idea of the tremendous pressure on our borders for entrance into this country.

The authorities expect a big increase in the number of aliens who will use the airplane. We are told the airplane is the most difficult means of smuggling to intercept.

Border patrolmen recently broke up an air-smuggling ring which brought 19 orientals and 4 Europeans to various airports in the East. Each passenger paid the smugglers between $600 and $1,500.

The admittance of 200,000 additional immigrants out of a population of 200,000,000 people will solve no problem for Europe and will only contribute to our domestic difficulties in the United States. If those unfortunate people are farmers or skilled laborers, or of the professional class, the need for their services is far greater in Europe than in this country. Their labors are needed to rehabilitate those countries where we are now spending billions of dollars.

Instead of this bill we should have here, today, a measure terminating all immigration for a period of years and give us time to check the number of aliens in this country, what type of people they are, and to determine what to do about them.

In viewing this problem, I do not overlook the fact that this country was created by immigrants, and I pay my respects to the tens of thousands of immigrants who are today living with us and have made good American citizens, but there comes a time when we must safeguard the interest of our country in dealing with the question of immigration.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I join with those who have paid tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, my good friend, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], who made a very eloquent address. He prepared and delivered it in such a way as to make it a classic. But I am sorry I cannot agree with him.

He recited to you the history of immigration. Without being egotistical, may I say that I was a Member of this Congress and helped to write and to pass the legislation that is now the history and the story of immigration. Today I stand abashed to see this great structure, built up as it has been with the finest of purposes, with the finest of intentions, being employed for a purpose entirely different from that which was originally intended.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an immigration problem. This is purely a relief problem. It has no genuine immigration in it. What is an immigrant? An immigrant is one who comes to a country for the purpose of becoming a citizen of that country. An immigrant is not a person who has been brought into a country. The United States was the first country to develop the restriction of immigration as a national policy. Our country took the position that every country had the inherent right to determine who should be permitted to enter that country for residence and for citizenship. Our country has told the world that American residence and citizenship is a privilege and not a right.

I listened to my very distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Judge WALTER. I was waiting for the time when the first speaker would say, "We will bring them in." Sure enough Judge WALTER did say, "Bring them in." That is exactly what this bill does. It brings them in. You do not bring an immigrant in. The real immigrants who made this country great were not brought in. They came in. They stood in line and waited for their turn. They asked for the great privilege of becoming American citizens. They proved their worth on the other side before we accepted them and most of them proved their worth on this side after they got here. So I say to you that it is a misnomer to call this an immigration bill. This is a relief bill.

I join with those who sympathize with unfortunates. I join with those who feel for these people who are in these camps over in Europe. Some of them are deserving, while many, possibly most of them, are not. Certainly, it is a relief problem that has grown out of the war, yet not altogether out of the war either, because when I was in Rome last year I spoke to a man I considered one of the best-posted individuals over there, and he told me that in that September more persons had come into the DP camp than were taken out that month and more had come in than in the preceding month of August. Many of these who came were coming into the camp many months after the war. They were not people who were first displaced. Certainly not. So I say to you again, this problem is a relief problem.

Now, you may ask me how I would solve this problem. How would I dispose of this problem? What about these billions of dollars we have been sending to Europe? We have been sending it over there for relief. If these people are so terribly located as we are told, what individuals in Europe should have that money first? Is there any who should have received more of that relief money than these poor displaced people? Certainly not. They have had the money, they have had lots of that money and many of them have come to this country. Did we do our part? We have done more than our part. Six hundred thousand have found their way here legally, and hundreds of thousands have found their way here illegally all through this country.

I am going to ask you one question: Who is going to pay for bringing these people here? Will you answer me?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. These various church groups have already made arrangements to raise the money to bring all of the people over here, and not only that, but will provide bond if they get them here.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is right; they will bring them here. In other words, somebody will have a choice in saying who shall come. That means that someone will be left out. That will be no antidote to the hunger of those who will not be chosen. There are plenty of little children right here in America who need help. What church is going to select whom and what? They will probably select their own communicants, their own people. That will bring complaints from many people. Listen to me. When these persons who have been brought in show their real character and inclinations or get bad, as the gentleman from Maine intimated, when they violate the law and become deportable, where are you going to send them? What are you going to do with the bad ones, now? Answer me. Will you send them back to the country in which you found them? No; when you bring them here, they are here for good, regardless of communistic inclinations. You cannot send them back and you cannot throw them into the sea. One of the most popular statements a public speaker can make is, "Let us send them back where they come from." But that is just a hollow statement, for very few have been sent back since Franklin D. and Eleanor came into power.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Have we ever sent anybody out, no matter how bad he was?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Have we ever sent anybody out? No; we have not sent many out. I do not want to go into detail about that, but I have had a lot of experience with immigration matters. I know that the number sent out were shamefully few. That failure is a terrible travesty on the lack of administration in our country.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I understand that there are now 32,000 deportable cases in New York City alone, and there is no telling how many there are all over the country.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have no doubt that the gentleman is right. I do not want to inject politics into this argument, but politics belong here, when you talk about this proposition of why practically no deportations have been made. Not in the last 15 years has there been any genuine effort to deport anybody that ought to be deported, and you know that. That is a fact, and I think you will all agree with me.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. I am for this bill, but I would like to tell the gentleman this, that the Government of the United States has been trying for a year and a half to deport from this country what the entire world knows is the No. 1 American Communist, here illegally, Gerhart Eisler, and he is still here, and he is going to be here for a long time.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; and so is the man on the Pacific coast that has been stirring up so much trouble out there, and others that ought to be deported. You talk about sending them out. Do not delude yourself.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and you have a whole lot more Gerhart Eislers parked in these concentration camps coming to the United States as Communist spies; do not forget that. You will bring in a darn sight more of that kind than you have here now.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman from Mississippi is probably the best-posted man in this House on these matters and I agree with him.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman know that the Members of this House and the Members of the other body have introduced hundreds of bills staying deportations?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. I know that this is done very frequently by Members who come from sections populated heavily by foreign-born persons. In past years, when I was a member of the Committee on Immigration, I opposed many of these private bills quite successfully, but that was the time when the Government officials were making an effort to enforce the law.

Here is another thing that I wanted to mention, if I may. The distinguished gentleman from Maine says that we are going to spend millions and billions of dollars on this proposition of relief if we do not bring these people in. That is what he wants us to do, bring them in to save spending billions of dollars. What are you going to do with them when you bring them in? My friends, listen to me. Here is the way I would decide that. I would tell England, I would tell France, and I would tell Italy, "This is your problem; this is your relief problem. We have sent you the money. Take care of these people and wipe out these camps and do it quickly." You say that they have done their part. They have not been doing their part. The fact that the camps have increased in population shows that. My distinguished friend from Maine says that we have repatriated 7,000,000 out of 8,000,000 and that there are 832,000 there yet today. As far as that is concerned, the number is increasing instead of decreasing.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. In that connection, some of this Marshall-plan money, better known as the Bevin plan, was to be used to rehabilitate and settle some of these displaced persons. Also, is it not a fact that France owns colonial possessions that are still in a frontier state that these people could go to and work, if they only wanted to?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman is right about that. We are making a serious mistake if we pass this bill. There are several amendments going to be offered to this bill today. They say that if you bring in those provided for in this bill, then you should bring in others equally deserving. There are millions who are as hungry and deserving as those provided for in this bill.

I just want to touch on another point in the short time I have, and that is this. What are you going to do with these people when you get them here with reference to housing? The mayor of the city of New York, where most of these people will go—90 percent of them, I dare say, will not leave the east coast, but will go into the clothing factories; that is where they will stay. He stated that in New York City alone there are 150,000 families without homes today. Testimony was given before a committee of this House within the last 6 months that there are 450,000 out of work in New York City. This is a great problem. Why bring these unfortunate people into our country to punish them, and promise them this, that, and the other? How are we going to house them? In this connection let me say to you that the American Legion is most emphatically opposing this kind of legislation. I refer you to the address of Col. Paul Griffith, the national commander of the American Legion, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 6905 of date of June 2, 1948.

Further, I know some good people in Greece and other parts of Europe who love America and who have relatives in America. They have been taught over the years to respect America. They want to come here and have been standing in line now for years waiting to come in to join their relatives. What do you do with them? You say, "You have been standing there now for years and now you cannot come for another 5 or 10 years." I know a family that has fine boys who want to come here, to live with relatives who will take care of them in this country and give them a good education. They will have to stand aside for some of those provided for in this bill. Their coming here is 5 years off, and now this will put them another 5 or 10 years off. The result will be that they will never have an opportunity to come here, they will have to give this chance to someone else.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman spoke about the housing question, where we are going to put them, and so forth. I call attention to section 6 on page 7 of the bill, which provides that applicants for

admission shall be approved for settlement in the particular State or Territory to which they are destined only in accordance with the settlement opportunities and numbers certified to the Coordinator by the chief executive officer thereof.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I understand the gentleman's question. I do not attach much value to this provision. It just would not work and at least 90 percent of these persons would not get 50 miles away from the Atlantic coast. The governors in the States are not going to have the opportunity to certify these people for settlement. That is just put in the bill, not that the gentleman put it in, for no other reason than to make people think that these folks are going inland. They will never get there, and the gentleman knows they never intend to get there.

In proof of that, let me call your attention to another thing in the bill that makes me wonder. I may be wrong about this, and if I am, I want you to correct me. On page 6, in paragraph (a) it states that you are going to admit certain groups of people. You list first aliens qualified as farm laborers, and after that physicians, dentists, medical nurses, clothing and garment makers, and so forth. Does that mean that the physicians and the medical nurses and the household and construction people and garment workers will come in on the same priority as the farmer does?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is exactly what I thought. At first glance one would think that the farmers would come first. But that is not true. That is what I want to call attention to. The bill first says farmers. Do not be misled by this. What is the list that follows? Physicians, dentists, medical nurses, household, construction, clothing, and garment workers, or aliens possessing educational, scientific, or technological qualifications. Under that language the students can come in. They who will be getting ready to become graduate Communists, they who will keep us in trouble all the time. The farmers are put out in front but there will be no farmers. These places will be taken by garment workers, students, persons claiming to be ministers and scientists. They will fill up the lists with that type that always crowd themselves to the front. The timid, deserving persons will never be chosen.

I repeat that this is a relief problem which should be solved by the European countries themselves.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to answer some of the assertions made by the previous speaker concerning housing. I am sure this is not laughable. This is a logical answer that was given by representatives of various religious agencies, among them the head of the Rural Catholic Life Conference, who said the following:

> The conference is convinced that the admission of these displaced parties to the United States can be effected without any undue strain upon our domestic economy, without any injustice to our veterans, and without aggravating the housing situation. A proportionate share of these people is not a large one in view of the size and resources of our country. The number is somewhat less than 100,000 families.

He spoke of the Stratton bill. The Fellows bill reduces its number of DP's to 200,000. He continued:

> Many of them would be cared for by relatives and friends or others willing to assume responsibility during the period of adjustment, for their housing and employment. Since many of the displaced persons are rural people, it is highly desirable that they be directed to rural areas and away from congested areas, and to see that these persons are prepared for such a life and be so directed is the fixed policy of our organization.

To the same effect is a statement by the National Lutheran Council consisting of 8,000 pastors throughout the country, 50 percent of them serving in rural and small towns. It was stated they would use their best endeavors to settle the Lutherans amongst the displaced persons in rural sections of the Nation. To the same effect were statements by representatives of the American Baptist Associations, as well as statements of organizations of the Jewish faith and the Quakers and Mennonites.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], a member of the committee.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot begin to speak without paying my compliments to the gentleman who spoke a few moments ago. I am glad that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is still here. I hardly think that he meant what he said. He has a perfect right to be critical of this or any other bill. He has a perfect right to laugh it out of court if he can. But I submit as a fair question: Have you the right, sir, to say that the subcommittee that has worked on this bill for nearly 2 years, and drew the provision in question, had no intention that any should come in in accordance therewith? I submit that that is perilously close to insulting honorable Members of the House of Representatives, gentlemen who need no defense. I doubt seriously if the gentleman meant to make any such imputation or charge.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to to the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I should like to say that no Member of the House has on more occasions complimented the Committee on the Judiciary than I have. I think the gentleman must have misunderstood what I said. I cannot quite recall now what he alludes to. Whatever I did say, I am not attempting to impute any improper motives to anyone.

Mr. HOBBS. I appreciate the honorable gentleman's statement. But we do not want compliments that we do not deserve, and many times we may not. But I am not mistaken about what I heard the gentleman say. I hope and I believe, as I said I hoped and believed, that the gentleman did not mean it. I hope that he will correct his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, the eminent chairman of the subcommittee has already made a masterly and unanswerable argument in support of the bill that bears his name. It leaves nothing to be said. I am proud to be his pupil, supporter, and friend. I join in the loud "Amen." I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I have sat there and observed the grinding of that mill for nearly 2 years. I have seen the sentiment of our whole committee change on this subject in spite of the able arguments and adroit questions of another honest, outstanding, and patriotic student of this problem, for whom I entertain nothing less than the highest regard, our fellow Member, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. ED GOSSETT. I listened to him cross-examine General Marshall and Judge Patterson, then the Secretary of War. I saw him answered by those gentlemen and others. I would feel presumptuous were I to discount the testimony given by men perfectly qualified to speak by reason of superior knowledge, daily experience, and desperate study under the spur of great responsibility, facing the pressing need of solution of this problem. General Marshall was good enough to build our armies, plan our defense and attack, and lead us to victory in the greatest war of all time. Secretary Patterson was good enough to perform admirably the multitudinous duties of the office of the Secretary of War, one of which was the care of these DP's in the American zone. I submit that no one of you could have heard their testimony, never blinking an eye, never dodging an issue, who did not become sold on the final product that FRANK FELLOWS and the men on his subcommittee wrote into this bill.

This bill does not authorize the admission of even one additional alien, in the long run. It preserves our immigration laws and quota systems, exactly as they are. It simply steps on the accelerator for 2 years, charging every immigrant admitted to his proper quota, and then steps on the brakes. No matter how long it may require to pay off the mortgage put upon future quotas, it must be paid. And by reason of the better screening required we will get even more desirable citizens from those DP's admitted under this bill than would be possible under routine administration of the law as it now stands. Finally, this bill will save money by reducing the burden of our DP camps.

I just want to ask: Who prepared the housing for our ancestors who landed at Plymouth Rock? Where were the mansions that they were to occupy? There were none. It is said: We have got to house these immigrants. Already we knew it, and in the bill we wrote a provision that provided for that necessity.

I say no man could have witnessed the tremendous change that came over our committee, from the point where there was hardly a single man in favor of the Stratton bill to where there was only one distinguished gentleman who is against the pending bill, and not be for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FOOTE].

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Chairman, after the masterful presentation of this matter by my New England colleague, the gentleman from Maine, FRANK FELLOWS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, little further need be said concerning it. He has demonstrated, both from an economic and humanitarian standpoint, the advisability of this legislation beyond all reasonable doubt.

The subject of displaced-persons legislation is one in which the people of my district are vitally interested. In New Haven a citizens committee was formed to sponsor this matter, composed of prominent people of all racial backgrounds. Many of these people could not possibly personally benefit from the passage of this bill. By that, I mean they have no relatives or friends in foreign lands who might come here if this legislation becomes law.

This matter was first brought to my attention about a year ago when the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman at Large STRATTON, introduced his bill on this subject. I was then a fellow member of the Banking and Currency Committee and obtained considerable information at that time concerning this troublesome problem and became sympathetic to this cause.

The Fellows bill is not as liberal as the Stratton bill. To my mind the Fellows bill is a fair compromise of the situation as between those who would let down the bars of immigration absolutely and those who would restrict further immigration in the same manner.

The immigration quotas remained unfilled during the war years and under the law if not used they lapse. The number permitted to enter under the Fellows bill is much less than the number of persons that would have come here legally during the past 5 years under the present quota if it had not been for wartime conditions.

Furthermore, under the Fellows bill no more people come here eventually than under the existing quotas. The bill permits them to come here sooner and eventually all those persons who are admitted are charged off to the existing quota, except the orphans.

There is no relaxation of the immigration laws. Undesirables cannot come here as all applicants must meet the same standard our present immigration laws require and must have sponsors who will enter into a binding agreement to guarantee they will not become public charges.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], a member of the Judiciary Committee, was privileged to visit these displaced-persons camps last summer and assured the members of the committee that the majority of these persons are industrious and skillful. He exhibited to us certain handiwork which they had made under most trying conditions. He was satisfied that these people are not Communists, but by virtue of their experiences are confirmed despisers of it. The longer these persons stay in the displaced-persons camps just so much faster will they lose their morale. A large portion of them can be salvaged today if they are given that hope of leading decent lives under a free system of government. In addition, it is costing this country approximately $100,000,000 a year to maintain them there.

It is my opinion that this is one of the responsibilities we must assume in our role of world leadership. These people who stood out against aggression, whether of nazism or communism, and survived the terrors of war, are people of character who have demonstrated they can stand up against devastation, and it is believed they will lead useful lives in this country. This legislation is justified from a humanitarian as well as an economic standpoint. No State will have any displaced persons forced upon it. The governor thereof must signify how many he will permit to enter his jurisdiction.

We are all immigrants or the sons of immigrants, except the Indians. It is fitting, therefore, that we extend a hand of welcome to the oppressed of other lands. The history of our Nation shows that the rich blood of the immigrants has fired the life stream of America with new courage. It has given us great men and great women of wisdom, devotion, and talent. Our Republic has expanded because it extended its charity and opened its gates to those who knew even better than we, the blessings to be found in a Government of free people.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, after what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] has just said, it humbles me to contribute my two cents' worth; but I was sent here to try to think for myself, and I hope on this subject I am thinking correctly.

I understand that in 1940 there were 5,000,000 aliens registered under the Alien Registration Act. There is no telling how many are not registered.

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Kentucky how he figures everyone in a displaced-persons camp are people who would be desirable citizens of this country when 40 percent of them—and this is according to information from our own consular officials—have made fraudulent applications for visas to enter this country. I do not understand that. The gentleman from Ohio has touched the key spring to this whole question. We are on the road to wreck our immigration laws and I believe we should be strengthening instead of weakening them.

This is a moral issue, they tell me. For the sake of argument let us grant that it is. I feel the deepest compassion for the children of the world who are unfortunate enough to be in displaced-persons camps, and we should help them. But who are displaced persons? All around the world, people during the last war who had hung on to mythical ideas, created devious rituals as something to aid them in achieving their desires. Then they saw great silver birds soaring in the air on which men rode and from which death spewed and they wanted to come into this country as the land of their Elysian dreams, a country that could fill their awakened desire in a material way.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. No; the gentleman would not yield to me.

Mr. CHELF. But the gentleman referred to me.

Mr. BURLESON. There is a very old story I once read in a very old book, a dust-covered book, that may be found in many good homes throughout this land. It is the story of a man on the road from Jericho to Jerusalem. That is a very busy road today, but it seemed then to have some lonely and deserted places along the way and he was fallen upon and robbed, and he was beaten, and stripped of all his earthly possessions and left beside the road to die. Soon there came a man, a goodly man, who wore the robes of a priest, but who did not think he was his brother's keeper, so he passed on the other side of the road. Then came a Levite on the scene, a man of the same nationality as the man who lay dying beside the road; but he did not think he was his brother's keeper and he passed by on the other side. Finally a Samaritan came that way, the natural enemy of the Levite; but he felt that he was his brother's keeper and he took him to the inn and told the innkeeper to take care of him, gave him money to pay for his keep, and said, "I shall return soon and if there is aught that he owes, I will pay you, I will be responsible." It seems to me the answer is not that we must bring displaced persons into this country, but to care for them as best we can where they are in the hope that conditions may improve in time. Delay this action to study the proposition of recolonization in Africa, or until circumstances may change in their native country. In the meantime, we are taking care of these people in a fairly good manner. The report of the committee has determined that to be true. For instance, they are receiving 2,100 calories per person as compared to 1,500 for the German workingman. They are not in concentration camps, as many people believe. Incidentally, it is my belief we would have seen even more results if the $73,000,000 already given to the IRO had been spent by the Army as it was originally intended, and I shall refer to this matter later.

Now, Mr. Chairman, who are the displaced persons around this world?

Millions of people are no more displaced now than millions have been for hundreds of years, and more particularly since World War I. In Maurice Davie's book Refugees in America he says that in 1939, 20 years after World War I, there were 600,000 stateless persons, and the sources of his authority is the records of the League of Nations.

At the close of hostilities I understand there were an estimated 8,000,000 displaced persons in central Europe alone, and that about 7,000,000 have been repatriated, and that we are now concerned with the million left over in and out of camps in the American, British, and French zones in Germany and Austria. But this figure takes on certain assumptions, and the committee created under Senate Resolution 137 in its Report No. 950, filed March 2 of this year, necessarily accepted certain arbitrary defini-

tions and designations of displaced persons.

Who are displaced persons around this world, and why are we at this time becoming so deeply concerned about the situation from the moral and political standpoint? I have not the least objection to concerning ourselves with the economic and political rehabilitation of peoples all over the world insofar as our abilities will permit, but must we bring them here now and is there no other solution?

Mr. Chairman, I understand that as a part of the United Nations there is the International Refugee Organization, and by authority of Public Law 146 the President is authorized to accept membership for the United States, and that such Organization take over the displaced-persons problems. I understand that the authority was given upon the condition and with the reservation that no agreement should be concluded on behalf of the United States which would affect or abrogate any of the immigration laws of this country. By this condition the security of this country in its action upon this subject has been preserved.

But, Mr. Chairman, who are displaced persons? Should we include a half dozen or so Pakistanians? There are about 10,000,000 of those. I know of a little atoll out in the Pacific called Ulithie, composed of about 11 tiny islands. The natives were moved off one of those called Mog Mog because we needed it for a place to stretch our legs, and they were not happy, and I understand they are not yet returned; but if that appears facetious, how about those 10,000,000 people said to be of German ethnic origin who lived in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, many of whom were from families who had lived in these countries for generations and who were forcibly expelled from those countries; their property confiscated; and they were driven into Germany and Austria. This was done pursuant to the Potsdam agreement of August 1945. These people, Mr. Chairman, constituted a new class of displaced persons, and our Nation participated in creating it. It is estimated that about 3,000,000 of these people have since the end of the war been driven into the American zone of Germany alone. These 10,000,000 people were displaced pursuant to the Potsdam agreement and are expressly excluded by the Constitution of the UN, from the care and assistance of the International Refugee Organization. They are not looked upon today as displaced persons, when as a matter of fact there are no people more displaced than these who are left out of the definition.

But these are not all of the displaced persons, even in Europe. Hundreds of thousands are lodged in the Scandinavian countries of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, and are beyond the purview of the International Refugee Organization, and it is reported periodically that great numbers of these people are being deported to Russia as slave laborers. Then there are those men, estimated at 200,000, who were members of the Anders Polish Army, who cannot return to Poland. They are scattered in the various areas of Europe and are excluded from the jurisdiction of the IRO. We know from our officials in Germany that hundreds of thousands since the end of the war have been leaving countries behind the iron curtain and entering into Germany and Austria, and it is estimated, I believe, that there are approximately 200,000 of these who are eligible under IRO who have gone into the camps of Germany.

This is still only a small part of the displaced persons around this world. We can go on and on, and the problem insofar as today is concerned is insurmountable, but we can assist as we are doing now, to care for these people who are in need of assistance, and I think the report of investigating committees in Europe last year indicates that a fairly good job is being done, even though the International Refugee Organization is not in actual operation. You will recall that it has not come into being because of the 54 nations which are members of the UN only 14 have accepted participation in IRO as of this date, and the Constitution requires that 15 nations must sign before it becomes effective. The organization is working under the name of the Preparatory Commission for International Refugee Organization, an interim agency operating under agreement of the governments which have already signed.

Up to the present time the United States has contributed approximately 79 percent of the total contributions. We have placed at the disposal of IRO $73,000,000, but our agreement when we entered into the organization was to pay 39 percent of the operation cost and 45 percent of the relief. I repeat that it occurs to me that it would have been considerably wiser to have left the care of refugees with the United States Army, rather than create a successor to UNRRA with all its miserable failures.

Mr. Chairman, it is not denied that there are many Communists in the displaced persons' camps, and among those people coming within the definition of refugees. The records indicate that 40 percent of the applications for visas filed by displaced persons in Germany and Austria were fraudulent and that the number is increasing. This information is from our consular officers, and they admit that it is a most serious matter and one which will be most difficult to overcome. Of course, they are not all Communists—nobody would contend that to be true—but many of them are and will fit into the Communist scheme directed from Moscow if they are permitted to come into this country, as surely as round pegs go into round holes and square pegs go into square holes. I cannot be a party to bringing one single potential saboteur into this country, when we now have an estimated 100,000 already here. Rather I should make the proposition in reverse, that those who believe there is something better than what we have here and wish to destroy it, should be retured to those places where their philosophies are accepted as perfect.

Aside from the proposition of bringing disloyal persons into this country, it has always been the general purpose that immigrants should be assimilated with those Americans who have already been indoctrinated into our philosophies and our way of living. You know very well what will happen when displaced persons are brought into this country. They talk of farmers and farm help. Most of them will be farming in the heart of New York and Chicago, and will probably never cultivate anything larger than a window-box. I understand there are something like 32,000 deportation cases now on the docket in New York, but we insist on bringing in another 200,000 to house, feed, and clothe, to educate and assimilate into the people of this country.

In 1940 approximately 5,000,000 aliens registered under the Alien Registration Act. Almost 70 percent of them were concentrated in urban areas of 50,000 population, whereas only 34 percent of the total population of the United States, including the aliens, were in such urban centers. Where have been the areas of settlement of the displaced persons who have been admitted since 1945? Statistics show that about 90 percent of the 17,000 displaced persons admitted during the fiscal year 1947 settled in the urban areas, and 50 percent in New York City alone.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been sold to many people in this country on the basis of a moral obligation. All right, we are accepting that obligation in numerous ways today. Investigating committees, or at least some of the members who had occasion to visit a number of displaced persons' camps, will testify to the fact that those in Germany are now receiving comparatively good care; that the camps are clean, where the occupants want them to be clean; they are not concentration camps; they are receiving 2,100 calories per day, as compared to the working German of about 1,500 to 1,700 calories. And all in all the taxpayers of this country are doing fairly well in meeting a moral obligation in caring for unfortunate people around the world.

Perhaps it can be reasonably assumed that many people defined as DP's have a better living standard under their present status than they ever had before. That is small comfort from the standpoint of rehabilitating the peoples of the world but the fact remains, it cannot all be done immediately but is a gradual planned process and it seems to me the safest answer lies in eventual repatriation or colonization of these unfortunates.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to utilize this minute by saying to the gentleman that I admire his stand. That is America, that is democracy, that is what makes this country of ours great—difference of opinion. I want to say to the gentleman that his information is incorrect insofar as all of the displaced persons wanting to come to the United States. For instance, of the 23 percent of the Jewish people involved, 90 percent of those people want to go to Palestine. Those are the figures from one of the biggest Jewish DP's camps in all of Europe. It has a population of some 4,500, which is as large as my home town of Lebanon, Ky. Thirty-three

Jewish people of this camp out of thirty-four polled by me wanted to go to Palestine. I may say to the gentleman that there were very few who wanted to come to the United States. The bulk of them wanted to go to Great Britain, Australia, Belgium, Canada, and other places. We were a poor fifth in the list of countries the DP's wanted to go to because many nations had recruiting teams over there in the camps soliciting the DP's trying to get them to immigrate to their respective countries. We were dilatory on this particular subject insofar as our country was concerned.

Mr. BURLESON. I would suggest that they go to those places then where they wanted to go.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman knows that the only natural-born Americans are the Indians. The gentleman is no Indian. My ancestors were Welsh and I would not be here in the United States of America, the garden spot of the world today, if the Congress back in 1767 had rejected immigrants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, during my brief sojourn as a Member of this House, a sojourn soon to be terminated, I have tried to keep in mind the comment made by Mr. Disraeli, the famous Prime Minister of England when, in disagreeing with the suggestion of a young member of Parliament that his constituents ought to hear him express himself on the floor, Mr. Disraeli said that he thought it was better, much better, that the young man's constituents should wonder why he didn't speak, than why he did. Possibly I should have continued to bear that in mind today, but I have such a keen interest in the bill we are presently considering, H. R. 6396, that I am taking, for myself, one of those calculated risks of which we have heard so frequently of late.

This is a bill to authorize, for the next 2 years, the admission into the United States for permanent residence, of not more than 200,000 persons, who fall within the category of displaced persons, as therein defined.

Section 4 of the bill extends to those persons now legally, but temporarily, in the United States, who are ideologically as much displaced persons as those in the displaced persons camps in Europe, the same opportunity that we propose to extend to their ideological brethren abroad. The students from those countries, now in our colleges, who have become imbued with American ideals, the attachés of the Czech and other embassies, who have denounced the Communist rape of their countries, and many others similarly situated, can no more return home than can those in the displaced persons camps. To send them back now, after we have taken them in, inoculated them with the ideals of democracy and rendered them totally unfit for life in a totalitarian state, is to condemn them to the concentration camp and the firing squad, and the latter is much the more merciful.

I shall not attempt to go over all the other provisions of the bill in detail, for that has already been done by others more capable than I am. The scholarly and informative report written by the gentleman from Maine, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the author of the bill, and his masterly summation in opening this debate, adequately cover the subject. I should like, Mr. Chairman, if I may, to speak briefly on the bill as a whole.

It seems to me that there are so many cogent and compelling reasons why this bill should be passed that I find myself in somewhat of a quandary, in the short time at my disposal, in selecting those points that should be stressed, lest I seem to neglect others equally important. So much can be said in support of the bill, from every angle, that it would require much more time than I have available adequately to discuss it. From the economic, the political, using that word in its broad and not in its narrow, partisan sense, and the humanitarian points of view, it is the wise, just, and proper step to take.

From the economic standpoint this bill, supported as it is by the two great labor organizations of America, will bring into our economy people whose variegated skills we need and can use. On pages 16 and 17 of the committee report, there is a list of them. Of that, the committee has said:

> In conclusion, it may be stated, about the occupational skills possessed by refugees under IRO care and maintenance, that they are varied and represent a rich source of labor supply. Countries actively seeking persons for resettlement in order to diminish their labor shortages have already found, and will continue to find, that refugees can be of considerable value in aiding the solution of manpower problems. That they have other characteristics as well, which should be of help in making them valuable citizens of the country of their resettlement, is also apparent in any analysis of this group.

Already those who have come have made significant contributions to American life. On pages 69 to 73 appears a list of some of them. Two hundred and twenty of them appear in America's Men of Science, twelve of them Nobel prize winners. Seventy-three are in Who's Who in America. There is no reason to believe that those to come will not do the same. This country became great and strong through its immigrants, for they have been, and are, the raw material from which our national stature comes. In my own home county, the people of middle European ancestry, the Poles, the Slovaks, the Lithuanians, have by their sturdy qualities, made themselves a valuable asset to the community. To say that a country of 140,000,000 people with the productive capacity of America cannot absorb an addition of about one-sixth of 1 percent, shows but little faith in our present capacity or our future progress.

Ideologically, too, they are our kind of people. They hate communism and all that it implies, as only those who have suffered from it can. Their first-hand statements of what they have endured, as they permeate through our society, will do more to awaken our people to the danger we face in the world today than all the speeches you and I can make on this floor. These people love liberty and freedom and democracy so much, that they have been willing to lose everything, including their lives, to preserve it and to avoid submitting to the tyranny of Stalin. We can use people like that—people whose only fault is that they believe passionately in the things in which we believe, and for which this Nation has stood.

Today we are, here in Congress, spending millions of dollars to attempt to stop the engulfment of democratic institutions by the rising tide of communism. Dollars will not do that job alone. You cannot defeat ideas with dollars any more than you can defeat them with bullets. More than that is needed. It needs the whole-souled cooperation of liberty-loving peoples everywhere. Only as we put hope into the hearts of those millions of people who want freedom, who want to throw off the Russian yoke—hope that America really meant what it said in the Atlantic Charter—hope that, if they keep alight and even faintly flickering the torch of liberty in their lands, they or their children may some day see it turn into a blaze that will burn away all Communist domination—can we have any chance of success in the policy on which we have embarked. Otherwise, our dollars are futile. This bill gives us a chance to prove we mean what we have said, to show that our deeds match our words, and that it has not all been only empty protestation.

As a veteran of this last war, with almost 5 years of service, part of it on overseas duty, I have had an opportunity to see what America means to the peoples of the world—how they look to us for leadership. Either we assume that leadership, or we will yield the field to Communist Russia, with all that that implies. We cannot assume it without assuming, likewise, the responsibilities inherent in that position; to help solve the problem posed by these people, is one of those responsibilities. In our own interest, to say nothing of the humanitarian appeal, we cannot permit this problem to remain and fester in the heart of Europe.

This bill provides a method whereby we can help solve that problem and I urge the House to act favorably upon it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to repudiate the shocking words of disparagement inveighed against the Puerto Rican people here this afternoon.

There are some 20,000 people of Puerto Rican origin who reside in the district I have the honor to represent. They are decent, industrious, God-fearing people, who live in our district in dignity and friendship with others and who make a very valuable contribution to our way of life.

It is shameful indeed that the source of this criticism against the Puerto Rican people is the same source that is an apologist for the grand mufti of Jerusalem and his fanatical Arabs. It is this same source that maligns and vilifies and seeks to obstruct the efforts of the Jewish people to build their homeland in Israel.

Mr. Chairman, the horrible, unrelieved plight of the 835,000 displaced persons herded into concentration camps in Eu-

rope and the cruel disregard in which these people have been held by Congress since the end of the war shames the conscience of our Nation.

This House today has a historic opportunity to affirm once again the humane and traditional welcome of America to distressed peoples everywhere in the world.

This House today can rekindle the beacon of our Statue of Liberty shining out from New York Harbor toward the shores of the Old World and burnish anew the historic words graven on her pedestal:

"Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!" cries she,
With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

Mr. Chairman, the humane people of our Nation look today to this House of Representatives to open once again in the true spirit of that mother of exiles, our Statue of Liberty, the golden door of American humanity to the tired, the poor, the huddled masses surviving the racist scourge let loose on Europe by Adolf Hitler, the skeletal survivors of the Nazi lime pits and crematoria.

The House bill before us today, H. R. 6396, provides for the admission of 200,000 persons into the United States during the next 2 years. It is a minimum bill. It is a compromise bill. It is not as desirable as the Stratton bill. Yet it represents and reflects the hope and the promise of the significant words that remain indelible on the base of our Statue of Liberty. Conversely, the Senate bill, a product of years of political maneuvering, brazenly seeks to intrude into the statute books of America the discriminatory selection of immigrants on a racist and antireligious basis. It seeks to perpetuate the very racist ideas which sons of America and other Allied Nations died to defeat in the last war. It seeks to bar Jews and Catholics who wish to enter this country. It closes the golden door of America to the victims of fascism while it opens a small side door to Nazi collaborationists and ethnic Germans. The DP's—displaced persons—would then become BP's—betrayed persons.

This House today should pass the Fellows bill, H. R. 6396, and reaffirm the belief of all Americans in the equality of human beings before God and the historic mission of America as a refuge for the oppressed.

To accept the concepts embodied in the Senate measure would be to extinguish forever the kindly beacon of our Statue of Liberty and to erase from its base the legend of hospitality of our land to the wretched victims of oppression elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I ask this House to act now to open the gates of our land to the exiles of Hitlerism with full regard and compassion for the anguish they have suffered, with a warm embrace and the welcome of new hope, and without discrimination on racial or religious grounds.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this bill have been carefully analyzed and well presented by the Members who have preceded me, and there is little that I can add that would not be repetitious. This bill represents results of meticulous efforts, particularly by the members of the subcommittee, and by the members of the full committee as well. Two important factors, in my opinion, should be especially stressed, and they are, first, that this bill does not increase immigration quotas, and secondly, it is designed to offer a partial solution to the problem of displaced persons residing in the occupied zones of Germany and Austria, as well as in Italy. Also we must recognize that the United States is paying the major share of the money necessary to maintain these displaced-persons camps. The bill provides necessary safeguards for proper screening of prospective immigrants.

The displaced-persons problem is one of the unfortunate aftermaths of the recent war, especially since the war involved a clash of ideologies. The ravages of the recent conflict uprooted many persons from their homes, which were totally destroyed, and caused many to flee from their homes because their sense of righteousness and justice precluded their living under a government the philosophy and dictates of which are diametrically opposed to their fundamental beliefs in the dignity of the individual, which they cherish. Their present living conditions are far from comfortable, but they readily accept the hardships under conditions which enable them to enjoy freedom of thought, religion, and movement. They live in hope that they may be transferred to a land where they may enjoy freedom as we know it; freedoms which were proclaimed by the Atlantic Charter, and to establish which we engaged in the recent war.

Many of the displaced persons lived in abject slavery under two conquering armies, and by their physical stamina and spiritual fortitude, they have survived, and now look hopefully for an opportunity to live where the dignity of the individual supersedes the rule of the state.

It is easily understandable why these persons will not accept repatriation in a country where freedom is not guaranteed and where they will be punished and forced to live in a country bereft of the freedom which they seek. It is natural to expect that they have no desire to rear their families under such circumstances.

Ample testimony has been given the committee revealing the undesirable features of releasing the displaced persons upon the economy of Germany, Austria, and Italy. Secretary of State, General Marshall, clearly presented to the committee forceful arguments against abandoning the displaced persons to the German economy, and against continuing indefinitely the segregation and maintenance of the displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, necessitating continued contribution from the American taxpayer through the International Refugee Organization. The only humane solution of the problem is resettlement of the displaced persons in the various countries of the world which will be willing to receive them.

Apart from the humanitarian standpoint, the caliber of the displaced persons is a tremendous factor which should not be overlooked. The committee report sets forth the occupational and professional skills of those living within the confines of camps. This bill endeavors to be fair and equitable in the selection of the displaced persons with proper consideration for our economy. These camps, if retained, will continue to be a festering sore in Europe and will present a handicap in the framing of peace treaties.

Last fall I inspected many of the displaced-persons camps in the occupied zones, and observed first-hand their living conditions and habits. Within all camps there were established places of worship and schools for both the young and the old. There were also set up trade-training schools where various arts and trades were followed and taught. Most of these were limited because of the scarcity of materials. However, the resourcefulness of some of these people was very surprising. The materials available included shoddy clothes which were rewoven, and old oil cans which were remade into precision instruments. The gamut of their activities spread from the most simple arts to talents in fields of sculpture and painting. There are many well-educated professional men and women in classifications enumerated in the committee report.

Enactment of the Fellows bill, which would expedite the immigration of displaced persons, should set an example for, and likewise encourage other nations to accept a fair share of these unfortunate people.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I consider it a simple moral duty to rise in support of the serious intent and purpose of this proposed legislation to establish a fair, just, adequate basis for the selection and admission of displaced-persons immigrants. I earnestly hope that, before debate concludes, provisions will be adopted for equitable recognition for those courageous underground allies and the brave men, such as the stalwart members of the Polish Second Army at Cassino, who fought side by side with our own forces in the common cause against dictatorship.

In squarely facing our rightful obligation to assume a just share of the responsibility to solve the whole problem of displaced persons and war refugees, in my opinion, there are four courses which might be pursued. One is to let these distressed people, who have suffered so many and such terrible hardships through no fault of their own, stay forever in these semiconcentration camps, at a cost of $300,000,000 a year to the American taxpayer. Another is to abandon them to starvation. A third

is to try to force them on other countries and shirk our own duty. The fourth is to take the lead in promoting their distribution among the other nations by offering to accept a substantial qualified number into this country.

The first two solutions are out of the question, as too expensive and too brutal. The third is the policy we have been following and which has produced no results. The fourth solution has both logic and humanity on its side; the moral reason for helping these people should not need any recital.

One of the proudest of our American traditions lies in the fact that this country gave harbor to the victims of religious and political persecution. The Pilgrim Fathers came to our shores for those very reasons. America was built by refugees from foreign lands. Immigrant stock has helped make this country what it is today. One has only to think of the friends and neighbors he has, who are of Polish, Lithuanian, Italian, Jewish, Swedish, German, French, or other European descent, to realize how valuable it has been for us to have an admixture with the blood of other nations. We must not forget that this Nation itself was founded almost altogether by displaced persons.

Today there are suffering thousands of freedom seekers yearning for a new life in a new world—displaced persons uprooted from their native lands, with no place to go—innocent victims of war, who endured all the Hitler terror only to find the road to freedom blocked even after victory. Relieving their misery—restoring them to normal living—will remove one great source of tension in uneasy Europe. The world waits for us, the children of the pilgrims, to point the way, to set the pace for immigration to all the many lands where displaced people can settle.

The United States today is moving into the arena of world politics as a self-designated champion of the free peoples. A good part of the world looks with doubt on this move as a play for unbridled power. Protests of good intention will carry little conviction if so clearly cut a moral challenge as the refugee problem is bypassed. Let us prove our concern for free peoples by giving them a chance to be free.

American leadership in this matter does not involve the rash, unconsidered lowering of barriers; since all of the usual tests of fitness will be applied there is very little likelihood that the wrong kind of immigrants will be admitted. The requirements of financial guaranty for every immigrant will make it virtually impossible for newcomers to become public charges, while careful screening by the FBI and the Army certifies moral and physical well-being. There is no danger to our quota system of immigration and no possibility of an excess of immigration beyond our power to assimilate.

Our country is now suffering from a shortage of doctors, nurses, farm laborers, garment workers, and a hundred and one other professional and trades people. There are many such people among the displaced persons; most of those who will finally come have relatives here and all must have guarantors. A goodly number of these people have a long agricultural background and they could, in my judgment, be distributed in the farming areas of America to the great benefit of our country. Many of them have a dairy background and they contribute a group of people who could be used in the dairy industry of this country. If we distribute these immigrants widely enough in accordance with their special skills and economic background we shall have adequate room for them in this country without upsetting, in any degree, our own economic and social stability. These people would be a genuine national asset. They are in a real sense, chosen people—people who have been chosen by a ruthless process of natural selection. They are the people who resisted totalitarianism from its beginning, who had courage enough and were tough enough to survive all its efforts to extinguish them. They are people who prize freedom—prize it enough to have suffered for it deeply. They are the kind of people in whose behalf the American tradition of asylum was established and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our society from its earliest days forward.

The scientific, mechanical, and other skills together with the culture brought by these immigrants will be permanent contributions to our national welfare. We boast of the many contributions made by our ancestors who came here from other lands; our history books are filled with the achievements of immigrants. Shall we now, by inadequate action, in effect erase and blot out that famous Christian apothegm, written at the base of our Statue of Liberty: "Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me"?

National organizations of all descriptions, representing church groups, labor organizations, university and professional groups, and others, have passed resolutions and recorded themselves in favor of this legislation.

We can no longer delay in meeting a great humanitarian challenge. The time for action is now. We are engaged in, and planning to extend, an ambitious program of aid to European nations resisting the imposition of communism. Let us implement this program by concrete evidence of willingness to assume a just obligation toward refugees from countries in Europe already Communist controlled.

Our fighting men displayed during the war a devotion to human liberty. Their relatives at home felt that same devotion. For Europe's displaced populations the war is not yet over and the cause of liberty and human dignity is not yet triumphant. In world leadership we can speak more convincingly for freedom everywhere when we have done our fair share to bring real freedom to those who have suffered most. Our country, built with immigrant labor and immigrant talent, is by its very nature and history best fitted to take the lead and set an example of rescue and charity. Those to whom we have traditionally offered opportunity and freedom have repaid us in untold measure with their industry, their loyalty, and their lives. Our policy of haven has been a generous one—but it has paid us rich dividends. I urge you, my colleagues, to endorse this proved investment of the past, and enact this legislation into law without further delay.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 6396 is a bill so much in the democratic tradition of this country that every Member of this body should feel morally bound to support it.

The Emergency Displaced Persons Admissions Act would admit 200,000 displaced persons over the next two fiscal years, displaced persons whose activities during World War II have earned them the right to the refuge and haven in these United States. No group is excluded by virtue of its race, religion, or political aspirations, provided it meets other and fair qualifications.

All persons admitted under this bill must have been in Italy or in the American, French, or British zones of Germany or Austria on or before April 21, 1947. If they have borne arms against the enemies of the United States, or if they have been registered with the IRO as a refugee in the terms defined and accepted by the United Nations' standard, they would be welcomed to these shores.

Morally, then, they have earned the right to entrance.

But in addition to their belief in our democratic ideals, if they have special skills that are sorely needed in this country, they will receive priority in admission—farm laborers, construction workers, clothing workers, doctors, dentists, nurses, and so forth.

That means that these United States have the chance to get skilled workers immediately, without the investments in long periods of training and apprenticeship.

For example, there is today a great shortage of tailors—master craftsmen.

One hundred and fifty manufacturers throughout the country have filed with the Clothing Manufacturers Association of the United States affidavits indicating their need for tailors from the displaced persons camps in Europe, where there are many of them to be found.

The Fashion Park Co. in Rochester asked for 100 tailors; Kahn Tailoring Co. in Indianapolis asked for 50; Stratbury Manufacturing Co., of Galion, Ohio, asked for 25; Hart, Schaffner & Marx, of Chicago, asked for 350 tailors, and M. Born & Co., of Chicago, also asked for 100; the Globe Tailoring Co., of Cincinnati, asked for 75; in Philadelphia, H. Reeman & Son asked for 225; H. Daroff & Sons for 100; and Jacob Siegel Co. for 80; in Allentown, Phoenix Clothes asked for 60; in New York City, Eagle Clothes asked for 50, Hickory Clothing Corp. for 40, and Currick & Leiken Co. for 75. In the garment industry alone over 3,000 skilled tailors in the displaced persons camps have already been spoken for by the Clothing Manufacturers Association in this country.

Many of you will say, How will these persons be housed, where will they live, what is their background, how have other countries fared?

The clothing industry has been, historically, an industry that employed immigrant labor or else second-generation Americans. Consequently, we find that today the overwhelming majority of the workers are Italians, Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, and other nationalities of similar strain. In cities where the Polish population is large, as in Buffalo, we find that the workers in the clothing factories are Poles in very many instances, and a similar situation is found in each important clothing market, as Chicago, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Rochester, and Cleveland, where the immigrant strain predominant in the locality is usually predominant in the clothing plants of the area as well.

The majority of displaced persons, who qualify as tailors, would therefore become part of an industry where they would find many of their countrymen employed. Quite often, they would have relatives, or neighbors in Europe, within the same plant. In turn, the current working force, would find that the new workers are closely related by ties of blood or friendship.

Because of this very reason, the experience in Canada where displaced persons have recently entered the country to become clothing workers should prove of interest to us.

According to the executive secretary of the Canadian Clothing Manufacturers Association, when the news was published that a committee of the industry was leaving for Europe to select tailors among the displaced persons, there was a deluge of letters and petitions from the actual workers within the industry, and many employers as well, asking the committee to seek a particular relative or friend in a specific displaced persons camp, and indicating that they would gladly house the displaced person if he entered Canada. Actually, the housing problem is being met to a great extent on that basis, and relatives, or fellow countrymen, are more than anxious to cooperate and give proper shelter to the displaced persons.

The executive secretary of the Clothing Manufacturers Association of the United States of America, discussed with labor leaders and manufacturers throughout all of the important clothing markets in the United States, the problem of housing displaced persons who may enter our industry. It was their opinion that we would be likewise overwhelmed by letters from clothing workers who are Poles, Balts, Hungarians, and others, who would seek to have their relatives, friends or countrymen enter the United States, and that the problem of housing the displaced persons would be greatly eased, if not entirely eliminated in a manner similar to the Canadian experience.

And lastly the experience of the manufacturers in the United States in their efforts to train and keep in the trade skilled tailors in this country has been very unsuccessful.

For example, in Philadelphia, one of the most important clothing manufacturing centers in this country, a special class was set up by the Clothing Manufacturers Association itself to train apprentices. They were paid 50 cents per hour while learning. The size of the classes averaged throughout the year about 30 pupils, and by the time the program was concluded 200 hand sewers were sent out into the industry, of which less than one-third remained.

If we go to other fields of activity—construction, farming, medicine, and so forth—where there is a similar shortage of skilled personnel, we find the situation as acute as it is in the garment industry.

We have as much or more to gain from the passage of this bill as the courageous men and women who, having fought for freedom, have waited long to enjoy it.

Over 125 national organizations have earnestly supported such legislation for the solution of this international problem.

We have become a great nation because we have welcomed the distressed and the oppressed of the world. If we are to continue to be that great nation we must hold fast to the ideals that are the proven sources of our strength.

To repeat the words inscribed on the Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearing to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the distinguished, able, and eloquent gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] explain the contents of the displaced persons bill there remains but little to say about the measure as it is presented to us. But I want to submit additional and I trust pertinent suggestions which the committee might well consider and act upon favorably at this time.

I have in mind Mr. Chairman the heroic Polish Army which fought in every major battle, in every major campaign outside of the Orient. They began their continuous battle on the first day of the war and fought bravely and without respite even until the last day and for these even today the war is not yet over. The Polish Army of General Anders fought with great courage and distinction but without reward.

They were ultimately denied even the entry and possession of their beloved Poland. For their gallantry and courage they are today classed as outcasts. They fought the enemy, both Nazi and Communist, wherever they found him and they met him frequently first in Poland, then in Syria where they put down the pro-Vichy recalcitrants. It was the Poles who for the large part, held Tobruk in the first seige for over 8 months. They fought in France before and after the fall of that country. It was the Poles who defended England during the blitz. They were in Narvik even without air cover. At Monte Cassino they left their imperishable mark of heroism confirmed by over 4,000 graves. But they gained their objective and continued north through Italy—side by side with our American boys. They marched triumphantly through the decimated ranks of the defeated and demoralized Huns in northern France and continued through Holland and Germany now to remain stalemated by an ungrateful combination of circumstances, conditions, and persons. They are entitled to special and prior consideration in any bill which permits admission of immigrants to the United States. God knows of their sacrifices even if humanity has forgotten. They are not only anti-Communist, but anti-Nazi and they are the timber that would make the best among our citizens of immigrant stock. They should be included in this bill beyond the number which Chairman FELLOWS claims will cover their classification. His figures indicate 50,000 Polish soldiers might be eligible—what about the remaining number of 200,000—all of these heroes—all of them deserving the haven that is America?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I first want to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] on making a wonderful résumé of what has been happening in Europe. Although I personally do not quite agree with either the House or Senate bill, I still believe something is better than nothing. I am sorry that the gentleman, the head of this committee, has not seen fit to actually bring in a displaced-persons bill, instead of mortgaging the quotas of the countries, especially the central European countries, which quotas are very low. When you mortgage these quotas for the next 40 or 50 or 60 years, you are damaging the next generations who would love to come to this country, but will be forbidden on account of this law.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. It is true that the bill does mortgage the quotas to the extent of 50 percent. But is not the situation quite academic? The quotas that are mortgaged are quotas of satellite countries of Russia, which countries would refuse to allow their nationals to emigrate. Therefore, the situation is not harmful at all in that respect.

Mr. LESINSKI. Why do we find the central European countries in the plight they are in? The fact is that our administration has been blamed for turning over the central European countries to be controlled by Russia. We have given 50 percent of Poland to Russia without their authority, and naturally we owe those Polish people certain things on account of what they did for us during the war. Why is it that the Polish soldier who fought on the other side of Warsaw and who was shoved into Siberia and then into Iran and then fought in Italy and took Monte Cassino, why is he eliminated? Do you mean to say that the man who has fought all through the war with us has been sold down the

river? I feel there should be some kind of amendment to permit at least some of these people the chance to come into this country.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. If the gentleman will support the amendment that I intend to offer, we will bring those people in under this bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. Well, it all depends on what the amendment is. We realize we cannot bring them all in. It is just impossible. We cannot bring in all of the refugees. We have a certain limit that we must go by. But we should at least give each nation a small portion of these displaced persons.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend passage of the Fellows bill, H. R. 6396, providing for the admission of displaced persons into this country. I have long advocated the need for legislative action in this important social field.

I believe there has been great public misunderstanding as to the proposals to permit the admission of some of these people to our shores. In the course of the last year and a half, I have made numerous public addresses in explanation of the plight of these people, of the proposals providing for their admission, and of the great social and humanitarian need for affirmative action by the Eightieth Congress.

The Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary has held thorough and extensive hearings. The subject has been explored from every conceivable angle, and now this bill comes forth with just about the unanimous recommendation of the 27 members of the House Committee on the Judiciary. As is true of most legislation, this is a compromise between varying views on the subject. There are some who are overly generous in their desires to open the gates to the foreign-born. There are others who, in their great subscription to what they believe is stout Americanism, believe that the gate for admission should be closed for all time. The principles embodied in the Fellows bill which we are considering today represent a fair compromise of these various views.

In my judgment there are three strong and impelling arguments in favor of the admission of displaced persons. First, is the practical argument that by admitting a fair share of these people to America we unburden ourselves from the financial responsibility of caring for them in the displaced persons camps. Each year we contribute some $72,000,000 as our share of this expense. This does not take into consideration the sums expended by the Army of Occupation. It is a fair estimate to say that in the course of the next 10 years we would expend not less than $1,000,000,000 to care for these people in the overseas area. Should we not now take some action which will relieve us of this great financial strain on our Treasury? The second argument is a humanitarian one. We cannot let these fellow human beings live like animals in idleness and inaction for any longer time. Their plight is a most sorrowful one. While the physical condition of most of them is sound, they suffer great mental sorrow as the result of the apparent futility of their status as citizens of the world. They cannot devote their energies to useful and gainful pursuits. They are deprived of normal social intercourse and association. Many of them are separated from their families and friends. They live in strange lands, and in many instances are handicapped by the lack of a common tongue. They are human beings—all of them. We must view them as fellow human beings. In the spirit of the good Samaritan, it is obligatory upon us to aid them. How can a great civilized people turn their eyes from such a sorrowful sight? We must discharge our obligation and extend to them the helping hand of aid and friendship.

The third argument is again a practical one. We need these people and their skills and abilities. We can use the farm hands and the carpenters and the artisans, the professional men and women, the tradesmen, and the domestic servants. They are a great and intelligent group of people possessing a tremendous potential usefulness to us in America. They can contribute so much of their abilities and intelligence to the continued growth and prosperity of our country.

In my own State of Minnesota, a great movement has been led by our eminent Governor Luther W. Youngdahl, looking toward the settlement of many of these people in the fertile fields and valleys of the great North Star State. Minnesotans have opened their arms and will welcome these people to the State. We need them—we can profit from them, and these displaced persons can in turn settle down and live a normal and useful life in Minnesota and elsewhere in the United States.

The provisions of this bill are exceptionally meritorious insofar as they establish safeguards against the admission of undesirable persons. All of the usual provisions of the immigration laws with reference to character, cleanliness, and sound physical condition are applicable; in fact, under the present bill, it is apparent to me that the class of immigrant admitted will be of a higher type and will make a more useful citizen than the type of immigrant who enters through normal immigration channels. This is because of the basis of selectivity set up in the bill. Other sections of the act assure that these persons will be distributed around the country in accordance with the need for their skills. Fairness is insured by providing in section 3 for the admission of persons of various national and religious groups in accordance with their present numbers in the displaced persons camps. In this respect and in many others, the Fellows bill is far superior to the act passed by the other body.

I cannot refrain from expressing the hope that this bill will be expeditiously enacted today and that in the course of conference between the two bodies, the principle embodied in the Fellows bill will predominate in the final recommended draft. I believe it to be a superior piece of legislation.

I urge passage of H. R. 6396 so that we in America may recognize our great world obligation of helping the unfortunate displaced persons in Europe.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has put forward a very powerful plea in support of an amendment which I have already placed on the Clerk's desk. My amendment would strike out the language beginning at the word "who" in line 7 on page 2, down to and including the word "Austria" in line 10, and would insert words so that this section would read:

> A person who has applied for admission into the United States for permanent residence before April 29, 1948, and who during World War II bore arms against the enemies—

And so forth.

The purpose of the bill is to give some degree of preference to the Polish soldiers who fought at Warsaw and elsewhere in Poland. They were sent to Siberia and later were allowed to leave Siberia only if they would sign up with the Polish Army and be trained. They ultimately fought in Italy.

More than 4,000 of them are buried on the mountainsides outside of Monte Cassino. Those of us who have been in Italy, those who have seen the concentration camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy, realize that this is a bill with tremendous merit, which should be passed. But in giving consideration to those unfortunate people who are in the concentration camps, many of them have done nothing directly as individuals which was helpful in the war effort or which helped the American soldiers in their struggle against the enemy, but the Polish soldiers fought shoulder to shoulder with the American soldiers in Italy. They died on the same battlefields.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have stated a number of times that I would support this bill, as I feel most of the Members of the House will. However, a bill which is designed to admit into this country 200,000 immigrants, whom we all hope will make good Americans and produce more good Americans in the generations to come, depends upon one thing, and that is how the law is carried out; how they are screened. If I understand the bill, it will bar any person who is a Communist, who is a Nazi, who is a Fascist, who is diseased with some disease that cannot be cured or has some mental aberration which would make him a liability on this country.

I would like to say, not only for myself and the committee of which I am

a member, but for the future sessions of Congress, that how these people are selected and how they are screened is going to be very carefully watched by all Members of Congress, both of the minority and the majority.

In answer to some of those who have made the plea that we have no place to put them, that there are not enough homes in the country for those who live here, for the GI's who have married and now have children and who must live with their relatives or in-laws, I would like to say this: If the President, who has publicly stated that this Congress should be defeated, if the President of the United States would order his Attorney General, who is the chief officer in charge of immigration and naturalization affairs in the United States, to pick up and arrest and try and deport some 855,000 people who are in this country illegally and should be deported, regardless of whether they are good or bad people, there would be plenty of room for these immigrants. This is a Nation created and operated by law. According to the best estimates that can be made by those who are skilled in these matters, there are some 20,000 people in this country now who are Communists, who are Fascists, who are Nazis, who are criminals or who have some mental difficulty. The entire success of this bill will depend upon how it is administered. This bill will be America's gift to the world. Those officials who are charged with the administration of its provisions are going to be very carefully watched.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 6396, known as the Fellows bill, for the admission of 200,000 displaced persons during the next 2 years, is by far more practical and equitable legislation than the bill passed by the other body. The screening process set out in the House bill, will assure absolute protection against the admission of any persons whose ideologies would be contrary to the Government of the United States. The percentage which will be assigned to farms, business, crafts, both skilled and unskilled, will insure that the admission of this relatively small number of displaced persons will not, in any way, encroach on the employment problem in congested areas. The provisions setting out that the entrants must assure the Immigration Department that they have suitable living quarters, will not seriously jeopardize the present housing crisis in congested areas.

In enacting the Fellows bill into law, we are not only cooperating in the solving of a great humanitarian problem, but economically we are extending to this number of people an opportunity to produce for themselves. The expense of keeping these displaced persons in camps throughout Europe will consequently be eliminated. By the United States cooperating in taking care of a share of the present estimated 800,000 displaced persons, it will serve to encourage other nations to do their share and provide opportunities for the remainder.

Considering all angles of this displaced persons problem, the members of the House subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] should be congratulated on the outstanding work they have done in holding hearings on this bill and presenting a practical piece of legislation such as is contained in H. R. 6396.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all those who have spoken may have the right to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act."

SEC. 2. When used in this act, the term "displaced person" means—

(a) a person who was on April 21, 1947, and is upon the effective date of this act in Italy or the United States, British, or French zones or sectors in Germany or Austria and who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States and is unable or unwilling to return to the country of which he is a national because of persecution or his fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions; or

(b) a person who is registered by the International Refugee Organization, according to the definitions of displaced persons and refugees set forth in annex I to the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, except clause (b), paragraph 1, section A, part I thereof, to which the United States has adhered (Public Law 146, 80th Cong.), and who entered Italy or the United States, British, or French zones or sectors in Germany or Austria, on or before April 21, 1947, midnight;

(c) the term "displaced person" shall not include any person who is or has been a member of, or participated in, any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN:

On page 2, line 4, after the words "opinions, or", insert the following: "the person who has fled as a direct result of persecution or fear of persecution developing from the overthrow of the government of his country of origin since April 21, 1947."

On page 4, line 10, after the words "United States", strike out the words "prior to March 15, 1948," and replace with following: "prior to the effective date of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which I explained during the time when the rule was debated. Many of you know the history of Czechoslovakia. Many of you know the history of John Huss, who was burned at the stake in Czechoslovakia because of his fight for freedom. Many of you know the history of the Czechoslovakian regiments which marched around the world during the First World War aiding the Allies in the fight for democracy. Many of you who are here on the floor of the House have been in Siberia and China and have seen the graves and the bones of those brave Czech soldiers who fought side by side with America's other allies for liberty. I need not tell you what the Czech soldier and the Czechs did in the underground and on land, sea, and air during World War II. Of course, you cannot so quickly forget the story of Lidice.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is an effort to give just a little relief and hope to these brave Czechs who recently escaped from communistic threats when the Communists overthrew the Republic of Czechoslovakia, a republic which was founded after our own Republic, the constitution of which was written here in the United States of America. Surely you have not forgotten the words of the late Thomas Masaryk.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, has the approval and the recommendation of the Department of State, and the Department of State in a letter which I now hold in my hand not only recommends and approves this amendment but states it has authority from the Department of the Army to state that it, too, concurs.

I have here a letter which just arrived from a Czech refugee relief committee chairman in a camp in Weisbaden, Germany. It is written by an American woman who is voluntarily assisting these Czechs who escaped from communism only a few days ago. She tells a sad story of the plight of these enemies of communism.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Can the gentleman tell us about how many people would be involved in his amendment?

Mr. STEFAN. Not over 2,000 or so of these brave Czechs.

I quote the following memorandum from the Department of State:

MEMORANDUM ON THE CZECHOSLOVAK REFUGEES

JUNE 8, 1948.

Following the Communist seizure of power in Czechoslovakia, many Czechoslovak citizens found it necessary to flee from their homeland in order to escape punishment and retaliation at the hands of the Communist Government. Over 8,000 of these refugees have entered the western zones of Germany and Austria. They include former members of the government, journalists, professional, and businessmen, and other citizens whose acts in defense of the democratic traditions of Czechoslovakia and opposition to the methods of the Communists in seizing control marked them either for punishment or for the loss of their civil and economic rights.

It has always been the objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support democratic movements in their opposition to totalitarian governments and to give refuge to individuals whose lives or security is directly threatened.

I am quoting the Department of State when I tell you this, and I continue to quote that Department so that you will know these are not my words but the words of the Department of State that is also speaking for the Department of the Army in support of my amendment.

These Czechoslovak refugees have demonstrated by reason of their flight that they are staunch supporters of the democratic cause who preferred to flee rather than to remain in Czechoslovakia. They were neither persuaded or coerced to support the Communist government.

Many of these refugees now wish to come to the United States where they may contribute to our national democratic life. Under the existing legislation, many years would be required for them to fulfill the requirements of immigration and wait their turns under the quota system. This means they would have to remain in camps in the western zones of Germany and Austria for an indefinite period with no facilities for supporting themselves.

Here is a letter from this American lady which arrived today, who is helping in these camps. She tells the pitiful story of these people who run away from communism, who were soldiers in the last war fighting alongside of the RAF and the American soldiers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I have several counties which border the district represented by the able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], in which are located a great many people of Bohemian descent. Those border counties are Gregory, Tripp, Todd, and Bennett. Two of those counties during the war-bond drives repeatedly were leaders of the State in war-bond subscriptions. The Czechs are fine people, thrifty, hard-working, and make excellent American citizens. We should adopt this amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. We have over a million Czech people in the United States. If you visit their farms, you will find they are of the finest. Those people are lovers of America. Those who tilled in their homelands and came gratefully to this country, this free America, to till our rich soil, are great producers and great American patriots. They are lovers of God's good earth. They raise some of the finest crops you will find anywhere. You will find them among the best businessmen in America, among the finest artists, among the finest musicians, some of the finest teachers, some of our finest painters. I guarantee to you that if we allow these few Czech refugees to come to the United States, they will contribute greatly to our American citizenship. They will become some of our best citizens.

Let me tell you more about these recommendations of the State Department in favor of my amendment which I am offering in all good faith:

The Czechoslovak refugees from Communist rule are in a similar position as the displaced persons who were uprooted by the Nazis, or who fled from persecution in Poland. The Czechoslovak case is unique in that the people involved voluntarily fled from Czechoslovakia because of the strength of their democratic convictions and the depth of their democratic commitments.

Mr. Chairman, other countries of western Europe have already admitted thousands of these refugees. It is in the interest of the United States to do the same.

This memoranda states:

Other countries of western Europe have already admitted 3,000 of these new refugees. It is in the interest of the United States Government to help as many of these refugees as it is possible to do. Accordingly, the Department of State strongly supports the proposed amendment to give a status similar to that of displaced persons to a fixed number of Szechoslovak refugees in order to permit their entry into the United States. It is understood that only those who are bona-fide refugees from Czechoslovakia after February 1948 will be considered.

Members of the committee, I plead with you to accept this amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Does the gentleman's amendment cover only these 2,000 Czechs?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; but it could help others and set an example for other countries to take some others.

Mr. BRADLEY. It does not cover nationals from other countries?

Mr. STEFAN. In my opinion, this amendment would make it possible for some other refugees in the same condition as the Czechs to benefit by this bill which we are about to pass.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Nebraska has made a very eloquent and proper plea for this group, but the same type of plea can be made for Germans or many other groups. This bill is a compromise bill, and if we start to give preferential treatment to each and every group for which a case can be made, there will be no limit and no possibility of giving any assistance or relief to anybody by any legislation at this session.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Michigan is making the same argument that some of the other members of the committee made. You are closing by this bill the entry of heroes and lovers of democracy who have been fighting for democracy for over a period of many years. I plead with you to vote for this amendment.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply sympathetic with what the gentleman from Nebraska is trying to do in his amendment. I have no doubt but what they are fine people, and as he described them patriots, all. I would like to call attention to the fact, however, that the annual quota for Czechoslovakia is 2,874, and if I understood the gentleman correctly, this amendment involves but 2,000 people. That quota is not preempted by this bill, because there were no Czechs to amount to anything in these camps. But that is not the point. The chairman of the committee indicated what it would lead to. I have every sympathy in the world and personally I would like to accept many of these amendments, but just as soon as you start doing that you are going to end up with no bill at all. We went over all these questions while we were considering the DP bill, so-called.

I hope that the Committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we all deeply sympathize with the purposes enumerated by the author of this amendment. We all know the great story of the Hussites, and our sympathy was deeply enlisted in the untimely death of young Masaryk. We know about his illustrious father, Thomas Masaryk; I yield to no one in my admiration for Czechoslovakia and the Czech people. It is rather anomalous that this situation has developed when only today, or even yesterday, the State Department saw fit to write a letter from which extracts were read by the gentleman from Nebraska. We have been considering this bill for months and months, and no statement was ever before us with reference to this situation. Nor was any reference to these Czechs since they fled after Moscow took over. The amendment comes without warning. We heard naught of it till this day.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that I showed the official letter from the Department of State to the gentleman from New York, and he read it, and he also read the entire memorandum which was submitted to me by the Department of State. There were no excerpts read. The entire letter was read.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman misunderstands me. I say that the proposition of the admission of these Czechs never came before our committee. I admit that the situation arose after the defeat of Benes, and with the coming into power of the Communists. The Czechs, naturally, not willing to remain under Communist domination, escaped from the confines of Czechoslovakia. Some fled to England, some to France, others to the DP camps. As has been stated, these Czechs could in great measure come into the country under the regular quota. But the minute we open the door to the admission of the Czechs under this bill, regardless of quota, we will have to open the door a little more widely with reference to the admission of the Volkdeutsche, and then we would have to push it open a little more with the admission of many Italians, who are very worthy, many of whom rendered yeoman service with the Allies during the war, and then we would have to open the door a little further with reference to the members of General Anders' armies, who are in England and other parts of the world. Many amendments are at the desk covering these people.

We must remember that this is a DP problem that we are trying to solve. We are trying to close the DP camps to save us money and, if possible, to enrich our economy with the admission of these DP's. If we are going to reach out and

get others who are not in the DP camps, who are not involved in the DP problem, we are not going to solve this DP problem at all. I think it would be most ill-advised to try to help these worthy Czechs with this bill. While I admit that we are reaching the closing days of the session, perhaps in the next Congress a bill could be specifically offered for a specific remedy in the event there will not be enough Czech visas, but I think there will be plenty of available visas for these Czechs within the Czechoslovak quotas.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in further opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on July 1 of this year there will be available under the quota to Czechoslovakia 2,874 admissions. That these people have been well taken care of in the past is evidenced by the report I am reading from. It is the annual report of the Commissioner of Immigration. In the year 1941 1,787 were admitted, in the year 1942, 568; in the year 1943, 362; in the year 1944, 323; in the year 1945, 276; in the year 1946, 964; and last year 2,663 persons were admitted from Czechoslovakia. So the argument of the gentleman from Nebraska does not apply for this reason: We are not reaching in and taking 50 percent of that quota at all because of the small number in the concentration camps.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman know whether or not there would be anything in the circumstance of these people having fled from Czechoslovakia, and now being in Germany or Austria, which would deny them eligibility under the present quotas?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In other words, this quota of 2,600 would be open for these people who have fled from Czechoslovakia, even though they come immediately from Germany?

Mr. GRAHAM. Provided, of course, they qualify under the other provisions of the immigration law.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am actually amazed at the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I am satisfied that if he were thoroughly familiar with the situation and the conditions, he would not oppose this amendment. The amendment will not affect anyone else or any other people, because all the other people are included in the bill. The bill was drafted before the unfortunate situation occurred in Czechoslovakia. After the bill was actually reported, Czechoslovakia was taken over by the Communists. From that time on, all the sincere liberty-loving democrats whose freedom was taken away from them by the change have fled to Germany, the only nearby country that they could possibly flee to, notwithstanding they have always been at loggerheads with the Germans and the German officials. I feel this amendment cannot and will not affect the bill in any way. It does not signify that if it is adopted it will be necessary to adopt other amendments. I think this is the most deserving and most humane amendment that has been offered, with the exception of the amendment that may be offered to permit soldiers serving in the Polish Army to volunteer for service in the United States Army because they fear returning to their native country. I plead and urge in behalf of these liberty-loving men and women, of which there are not many, that they not be foreclosed because they had not been deprived of their freedom and liberty at the time the bill was being prepared and acted upon by the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois knows that the State Department would not recommend this amendment, nor would the Army recommend it if it affected the bill. That has been their policy for the benefit of the United States Government, and the Department of State recommends this amendment, for which reason I am offering it.

Mr. SABATH. I am very pleased that the gentleman has offered the amendment, because I intended to offer it myself. I called attention to the fact that I intended to offer such an amendment when I made my first speech on the rule on this bill early this afternoon. I know that the Department of State and the War Department and every fair-minded man and woman who believes in justice and humane treatment of deserving people favor this provision. I plead and urge that relief will be forthcoming for these deserving people. For that reason, I most sincerely urge and hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska will be adopted.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the committee on bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I intend to support the bill. I think the committee has done an excellent job under very difficult and trying circumstances.

With particular respect to the pending amendment, I think we should keep in mind that we are trying to fight a battle of ideologies abroad.

We are trying to encourage people to resist the iron hand, and to adhere to the principles which the United States enjoys in its own Government. It is what we have uppermost in our minds. That is the reason why we are appropriating very large sums of money. That is the reason why we are carrying on, rightly or wrongly, this so-called Voice of America. That is why the United States is considered the bulwark of democracy in the world. There are some people in those countries which have been overrun by Russia, or which have suffered Communist coups in recent years, who, because they stand for freedom, have been, in effect, expelled from their own countries. They were not only expelled since April 1, 1947, but as time goes on and possibly additional coups take place, others may be so expelled. I can think of Hungary, in addition to Czechoslovakia, which I do not believe would come under the terms of this bill as presently drawn, but would under the terms of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. There are not a great many people who would be covered by this category, but they are deep patriots, they love freedom, and I think we should give them asylum. They are neither pants makers nor farmers. They are the intelligentsia, who are doing their utmost to uphold freedom and democracy in their own patriotic way, a way which our own forefathers took many years ago, the way which made America.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is it not true that this group is one which has been tried in the fire, and has proven their fundamental love of liberty, and that is why they have been expelled?

Mr. HINSHAW. I can point to you men whom I know who have suffered in Nazi Gestapo prisons. I know one who was in a prison camp in Germany for 7 months and was liberated by the Americans. The reason he was there was because he was fighting for the same principles that you and I fight for. If you want some really good people in the United States, people whom we deeply admire, adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in an unusual position. I am torn between a desire to be loyal to my good friend, Mr. CELLER, from New York, and my good friend from Chicago, Mr. SABATH. In all the years I have been here and they have been here, this is the first time we have ever agreed on anything that has to do with immigration. But I was impressed very much with the sincerity of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. He recognized that in this amendment was an element of justice and fairness to one group of people who were really being discriminated against. He is one of those who believes that this bill is not so sacred as to be above the possibility of being improved by an amendment. He proved what I said in my original remarks, that this is a relief problem and not an immigration problem. These persons sought to be reached by the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska want some relief, and they are entitled to it. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said by way of consolation to the gentleman from Nebraska: "Wait until next year. Wait until some other time. Do not impair this bill, but wait until next year." Yes; he can say that with all propriety, and he would say wait until next year to the Chinese and to the Indians and to the Japanese and to everybody that has suffered in the war and who were dislocated and are in a terrible condition. He would say to all of them that "Today is not your time, but we will reach you some other time." I leave it with you, my colleagues, that this is a

relief problem and it ought to be settled and it ought to be worked out, not through immigration by bringing individuals into this country but my relieving them where they now are.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would not the gentleman admit that, if you grant this amendment, there will be another amendment, and it will go on and on and on and you will destroy the whole bill?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If you permit this amendment to be passed, you take 2,000 off of the 200,000. That is all. You give 2,000 preferences to the Czechs and take that many off of the others. The Czechs have a just claim.

Mr. GRAHAM. And then comes the next amendment, with 15,000 Poles, and that will take off 15,000 more, and it would go on and on and there will be no one to be admitted.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I say. I say you will not have solved the problem by bringing in a few. They are all anxious to be helped by the United States. When you feed one hungry man and deny another, that last one is still hungry. There is nothing sacrosanct about this bill. It is simply giving a preference to a few and denying many. It should be amended and then defeated.

If you want to restrict immigration handle it as an immigration problem and not as a relief problem. Our relief money has gone to all these people. We have sent money to China, we have sent money everywhere. Let that money go to relieve these camps first of all. When we send money to England, when we send money to France, when we send money to Italy, let us say to them that if they do not use it first to clean up these camps that we will shut off the money. If we do not do this they are going to come back here year after year.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. I may suggest this, that since the Bohemian quota is 2,874 and there are only about 2,000, under the directive of December 22, 1945, the displaced persons have a right to be assigned 90 percent of the quota. In other words they can take up that 2,000 within their own quota without burdening this quota.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. My point is that this is a problem of relief and that the place to relieve these distressing conditions is the place where they are located.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 75, noes 52.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON: On page 1, section 2, line 8, after the word "in" and before the word "Italy", insert "Great Britain."

"FIRST AT DANZIG, LAST IN WASHINGTON"—PROPOSAL TO ADMIT A LIMITED NUMBER OF THE MEMBERS OF THE FORMER POLISH ARMY OF THE POLISH GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered would make eligible the members of the Polish army in exile, and still retain the 200,000 limitation fixed by this bill. These are the Polish soldiers who served in the army of the Polish Government that was formed in Paris, France, in 1939. These men served valiantly throughout the war under American and British commands on the far-flung battlefields. These men are presently in so-called resettlement camps in England—a resettlement camp is the British equivalent of a displaced persons camp.

BRAVERY OF POLISH SOLDIERS

When Britain's fate hung in balance they performed deeds of bravery in the skies over England. They fought at Narvik, at the Maginot line, and in Tobruk. On the slopes of Mount Cassino alone 3,600 of them laid down their lives, thus saving the lives of our American boys in Gen. Mark Clark's Fifth Army. The bravery of these Polish fighting men was not exceeded by that of any other fighting force.

These heroes of the last war, many of whom were decorated with America's highest honors for bravery, are now disarmed and deprived of their military status and placed in camps in Great Britain of the so-called Polish Resettlement Corps.

Is this the reward for the Polish soldiers, who with our American boys fought for the cause of freedom, and who were the first to fight Germany and the last to cease fire? Is this the reward for men who put their faith in the spoken and written pledges of the United Kingdom, the United States of America and I might add the United Nations? Marked by the Soviet police, slated for labor camps in Siberia, prisons or gallows, if they return—these young, healthy, heroic, and determined human beings are to languish in quonset huts of British camps.

These gallant Polish soldiers are entitled to come to the United States if only as a reward for the invaluable services they rendered America as our allies and for the sacrifices they and their comrades made. It would in some measure repay them for their fighting and for their services. Their hearts bleed at the thought that they cannot return to the kind of Poland for which they had fought. A great many of them come from eastern Poland, which at Yalta, without the consent of the Polish people, was turned over to Soviet Russia as an outright reward for aggression. And in what is left of Poland, there is a Communist Government, which owes its allegiance to Moscow. Try to visualize, if you can, our own American boys in the same plight—unable to return home—because a ruthless foreign power, in the guise of a liberator, had occupied their country.

WOULD MAKE DESIRABLE AMERICAN CITIZENS

These gallant Polish heroes represent the highest human material from the point of view of any sensible immigration policy. They love liberty. Most of them come from sturdy Polish peasant stock, psychologically akin to the American pioneer stock.

The displaced Polish soldiers and civilians are of the same blood and stock as the six million loyal Americans of Polish descent. Prior to the enactment of the draft law in 1940, over 17 percent of the entire United States Marine Corps—all volunteers—was composed of boys of Polish descent even though only 4 percent of our population are of Polish descent. Our casualty lists are replete with Polish names. Their record on the battle and home fronts is one of achievement.

AN INVESTMENT IN JUSTICE

These soldiers are an American responsibility. Their plight is attributable directly to the infamous Yalta Agreement, to which America was a party. In depriving them of the protection of a legal government, of an independent country, of freedom, of their homes and of their beloved ones, we are directly responsible for their present fate.

This is a group of fine fighting men who stood at Danzig and first bared their breasts to the Germans in defense of their native land. They fought the Communists and they fought the Nazis. I hope when the roll is called on this amendment we are not going to say to them "You may have been first at Danzig but you are last at Washington."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Of course, if you want to wreck this legislation the thing to do is to adopt the amendment just offered because, after all, if 110,000 Poles come in under this law, plus the 2,000 Czechs that you have already provided for, that leaves just a handful to be taken out of each camp.

Let us look at the position the Poles are in, and I want to say to the gentleman who offered this amendment that I feel very sympathetic to these people. I met many of them during the month and a half that I spent in England last summer, and I think he would be very glad to know that they are all employed, and they have become assimilated very well, and if they do not like it in England, up and down both sides of the Strand and every street of London are large signs urging people to migrate to the several British colonies. It seems to me it would be a very simple thing, if they are not satisfied in England, for them to migrate to the colonies that they have been invited to go to.

I would like to call the attention of the Committee to page 2 of the report on the bill. That shows the groupings and the percentages of the various nationalities that would be eligible for admission into the United States under this bill. The highest percentage is Poland, with 31 percent.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is not the distinguishing criterion the people in the camps we are responsible for and have to pay for? These people in England are self-supporting and they are able to take care of themselves.

Mr. WALTER. Of course they are. Furthermore, you must bear in mind this fact, that there is no unemployment in England. These people can all find jobs. As I said before, all of them are working and apparently getting along very well.

I think that this amendment should be rejected because, after all, our problem is to get rid of these camps and to get rid of them as quickly as we can, and the only way to do it is to enact this legislation without the kind of amendment that we are now considering.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: Page 1, line 7, after the word "who", strike out the balance of the line down to and including the word "Austria" on line 10, and insert the words "has applied for admission into the United States for permanent residence before April 29, 1948."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to give to less than 20,000 Polish soldiers and soldiers of other nationalities who are no longer able to return to their own homelands and who would like to come to the United States that opportunity. In many cases they have relatives in the United States; in fact, I have in my own district relatives of several of these soldiers now in England. Some of them are not working, regardless of the statement of the last speaker, and are receiving funds from their relatives here. These men are for the most part young, active men; they are men who fought in Poland against the Russians after fighting against the Germans. Some of them were sent to Siberia. They experienced the hardships of being forced to work at hard labor in Siberia. They were permitted to leave Siberia if they would join the Polish Army and fight on our side. They fought on our side in Italy and elsewhere. Thousands of them died in Italy. More than 4,600, as I remember it, are buried in Italy. They died on the battlefield, many of them fighting side by side with American soldiers.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman explain the significance of the date April 29, 1948, in his amendment?

Mr. CLASON. That is the date this bill was filed. I did that so no one could file a request for admission as of a date after this bill was filed with a view to getting the benefits of the bill, and not because in many instances he had determined long before this bill was filed that he wanted to enter this country. The bill states that it was introduced in April 29, 1948.

Mr. CELLER. That is the committee print. The original bill was introduced on April 7.

Mr. CLASON. April 7 or 29, it does not make much difference to the people abroad. I do not think it makes much difference in this case. The point is exactly the same.

Mr. CELLER. I want to understand the reason that specific date was mentioned. I do not quite get that.

Mr. CLASON. I have explained that, and I do not wish to lose any more time. The date of April 29, 1948, is right here on the bill I have, which is the bill that was handed to me by the Clerk. If that is not the correct bill, that is unfortunate. At any rate, I have not attempted by picking that date to pick any peculiar date.

There are less than 20,000 of these persons who fought on the battlefields of this war with American soldiers, and they are largely from Poland. Some may be from Belgium, because I know of one or two persons who were displaced, who happened to be of Polish origin and are now caught in Belgium. I feel that these people are entitled to preference rather than those in the concentration camps. I have been to several of these concentration camps. I feel very strongly that those people are victims of this war and are entitled to our respect and our help, and I want to see them helped, but I also feel that a man who fought in Poland, who went on to Siberia, and who was trained in Anders' army, which fought in Italy side by side with our troops, ought not to be barred as he will be barred in fact by the passage of this legislation from coming to the United States, because half the Polish quota will be taken out for years to come, and the number of people who have applied, not the soldiers alone but other Polish people, will cut down their chances immeasurably.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Are the soldiers to whom the gentleman refers now living in Great Britain?

Mr. CLASON. They are living in Great Britain and other countries. I do not limit this to those in Great Britain. Many of these people have relatives in the United States. As a matter of fact, some are relatives of two or three priests in my district. They are from high-grade families and high-grade persons. I believe they are entitled to full consideration under this bill. The bill otherwise will make twice as difficult their opportunity to secure favorable action on their application for entry into the United States. I hope this amendment will be adopted in fairness to a group of young men, physically fit and already capable of entering into the American way of life and thought.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as everybody knows, this bill was designed to do one thing primarily, and that is to solve the question of the displaced persons in Europe, to eliminate those camps, not only because of the humanitarian aspects but because they are costing us $100,000,000 a year. Anybody can understand that. We all have sympathy for the soldiers whom this amendment would assist. They are in the British Isles. Of course, if we had undertaken to solve the question of the British Isles in this bill, we would have had to bring in a very different piece of legislation. This is designed wholly to relieve the army of occupation of a horrible cancer in the middle of Europe and at the same time to give these people some chance to put roots into the earth and build their lives anew. If we are going into Britain or if we are going into this place or that place or some other place we are not going to have any bill at all. I understand that an amendment will be offered that will involve the 7,000,000 people of German ethnic origin that after the Potsdam agreement were forced to come into Germany. So that will be coming in soon. I understand a very excellent way to defeat the bill is to load it up with all kinds of amendments, which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is doing. He is a very clever gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not a fact that an amendment may be offered to admit a large number of Italians?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes. Therefore, we are losing sight of the problem, which is the problem of the displaced persons camps in Germany.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. We have tried to be fair about this, because we have prorated those who are to come in under this bill on the basis of the existing numerical strength now in the camps. It happens 31 percent in the camps in Austria and Germany and France are Polish citizens.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. How do you justify the distinction of taking in these Polish soldiers if they happen to be in Italy and not taking them in if they happen to be in Great Britain?

Mr. FELLOWS. Because we are paying for the upkeep and that is part of the thing that I am talking about. The gentleman evidently is not listening, and I am very sorry.

Mr. MACKINNON. I have listened, but we are paying for the upkeep equally in Great Britain. What is the difference between Great Britain and Italy?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. LODGE for the Clason amendment:

Page 2, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

"(b) A person who (1) during World War II was a member of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland; (2) was honorably discharged from such forces; (3) resides in the British Isles upon the effective day of this act; and (4) has filed an application for an immigration visa with the United States consular office in Great Britain prior to June 1, 1948. Section 3 (a) (2) shall not apply to a person coming within the provisions of this paragraph; or

"(c) A family dependent of any person coming within the provisions of paragraph (b). Section 3 (a) (2) shall not apply to persons coming within the provisions of this paragraph; or."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)"; and page 2, line 15, "(c)" and insert "(e)."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the substitute amendment is not germane to the so-called Clason amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard on the point of order, in the first place, the Clason amendment is in order because it has to do with the definition of the term "displaced persons." My amendment also has to do with the definition of the term "displaced persons," and would encompass a part at least of those who would be included in the Clason amendment. Therefore, I submit the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DONDERO). The Chair holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut goes to a different part of the bill than the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt in the mind of anybody about the fairness and equity of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. These soldiers who had fought and are now displaced—because that is what they are; they are displaced persons—are probably the best material we have for American citizenship. They have demonstrated, first of all, that they were anti-Nazi, because they fought against Hitler and the Nazis. They are also anti-Communist. If those men do not make good American material I do not know who would. They went through all the hellish fighting that any other soldier went through. There is no doubt about the justice of this amendment.

I had offered a bill some time ago to take care of these soldiers. The committee did not act on that bill. My bill was simple. It provided that these soldiers, who fought in the Allied armies and who were displaced, could come to the United States outside the quota. There were not very many soldiers like that, but those soldiers who fought on our side and feared both communism and nazism certainly should have a right to come here outside the quota, on a nonquota basis. That is what my bill intended to do, but the committee did not take any action on that bill.

I have another bill which would have permitted orphans to come in on a nonquota basis, outside the quota, if those orphans were related to American citizens. If they were nieces or nephews of American citizens, they would come under the bill. That was a fair bill. I cannot see how anyone could be opposed to it. If you, as an American citizen, had a nephew or a niece in Europe, a blood relative of your own brother or sister in Europe, who had been killed in the war, certainly you would feel it an obligation to take care of their children. But the committee did not act on either of those bills. The committee should have taken action. The committee was bound to take action on those bills because they were humanitarian bills, but nothing has been done about them.

The only point I might criticize about this amendment that has been offered is the fact that you are going to take these soldiers out of the quota—out of the 200,000. That is the part of it that I do not like. The 200,000 should not be reduced by the immigration of these soldiers. These soldiers should be permitted to come in here outside of this quota of 200,000. In all justice, the doors of the United States should be open to men like that, regardless of the quota.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the gentleman realize that some 1,300 bills were introduced and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and it is simply physically impossible to read every one of them.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes; I understand you have had a lot of bills. I am not going to criticize you too seriously for not considering all the bills, but I did feel that these two bills of mine were meritorious and humane bills and should have been considered, and the House should have had an opportunity to vote on them.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. How many would be involved in this amendment that would be carved out of this quota of 200,000?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Well, I do not know. I think probably around 20,000.

Mr. CELLER. Is that not quite a sizeable number, and would it not vitiate the real purpose of the bill?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Well, it would not vitiate the purpose of the bill.

Mr. MACKINNON. It would still just equal the Polish quota; would it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the subcommittee for the very arduous efforts it has made in connection with this bill. I wish to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] and all members of the subcommittee, as well as the full committee for their fine work.

I wish to pay special tribute to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] for the very courageous and statesmanlike manner in which he has approached and considered this very important question. I commend them also for the very splendid, constructive, statesmanlike report by the subcommittee of which he and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the gentleman from New York, Mr. JAVITS and Dr. PFEIFER, are members. This report which is an outstanding piece of work was the result of their investigations while abroad last year.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], in his brief service in this body, has made an outstanding record, and the people of his district can well be proud of him.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the amendment pending I find difficulty in agreeing with my friends on the committee who say that the last amendment will be destructive of this bill. It is an amendment based on justice.

We are faced with the situation where these men served and fought with our forces and then through no fault of their own these men remained in Italy and some were sent to Great Britain. Those who were born in Poland who fought with our soldiers in the Italian campaign and who are now in Italy come within the purview of this bill; yet those who with their comrades of the Polish Army—and we all know of their heroism and their abhorrence of communism, of the terriffic dangers they underwent, of the sacrifices they made, men who fought with our own troops in the Italian campaign, but who are now in Great Britain, cannot receive consideration under this bill. My sense of justice tells me there is a case of equity involved, the same as there was in the case of the Czechoslovak amendment that was adopted a few moments ago.

In this case we have men who served and fought with our soldiers, those in Italy subject to the provisions of this bill, those in Great Britain not; and in accordance with the provisions of this bill only a limited number of those who served in the Polish Army in World War II who fought with our troops but are now in Great Britain can be considered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. The difference between Great Britain and Italy is that in Italy they are in the displaced persons camps whereas in England they are free, are working, and are supporting themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. I recognize the argument presented by my friend but I think that that is in a sense irrelevant to the basic question involved here, one of justice in connection with the same group of Polish soldiers who fought with our own men in Italy. Those who remained in Italy come within the purview of this bill, but those who were shipped to England—and they went there as soldiers—are not subject to the provisions of this bill.

I think the adoption of the amendment with reference to the Czechoslovaks and the adoption of this amendment will strengthen the bill. Certainly it will be an act of justice to adopt this amendment. Neither amendment is hostile to the bill. While I respect the position of those who do not want to see too many amendments adopted, I think that these

two amendments are based upon equity and I favor them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, we are here discussing a bill that has resulted from the work of one of the distinguished committees of this House under the leadership of the chairman of a subcommittee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]. I intend to support this bill. Yesterday you appropriated in an appropriation bill $130,00,000 to pay the administration expenditures of State employees in every State in this Union who are carrying on the Unemployment Compensation and the Employment Service activities in those States.

For many months now the investigators of the Appropriations Committee have been going out into the States of this Union in order to make reports to the Appropriations Committee so that we may know what they are doing with these funds. A cursory examination in the State of Tennessee brought forth certain facts as a result of a preliminary examination, which the chief investigator brought to the attention of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the gentleman who is now addressing you as chairman of the subcommittee, that required further investigation.

The chief of the investigators went down into Tennessee to investigate the reports which charged that a bite was being put on the salaries of all the employees in the Unemployment Compensation and the Employment Services to the extent of 10 percent of 1 months' pay to go into a political slush fund in behalf of one of the political people who is now engaged in a political contest in the State of Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I know nothing about the political situation in Tennessee and have no interest in it at all except insofar as the use of Federal funds that we are appropriating might be involved. When the Committee rises and we are in the House again, I shall ask that there be incorporated as a part of these remarks the preliminary report of the investigatory staff of the Appropriations Committee. I am making no charges against anyone. But this report will be submitted to the Department of Justice. It is a very interesting and illuminating situation. It will also be filed with the Civil Service Commission for such remedial action as may be deemed necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time now in order to serve notice upon the State administrators and State authorities in all of the 48 States that if it comes to the attention of the Congress and the investigatory staff of the Appropriations Committee they are attempting by coercion or intimidation to bite into the salaries of these State employees who are paid 100 percent out of Federal funds, they are going to hear about it. This investigation will continue throughout the summer and the matter will be brought to the attention of the proper authorities. If this Congress can do anything to stop it it is going to be stopped. The time to stop it is now. I serve notice upon all of the State administrators and all of the people in all of the States that the Congress is not appropriating this money for political purposes.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS IN STATE OF TENNESSEE

The Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security of the Appropriations Committee some time ago directed that a study be made of the United States Unemployment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Commission concerning their efficiency of operation, both at the State and Federal level.

In connection with that study some nine representative States were visited and the operations examined in detail to form the basis of conclusions that has been reported in full to the subcommittee under date of June 4, 1948.

In connection with the examination of the operations of the State of Tennessee, however, a situation was called to the attention of the staff bearing on alleged enforced contributions to a political campaign contrary to the provisions of the Federal law dealing with that subject. The facts, as alleged, were gathered and are reported on hereinafter. However, attention is invited to the fact that this should not be construed as a complete investigation as such a matter comes within the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission. Investigation in this regard was confined to the city of Memphis whereas the allegations would indicate that the alleged violations are State-wide known agencies where Federal grants are involved and sweeping inquiry would appear to be wholly justified.

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS

At the present time, in the State of Tennessee, the principal contestants for the governorship of the State are Gordon Browning, former governor, and James McCord, incumbent. This promises to be a very close race and all participants are concerned over the outcome. The relative merits of the two men are unknown to this staff.

It appears to be traditional in the State of Tennessee to enforce a contribution on the part of the State employees to political campaigns as a measure of loyalty to the existing administration. This has not been traditional, however, in the Employment Service, which is operated under Federal grant and this is the first time in the memory of the old employees that such a campaign has been officially sponsored within the Employment and Unemployment Compensation Services.

It appears that in the latter part of April, Commissioner Hake had a meeting in Nashville of representatives of all the district offices and advised them of the urgency of the political campaign. He suggested that contributions of 10 percent of 1 month's base salary would be accepted and suggested that this message be circulated to all employees so that the contributions could be turned in no later than the first few days in June. Commissioner Hake emphasized that the contributions should be voluntary; however, the method of handling same, at least in Memphis, left no doubt in the employees' minds of an implied reprisal if they failed to so contribute.

In the city of Memphis, Mr. Hugh Magevney called a conference of the supervisors and advised them in very specific terms that the contribution would be expected. Mr. Ike Friedman, local office manager, appointed the supervisors as collectors. They objected, however, and, subsequently, Mr. William O. Farmer acted as collector.

On May 5, 1948, Commissioner Hake had circularized a statement explaining to employees that they were not violating the Hatch Act if they made contributions and explaining it was their privilege so to do. He again emphasized the voluntary provisions which pious explanations were accepted by employees with a "tongue in the cheek" attitude. With but two or three exceptions in Memphis, all employees contributed approximately 10 percent of a month's base salary, turning the funds over to Mr. Farmer who in turn gave them to Mr. Magevney who thereafter traveled to Nashville turning the same over to the campaign headquarters of Governor McCord. The facts, as reported, would indicate rather specifically that the Hatch Act had been circumvented and specifically violated.

THE LAW

The act of August 2, 1939, as amended by the act of July 19, 1940, cited as title 18, United States Code, Annotated, 61 (1), provides as follows:

"Eighteen United States Code, Annotated, 61 (1): Employees of State or local agencies financed by loans or grants from United States—influencing elections; officer or employee defined.

"(a) No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall (1) use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or a nomination for office, or affecting the result thereof, or (2) directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any other such officer or employee to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes. No such officer or employee shall take any active part in political mangement or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. For the purposes of the second sentence of this section, the term 'officer or employee' shall not be construed to include (1) the governor or the lieutenant governor of any State or any person who is authorized by law to act as governor, or the mayor of any city; (2) duly elected heads of executive departments of any State or municipality who are not classified under a State or municipal merit or civil-service system; (3) officers holding elective offices."

The regulations of the Civil Service Commission contain interpretations of the act and, among other things, provides as follows (p. 8 of Form 1236 (a) September 1940, titled "Political Activities and Political Assessments"):

"Contributions: Employees may not solicit, collect, receive, disburse, or otherwise handle contributions made for political purposes. They may make voluntary contributions to a regularly constituted political organization for its general expenditures."

THE FACTS

Shortly after arrival in Memphis, Tenn., it was obvious that a serious situation existed in the office as the employees had just completed making a contribution, the amount of which seriously affected their current finances. All of the employees who were interviewed by the writer were most apprehensive lest punitive measures be taken against them as a result of answering honestly and fearlessly the questions put before them. They were assured that they were

expected to answer truthfully the direct questions propounded and they were assured that their specific identity would be protected. The matter of any reprisals against employees was likewise discussed with Commissioner Hake. He assured the writer there would be no reprisals or attempted reprisals as it was his position that he had done nothing wrong in inaugurating this program and if his orders were not followed by his subordinates it was against his desires.

Employees interviewed are being assigned a code number the identity of which is available to the writer and, in the event hearings are desired on this matter either at Memphis or Washington, D. C., they would truthfully answer direct questions if placed to them under oath.

Quotation of a letter from employee A to employee B might best illustrate the reaction of these employees to the assessment.

"Here I am again—old bad news. The bad news this time though is all for us State employees in Tennessee. Mr. Magevney just returned from the Democratic convention in Nashville and told us we had to give 10 percent of 1 month's base salary or else. I don't see how they can ask it of us if the Hatch law means anything, but it seems Mr. Hake can get by anything and he is the law. I was told yesterday not to buck this, but to go ahead and pay. I was advised that it was not likely that anyone would get fired for not paying if it came to a show-down, but they really mean business. This is the first time I have ever been asked to contribute and you know what I think of having to pay to keep my job."

Employee C advised that the local office manager called a meeting of employees and announced that a contribution was expected. It was everyone's understanding that it was of their own accord and, although many of the checks were made payable to the State Democratic Committee, there was no direct coercion, but everybody understood that it was expected. A collection was made and the funds turned over to Mr. Magevney.

Employee C–1, a veteran, was very bitter in off-the-record discussion. He indicated that he was a comparatively new employee and was greatly disappointed after having helped to win a war to have to return to such demagogy. He further indicated that the local office manager after meeting with Mr. Magevney read a communication of some kind to the effect that 10 percent would be acceptable (this communication apparently was in the form of notes taken by the local office manager during the course of the meeting with Mr. Magevney. Subsequent to the writer's visit to Memphis, this particular individual was taken to the hospital in a serious condition and, accordingly, was not interviewed). C–1 indicated the inference was very clear to him and to the other employees that they had better kick in and that he had, in fact, contributed very much against his will.

Employee D was a very high type, intelligent person who indicated that, personally, contributions were always made by him (D) to a chosen political organization, but this was the first time that an assessment of this type was remembered. This individual was advised by telephone by Mr. Magevney of the assessment at which time information was requested of Mr. Magevney as to how this matter should be presented to the other employees. He advised that the employees should be told point-blank that the contribution would be expected. This information was passed on precisely as he indicated. There was utterly no enthusiasm on the part of the employees involved who felt that it was a forced assessment.

Employee E was present at the manager meeting early in May at which time Mr. Magevney advised that he had returned from Nashville where the Commissioner had told him to suggest a donation from employees. The voluntary nature of such donations was emphasized at this meeting although everyone understood it was very definitely expected.

Mr. Ike Friedman, the local office manager, delegated the collection to the supervisors at which time there was some reluctance on their part in view of their apprehension concerning the Hatch Act. As a result of this, employee William O. Farmer was delegated the task of contacting and collecting the funds. The money was subsequently turned over to Mr. Magevney.

Employee E–1 advised that contribution was made by employees in the office, including E–1, and while they were advised verbally that any contribution was voluntary, the inference and the grapevine was very clear that it was definitely expected. The employees were very much upset although they all, substantially, complied. This employee likewise alleged that the result of the writer's inquiry could not amount to anything as the Commissioner was too big politically to be hurt.

Employee F advised that the method of assessing the employees was a crime and a shame and was not consistent in any respect with good government. This employee pointed out that the 10 percent assessment on base pay was substantially more than 10 percent of take-home pay and, further, there were a number of employees in the service who had other members of their family in the service which created a double contribution. In the opinion of this employee there was nothing voluntary about this assessment.

Employee G was most vehement in his denouncement of this return to bossism and devoutly hoped that the jeopardy of the employees who were talking frankly would be rewarded with some substantial action on the part of Congress to prohibit a recurrence of this type of thing. This employee pointed out that political activity in this service was the very thing that the proponents of Federal control had predicted would happen if the service was given to the States. This employee is a very high type individual, most familiar with the machinations of maneuvers of this nature, and is completely reliable.

Employee William O. Farmer advised that he attended the meeting with Magevney and was told of the campaign to obtain funds for the Governor. It was explained that it would be a nice gesture of loyalty to the Governor if 10 percent of the base pay for 1 month would be contributed. The voluntary nature was emphasized time and again and Mr. Farmer had no reason to feel that there would be any reprisals against employees who did not care to contribute. Subsequent to the meeting, the supervisors indicated some reticence with respect to acting as collectors, and Mr. Friedman appointed him to do the collecting. He collected the funds and turned them over, together with a list of employees contributing. He advised that all but five or six in the office had paid the assessment which in all cases approximate 10 percent of base pay for 1 month. The funds were turned over to Magevney with the list (efforts to locate the list were unavailable as Mr. Magevney subsequently advised that the list was turned over with the funds to campaign headquarters and he presumed that the list would be returned to Commissioner Hake for his information).

In view of the fact that this employee actually handled the contributions, it was suggested to him that he might wish to file a statement explaining that he was ordered to make this collection as he would appear to be a rather innocent victim. His statement is quoted hereinafter:

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Memphis, Tenn., June 2, 1948.

Mr. ROBERT E. LEE,
Chief of the Investigation Staff of the House Appropriations Committee, Memphis, Tenn.

DEAR SIR: In response to your request for a statement as to my connection and participation in the collection of money contributed by the personnel of the Tennessee Department of Employment Security Office, located at 122 Union Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., to be used by the State headquarters campaign fund.

Approximately 30 days ago at our weekly supervisors' meeting, Mr. Hugh Magevney, our district manager, remarked in the course of the meeting that it was permissible for us to make a voluntary contribution to the campaign fund, and that we could notify our division personnel that they could do the same if they so desired. I notified my personnel of this and told them it was absolutely voluntary and up to each individual as to whether they contributed or not.

At our weekly supervisors meeting on May 20, Mr. Ike Friedman, our office manager, advised the group of supervisors to tell their personnel that he had delegated Mr. Harry Schroeppel, supervisor of the Employer Relations Division, and myself as receivers of any contributions the employees felt like they wanted to make to this fund as he would be out of the city.

On date of May 28, I advised the other supervisors that I was ready to receive any voluntary contributions anyone desired to make. The majority of the office personnel came to my desk and stated they wished to make a contribution to the State campaign fund. I asked each individual specifically if the contribution they were making was voluntary and accepted it only when they assured me it was.

On May 31, around 1 o'clock, when I felt that everyone who wanted to had made their contribution, I went to Mr. Magevney's office with the money and turned it over to him. I wish to state that no one was solicited for any money, and what I received was brought to my desk by the employees voluntarily.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM O. FARMER.

Copies to Messrs. Hugh Magevney, Emmett Norment, Ike Friedman.

It was subsequently determined that prior to giving the statement to the writer, Mr. Farmer cleared the matter with Mr. Friedman who revised the statement. The nature of the revisions was not ascertained.

Employee H advised that personally contributions have been made to the party of H's choice for years. As a result, Employee H did not feel any particular pressure in this regard. Employee H advised that, currently, many of the employees in the local offices outside the city of Memphis were extremely disturbed and several were expecting to resign momentarily as a result of this incident. It was likewise indicated that a number of employees in the field had refused to contribute even under the pressure of the local manager and were waiting to see what, if any, reprisal was made against them.

Employee I advised that no contribution has been nor will be made to this fund and that, to date, no reprisals have been taken against same. The time limit of contributing, however, had not been fully crossed and Employee I indicated some apprehension about what, if any, action would be taken.

Of all of the employees interviewed, who were picked at random from the list, this was the only one who indicated that no contribution had been made.

Employee J advised that information received was definite to the effect that the contribution was expected to help Governor McCord. Likewise, the amount of 10 percent was suggested. This employee advised that the question of voluntary was somewhat of a joke as the term obviously meant a desire originating with the employee. This employee also indicated the rather poor morale situation that had currently developed as a result of the assessment.

Employee K was a rather pathetic case and spoke very emotionally concerning what was referred to as a "dun." Personally, it was

indicated that this employee actually favored Governor McCord's opponent; however, contribution was made by reason of the fact that the grapevine which was started by Mr. Friedman according to the employee indicated that the list of contributors "would be made available to the Commissioner and it would be scrutinized." This employee was tearful in indicating that economic necessity forced contributions that were against conscience.

Employee L was definitely advised that 10 percent of base salary was expected or else. This employee likewise was asked to pass on the information which request was complied with. This employee indicated personally the contribution was made in good faith and has no objection to the same although it was hardly voluntary.

Employee M definitely indicated that no contribution would have been made if the approach had not been instituted by the administration and that the voluntary nature was purely lip service.

Mr. Ike Friedman, manager of the Memphis local office, when interviewed, concerning this matter, declined to give a written statement regarding his participation in this matter. He advised that there was a staff meeting the latter part of May at which time Mr. Magevney having returned from a district managers' meeting in Nashville, advised that the voluntary contributions of 10 percent of base salary would be accepted for the governor's campaign fund. He delegated supervisors to undertake the job and pass on the message. The supervisors objected to acting as collectors, and he accordingly appointed Mr. Farmer and a Mr. Schroeppel (who resigned for unknown reasons prior to the collection and was not located by writer for an interview). Mr. Friedman handled the collection and gave the money direct to Mr. Magevney. It is interesting to note at this point that while Mr. Friedman denies being with Mr. Farmer at the time the funds were turned over to Mr. Magevney, Mr. Farmer states that Mr. Friedman accompanied him to Mr. Magevney's office.

Mr. Friedman likewise indicated there was no coercion and he received no complaints on the matter and, as a matter of fact, on the day the collection was made, he was out of the city.

Concerning the fact that the commissioner had required that the registration number and poll tax receipt of all employees be furnished him, Mr. Friedman denied any specific knowledge, merely indicating that he received a list containing this data and turned it over to Mr. Magevney.

During the course of the inquiry, Mr. Magevney was out of town, presumably in Nashville, where he had gone to turn in the funds collected the preceding week. He returned, however, before the writer left and, when questioned concerning this matter, he declined to furnish a written statement. He intimated that he could not see what interest the writer had in such a matter but he would orally advise that he had been instructed by Commissioner Hake concerning this collection for the Governor's campaign and he felt that the employees supervisors in a conference to contact employees to advise them that donations of 10 percent of base pay for 1 month would be gratefully received. His justification for this was that it was going to be a tough campaign and he felt that the employees owed some loyalty to the Governor. He likewise emphasized that he stated that the contributions were to be voluntary. He accepted the funds as collected by Mr. Farmer as well as from other individuals throughout the territory and took the money and a list of employees to Nashville, Tenn., where he turned it over to the Governor's fund. He indicated that he did not have a copy of the list but he presumed it would be returned to Commissioner Hake for his scrutiny.

Concerning the matter of poll-tax registrations, he indicated that he followed Commissioner Hake's desires in this respect. He transmitted to the Commissioner the list of employees with the poll-tax receipts and registration numbers as it was the Commissioner's desire, in which he concurred, that all employees should be required to vote. He likewise emphasized the fact that none of the employees were told how they were to vote but merely that they must vote. The inference is, however, rather obvious.

This matter was taken up with Commissioner Hake at Nashville, Tenn., and he advised that he handled no funds of any kind but merely passed on the desires of the Governor to his organization and emphasized the fact that the contributions were to be voluntary. Concerning the list of employees who contributed, he presumes that it will be turned over to him at some time in the future. Concerning the method of handling the collection in Nashville, he advised that there was no collector appointed and he had no knowledge as to who collected although he understood that some of the employees centralized their collections in an individual on the outside.

It was determined from another source that arrangements had been made to have a State employee, not financed by Federal funds, come into the office at Nashville and handle the collection, thus to circumvent the Hatch Act (which procedure was not followed at Memphis). Mr. Hake's attitude was that this did not amount to anything and, if his instructions were misinterpreted by some of his subordinates, it was unfortunate. He intimated that he failed to see the connection in this matter with the official inquiry, and it was explained to him that the proponents of full Federal control had predicted the very thing that appeared to be happening if the States regained control of the program.

Concerning the matter of the poll tax, he advised that it was the Governor's position that all State employees should be required to vote, and the Governor had, in fact, sent forms to all employees to be executed indicating that they had qualified. The Commissioner did not happen to use these forms and took the other method of assuring himself that all employees had properly qualified. Commissioner Hake emphasized that no pressure was used but that they were required to vote one way or another. He likewise advised that this entire matter was very likely a campaign issue, and the Governor had taken cognizance of it, and on May 7, 1948, issued a statement concerning this matter, which is quoted as follows:

"Reports are current that employees of the State government are being 'forced' to make campaign contributions. Opponents of this administration are charging almost daily that State employees are being given the hard choice of contributing or of losing their jobs.

"These charges are absolutely false. No employee of the State government is in any danger of losing his job through failure or refusal to make a campaign contribution.

"Only voluntary contributions will be accepted.

"This office will welcome any information relative to any forced 'shake-downs.' Employees may have the utmost assurance that corrective steps will be taken immediately.

"I will not condone the action of any individual who seeks campaign contributions with an open or even a veiled threat that refusal to contribute will lead to termination of employment."

The memorandum from Commissioner Hake, concerning the matter of poll tax, is quoted hereinafter:

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Nashville, Tenn., April 12, 1948.

Memorandum to: All employees.
Subject: Exercise of voting franchise.

This is an election year. Under our system of government, public officials are elected by the voters. Your salary comes from public funds. You are a part of and interested in Government.

It is, therefore, the policy of this department of Government that every employee become a qualified voter and exercise his right of franchise.

Please advise your supervisor if you are qualified to vote in the primary and general election of this State at your legal residence.

W. O. HAKE,
Commissioner.

Distribution: A, B, C.

The statement of Commissioner Hake advising employees of their rights under the Hatch Act is quoted hereinafter:

"Memorandum to: All district managers.
"From: Henry R. Burkitt, State field manager.
"Date: May 5, 1948.
"Enclosed you will find copies of Commissioner Hake's talk to the personnel of the central office. Sufficient copies are enclosed for you to give each local office a copy."

"COMMISSIONER HAKE SPEAKING TO ENTIRE CENTRAL OFFICE FORCE OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DEPARTMENT APRIL 30, 1948

"Mr. HAKE. Good morning—Is everybody here? Has every floor and everybody in our Department been notified to be here? I don't see but five or six men—wonder if there are any men in this division.

"I wanted to talk to you a little bit as your Commissioner this morning about a matter, which you hear so much about and read so much about, most of whcih is undoubtedly untrue, and it regards the question of contributions under the so-called Hatch Act.

"I want to talk to you because I want you to know it from me, and as nearly as I can I am going to tell you the truth about it. Everything I am telling you is being taken down by two stenographers, so if you quote me be sure to quote me accurately when you leave from here. Let me restate, if you have any doubts about what I said, you can read what I have said so you will be absolutely sure, if you are going to tell anything on the outside that I have said, to quote me correctly.

"Now there have been rumors of what they call a shake-down from the State employees for campaign purposes, and, of course, a shake-down has a connotation of nastiness about it. Anybody making a contribution for a campaign fund is doing as honorable a thing as if making a contribution for the cancer fund, the Red Cross, or any other contribution you make. In our scheme of government, and I thank God we still have it, we elect our officials, and to elect officials you have to have campaigns. That is the law, both Federal and State—there must be candidates and candidates can't run without money, consequently, money is raised by various means. If that were not true, a very good man who had no money could never hope to achieve any honorable position in our democracy.

"Now there is a law—called the Hatch Act, and the act was introduced by Senator HATCH from New Mexico, that is on the statute books, and that is what I want to talk about.

"Under that law anyone can make a contribution to any campaign, to any candidate; that is absolutely legal. You can make $1,000 contribution to all candidates if you want to, if you are inclined to do so. The law does not prohibit you from doing it. I am going to make a contribution; I have done it since I have been old enough to vote, and I will always do it because I believe in our form of government, and I have always had a candidate that I preferred over some other, and I am going to do it this time. You have that privilege, and no one can deny you that privilege. It is a legal right you have. You can make those contributions to whomever you want, no matter

what candidate is in the field. You can go to the headquarters in the Andrew Jackson or the Hermitage, and take a check made out to the State Campaign Headquarters, marked that way, and give whatever amount you desire and that is proper and legal. That is a good way to evidence your interest in good government. Above all, every one in the sound of my voice should vote on election day. I am certainly not telling you for whom you should vote, but I am telling you that anyone who is on a public payroll and does not vote when election time comes has no business on that pay roll. I hope you understand that. If there is anyone here that thinks they are not interested in government, especially when you get your bread and butter from the taxpayers' money you are not worthy of the position you are holding. I hope that is strong enough to understand—nobody is indispensable in an organization from my office down. You are in the State service because somebody wanted you. You will remain in the State service because somebody wants you. There is always somebody to take our place.

"Now, if there is any question that anyone wants to ask, I want them to ask me now while I am here. You can make a contribution to any campaign headquarters—I want to repeat it, you can make all the contributions you want to—it is legal, and it is proper, and you are not violating any act. You don't need to go around and sneak and hand it to anybody. You can walk right down and write his name on it. If you want to make a contribution to McCord, you can make it directly to Jim McCord, or directly to Gordon Browning, or directly to Jimmie Harden, write on the face of the check, and mark it 'for campaign purpose,' and that is perfectly legitimate. I don't want anybody to misunderstand what I have said—I am not asking you to vote for anybody; I am not soliciting any funds from anybody for any candidate. You are privileged to make a contribution to any candidate you want to. I know that this department, because of the fact that our administrative funds come from Federal sources, is entirely under the provisions of the Hatch Act, but what I have said you may do is no violation of the Hatch Act.

"If anyone is not clear on what your rights and privileges are, as an American citizen, in any election year—any question that bothers you at all, ask me, and if I cannot answer it, I have my chief counsel here and a good many others that know what I am talking about—don't hesitate to ask.

"Mr. HEPBURN. Is there a penalty if you don't contribute?

"Mr. HAKE. That question is not worthy of an answer. Is there anyone in this room that was ever asked about his or her politics or religion before they got the job? If there is, I want to see your hand. [No hands.]

Are there any other questions? I don't mean for that question to shut off all other questions. I am not here assessing penalties or requesting contributions. I am merely trying to tell you your rights.

"Mr. BURKITT. Would you explain to them the qualifications for voting?

"Mr. HAKE. I don't know as I can go into all the ramifications.

"Mr. BURKITT. Some have asked whether they would require poll tax in this primary.

"Mr. HAKE. I think I can answer that very easily by answering 'Yes; poll tax is a requirement'; if you don't have one, you should get one that makes you eligible to vote. Now, anyone under 21, and doesn't reach their twenty-first birthday, I think if they reach it before the November election they can vote in the August primary, but if you are under 21 on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, you are not eligible to vote in the August primary. I think most of our people are rather mature—we have a few under 21. Any other questions?

"EMPLOYEE. What is the closing date for paying poll tax?

"Mr. HAKE. You can pay your poll tax the day of the primary election, 5th of August in Tennessee. You can get your receipt that day and go right over and vote.

"Mr. CONNER. You have to pay 60 days before August 5 in the county election.

"Mr. HAKE. I was speaking of State and national, but if you are interested in your county offices you have to have your poll tax 60 days before the 5th of August, and likewise if you don't vote in the primary—are out of the State—you would have to have your poll tax 60 days before the regular election in November.

"Mr. CONNER. Anybody required to pay poll tax should go ahead and pay to get full privilege.

"Mr. HAKE. That bulletin that was put out from my office was simply to the point that you become eligible to vote in the primary, and I presume that all of you have followed through on that. We will, of course, keep a check on that—I am interested to know whether the people in this department are interested enough in good government to qualify themselves for voting purposes on the 5th of August. That went out by the A, B, C routing.

"Mr. CONNER. Everybody knows, I presume, that you have to register in the cities, and will have an opportunity to register 20 days before election in the cities.

"Mr. HAKE. Many counties do not require registration; you will know whether your home county does or not. Are there any other questions?

"Mr. MOORE. Mr. Hake, about that registration; you might tell them if they happen to move within the time that they would have to register in a supplemental registration.

"Mr. HAKE. You have already said it, so I could hear it, and everybody else could hear it also. Any other questions?

"EMPLOYEE. I would like the application we once filled out not to have what is your religion; that hasn't anything to do with it.

"Mr. HAKE. That is another department.

"EMPLOYEE. No, I remember the first application I filled out wanted to know my religion.

"Mr. HAKE. I have never asked that question. There was a very proper question asked, 'Could State employees work at the election polls?' You cannot do that. There are certain prohibitions, but you wouldn't be too much interested in that; you cannot get out and make political speeches, cannot work at the polls, cannot be on the executive committee of the Democratic or Republican Party. Those things I know none of you will violate. I feel that all of you are familiar with the things you should not do under the law. I am merely trying to advise you of those things you are privileged and permitted to do.

"It is all right to express your ideas privately. No law is ever going to prohibit you from saying to Nellie Jones or Mr. X who you are for, or 'I hope you are for so and so,' and that is proper. You have a perfect right. Of course, you couldn't get out on the courthouse lawn and get up and begin shouting for some particular candidate. Those are things that you don't have to bother about; you don't need to worry about saying you are for such and such a candidate. You have that right.

"Now, any other questions? If not, you ought to think of a lot of little questions so we could stay for half an hour. Anyway, I felt it an opportune time when you are hearing and seeing so many rumors to get you together and talk to you in this way, because I feel—I hope I am not wrong in my feeling—that you do have a certain amount of confidence in me. If I didn't think so, I would not want to be here. I have confidence in you, I love you all, and I hope you like your work. Now we can go slowly and gently back to our jobs. Nice to see you."

There is likewise quoted below a very pertinent anonymous letter that was sent to the writer, addressed to the Department of Justice:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *May 15, 1948.*

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: There is a situation going on here that stinks. I am employed in the Department of Employment Security at 122 Union Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. I am a veteran and on returning from the service I took the merit examination and passed. I was appointed from the list and did not think politics would enter and that we would be simply on our merits. Now we are informed that we must come across with 10 percent of our salary for the Governor's campaign or we will be sorry. We know that we won't loose our jobs for that cause but we are given to understand there will be a lot of other reasons given.

Then we are given a letter from the commissioner where he states we can give voluntarily to anyone we want to but we understand we had better come across to the Governor or else. We must also turn in our poll-tax and registration receipts, these to be inspected by the district manager, we also understand a list will be made of our names for the commissioner, and the district manager and probably the manager, so if one overlooks us if we don't come across the others will have a reminder and will make us sorry.

Now I was attracted to this job because I thought it was Federal funds.

Now we understand why the State wanted the employment service back and fought so hard for State control, I am convinced we should have stayed as a Federal service.

I am informed that the other office at 199 South Second Street is coming across 100 percent, some of the veterans there tell me that they are also mad about this situation but are scared as they have to support a family and have to work to do so, this is the condition we are in at 122 Union Avenue.

In fact there is general anger but we don't dare do anything, some of us planned to vote Republican but we understand our ballots will be marked and now we will have to go along with the machine in fact we will hand our ballots in open so they can see we voted right, but we still think it wrong.

We understand the district manager, will take up the money about June 1, after making the collection locally visiting all the other offices in the district collecting their money then carry it to the commissioner.

I suppose he will send us a letter sanctimoniously thanking us for our voluntary donations.

* * * * *

You might ask why all of us hit on the same percentage. I regret economics make me a bigger coward than bullets ever did but I understand if I am ever identified the heat will be turned on and I am finished for good here. I will lose my home, job, and will be blacklisted from any other work and we know it can and will be done.

A VETERAN.

P. S.—I was going to mail this but I understand you are here representing Congress, so I will hand this letter to let you have a clear picture of the situation.

CONCLUSIONS RELATIVE TO THE VOLUNTARY NATURE OF THE ASSESSMENT

1. Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines the word "voluntary" as follows:

(1) Proceeding from the will, or from one's own choice or full consent.

(2) Unconstrained by interference; self-impelled; freely given, done, etc.

(3) Done by design or intention; intentional; not accidental; as, voluntary manslaughter.

(4) Of or pertaining to the will; subject to, or regulated by, the will; as, the voluntary muscles.

(5) Able to will; having power of free choice; as, man is a voluntary agent.

(6) Provided or supported by voluntary action; not established, state-supported, etc., as, voluntary churches.

(7) Law. Acting, or done, of one's own free will without valuable consideration or legal obligation.

2. While the employees were advised that they could contribute to anyone the collection was handled as being specifically for McCord and was handled, at least in Memphis, by an employee of the office.

3. The amount expected was specified and in almost all instances approximated 10 percent of the base salary for 1 month.

4. The grapevine technique was used, at least at the local office level, in bringing pressure to insure that substantial compliance was achieved.

5. Employees appointed by the former Governor and presumably owing loyalty to him contributed to the present Governor.

6. While assessments of this type may be historical in Tennessee, old employees had never recalled such an assessment in the Employment or Unemployment Compensation Service.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This matter is being called to the attention of the committee for their consideration. In view of the fact, however, that this appears to be a matter involving the entire State of Tennessee, it is suggested that copies of this document be directed to the Civil Service Commission and to the United States Department of Justice suggesting that a full and complete investigation be ordered and that the committee be promptly advised as to the results thereof.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT E. LEE,
Chief, Investigative Staff.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the minority whip who sort of damned the members of the Judiciary Committee with faint praise. He said they had done a remarkable job—but. He does not give us any support whatsoever for what he terms the remarkable job that we did. We worked for months and months in an endeavor to perfect a bill. Now we are confronted with these amendments which will wreck the bill and destroy the remarkable work—in the language of the gentleman from Massachusetts—that the members of the Judiciary Committee, both on the majority and the minority sides, have done. We want not only his words of praise but his vote. With one voice he praises but with the other he hurts us.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not a fact that in almost the 16 months we spent on this matter, we heard witnesses of every type and of every character day after day; witnesses from the foreign field of the State Department, the occupational zones, the Department of Justice, that we considered every one of these amendments now being offered and rejected them after they had an honest hearing?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. Then too, if my memory serves me correctly, the gentleman who damns us with faint praise—and I love him despite his statement—appeared before our committee advocating the Stratton bill providing for the admission of 400,000 DP's. Now, as the result of a compromise, we come in with a bill for 200,000, and he wants further to whittle down the 200,000 for DP's by admission of some 40,000 Poles. He should know full well that the largest grouping among the 200,000 in our bill are the Poles. Poles comprise 31 percent of all the 200,000 DP's. We have been mighty fair to the Poles in this bill. Now he would increase the number of Poles to be admitted by something like 40,000. That is a 20-percent increase on the basis of 200,000. Superimpose a 20-percent increase upon the 31 percent and the Poles will get fully 50 percent of all the relief this bill affords. I would like to admit them all. I am a liberal when it comes to immigration. But I am realistic also. I want a bill to pass. I cannot approve a bill that gives all the cream to the Poles and the skimmed milk to all the others. That is highly unfair. These 40,000 comprise the so-called Anders' men in England. They are not stateless; they have roofs over their heads; they are not behind barbed wire; they are working, or jobs are available to them; they have freedom of action. They are not in camps or compounds. They are not, under any circumstances, to be deemed displaced persons. Now just because they may have served in the armed forces, which is a very creditable thing, is no reason why they should come in under this bill. There were the Italian soldiers, many of whom deserted Mussolini and who fought underground in Italy, many of them heroes. Shall we also embrace them under the 200,000? There are many French Maquis who fought underground and many heroes among them. If we are going to admit Anders' men just because they served in the Allied armed forces, by the same token we must admit all these Italians and we must admit all these Frenchmen. I do not think that is good logic, and you cannot agree with it.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority whip, Mr. MCCORMACK, said that he is going to "stick" with us. Well, that is fine sticking with us when he supports this amendment. He rather uses a "stick" to strafe us and make impossible the passage of a decent bill—a bill that will be generally acceptable.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. If we are going to do this with these fine worthy people, by the same token why should we not include the kith and kin of Japanese-Americans who fought so wonderfully and who rescued the lost Texas battalion in Italy during World War II?

Mr. CELLER. There would be no end to the lists we would admit.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I was going to ask the gentleman whether or not these Poles that are now in Great Britain would be eligible for British citizenship, and if they could qualify in that way, they might come in under the British quota rather than under this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Place of birth and not citizenship determines quota. They might come in under the Polish quota subsequently, but not under the British quota.

Mr. COOLEY. I was talking about eligibility for British citizenship.

Mr. CELLER. They would be eligible for British citizenship under the British law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House. I am opposed not only to the amendment but to the entire bill. I listened with a great deal of interest a few minutes ago to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and various others. I understand that many of the Members of the House were overseas recently. I would like to say that last week my brother returned from Japan. He went to Japan in October 1945, and came back last week. He said that it is impossible—and I know myself that it is impossible—for a Member of Congress to go overseas and find out the real, true, honest situation, because the word leaks out one way or the other that you are a Congressman and consequently it is difficult for you to find out the real truth.

There are strange things taking place in this Nation today. Under present immigration quotas only 307 Greeks are allowed in America annually. I personally have known many Greeks and they make the best of citizens. I have never seen one in jail or on relief rolls. They will all work. Only 569 Finns are permitted to immigrate to America yet little Finland paid her debts to the United States and her people are gallant and brave. At the same time other nationalities are pouring into this land by special Presidential directives, large quotas, and many other ways.

As to this bill, may I say that I am opposed to it for many reasons, the first of which is administration. Could it be the same type of administration that has reversed itself so often on Palestine and Trieste that lets war material go to Russia and at the same time tries to stop communism with money. Could it be a similar crowd to the old WPA bunch or the UNRRA boys. I rather think so. I understand there are provisions in this bill for screening. I hope it is not the kind of screening the Voice of America pulled off down in South America. I hope the Intelligence of this country will not be overruled as it was overruled at Pearl Harbor, as the high command overruled the Intelligence reports coming in before the Battle of the Bulge, which I myself knew was coming. It is the administration of these star-gazing, one-world ideas that continually come before this Congress that I am worried about. I am greatly alarmed, not only alarmed but disillusioned over the idea in this

land that the United States of America is obligated to support the whole world and take care of the world's problems.

I served in Germany as an enlisted man. For many months I was camped right near a displaced-persons camp, near Munich. I visited the DP camp at Brunswick. I saw the DP's on the roads of Germany and on the highways of France, Belgium, and Holland. It was my personal observation that these men and women are unfit to be American citizens, that is, the great majority of them. I personally escorted home a lady in tears who had been raped by these DP's. I have personally prevented the robbing and killing of civilians by gangs of these displaced persons. I visited some of the barracks and saw no segregation of the sexes, all staying together in one building.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit here in this body and conscientiously stay here without raising an objection to this bill, because I feel that I know as much about these DP's as the distinguished gentleman from New York and others who have spoken.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. If this bill does not pass, under the directive of the President of December 22, 1945, which directs that special effort be exerted in behalf of the people in these camps and gives them 90 percent preference, these same people will come in under the present immigration laws, so it will be the same people that will come in whether under this bill or under the present laws, except that they will come sooner under this bill and be better screened.

Mr. DORN. I am opposed to any immigration. I am opposed to the present immigration quotas for a few years until the present world situation is straightened out. I am against the policy of the President to let people into the United States according to his own wishes. One of the favorite devices of the dictators and would-be world conquerors is to employ a fifth column. In these DP camps I know the Russians and the Nazis and the various interests who are opposed to American democracy have planted men that no screening you can devise can tell whether or not they are Communists or Fascists or Nazis, because they have been there and been themselves screened in anticipation of just such screening as you propose in this bill.

There is another reason I am opposed to this bill, and that is on economic grounds. The United States economy is such that we are more subject to a sudden depression than any other country in the world. We had more unemployed in 1931 and 1932 than any other nation in the world. It took longer for the United States to get over the depression than any other country in the world. The crash in 1929 was almost overnight and millions were out of work. It could happen again. Even now we have approximately 2,000,000 unemployed.

At the outbreak of World War II, there were still approximately six to eight million unemployed people walking the streets of this country. Gentlemen of the Committee, if you are going to continue to bring people into the country while GI's are walking the streets without homes to live in and when our economy is geared in such a way that if you have a sudden depression, you will have more unemployed than any other country in the world, then we are not doing our duty toward our country. What we need in this country today is someone to stand on the floor of Congress and stand up for America. What we need is some real, genuine Americanism. There are bills coming up to help other nations, to vote for relief abroad, and to bring thousands of people into this country, but we cannot get Federal aid to education passed in this Congress. The compensation of widows and orphans of veterans was cut. Disability compensation was cut. Gentlemen of the Committee, listen—I am told there are more Communists in New York City today than there are in the entire country of Holland. I say our Nation needs some attention right here from within. No great country was ever destroyed, or at least it has happened very seldom—from without. It was always from within. Most of the time it was by political demagogs taking advantage of political expediency at such times as this and riding into office, then overthrowing the government. This Nation, particularly here in Washington, is getting pro-European rather than American. It is a dangerous trend and I hope you will defeat this bill.

I am sympathetic toward this problem and sincerely believe that if our Government exerted enough pressure these DP's could be settled in South America, Africa, Australia, or some other great frontier, undeveloped country where they could work as our forefathers did and build their own civilization.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to refute some of the statements of my good colleague and my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. There can always be a difference of opinion, and I think that is what makes the horse race, and I think that is what makes this Congress run. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] is a former serviceman and saw a few displaced-persons camps. However, when the subcommittee of which I was chairman went abroad, we had on it the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], whom I see in the Chamber, and the gentleman from New York, Dr. PFEIFER. Mr. CHELF was a public prosecutor in Kentucky before coming to the Congress. May I now ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] whether he found the record of crime in the displaced-persons camps above or below any country in Europe?

Mr. CHELF. It was far below. We made a complete study of that. I am happy to report to you that in every camp we investigated and checked the jails in the displaced-persons camps, the only man we found in jail was there for slapping his mother-in-law—a typical American custom.

Mr. FULTON. I heartily agree with the gentleman. The remarkable thing about the crime record of displaced persons is that it was a lower crime record than that of our own Army boys—the same Army that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] was in. We found that to be a fact. It was lower than any country in Europe. In addition to that, we wonder whether they are fit people. You know, the displaced persons are peculiar in their age groups. There are almost none over 55 years of age. There are almost none from age 3 to 21. All of the adolescents were either not taken for work or died in these concentration camps. The new generation is from 0 to 3 years of age. The average age of displaced persons is 37. Dr. PFEIFER, one of the eminent surgeons of this country and head of his own hospital in Brooklyn, was a member of the subcommittee that looked into this problem for Congress, and he is here in the Chamber.

May I ask the gentleman from New York, Dr. PFEIFER, what he found on the health and physical condition of these people as far as their being residents of the United States is concerned.

Mr. PFEIFER. It was exceptionally good. The mortality rate was extremely low, considering the circumstances under which they were living.

Mr. FULTON. The sickness rate was below that of the countries in which they were living, was it not?

Mr. PFEIFER. It was.

Mr. FULTON. You examined people in a great many camps?

Mr. PFEIFER. I did.

Mr. FULTON. What did the gentleman find generally as to their freedom from disease? Were they carriers of disease to any degree?

Mr. PFEIFER. No; not at all. It was surprisingly low. The health standard was far above the average.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I might say to the gentleman that he will recall from the facts we gathered within the then existing 1,037,989 in camps there were only 6,917 hospitalized, a pretty fine record.

Mr. FULTON. In addition to that, when you look on the back of this 9-page report which the subcommittee put in and find the distribution of occupational skills, you will find above 90 percent that are experienced and trained people. Those are the kind of people that, on a selective basis, this country needs. We need people who will be trained and selected, rather than to be taken in here just seriatim, according to numbers, without selection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman also call attention to the fact that the first structure which these displaced people built was a church or some house of worship? And also, should not the gentleman elucidate on the fact that they furnished themselves their own self-govern-

ment and with education, and with classes right up to college in the DP camps?

Mr. FULTON. We found rehabilitation going on. We found special training going on in the various professions and trades. We found them making a great many of their own things, and, in many cases, raising a lot of their own food.

May I conclude by saying that after looking over 200 displaced-persons camps, and looking them over with an unbiased eye, because we were not to recommend legislation, we came back with the feeling that these were the type of people who would make good American citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if we could agree on this amendment and finish this amendment tonight, then the Committee would rise. We are all tired and want to get away. We can come back in the morning at 11 o'clock and finish the bill if we could just settle this amendment tonight.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand it, this would not prevent offering another amendment to this section tomorrow?

Mr. FELLOWS. Oh, no.

Mr. MICHENER. Just vote on this one amendment, and then take your time on other amendments tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine, that all debate on this amendment do now close?

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object; for instance, I would like an opportunity to answer the gentleman who just left the floor. Would I have a right to speak in reply to that?

Mr. FELLOWS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will amend the request to make it that all debate close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. COOLEY. Reserving the right to object, do I understand it is your purpose to have the Committee rise after the 5 minutes have expired?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise in support of the very fine speech made by my distinguished friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], and to present a little evidence in refutation of the testimony offered by my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], and my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] about the fine character and reputation of those remaining in the DP camps.

I have here a letter from a very able young American officer, written in March of this year. He said:

> We seem to be forgetting the fact that hundreds of thousands of our boys died over here. I am asking, for what?
>
> We let these thieving, criminal, depraved DP's stay in our occupied zones and contribute to nothing more than the crime rate, the unrest, and the black market.
>
> They are virtually immune to arrest—no American troops can raid their camps without a lot of red tape, and then they can't confiscate all the illegal material to be found there. You can find more chocolate in the DP camps than you can in the post exchange.

I have another letter here from a very fine Irish Catholic judge, a gentleman out in Minnesota, Judge Joseph J. Moriarty. Here is what he said in a letter to the President:

> (1) That the other nations of the world have already picked and repicked this group on the basis of character and talent; the musicians, men of science, professional and tradesmen were long ago in other countries, and what is left now consists principally of the nontalented class; (2) that these people are not refugees who reached the zone in flight from the pursuing persecutor, but principally people of all classes and types of character, caught in the shifting chances of a roving life; (3) that this group has among them many persons capable of adopting and living good and useful lives, but in the great majority are a collection of lazy, worthless persons, totally devoid of any notion to earn their way by honest industry or effort and resting from day to day on the assumption that the world owes them a living; (4) that many of these persons were people attracted to Germany by Hitler's policies and who took part in the Hitler economy against their own countries, and now are afraid to return to the people whom they betrayed; (5) that many of these people live in elaborate quarters at American expense with German people as maids and attendants while anxiously awaiting the day to enter into America to engage in profit-making commercial manipulations; (6) that many of these people are in the black markets of Germany sucking the lifeblood out of the German economy and deliberately robbing the German people of whatever little means in their possession—

And so forth. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], a distinguished colleague, whom we all know and whom we all respect, told me just today that he took the trouble on a trip to Europe last summer to find out what the Americans there familiar with the situation had to say. He asked over a hundred Americans about admitting DP's to this country, and only two said that DP's should be permitted to come in here under any circumstances, and one of them was Col. Jerry Lelage, and the other was his office boy, both of whom are employees of the Displaced Persons Division of the War Department, and naturally so testified.

The evidence is irrefutable that the people now left in the DP camps are human refuse. We should take care to protect this country from the entry of such people. We should put enough restrictions into the bill and bend our efforts toward the proposition of getting the best and not the worst folks as immigrants.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman vote for the bill if this amendment is adopted?

Mr. GOSSETT. No; I am not going to vote for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TREACHEROUS MADE-IN-BRITAIN TRUCE FOR PALESTINE

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, by this time tomorrow an uneasy 4-week peace will have settled down over the Holy Land under the terms of the United Nations truce—a truce stamped "Made in England."

Regardless of our own complicated domestic policies, it is absolutely imperative that our own Government should know that it has the full confidence of Congress in using this short breathing spell wisely for world peace.

Our prompt recognition of the Republic of Israel must be implemented at once by exchange of diplomatic representatives.

We must grant immediate economic aid for purely peaceful uses—loans and credits and clearance for shipment of urgently needed supplies and machinery.

We must make sure that the territorial and political integrity of Israel is preserved.

We must prepare now to lift the arms embargo instantly at the end of the truce, if no permanent settlement has been arrived at, to equalize the resources of the opposing forces.

TERMS OF TRUCE FAVOR ARABS

No one can pretend that the truce is fair to the embattled Jewish defenders of Israel. The terms were proposed by the British delegates to the United Nations, and they were framed to preserve the advantages which the Arabs already have.

The United States has an international obligation to redeem its honor and prestige by doing at least as much for Israel as it has done for Greece and Turkey and China.

This bill now before us, known as the DP bill, is profoundly affected by what goes on in Palestine.

However, we may feel individually toward this particular measure, the facts show that the pitiful human wreckage scattered in DP camps throughout the world must be resettled. They cannot remain in Europe, regardless of their national origins or politics or religion.

The stateless Jews of Europe would almost unanimously prefer Palestine to any other destination.

American contribution to solving the DP problems under this legislation will be infinitely simplified and made more useful if Palestine can be opened to rapid settlement by the devastated European Jews. Israel needs their help, and they

need Palestinian refuge, a chance to start over and build new lives.

PEACE SOLVES PROBLEMS

A permanent and just peace in Palestine, with the Republic of Israel protected in its territory by international guaranties against Arab interference, will help solve the resettlement problems of all DP's. Stateless Jews make up about one-fifth of all the displaced persons now crowding Europe and draining slim resources without the means of making equal contribution of their own to common needs.

An overwhelming majority of the Jews will choose Israel if they get the chance, and they will go there just as fast as transportation and living quarters can be provided. Obviously, these destitute people cannot go to Israel in the midst of war. They can't build houses, till the soil, or produce goods under shellfire.

The American Government, and that includes the Congress, lies under a mandate from world opinion to do everything possible to bring about a just peace in Palestine, to pass this bill in the most liberal form we can agree on, and to help Israel get on its feet as a self-sustaining member of the family of nations.

Because it says what many of us are thinking about the truce terms, I am inserting at this point, and adopting as my own views, an editorial from the New York Post of June 9, which follows:

TREACHEROUS TRUCE

(By T. O. Thackrey)

The armies of seven Arab states, six being members of the United Nations, have at least until next Friday at 2 a. m. to rush additional military men and supplies into Palestine in their aggressive war on Israel.

Meanwhile Great Britain prevents Israel from receiving additional men, the United States prevents her from receiving military supplies, and both cooperate with the Arabian blockade to prevent either men or supplies coming in.

This is neutrality and impartiality—Bevin style.

This is friendship—Truman style.

This is support of democracy abroad—Forrestal style.

This is upholding American honor and integrity abroad—Loy Henderson style.

Count Folke Bernadotte, UN mediator, is to be congratulated, rather than criticized, for the terms of the 4-week truce he has hopefully set for next Friday. He has done as much as one man could be expected to do in trying to bring neutrality and impartiality to bear on the war, in the face of instructions from the UN Security Council which made a fair truce utterly impossible.

A fair truce would have called for the withdrawal of all Egyptian, Syrian, Lebanese, Yemenite, Iraquian, Transjordanian, and Saudi Arabian armies from Palestine, back into the territory of their own nations.

It might well have called, at the same time, for a withdrawal of Israel's forces into the territory set forth in the November 29 decision of the General Assembly of the UN for the Jewish state.

This, at least, would have restored the United Nations to full recognition of its own unrevoked declaration.

The terms Count Bernadotte was required to set are unfair not only because hostile Arab armies are allowed several more days to build up their forces in Palestine, while Israel is prevented from doing so, but because of vastly different penalties in the event of rejection.

If the Arab states should violate the truce, it is barely possible that sanctions, including military, economic, and immigration blockades, would be set up for the Middle East—after more weeks of debate during which Israel would continue to suffer all the penalties of such sanctions.

For the fact is, restrictions akin to sanctions are really now in effect against Israel, but not against the Arab League.

Should Israel reject or break the unequal truce, however, it is certain that with little debate, the full weight of formal sanctions completely isolating Israel from outside communication would be invoked under Bevin's insistence and with Truman's consent.

Should the truce actually begin next Friday, the need to be on guard against final and complete betrayal of Israel into the hands of the enemies of independence and justice will be greater than ever in history.

In that period it will be pointed out that Arab forces would be overwhelming in the event of renewed warfare, while Israel would remain cut off from outside help * * * and that therefore, a political compromise would be desirable.

Britain's terms, echoed by the Arabian anti-Semites who are Bevin's mouthpieces and foot soldiers, will include abandonment of statehood, cessation of immigration, and incorporation as a minority series of communities under Arabian sovereignty.

Only if the President—and Britain's eager supporters in his administration—can be brought to realize what a catastrophe Bevin's success would be for America, let alone Israel, is there any hope of removing the United States from our uncomfortable position beneath the paw of the British lion we continue to feed.

For Bevin means not merely to exterminate Israel and complete Hitler's pogrom, he also clearly means—and has shown it on many occcasions—to drive out American influence in the Middle East except that which will be wholly subservient to his dream of re-creating the British Empire there.

When Israel—champion of democracy and friend of the United States—can be destroyed, and American promises finally clearly demonstrated to be as worthless as they currently are in fact, not even an Arab will trust us.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the close of general debate on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 60, noes 78.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6396) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be excused on June 11 and 12 on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio broadcast on soil conservation.

REVISION OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which will revise the rules of the House so as to provide continuous liaison and coordination between the appropriations subcommittees and the committees responsible for the substantive law governing specific departments.

This resolution will add to the rules of the House a provision which was placed in the Senate rules at the time of the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act. It provides that the House Committees on Agriculture, Post Office and Civil Service, Armed Services, District of Columbia, Public Works, and Foreign Affairs will select three members of their respective committees to serve as ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations when the appropriation of the activities for which they provide substantive law are being considered. This is a procedure already in effect in the Senate for these committees.

The resolution as well provides for one member of the committees to be a member of the conference committee appointed to confer with the Senate upon the annual appropriations bill making appropriations for these same activities.

In my opinion, the addition of this procedure will be an effective way of placing into operation the many recommendations which have been made for savings in the postal service as a result of the surveys and studies of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee made pursuant to House Resolution 176. Under House Report 1242 the committee pointed out savings in the amount of $54,000,000 which could be made if certain practices of the postal service were revised. House Report No. 1656 is a report on the city delivery operation of the postal service and points to savings of $1,400,000 in one post office alone. There was also attached a study made by Remington Rand, Inc., which pointed toward potential savings of $74,000,000 annually in the postal service by the revision of mail-sorting procedures and adding properly designed equipment.

As chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and succeeded in obtaining an allotment of $50,000 to establish a pilot installation in Cleveland, Ohio, to prove the findings of the Remington Rand Co. and to be used as a basis for future action in regard to the heavy expenditures in the mail-sorting problem.

In a study made for the committee by the General Accounting Office at the Philadelphia, Pa., post office recommendations are made which will result in savings of more than $1,500,000 annually in this post office. The committee has approved and will file a report covering the Los Angeles, Calif., post office containing recommendations which will improve the fiscal situation in that particular post office by more than $5,000,000 annually.

It is only by proper liaison between our committee which has made such extensive studies of the postal service and the Appropriations Committee that these savings can be realized. This is a simple resolution requiring only action by the House and I hope it will be adopted this session so that plans can go forward which will have as their final objective the realization of these substantial savings in our postal operation.

I am sure that the able chairmen of the other committees contained in my resolution will also find this procedure an effective means of coordinating this substantive law under the jurisdiction of their respective committees with appropriations. For example, in the recent Post Office Department appropriation bill more than 16 authorizations for funds were made for activities not authorized by substantive law. Any of these could have been subject to a point of order. This procedure will make effective use of the knowledge of the members of the legislative committees of the departments under their jurisdiction and, as well, assure that there is basic law provided for activities for which appropriations are made.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Bernard Baruch regarding what America has done for other countries.

WHY CONTINUE EXPORT TO RUSSIA?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that one of our Cabinet members, seemingly, has had orders from the administration to "keep mum" on the amount of material we are shipping to Russia.

On many, many occasions, on the floor of the House, I have objected to our exporting heavy machinery and war goods to the Soviet Union. I am also informed that Mr. Harriman who was recently appointed by President Truman as our roving Ambassador for the European recovery program said, and I quote:

> It is my strong personal view that we should give no aid to any country behind the iron curtain.

The records show, however, the President is again requesting more money for Europe, demanding the draft, universal military training, and price and production controls under the pretense of stopping communism, and, at the same time, he is asking that our exports to Russia continue.

The records also show the State Department is trying to bolster United States and Russian trade through a new policy which will soon ease export licenses for all goods, except military supplies. Western European nations will be allowed to reexport processed American goods over the iron curtain as long as they cannot be used for war.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, why export any of our critical material which causes shortages and high prices here at home?

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LANDIS, SCHWABE of Missouri, and KELLEY.

PROGRAM IN THE FIELD OF LIGHTER-THAN-AIR AERONAUTICS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WEICHEL, HAND, LATHAM, BLAND, and HART.

REPORTS ON H. R. 4073 AND H. R. 6439

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight to file a report on H. R. 4073 and a report on H. R. 6439.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, may I say for the benefit of those who remained for this hour's special order I asked for on Monday for the gentlemen from California [Mr. ELLIOTT and Mr. LEA], that I shall ask that that time be transferred until tomorrow after the legislative business of the day has been disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JUNE 10, 1948.

To the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the House Committee on Public Works.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK W. BOYKIN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 659).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, be, and he is, hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I send another resolution (H. Res. 660) to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ROBERT E. JONES, JR., be, and he is, hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include a report from the investigating staff of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a letter.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain correspondence.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an address delivered by Fleet Admiral Halsey and in the other an address delivered by Mr. Barney Balaban.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh Press.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow or on the following legislative day the House will consider H. R. 6777, reported by the Committee on Ways and Means—the proposed Social Security Act amendments of 1948. Although the bill contains a few desirable features, it is so deficient in meeting the urgency for strengthening of the social-security structure that I have been impelled to take this time to point out its bad features. In fact, much as I favor extension of coverage to State and local employees, and employees of nonprofit institutions, as well as to other smaller groups of workers covered by H. R. 6777, the method of granting coverage is so inadequate as to make social-security benefits a mirage to most of these employees for many years to come.

It is especially significant, I think, that the bill includes the provisions—in principle—of House Joint Resolution 296, which would exclude as many as 750,000 workers and their families permanently from the social-security coverage which the Supreme Court has said Congress in 1935 intended them to have. In reversing the Supreme Court, the bill would establish a so-called usual common-law rule for determining whether a worker is an employee covered by social security. The result will be infinite confusion pending another Supreme Court determination with opportunities for employers to adjust employment contracts in order to avoid the technical, legalistic standards that the bill would establish.

In summary, let me list briefly the principal bad points of H. R. 6777—and conclude with some affirmative suggestions for an adequate social-security bill. In my opinion, the following amendments are necessary if the bill is, on balance, to contribute toward a more adequate system of social security:

First. Section 201 of the bill, which is the one depriving 750,000 persons of employee status should be deleted.

Second. A new section should be added to provide that the employees who would be covered by the bill may become fully insured after 20 quarters or 5 years of coverage—within the 40 quarters or 10 years before death or retirement. Under H. R. 6777, a person under the age of 58 would have to work every quarter for at least 10 years to become fully covered.

Third. Another amendment which should be made in behalf of the newly covered employee is to change the method of computing benefits so as not to average in the time since 1937 during which they were legally ineligible for coverage.

Fourth. Section 116 of the bill should be amended to enable State and local governments to supplement their own civil service or pension plans with voluntary compacts for social security coverage of their employees.

Fifth. Since the hazards of old age and unemployment are universal, the so-called voluntary coverage of groups of employees should be held to the minimum required to maintain the constitutional guaranties. The bill should be amended to limit voluntary coverage to State and local employees and employees of religious institutions.

Sixth. Section 109 of the bill should be amended to prevent delays in the payment of benefits in the case of employees whose employers are resisting imposition of the employment taxes.

Mr. Speaker, at least six amendments I have mentioned are required if the good in this bill is to outweigh the bad. I asked Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Administrator of Federal Security, for his views on H. R. 6777, as reported to the House. In a letter that I received only today, he says:

> Even though the present bill is so limited in its objectives, I should be happy to recommended its enactment if it were not for the provisions which, as I have indicated above, appear to me on careful consideration to have harmful effects. My views may be summarized as follows: The deficiencies in this bill in its present form so far outweigh its limited advantages that I cannot favor its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the entire letter from the Federal Security Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, June 10, 1948.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EBERHARTER: This is in response to your request for my views on H. R. 6777, the Social Security Act amendments of 1948, as reported to the House of Representatives.

I am in wholehearted agreement with the general policy of extending the coverage of the insurance program and while I favor the coverage of all groups not now covered, I recognize that there is more general agreement on covering some groups than on others. However, in my opinion there are serious deficiencies in the bill which should be corrected in order to make the coverage extensions equitable and possible of simple and efficient administration.

First, the bill makes no changes in the insured status or average wage provisions of the present law. Under the bill a newly covered person under the age of 58 will have to work every quarter for at least 10 years to become fully covered and even then the amount of his benefits will be reduced substantially because his average wage will be calculated on the entire elapsed time since 1937. Thus, a person retiring on January 1, 1959, who earned $200 a month would have his total earnings of $24,000 ($200 by 12 months by 10 years) divided by 264 elapsed months. His average monthly wage, therefore, would be about $90, and his monthly benefit would be $26.50 instead of $38.50 calculated on the basis of his $200 monthly earnings.

I recommend, therefore, that the bill include a provision for recalculating the average wage, effective January 1, 1949, on the elapsed period after 1948 or 1936, whichever is the most advantageous to the individual. I also recommend that anyone who has 20 quarters of coverage within the 40 elapsed quarters prior to retirement or death be fully insured. Both these provisions or provisions substantially equivalent thereto undoubtedly would have to be included in any bill for general extension of coverage. Including these provisions in a bill for limited extension of coverage in my opinion will not jeopardize the early extension of coverage. In fact their absence from the bill may make the uncovered groups reluctant to be covered. I strongly urge, therefore, that these two provisions be included in the bill.

The provision in the bill for the coverage of State and local employees has a weakness in addition to the points I have just noted. The bill prohibits the coverage of employees under a retirement system even though the State or the local units of the Government might wish to have them covered. Several States have expressed a desire to have their retirement systems supplement the basic old-age and survivors' insurance benefits. In this way they would be able to provide their employees with larger total retirement benefits and broader survivorship protection than they can give them under a State plan alone. The insurance plans adopted by some 8,000 private employers have been written with a similar goal in mind. If State employees were covered under both the State plan and old-age and survivors' insurance they would have the added advantage of continuing protection under old-age and survivors' insurance if they shifted to private employment. If States were given the option of either including or excluding members of retirement systems those that wished to preserve their plans as now constituted could do so, and States that wished to tailor existing plans to the basic old-age and survivors' insurance benefits would have no barriers placed in their way. H. R. 6777 as passed by the House would force States in the latter group to dissolve their existing systems and draw up entirely new plans. This would seem to be a cumbersome and unnecessary procedure.

I should like to point out that the Advisory Council on Social Security, appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance, recommended that the States and their political subdivisions should not be permitted to exclude

from coverage members of retirement systems. The report states: "Many proposals previously advanced for covering these workers have advocated excluding, on either a permissive or a mandatory basis, various limited groups of State and local employees, apparently in fear that coverage under old-age and survivors' insurance would weaken or even completely destroy their State and local retirement system. * * * The Council believes that in light of (a) the incontrovertible merit of the retention and development of supplementary plans, (b) the fact that employees under industrial pension systems did not suffer losses in benefits attributable to adjustment to the old-age and survivors' insurance program, and (c) the fact that State and local governments have recognized the need for, and taken action to provide, retirement protection for their employees, any fear that the availability of old-age and survivors' insurance will lead Government units to reduce the total protection afforded their employees is unjustified."

I regret to see that the bill would also cover nonprofit institutions on a voluntary basis. I should like to repeat what Leonard J. Calhoun said about this question in his report on Issues in Social Security which was prepared for your committee. "The implications of voluntary coverage are serious to OASI, and voluntary coverage cannot be expected to result in solving the social problem for which OASI was created. Experience has indicated that voluntary coverage cannot be expected to serve as an effective substitute for compulsory coverage. If a situation is serious enough to justify any action in connection with OASI coverage, it would seem to warrant extension on a compulsory basis" (p. 131).

As you know, the Senate Advisory Council also recommended that nonprofit institutions should be brought under the program compulsorily except that clergymen and members of religious orders should continue to be excluded. In my opinion the arguments of the Council against voluntary coverage for any area except State and local employment are persuasive. On page 8 of its report the Council said in part:

"Voluntary coverage under old-age and survivors' insurance has been suggested. In the opinion of the Council, voluntary coverage is defensible only where the Federal Government cannot under the Constitution apply compulsion.

* * * * * *

"We are convinced that to offer voluntary coverage in any area where it can possibly be avoided would be a grave mistake.

"* * * The organizations most likely to participate in an elective program would be those whose employees as a group would stand to gain disproportionately large benefits in return for their contributions, such as organizations largely made up of persons nearing retirement age or men with large families. Furthermore, many employers in the groups now excluded employ only a few persons. The smaller the staff, the greater the probabilities that the distribution of employees by age, sex, and family dependents will differ from the distribution which obtains among the employee population as a whole and therefore the greater are the possibilities of adverse selection."

The Council believes that the fear of compulsory coverage expressed by some nonprofit institutions is without substantial foundation. It is convinced that religious freedom would be fully preserved if persons engaged in religious duties, such as clergymen and members of religious orders, remain exempt from coverage. Furthermore, the Council believes that the traditional tax-exempt status of all nonprofit institutions would be preserved if Congress indicated its intent that "the tax on nonprofit organizations for old-age and survivors' insurance in no way implies a departure from the principle of promoting the function of these organizations through tax exemption, and that a major reason for extending protection to this area of employment is to assist these institutions in fulfilling their purpose" (see p. 20). I concur in these opinions of the Council.

I understand that in the discussion of this bill by the Committee on Ways and Means some consideration was given to applying the voluntary election principle only to the religious institutions and that both the Treasury Department and the Federal Security Agency believed that such a dividing line would be administratively workable. If compulsory coverage of lay personnel of religious institutions is unacceptable to the Congress, voluntary coverage might be permitted for these organizations alone. The dangers inherent in voluntary coverage would thus be minimized.

The bill contains certain provisions correcting inequities in provisions affecting widows and children of deceased insured wage earners. I am wholeheartedly in support of these provisions as far as they go but in my opinion there are many other inequities in the present law affecting widows and children which should be corrected. I would like to point out just one. Under the present law when a man is disabled his children cannot draw benefits if his wife who is the sole support of the family dies. This is manifestly unfair. I recommend, therefore, that when any woman dies fully or currently insured, who is contributing one-half or more of the support of a child, her child or children shall be eligible for insurance benefits.

Section 201 of the bill incorporates the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of House Joint Resolution 296, as passed by the Congress on June 4. I will not repeat at length our reasons for being opposed to the enactment of these provisions. Essentially, the reasons are that these provisions would jeopardize the present coverage of some people.

The bill amends section 205 (c) (1) of the Social Security Act to provide that no wages can be included in an employee's account unless a tax on such wages has been assessed, or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue certifies that such tax is assessable, or the remuneration in question is held by a court to constitute "wages" as defined. To avoid extreme delays in the payment of benefits, I would recommend that where the Federal Security Administrator finds that the remuneration constitutes "wages" he be authorized to commence the payment of benefits and to continue such payment unless and until the Commissioner of Internal Revenue holds that taxes are not assessable. It is my understanding that the payment of benefits under such circumstances would accord with the practice generally applicable to other Federal and State contributory social insurance systems.

I must also point out that the bill does not increase the general level of benefits to take account of the increase in the cost of living and general level of wages since 1939. Even without this increase I believe that the general level of benefits is inadequate.

In view of the fact that both the House and the Senate have passed legislation providing for more adequate assistance to the needy, aged, blind, and dependent children, it is imperative that the insurance benefits also be increased.

I note also that the House has passed a bill to liberalize the old-age and survivors insurance provisions under the railroad social-security program by increasing the benefits 20 percent over present amounts. On numerous occasions I have pointed out that the benefits under the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act are grossly inadequate. I can see no valid reason for failing to give social-security beneficiaries at least the same increase in benefits as railroad beneficiaries since the present general level of social-security benefits is far below that of the railroads. The cost of living has increased nearly 70 percent since the level of old-age and survivors insurance benefits was established in 1939. No improvement in the benefits has been made since that time. I recommended, therefore, that the bill include provision for substantially increasing the insurance benefits to the aged, widows, dependent children, and dependent parents.

Even though the present bill is so limited in its objectives, I should be happy to recommend its enactment if it were not for the provisions which, as I have indicated above, appear to me on careful consideration to have harmful effects. My views may be summarized as follows: the deficiencies in this bill in its present form so far outweigh its limited advantages that I cannot favor its enactment.

Time has not permitted us to obtain the advice of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the relationship of this bill to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, unless one had assurances to the contrary, I think he might very well conclude that this bill "To extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes," really concentrates on the "other purposes." The extension of coverage to State and local employees and employees of nonprofit institutions is voluntary with the employer, and benefits would be computed on a grossly inadequate formula. The "other purposes" include the deprivation of coverage of some 750,000 employees now entitled to coverage. The end result looks like a Republican-NAM compromise. The Republican Eightieth Congress can claim that it has enacted a social security bill providing for some extension of coverage, and the National Association of Manufacturers can point with pride that their lobbyists have been able to prevent extension of coverage among the employees of a single major group of private employers.

Mr. Speaker, I have summarized the bad features of H. R. 6777. In contrast with the paltry, pitiful pittances with which old-age and survivors' insurance beneficiaries and old-age assistance recipients now seek to stave off starvation and inflation is the program of the President on social security which he has repeatedly requested this Congress to enact. On May 24, 1948, the President submitted five essential proposals which should be enacted yet at this session of Congress. They are the following:

First. More adequate benefits under old-age and survivors' insurance.

Second. Extended coverage for old-age and survivors' insurance.

Third. Extended coverage for unemployment insurance.

Fourth. Insurance against loss of earnings due to illness and disability.

Fifth. Improved public assistance for the needy.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to accomplish what I believe the President had in mind, although I cannot say that my bill conforms in specific details. When H. R. 6777 is considered by the House, I shall seek to qualify to offer my bill as a motion to recommit in order to give the Members of the House an opportunity to express themselves for or against an adequate social-security program. The principal provisions of my bill are:

First. Coverage: My bill would extend coverage to all workers included in the committee bill, as well as the self-employed, including small-business men and professional people, domestic servants, and men and women in our armed services. The total number of workers whose families would thus become entitled to social-security protection would be approximately 11,000,000.

Second. Increase in old-age and survivors' insurance benefits: A change in the method of computing benefits would substantially increase average benefits. Moreover, the minimum monthly insurance benefit payable to a married couple would be increased to $30 and the maximum monthly benefit payable to a retired beneficiary and his family or his survivors would be raised from $85 to $150. This latter change would help large families with three or more children.

Third. Retirement age for women: My bill would reduce the retirement age from 65 to 60 for women employees, widows, wives, and mothers.

Fourth. Disability insurance: In line with the recommendation of the President and the Senate Advisory Council on Social Security, I have included a program of disability insurance to cover the hazards of unemployment from sickness or other disability.

Fifth. Financing: The tax rate upon self-employed persons covered by my bill would be one and one-half times the rate paid by employees. This agrees with the Senate Advisory Council recommendation.

Sixth. Public assistance: My bill would provide Federal aid for all needy persons on a basis ranging from 50 to 75 percent of total costs, depending on the relative per capita income of the States. Standards of assistance would be left to the States without maximum limitations specified by the Federal Government. Present limitations upon receipt of public assistance by the aged, blind, and dependent children would be eased in the interest of an adequate Nation-wide system of public assistance.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide a program under which beneficiaries of old-age and survivors' insurance can really survive, and recipients of old-age assistance can, at least, exist. It is my hope that the bill will be enacted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

UNITED STATES EXPORTS TO RUSSIA

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, newspaper articles published throughout this country yesterday reported on the sudden cancellation of the plan of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer to reveal the nature of the exports from this country to the U. S. S. R. since March 1. The article which I shall quote in the RECORD is an AP dispatch from this city. It is headlined, "United States-Russian trading shrouded in secrecy."

United States policy on trade with Russia settled into a "keep 'em guessing" phase today under strange circumstances.

To the secrecy over what goods the Soviet Union will be licensed to buy here was added another puzzler: What she actually has been allowed to get since the United States clamped down on export licenses March 1.

Plans for Secretary of Commerce Sawyer to tell what American goods Russia has been getting recently—as a rough guide to what she can have in the future—were canceled abruptly yesterday.

No reason was given for the cancellation, but it was learned authoritatively that Secretary of State Marshall made a personal call on Sawyer shortly before the plans were changed.

WILL GIVE DATA LATER

Sawyer told reporters he will release data later—he did not say when—on types and values of goods shipped to Russia, after the shipments have been cleared. He declined to go beyond that except to say that some industrial goods have been cleared to Russia since March 1. He added:

"There is no agreement or policy that will prevent shipments of industrial goods to eastern Europe in the future."

But Sawyer, who took over the Commerce post only a few weeks ago, declared flatly that no advance word will be given on what goods the Russians can count on getting from this country. He said any further comment would have to come from the White House.

Sawyer hinted that American foreign policy—and Russia's own attitudes and actions—will have a part in determining from time to time whether the Soviets will find it hard or easy to buy from the United States.

This Congress and this country is not only keenly interested in but vitally concerned as to the administration of the export control law. Because of its responsibilities under the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has constantly examined the administration of export controls in its relation to both the field of transportation and the situation as to petroleum. It is currently engaged in further hearings as to the operation of export controls and will have before it next Tuesday morning Mr. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Director of the Office of International Trade. Mr. Blaisdell was a witness before the committee on May 27 and was then asked to furnish further detailed information as to the tests and standards applied in determining the export quotas with reference not only to requests made for licenses but also as to the impact on our domestic economy resulting from the shipment abroad of materials in short supply here.

While the hearing on May 27 was addressed primarily to the problem of exports of steel, the committee has been concerned as to exports of petroleum and petroleum products and of many other articles. The commitee expects Mr. Blaisdell to present a detailed and satisfactory explanation of the current administration of export controls, including an understandable description of the process of preparing applications from foreign sources, the screening undertaken and the reasons for the decisions made as to the amount and type of exports established under the system of quotas.

In this connection, and with reference to the nature and extent of exports to Russia, I would like to refer briefly to testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on January 27, 1948, and to further testimony during the hearing on May 27 last.

During the formal statement of Mr. William C. Foster, then Under Secretary of the Department of Commerce, on January 28, I inquired as to a reported shipment of petroleum products from a California port in a Russian ship to Russia. Mr. Foster replied:

That must have been last spring * * *. There has been no shipment of that sort since June 30 * * *. Again I make the statement that that could not have been a picture taken since June 30, 1947.

Later the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] examined Mr. Foster and his questions and Mr. Foster's replies are most significant and were as follows:

Mr. LEA. To what extent were supplies curtailed to Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. In the case of the Soviet Union we asked of them, as we did of all takers of our petroleum products, for a listing and a backing of the end-use needs, a list of their other sources of supply and, in the case of the Soviet Union, we obtained no information as to those figures. We therefore made no allocations to the Soviet Union.

Mr. LEA. At what date was that decision made?

Mr. FOSTER. The request to all nations was made shortly after June 30, 1947. We received no answers to those requests, and therefore there were no allocations made to Russia after that date except for one shipment which was a case of an American exporter who had undertaken contracts and who had made all of his loadings and transportation. That shipment was made sometime after that date.

Mr. LEA. Russia made only one request after June 30?

Mr. FOSTER. Russia had requested additional petroleum, but had not given the substantiating data which would allow us making a determination that they were entitled to it.

Subsequently I requested that detailed information as to exports to and imports from Russia from January 1947 to the last available date should be furnished to the committee. It was so furnished and is as follows:

EXHIBIT 3

United States domestic exports to U. S. S. R., total and by principal commodities, monthly, January–November 1947

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Commodity	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	January–November
Total exports	24,435	15,737	7,218	9,281	27,106	7,088	15,712	4,047	3,030	9,157	10,371	133,182
Animals and animal products, edible:												
Pork, canned	(1)		(1)		379			(1)				380
Sausage, bologna, and frankfurters, canned	(1)	844			11	18		(1)				872
Tushonka, canned		1,313	470		9							1,792
Other meat products	(1)		31	54			(1)	1				86
Milk and cream, condensed, sweetened							34				47	81
Nonfat dry milk solids					127							127
Other dairy products	23	1	77		106	65		(1)				272
Other products	1		29			12						43
Animals and animal products, inedible:												
Leather manufactures	59	22			18	5						103
Other products	73			219	206		1	1				500
Vegetable food products and beverages:												
Grains and preparations	1				56	24						80
Vegetables and preparations	8	1				4						13
Other products			(1)		4			(1)			19	24
Vegetable products, inedible, except fibers and wood:												
Synthetic rubbers	57						41	5				103
Automobile tires (casings)	22	34		(1)				3	10			69
Rubber hose and tubing, except garden hose	22			10	81	(1)		(1)				112
Other rubber and manufactures	5	51	7		21	9	5	25	1	13	5	142
Vegetable oils and fats, inedible		14		42								56
Leaf tobacco, flue-cured, stemmed, and unstemmed	444						715					1,160
Naval stores, gums, and resins	(1)			2						141	245	388
Other products	17	1			1		4					23
Textile fibers and manufactures:												
Twine, rope, and cordage	91											91
Other cotton manufactures	3	41	1							(1)	30	75
Sisal and henequen	8	24			429	143	48		403	84	155	1,294
Wool semimanufactures		40	88		228	44						400
Wool cloth and dress goods	76	73	(1)									149
Other fabrics wholly or chiefly of wool	58	5	(1)		5							68
Other fibers and manufactures	4	8		3				55		24		95
Nonmetallic minerals:												
Motor fuel, except antiknock and aviation	17				224	448	150					839
Kerosene							152				4	156
Gas oil and distillate fuel oil	38			128	294	136	762					1,358
Residual fuel oil		81			104	86						272
Lubricating oils	94			(1)	(1)	(1)	373	6	106	2	(1)	581
Lubricating greases			(1)			1	102	4	13	(1)		120
Other petroleum and products	1		(1)			1	5					7
Carbon or graphite products	54	28	87	29	64	2		38	32	102	126	560
Wheels or artificial abrasives	1		(1)			29	43	30		11	33	147
Sulfur, crude									55		156	211
Other nonmetallic minerals	207	30	12	36	205	1	22	2		2	1	518
Metals and manufactures, except machinery and vehicles:												
Iron and steel bars and rods	392	161		141	797	207	139	370		19		2,226
Tubular products and fittings	1,198	810	100	228	746	79	306	24	100	87	4	3,682
Wire rope and cable, not insulated	1,023	472	50	773	586	101	185	43	27	229	34	3,523
Other wire and manufactures	165	16	19	38	16	1	1					256
Railway car wheels, tires, and axles	380	432	446	319	530	301	366	59	203	448	254	3,738
Other iron and steel-mill products	256	221	7	213	137		217		6	21	20	1,098
Tools	132	22	25	26	54	27	13	35	1	2	25	362
Other iron and steel advanced manufactures	43	19	24	54	286	78	16	10		30	12	572
Copper wire and cable, insulated	298	13	50	34	55						(1)	440
Other copper and manufactures	35	8		3							(1)	46
Other metals and manufactures	73	1	1	6	35	110	6	3	1	25	9	262
Machinery and vehicles:												
Generators, accessories, and parts	527	359	378	291	734	73	85		53	87	48	2,665
Welding sets	5	22		(1)	77	78	122	7		16	7	334
Generating sets, powered by Diesel engines	96	714	8	2	75		65				8	968
Batteries		(1)		6		5	65			4	2	82
Transforming or converting apparatus	348	192	36	96	200	240	775	117	3	330	715	3,052
Transmission and distribution apparatus	274	276	162	99	565	70	621	137	187	411	372	3,174
Motors, starters, and controllers	1,148	433	96	167	990	61	337	19	31	323	438	4,043
Industrial heat-treating furnaces and parts	48	47	42	6	68	67	79	9		70	273	709
Radio apparatus	57	171	5	5	34	32	79	20	3	53	18	477
Other electrical machinery and apparatus	237	89	87	815	185	20	269	202	18	124	266	2,313
Steam locomotives	168	84	418	138	300					163		1,271
Internal-combustion engines, excluding locomotives	196	90	94	13	1,048		48			(1)	126	1,615
Accessories and parts for internal-combustion engines	120	155	44	62	248	77	9	58	1	69	36	879
Construction and conveying machinery	1,223	486	324	388	1,619	67	1,387	588	164	569	463	7,278
Mining, well, and pumping machinery	3,076	1,724	696	942	2,675	431	1,585	303	161	1,797	1,628	15,018
Power-driven metal-working machine tools, and parts	4,304	1,295	749	722	2,240	1,750	1,973	221	247	976	784	15,291
Metal-working machines, and parts, including power-driven	570	239	96	129	747	340	1,345	118	224	653	1,185	5,646
Air compressors	340	137	74	133	732	75	465	50	47	716	15	2,774
Pipe valves	164	268	39	314	145	67	50	16	(1)	184	69	1,316
Other industrial machinery [2]	3,539	2,074	830	1,326	6,474	1,476	903	527	449	741	1,131	19,470
Tractors and parts	615	329	5	826	302	28	58	24			16	2,203
Other agricultural machinery and implements	32	13	102		98	11	36	18	35	80	25	450
Motortrucks, busses, and chassis (new)	216	201	36	168	297		30				38	986
Station, warehouse and factory trucks			50				51					101
Automobile parts for replacement	37	109	3	5	60	6	38	3	(1)	8	18	287
Other automobiles, parts, and accessories	4		20	28	14		1	7	5	8	7	94
Aircraft parts and components	2	26	2		108	8	60			119	2	327
Merchant vessels		652					589					1,241
Freight cars over 10-ton capacity				33	67	67	168	565	339		377	1,616
Other machinery and vehicles	146	2	5	10	127	48	24	1	3	2	5	373
Chemicals and related products:												
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	38	14	11	2	49	1	1		(1)	2	9	127
Laundry soap	328	249	633									1,210
Other products	70	11	20	32	20	1	17	9	9	55	46	290
Miscellaneous:												
Scientific and professional instruments, apparatus, and supplies	178	225	80	51	254	344	423	88	25	172	659	2,499
Books, maps, pictures, and other printed matter	146	20	27	1	41	14	101	9	3	9	9	380
Commodities exported for relief and charity [3]	756	215	134	17	430	129	93	86	36	134	55	2,085
Household and personal effects	13	16	350	8	62	68	33	44	11	29	335	969
Other miscellaneous exports	45	15	37	58	194	26	22	88	17	13	6	521

[1] Less than $500.
[2] Includes commodities not available separately.
[3] Shipments by private relief organizations.

Prepared in the Department of Commerce, by Special Programs Branch, Areas Division, Office of International Trade, from basic data of the Bureau of the Census, February 1948.

United States general imports from U. S. S. R., total and by principal commodities, monthly, January–November 1947

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Commodity	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	January–November
Total imports	9,006	1,047	1,245	6,325	4,466	10,475	9,956	2,508	13,994	7,835	5,102	71,959
Animals and animal products, edible:												
Sausage casing				55	116	104		151	8	56	127	617
Caviar and other roe	3	5	1	436	13	3	9		17	7		494
Other products												
Animals and animal products, inedible:												
Fox, other than silver and black	484	(1)	5	14	91	462	177	23	611	178	32	2,077
Hare	366		66	44	191	635	659	310	124	639	85	3,119
Persian lamb and caracul	3,109	37	13	142	18	215	3,353	7	7,273	2,869	879	17,915
Marmot	30			166	955	667	191		425	178	55	2,667
Marten	141		2	123	117	404	268	5	301	94	104	1,559
Muskrat	48			23	33	774	64	17	408	29	54	1,450
Sable	11	7			222	287	226	103	250	210	48	1,364
Squirrel	210	4	59	331	496	3,570	503		889	136	101	6,299
All other undressed furs	213	1		220	600	1,005	279	64	806	247	364	3,799
Furs, dressed	2				14	11			13	134	1	175
Fur manufactures	62			164	22	139	132	31	147	212	198	1,107
Other products					31	4		1	12	26		74
Vegetable products, inedible, except fibers and wood:												
Licorice root			71	56	13		72			72	28	312
Drugs of vegetable origin not edible, crude	4		11	6	23	6	10	3	1	12	1	77
Pine needle oil	28					45						73
Tobacco, cigarette leaf, unstemmed	1,977			776	12	285	1,198					4,248
Other vegetable products	1				1							2
Textile fibers and manufactures:												
Cotton linters	23		220	155	35	133	340		435	177	411	1,929
Cotton waste	108		26	12	76	20	64	7	185	75	101	674
Flax, hemp and ramie and manufactures	8	14	2	1		87	9	10		64	24	219
Wool, unmanufactured		419	48			151					267	885
Animal hair, unmanufactured		90		33	7				100	56	91	377
Other fibers, and manufactures	30	2			9				77	28	2	148
Wood and paper:												
Sulphite wood pulp						290		5		163		458
Other wood and paper	3				2			1	2	11	19	38
Nonmetallic minerals:												
Asbestos, unmanufactured						45	94		78	56	152	425
Diamonds cut but not set					99		211		194	9	194	707
Other nonmetallic minerals				2				1				3
Metals and manufactures, except machinery and vehicles:												
Manganese ore	1,673	206		1,320	268	683	488	680	196	741	514	6,769
Chrome ore or chromite	209	255	410	1,073		285	1,649	1,084	1,222	1,288	881	8,356
Platinum ingots, bars, sheets or plates, not less than ⅛-inch thick	220		262	572	710							1,764
Iridium				84	45				54			183
Osmium				76					76			152
Palladium	36			403	203	135					355	1,132
Other metals and manufactures				1	1		46			30		78
Chemicals and related products:												
Arsenic trioxide			35	15		14	2		60	23	7	156
Other products						6			22			28
Miscellaneous:												
Equipment and supplies for outfitting and repairing vessels	(1)		9		34	2		3	2	2	2	54
Books, maps, pictures, and other printed matter	5	7	3	22	4	2	5	2	3	11	3	67
Other miscellaneous imports	2				6	7			2	1	1	19

[1] Less than $500.

Prepared in the Department of Commerce by Special Programs Branch, Areas Division, Office of International Trade, from basic data of the Bureau of the Census, February 1948.

Mr. Speaker, at the hearing on May 27 I called Mr. Blaisdell's attention to a reference to destination control in his formal statement. The reference was to this language in that statement:

Another major component of the export control presently exercised over steel—destination control—is worthy of comment. Employed to good effect during the war, destination control was allowed to lapse during the period when it appeared that the whole export control program could safely be abandoned. However, as 1947 progressed the necessity for this type of control became increasingly manifest and it was reimposed with the beginning of the fourth quarter of that year. Since that time quotas have been established for each principal export commodity and foreign market and individual export licenses are issued against each of these quotas.

I then called Mr. Blaisdell's attention to a paragraph in the Third Quarterly Report of the Secretary of Commerce on Export Control and Allocation Powers, dated April 30, 1948, which is as follows:

The effectiveness of destination controls is necessarily dependent to a large extent upon the cooperation of the governments of importing countries in supplying the United States with detailed statements of total steel requirements, indigenous production, projected imports from other countries, and intended end uses of steel requested from the United States. Such information is indispensable if the limited quotas for the export of steel from the United States are to be distributed among various countries on a sound, intelligent, and equitable basis. Many of the requirements statements submitted by foreign governments have contained insufficient detail, but there is evidence of gradual improvement in these cases and, perhaps even more important, a general willingness to cooperate. In the case of the U. S. S. R. and most countries of eastern Europe, however, no information whatever of the kind requested by the United States has been forthcoming. The Department of Commerce has had no alternative but to establish a zero export quota for these countries, pending the receipt of requirements information similar to that supplied by other countries.

I emphasized the last two sentences and then attempted to develop the facts as to the current and prospective use of this destination control power in connection with exports to Russia or to countries under Russian domination. Since I expect that Mr. Blaisdell will inform the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as to the full facts next Tuesday, I am including my questions and Mr. Blaisdell's replies as a background on that problem and for the information of those who wish to be informed as to this governmental policy.

My direct question is this—the report states on page 27:

Mr. BLAISDELL. In the case of the U. S. S. R. and most countries of eastern Europe, however, no information whatever of the kind requested by the United States has been forthcoming.

Mr. HESELTON. The next sentence leaves a doubt in my mind.

Mr. BLAISDELL. The Department of Commerce has had no alternative but to establish a zero export quota for these countries, pending the receipt of requirements information similar to that supplied by other countries.

Mr. HESELTON. Now, on table 3 on page 28 of the Third Quarterly Report, I note that there was exported a total of 90.4 thousand net tons of steel goods to the U. S. S. R. in 1947, including 27,000 tons of pipe and tubing, which we have been discussing.

Does that last sentence, in view of the record of exports, indicate that if the U. S. S. R. furnishes some kind of information, or if countries under the present domination of the U. S. S. R. furnish certain kinds of information, this country is going to

issue export licenses of steel to those countries?

Mr. BLAISDELL. You interpret the statement correctly, Mr. Heselton, that these products which have been on the positive list and under control, when the information required has not been supplied automatically, there was no quota established and no shipments made.

Mr. HESELTON. That might be true, but my question is, assuming that they furnish the information?

Mr. BLAISDELL. Your question, is, What would be done?

Mr. HESELTON. Yes.

Mr. BLAISDELL. If the information were supplied? We would apply the principles which have been operative right along, that if this information were adequate and the justification regarded as sufficient, we would issue licenses, the presumption being that we are receiving from the Soviet Union and from the other countries involved, an adequate return for what we were sending to them; in other words, that it was a real two-sided trade between the countries, where the United States was benefiting to the extent that the Soviet Union was benefiting from what we were sending them.

Mr. HESELTON. Well, I assume that it is fair to guess that you are not going to get that information; is that not probable?

Mr. BLAISDELL. In which case there would be no quota.

Mr. HESELTON. If it turns out that assumption is incorrect and they do furnish certain kinds of information, the most important condition precedent, as I understand your statement, would be that in return they give us, they export to us critical material, ores, metals, and that sort of thing; is that right?

Mr. BLAISDELL. Or other equivalent concessions.

Mr. HESELTON. Then you are not going to get again into that controversy we had early this year of sturgeon roe and furs as quid pro quo, for petroleum, are you?

Mr. BLAISDELL. No. What I have in mind is that in the relationship obviously the over-all position has to be taken into account in dealing with the export policies toward any country you are dealing with, the whole broad range of problems as well as the specific trade problem. If you were dealing simply with the trade problem then you would say we will let the money transactions control; and as long as anybody pays the dollars, let them take what they want.

The reason we put in export control is because that dollar transaction was not satisfactory in such category.

Mr. HESELTON. I assume that one of the methods of testing the wisdom of that sort of a policy is a very careful examination of what happened in 1947 in terms of imports from these countries; how much and what kind of imports we actually received. Is that information available to the committee, and could you give us that as against this?

Mr. BLAISDELL. Oh; yes, sir.

Mr. HESELTON. Let us take the steel; can you furnish that information?

Mr. BLAISDELL. The information is completely available and while I do not have the tables——

Mr. HESELTON (interposing). It is not important at the moment.

Mr. BLAISDELL (continuing). I believe it has been made available for the record of this committee heretofore, but I will be glad—if it has not, I will be very glad to make it available.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it available in these hearings?

Mr. BLAISDELL. I think not in these specific hearings, but other hearings.

Mr. HESELTON. Well, suppose we handle it this way. Why not send up to the chairman that information and then he can decide whether or not it is necessary to put it into the record of the hearings.

Mr. BLAISDELL. We will be glad to do that. One always has the hesitancy, as you appreciate, of saying what he is going to do if certain things happen, because so many other things are always happening at the same time.

Mr. HESELTON. I am just expressing this as a thought that this committee, if the other members agree with me, might like to have that. I do not know about that. I may bring it up again if I can return. Would it not be a pretty sound policy to adopt in terms of export of tubular goods or critically needed steel as you have discussed it in your formal statement, that is domestically needed, to first insist if they furnish the information that they also provide the goods here first and then in terms of the goods we actually get from them we could determine whether that might be worth while to issue some export license, but not issue them ahead of evidence that actually in good faith they are going to furnish us with these goods?

Mr. BLAISDELL. Well, if you are intending that as a question.

Mr. HESELTON. Yes.

Mr. BLAISDELL. I will simply say that it becomes a matter of administration and the acceptance of what is delivery at the present time, so that they can continue to deliver goods to us regularly and on the contracts which our companies have with them; and as far as I know that, there has never been any problem on that score; but I mean this is one of those details where you have to get down to the specific cases and decide them in the light of the whole range of factors that do bear on any specific concession.

Mr. HESELTON. Including the situation which everybody knows exists today.

Mr. BLAISDELL. Exactly.

Mr. HESELTON. In the matter of conflict of policy between that government and ours.

Mr. BLAISDELL. Exactly.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3433. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida;

S. 263. An act to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes;

S. 424. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins, and others;

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census;

S. 692. An act to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for United marshals and their deputies for travel on official business;

S. 873. An act for the relief of Warren H. McKenney;

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1249. An act authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes;

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes;

S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036);

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen;

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946;

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army;

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174);

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels;

S. 1861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.;

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School Board District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.;

S. 1987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws;

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes;

S. 2152. An act to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks;

S. 2215. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes;

S. 2288. An act to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction;

S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft;

S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances;

S. 2479. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States;

S. 2496. An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described;

S. 2553. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.;

S. 2592. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings;

S. 2593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.;

S. 2643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939;

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

THE LATE LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 661), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, late the Secretary of Labor.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 11, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1640. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to Southern Counties Gas Co. of California a perpetual easement for a natural-gas line over lands within Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1641. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 649. Resolution for the relief of Rose Cohen, widow of Maurice G. Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2299). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 656. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6712, a bill to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2300). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 657. Resolution providing for consideration of S. 1260, an act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2301). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FULTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6656. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4073. A bill to provide a more satisfactory program of benefits relating to active service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6439. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 6867. A bill to establish a committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the tobacco and cigarette problem; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 6868. A bill to amend section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act with respect to widows of certain deceased Coast Guard personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 6869. A bill to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6870. A bill to amend part II, section 203, 21 (b)-6, of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6871. A bill to amend rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for certain ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6872. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Kanosh Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 6873. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to be held in St. Louis, Mo., August 29 to September 3, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6874. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6875. A bill to amend section 251 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from taxation certain income earned by employees at naval and air bases leased from foreign countries for periods of 25 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 6876. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6877. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, so as to permit such federation to extend certain benefits to all its members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6878. A bill to authorize granting increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6879. A bill to provide a comprehensive program of old-age retirement, survivors, and permanent disability insurance and to assist the several States to establish an adequate program of public welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 422. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the annexation of Hawaii to the United States: to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 423. Joint resolution to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution providing for expansion and intensification of public-health research on the family aspects of chronic illnesses, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee, current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. Res. 655. Resolution authorizing the printing of the Fifteenth Report of the Commission of Fine Arts as a House document with illustrations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 658. Resolution authorizing inquiry by the Judiciary Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6880. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Devine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6881. A bill for the relief of certain Filipino laborers in Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6882. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2084. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Kenosha Post, No. 21, American Legion, Kenosha, Wis., endorsing the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2085. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dale I. Steele and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to freeing of the Federal employees' pay-raise bill from the House Rules Committee for action on the floor of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

2086. Also, petition of Loretta Moore and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of a $1,000 per annum pay raise for all Federal workers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, our Father, to show other nations an America to imitate—not the America of loud jazz music, self-seeking indulgence, and love of money, but the America that loves fair play, honest dealing, straight talk, real freedom, and faith in God.

Make us to see that it cannot be done as long as we are content to be coupon clippers on the original investment made by our forefathers. Give us faith in God and love for our fellow men, that we may have something to deposit on which the young people of today can draw interest tomorrow.

By Thy grace, let us this day increase the moral capital of this country. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 10, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 2201. An act supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1938;

H. R. 5728. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6355. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, which is a privilege and a pleasure, indeed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his kindly reference.

On the day before yesterday, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce adopted a resolution and instructed me to ask that it be extended in the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which I now send to the desk, be printed as a part of my remarks. I make no other request in connection with it.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MCFARLAND moved the following motion:

"Whereas the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by the terms of the Congressional Reorganization Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), has exclusive jurisdiction over communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television, and over interstate and foreign commerce generally; and

"Whereas, by the terms of the said Congressional Reorganization Act, each such (standing) committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and has the further duty of exercising continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee, and for that purpose shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government; and

"Whereas, in the opinion of the committee, the term 'communications' means both the means of the transmission of intelligence as well as the matter transmitted, which is substantiated by the fact that this committee has had consistently assigned to it for consideration such legislation as relates not only to the instrumentalities of telephone, telegraph, and radio transmission, but also to such matters as rates for, and the classification and kinds of, material transmitted, and in particular the use of radio frequencies for the transmission of various kinds of intelligence; and

"Whereas this committee has had jurisdiction over the Communications Act of 1934 and its antecedent and subsequent legislative enactments and by its terms has given and continues to give consideration to the use of frequencies in the radio spectrum in the public interest; and

"Whereas the entire problem of the use of high-band frequencies for international short-wave transmission of intelligence is directly within the specific and general jurisdiction of this committee; and

"Whereas the membership of this committee appealed successfully from the ruling of the President pro tempore of the Senate on May 27, which assigned the question of investigation of short-wave broadcasting under the so-called Voice of America program to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the very obvious ground that if such ruling were upheld all matters involving an expenditure of public moneys, regardless of the subject matter, would come within the jurisdiction of said committee, thus stripping all other standing legislative committees of the powers and duties assigned them by the Congressional Reorganization Act; and

"Whereas the membership of this committee have the highest regard for the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States and, in view of the fact that he is also chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, they did not formally contest his subsequent decision to refer the investigation of the Voice of America broadcasts to the Committee on Foreign Relations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this committee formally desires to serve formal notice that the failure to appeal from the decision of the President pro tempore assigning the resolution authorizing this committee to conduct an

investigation of the Voice of America broadcasts to the Committee on Foreign Relations as any precedent for the subsequent assignment to any committee other than the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of any matter dealing with communications by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television, or the use of in any manner of frequencies of the radio spectrum for any purpose, and this committee now asserts and will continue to assert complete jurisdiction over all matters dealing with communications by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this committee, regardless of any current investigation, study or other hearing by any other standing committee of the Senate into matters relating to communications by radio and the use of frequencies in the radio spectrum, continue to carry out the duties assigned to it by the Congressional Reorganization Act in respect to these matters and specifically to continue its study of international short-wave communications; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chairman of this committee be formally instructed to present this motion to the Senate for its information."

Approved by unanimous vote of the committee on June 9, 1948.

ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, one of the grand men of the Senate, of course, is ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas. He has served five 6-year terms in the United States Senate. All of us know of his recent announcement to retire. A very splendid article has been written about him by the veteran newspaper correspondent, Gould Lincoln. I ask unanimous consent, as a tribute of honor, that this article be printed in the RECORD, so that all of us may read it. I am sure I express the sentiments of every Member of the Senate when I say that we endorse the good things the writer of the article has said about the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETIRING SENATOR CAPPER CRUSADED FOR JUST CAUSES—SET UP RECORD AS A LEGISLATOR IN FIVE CONSECUTIVE TERMS

(By Gould Lincoln)

Not many men have been elected to serve five consecutive terms of 6 years each in the Senate of the United States—and have then voluntarily determined to retire. Not many men at the age of 83 have been able to attend day after day the sessions of the Upper House of Congress. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, is one of the very few.

When he made his recent decision not to seek renomination and reelection, the Kansas Senator took his colleagues and the Republicans of Kansas by surprise. He had, indeed, said earlier he would run—and the mild-mannered, slender, and soft-voiced Senator CAPPER has never run from a fight. It was not, therefore, the threat of severe competition from a much younger opponent—former Gov. Andrew Schoeppel—which took him out of the race. He just decided for himself that he had had enough; that he preferred not to go through the heat of another campaign; that he would go back to Topeka and continue the publication of the many Capper newspapers and periodicals.

FRIEND OF THE FARMER

It's often said the farmer needs a friend. ARTHUR CAPPER has been the answer to the prayer of many farmers. During his long service in the Senate he sponsored some of the most important legislation enacted to aid the farmers of the country—and he is winding up that long service as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. He was coauthor of the Capper-Volstead Act—not the prohibition law, although the Kansas Senator has always been a dry—personally as well as politically. The Capper-Volstead Act provided a foundation on which all the farm cooperatives have flourished, exempting them from the operation of the antitrust laws and giving other benefits. He was coauthor, too, of the Capper-Tincher Act—the first Federal law for the regulation of the grain exchanges, and of the Capper-Katchman Act, the basis of the annual appropriations made by Congress for the 4-H Clubs. Senator CAPPER, too, sponsored the legislation which finally resulted in providing that one member of the Federal Reserve Board should be representative of agricultural interests of the country.

The Kansas Senator made his debut in the Senate in March, 1919. World War I had just closed and Woodrow Wilson was soon to begin his fight for a League of Nations. It is of more than passing interest that Senator CAPPER was in sympathy with the League of Nations, that he was one of the so-called mild reservationists who hoped to get the United States into the League without doing violence either to the League or to the Constitution and interests of the United States of America. As he is concluding his Senate career, he is the ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, next to Chairman VANDENBERG—whom Senator CAPPER has stanchly supported in all recent questions of foreign policy. Indeed, Senator CAPPER stood aside when the Eightieth Congress organized so that Senator VANDENBERG might become chairman of the prized Foreign Relations Committee.

CRUSADER FOR JUST CAUSES

Senator CAPPER, for all his mild manner, has always been a crusader for causes he considered just. With a tremendous persistence, he has been an effective operator, too. For example, he went down the line for national prohibition. His retirement from the Senate is reminiscent of the passing of an era—the so-called dry era. Another cause which he espoused was that of the National Capital and its voteless population. For years he headed the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia—and he had a hand in its development—as a city of great beauty and dignity worthy of the country. Year in and year out he labored to give the people of the Capital City the right—denied to the people of no other capital city in a democratic Nation—to have a hand in thir own government. It is one of his regrets that he leaves the Senate with this end still unattained.

The Kansan is leaving public office on no note of pessimism. "We have," he says, "the greatest, most beneficial and most satisfactory system of government in the world." He is convinced that "things are getting better, not worse."

Coming from the progressive Midwest, Senator CAPPER was a great admirer of the first Roosevelt—T. R. Indeed, it was the split in the Republican ranks over Roosevelt and his Bull Moose ticket which caused Senator CAPPER to lose his first try for Governor of Kansas—he was defeated by his Democratic opponent because stand-pat Republicans voted for the Democrat. Senator CAPPER, in his newspapers, had supported T. R. Although he had no use for the New Deal of the second Roosevelt—F. D. R.—Senator CAPPER was always on friendly personal relations with him.

Twice a Governor of Kansas and for 30 years a Senator of the United States, Mr. CAPPER will be missed—make no mistake about that.

DEATH OF DR. JOSHUA LOTH LIEBMAN, RABBI, TEMPLE ISRAEL, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, only a few weeks ago, on May 19 to be exact, the Senate had the privilege of hearing the invocation delivered by Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman, of Temple Israel in Boston. Hearing his vigorous voice and seeing his robust appearance, it is hard to believe that on Wednesday, June 9, he died. In addition to being the rabbi of this big temple, he was the author of the best-selling book Peace of Mind. Not only was he a leader of his flock, but he also helped a great many others. He was a learned, useful, and truly inspiring man. I am sure that my colleagues in the Senate, who were so inspired by his prayer, join me in extending our deepest sympathy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

HARRY FUCHS VERSUS THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Harry Fuchs against the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 28 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution No. 1

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact the proposed legislation to amend section 5219 of the United States revised statutes to give the States which have sales tax laws the authority to levy similar taxes on National banks

"Whereas section 5219 of the United States revised statutes enumerates the methods by which States may levy taxes on National banks; and

"Whereas at the time of the enactment of said section, there were no State laws which levied sales taxes; and

"Whereas the apparent purpose of section 5219 was to prevent discriminatory and burdensome taxes on National banks; and

"Whereas since sales taxes apply equally to all State banks, trust companies and other financial corporations which might be competitors of National banks; and

"Whereas there is no sound reason why National banks should not properly share the tax burden with other taxpayers of the State; and

"Whereas the American Bankers' Association has prepared an amendment to section 5219 of the United States revised statutes to accomplish this purpose; and

"Whereas it is understood that in certain jurisdictions some National banks have voluntarily paid sales taxes, although not legally obligated to do so: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to amend section 5219 of the United States revised statutes to give the States which have sales tax laws the authority to make said laws apply to National banks to the same extent as they apply to other banking institutions; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Representatives in Congress from Maryland be and they are hereby respectfully requested to support any legislation in Congress which will accomplish the above-mentioned purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby requested to send copies of this resolution, under the great seal of the State, to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress.

"Approved June 1, 1948.

"WM. PRESTON LANE, Jr.,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 4

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for salary increases for postal employees

"Whereas the price of all commodities and services has been continuously rising since 1939, with every indication that the advance in prices will continue; and

"Whereas this condition of high prices has lowered the standards of living for all postal employees, increased indebtedness, threatened ownership of homes, and dissipated savings; and

"Whereas this lowered standard of living for postal employees seriously threatens the efficiency of the postal services by the loss of employees, resigning from the service, so that no permanent, efficient force can be built up: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to enact legislation at the earliest possible date, granting to postal employees an annual increase compatible with present living conditions, and that such increases be retroactive to January 1, 1948; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby requested to send a copy of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to each Member in the United States Congress from the State of Maryland.

"Approved June 1, 1948.

"WM. PRESTON LANE, Jr.,
"Governor."

The petition of A. Imperato, of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of postal employees; ordered to lie on the table:

A resolution adopted by the Colorado-Wyoming Academy of Science, Greeley, Colo., favoring the enactment of House bill 6007, establishing a National Science Foundation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation providing increased pay for postal workers; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Ludvig Harrigan, president, St. Croix Federation of Small Land Holders, and president, St. Croix Labor Union, St. Croix, V. I., praying for the enactment of House bill 5904, to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation; ordered to lie on the table.

The memorial of Mrs. A. Rupp, of Falfurrias, Tex., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for universal military training; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation reducing the funds appropriated for the European recovery program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 238. A bill for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1593).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution to change the name of the site of Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State to Chief Joseph Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1595).

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. Res. 247. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Public Works; without amendment (Rept. No. 1602), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 239. A bill to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1594).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2676. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 1596);

H. R. 2867. A bill to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1597);

H. R. 4455. A bill to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1598);

H. R. 5655. A bill confirming the claim of Juan Berrer to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing one hundred and thirty-nine and sixty-one one-hundredths acres; without amendment (Rept. No. 1599);

H. R. 5889. A bill to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1604);

H. R. 5936. A bill to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1600);

H. R. 5957. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1605);

H. R. 6239. A bill to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1606); and

H. R. 6246. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1601).

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1821. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; with amendments (Rept. No. 1603).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature; without amendment (Rept. No. 1607).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of May 1948, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
June 8, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of May 1948, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Leona V. MacKinnon, 1443 Spring Road NW.; Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, $5,905.20.

Fedele F. Fauri, 3227 Northampton Street NW.; Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; annual salary, $9,975.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2852. A bill to permit Hedwig Rosenbaum to be admitted to the United States; and

S. 2853. A bill for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming introduced Senate bill 2854, to amend section 2402 (a)

of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2855. A bill for the relief of Arkady Tkachenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and I request that an explanatory statement of the bill by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2854) to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanatory statement of Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming is as follows:

This bill is for the purpose of removing a wartime tax from supplies used by the beauty parlors and barber shops—a tax which has been a serious burden to the profession and a tax which has no place in our peacetime tax structure.

A similar bill, H. R. 3825, has been recommended for passage by the House Ways and Means Committee and I understand that a similar bill has been introduced in the Senate. I would not further burden the legislative schedule of the Senate at this time were it not for the fact that this is a very simple measure and completely justified and should be passed before the Congress adjourns.

The bill would exempt from the retailers' tax toilet preparations sold to the operator of a barber shop, beauty parlor, or similar establishment for use in the operation thereof. By specific provision of existing law, such a sale is now considered a sale at retail and is taxed accordingly. Resales by such an establishment would continue to be taxed as under existing law, but the passage of this bill would relieve the industry of paying the 20-percent excise tax on bulk cosmetics and supplies used in beauty parlors and barber shops in rendering service to customers.

The amount of revenue which the Government will lose, if the bill is passed, is trivial, but the benefit to the industry would be tremendous and completely in the public interest.

I have had many letters and petitions from operators of beauty parlors and barber shops in Wyoming requesting my support in the effort to obtain a repeal of this tax as it affects their profession, and I hope that the introduction of this bill will expedite action on the proposal so that relief can be obtained before we adjourn.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH CANADA RELATIVE TO CONSTRUCTION OF RAILROADS IN ALASKA, ETC.

Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the defense of the Territory of Alaska is essential to the national security of the United States; and

Whereas further development of mineral, timber, and other resources of Alaska is necessary to the defense of that Territory and to the welfare and security of the United States; and

Whereas adequate transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are essential to the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska; and

Whereas existing transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are inadequate for the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward extending the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska, and to cause surveys to be made and plans, specifications, cost estimates, and budget requests to be prepared for the purpose of constructing a railroad connecting the existing railroad system terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, with a railroad system extended from Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska; also including negotiations with the Canadian Government for the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements.

STUDY OF OPERATION OF MARITIME COMMISSION — AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE CERTAIN EXPENDITURES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution relating to the study of the operation of the United States Maritime Commission. In order to save time, I request that the resolution be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration instead of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 259) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in studying the operation of the United States Maritime Commission with a view to determining its economy and efficiency, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $6,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the amount heretofore made available to said committee under the provisions of Senate Resolution 152 is hereby reduced by the said amount of $6,000.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN AERONAUTICS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALDWIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2348) to amend Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress, to accelerate scientific research in aeronautics by authorizing the creation of 15 additional positions in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at rates of pay from $10,000 to $15,000 per annum, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

HUMOR AS A WEAPON AGAINST DICTATORS — STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on humor as a weapon against dictators, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL—LETTER FROM RAYMOND L. WISE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the Mundt-Nixon bill, by Raymond L. Wise, from the New York Times of June 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE "DELAWARE PLAN" FOR VETERANS

[Mr. BUCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements, letters, and other material relating to the "Delaware plan" for veterans, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE MUNDT BILL

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement entitled "Mundt Bill Is Aimed at Your Freedom," published by the Communist Party in the Atlanta Journal of June 2, 1948; and an editorial entitled "Communist Advertisement Is Full of Lies About Mundt-Nixon Subversive Control Bill," published in the Atlanta Journal of the same date, which appear in the Appendix.]

RECIPROCAL TRADE SABOTAGE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reciprocal Trade Sabotage," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette for June 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow, June 12, 1948.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

FLOOD-DAMAGE SURVEY IN WASHINGTON STATE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a flood-damage survey in the State of Washington which I have received this morning from the adjutant general of my State. The survey provides a reasonably accurate estimate of flood damage, and it will give the Senate the data needed to begin the study of reconstruction and rehabilitation requirements.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD-DAMAGE SURVEY, WASHINGTON STATE

LOSSES SUFFERED

Homes destroyed, 681, 21 cabins; value $1,874,000.

Homes damaged, 3,564; cost to repair $3,870,900.

Farm structures destroyed, 276; value $1,331,300.

Farm structures damaged, 1,728; cost to repair $1,176,400.

Personal property loss and damage; value $1,925,800.

Farm crop loss and damage; value $5,572,140.

Farm pasture loss and damage; value $1,232,250.

Farm livestock loss; value $114,500.

BUSINESS PROPERTIES

Business structures destroyed, 42; value $107,000.

Business structures damaged, 344; cost to repair $1,193,600.

Business stocks damaged and destroyed; value $102,000.

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES

Industrial property destroyed, 1; value $300,000.

Industrial properties damaged, 96; cost to repair $8,348,000.

PUBLIC PROPERTIES

Public buildings destroyed, 2; value $128,000.

Public buildings damaged, 19; cost to repair $50,000.

Public sewer system damage, cost to repair $689,420.

Water system: Damaged, 6; destroyed 1; cost to repair $356,930.

Power system damaged, destroyed, cost to replace $143,500.

Roads: miles damaged, 96.3; yards destroyed 16½; cost to replace $3,915,800.

Bridges damaged, 54; cost to repair $249,660.

Bridges destroyed, 21; cost to replace $1,792,000.

Miscellaneous damage: Cost to replace or repair, $5,163,800.

Total community loss, $39,264,300.

FATHER'S DAY

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, all of us are well aware of the fact that Father's Day occurs Sunday, June 20; but may I remind the Senate, and proudly, that Father's Day holds special significance for us in Washington State?

It was in Washington State that Father's Day originated.

In 1910, Mrs. John Bruce Dodd suggested the idea in an interview with a Spokane newspaper reporter as a tribute to her father, William J. Smart. Mrs. Dodd's suggestion was adopted by the Spokane, Wash., Ministerial Association and the YMCA, and these two groups sponsored the first Father's Day in Washington on the 3d of June 1910.

In 1914 Congress recognized Father's Day as a national holiday, but when the war intervened the idea was forgotten until 1922. Since then, Father's Day has been proclaimed a national holiday, the third Sunday in June every year.

FEDERAL AID FOR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—LETTER FROM ALBERT D. BLAKESLEE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a letter from a constituent of mine in New Haven. It comes too late to be considered in connection with the action the Senate took yesterday, but it does seem to me that it is such a fortright, honest opinion of a man who had much to gain from the appropriation of a huge amount for roads, that I should like to read the letter, because it is a refreshing comment from a disinterested American. The letter reads:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 8, 1948.*

Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I understand the Federal-aid highway bill is being considered, or is to be considered in the immediate future by the Senate.

While I am a contractor and from that point of view like to see plenty of funds available to build roads, I do not feel that I can consistently urge the passage of amendments increasing the yearly amount of the Federal aid to $500,000,000 a year, and to extend the time for 3 years.

I feel that this is a time when our Government should be economizing wherever it can, and I think probably this is one place where the expenditure is not wise at this time. Around here, we find that construction labor is extremely well-employed and, therefore, certainly it is not necessary to provide funds to take care of unemployment.

I trust that you may see the matter in the same way.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT D. BLAKESLEE.

Mr. Blakeslee is a member of the firm of C. W. Blakeslee & Sons, one of the oldest and most highly regarded companies in the State of Connecticut.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to socialized medicine.

The record of the medical profession is an enviable one, and there is no one who can successfully refute the assertion that the medical profession has proven its ability to safeguard the well-being and the interests of the general public without unnecessary governmental interference.

Of course, any person conversant with general affairs will agree that the extraordinary conditions existing throughout America have produced difficult problems which require the cooperation of the medical profession and governmental agencies. The question of proper medical care for indigent and medically indigent persons has presented a challenge to legislators, governmental administrators, and medical leaders alike during recent years.

Mr. President, I am happy to observe that the State of Maryland was the first State in this Nation to initiate a program of medical care. It was my privilege, then, as Governor of Maryland, to give approval to this undertaking.

A recent issue of the American Journal of Public Health comments most favorably on Maryland's initiative in this important field, and holds up the Maryland program as one which should be seriously studied and its lessons applied in other States.

Inasmuch as it was my privilege to participate in the efforts which resulted in the development of the Maryland plan, and to include in the State budget for the first time financial aid to put the program into effect, I am naturally most interested in reactions in the other States of the country to its functioning.

The operation of the Maryland plan has been the subject of extended study by a committee of the American Public Health Association. The editorial comment on this study, the report of which will be forthcoming shortly, is one that deserves widespread attention among legislators, as well as health authorities. It is for this reason that I consider the editorial worthy of publication in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Journal of Public Health]

A HEALTH DEPARTMENT MEDICAL-CARE PROGRAM

The Maryland medical-care program was described in general terms in this Journal a year ago. The operation of this plan has been intensively studied by the subcommittee on medical care of the association, and an important report on the subject will shortly be available for distribution. We are permitted to make reference to the main conclusions of this report.

The Maryland plan was an outgrowth of a movement initiated by the medical and chirurgical faculty (the State Medical Society of Maryland), and was formulated after careful study by the State Planning Commission. It aims to provide medical, hospital, nursing, and dental care for the indigent and the medically indigent of the State. It is directed by the State health department, with the agencies and the various health professions concerned.

The provision of hospital service remains in the hands of local welfare departments, and shortage of funds has so far limited the program largely to home and office physicians' calls and certain prescribed drugs. It has not made much progress in the care of the medically indigent for whom special authorization for each specific illness under a means test is required. For recipients of public assistance in any form, however, registration for service is automatic, and this group of the population has, for the first time in the United States, received basic physicians' services under a State-wide system operated by a State department of health. The experiment, therefore, deserves careful study.

Our subcommittee on medical care has criticisms of the present program and has pointed out a number of desirable changes (many of which are advocated by the Maryland department itself). On the whole, however, it is found that after original apprehension about the flood of demands for free medical care and the burdensome volume of red tape proved groundless, county health officials found the new program relatively easy to administer, the wide relationships with professional people helpful, and the opportunities for service augmented. The program is a decentralized one and is administered on the local level by county health officers, each with his own advisory committee. Our subcommittee finds that lack of local initiative (or existence of local prejudice) has caused some areas to lag behind, but the decentralized plan offers valuable assurance against the bogy of bureaucracy. Our subcommittee finds that the bureau of medical service of the State department of health has demonstrated a high level of administrative and professional efficiency in the development of the Maryland medical-care program. Actual service is sought by each recipient from the physician of his own choice and payment is made directly to the physician by the State treasurer. Physicians and dentists feel that the program has been skilfully organized to involve a minimum of red tape in administration. They are required each month to submit a single standard form for every patient seen. The forms are compactly designed to reduce paper work.

The Maryland program has not yet found all the answers, but it is a serious attempt to solve a problem which has troubled all who are seriously concerned about the public welfare, and which cannot be solved by arm-chair pronouncements but only by trial and error.

The board of trustees of the American Medical Association, in a recent statement, wipes this problem comfortably off the slate. It states that the group of the population who are wholly dependent on the public welfare for even their housing, clothing, and food is well cared for on a charity basis in most areas, but certain arrangements must be made in a few areas. The problem here is a social one of raising the economic level of the group rather than a medical one. It is difficult to take refuge behind the utopian ideal that a class below the poverty line can be completely abolished unless one is a Marxian idealist of the most extreme type. Nor can it be maintained with any seriousness that this group of the population is well cared for on a charity basis in most areas.

All scientific studies of the question have shown beyond any shadow of doubt that this low economic group has less than half the medical care which is essential for health and which is enjoyed by the well-to-do. Even if hospital and clinic facilities were actually reaching the lower economic group in sufficient quantity, we should hardly be satisfied. The public-health worker realizes that personal individual contact with a family physician of one's own choice is essential to good medical care. Such a relationship is completely absent from most "charity medicine"; but is clearly visualized in the Maryland plan.

Equally unfortunate—and wholly unjustified—is the thesis maintained by the board of trustees that "Health departments should not assume the care of the sick as a function, since administration of medical care under such auspices tends to a deterioration in the quality of service rendered"; and also, their "emphasis on the principle that medical care and treatment are not properly functions of public-health units." We challenge the ability of the trustees to provide any concrete evidence in support of the assumption that health department direction of medical facilities tends to deterioration in quality of service. The high standing of tuberculosis sanatoria, chiefly under health department direction, is a fairly clear refutation of the assumption.

Since it is agreed that funds for the care of the indigent must chiefly come from the Public Treasury, it is obvious that some form of control of these expenditures must be provided. The practical alternative is a choice between welfare departments and health departments. It might have been assumed that the American Medical Association would have preferred medical rather than lay control of medical-care allotments. That, at any rate, is the position of the American Public Health Association, which recognizes that the health officer as representative both of the medical profession and of the public interest is the man to do the job. That is why the association has declared in its resolution on medical care in a national health program that "A single responsible agency is a fundamental requisite to effective administration at all levels—Federal, State, and local. The public-health agencies—Federal, State, and local—should carry major responsibilities in administering the health services of the future. Because of administrative experience and accustomed responsibility for a public trust, they are uniquely fitted among public agencies to assume larger responsibilities and to discharge their duties to the public with integrity and skill."

Of particular significance is the progress already made in Maryland in the basic improvement of the quality of medical care. "Plans have been completed and the necessary funds have been appropriated for the extension of diagnostic facilities by expanding the staff and equipment of the 11 branch State laboratories in order to make it possible for them to provide an increased volume and variety of clinical laboratory procedures.

"Additional public-health nurses have been added to the staff of a number of county health departments. A study is being planned in one county in order to determine the requirements of patients under the medical-care program for bedside and other nursing services. In addition, a detailed clinical study of the dental needs of 100 eligible patients has been completed in one county and others are contemplated. Once these estimates of needs are available, it will be possible to formulate more appropriate programs of service."

"Probably the most important potential contribution of the medical-care program in improving quality is the projected plan for consultation services. This plan calls for an organized consultation service based on the facilities and personnel of the medical schools in Baltimore, whereby specialists would go into the counties at regular intervals and hold consultations with local practitioners on difficult cases under the medical-care program."

It is such comprehensive planning for improvement in basic medical services and for their correlation with preventive services that can be attained—and can only be attained—by health department leadership. The Maryland plan is only a beginning; but it is a most important beginning. It reflects great credit on the Maryland State Department of Health and on the medical and chirurgical faculty which stimulated the movement 9 years ago. It is a program which should be seriously studied and its lessons applied in other States.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of Senators the fact that yesterday in the calling of the Consent Calendar we stopped at Order No. 1579, Senate bill 784, when objection was made and it was stated objections would be made to the remaining bills on the calendar. I think, in all fairness, Senators who are interested in calendar bills should at least have an opportunity to have brought up the bills which remain on the calendar from that point on, under a unanimous-consent agreement, if it is possible to obtain it. It will therefore be the intention, if agreeable to the Members of the Senate, to ask unanimous consent at the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution about to be presented by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, which constitutes the unfinished business, provided there is ample time remaining in which to call the calendar, between the time the unfinished business is disposed of and 6 o'clock tonight. It is not the intention to have a night session. It is our present feeling that the unfinished business will be concluded possibly within 2 hours. If that occurs, I shall then ask unanimous consent to return to the call of the calendar.

I am making the announcement at this time because I should like to have all the Senators present when I ask unanimous consent to call the remaining unobjected-to bills on the calendar, and to have Senators ready to proceed with the calendar at that time. I may state for the RECORD that when I ask for the unanimous-consent agreement, the request will be for consent to resume the calendar call beginning with Order No. 1579, which is Senate bill 784, and not to go back of that. The intention then would be to continue the call to the end of the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska if I am correct in understanding that at the conclusion of consideration of the United Nations resolution and the calling of the calendar, it is anticipated that reciprocal trade agreement bill will be taken up next?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in understanding that the long-range farm program is scheduled to follow the reciprocal trade agreement legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the present intention, under the program we present to the Senate as of this moment, and I am quite satisfied it will be carried out, if it meets with the approval of Members of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). May the present occupant of the chair inquire of the Senator from Nebraska whether, during the call of the calendar, it would be proper to ask unanimous consent to refer to one or more of the bills to which objections were made yesterday?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate the Chair's suggestion. When the time comes to ask unanimous consent I shall make the announcement at that time. I am simply saying at this time that it is our intention to call the calendar after the legislation before us is concluded, if it is concluded before 6 o'clock this evening.

REVISION OF ROLL OF INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2878, to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HUGH BUTLER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
J. E. MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 239) reaffirming the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and indicating certain objectives to be pursued.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas peace with justice and the defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms require international cooperation through more effective use of the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate reaffirm the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except in the common interest, and that the President be advised of the sense of the Senate that this Government, by constitutional process, should particularly pursue the following objectives within the United Nations Charter:

(1) Voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members.

(2) Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

(3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

(4) Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

(5) Maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as provided by the Charter, and to obtain agreement among member nations upon universal regulation and reduction of armaments under adequate and dependable guaranty against violation.

(6) If necessary, after adequate effort toward strengthening the United Nations, review of the Charter at an appropriate time by a general conference called under article 109 or by the General Assembly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is an agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, if that meets with the approval of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I know that Senators are engaged in important business connected with the necessary efforts to conclude the work of this Congress, and I am wondering whether what I have to say cannot be stated for the RECORD. I would be inclined to leave it to the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator will leave it to my judgment, I should like to have a full attendance in the Chamber to hear the Senator's presentation of this matter. I think it is vital, and I think all Members of the Senate should hear it.

So, if the Senator from Michigan does not mind, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bricker	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Ives	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capper	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Taylor
Connally	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Lucas	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Feazel	Martin	White
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
George	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent from the city.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I realize that Members of the Senate are very largely engaged this morning in important committee work, speeding toward the conclusion of the session, but I think I should make a statement regarding the pending resolution, at least for the RECORD, because of its importance. I desire to make a very brief preliminary statement which will certainly not take me more than 10 minutes. Then I want to go through the resolution, and when I reach a discussion of the resolution itself, I shall be glad to be interrupted at any point.

This resolution is a sound answer to several critical necessities in respect of foreign policy which America confronts. It is the unanimous answer of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is an answer which, after many weeks of earnest consultation, has the wholehearted approval of the State Department. It is an answer which offers new hope for security and peace for us and others, through the United Nations.

What are the necessities which this resolution is undertaking to answer? The first necessity is this: Recognizing the indispensability of the United Nations as the key to collective security, many Senators have earnestly joined in numerous Senate resolutions proposing new United Nations patterns for a surer collective warrant of just and dependable peace. It is to their everlasting credit that they have thus sought to stimulate more effective relationships in pursuit of dependable peace for freemen in a free world.

The Foreign Relations Committee has been unwilling to bury these suggestions from so many of our Senators in a "deep freeze." It has sought, instead, a simple forthright separation to bespeak the essence of all these varying views and to find a common denominator which can hopefully represent the united opinion and recommendation of the Senate. We believe the pending resolution is today's best answer to this need.

The second necessity which we have confronted in this connection, Mr. President, is this: Up and down this peace-loving, peace-living land, which harbors no thought of conquest against any other power on earth, our people have looked with singular anxiety upon the often unhappy vicissitudes of the scarred United Nations, too often stranded on the veto rocks. They have groped for light with a sense of frustration amid a confusion of well-meaning advice. It is a tribute to their instinct that the infirmities of the United Nations have served only to intensify their zeal in its behalf. It is a tribute to their wisdom that they sense its fundamental utility as the only base upon which to build the hopes by which we live. They are entitled to the practical encouragement which this resolution provides.

The third necessity, Mr. President, is this: Facing the grim reality that peace may fail through the acts of others, Congress is concurrently driven by prudence to rebuild the minimums of national armed defense in the presence of possible aggression which might sneer at any arguments save those of force. At such a moment it is necessary that the same Congress, if faithful to the spirit of America, should simultaneously renew its relentless dedication to collective peace.

We have just passed a draft law, a peacetime draft law, for the first time in the history of the Nation. We have passed it in the name of peace. It is necessary, it is indispensable, that the same body which took that action should demonstrate that it had a peaceful purpose in mind when it passed it—to demonstrate it by now turning to the problem of strengthening the one and only organized, centralized hope there is for organized peace, in a fashion which shall prevent the necessity of ever calling

into actual being the resources of physical national defense which we are concurrently creating.

It is necessary to make it plain that we are not preoccupied with bombs and bayonets. It is necessary to make it plain to our own people and to the world that we continue to give unequivocal priority to peace cooperations through a peace fraternity that works. Another war will never be our fault.

This resolution, Mr. President, is the sturdy answer to any misunderstandings upon this score.

There is a fourth and final necessity which we have sought to answer through this resolution. We are embarking upon tremendous efforts to help others to help themselves into economic convalescence which follows independent strength and whatever makes for healthy peace for all nations, America included.

Pending this blessed outcome, it is inevitable that related questions of physical security should arise. This results and has resulted in immediate speculation abroad and at home regarding our American role in this collective-security base. The pending resolution is the responsible answer, so far as Congress can presently foresee. It declines automatically military alliances. It declines all peacetime renewals of the old, open-ended lend-lease formula. It declines unilateral responsibility for the fate of western Europe. It is none of those things; it is the exact opposite.

On the other hand, it is a plan for our practical American cooperation under specified circumstances, within the framework of the United Nations. It is an answer which encourages individual and collective self-defense against armed aggression within the Charter and outside the veto. It asserts our interest in regional arrangements, specifically invited by the Charter, as a means to renew its effectiveness for peace. It declares our willingness to consider by due constitutional process our own cooperation, in one way or another, with such regional arrangements, if and when we conclude that our own national interests are involved. But it warns that self-help and mutual aid are prerequisites. Our cooperation must be a supplement and not a substitute for the adequate and continuous defensive activities of others. It is a paraphrase of the Rio Treaty which the Senate overwhelmingly approved. It is a plan to make the Charter work in behalf of individual and collective self-defense against armed aggression. It is a potential power for peace. It is another forward move in the indispensable pattern of collective security for us and for others. It never steps outside the United Nations Charter. It never steps outside the Constitution of the United States. It never steps outside the final authority of the Congress. But it steps constructively and hopefully toward a better and a safer world.

I agree with those who say it is an important and significant step, but let us make no mistake about the underlying facts. This is not the recital of an acceptance of new obligations, if we meant what we said when we assumed our underlying obligations under the United Nations. This resolution merely spells out an orderly and consistent procedure to implement them. It puts them into a plan. It gives them reciprocal vitality. We cannot escape these same general obligations by declining the resolution. But when we make them more realistic and make our interest more specific it is less likely that an aggressor will take the chance and pay the price of ignoring them.

Mr. President, I wish now briefly to run through the resolution itself. I shall be very happy to be interrupted at any time in connection with any point in the discussion.

Senators will note that the resolving clause reaffirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except in the common interest. It then advises the President of the United States "that this Government, by constitutional process, should particularly," at the moment, pursue six identified objectives for the purpose of implementing this aspiration and this dedication.

Each of these six proposals is stated in a single sentence. There is nothing devious about the resolution. It is plain and simple. It is direct, and, if I may be allowed to say so, I think it is pregnant with possibilities of infinite advantage for the peace of the world, as well as our own peace.

What is the first of these objectives? "Voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members." I shall briefly explain the imports of this particular assertion in the resolution.

It will be noted that we are not proposing that the voice of the United States, for the time being at least, should seek to remove the veto from the use of armed sanctions. In other words, we are not invading that section, that ultimate section, of the United Nations activity which could involve the use of armed force. We are not proposing to remove the veto at any point which would involve a decision that takes us into the activities of war. We are proceeding on the theory that the people of the United States and the Government of the United States would not consent to any arrangement which would require us to go to war at the behest of others and without our approval.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the Senator contemplate that the veto would be defended in case the Security Council proposed to use and employ economic sanctions?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The removal of the veto as proposed at this point would leave the veto on economic sanctions. Let me develop that thought, because I think it is very important, and I want the Senator to have a complete answer.

The United Nations Charter was built at San Francisco on the theory that if all the pacific arrangements for the prevention and cure of international disputes were used, it would never be necessary—except, perhaps, once out of a thousand times—to proceed to the ultimate use either of economic sanctions or armed sanctions.

It was our feeling, and it certainly is the feeling of the Senator from Michigan today, that if the pacific settlement chapter of the United Nations Charter can be effectively put into adequate operation, it will not be necessary once in a hundred times to proceed either into economic sanctions or into that chapter of the Charter which deals with armed sanctions.

Therefore, Mr. President, the resolution, in proposing the removal of the veto from the pacific settlement sections of the Charter, proceeds on the great fundamental theory that the United Nations is primarily an institution to keep the peace, and not a contract to go to war. Therefore it proposes the removal of the veto at those points where pacific settlement can be pursued by pacific methods.

Yet—and this is the significant point I wish to emphasize—it would have met the situation in which every veto has been applied in the life of the United Nations. If this proposal ever became effective, no veto such as those in the entire list of vetoes up to date would be permissible.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In article 41 of chapter 7 of the Charter the following occurs:

> The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations—

At that point I pause to ask the able Senator whether under subparagraph (1) of the resolution it is intended to suggest that the veto power should not exist in case the Security Council should call upon its members, in pursuance of a possible effort to settle disputes, to interrupt economic relations with the state which might be adjudged to be guilty of aggression. Did the Senator mean to include that under "economic sanctions?"

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan did.

Mr. PEPPER. And the Senator meant to say that the veto power would exist in that case?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would, so far as this resolution is concerned. The Senator regrets that it is not possible to go further, but that is what this resolution does.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will further permit me, it is next provided in article 41—

> And of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication.

In case the Security Council were to determine to recommend to its members that they sever "rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication" with a member state, would the veto exist or not exist, under the resolution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The veto would exist under all sections of article 41.

Mr. PEPPER. The veto would exist under all sections of article 41?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Is that true with respect to article 42 as well?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Section 42 reads:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

The veto would exist under article 42?

Mr. VANDENBERG. So far as the pending resolution is concerned, the Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I should like to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Florida for asking the questions he asked because I was about to ask them myself.

May I ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether his own interpretation accords fully with that of the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator referring to the interpretation I have given——

Mr. MILLIKIN. That the veto shall be retained in the manner specified by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the personal opinion of the Senator from Michigan in respect to the meaning of this resolution. The Senator from Michigan himself would be interested in seeing the time arrive when further advance could be made into a wider use of vetoless sanctions, but that issue is not here.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the Senator, if he has not already done so, to give us some examples of the type of specific action which might be taken where the veto would not prevail.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, Mr. President. I think the best answer to the Senator is to place in the RECORD at this point a résumé of the experience of the Security Council with the use of the veto since the United Nations was organized. In 23 instances the veto has been used. In all those instances the veto could not be used under the terms of this resolution. Therefore, the entire history of the use of the veto in the United Nations up to date is a catalog of the incidents of the nature to which the Senator refers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator be good enough to allow me to examine the résumé?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I ask that the list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USES OF THE VETO IN PUBLIC MEETINGS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I. THE SYRIA-LEBANON CASE

The United States proposed a resolution under which the Security Council would have expressed confidence that foreign troops in Syria and Lebanon would be withdrawn as soon as practicable and that negotiations to that end would be undertaken without delay, and would have requested that it be informed of the results of the negotiations (Journal, p. 337). The following vote occurred on this resolution: for—Australia, Brazil, China, Egypt, Mexico, Netherlands, and United States; against—Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; abstentions—Poland, France, United Kingdom. After indication of approval of the resolution during the discussion, France and the United Kingdom abstained, but did not say they were parties to the dispute (Journal, pp. 346–347, 339, 343; February 16, 1946).

Even though France and the United Kingdom did not specifically concede that they were parties to a dispute, it seems clear that their abstention was not intended to be the equivalent of a negative vote, especially since after the resolution failed of adoption both the UK and France indicated their intention to abide by its terms. The president of the Council, after discussion, specifically ruled that the resolution failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R.

II. THE SPANISH CASE

A resolution was proposed to adopt the amended recommendations which the subcommittee on Spain made after its study of the Spanish question (June 13, 1946; journal, pp. 742–743). Nine votes were cast in favor of the adoption of the resolution, with the U. S. S. R. against and the Netherlands abstaining (Journal, p. 795; June 25, 1946).

III. THE SPANISH CASE

Australia and the United Kingdom proposed a resolution to keep the Spanish case on the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized without prejudice to the rights of the General Assembly (Journal, p. 822). All members voted in favor except the Soviet and Polish representatives, who voted in the negative, as they objected to the final "without prejudice" clause (Journal, p. 834; June 26, 1946).

The President of the Council ruled that the Australian-United Kingdom resolution (Journal, p. 822, see above pt. III, par. 1) was a question of procedure. This ruling was put to a vote (Journal, p. 841). Eight members voted that the matter was procedural; France and the U. S. S. R. voted that it was not; Poland abstained (Journal, p. 841; June 26, 1946).

IV. THE SPANISH CASE

Australia proposed a resolution to add the "without prejudice" clause to the previously approved paragraphs of the Australian-United Kingdom resolution (Journal, p. 862). All members voted for the inclusion of this clause except the Polish and Soviet representatives, who voted against it (Journal, p. 864; June 26, 1946).

V. MEMBERSHIP OF TRANSJORDAN

The application of Transjordan for membership in the United Nations received eight affirmative votes. Poland and the U. S. S. R. voted in the negative and Australia abstained from voting. The negative vote of the U. S. S. R. prevented the proposal from being carried (S/P, vol. 57, pp. 178–180; August 29, 1946).

VI. MEMBERSHIP OF PORTUGAL

The application of Portugal for membership in the United Nations received eight affirmative votes. Poland and the U. S. S. R. voted in the negative and Australia abstained from voting. The negative vote of the U. S. S. R. prevented the proposal from being carried (S/P, vol. 57, p. 181; August 29, 1946).

VII. MEMBERSHIP OF IRELAND

The application of Ireland for membership in the United Nations received nine affirmative votes. The U. S. S. R. voted in the negative and Australia abstained from voting. The negative vote of the U. S. S. R. prevented the proposal from being carried (S/P, vol. 57, pp. 178–180, August 29, 1946).

VIII. SECOND GREEK CASE

In the second Greek case the United States proposed a resolution to appoint a commission to investigate the situation alleged to exist on the northern frontier of Greece. This resolution received eight affirmative votes, Poland and the U. S. S. R. voted in the negative and Australia abstained. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 70, p. 87; September 20, 1946).

IX. CORFU CHANNEL CASE

A resolution was introduced by the United Kingdom, finding in substance that the mine field in the Corfu Channel which caused the destruction of two British ships with loss of life and injury to their crews "cannot have been laid without the knowledge of Albanian authorities" and recommending that the United Kingdom and Albanian Governments settle the dispute on the basis of the Council's finding. This resolution received seven affirmative votes, Poland and the U. S. S. R. voted in the negative and Syria abstained from voting. The United Kingdom as a party to the dispute under consideration was precluded by article 27 (3) of the Charter from participating in the vote. The resolution failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 122, p. 76; March 25, 1947).

X. THE THIRD GREEK CASE

The resolution proposed by the United States to adopt the proposals for the maintenance of international peace made by the majority of the members of the Committee of Investigation established by the Security Council received nine supporting votes with Poland and the U. S. S. R. voting in the negative. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 170, p. 41, July 29, 1947).

XI. MEMBERSHIP OF TRANSJORDAN

The application of Transjordan for membership in the United Nations, upon submission for the second time to the Security Council on August 18, 1947, received nine affirmative votes with Poland abstaining. The negative vote of the U. S. S. R. prevented the proposal from being carried (S/P, vol. 186, pp. 83–85).

XII. MEMBERSHIP OF IRELAND

The application of Ireland for membership in the United Nations, upon submission for the second time to the Security Council on August 18, 1947, received nine affirmative votes with Poland abstaining. The negative vote of the U. S. S. R. prevented the proposal from being carried. (S/P, vol. 186, p. 87; August 18, 1947).

XIII. MEMBERSHIP OF PORTUGAL

The application of Portugal for membership in the United Nations, upon submission for the second time to the Security Council on August 18, 1947, received nine affirmative votes with Poland and the U. S. S. R. voting in the negative. The negative vote of the U. S. S. R. prevented the proposal from carrying. (S/P, vol. 186, pp. 102–105; August 18, 1947).

XIV. THE THIRD GREEK CASE

The resolution proposed by Australia and amended by the United States finding the existence of a threat to the peace on the northern border of Greece and calling upon the parties involved to cease all acts of provocation and to enter into direct negotiation to relieve the tension, when put to a vote on August 19, 1947, received 9 supporting votes with 2 votes in the negative. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 188, p. 88; August 19, 1947).

XV. THE THIRD GREEK CASE

The resolution proposed by the United States finding that the support given to guerrillas fighting the Greek Government by Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia constituted a threat to the peace and calling upon Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to desist from rendering further support to the guerrilla fighting and to cooperate with Greece in the settlement of the dispute by peaceful means, received 9 supporting votes in the Security Council on August 19, 1947, with two votes in the negative. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 188, p. 106; August 19, 1947).

XVI. MEMBERSHIP OF ITALY

The resolution proposed by Australia that the Security Council find that Italy is a peace-loving state able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter, and recommend its admission to membership in the United Nations at such time and under such conditions as the General Assembly may deem appropriate, received 9 affirmative votes with the U. S. S. R. voting in the negative and Poland abstaining. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 196, p. 71; August 26, 1947).

XVII. MEMBERSHIP OF AUSTRIA

The resolution of Australia finding that Austria is a peace-loving state able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter and recommending its admission to membership in the United Nations at such time and under such conditions as the General Assembly may deem appropriate received 8 affirmative votes with the U. S. S. R. voting in the negative and Poland and France abstaining. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 196, pp. 82–85; August 26, 1947).

XVIII. SECOND INDONESIAN CASE

A joint Australian-Chinese resolution, which ultimately was carried, proposed that members of the Security Council that have career consuls in Batavia instruct them to prepare joint reports on the situation in Indonesia for the benefit of the Council. An amendment to this resolution proposed by the U. S. S. R. substituted a commission composed of states members of the Security Council in somewhat broadened terms of reference of the commission. This amendment received 7 affirmative votes with France and Belgium voting in the negative and China and the United Kingdom abstaining. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of France. (S/P, vol. 194, p. 66; Aug. 25, 1947).

XIX. THIRD GREEK CASE

The United States resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the dispute between Greece and her northern neighbors and to make any recommendations which it deems appropriate under the circumstances on September 15, 1947, received 9 affirmative votes, but failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 202, p. 167).

XX. THIRD GREEK CASE

The United States challenged the ruling of the President that the decision set forth in XIX was one of substance and therefore failed to carry because of the opposition of the U. S. S. R. The United States resolution that the question be deemed one of procedure received 8 affirmative votes, with Syria abstaining and Poland and the U. S. S. R. voting in the negative. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 202, p. 168–170).

NOTE.—XIX and XX could be deemed one veto rather than two. All newspaper accounts listed these as two vetoes.

XXI. MEMBERSHIP OF ITALY

Upon reconsideration of the membership application of Italy on October 1, 1947, nine members of the Security Council favored the admission of Italy with U. S. S. R. and Poland voting in the negative. The application failed because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 206, p. 132–135).

XXII. MEMBERSHIP OF FINLAND

The application of Finland for membership in the United Nations received 9 affirmative votes on October 1, 1947, with U. S. S. R. and Poland voting in the negative. It failed to carry because of the negative vote of U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 206, pp. 136–140).

XXIII. MEMBERSHIP OF ITALY

The reapplication of Italy for membership in the United Nations received nine affirmative votes on April 10, 1948, with U. S. S. R. and the Ukraine voting in the negative. The application failed to carry because of the negative vote of the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 279, p. 51).

XXIV. THE CZECHOSLOVAK CASE

Before a vote was taken on the Chilean draft resolution to establish a subcommittee to hear evidence and testimony in regard to the coup in Czechoslovakia, the President asked for a preliminary vote on whether the vote on the resolution would be considered one of procedure. Eight members voted in the affirmative, two members voted in the negative (U. S. S. R., Ukraine) and one member abstained (France). The President ruled that, since a permanent member had voted in the negative, the vote on the resolution would be a substantive vote. (S/P, vol. 303, pp. 66–70, May 24, 1948.)

XXV. THE CZECHOSLOVAK CASE

The ruling of the President that the resolution should be deemed substantive was challenged. Six members voted to over-rule the President's ruling, two members (U. S. S. R., Ukraine) voted to sustain the President's ruling and three members (France, United States, United Kingdom) abstained. Therefore, the President's ruling that the Chilean resolution was substantive, stood. The President submitted to the Council the Chilean draft resolution. Nine members voted in favor of the resolution and two voted against (U. S. S. R., Ukraine). The resolution failed of adoption due to the negative vote of a permanent member, the U. S. S. R. (S/P, vol. 303, pp. 137–140, May 26, 1948).

NOTE.—Vetoes XXIV and XXV could be deemed one veto rather than two. All newspaper accounts listed these as two vetoes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Since other Senators will be interested in some of the details let me give two or three examples from the list for the information of the Senate.

The application of Italy for membership in the United Nations was vetoed. It could not be vetoed under this resolution. That applies in a number of cases regarding the admission of members.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As the Senator goes along will he kindly specify how many of the vetoes related to the question of admission of member states?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think 11 of the 23. That is my best information.

The United States presented a resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the dispute between Greece and her northern neighbors, and to make any recommendations which it deemed appropriate under the circumstances to help correct the border situation. That movement was frustrated by veto. The veto would not apply under the terms of the resolution.

A resolution was presented by Australia, and amended by the United States, finding the existence of a threat to the peace of the northern border of Greece, and calling upon the parties involved to cease all acts of provocation and to enter into direct negotiations to relieve the tension. I think that is probably as typical an example as I could give, because it goes to the heart and core of the entire problem.

Here was a resolution which proposed to identify a threat to the peace of the northern boundary of Greece. It proposed to call upon the parties involved to cease all acts of provocation and to enter into direct negotiations to relieve the tension. That simple, elementary approach in a perfectly obviously useful fashion to start to commence to begin to unravel the causes behind the Greek-border difficulties, was defeated by a veto. It could not be vetoed under the terms of this resolution.

Mr. President, I think the case I have given the Senator pretty well generalizes the character of problems involved.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me make this further statement, because I think it is very important. Under the terms of the Charter—

> The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation—
>
> That is one—
>
> inquiry—
>
> Two—
>
> mediation—
>
> Three—
>
> conciliation—
>
> Four—
>
> arbitration—
>
> Five—
>
> judicial settlement—
>
> Six—
>
> resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

That is No. 7.

That defines the methods in serial rotation which it is the duty of the Security Council to embrace in undertaking, in the first instance to deal with international situations and disputes which threaten peace and security. That entire formula is at present subject to a veto, which is responsible for the entire paralysis up to date in the Security Council. In none of those instances would the veto apply if the objective of paragraph 1 in the pending resolution could be achieved.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is there any instance among those listed which, if the action were taken as proposed, would have inherently in it the probability or a strong tendency to involve nations in war?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The answer to the Senator's question has to be specula-

tive, because his question is speculative. The theory of the Charter is——

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The only reason I ask the question is because I have not had time to examine the instances, so I am asking for the Senator's advice on the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The theory of the Senator from Michigan, and I think of all those who joined in writing the Charter, and practically all those who have joined in approving it, I repeat, has been that if the chapters dealing with the pacific settlement of disputes could become automatically effective without the intervention of selfish interests, it would be highly improbable that the other subsequent evolutions would occur to which the Senator from Colorado refers.

Now I would say the answer to this question is that if the veto is removed from the chapters dealing with the pacific settlements it would greatly minimize the possibility that we would confront the obligations which we already have in respect to the remainder of the Charter. I should not think that this resolution would mitigate in any way or lessen in any way whatever our obligations may be in respect to the remainder of the Charter, but I would say that it would infinitely encourage the hope that we would be less likely to have to face the other obligations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If we came to that next step, that, of course, would be considered on its own bottom, and there the veto would prevail.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. He has stated that from his own viewpoint he would hope to remove the veto in an enlarged category of cases which, as I understood, might be taken to include matters such as those mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Some of them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Some of them. Is there anything in what we are doing here today which, by interpretation, could lead to the removal of such veto?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. Let me be a little more specific in my answer, because there must be no doubt upon the subject.

The Senator from Florida read divers and sundry recourses which could be under article 41.

These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Giving the Senator one example, because it is hardly possible to argue this question out in detail, since it is a highly speculative anticipation of an unknown future, the Senator from Michigan would think it perfectly appropriate, without a veto, for example, for nations to join in severing diplomatic relations as an emphatic indication of the condemnation of the Security Council of an act of aggression. But I repeat that the area into which we are now going with the discussion is not involved in this resolution, directly, or indirectly, by implication or otherwise.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has just mentioned something which, in international affairs, in and of itself sometimes leads to war, namely, the withdrawal of diplomatic recognition. Does this resolution contemplate that the right of veto would not exist in the case of a proposal to sever diplomatic relations?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The right of veto would exist. I repeat that the field of discussion into which the Senator and I are now going is a field entirely outside and beyond the jurisdiction of this resolution. There is no point in the United Nations Charter, except as we are dealing with the use of pacific methods of settlement, which is affected by the proposed release of the veto.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very grateful for the Senator's explanation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Would it be a correct statement that the section of the resolution with regard to the removal of the veto applies to chapter VI of the Charter, articles 33 to 38, inclusive, but does not apply to chapter VII of the Charter, articles 39 to 51, inclusive? The first chapter to which I refer, chapter VI, is entitled "Pacific settlement of disputes," and covers the points which the distinguished Senator has been reviewing, with respect to which the veto would be taken out of the picture. Chapter VII is entitled "Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression," with respect to which the veto would still remain.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from New Jersey is correct in saying that the veto would not be removed in connection with chapter VII. But the fact of the matter is that all through the Charter there are many scattered provisions with respect to which the veto would be removed. However, in every instance they fall within the general rule which I have indicated. The Government of the United States has already proposed, for example, and is proposing at the present time in the United Nations at New York, removal of the veto from 31 specific sections or specific articles in the Charter. The proposal before us goes a little further because we have found other sections of the Charter which similarly involve nothing but pacific settlements. So the Senator cannot pin himself down to any one chapter.

Mr. President, I think it might be useful if the list of the Government's proposals identifying the 31 sections of the Charter with respect to which the Government of the United States is already proposing the release of the veto were printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Interim Committee of the General Assembly, Subcommittee 3]

ANNOTATIONS TO THE "PROVISIONAL LIST OF CATEGORIES OF SECURITY COUNCIL DECISIONS WHICH THE UNITED STATES PROPOSES SHOULD BE MADE BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF SEVEN MEMBERS, WHETHER OR NOT SUCH CATEGORIES ARE REGARDED AS PROCEDURAL OR NONPROCEDURAL"

(Memorandum prepared by the Secretariat)

EXPLANATORY NOTE

(1) At the first meeting of Subcommittee 3 of the Interim Committee the Secretariat was requested to "annotate each one of the 31 items, giving all information relating to the Council's action in the past in regard to the questions raised by those items, and all other available information that might be derived from the Charter, or from the jurisprudence of other international organizations, such as the Council of the League of Nations, it being clearly understood that such information is to be limited to facts and is not to constitute an interpretation of the Charter or of the precedents considered."

(2) The following annotation has been prepared by the Secretariat in compliance with this request. Reference is made to:

(a) Significant votes of the Security Council on certain questions included in the "provisional list."

(b) The Articles of the Charter and of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

(c) The joint Statement by the Delegations of the Four Sponsoring Governments on Voting Procedure in the Security Council, to which France adhered.

(3) In connection with paragraph 2 (a) above the votes which have been considered significant are:

(a) Votes expressly taken on the procedural or nonprocedural nature of a question.

(b) Votes on proposals which have been adopted by a majority of seven or more members, despite the adverse vote of a permanent member.

(c) Votes on proposals which have been rejected through the adverse vote of one or more permanent members, despite the vote in favor by a majority of seven or more members.

(4) In accordance with the instructions of the subcommittee, reference has been made, when necessary, to the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council and to the practice of the Council of the League of Nations in a somewhat similar problem. Reference is made to the practice of the League only on one question on which no significant vote of the Security Council can be cited.

1. Decisions with respect to admission of States to membership in the United Nations, pursuant to article 4, paragraph 2.

Certain instances in which recommendations for admission to membership have failed of adoption through the adverse vote of one or more permanent members, despite the vote in favor by a majority of seven or more members, are:

Official records of the Security Council, first year, second series, page 139, S/PV/186, pages 83–85–87; S/PV/186, pages 102–105; S/PV/190, page 71; S/PV/190, pages 82–85; S/PV/206, pages 132–135, 136–140.

2. Decisions to bring a question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security before the General Assembly pursuant to article 11, paragraph 2.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

3. Decisions to request the recommendation of the General Assembly concerning a matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security being dealt with

by the Security Council, pursuant to article 12, paragraph 1.

Established as nonprocedural by the Security Council by express decisions to this effect. S/PV/202, pages 168–170, 171, 172. Relevant statements on the nature of this question may be found in S/PV/202, page 26, pages 41–45, 47–50, 52–55, 131, 132, 137–40, 146.

4. Decisions to cease dealing with a matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security pursuant to article 12, paragraph 2.

An affirmative decision was adopted by a majority of seven or more members despite the adverse vote of a permanent member. S/PV/202, page 186.

5. Decisions with respect to the consent of the Security Council to the notifications made by the Secretary-General under article 12, paragraph 2.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

For an occasion on which the Security Council, after deleting a question from the list of matters of which it is seized, deleted it as a consequence from the list which the Secretary-General communicates to the General Assembly under article 12 (2). (See S/PV/202, p. 186.)

6. Decisions with respect to the request directed by the Security Council to the Secretary-General that he convoke a special session of the General Assembly under article 20.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Article 20 of the Charter, chapter IV, "The General Assembly," is included beneath the heading "Procedure."

7. Submission of annual and special reports from the Security Council to the General Assembly pursuant to article 24, paragraph 3.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

8. Decisions of the Security Council as to whether a matter is procedural within the meaning of article 27, paragraph 2.

For certain occasions on which an affirmative decision on the procedural nature of a question was not adopted through the adverse vote of one or more permanent members, despite the vote in favor of a majority of seven or more members, see Journal of the Security Council, page 841 and S/PV/202, pages 168–170. Selected statements made in discussions concerning his question may be found in Journal pages 134, 135, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 841, 842, 844, 845; O. Records, first year, second series, pages 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, and S/PV/202, pages 146, 156, 157–160, 161, 162–5, 166, 167, 168–170, 171, 172.

According to the San Francisco Statement, this is a decision which requires the unanimity of the permanent members (San Francisco Statement, pt. II, par. 2).

9. Determination of the parties to a dispute and the existence of a dispute for the purpose of deciding whether a member of the Security Council shall be required to abstain from voting, pursuant to article 27, paragraph 3.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Relevant statements on the nature of this question may be found in Journal, pages 266, 267, 268, 269, 272, 273, and 58.

10. Decisions concerning the manner of the organization of the Security Council pursuant to article 28, paragraph 1.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Article 28, paragraph 1, of the Charter, chapter V, "The Security Council," is included beneath the heading "Procedure."

The San Francisco Statement refers to decisions of this nature as procedural (pt. I, par. 2).

11. Decisions concerning the time and place of its regular and periodic meetings pursuant to article 28, paragraph 2, and article 28, paragraph 3.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Article 28, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Charter, chapter V, "The Security Council," is included beneath the heading "Procedure."

12. Establishment of subsidiary organs pursuant to article 29.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Article 29 of the Charter, chapter V, "The Security Council," is included beneath the heading "Procedure."

Relevant statements on the nature of this question may be found in Official Records, 1st year, second series, pages 410, 411, and 412 and Official Records, 2d year, pages 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, and 431.

13. The election of a president pursuant to article 30.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Article 30 of the Charter, chapter V, "The Security Council," is included beneath the heading "Procedure."

14. Adoption of rules of procedure pursuant to article 30.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Article 30 of the Charter, chapter V, "The Security Council," is included beneath the heading "Procedure."

15. Decisions to permit the participation of members of the United Nations in the discussion of any question where the Council considers that the interest of the members are specially affected pursuant to article 31.

Affirmative decisions were adopted by majority of seven or more members, despite the adverse vote of a permanent member: Official Records, 1st year, second series, pages 4 and 5 and S/PV/268, pages 62–65.

Article 31 of the Charter, chapter V, "The Security Council," is included beneath the heading "Procedure."

The San Francisco statement refers to decisions of this nature as procedural. (Pt. I, par. 2.)

16. Decisions to invite a member state which is not a member of the Security Council or a state not a member of the United Nations which is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Council to participate without vote in the discussion relating to the dispute pursuant to article 32.

Article 32 of the Charter, chapter V, "The Security Council," is included beneath the heading "Procedure."

The provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council do not provide for a decision in connection with the participation of member states which are not members of the Security Council (rules 37 and 38 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council).

It was not considered advisable to provide in this rule (rule 38) for members invited in accordance with article 32 of the Charter, "because the invitation to a member under this article is mandatory" (report of the Committee of Experts, Journal, pp. 661–662).

An affirmative decision was adopted in regard to participation of a nonmember state by majority of seven or more members, despite the adverse vote of one or more permanent members. (S/PV/181, p. 111).

The San Francisco statement refers to decisions of this nature as procedural. (Pt. I, par. 2.)

17. Decisions with respect to conditions for the participation of a state which is not a member of the Security Council in the Security Council discussion in accordance with article 32.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

18. Decisions to consider and discuss a matter brought to the attention of the Council.

Affirmative decisions to include in the agenda of the Security Council a complaint brought by a state have been adopted by majority of seven or more members, despite the adverse vote of one or more permanent members: Journal, page 385; Official Records, 1st year, second series, page 197; S/PV/268, pages 58–60.

The San Francisco statement refers to certain decisions of this nature as procedural. (Pt. I, par. 3.)

19. Decisions to call upon the parties to a dispute to settle their dispute by peaceful means of their own choice, pursuant to article 33, paragraph 2.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

The San Francisco statement includes these decisions among those which require the unanimity of the permanent members (pt. I, par. 5).

20. Decisions to investigate a dispute or a situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, pursuant to article 34.

An instance in which a decision to investigate has been rejected through the adverse vote of one or more permanent members, despite the vote in favor by a majority of seven or more members is: Official Records, 1st year, second series, pages 412 et seq. (Presidential statements on the applicability of paragraph 3 of article 27 to these decisions, see Journal, p. 252, and Official Records, 1st year, second series, p. 412. See also S/PV/194, p. 66.)

The San Francisco statement includes these decisions among those which require the unanimity of the permanent members (pt. I, par. 5).

21. Decisions to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment of a dispute or situation endangering the maintenance of international peace and security, pursuant to article 36, paragraph 1.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Decisions containing recommendations for procedures or methods of adjustment of a dispute have been rejected, through the adverse vote of one or more permanent members, despite the vote in favor by a majority of the members (see Journal, 346–347, S/PV/122, p. 76, and S/PV/170, p. 42). These decisions recommended, besides procedures or methods of adjustment, terms of settlement for the dispute.

The San Francisco statement includes these decisions among those which require the unanimity of the permanent members (pt. I, par. 5).

22. Decisions of the Security Council pursuant to article 36, paragraph 3, to recommend to the parties to a legal dispute that the dispute should be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with provisions of the Statute of the Court.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

The San Francisco Statement includes these decisions among those which require the unanimity of the permanent members (pt. I, par. 5).

23. Decisions to make recommendations at the request of all parties to a dispute with a view to its pacific settlement, pursuant to article 38.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

The San Francisco Statement includes them among those which require the unanimity of the permanent members (pt. I, par. 5).

24. Decisions to request assistance from the Economic and Social Council pursuant to article 65.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

25. Reference of a legal question to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion pursuant to article 96, paragraph 1.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

Relevant material on a somewhat similar problem in the League of Nations is appended as an annex to the present document.

26. Decision to convoke a conference to review the Charter prior to the tenth annual session of the General Assembly pursuant to article 109, paragraph 1.

See article 109, paragraph 1, of the Charter.

27. Decision to convoke a conference to review the Charter subsequent to the tenth annual session of the General Assembly pursuant to article 109, paragraph 3.

See article 709, paragraph 3, of the Charter.

28. Election of judges of the International Court of Justice pursuant to article 4, paragraph 1, article 10, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the Court (art. 10, par. 2, of the statute).

See article 10, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

For the election of a judge of the court by six votes, see Journal, pages 145–146.

29. Decisions of the Security Council determining the conditions under which a state which is a party to the present statute of the International Court of Justice, but which is not a member of the United Nations, may participate in electing the members of the court pursuant to article 4, paragraph 3, of the statute of the court.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

30. Appointment of conferees in connection with election of judges of the International Court of Justice pursuant to article 12 of the statute of the court (art. 10, par. 2, of the statute).

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

See article 10, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

31. Determination of the date of election of judges of the International Court of Justice pursuant to article 14 of the statute of the court.

No significant votes within the meaning of paragraph 3.

ANNEX

1. Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Covenant of the League of Nations, provided that: "Except where otherwise expressly provided in the Covenant or by the terms of the present treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the members of the League represented at the meeting."

2. Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, provided that "all matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointment of committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the members of the League represented at the meeting."

3. Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations provided that "the Court may also give an advisory opinion on any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly." This article did not specify the vote necessary for the request of an advisory opinion.

4. The point in question was whether the request for an advisory opinion from the Permanent Court of International Justice constituted or not a matter of procedure.

5. The matter assumed great importance in connection with the proposed participation of the United States of America in the protocol of the Permanent Court of International Justice. The fifth American reservation to the protocol was as follows:

"Nor shall it (the Court), without the consent of the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims to have an interest." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 67, pp. 2824–2825.)

6. The final act of the Conference of Signatories, held at Geneva in September 1926, in order to consider the reservations made by the United States, said, in connection with the fifth reservation:

"As regards disputes to which the United States is not a party but in which it claims an interest, and as regards questions, other than disputes, in which the United States claims an interest, the Conference understands the object of the United States to be to assure to itself a position of equality with states represented either on the Council or in the Assembly of the League of Nations. This principle shall be agreed to. But the fifth reservation appears to rest upon the presumption that the adoption of a request for an advisory opinion by the Council or Assembly requires a unanimous vote. No such presumption, however, has so far been established. It is therefore impossible to say with certainty whether in some cases, or possibly in all cases, a decision by a majority is not sufficient. In any event the United States should be guaranteed a position of equality in this respect; that is to say, in any case where a state represented on the Council or in the Assembly would possess the right of preventing by opposition in either of these bodies, the adoption of a proposal to request an advisory opinion from the Court, the United States shall enjoy an equivalent right.

"Great importance is attached by the members of the League of Nations to the value of the advisory opinions which the Court may give as provided for in the Covenant. The Conference is confident that the Government of the United States entertains no desire to diminish the value of such opinions in connection with the functioning of the League of Nations. Yet the terms employed in the fifth reservation are of such a nature as to lend themselves to a possible interpretation which might have that effect. The members of the League of Nations would exercise their rights in the Council and in the Assembly with full knowledge of the details of the situation which has necessitated a request for an advisory opinion, as well as with full appreciation of the responsibilities which a failure to reach a solution would involve for them under the Covenant of the League of Nations. A state which is exempt from the obligations and responsibilities of the Covenant would occupy a different position. It is for this reason that the procedure to be followed by a nonmember state in connection with requests for advisory opinions is a matter of importance and in consequence it is desirable that the manner in which the consent provided for in the second part of the fifth reservation will be given should form the object of a supplementary agreement which would insure that the peaceful settlement of future differences between members of the League of Nations would not be made more difficult." (League of Nations Official Journal, 1926, p. 1565.)

7. Again in 1929, the Committee of Jurists, appointed by the Council to consider the revision of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, submitted a report concerning the accession of the United States, in which it was stated:

"The committee has also felt obliged to reject another method by which satisfaction might without difficulty be given to the conditions laid down by the United States. It is that of recommending the adoption of a rule that in all cases a decision on the part of the Council or Assembly on an advisory opinion from the Court must be unanimous.

"As it is pointed out in the final act of the special conference of 1926, it was not then possible to say with certainty whether a decision by a majority was not sufficient. It is equally impossible today. All that is possible is to guarantee the United States a position of equality in this matter with the states which are represented in the Council or the Assembly of the League." (Document C. 142 M. 52, 1929, vol. 4.)

8. In 1938 the Swiss delegation placed the following resolutions before the Assembly:

"The Assembly recommends the Council to consider whether it would not be desirable to submit to the Permanent Court of International Justice, for an advisory opinion the question whether the Council or the Assembly can, by a simple majority, request an advisory opinion under article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations." (Records of the Ninth Assembly, Plenary, p. 73.)

9. The Assembly adopted the following resolution:

"The Assembly * * * expresses the desire that, when circumstances permit, the Council may have a study made of the question whether the Council or the Assembly may, by a simple majority, ask for an advisory opinion within the meaning of article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations" (ibid., p. 139).

10. In 1930 the Committee on "Amendment of the Covenant of the League in order to bring it into harmony with the Pact of Paris" suggested the following amendment:

"At any stage of the examination the Council may, either at the request of one of the parties or on its own initiative, ask the Permanent Court of International Justice for an advisory opinion on points of law relating to the dispute. Such application shall not require a unanimous vote by the Council." (Records of the Eleventh Assembly, First Committee, p. 109.)

The following appears in the report in explanation of this suggested amendment:

The majority of the members of the committee thought that, in order to render the asking of an advisory opinion easier, the Council should be given the possibility of making a request for an advisory opinion by a decision adopted by a simple majority. The committee has left entirely on one side the question whether, as a general rule, a request for an advisory opinion requires unanimity or may be made by a simple majority. It has merely intended to make it clear that, in the course of the proceedings of enquiry which take place under article 15, such opinions would be asked by a majority decision." (Ibid.)

11. In September 1935, the proposal was again made to submit the question to the Court for an opinion (Records of the Sixteenth Assembly, Plenary, p. 76). The Assembly, faced with the assertion that the Court could not decide on a question thus submitted to it in the abstract, reiterated in a resolution of September 28, 1935, its earlier request that the Council submit the matter to examination (Ibid., p. 127).

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if I may restate my question, it probably would be correct to say that we are removing the veto by this suggestion in every case except, perhaps, chapter VII, which applies to specific cases of threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. In other words, can we pin down the veto to chapter VII, articles 39 to 51?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, because there are other articles of the Charter which tie in directly or indirectly to the implementation of chapter VII. But we can tie ourselves without any sort of reservation whatsoever, directly or indirectly, to the proposition that the language, "voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members," does not involve any area of Charter authority which relates to either economic or

armed sanctions. That is the best answer I can give.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The recommendations of our representatives at the United Nations on this subject have been brought into the debate. Since we do not know what they are, can the Senator say now that they are not to be taken as a part of the background of this resolution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. They are not involved in any way in this resolution, except that I think they are illustrative. If the Senator had the time to inspect each of the 31 proposals he would be completely content with the demonstration that there is nothing involved, even in the present movement in New York of the Government of the United States, which goes one-millionth of an inch beyond the limitations I have indicated.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I glory in the leadership in behalf of international cooperation and plans for an enduring peace which he has furnished to the Congress and the people of our Nation. When he speaks today in behalf of this new plan to promote our desire for peace, I hear him gladly, and will take pleasure in supporting his resolution.

The press and the people generally have complained in recent years that the Charter of the United Nations was defective, and that the organization was ineffectual in doing the job it was supposed to do, because of the arbitrary use of the veto power by one member of the United Nations. Am I to understand from the Senator from Michigan that our Nation has supported each of the proposals which have been vetoed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator is categorically correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. And that section 1 of this resolution will so amend the right of veto that not a single instance of the same character can occur in the future?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. And that the next four provisions——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am reminded of course, that before the resolution can become effective, it must have the consent of the great powers in the United Nations. But so far as we are concerned, and answering the Senator's question on the basis of the assumption that the proposal becomes effective, then the Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator from Virginia was contemplating that——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Because the section begins with the statement that by "voluntary agreement" this change shall be made.

I further understand that in the next four sections of the resolution we renew our allegiance to undertakings to which we have previously been committed by becoming members signatory to the Atlantic Charter and to the Charter of the United Nations—to cooperate for the economic rebuilding of countries who have suffered from the war, to join with them under article 51 if they have occasion to resist aggression, and to cooperate in any program they may have for self-help, especially as contemplated under our so-called Marshall plan. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Virginia is moving ahead to a discussion of the body of the resolution. I should prefer to withhold any answer regarding the remainder of the resolution until I have an opportunity to go into it in detail. But speaking generally, I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Then I understand that the resolution concludes with the declaration that if the nations will not voluntarily adopt the plan proposed in section 1 of this resolution, we then reserve the right to propose an international conference to consider amendments to the Charter, as authorized by the Charter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I note in the report which accompanies the resolution that it was unanimously reported by the committee. Does that mean that in spirit, as well as in fact, the distinguished committee brings us a measure in behalf of peace which has its endorsement in the full meaning of the word "unanimous"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have several questions regarding the first paragraph of the numbered sections of the resolution.

Would the veto apply to a resolution of the United Nations Security Council outlawing certain types of weapons—for instance, the atomic bomb—without any conditions being laid down for protection?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand the Senator from Michigan to say it would.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is, the veto would not be removed.

Mr. WATKINS. The veto would apply and would be effective against that?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Then, to what field would the resolution narrow down the use of the veto? Would not what I have suggested come under the heading of pacific settlements?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I think it would come under the heading "control of armaments."

Mr. WATKINS. Would it not relate to movements to prevent aggression?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is stretching the application of the words "pacific settlements" beyond any specifications whatever. He is applying those words in a general way which would carry them over into the entire body of the Charter. For instance, even if the use of armed force were invoked, it would be for the purpose of peaceful results and in the hope of stopping a war.

Therefore, I know the Senator is carrying his use of the phrase "pacific settlements" far beyond the intention. I think it is perfectly clear.

Mr. WATKINS. Should not there be a limitation on the application of the phrase "pacific settlements," so that we would know exactly what it means?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is so clear that there can be no doubt in the world about it. I think the committee report makes it plain; but, if not, the statement of the chairman of the committee has made it unequivocally plain.

Let me supplement that answer to the Senator, for I know of his very deep faith in asking the question, and of his constructive interest in the whole subject. When the resolution was in the course of preparation, I tried to identify it by at least chapter identifications from the United Nations Charter; but I found that the pacific settlement articles are spread all the way through the Charter, from one end to the other; and it simply became an impossibility, as will be seen by looking at the document I have just put into the RECORD, covering the 31 proposals the Government has already made on this subject at New York.

Mr. WATKINS. With respect to voluntary agreements, let me say I understand an international conference would have to be called for the purpose of preparing voluntary agreements.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; this is purely a matter of voluntary interpretation on the part of the permanent members of the Security Council.

Mr. WATKINS. And it would not need to be presented to the Congress of the United States for ratification?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It requires nothing except the self-denying agreement of the five permanent members of the Security Council to forego their use of the veto power in respect to these particular sections.

Mr. WATKINS. Would not that be a serious modification of the Charter, which the Senate of the United States has already approved?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I do not think it would be any modification at all, because the question of what sections of the Charter the veto applies to has always been a matter of dispute, and still is. It is a procedural question; and procedural questions are settled by the institution itself.

Mr. WATKINS. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan has misunderstood me. I am referring to voluntary agreements.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So am I.

Mr. WATKINS. I am referring to a voluntary agreement that will have to be entered into. I understood the Senator from Virginia to say that an international conference would have to prepare such an agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; the Senator from Virgina was referring to section 6 of the resolution, which is the point at which the answer indicated would be made.

Mr. WATKINS. Then let me see if I clearly understand. It woud be possible, then, through the United Nations Organization itself, to have the use of the

veto limited, without any resubmission of the matter to the Congress of the United States for approval. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It can be done by voluntary self-denial of any nation among the five permanent members.

Mr. WATKINS. Again I ask the Senator, is not that a serious modification of the Charter, which now provides for a veto in respect to practically everything, as Russia demonstrated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is a very serious change, if the word "serious" be used in an optimistic rather than a pessimistic sense. It may be entirely too much to hope for. But it is at least a final, official assertion on our part that, so far as we are concerned, we are prepared not to exercise the veto, which is our right, in respect to purely pacific settlements; that we are prepared to say that there should be no veto upon any of the questions which heretofore have been vetoed, because they fall within the classification of pacific settlements.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Then am I to understand that Senate Resolution 239, if adopted, will, in effect, give the representatives of the United States to the United Nations the power to waive the right to veto certain resolutions which come within the scope of this resolution? In other words, instead of presenting it——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to wait a moment and let me answer him.

Mr. WATKINS. But I have not finished my question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator gets ready to start to commence to finish his question, let me deal with his premise.

Mr. WATKINS. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This resolution proposes no new power or authority which the representatives of the United States do not presently have or which they are not presently exercising. The resolution simply backs them up in what they are at present undertaking to do.

Mr. WATKINS. That does not seem to answer the question I have in my mind with respect to this matter. As I understand, the resolution will be something even more than a moral commitment to a policy of permitting our representatives in the United Nations to waive certain veto rights they now have with respect to measures that may be proposed involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations. That is the intent of the resolution, is it not, to give the executive department which takes care of foreign relations the power to go ahead, the Senate agreeing in advance to the withholding of our right of veto?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The resolution does not give the executive department a single power it does not possess under the Charter. It simply indicates that in meeting the crisis which the United Nations obviously confronts, in attempting to escape further wreckage on the veto rocks, the Senate agrees that the thing of immediate hope is to persist in our existing present effort, an effort which was born at San Francisco itself, to make the pacific-settlement sections of the Charter free of the right of any selfish interference on the part of anybody.

Mr. WATKINS. Suppose the Security Council should adopt a resolution interpreting just what is included within the term "pacific settlements": Would that be subject to the veto?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would, except as there was a voluntary willingness that it should not be. The whole thing is voluntary. There is not a thing in the resolution that is not dependent upon the voluntary attitudes of the five permanent members.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that is correct, but now I am inviting the Senator's attention to a resolution which would be submitted by the Security Council, in which it interpreted just what is meant by "pacific settlements of international disputes and situations." Suppose we did not agree with that; suppose we should not agree with that interpretation, could we veto it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. That would be the Senator's interpretation, would it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, absolutely. There is no question in the world about it.

Mr. WATKINS. Does that not have reference to, and is it not concerned with, pacific settlements?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course it is. So what? I am sure it is my fault, but I do not follow the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. I probably have not made myself clear. It seems to me that by interpretation of the Security Council itself, it could enlarge the meaning, or determine what the meaning is of "pacific settlements of international disputes and situations." A great many situations may arise in the future that we cannot foresee now.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Would it be possible by resolution of the Security Council itself to enlarge that meaning beyond what we would want to do at the present time?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Any such resolution would be subject to veto.

Mr. WATKINS. Is that what is intended?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is inherent in the situation and cannot be escaped.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Perhaps we should bring it into a sharper focus with this question: Does any country on the Council which has not subscribed to the voluntary agreement give up its right of veto?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, indeed. And there will be no suspension of the veto except as all do subscribe.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So the resolution, I assume, has the hope of helping finally to generate a universal restraint in these particulars. But if it does not succeed, any nation not joining in this program of voluntary restraint will continue to have the right under the Charter, until it be amended, to exercise its veto. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And even as to the voluntary agreement, I assume it would constitute no more than a moral obligation, so that if a nation that subscribed to the voluntary agreement felt like abandoning the moral compunction, or not yielding to the moral compunction, it would still exercise the veto if it felt like doing so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct. This is a complete emphasis upon the wishful possibility that there is a way to approach the veto question with some anticipation of results. The whole country is alive with a discussion of divers and sundry formulas for getting rid of the veto, and so forth. Many of them—all of them—are in the best of faith, and I do not speak critically of any of them. But a large proportion of them are completely unrealistic, because they are not attached to an understanding of the precise problem that is confronted in trying to get away from the veto.

There is only one way finally and categorically to get away from the veto, if it is desired to do that, beyond redemption, and that is to amend the Charter. There is a veto on any amendment to the Charter, so it is perfectly obvious that except as there can be a new meeting of minds upon the part of the permanent members of the Security Council, there is no way except by the disruption of the institution to avoid the veto. Therefore, the hopeful approach is to take the first and immediately available method to determine whether it is not possible to get a voluntary agreement upon the new point of view.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not fair to say that the resolution constitutes an initiation of a process by which we may hope that those who have exercised the veto heretofore in a way we do not think was originally contemplated, may ultimately come around to an amendment of the Charter so as to restrict their own veto power?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That would be the ultimate objective. But since they would have to waive their present point of view voluntarily, before an ultimate amendment could be made, if that same waiving of their present attitude could occur at once, we would not have to wait for the tortuous process of amendment in order to achieve the result.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. But the existence of the United Nations, we hope, in spite of its tortuosity up to now, is a long-range and long-term institution, and we hope that gradually by bringing whatever moral influence the adoption of this resolution could bring upon any intransigent nation which may have overexercised the right of veto, it might be regarded as a step in the direction of persuading them ultimately to amend the Charter itself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct. In fact, I might just as well briefly discuss paragraph (6) at this

point, because it directly ties in with the whole discussion. Paragraph (6) reads:

If necessary, after adequate effort toward strengthening the United Nations, review of the Charter at an appropriate time by a General Conference called under 109 or by the General Assembly.

In other words, we are not ultimately running away from the fact that we may have to face the question of change in basic law, but we are first proposing to exhaust the existing facilities which are available to us within the present terms of the Charter on the one hand, and, on the other, to exhaust the possibility of seeking a voluntary agreement which, through some degree of self-restraint, can accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I assume that means voluntary agreements with members of the Security Council. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. This resolution represents practically the opinion of the Senate regarding further progress in the formulation of our foreign policy. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would say it is an effort to implement our existing foreign policy in respect of the United Nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am interested in it from the standpoint of what I think is a very commendable course of the Senate in cooperating with the Executive in seeking to unify our approach in foreign policies. I think we have made considerable progress in that direction in recent years. It started under the chairmanship of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] when we began evolving the United Nations, and continued under the present distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I would be interested in the view of the Senator from Michigan as to how far we might anticipate going in time to come in the formulation of expressions of opinion, realizing the primary responsibility of the President in the conduct of foreign relations, and yet recognizing, also, the consultative responsibilities of the Senate. I think it is one of the most hopeful auguries in our foreign relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator ask me to turn aside from the resolution to discuss the general subject of Executive relations with the Senate in respect to the development of foreign policy?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I recognize that that is entirely too broad a field. But it has been occasionally suggested, when we have been discussing questions of foreign policy, that we were entering a forbidden realm. This resolution obviously establishes an additional indication that the Senate is concerned in not merely passing on treaties and the appointment of ambassadors, but in expressing opinions and the sense of the Senate regarding the evolution of our foreign policy. I do not know how many instances there are. Has the Senator from Michigan given any attention to the matter of how frequently a thing of this precise character has happened in the past?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It has not happened frequently, but it has happened a number of times.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a responsibility which must be exercised, obviously.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me point it up a little more, because it was only a short time ago that the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations stated categorically on the floor of the Senate that he had not been consulted regarding the policy on Palestine.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And in a public address in Cleveland, a year ago, the Senator made a similar statement as to our current problems in connection with South America, the Orient, and China.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. So that if the circumstances seemed to warrant, there would have been a similar reason for the Senate to consider advising the Chief Executive regarding those three extremely important fields of foreign policy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senate is entitled, at any time it pleases, to use the advice clause of the Constitution to tell the Executive what it thinks concerning foreign affairs. But I think it would be a tragic and unfortunate thing if the habit ever became general or too contagious, because, I respectfully submit to the Senator, only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by some sort of a premature and ill-advised expression of its advice to the Executive.

Therefore, referring to the exhibits mentioned by the Senator from Maine, I certainly have no complaint that the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was not consulted in respect to Palestine or in respect to South America, under the administration of Mr. Braden, or in respect to China, under the mission of General Marshall. I think it is a fantastic unreality to think that there can be cooperation either between the legislative branch and the executive branch or between the two major parties in any such specific detail in respect to the conduct of foreign affairs.

The Constitution places in the President the primary responsibility for the conduct of foreign relations. He exercises that authority through his Secretary of State. When and where it is possible, in clearly channeled and clearly identified projects, for the legislature, the Executive, and the two major parties to proceed from the beginning to the end of a specific adventure, so that all are consulted in respect to all phases of the undertaking, I think it is a tremendously useful thing, and I believe it has been demonstrated as being useful, particularly in connection with the development of the United Nations, which is the spectacular example of those contacts. But to think that that can be done as an every-day practice in regard to all of the multiple problems of international import which now descend upon the State Department every day, in my opinion is totally out of the question. I think we must anticipate that this sort of cooperation can occur only within very fundamental and often narrowly channeled enterprises. As someone put it one day, I thought, rather effectively, we want to be in on the take-off as well as in on the crash-landing. If we cannot be in on the take-off, we would just as soon not be present at the crash-landing.

Mr. BREWSTER. There is a middle ground between the position of 96 Members of the Senate consulting regarding fields of foreign policy, which obviously is fantastic, and that which has evolved in the past 5 years under the leadership of Secretary Hull, who took an attitude toward the Senate and its deliberations which I think marked a great milepost in our progress in the evolution of foreign policy. The whole-hearted cooperation of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, with the small group of, I believe, eight Senators, on a thoroughly bipartisan basis, the collaboration of that group, and the subsequent collaboration of the Senator from Michigan, who succeeded to the chairmanship of the committee, unquestionably, in my mind, led to the nearly unanimous approval of the United Nations Charter. The vote stands out in a century of history. As John Hay once said, the outcome of a situation of that kind is like bullfighters entering the arena: They do not know how they are coming out. They may come out dead.

The pending resolution received almost unanimous approval in the committee. So I should like to emphasize at this time that that middle ground of consultation with the 8, 10, or 15 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations has been an extremely happy development.

It did disturb me somewhat to have the Senator from Michigan obliged to state that in regard to Palestine he had not been consulted; and I assume that that applies to the other members of the committee, certainly, and that in the other fields, matters relating to South America and China, that similarly occurred.

I can recognize the problem and the difficulty, but certainly the Palestine episode stands out. We did express ourselves on that; as a matter of fact, we adopted a resolution, I believe under the chairmanship of the Senator from Michigan, expressing what was the sense of the Senate, which apparently had little impact, and a very great deviation from that policy developed, without, as we now understand, consultation with the Senator from Michigan or other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I think this is a very appropriate time to point out the unfortunate results of that lack of cooperation and coordination, because I feel quite positive that if the Senator from Michigan, the Senator

from Texas, or the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, had been consulted, some of the most unfortunate chapters in our foreign relations in the past 6 months, as illustrated at Lake Success in the Palestine matter, would never have occurred.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Texas in a moment.

I wish to make just one comment, to be sure there is no misunderstanding about the matter discussed by the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Michigan desires to assert again that he has no complaint on earth because he was not consulted with respect to these other problems. He knows of no reason why he should have been consulted, except as the President and the Secretary of State might have had an interest in his point of view.

I think it would be very unfortunate, Mr. President, if we developed any sort of a relationship between the Executive and the legislature in respect to problems of this nature which brought a degree of responsibility to the legislature which it would have no power or authority to implement. I do not want to get into that position. I do not want to be such a constant consultant that I assume responsibility for policies over which I have absolutely no administrative control whatever. So that there is no complaint on my part when the field in which these consultations occur is kept narrow and limited.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have been much interested in the comments of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] about this matter. I wish to thank the Senator from Maine for his generous reference to the initiation of the policies back some years ago under Secretary Hull's administration, and during the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senator from Texas and the chairmanship later of the Senator from Michigan. I think we did in those early days sow seeds of a spirit of cooperation, at least in our foreign relations, which have eventuated in what has transpired in recent years.

I wish to say a word about the relationship of the Executive and the Senate with regard to foreign affairs. Of course, we all recognize that the initial and primary responsibility is with the Executive, but under the Constitution our rights are clearly defined as "advice and consent." I think it would be unfortunate, however, if the matter were prosecuted to the point of bringing about an antagonism between the Executive and Senate, through either jealousy or a feeling of invasion of their respective responsibilities, which might result not in good, but in harm.

In the matter of foreign relations we always occupy a rather delicate position, because what we do not only affects us at home, but affects foreign relations, and with all the diplomatic leaks, and the prevalence of foreign agents in our country, what happened would be magnified a thousandfold, and might militate against our influence and prestige in foreign lands.

I thoroughly agree with the idea that it is wise for the Executive to consult Members of the Senate with regard to these matters, but, as suggested by the Senator from Michigan, as to matters with regard to which we have no authority, it would not be compelling advice we would give.

I wanted merely to submit these remarks, and to say that we have to keep in view mutual respect for each other's authority, a spirit of tolerance, and an ambition and desire to cooperate within our proper responsibilities, and to carry out our authority with respect to foreign relations in a united spirit. We should not let partisanship or party politics invade the scope of the action which we undertake to exercise.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question, because I have been absent from the floor for a few minutes. Is the Senator now discussing paragraph (3)?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I have not been able to reach it yet. I hope I am about to come to that point.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask one question, then. As I understood the Senator's observations regarding the general provisions, the Senate could adopt the pending resolution and not go outside the constitutional processes, which, of course, we should maintain. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the resolution is not the subject matter for a treaty?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is not at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore we are not in any way voting on a measure to be ratified by a majority vote, which should require a two-thirds vote because of the subject matter involved?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. Let me say specifically to the Senator that the subject matter involves existing obligations under the Charter, and is simply an effort, after a long and careful study not only by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but by the experts of the State Department in the particular field of action, to point out how our existing obligations under the Charter, which are not extended by one-millionth of an inch, can be underscored in certain directions to the advantage of a hopeful result.

Mr. WHERRY. One more question. In agreeing to the resolution do we make a moral commitment, the implementation of which might involve an alliance which should require a two-thirds vote of the Senate?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan will point out, as soon as he reaches the other sections of the resolution, that if any sort of a subsequent obligation is even proposed as a result of evolution, it will be subject to the approval of Congress by constitutional process.

Mr. WHERRY. The constitutional processes will be invoked?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will make that just as categorically plain as I made my answer to the Senator from Colorado with respect to the first part of the resolution.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I have one further question about paragraph (1). Is the voluntary agreement to be put in writing, or is it to be merely a verbal understanding?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a voluntary agreement, and I should think it would have to be a resolution of the Security Council. It is purely a modus operandi.

Mr. WATKINS. It would, then, require the unanimous consent of the members of the Council?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would require the unanimous consent of the permanent members.

Mr. WATKINS. I mean the permanent members, those who now have the right of veto, so that one nation could stop the operation by veto?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is entirely correct.

Now, Mr. President, let me come to subsections (2), (3) and (4), which I think I can deal with together more effectively than if I should attempt to deal with them separately. Let me read them, so that the RECORD will indicate precisely what it is we are discussing.

It will be remembered that the controlling clause of the resolution advises the President that it is "the sense of the Senate that this Government, by constitutional process, should particularly pursue the following objectives within the United Nations Charter." These are the three objectives which I now propose to discuss:

(2) Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

(3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

(4) Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

Mr. President, it is the belief of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the State Department—and in this instance I can speak for both—that one of the ways by which the Charter can be made infinitely more effective, without the necessity of any amendment, is to put this new emphasis on regional arrangements. The Senate will remember that the United Nations Charter itself categorically recognizes the importance of regional arrangements as a contribution to the effectiveness of the Charter in preventing aggression and in controlling international security and peace.

The regional arrangements are covered in chapter 8, article 52. I would point out in this connection and would have the Senate bear it in mind, that a regional arrangement under chapter 8 can take no enforcement action under chapter 8, and I quote from article 53—

without the authorization of the Security Council.

There is one exception in connection with measures against a former enemy state, but that is inconsequential for the purposes of this discussion.

The regional organization as such can take no enforcement action under chapter 8 without the approval of the Security Council. Therefore there is no release from the jurisdiction of the Security Council in respect to enforcement when a regional arrangement has been entered into.

The important thing to remember in this parallel connection is that article 51, which is the other article involved in these three sections of the pending resolution, reads as follows:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

In other words, where there is an armed attack against a member nation of the United Nations, the nation attacked preserves all its inherent rights of self-defense regardless of any of the Charter obligations to await collective security. The nation thus attacked not only preserves this right of individual self-defense at that point but the right of collective self-defense at that point is also recognized, and it is outside the veto, because it has the authority to meet a sudden critical situation which could not possibly await any sort of consolidation or any sort of planned defense. I continue to read from article 51:

Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

The point is that this right of summary self-defense, individual and collective, resides in each member nation not only at the moment of attack but "until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

Therefore there is an area of action at that point which is strictly within the definitions of the United Nations Charter but outside the veto, because it is outside the authority of the Security Council. The theory of developing the regional arrangement idea to a greater degree very clearly contemplates the fact that, if regional arrangements perfect the means for collective security, their exercise and use under article 51, pending the time when the Security Council shall take "measures necessary to maintain international peace and security"—the creation of an integrated defense for use upon that unhappy day when the power and authority of article 51 would be exercised—is a very definite and specific step forward, strictly within the limitations of the Charter, a step forward toward a more effective integration of the peace-loving nations of the earth toward peace and security.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it is very clear that an individual nation when attacked can, under the United Nations Charter, take immediate and summary measures to protect itself. I should like to suggest that there be a documentation of the theory that, more than that and beyond that, an individual nation so attacked can summon to its assistance other nations in a regional or other association of nations to set up a resistance to the aggressor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is asking me to illustrate what it is I am talking about. I think the best possible illustration by way of a model, with certain reservations, is the Pan-American Regional Pact which was not only written but was ratified by the Senate by a vote which was very nearly unanimous. I think within the pan-American example the Senator has an answer to his question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. With pleasure.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I remind the Senator that at one time the whole world, except one man, thought the world was flat.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is quite correct, and I hope the RECORD will be read as indicating that the Senator has now identified the one vote against the Pan-American Treaty. The Senator from Michigan still wonders sometimes whether at least parts of the world are not still pretty flat.

Now, when we contemplate the Pan-American Treaty as an example of the thing we are talking about, I think we see a pretty precise picture of the possibilities involved. Under the Pan-American Treaty which has been ratified by the Senate, what happens in case of an armed attack, let us say, against—

Mr. MILLIKIN. Country X.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Country X in South America? The first thing that happens is that the authority in article 51 of the United Nations Charter is immediately invoked, that being the article of the Charter which recognizes the right of summary individual and collective self-defense. That means the country X immediately resists the aggression. It means that the United States as a member of this regional fraternity resists the aggression if it thinks that it is involved in a fashion which requires immediate cooperation. It is the sole judge of its own action at that moment. The only compulsory obligation is an obligation immediately to consult regarding what shall be done respecting collective security. In that consultation in respect to collective security the regional organization cannot—using the United States as an example—order us into collective defense action in behalf of country X. But the consultative group has met under a general overriding pledge of united interest for the purpose of determining in what manner collective security shall be pursued. There is no point in the exercise of the authority under the Pan American example I am giving which requires the Government of the United States to engage in armed activities of any nature without our approval. I wish to reiterate in this connection that it will be noted—and I call my current comment particularly to the attention of the Senator from Nebraska—that nothing can happen which does not happen under our constitutional processes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the other country—country X—know, and will the people of that country know, when we adopt the resolution and we are called upon to act, that the demand for armed services, and whatever policy is to be adopted, must come back to the Congress of the United States to go through the constitutional processes? Is there any moral commitment made in the resolution upon which the people of that country will rely, and with respect to which they will be disappointed if in complying with the constitutional requirements we nullify the position taken here? Perhaps they are not acquainted with our constitutional processes. That is what bothers me.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me say to the Senator that probably by now they are not only acquainted with our constitutional processes, but are usually very unhappy about them.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator believe that in the future they will become better acquainted with them?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid they will. Whether it be for better or for worse, our constitutional processes are valid, indispensable, very precious, and are to be preserved.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator sees the point I am making.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do, entirely.

Mr. WHERRY. I am open-minded. I do not want to back up on a moral commitment. If we are to approve this resolution, I do not want some other country to say, "This particular Senator voted to approve, and now he has backed up on his moral commitment because he has hidden behind the constitutional processes and has not indicated a desire to carry out the provisions of the resolution."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope there will be no misunderstanding about the nature of the resultant obligation. I do not think the situation remains entirely as it was before we acted. I think we have emphasized our very deep interest in exploring any regional arrangements which may be made, from the standpoint of our own national security. I think that carries with it the implication that if we find it to be to the advantage of our national security, we shall be very definitely sympathetic with the objective. At that point we shall assess the situation from the standpoint of our own national

security and make our decision accordingly.

Mr. WHERRY. In reality, to state it in layman's language, it is only extending the Monroe Doctrine to certain regions in Europe. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is giving them one of their own. That is a pretty loose statement.

Mr. WHERRY. It is all pretty loose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to narrow my question by asking the Senator to point to the provision of the Charter which would permit a regional group to go to the defense of a nation within the group which becomes the victim of aggression.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Article 51.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Relative to the Chapultepec Treaty, which I observe is the general pattern of this provision in the pending resolution, the pamphlet issued by the State Department, which I hold in my hand, entitled "Aspects of Current American Foreign Policy," on page 54 has the following to say:

> The Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security (Rio de Janeiro, August 15 to September 2, 1947) aimed "to fulfill the promise of Chapultepec and the sanction of the United Nations Charter." Under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance signed at Rio de Janeiro on September 2, 1947, 19 Republics agreed "that an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered an attack against all the American states," and each undertook to assist in meeting the attack. In the event of such an attack each state shall decide upon the immediate action which may be required of it in support of this obligation. This immediate mutual defense action is to be followed by prompt consultation to determine more definitely upon collective plans. Possible collective procedures range from the recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions to the collective use of armed force. Consultative decisions are to be made by two-thirds vote, and are binding on all ratifying states "except that no state shall be required to use armed force without its consent."

Reading from the act itself, I first read subparagraph 3 of part I:

> That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act.

I now read from subparagraph 4:

> 4. That in case acts of aggression occur or there are reasons to believe that an aggression is being prepared by any other State against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State, the State signatory to this act will consult among themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take.

Subparagraph 5 reads as follows:

> 5. That during the war—

That may mean during World War II, or it may mean following the attack—

> and until the treaty recommended in part II hereof is concluded, the signatories of this act recognize that such threats and acts of aggression, as indicated in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, constitute an interference with the war effort of the United Nations, calling for such procedures, within the scope of their constitutional powers of a general nature and for war, as may be found necessary, including: Recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radio-telephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repeal aggression.

My first question is: Is there not very definitely a moral obligation under that agreement, that when an attack occurs on any member state in this organization it shall be regarded as an attack upon all states, and that they have a common duty to do something with respect to the attack?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me answer as the Senator goes along. Certainly that is true. It is equally true under the basic obligation which every nation took when it signed the original Charter of the United Nations, because that language is taken verbatim, as I recall, from the charter itself.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator recognize that the distinction is that the Security Council is the agency of the United Nations to determine when the organization shall act? Under article 51 the right of self-defense is asserted simply as an inherent right which may be asserted by those who are the victims of the attack. But certainly the Senator from Florida had not contemplated that the recognition of the inherent right of self-defense—which, according to the context of article 51, suggests something like a sudden and emergent attack which might involve the element of surprise and the necessity of an immediate response before access could be had, possibly, to the Security Council, and before the Security Council could act—ever envisioned a long-range, premeditated, preconceived, formally entered into regional military alliance. The Senator from Florida never contemplated, reading article 51 in its context, such an arrangement, for example, as the Chapultepec Treaty, to which I have just referred.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I entirely agree with the Senator. I am not conscious of having said anything to the contrary.

The creation of a regional organization under article 52 and subsequent articles definitely and specifically is subject to the control of the Security Council in respect to enforcement sanctions. I do not think the self-defensive right asserted in article 51 is changed in any aspect as a result of the organization of the regional group. I have simply said that when the regional group organizes within its own regional resources for the purpose of defense it is to that extent in better shape to proceed to exercise whatever obligations or privileges are involved under article 51. I do not conceive that the powers and privileges of article 51 are changed or enlarged in the slightest.

Mr. PEPPER. But it seems to me this is the very heart and core of the resolution, to which I shall address myself fully later.

It seems to me that, as compared to the Chapultepec Treaty, which is an American arrangement legitimatized by article 51—and, incidentally, in the extent of its application the Monroe Doctrine was responsible, under article 51 of the Charter, if the readings I have made of it are properly made—I say this suggests a pattern for setting up in the world regional arrangements which would mean that the world would be divided into three military alliances, one in the Soviet sphere, one in western Europe, and one in the Western Hemisphere. Then, instead of having a dynamic and dangerous and rampant nationalism, it is proposed that we progress to the same sort of thing in regionalism. That is what I wish to observe to the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well; the Senator from Michigan observes the Senator's observation.

I would not want my use of the word "pattern," in the first place, to be misconstrued. I think perhaps that was not a fortunate word to use. I am not for an instant indicating that the precise routines spelled out in the Rio Treaty would be the things involved in other regional arrangements. I am simply referring—and I use the word "pattern" in this respect—to the fact that at Rio 21 republics took the first step in respect to a regional organization which has been found so acceptable that it was ratified by the Senate of the United States, for example, with but one dissenting vote; and the distinguished Senator from Florida, I think, at that time joined with the Senator from Michigan in approving what had been done.

If my use of the word "pattern" indicated that I was suggesting that the particular procedures in the Pan-American constitution were those that were to be used elsewhere, then it was a very unfortunate use of the word, because obviously in this western world we have an integrated mutality of interest to a degree and extent and with an historic and traditional background which probably cannot be paralleled anywhere else in the world. Therefore, the extent to which a regional arrangement might be perfected in the western world is probably far beyond the extent to which, at least for the time being, one could be perfected elsewhere.

I meant to use the word "pattern" as indicating the utility of the regional chapter of the Charter in producing a more immediate and more intimate integration of like-minded nations in pursuit of whatever peace objectives they may have in mind.

With respect to the resolution, the assertion of American interest in regional arrangements, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, is contingent always upon what the arrangement ultimately involves, who is in it, and what is to be the method of regional relationship; and the security of the United States at all times would be the paramount and overwhelming factor in determining the nature and extent of our cooperation, if any cooperation at all.

Mr. PEPPER. I appreciate the comments the able Senator has made. I wish

to say that the Senator from Florida, probably like many other Senators on this floor, voted for the Chapultepec Treaty with many misgivings. The real reason the Senator from Florida voted for it was because he regarded it as nothing more than the embodiment in a treaty of the Monroe Doctrine, which we have been pursuing for a long time, and not as a treaty under the authority of article 51, except insofar as we may say that as regards our peculiar relationships, which are recognized by the Senator, the Monroe Doctrine was implemented by the Charter. But we also recognize that in the Covenant of the League of Nations, President Wilson referred to the Monroe Doctrine, because there were in this country many persons who felt that they would not enter into any organization without the distinct preservation of the Monroe Doctrine.

What troubles me is that in the committee's resolution we are asked to promote these regional arrangements. Such an able writer as Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong goes so far as to suggest, if I read his writings correctly, that the original arrangement under the Rio agreement would be a pattern for a similar enterprise in other parts of the world.

I cannot dissociate that kind of regional arrangement from the Triple Alliance or the Triple Entente or similar agreements in the past, which have led States to cooperative action in case of considered danger.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me interrupt the Senator at this point simply to say that before he draws historic parallels of that character, I think he must distinctly recognize the sharp difference between a regional arrangement which is sovereign within itself and a regional arrangement which is subject to the jurisdiction of the sovereignty of a united world organization. I am sure there is a great difference between those two situations.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but the Senator will also recall that by means of the preserved right of the veto, we have immunity, for all practical purposes, from interference by the Security Council. The Council could not interfere with the discharge of our believed duty in this hemisphere because by means of the veto we could prevent such action against us. So, under the whole verbiage and scheme and pattern of the United Nations Organization, we would be relatively supreme in carrying out the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere. Does not the Senator from Michigan agree?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think so, but I fail to see how that negatives in any way the statement I made.

Mr. PEPPER. Only to the extent that because of the supervisory veto power, such attempts by the Security Council would practically mean nothing, since we could prevent their operation at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to be persuaded by the Senator that there is any remote parallel between one of the old, historic military-alliance arrangements of the yesterdays and a regional arrangement of the sort I have been discussing. I am unable to be persuaded that there is any legitimate parallel between that concept and the concept today of a regional arrangement which lives completely and scrupulously within the letter of every protection of the Charter of the United Nations, which embraces the entire globe. I merely insist to the Senator that the two concepts are not analogous.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that is a subject for debate, and undoubtedly not one for prolonged questioning here.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid, the moment the Senator addresses himself to it, because he can almost make me think black is white, usually, when he turns on his irresistible eloquence.

Mr. PEPPER. When I hear the Senator from Michigan, that is when I am most troubled with respect to a difference of opinion, I am fearful I may be wrong.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations a question with respect to the Chapultepec Treaty, subparagraph 5, from which I quote very briefly, wherein the possibility is mentioned of "recalling of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radio-telephonic relations, interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations." It might be that the intervention of the Congress or the concurrence of Congress might be necessary as a part of our constitutional system, but those measures could be taken by our Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator referring to the Pan-American agreement?

Mr. PEPPER. I refer to the Chapultepec agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Without refreshing my recollection from the text, I do not believe I can answer the Senator, although I believe the answer is that we are bound by all continuing constitutional restraints.

Mr. PEPPER. If that might be regarded as an authentic interpretation of that provision, it would be contrary to my general assumption about the Presidential prerogative in any case to break off diplomatic relations and do the things enumerated, and I would assume that the Executive had such authority, if the question arose in this connection, as well as in any similar situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me be a little more specific in my answer to the Senator's question. What I had in mind was that under the language read by the Senator from the Chapultepec agreement, we are exempt from the use of armed force, except as we consent to its use.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think otherwise we are bound by the decision of two-thirds of the governing body.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand the Senator, and that would be my own idea. That confirms the point the Senator from Nebraska was making a moment ago, that when we enter into the regional agreements we assume definite moral as well as legal obligations which involve a commitment on our part to do something which may mean an act of great significance, although it may not mean the actual employment of armed forces until the Congress should give its consent.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall yield to the Senator from Texas in a moment. Let me make very sure at that point that when I used the word "pattern", I certainly am exempting from the use of the word "pattern" any thought that new regional arrangements could in any aspect involve any such commitment as we are willing and hoping to take in respect to our North American-South American relationship in regard to the exercise of the sanctions to which the Senator from Florida has referred. Of course, no regional arrangement can be made without consent of the Congress by constitutional process, and in the case of this particular regional arrangement the constitutional process was exercised with a tremendous degree of approval by Congress.

That same necessity for congressional approval would continue to exist in respect to any new regional arrangements to which we might be invited to attach ourselves, but I would say in advance that I would not expect any approval by the Senate of the United States of a regional arrangement which would include, outside the Americas, any such automatic obligations as we have been discussing in respect to the Chapultepec Conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry, I agreed to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely wanted to suggest to the Senator from Florida and to the Senator from Michigan that the point about requiring congressional approval of the invocation of the sanctions of which the Senator from Florida spoke a moment ago is not applicable here. There must be congressional approval of the treaty, the obligation, the promise we make in joining.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. But we could not be expected, nor could the regional organization be expected, to waive or put into effect the economic sanctions, although Congress had been consulted about their application. The power of Congress is exercised when we approve the treaty, so it is impossible to do those things. I think there is no conflict there.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me at this point to say a word in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. A regional agreement with respect to any other area of the world, if it were to mean anything, would obviously have to carry something like these obligations. Although Congress might have given previous approval to them, such an agreement would obviously have to carry some meaning and significance, or it would have no reason to exist.

Mr. CONNALLY. The treaty we make in forming a regional agreement in any part of the world would govern, of course. We would have to meet the problems as we came to them. I think the question of heimspheric arrange-

ment is peculiar from our viewpoint, by reason of the historical setting, referring particularly to the Monroe Doctrine. But I should be very reluctant, I may say, to join any other regional organization in the world. It would involve us in difficulties we might not be able to avoid.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I was the lone and lonesome dissenter to the agreement to which he refers. The agreement did not save to us the right of veto in the imposition of embargoes, which are often considered in and of themselves as acts of war, and which history shows often lead to war. We find ourselves dogged by precedents that we set in an off-the-cuff fashion.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has considered what would be the specific constitutional process in the event we allied ourselves with some regional arrangement of the type described, other than with the countries to the south of us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, I think not. Under fundamental circumstances the first choice obviously from our point of view would be a treaty. In connection with the Rio agreement, I remind the Senator that we acted by treaty, and since I have used the Rio treaty as a form of synthetic exhibit in connection with the discussion, I should like to continue to do so at that point, to the extent of responding that I should say the heavily predominant opinion ought to be that any new regional arrangements would similarly come to the Senate for ratification in treaty form.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator say whether, if we should aline ourselves or associate ourselves fully with an existing regional agreement other than the one to which reference has been made, such an alinement or association should also be by treaty?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under those circumstances, most emphatically, because, under those circumstances, we would not have had any part whatever in the initiation. I would say most emphatically, under those circumstances, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I deeply appreciate the Senator's answer. The importance of the answer is emphasized in my mind by the fact that the State Department proceeds on the theory that a treaty is that which it calls a treaty, and that is the governing factor in its part of the submission of international documents to the Senate. I think we necessarily must probe the kind of arrangement that shall be brought to us and how it shall be brought to us.

I should appreciate it very much if the distinguished Senator from Michigan would tell us exactly what is in mind in paragraph (4), which reads:

> Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

How will we make it clear?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think we make it clear by just such action as is proposed through the adoption of this resolution. The power and authority which is retained to the sovereign member nations of the United Nations, under article 51, is something of very great and grave importance to us and, it may well be, to others, under circumstances which we can easily anticipate. I would say that the purpose is simply to underscore the fact that there is an article 51, and that we most emphatically propose to recognize it and to use it for our own national security.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So that paragraph (4) operates by proclamation rather than action. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. President, there is just one more thing I want to add, and then I should like to take my seat, because I have occupied far more time than I had anticipated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before I yield I should like to say a word or two more regarding this subject. I think it is very interesting, and I want the RECORD to show it, that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives has been exploring the same subject independently and on its own responsibility during the past 3 or 4 months, while the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has been doing the same thing. We have not developed our inquiry together. We have each gone upon our own way in developing the inquiry. I think it is extremely significant that we have both arrived at approximately the same point. I am very happy to contemplate the fact that a resolution which has been presented in the House and recommended by the House committee is almost identical in its impact and its import with the resolution which is pending for Senate consideration.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think that the veto question, so far as the general public is concerned, has been more discussed and debated than has any other one thing in connection with our foreign relations. I have from time to time received a series of questions asking me concerning the veto power which can be exercised under the United Nations Charter. It may be that the Senator from Michigan explained it or answered questions regarding it in the early part of the debate, before I came in.

I turn to page 4 of the report, on which I find this statement:

> Thus far the Soviet Union has invoked the veto some 23 times. Eleven of these vetoes related to admission of new members. Most of the others related to the pacific settlement of international disputes.

Am I correct in my understanding of that statement that the application for admission of Transjordan, Ireland, and Portugal were vetoed twice by Soviet Russia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And that the applications for the admission of Spain have been vetoed on four different occasions?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can not remember in quite that detail, but let me say to the Senator that before he came in we canvassed the subject in great detail, and I have put into the RECORD a list of the 23 vetoes, so that they can be specifically identified. Let me say to the Senator that the language used in lines 8, 9, and 10, on page 1 of the pending resolution, regarding voluntary agreement to remove the veto, would remove it from every one of those situations in which it has thus far been exercised.

Mr. LUCAS. Does that include both categories which are set forth in the resolution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask whether or not the report contains the reasons set forth by the Soviet Union for the veto?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I do not think so.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the United States exercised its right to veto with regard to an application of a new nation for membership?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It never has.

Mr. LUCAS. Has England exercised its right?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think any nation has, except the Soviet Union, and perhaps France, at one point. The Senator will find the complete information in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Michigan, and I am sorry to have taken the time, but I was not sure on that point.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether the regional and other collective arrangements mentioned in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), have not taken a form and gone to an extent which was not contemplated at the time the Charter was written?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think I follow the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. My second question possibly would be whether they have not become or are rapidly becoming military alternatives to a United Nations Organization which has not been quite so successful as we hoped it would be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not see how the Senator can set up that premise, to begin with, because we have no regional arrangements under the United Nations except the pan-American regional arrangement. One of my friends suggests the Arab League. It may be a regional arrangement.

Mr. FLANDERS. Still, do not those three paragraphs envisage the possibility of some relationship with the so-called western union which will be of a military nature?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It envisages any arrangement which is to the mutual aid of any group of peace-living states in whatever fashion they may conceive it to be to the advantage of peace and security, and our relationship to it is subject to our decision on the same basis in respect to our national security and welfare. That decision will have to be justified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate in approving a treaty.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that I understand that clearly, but I again raise the question which is in my own mind, as to whether we are moving rapidly in the development of regional arrangements which are an undesired, unforeseen alternative to a successful United Nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not prepared to say yes to the Senator's question, nor am I prepared to say no, because I am not clear what the trend is in the United Nations at the moment, beyond the fact that in this formative period, when the institution is meeting such grave difficulties, and is being asked to run before it has ever learned to creep, I do not think one can tell what trends are developing. But if the Senator means that he thinks he sees a purpose to resist an indefinite impotence on the part of the United Nations, I agree with him. In resisting that impotence I do not know what direction the trend will take. I think it well might take the direction of emphasized regional arrangements.

Mr. FLANDERS. As Will Rogers used to say, "All I know is what I read in the papers," and the impression I get from what I read in the papers is that there is building up an alternative to a present measure of weakness, a measure of ineffectiveness—it is not total weakness or total ineffectiveness—on the part of the United Nations. As the Senator from Michigan, I hope, is aware—I have tried to make him aware of the fact—I am among those who have been profoundly disturbed by what has seemed to be a growing, though not total, weakness and ineffectiveness on the part of the United Nations, and have desired to do something more or less definite about it.

I may say to the Senator that at the present moment I do not feel like pressing to a conclusion any proposals in which I have been interested. I am for myself taking this resolution as a proposal to support at this time.

However, I should like to say to the Senator from Michigan that, rightly or wrongly, I feel that in the wording, in the general approach, and I regret to say that in the latest speech which I have read of my very distinguished, conscientious, and capable predecessor in the United States Senate, there is a certain measure of complacency in the progress made so far which I cannot feel. I wish it might be possible in this resolution to insert a few words somewhere which would indicate that we wish we had done a little better.

Mr. Grenville Clark sent me a copy of a letter which he wrote to the distinguished Senator from Michigan in which he made a suggestion with regard to article VI which would meet this little flavor of complacency—about which I may be mistaken, but which I nevertheless feel—and in some measure counteract any impression of that sort. I shall read from the suggestion of Mr. Grenville Clark, who, as many Senators know, is one of the respected elder leaders of the New York bar. He suggests that article VI might be amended to read as follows:

> Review of the Charter at an appropriate time by a general conference called under article 109 recognizing that a revision of the basic structure of the United Nations will ultimately be essential in order to make it an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace with justice.

I may say to the Senator from Michigan that if that somewhat more definite indication of our doubt as to the completely satisfactory operation of the organization as it at present exists could be put into the pending resolution, I would feel thoroughly satisfied with it. I shall vote for it in any case, but I would feel thoroughly satisfied with it in that case.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution to the discussion made by my distinguished friend from Vermont. I wish publicly to acknowledge the constructive and the insistent interest which he has registered throughout his presence in the Senate in respect to the development of peace plans through an effective United Nations. He is the author of one of the resolutions which prompted the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to move into this field for the purpose of action before adjournment.

The first thing I wish to say to the Senator is that I do not think there is any complacency about the failure of the United Nations fully to justify the expectations which we had in respect to it. I am not surprised that there has not been complete fulfillment, or anything like complete fulfillment, of our expectations, because this great institution was called upon to do things almost overnight, almost 20 minutes after its birth, long before it had had any opportunity to implement itself, or even organize itself. It was called upon to do things which would have strained its ability and its genius even in its maturity.

I think the most amazing thing is, not that the United Nations has failed to justify our expectations quite frequently, but that it has been able to function as successfully as it has under all the circumstances. After all, there still is no great international shooting war going on, and I am not clear that that would be our relatively happy status if there had not been a United Nations, even though it were functioning under handicaps.

As the Senator well knows, the United Nations even at this moment has not been furnished with its complete implementation, as contemplated by the Charter itself. It is forced to stagger and improvise under circumstances which are very difficult often, and very disappointing often.

I repeat, Mr. President, the greater the difficulties which are developed in the world, the greater the need for this institution. On the one hand, I see no lack of fidelity to its ideals in the attitudes of the American people or the American Government; and, on the other hand, I certainly see no complacency in the presence of its failures, and I think the pending resolution is exhibit A as proof that, so far as the Senate of the United States is concerned, there is no complacency.

When the Senator reaches his suggestion of words which he would like to add to one portion of the resolution, I merely desire to say to him that I know perfectly well that almost every Member of the Senate would like to change these words in some way. I know of at least a dozen Senators who would like to add this, subtract that, state this a little differently, and if we should embark upon that piecemeal assault upon this rather carefully integrated fabric, when we got through I should not be perfectly happy about the mongrel net result. I use that word without any invidious implication, particularly in respect to the Senator's suggestion, but in view of the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the State Department, after 3 months' work, after weighing the impact and purpose of every single word that has been put into the resolution, have come up with a series of 6 sentences which have had this utterly careful consideration, I hope he will join me in believing that it is better to proceed with the finished product as recommended rather than to attempt to start on the floor of the Senate to take it to pieces and rewrite it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Without pressing the analogy too far I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, that the healthiest and most intelligent dogs are mongrels, and that this Nation is governed by mongrel legislation, because since I have been in the Senate it has been the fate of every bill with which I have had any interest to be mongrelized. But I am not pressing that too far. I do want to say to the Senator from Michigan that I did not impute any of this complacency to him, nor to any member of his committee, nor to the committee as a whole. I shall not press this matter, but simply state to him that I wish the necessity for some revision had been recognized, rather than that there should be a willingness to consider it if and when some reason for it might arise.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I now yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator yields the floor will he yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I confess it is difficult for me to understand all the significance of paragraph No. 2 of the resolution, in view of the discussion regarding the Monroe Doctrine, and the implication that the regional arrangement between the United States and the States of South America is somewhat unique, and that there may be no others. I should like to ask the Senator if under paragraph No. 2 a federation of the European countries may be contemplated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Most emphatically, and I join the Senator from Arkansas in thinking that it would be one

of the most hopeful possible evolutions that could be contemplated. I know of the interest of the Senator from Arkansas in a United States of Europe. He has a resolution before the committee on the subject. I substantially share his interest in that objective. I think the emphasis in the present resolution upon the development of regional and other collective arrangements specifically includes the great idea of a United States of Europe, to which the Senator from Arkansas has been so devoted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That would be under paragraph No. 2. Then am I correct in interpreting the significance of paragraph No. 3 if it refers to paragraph No. 2 as perhaps being that it contemplates some agreement between us and such an organization, or an alliance between us and some such organization?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would not think that paragraph No. 3 indicated any association by us with a United States of Europe, but I should think it did suggest that a regional arrangement for purposes of national security might involve our closer relationship to such an organization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I was trying to clarify—and I did not make it clear—is that obviously under the European recovery program we are in a sense associated already with that group.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not clear what was meant by the word "association"; whether it meant something different from the type of association to which reference has been made, or so to speak, association of a civilian nature contrasted to a military.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it can be any association which the judgment of the Government of the United States feels to be useful to our national security. The ultimate decision of course coming back always to the Senate for final authority.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is another point which interests me, and that is the significance of the word "individual" in the second line of paragraph 2. The language is:

> Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual—

And so forth. I do not quite see how that would work out. It would seem to me the development should be collective or mutual.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a literal quotation from the language of the Charter covering this particular point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. But I thought when I was reading it that it was the regional arrangement really under article 52, that is it begins with article 52. I could not see exactly what that word meant. It seemed to me the arrangement should be a collective one for mutual self-defense. I do not see how a collective arrangement for the defense of only one member could be made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I may say to the Senator that about 2 hours ago I discussed that point in considerable detail, and if the Senator will be good enough to consult the RECORD in the morning I think he will become completely familiar at least with the viewpoint of the Senator from Michigan on the subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be very happy to do so.

I wish to make one further observation. I notice on page 5 of the report that defense arrangements are directed solely against aggression. It does not quite occur to me that either the western European arrangement or any other contemplated regional association is solely against aggression.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator indicate from what he is reading?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The last paragraph before the subject numbered 7, on page 5 of the Committee's report:

> These defense arrangements are openly entered into with the full and free consent of their sovereign members to meet their individual and common security needs and to fulfill their Charter obligations. They are not to be confused with military alliances. They are directed against no one.

With all of that I agree.

> They are directed solely against aggression.

I had the thought respecting this language that I also had respecting ECA, that exclusive concern with either economic or military is, I think, a position that we should not take. I think many people have been led to believe that the political aspects of these associations has no significance, whereas I happen to feel that the political is basic, and that in order to hold them together for the future such arrangements do have a continuing political significance, and they are not solely military against aggression, or solely economic for the immediate relief of starvation. That was the only thought I had.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator in his philosophy. I may say that it is necessary to identify armed aggression in connection with any discussion of the United Nations situation, and the resolution, the Senator will remember, is confined exclusively to a discussion of what is to happen within the machinery of the United Nations in respect to armed aggression. That is the reason why the definition is limited. The Senator certainly is correct that today there is vastly more than armed agression involved in the emancipation of the difficulties of not only western Europe but of the whole earth.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the purpose was preventive rather than meeting armed aggression.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And if that is true the political is what is of basic significance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It struck me that in paragraph (2) it might not be amiss to make some reference to that, because I recall that in the discussion of the ERP the distinguished Senator from Michigan agreed with the purpose, as did other Senators on the committee, but thought it was inappropriate to put the provision in that legislation. If the pending resolution is an expression of opinion or an expression of advice there could be no more appropriate place in which at least to give some notice of our recognition of the importance of the aspect of some political association particularly with regard to the European countries. Yet this language seems to emphasize the military in the same way that the ERP emphasized the economic, and in neither place do we give any attention to or recognition of the political aspect of these problems. That was a thing I hoped could have been recognized as being important.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WEICHEL, Mr. HAND, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BLAND, and Mr. HART were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of W. A. Knox, W. L. M. Knox, and Frank C. Morris, operating as Knox Lumber Sales Co., of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 1726. An act for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor;

H. R. 1855. An act for the relief of Elbert Spivey;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee;

H. R 2273. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;

H. R. 2588. An act requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of a city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter numbered 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 2684. An act for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese beetle quarantine;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Emeline Lartigue;

H. R. 3402. An act to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield;

H. R. 3883. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene;*

H. R. 3915. An act to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4032. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States;

H. R. 4688. An act to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery;

H. R. 4830. An act for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.;

H. R. 4874. An act to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county;

H. R. 5071. An act to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma;

H. R. 5112. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes;

H. R. 5147. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens;

H. R. 5174. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii;

H. R. 5344. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5758. An act to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 5770. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5808. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5891. An act to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto;

H. R. 5983. An act to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps;

H. R. 6073. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes;

H. R. 6110. An act to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6113. An act to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service;

H. R. 6114. An act to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6229. An act to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6368. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory;

H. R. 6489. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of lead;

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 239) reaffirming the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and indicating certain objectives to be pursued.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The real question confronting the Senate is not whether or not the proposed resolutions violate the United Nations Charter, but the real question is—do the resolutions violate the established principles of the United States Senate and its constitutional relationship with the executive branch of the Government.

Is it the Senator's idea in presenting the resolution that he wishes to encourage the President and the State Department to go further in making such treaties as he indicates are necessary, than they normally would go, under the normal independent operations of our Government departments?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the purpose is to encourage the use of regional arrangements for whatever advantage can be found in them, not only for the sake of international peace and security, but also for the sake of our own national security, wherever it can be developed through this instrumentality.

Mr. MALONE. Is it the Senator's idea that individual Senators shall commit themselves to this type of treaty without any understanding whatever of the details which may be included in such a treaty?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not the slightest. On the contrary, the statement is categorically made, not only in the text of the resolution, but in the committee report, and in every word that I have uttered during the past several hours, that there is no commitment which is not completely subordinate—if there be any sort of commitment at all—to the utterly independent judgment of the Senate when the constitutional process is subsequently invoked.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask one further question. I have listened very carefully to the able Senator from Michigan for the past 2 hours. While I have heard him assure Senators that the resolution was not a violation of the United Nations Charter, at the same time I have heard very little discussion as to whether or not it is a violation of the principles laid down in the Constitution of the United States, under which the Senate is charged with checking independently any action, through treaties, of the President of the United States and the State Department. We are not supposed—at least, until now, we have not been supposed—to be a party to a treaty until all the evidence is known to Members of the Senate, and after committee approval, full discussion and a two-thirds affirmative vote is had.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan permit me to respond to that point?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid that I do not follow the argument of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. We dislike to leave our desks. We are very much interested in what our colleagues are saying. Until the acoustics of this Chamber are improved, I ask Senators to speak a little louder.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me to respond to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. It so happens that I was one of the Senators in the committee who brought out the very point to which the Senator from Nevada refers. The committee inserted language in the resolution to meet that very point. In line 6, on page 1, the language "by constitutional process" was inserted; and on page 2, lines 5 and 6, the words "by constitutional process" were inserted. That language is inserted because it is the surest, most effective, and most nearly indisputable manner of making it absolutely certain, beyond any possibility of doubt, that any kind of arrangement to which the Senator from Nevada refers will come back to the Senate for ratification. I can completely set the Senator's mind at rest on that point.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield while I discuss the question further with the Senator from Massachusetts, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts what, then, is the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. I think the purpose of the resolution is to show that we are in sympathy with the broad trend of strengthening the freedom-loving countries; but it does not commit us to anything definite. They must make the showing. If they make a good showing, and if it is advantageous to our national security to help them, we shall help them. If the showing is not good enough, we shall not help them. It is the most perfect arrangement, from the standpoint of American interest, that could possibly be imagined.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, I defer to the wishes of the Senator from Massachusetts to participate in the debate, but are we not already on record through the United Nations and other actions of the United States Senate making our position clear?

Mr. LODGE. I wanted to participate at this point, because this happens to be

something in which I was very much interested when the subject was before the committee.

Mr. MALONE. I yield to that impulse.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONE. Do I correctly understand that at the close of this debate we are to vote on this very important policy-making resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I had intended to make a statement on this subject. I consider it very important, for the reason that I believe there has been a tendency on the part of the Senate over a period of years slowly to relinquish its independent attitude, not only with respect to treaties, but with respect to appropriations for foreign nations and various other subjects concerning which we were supposed, at the time of the original writing of the Constitution, if I correctly understand it, to be independent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield the floor so that the Senator from Nevada may make his statement.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion, the resolution before this body places the Senator on record as advising the President to pursue, among other things, to quote the language of the resolution:

> Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.
>
> Association of the United States by constitutional process with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.
>
> Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

These recommendations are paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) in the resolution presented by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Their purpose is to place the Senate on record as advising the President to negotiate regional security agreements under the United Nations Charter. Each regional security agreement, when negotiated by the President, must be ratified subsequently by the Senate. But by advising the President to go ahead the Senate in effect guarantees that a future Senate will ratify such treaties.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know that the Senator would want me to give at least my interpretation of the record, and make it perfectly clear.

Mr. MALONE. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I certainly should not want the statement of the Senator from Nevada to stand as the interpretation of what is to occur.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to have the Senator explain his position.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Repeatedly I have insisted that we must be perfectly sure that when we exercise the advise function in respect to the advice to the President on this subject, we are not yielding any of our subsequent consent prerogative. So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he completely disagrees with any assertion that the exercise of the advice functions is a surrender of the consent function. I know that that is precisely the position which the able Senator from Nevada wishes to maintain. I agree with him 100 percent as to what is the correct interpretation of the situation which we confront when we give advice. I would not want him to withdraw from his own conclusion by asserting that we had surrendered any such right.

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad to have the opinion of the Senator from Michigan. I have listened very carefully to the Senator from Michigan, and all his proposed policies for the past several months, and I understand his position perfectly well.

I am not contending that such a treaty made subsequent to the passage of the resolutions would not have to be ratified by this body, but I also believe that there is through these resolutions an implied approval of any such treaty which may be made, and that this action could well be the first step in relinquishing the policy which has long been established through the Constitution of the United States. This is the first step, just as we took the first step in violation of the Constitution by appropriating money for foreign nations for any purpose over a long period of years, through small appropriations in the beginning. Finally we reached the point where the appropriations for foreign nations closely approached, and even surpassed, what ordinarily would constitute an entire year's appropriations for the expenses of this Government. It required some time to establish this precedent, but it was finally established, and is not now questioned.

In my humble opinion this is the first step toward breaking down the independence of the Senate of the Executive department, and the constitutional provision that the Senate review any such treaty before final approval.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I think I understand perfectly what the Senator from Nevada has in mind. He is not saying that after we give our advice, we must give our consent; but he is saying that if we advise about a matter, then if that matter is carried out substantially in accordance with our advice, we shall have practically bound ourselves morally to give our consent. I understand that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey has expressed perfectly my feelings in the matter.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to say, if the Senator will further yield, that one thing which has been difficult for me to understand is that repeatedly on the floor of the Senate Senators have argued that we cannot do what we would like to do in a certain matter because we have done something 1 or 2 years before, which binds us in our action now. I think the Senator from Nevada wishes to be sure that when we give our advice, we shall be willing to go through with the matter and give our consent later on, rather than run the risk of being accused by any nation of a breach of good faith if we do not later give our consent.

Mr. MALONE. I think that is entirely true. It would be like the situation which has developed in various committees—for instance, in the committee considering flood-control matters. Witnesses appearing before the committee often say, "The authorization of this project does not appropriate the money." But once the project is authorized, the witnesses then say to the Appropriations Committee, "You are morally bound to make this appropriation, because the Congress of the United States has authorized this project." In other words, although technically the committee could refuse to make the appropriation, morally it is bound and cannot refuse.

Mr. HAWKES. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I am one who believes that the Congress should be very careful in the authorizations it makes. In my business life, my constant practice has been that after I have authorized something, I follow through with it and pay the bill and carry on in accordance with the authorization.

One of the criticisms I have of this great body—and I have made this criticism both on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere publicly—is that often when we authorize an expenditure we are told at the time of the authorization that it does not necessarily follow that we shall appropriate the necessary funds, following the authorization; whereas, in the last analysis, I find that every time a question of making an appropriation arises, the argument is advanced that inasmuch as the authorization has been made, we must make the appropriation.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator's analogy is perfect. In other words, if the Senate in effect directs the President and State Department to make such treaties, indicating the nature of such agreements, they will have a perfect right to say to the Senate later, "You directed us to do this, and now we expect you to ratify this treaty." Then tons of propaganda will go out over the country; and the first thing we know, our votes will be in the pocket, or else our votes will be minority votes and we have lost our opportunity.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the point the Senator from Nevada has raised go to the very basis of this entire matter? I understand that the Senator has raised the point that if we take the initial step now proposed, we shall ultimately be bound to take others. Is that the point?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. We shall be taking this step without having any idea whatever of what is in the mind of the President or the State Department as to the kind of treaty that will be presented to us later, but in effect we are directing them to make it without such knowledge.

Mr. BALDWIN. Then the only alternative the Senator has to offer is that we do nothing. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. We have already indicated our position through ratifying the United Nations Charter in the regular way. The alternative I would offer is that we follow the Constitution of the United States and not commit ourselves in advance. I am not a part of the State Department, and I do not believe the distinguished Senator from Connecticut is a part of it. Certainly we are not the President of the United States. The Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall make the treaties and shall send them to this body for ratification. At that time when the Senate considers the proposed treaties, prior to ratifying them, all the evidence is supposed to be available to the Senate. It is not available now.

Mr. BALDWIN. Where does the Senator find in the resolution anything which says that any treaty made under this resolution by the State Department or the President is not to be ratified by the Senate?

Mr. MALONE. The entire requirement that we must later ratify it in the regular manner is lost in a maze of verbiage indicating that we are urging such treaties—and therefore the final ratification will be a mere matter of form.

Mr. BALDWIN. Then obviously the Constitution will prevail, and the arrangements now being considered by us would be subject to the constitutional requirements.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator is entirely correct. The Senator from Connecticut has been a Member of the Senate for about the same time that I have; he and I are both yearlings. Of course, I defer to the long experience of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I listen with very great attention to everything he has to say. But still I say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that there is nothing in the Constitution which even implies or in any way would lead me to believe that we are a part of the State Department or the executive branch of the Government, and that we must, in advance, give them permission to make or, in fact, direct them to make, any kind of treaty whatever.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me call the attention of the Senator to paragraph (2) of the resolution:

(2) Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

That means that we favor taking the step of developing regional arrangements, as I understand.

Then the resolution further says:

(3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process—

I take it that means exactly what my good friend the Senator from Nevada is talking about—

with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

In other words, we shall enter into these regional arrangements if we find it advisable and wise to do so as a protection of our own national security and our own national interest.

It seems to me that in all the history of treaty making, that is the process we have always followed. Whether we undertake it individually as a nation or whether we undertake it as a group of nations, does not seem to me to make very much difference. It takes two to make a contract; but there have been treaties between 2 nations and there have been treaties between 22 nations.

It seems to me this proposal envisages no more than we already have done, except it indicates our willingness to go forward along the path of settling our difficulties by the process of agreement in treaties; and then we go further in the resolution and say that if the United States becomes a party to such an arrangement, it must be on the basis of observance of our constitutional processes.

I submit to the Senator that is the time-honored way by which we have always proceeded in such matters.

Mr. MALONE. May I interpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. I say to my distinguished colleague that the present proposal is somewhat similar to the procedure used in connection with trade treaties at this time. There was a time when all treaties had to be ratified by the Senate. Then it was proposed to the Congress by the Executive branch of the Government that a different procedure be followed; and, finally, after first one step and then another, this body relinquished all authority in respect to ratifying trade treaties. They are now made entirely independent of the Senate—and go into effect even against the wishes of this body.

I submit to the Senator from Connecticut that if we take the initiative in this matter and urge the President or the State Department to do certain of these things, then we shall be morally bound to follow whatever they do. However, we will be taking this action without any indication of what those treaties will provide.

If the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will bear with me until I proceed a little further with my remarks, perhaps some of his questions will be answered.

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall be glad to take my seat, at the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I wish to say to my friend the Senator from Connecticut that in view of the disturbed situation in the world today, I think it is necessary for us to do many things which perhaps we have not previously done.

I have listened for some time to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. It seems to me that under a strict interpretation of the resolution we do not have to ratify anything that is done, except by constitutional process. I think that is what the Senator has in mind. It seems to me to be excellently worded. It has had a great deal of thought.

I believe all of us must think about peace. It is the most coveted and most cherished thing on the face of God's earth today. Every human being in this country should think about peace.

But what the Senator from Nevada is saying, and what I said—and I do not wish to be misunderstood—is this: In agreeing to the resolution, I do not think we should leave any question of doubt in our own minds or in the minds of the world that when there comes back to the Senate any agreement or treaty, which, under our Constitution, should have the ratification of the Senate, no moral obligation has been created which would keep us from being the judges at that time as to the wisdom of ratifying the treaty or as to the question of whether it is definitely in the interest of the American people. That is all I wish to be understood as saying.

Mr. BALDWIN. My distinguished friend from New Jersey is a businessman. In his business he has agents who conduct his affairs. He authorizes them to open up negotiations in connection with his business, but he always retains the right to say whether or not he will agree to a contract they may propose. His men work on that particular basis. That, I submit, is exactly the situation here. The Senate does not have to ratify the treaties if it does not like them. That right is expressly reserved. I go so far as to say it need not be expressly reserved, but it is expressly reserved by the resolution.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for just a moment?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to reply briefly to my friend from Connecticut, for whom I have great respect. I should like to say that in conducting business I have gotten into a great deal of trouble, as a result of representations and things that have been done by agents, salesmen, and others working for the company, because what they did was outside the scope of their authority. The Senator and I may know they had no right to do it, but it is necessary to convince all customers—in this case all the people throughout the Nation—that our agents had no right to commit us. While legally it is possible to resist something and say we had no obligation with respect to it, what the Senator and I are talking about in connection with the world-wide question of peace, is not merely to assume that our legal rights are understood but to make sure that they are understood, so that there may be no charges against us for breach of good faith.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to my distinguished neighbor and friend, for whom I have and always shall have a very warm affection, and whom I recognize as one of the great businessmen of the country and a man who has set a fine example of leadership in business, it is true, no doubt, that he has had trouble with misrepresentations and things of that kind made by his agents, but he never for that reason refused to send out any agents, he never for that reason tried to shut himself up in his shop and say, "Well, I won't send out any salesmen, because they are apt to get me into trouble." He has gone forward in his business on the old American adage, which is a very sound one indeed, "Nothing ventured, nothing gained."

It seems to me the resolution is founded upon the same proposition, "Nothing ventured, nothing gained." If we do nothing about the process of strengthening the United Nations it is bound to be a failure; if we do something about it, it may be crowned with success, the kind of success we want to see. But under the resolution we at all times keep control over those who are acting in our behalf and we retain the old constitutional process of ratification. That is specifically safeguarded by the very terms of the resolution.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator will recall that I said in my opinion that constitutional protection is provided by the resolution. All I want to say now—and then I shall not further detain the Senator from Nevada—is that I should like to exercise the same prudence in looking after the affairs of the people of the Nation, as one of their representatives in the Senate, that I have tried to exercise in conducting my own business. I am perfectly willing to venture something, but I want to use the best judgment in protecting the interests of the people before we get into trouble.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I may say to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut that I am very happy to have him interrupt me at any time. I merely thought that I might answer some of his questions a little further along in my address; it was merely stated as a matter of information. I may say again to the able Senator from Connecticut, it seems to me we are taking a lot of authority upon the United States Senate, in a sort of mischievous way, going beyond our prerogatives in trying to direct the President of the United States and the State Department, which is an entirely different, independent part of the Government, and deliberately so. We seem to be trying to influence the executive department. It could be perhaps that some personnel are in the wrong jobs; possibly they should be in the State Department, or in the office of the President of the United States.

With respect to the treaties we are contemplating that the State Department and the President of the United States may make under their prerogatives they will in fact be military pacts, no matter how ingenious may be the excuse or the explanation.

For the first time in history, the Senate is asked to propose that the United States enter into solemn treaties to go to war to defend foreign nations against invasions or any other act of war that the ally may term aggression.

The United Nations Charter itself calls for this action. The Charter proposes that in any regional security agreements all the parties to the agreement must go to war to defend any one of the group when it is attacked by an aggressor. Needless to say, the aggressor will always be the fellow who goes to war against one of our friends regardless of the fact as to who started the war.

The main purpose of this resolution, it seems to me, is to give the green light for a mutual military aid pact with Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg. Once negotiated by the President, this military pact will be submitted to the Senate for ratification. Once ratified, the United States is compelled to go to war if any other nation attacks any one of these five.

I want to say again for the benefit of the Senator from Connecticut, in further clarification of my belief, that once we make this solemn declaration on the floor of the Senate and adopt the resolutions, then when a treaty comes to the floor of the Senate and there is any serious discussion as to whether or not we will ratify the treaty, a flood of propaganda will go out from the executive department and from all the bureaus of the Government, just as it has on everything that has confronted the Senate heretofore; and the Nation will be immediately convinced of the necessity of the treaty, whether it is a fact or not. No one will ever read the resolutions, and the propaganda will convince the people that we have in advance invited the State Department and the President to enter into the treaties which they are asking the Senate to approve.

Our founding fathers warned us many years ago against entering into entangling alliances, and certainly any proposed alliance should be thoroughly considered. Now, however, we are to be slid into one without ever having the issue properly debated before the country and without giving the American people any opportunity to voice their convictions on this grave issue.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that we have moved far through the United Nations, but we must still keep an independent attitude in the Senate of the United States to discuss all of the evidence when any treaty is offered, and independently ratify it or turn it down. When once ratified, of course, we are ready to accept our obligation.

It is the back-door approach or the cellar-window entry into an entangling alliance without proper consideration. It is done with sugar-coating, with candied icing on it. We are told it is done in solemn keeping with the provisions of the United Nations Charter which the Senate has already ratified.

At the time this part of the Charter was adopted, it was generally believed—and there was no other explanation ever given—that regional agreements would apply only to nations in close proximity one to another, or to nations in the same hemisphere. The only one ever mentioned at San Francisco in which the United States would participate was the Chapultepec agreement for the security of the Western Hemisphere. I attended the San Francisco Conference where the United Nations was born.

Now the administration, with the prodding from the Senate, is to extend the meaning of the phrase "regional agreement," to cross the Atlantic Ocean and bring Europe and the United States into the same region. This is factually untrue.

The effect will be to make the Rhine the frontier of the United States. Once, years ago, before the United States entered the Second World War, the late President Roosevelt was quoted as having told a congressional delegation that "America's frontier is on the Rhine." The late President indignantly denied having said it and indignantly denied that it was a fact. Now the Senate is asked to vote it to be a fact. The Senate may be unaware of this.

Mr. President, I believe that the American people have no conception of the tremendous potentialities of this resolution. The late President Roosevelt told the American people in his famous Boston speech in 1940 that he would not send "your American boys to fight in a foreign war."

Now the Senate is asked to implore the administration to enter agreements that will guarantee that American boys must fight in future foreign wars. These agreements call for American boys to fight in future foreign wars. These wars may be started by some act of the Government of Luxemburg or on the single voice of a Socialist Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Mr. President, when a treaty is made by the executive department and ratified by the Senate of the United States in the regular manner—then this Nation will follow through—but the Senate and the American people are entitled to thoroughly understand each and every agreement to which they subscribe.

I think we must guard doubly against the chance of starting a war, since only yesterday the Senate passed a draft bill which will be very drastic and will bring to the military service most of the able-bodied young men of this country. We must be very sure, after passing such legislation, that those young men are properly safeguarded and not sent into a useless war upon the whim of a foreign nation without proper foundation.

I am not opposing such treaties, but I am calling the attention of this body to the fact that it should ratify such treaties only after full debate and understanding.

There is a grave constitutional question at issue in the consideration of this resolution. It is whether the President and the Senate have the constitutional

power to carry the United States into a military pact that calls on the United States to enter a foreign war without Congress actually passing a resolution of war. Under the language of the United Nations Charter, each member of a regional agreement must go to the defense of any other member attacked by an aggressor. Thus, with the United States in such an agreement, the President might well order the Army, Navy, and Air Force into action instantly upon an appeal for help from a fellow-signatory who might declare he was being attacked by an aggressor. Congress then would be faced with a fait accompli with the armed forces of the United States actually at war without Congress having passed a resolution of war.

Apparently this possibility has given some concern to the Administration and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is noted that the distinguished chairman of that committee announced that he had no objection to the House joining now in adopting his resolution or one similar to it. Subsequently such a resolution was introduced in the House.

Each is a simple resolution; neither is a joint resolution such as is required for a declaration of war. But the effect of the two resolutions is to ask the Administration to bind the United States to future wars without giving either House or Senate a chance to vote upon declaring that particular war.

There is no precedent in all American history for this kind of resolution. It is pleaded that the Senate upon a previous occasion did advise the Administration on foreign policy. But this resolution concerns itself with war and not with a mere policy.

The Vandenberg resolution in its second objective mentions "collective self-defense." This itself means war. Its fourth objective mentions collective self-defense and any armed attack affecting its national security. This again means war.

Another phase of regional security agreements as proposed under the United Nations Charter is the mutual aid provisions. Once the United States entered into such an agreement it would be honor-bound as the richer nation and the arsenal of democracy to furnish military supplies to the other signatories.

Mr. President, I want to say at this point that there is even now a well-defined rumor—it is a little more than a rumor, because many industrialists have been contacted—to the effect that we are about to propose another scheme whereby we shall revive the lend-lease principle of furnishing free of charge arms, munitions, and supplies to the other nations in the United Nations.

These resolutions could well front for the next suggestion in that direction.

Mr. President, I am not opposing such treaties—but I am suggesting that this body should go slow in any advance approval for the reasons I have outlined. Each treaty should stand upon its own feet when it is submitted to this body.

The obvious purpose of taking the steps outlined in the Vandenberg resolution is to create a military alliance against Russia. While the initial objective is to create a European alliance, it may well be that the administration foresees a Pacific alliance—say with China, India, Australia, and New Zealand.

History records the fact that one of the reasons given by Hitler for the Second World War was his charge that Germany was being encircled by the democracies.

The Vandenberg resolution is the first step in a public effort to start the encirclement of Russia.

It is a public confession that the peaceful means set forth in the United Nations Charter for the maintenance of peace are hopeless and to be abandoned.

It takes advantage of a loophole in the Charter to launch the United States upon power politics and into European power politics for the first time in its history. It is being done lightheartedly, casually, and without the proper importance attaching such action.

I want to again emphasize, Mr. President, that I am not opposing such treaties at this time. I am opposing the advance consent of the United States Senate to any such arrangement until the full details are available.

It could result in a war move, Mr. President, without our consent. It could provoke retaliation by Russia, or that of any other nation. It is an absolute and utter abandonment of traditional American foreign policy. It could easily provoke the third world war. It is being done without consulting the American people or giving them a chance to vote upon it. It is in the nature of a betrayal of the promises to use peaceful means to secure the peace of the world. It invites war, through lack of understanding between the legislative and executive branches of Government.

I respectfully suggest that such an important policy as this one into which the distinguished Senator from Michigan would thrust the Senate of the United States deserves further study before voting upon it.

Mr. President, I spoke of a tendency over past years of establishing policies relinquishing the Senate's independence in matters of this kind. I wish to quote briefly from a historic commentary by the great Joseph Story on the Constitution, in volume I, page 672, paragraph 922:

> A power to lay taxes for any purposes whatsoever is a general power; a power to lay taxes for certain specified purposes is a limited power. A power to lay taxes for the common defense and general welfare of the United States is not in common sense a general power. It is limited to those objects. It cannot constitutionally transcend them. If the defence proposed by a tax be not the common defense of the United States, if the welfare be not general, but special, or local, as contradistinguished from national, it is not within the scope of the Constitution. If the tax be not proposed for the common defense, or general welfare, but for other objects, wholly extraneous (as, for instance, for propagating Mahometanism among the Turks, or giving aids and subsidies to a foreign nation, to build palaces for its kings, or erect monuments to its heroes), it would be wholly indefensible upon constitutional principles.

Mr. President, that principle was upheld for many years, and then, through a system of gradual encroachments, appropriations were made, very minor at first, until the practice finally became commonplace, and now we appropriate billions of dollars at one time to make up the trade balance deficits of other nations of the world and think nothing of it.

I should like to say one more thing in connection with this subject. I spoke of a policy being established when a resolution is agreed to inviting the State Department and the President of the United States to make treaties, that there is a moral obligation to follow through. I invite the attention of the Senate to a method of presenting treaties to this body for ratification. I read from page 6921 of the RECORD of June 2. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said:

> Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maine had hoped to be present to make a brief statement regarding this treaty.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I am very sure that the chairman of the committee—

The distinguished Senator from Michigan—

> would be at a total loss to understand the technicalities of the treaty even if it were explained for days. Therefore, the action which he recommends to the Senate is based upon the same reasons which he believes justify the Senate in accepting the treaty. I make this simple statement in respect to it.

In other words, there was no debate on the treaty. A simple statement was made that it conformed to the policy, and the Senate ratified the treaty without any debate or any study.

I submit that is the policy we are now about to establish, one step at a time. What is proposed is the first step toward the same objective, setting a precedent that the Senate, through resolution, shall direct or invite the President of the United States and the State Department to make certain treaties, implying in advance that it meets with the wholehearted approval of the Senate.

Mr. President, it has been the policy of the Senate in the past to approve in advance interstate agreements and treaties, but when an interstate agreement is approved in advance, the details are specifically set down in advance of the approval. Never in history, so far as I have been able to find, has the Senate in advance ever approved any interstate agreement or any treaty without specifying exactly what might be contained in the agreement or treaty.

I understand the argument of the proponents of the resolution, that there is nothing in the resolution which will prevent it coming back to the Senate for full debate in connection with any treaty of any kind the State Department or the President may make. But I submit, Mr. President, that it is a dangerous precedent, and, as I have said, appropriations for foreign countries have advanced to almost unheard of amounts. Then the United States Senate voluntarily relinquished their constitutional responsibility of approving trade treaties. It is dangerous to advance step by step and finally obligate this body to do something about which the Members have no details in advance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to say at the outset that I think the effort to take advantage of the "advice and consent," and particularly the "advice" provision of the Constitution, is a very excellent one under the circumstances. I believe the recent action of the House Appropriations Committee, which many Senators, including myself, have interpreted as being contrary to the foreign policy, as expressed by both House of the Congress recently, is in itself some reason for the Senate to undertake to express most clearly and to emphasize certain points in our foreign policy.

During the debate in March on the European recovery program, I suggested the inclusion of words expressing our hope that the European countries would move toward political unification during the next few years. To refresh the memory of the Senate I will say I suggested an amendment to the policy declaration of that bill as follows:

It is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the political unification of Europe, to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions—

And so forth. During the debate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] both expressed agreement with the objectives of that amendment, but felt that it was inadvisable to express this policy in that particular legislation because of considerations peculiar to that measure. In other words, the implication was fairly clear that they favored that policy, but that the occasion was inappropriate.

In the spring of 1947, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 10 endorsing a United States of Europe, and I understood the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to say at that time that consideration would be given that joint resolution before the end of the present session. I merely wanted to call the Senate's attention to the debate, which began on page 2030 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1948, and continued for some pages, and then later, on March 8, was resumed, and appears on page 2286 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I give that citation merely for the purpose of showing that the debate at that time indicated, I think quite clearly, that the Senators mentioned approve of the objectives of encouraging a federation of the European states.

I assume that in approving the present resolution the Committee on Foreign Relations gave some consideration to Senate Resolution 10.

Mr. President, it sems to me that Senate Resolution 239, being a simple expression of what this body deems to be a proper objective of our foreign policy, is the proper place in which to express, or to reaffirm, our endorsement of the objective of a federation of European countries. It seems to me that, as I stated a few moments ago, we should in some place in the resolution express more specifically our approval of the idea, the concept, of the political unity of Europe.

Paragraph (2) of the resolution is capable alteration in such a way, I believe, as to clarify this objective.

I should like to suggest language as a substitute for section 2, and I send an amendment to the desk and ask the clerk to read it for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 1, strike out all of lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert the following:

(2) Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for mutual defense and political unity in accordance with the purpose, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I stated earlier today, the language "for individual self-defense," which is found in paragraph (2) of the pending resolution, seems to me to be difficult to follow. I do not quite understand what it means. One of the principal alterations I propose to make is to strike out that language, and leave in the concept of collective self-defense, and then merely add the idea of the political unity within these regional developments.

On several occasions in the past I have spoken at length in the Senate on the subject of the federation of Europe, and I do not propose now to repeat all the arguments I have made on the subject. I ask unanimous consent, however, to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article I wrote some time ago entitled "A United States of Europe?" published in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for May 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE?

(By J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT)

The idea of a federation of European states has a long and respectable history. Since the Middle Ages many of the most distinguished scholars and statesmen of Europe and of America have advocated the political unification of Europe.

In America William Penn wrote an interesting treatise on the subject, and George Washington said that some day, taking its cue from America, Europe would form a United States of Europe. In earlier days such men as Henry IV, Grotius, Comenius, and Kant advocated a federation. In the twenties we find Briand and Herriot, and today Churchill, Auriol, Bevin, and Attlee among those advocating the unification of Europe.

From past experience it would seem that the impulse toward federation is strongest immediately after a destructive and devastating war. After the Napoleonic wars there was a kind of unity achieved under the Holy Alliance until the revolutions of 1848. Then, after World War I, Briand and Herriot, in their quest for security from a recurrence of war, sought to develop a federation of states. And now, within the last few weeks the concept of a federation of Europe has passed rather suddenly from the realm of academic and theoretical contemplation into the arena of practical politics.

In their weakness and helplessness the nations of western Europe seem to recognize their interdependence and are drawn to their neighbors by the urge for security. The tendency has been that, as they recover their strength, their nationalism and independence reassert themselves and the idea of unity disappears.

NOW IS THE TIME

Recent events seem to sustain this theory, and the theory leads us to the conclusion that, if the unification of Europe is to be achieved, it must be started without delay. The vehicle for starting the project is at hand. Unification should be made the principal objective of the European recovery program.

The response of the 16 European nations to Secretary Marshall's suggestion of last June has been encouraging to those who believe that unity is indispensable to a strong and stable Europe. It does not, however, necessarily follow that if with American aid Europe rapidly recovers, she will at the same time build a community which will contribute to the maintenance of peace in the future. Judging from past experience one may well believe that, if recovery is made too easy and too rapid, the reassertion of nationalistic individualism will appear before unity can be achieved. In other words, as the nations begin to feel strong again their national pride will gather strength and they will become immersed in their quest for prosperity and neglect their security.

As of the moment, largely because of the ill-mannered belligerence of the Russians, the political leaders of the western democratic states seem to recognize that their independence and freedom are threatened by the Communists. Many people now sense that the dynamic fanaticism of the Russian Communists cannot be contained by the ancient shibboleths of democracy backed up by the impotent and bankrupt sovereignties of a fragmented and prostrate Europe.

Regardless of how evil or unsound we may think the Communist conception of society, the fact is that it has made and is making enormous strides in the extension of its physical power. It threatens to overcome the western world by sheer force of numbers and weight of resources combined under the iron discipline of a central power. It is not enough to keep repeating that it is evil and that we are good, and that in the long run good will prevail. The validity of such a conclusion is not borne out by the lessons of history.

NEW CONFIGURATION NEEDED

What the western world must have is a new goal—some objective so dramatic and so full of hope that the enthusiasm of a tired and disillusioned people can be aroused. How can anyone have enthusiasm for the re-creation of the same old senseless conglomeration of quarrelsome sovereign states that has led to two World Wars?

This goal or inspiration is needed, not alone to sustain the people of Europe, but also to elicit the continuing support of the American people. The quibbling that has taken place in Congress over the differences in the financial estimates is indicative of the absence of a really worth-while objective in the plan. There is no sense of great achievement in the offing, but rather a dull though virtuous feeling of charity to a poor relative.

Suppose the Marshall plan is successful in reconstructing the industry and trade of France, Italy, Germany, and the others; does anyone believe that this crazy-quilt political pattern will lead to anything but another and more devastating war? No; the old pattern that has brought us two senseless fratricidal wars within a quarter-century must be broken. There is no question that it will be broken, either by the force of the Communists or by the considered and wise actions of the Europeans themselves.

The time to break this pattern has obviously arrived. We have made a bona fide attempt through the United Nations to create a voluntary association of nation-states. We have attempted in good faith to create a

mechanism to control the atomic bomb. Both have failed. We are now about to undertake the European recovery program designed to enable the 16 participating countries to become economically self-supporting and politically stable. When we commit ourselves to this program it will be difficult to withdraw. It will involve an enormous drain upon our resources and will result in a great increase in the industrial and economic power of western Europe.

But this increase in the power of Europe, as such, is not enough. Instead of being a source of strength and security to us, it could become the means of our destruction. To equip Europe industrially without at the same time creating a political community able to defend itself from the well-known tactics of infiltration, intrigue, and force of the Communists, is dangerous in the highest degree. If, as many people believe, the Communists are determined to expand until confronted by a superior force, it is far better to leave Europe for them to reconstruct, if they can, than for us to bear that burden and then have the fruits of our labor used in an attack upon us.

DIVIDED WE FALL

As practical people, if we consider the lessons of the past 50 years, is it not clear that the so-called sovereign nations of Europe are incapable of working together for their own welfare and common defense? They were conquered one at a time by the Germans, and now they are being subjected to the same treatment by the Russians. Without our aid it is probable that Italy or France, or both, would today have a Communist governor sent by Moscow. It simply is impractical to think that these small countries—any of them—can withstand the pressure of Moscow if it can be exerted against them one at a time. It matters not that France, the strongest of the continental states, may regain a high standard of living. She would still have only 40,000,000 inhabitants, and left to face the ruthlessness of Russia alone, she could not preserve her independence.

Power politics being what it is, it is blind folly to believe that the small states of Europe can either defend themselves individually by force of arms or escape conquest by neutrality. The idea of neutrality was of little help to the Netherlands, Denmark, or Norway in the last war. As against the Russian tactics of corruption from within and force from without, it could be no more effective in the future. The presence of these weak and defenseless little states directly under the nose of the Russian dictatorship is a continuing temptation to aggression. The ease with which they could be taken one at a time will certainly prove to be an irresistible bait as soon as we relax our vigilance.

When we consider the magnitude of the cost to us of the ERP, as practical people, it is inconceivable that we should undertake it without recognizing that an element indispensable to the success of the plan is the political union of the recipient countries. In no other way can progress be made toward our ultimate objective of a world of law to which all men are subject. There is no other course short of war that can stop the steady expansion of communism to the point where it will threaten the domination of the world.

In saying there is no other way to preserve the western world, it is not intended to dismiss as useless the United Nations or to exclude from consideration a federation of states more comprehensive than western Europe. To achieve world peace these steps will be necessary, but circumstances are such that our attention in the immediate future must be given to saving Europe. If Europe falls to the Communists, then all ideas of a UN, or any other federation for peace outside the Western Hemisphere, are only so much talk. In short, if the world is to have an opportunity to create voluntary associations of peoples, Europe must not be subjected to the forcible domination of Moscow.

UNITED STATES INTEREST

Because of the role that it is expected to play in the recovery of Europe, the United States has a legitimate interest in the unification of Europe. Not only does it have this interest because of the enormous material assistance that it is expected to give now, but it also has an even greater interest in the establishment of the foundations for a lasting peace in the future. In view of Europe's unique contribution to the origin of wars, her political organization cannot be a matter of indifference to us.

The American people would, I believe, respond to and support a program of aid to Europe if the unification of Europe were acknowledged as the goal. It would be an objective which they could understand. Aside from their natural pride in seeing others follow their example, they would rightly feel that a real solution to the anarchic nationalism that has twice involved them in total wars was in prospect. As I said before, a definite goal of this character would be an inspiration to our people. Not only would it inspire a more generous support for the present sacrifices, but it would also give us a continuing and lasting interest in the well-being of the Europeans. It is this interest and participation in their progress that would be the real basis for a successful United Nations of the future.

It is a mistake to assume that America has entirely relinquished her traditional isolationism. We are making a valiant effort to do so, but the lack of success in the United Nations and the failure of our efforts to control atomic energy are disillusioning. If on the top of these disappointments Europe, after receiving our aid, reverts to her ancient feuding and fighting, one might well expect us to give up in despair. In other words, it is highly important to us as well as to Europe that the recovery program be a success. If it is not, there can be little hope for a just and lasting peace.

There are many people who do not appreciate the eccentricities of American politics and are beginning to believe that perhaps a dictatorship may have something of value in it after all—a situation which plays into the hands of the Communists.

The Russians vigorously oppose the unification of western European countries. With great self-righteousness they defend with words the absolute sovereignty of all states and attack us for planning to impair the independence of the 16 nations. At the same time they are proceeding to communize completely and to incorporate into their own system Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. unification of eastern Europe is well on the way to completion.

During the past year, since the introduction of Senate Resolution 10 expressing our approval of a United States of Europe, there has been considerable discussion in the press of the proposal. The attitude of the great majority of the writers has been that it is an excellent idea, but that unfortunately it just can't be done. It is true of course that there are difficulties, but I do not think they are insurmountable. Let us examine briefly just what those obstacles are.

OBSTACLES TO FEDERATION

The basic difficulty which must be overcome is the intensity of national feeling, attended by prejudices, fears, and animosities deeply ingrained in Europe's people by patriotism and past history. National feelings are so powerful that they keep Europe divided, even though geographically it is no more broken by barriers than the United States, and it is less broken by barriers than China. We can ascribe lack of political and economic unity to human obstacles alone. In spite of the fact that Europe is a single permanent regional division of the habitable world, and in spite of the fact that not one of her political divisions can make a claim to a similar status, nevertheless every national group in Europe regards itself as a permanent entity. Nationalistic hatreds have kept European peoples apart for centuries, and as long as the present nation-states remain unmodified, they will continue to do so.

The bogey of a resurgent Germany is another obstacle—and I would be the last person to say that Russia is alone in her fear of Germany. It should be pointed out, however, that in spite of their being the most numerous people, the Germans still constitute less than one-third of the population of the contemplated federation of western Europe. Working together, there is no reason why the other people in the federation could not avoid domination by the Germans.

A third obstacle—which I referred to earlier—is Soviet Russia's efforts to unite the Continent in her own interests by power methods similar to those used by Louis XIV, Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler.

A fourth and important obstacle is the language problem. It makes difficult the ordinary intercourse of the citizens and hampers the free movement of persons and the flow of ideas and information so important to the achievement of understanding and unity.

A fifth obstacle is incompatible political ideologies, which are still active and which cannot be considered as conducive to cooperative or unified actions between or among states. Authoritarian states still exist in western Europe. Both communism and fascisim have holds upon large sections of the population.

A sixth obstacle is cultural differences, which oftentimes are much stronger than blood differences.

A seventh obstacle is religious differences, which are especially pronounced in eastern Europe.

But overshadowing all other obstacles in European history, from the nationalistic standpoint, is a ledger of unrequited injuries from the past, which each state keeps to be settled at some future date.

I firmly believe it can be argued, in the light of history and also of current events, that, formidable though they may be, these obstacles are not insurmountable.

EUROPE AND UNITED STATES COMPARED

In light of the many differences which separate European peoples, it is not surprising that the idea of a federated Europe should be slow in developing. We may recall the many efforts at union which characterized the relationships of the Thirteen American Colonies prior to their independence. Today the achievement of a Constitution and a Federal Government in 1787 appears to have been an easier task than the present one of attaining federation in Europe. But the record will show that not only was the process of ratification of the American Constitution a contentious one, but the Federal Government of 1787 was preceded by a loose confederation, which in its turn was preceded by the tenuous congresses and unions of an earlier date. The impelling threat from the Indians and then the dangers from the great powers of France, Spain, and England were as powerful factors in the unification of the United States as were domestic economic needs and social impulses.

We often hear it said that the problems of European unification cannot be compared with the problems involved in the federation of this country; unquestionably it was considerably easier for us to unitt than it will ever be for Europe to do so. But, in spite of this, it should not be overlooked that all the

difficulties under which Europe now labors were in some measure to be found in the colonial States prior to federation. There were boundary problems, currency difficulties, tariff squabbles, and a vast number of other issues which had to be adjusted before union could be achieved. There were differences of language, religion, and social institutions. In the United States the issue of slavery could not be solved in the beginning and finally had to be purged by a bloody civil war. Slavery was no small obstacle to unity.

Then, too, in the self-sufficient provincial economy of 1776, with its slow means of communication and its limited power of mass destruction. I doubt that the compelling necessity for federation was anything like as obvious to the citizens of that time as it should be to anyone who knows that there are supersonic planes and atomic bombs in the arsenals of today.

If the Dutchman of New York and the Englishman of Connecticut, if the Frenchman of Louisiana and the Spaniard of California, if the Swede of Delaware and the German of Pennsylvania could be molded into a single body politic, living together amicably, striving for common national purposes, then there is every reason to believe that the Frenchman of France and the Englishman across the Channel, the Dutchman of the Netherlands, and the German of Germany, and even the Spaniard of Spain, with all their neighbors, if given the right conditions, can unite for a reconstructed and rehabilitated Europe.

THE CHOICE

Europe has the manpower, the natural resources, and a democratic tradition which can be welded into a tremendous force for peace with freedom. Without political unification, however, she is today and she will continue to be the same source of trouble for the world that she has been since 1914. Her chronic condition was accurately described in the statement issued in 1926, when, under the leadership of Briand, the first congress to consider unification was called in Vienna:

"Anarchy is indeed the only appropriate description for a society of 34 states without law, without organization, without common organs or authorities, without a court of justice, without a police force, and without a solidarity; a society the members of which are in perpetual strife with one another and pile up murderous weapons against one another; a society in which might takes precedence over right, and in which the normal methods of negotiation are threats and blackmail; a society in which the members are ruled by a club law, as were states and castles in the darkest days of the Middle Ages."

There is no easy, gradual, painless way out of this anarchic confusion. Certainly it will be painful for the European nations to give up their ancient and cherished prejudices. But the alternative, subjugation by the Communist agents of Moscow, will be even more painful. It is difficult to see an escape from this dilemma. Europe must take one or the other of the horns, and it is inconceivable that she will not take voluntary unification with its promise of security and freedom if we tactfully and wisely help her along that path.

For America, the domination of all Europe by the Communists would be a calamity of incalculable danger to our future. Our trade would languish, unemployment would plague us, and the cost of military preparedness would bankrupt us. It would be extremely unlikely that under such conditions, isolated by the iron curtain from all of Europe and the Middle East, we could preserve our free democratic way of life. The regimentation which we found so galling during the late war would, by comparison, seem to have been a condition of idyllic freedom. And above all else, there would appear to be no other prospect than an eventual conflict with the Communists to settle the issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say that the article is simply in a sense a condensation of the arguments I have made on the floor from time to time during the last year, going to the merits and the necessity, I should say, of the political integration of the countries we are attempting to help through the European recovery program, and pointing out that unless there comes about some kind of federation, our efforts in that direction will probably be ineffective, that they will not be able to develop a sufficient economic strength to support proper and adequate armed forces, and in other respects are likely to succumb to the pressures of the Communists.

Mr. President, I also wish to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "Can We Guarantee a Free Europe?" which appears in the June 12, 1948, issue of Collier's. The article is written by John Foster Dulles, who is certainly one of the leading authorities in the United States, outside the Government, on the question of foreign affairs. The article supports the idea of a European federation, and I think Senators will find upon reading it that Mr. Dulles feels the same as I do with regard to the necessity for such a federation. I desire to quote several paragraphs from the article.

Mr. Dulles mentions in the first place the agreement between the five countries, that is the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxemburg, concluded only recently. I read from the article, as follows:

That was a happening of great significance. It showed that the nations of western Europe have waked up to the fact that they are in grave peril. Also it showed a determination to unite their strength to overcome that peril.

What is the peril? Some would put it in a single word: "Russia." That, at the moment, is the right word. But there is another word equally significant: "disunity."

This peril is one that is of utmost importance to the United States as well as to European states. And our contribution to solving the problem may well be decisive. We must not only assist in the recovery and stabilization of Europe but it may well be that success will depend on political and military guaranties which we should give western Europe in this critical transition period.

As for the basic problem of unity, there is every reason why the people of western Europe should come together. United, they have possibilities which are immense and challenging.

The 16 western European nations which are now working together under the European recovery plan, plus that portion of Germany which is free of Soviet control, have a population of over 250,000,000 people. The peoples are highly educated. Most of them have democratic institutions and similar moral and legal conceptions derived primarily from their common faith.

He goes on to describe the reasons and the necessity for this union. Later he says:

Our economic aid to Europe can keep an obsolete machine running for a little longer or it can effect reconversion from and obsolete to a modern design. Unless we do a job of reconversion, the European recovery plan will prove a terrible deception.

I think that is entirely correct. Mr. Dulles ends with this note:

The United States cannot, and should not, go on indefinitely bolstering up peoples who have the possibility of standing independently on their own feet. I am confident that they can stand alone. If so, we will have helped to create a great sister federation, a new regional grouping such as the United Nations Charter permits and encourages. That transformation in Europe would bring to an end the present considerable risk of war. It would fill with health the present vacuum into which Soviet power is penetrating.

The coming into being of a federation of western Europe should not, of course, mark the end of our efforts to replace international anarchy with international order. It might, however, mean that from then on our efforts could be on a more universal basis through the United Nations. There would be real chance of developing world order on a universal basis. We should never lose sight of that ultimate goal.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE GUARANTEE A FREE EUROPE?

(By John Foster Dulles)

This spring the representatives of five western European nations met at Brussels and signed an agreement to cooperate economically and to join in common defense against attack. The five were the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg.

That was a happening of great significance. It showed that the nations of western Europe have waked up to the fact that they are in grave peril. Also it showed a determination to unite their strength to overcome that peril.

What is the peril? Some would put it in a single word: "Russia." That, at the moment, is the right word. But there is another word equally significant: "disunity."

This peril is one that is of utmost importance to the United States as well as to European states. And our contribution to solving the problem may well be decisive. We must not only assist in the recovery and stabilization of Europe but it may well be that success will depend on political and military guaranties which we should give western Europe in this critical transition period.

As for the basic problem of unity, there is every reason why the people of western Europe should come together. United, they have possibilities which are immense and challenging.

The 16 western European nations which are now working together under the European recovery plan, plus that portion of Germany which is free of Soviet control, have a population of over 250,000,000 people. The peoples are highly educated. Most of them have democratic institutions and similar moral and legal conceptions derived primarily from their common faith.

They possess in Europe large resources of such basic things as coal and iron, and their colonial possessions in Africa have vast undeveloped mineral and agricultural wealth. They have almost everything, except common language, that the United States possesses and they have everything, and more, that the Soviet Union possesses. But—and this is a big but—they have disunity, whereas the States of the United States and of the Soviet Union are united in a federal system.

It may not be practical for all of the countries of western Europe to come together at once into a single federal system.

Preliminary steps may be needed. It would, for instance, help if the new Germany were a confederation of German states instead of a highly concentrated Reich and if there were European federal control to insure that key areas like the Ruhr would be economically developed to serve the general interest.

PLANNING ECONOMIC CONTROL OF THE RUHR

A start in this direction was recently made at London, where the five nations, parties to the Brussels agreement, and the United States, as one of the powers occupying Germany, agreed on the broad outlines of an international control of the economic activities of the Ruhr.

None of the special circumstances which exist are important enough to prevent the creation in western Europe of an area of political and economic unity which would have the population, the institutions, the ideals and the resources necessary to make it one of the great units of power in the world. Such a unit could be fully comparable to the United States or to the Soviet Union. It could be so strong that no other nation or likely group of nations would feel that they could be aggressive toward it with impunity.

Any union now formed ought not to be limited, for all time, to the original members. It should be expanding. Indeed, the Brussels Pact contains that thought and provides, that other states may be invited to accede to it. There is no reason to accept, as permanent, the artificial division of Europe which the Soviet state and Communist Party now impose by reason of their iron control over all or part of the 13 nations of eastern Europe.

The Brussels Pact is a beginning toward unity, but it is only a beginning. The unity to be adequate ought, even at the beginning, to embrace more than five countries, and the unity should have more reality than generalized pledges of economic and military cooperation such as are contained in the Brussels agreement.

A great obstacle to the necessary degree of unity is the fact that postwar economic distress has forced most of the European countries to operate under highly regimented economies. In these countries essential goods—food, clothing, and construction materials—are closely rationed so as to insure a somewhat equal distribution of what is in short supply.

Also, because individuals do not have much opportunity to provide self-security, the governments are setting up social plans which call for expenditures that shake international confidence in the continuing value and purchasing power of the different national moneys. That strikes at the heart of economic unity, for without currencies which command confidence there cannot be an adequate production and exchange of goods.

It is not easy, probably it is not possible, to conduct such regimentation and such social planning without building up walls which cut off outside influences and accentuate disunity. We found that out for ourselves in 1933.

In that year a World Economic Conference was held at London in which the United States participated. It had been called before the advent of President Roosevelt and the New Deal. It was called because the then leaders believed that the world would drift into war unless there were more economic unity, more productivity, and a freer exchange of goods. By the time the Conference was held Mr. Roosevelt had become President and he decided to meet the depression in our country by social and economic experimentation which would involve altering the value of the dollar.

He realized that he could not do that at home and at the same time join in a world program which would require the United States to surrender its independence of action in monetary matters. So he rejected increased international unity, in order to keep free to carry out domestic policies like some that the European countries are trying out today.

I was in Berlin while the London Economic Conference was going on, negotiating for the collection of German debts to American citizens. Hitler had just come into power and there was a division of opinion within the German Cabinet as to what policy the new Government should follow.

Some wanted Germany to try to regain big-power status by becoming a great factor in world trade, producing and selling abroad what she could produce most efficiently, and buying from abroad what could not be produced cheaply and easily at home.

Others wanted Germany to follow the road of autarchy and to become at all costs a self-contained economy which could wage war without danger of economic collapse under sea blockade. I was on the ocean, on my way home, when I received a telephone message from the Reichsbank stating that in view of developments at the London Economic Conference Germany would take the way of autarchy.

So, in 1933, each nation turned to handling its own affairs in ways that required intercommunication to be cut. Out of that division, war quickly developed in Europe. It may be that even if the London Economic Conference had succeeded, Hitler would still have plunged Europe into war. That we can never know. What we do know is that the United States chose to make its economy into a closed area of domestic experimentation.

PRESENT NEEDS CAUSE UNWISE DECISIONS

The governments of Europe today face a similar dilemma. They know that in the long run their peoples can only get peace and prosperity through unity. But also each government is engaged in social and economic planning which seems necessary to meet present needs and which calls for a closed economy and continuing economic and monetary disunity.

At this juncture the United States can play a helpful and perhaps decisive role. We can in the first place help the people of Europe to convalesce. We can make it possible for the peoples of western Europe to get more food and clothing and to get it with less exhaustion. Out of that can come the plentiful vigor of body and spirit which men must have if they are to find and to seize great new opportunities.

We can, furthermore, use our European recovery plan to induce greater unity by helping to meet the domestic dislocations which are inevitable when closed economies are put together.

When I testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee regarding the European recovery plan, I emphasized that there was great danger that our foreign assistance would "work in reverse" by subsidizing the continuance of the very conditions which ought to be changed.

I gave, as an illustration, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg, which had already begun to create a customs union as between themselves. I asked whether, if some countries in this way improved their economic condition, that would automatically disqualify them from American aid, leaving that aid primarily for the countries which lag behind because their leaders balk at the domestic consequences of increased unity. Our economic aid to Europe can keep an obsolete machine running for a little longer or it can effect reconversion from an obsolete to a modern design. Unless we do a job of reconversion, the European recovery plan will prove a terrible deception.

That point of view was, I think, accepted by the Congress when it gave the Secretary of State and the Administrator a policy directive which will enable them to use our aid to promote European unity.

Lunching with Prime Minister Attlee last December, I recalled his earlier statements as head of the British Labor Party that "Europe must federate or perish." I asked him whether he still believed that, and he said that he did.

I also talked with President Auriol of France who said, "Europe must unite herself if she wishes to recover and live, and if she does not want American assistance to be a gesture without future or a humiliating charity." The five-power Brussels Pact refers to "the necessity of uniting in order to promote the economic recovery of Europe." Unity is in the air and if we use European recovery aid skillfully to make it more real, we will not be dictating. We shall merely be helping the peoples of western Europe to accomplish what they freely recognize to be indispensable to their own good.

There is one further contribution that we may have to make. We may have to give some political guaranties to cover the period during which western Europe makes transition from the weakness of diversity to the strength of unity.

Soviet leaders are violently opposed to western European unity. They realize that if that happens, it will end, once and for all, the Soviet design of moving through western Europe to the Atlantic. So the nations of western Europe know that every move they take toward unity will involve the great displeasure of Soviet leaders and they feel that that displeasure may evidence itself in hostile acts.

Soviet doctrine sanctions the use of any means to accomplish Soviet ends and they have in the Russian Army a means which western Europe in its present state cannot resist and they have in the Communist Parties a means of penetration which it is difficult to resist so long as there is economic sickness.

The European states would feel safer in proceeding if they knew that, in doing so, they had over-all backing from the United States and not merely financial and economic backing.

A HOSTILE POWER'S OPPORTUNITY

If western Europe should succumb to despotism, as eastern Europe already has, then a great power which treats us as an enemy would, through Greenland, be in North America. It would through France, Italy, and Spain, come into control of long-established cultural ties with South America and then it would be difficult to prevent the kind of encroachment into South America which, President Monroe said over a century ago, would be "dangerous to our peace and safety."

The United States would, under those circumstances, be virtually encircled and isolated in the world and a process of slow strangulation would be well under way. Probably we would then try to fight our way out. But surely it is not in our self-interest to be half-hearted and ineffectual until we actually feel the noose tightening around our neck.

So, I say, the United States should be prepared to give to the uniting countries of western Europe assurance that, while unity is being forged, they will have our complete backing. That backing should be against military aggression and against the overthrow of their free political institutions by Communists who are within but who function as foreign affiliates of the Soviet Communist Party and take its orders.

All of that is permissible under the United Nations Charter, which authorizes collective self-defense and joint action to promote observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

I feel, however, that any military guaranty that we now give should be provisional and transitional, and not permanent. Perhaps that judgment would need to be revised in the light of future events, but my present thought is that western Europe, with its African territories, has the possibility of be-

coming a free and democratic area equally as powerful as the United States herself.

The immediately pressing problem is to bring about a realization of that possibility. That might not happen if the different nations of western Europe felt that they could rely continuously upon us. American aid and support, whether economic or military, is, today, a crutch. Crutches are good so long as they help convalescent people to get the strength to stand alone. Crutches are not good when people who can recover get to leaning on them permanently.

The United States cannot, and should not, go on indefinitely bolstering up peoples who have the possibility of standing independently on their own feet. I am confident that they can stand alone. If so, we will have helped to create a great sister federation, a new regional grouping such as the United Nations Charter permits and encourages. That transformation in Europe would bring to an end the present considerable risk of war. It would fill with health the present vacuum into which Soviet power is penetrating.

The coming into being of a federation of western Europe should not, of course, mark the end of our efforts to replace international anarchy with international order. It might, however, mean that from then on, our efforts could be on a more universal basis through the United Nations. There would be real chance of developing world order on a universal basis. We should never lose sight of that ultimate goal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is another aspect of this question which I think lends considerable support to the federation of Europe. On August 23, 1915, in an interesting article, Mr. Lenin, the prophet and high priest of the Communists, condemned the idea of a united states of Europe. I wish to read one or two excerpts from that article, in contrast to the articles by leading Americans. As pointed out in the article which I submitted for the RECORD, there is a long historical background in support of this idea among European countries and in this country. On the other hand, we have this article, No. 44, of August 23, 1915. I read for the RECORD from House Document No. 619, of the Eightieth Congress, second session, issued by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. It is entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism." On page 27 of supplement I of that document is the article entitled "The United States of Europe Slogan," written by Lenin on August 23, 1915, in which he condemns the idea of a united states of Europe. I wish to read one or two paragraphs from it:

On the other hand, political revolutions are inevitable in the course of a Socialist revolution, which must not be looked upon as one single act, but must be considered as an epoch, a number of stormy political and economic upheavals, a most-sharpened class struggle, civil war, revolutions, and counter-revolutions.

But if the united states of Europe slogan, conceived in connection with a revolutionary overthrow of the three most reactionary monarchies of Europe, headed by Russia, is entirely impregnable as a political slogan, there still remains the most important question of its economic content and meaning. From the point of view of the economic conditions of imperialism—i. e., capital export and division of the world between the progressive and civilized colonial powers—the united states of Europe under capitalism is either impossible or reactionary.

On page 29 he has this to say:

The United States of the World (not of Europe alone) is a state form of national unification and freedom which we connect with socialism; we think of it as becoming a reality only when the full victory of communism will have brought about the total disappearance of any state, including its democratic form. As a separate slogan, however, the United States of the World would hardly be a correct one, first, because it coincides with socialism; second, because it could be erroneously interpreted to mean that the victory of socialism in one country is impossible; it could also create misconceptions as to the relations of such a country to others.

The whole purport of the Lenin article shows the position of the Communists. I believe they felt that such a federation of the European countries would be an obstacle and obstruction to the world revolution which they seek to promote. I should think that from the point of view of this country, that in itself would be a very powerful argument to take seriously the proposal of a federation of Europe.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the meeting on May 7, which was held at The Hague, the Netherlands, for the purpose of encouraging and crystalizing the movement toward the unity of Europe. Mr. Churchill was chairman, and there was tremendous enthusiasm among the 600 or 700 delegates from the various European countries who were present at that time. I regret that I do not have and was unable to obtain a copy of Mr. Churchill's speech on that occasion, because it was a very fine exposition of the reasons and the hopes for a federation of Europe.

In this country only a few weeks ago a committee for a free and united Europe was formed, for the purpose of encouraging the movement. Among its members are found such men as John W. Davis, Herbert Hoover, and Allan Dulles; former Senators Robert LaFollette and Burton Wheeler, former Representative Claire Booth Luce, Representatives Boggs and Herter, former Secretary of War Patterson, and many others of comparable distinction and stature. Everyone who has seriously considered it feels that it could make a great contribution to the stability and peace of the world.

Since 1914 Europe has been the origin of constant turmoil and two world wars. These convulsions are, I believe, symptomatic of some great change. Russia is seeking in every way possible to make that change after her own image, to incorporate the great and powerful area into her totalitarian system; and she has made considerable progress along that line. I do not believe that Europeans desire regression to a dictatorship. I think they would like to move forward to a more enlightened and democratic way. I think they need our help in this period of transition. I believe, of course, that we shall proceed to give them that help under ERP; but, as I stated in the debate referred to a moment ago, we seem to be very hesitant even to make a suggestion relating to political affiliations of those countries. In that respect I believe we are wrong. I think it would be very helpful to them if we were to voice our approval of the political unification of those countries.

Our real objective in all the international measures for cooperation which we have taken, including economic measures as well as the United Nations, is to reestablish peace with freedom and justice. I can think of no single thing that could contribute more at this time than the unification of Europe voluntarily, and with democratic institutions. I can think of no more dangerous thing to our future than to have Europe consolidated by force under the domination of the Kremlin. I am unable to see how one or the other of these alternatives can fail to come about. It seems to me that the utter helplessness of the Europeans is not entirely due to the effects of the war, but to the development of modern industry and modern ways of doing business. They have resulted in making the old political and economic organizations of Europe completely obsolete. I cannot believe that Europeans can reestablish any reasonable standard of living or any reasonable economic system. Consequently, they will continue to be involved in quarrels until either they are consolidated under the aegis of the Russians, as has already been done in eastern Europe, or until they voluntarily federate.

So, Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will consider the suggested amendment to paragraph 2 of the resolution, which, as I say, is only for the purpose of indicating more specifically our approval of the political federation of these European countries.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand the Senator's purpose in this suggested amendment, it is to encourage the people of western Europe to go further than the collective arrangements referred to in the resolution reported by the committee. The Senator would have them go further, and would have them organize not only for their mutual defense but also for their political unity. In other words, it seems to me that if the Congress were to adopt the resolution in that form, it would be an official admonition on the part of the Congress of the United States to those people that they should get together in a political union—that is to say, organize a new nation, so to speak, or a new government. I ask my distinguished friend whether he agrees that there is a marked difference between having the Congress of the United States, as an organ of our Government, make that suggestion and having the suggestion come from individuals—for example, in the way that the suggestion originally came from Winston Churchill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The resolution refers to arrangements for "individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter." I believe my suggestion would merely qualify those words, because I do not think the nations will have

any collective self-defense without having some unity. In my opinion, they will not be able to sustain themselves economically unless they have some unity, and certainly they will not be able to sustain a sufficient army or an army upon which we can rely unless they have some such unity.

So far as Europe is concerned, I think an important part and parcel of the idea of self-defense is federation.

I realize that this morning the chairman of the committee said that was contemplated by this paragraph of the resolution. I think my suggestion would clarify the matter to such an extent that not only those who have been thinking about it a long time and have been engaging in the debates will know what is meant, but everyone will know what is meant by this expression of opinion.

Inasmuch as this resolution is to be advice to our Chief Executive and is to emphasize certain things which already are in the Charter—but the resolution is to be a guide in respect to what we would like to see come about—I do not see anything offensive about the suggestion I have made. In view of the fact that we are investing so much in the European recovery program, I do not think it is at all out of place for us to suggest that we believe it would be more effective if those nations would consider having some form of political unification.

If the Senator from Connecticut thinks such a suggestion would be officious meddling on our part, I do not agree. I think it is our duty to suggest whatever we think would contribute to the success of the program. I think it absolutely will not succeed unless they bring about some sort of federation.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am in complete agreement that we are very much involved in this matter, and its success is vital to us. I believe a federation of western Europe would be a good thing.

But I question the wisdom of having the Congress itself tell the western European nations, "We think you should get together and organize a new and different form of government than the form of government you now have; we think you should organize into a federation of states."

Mr. President, we have never tried to tell any of the people of the world what kind of a government they should have. Some of our individual citizens have offered all kinds of advice—most of it good, I think, and some of it not so good. Nevertheless, I do not believe our Government, as such, should take the position of offering such advice. It seems to me that would be a marked departure from our policy.

However, I wish to say that I am in hearty agreement with the Senator's suggestion that there should be a federation of the western states of Europe.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to observe that the argument that we have never done so before is not very persuasive to me. In other words, as I review the history of the last 30 years, that period in our history does not appeal to me as being so successful an era that we must not do anything that we did not do during that period of time. I think the period since the beginning of the United Nations has been a period of considerable experiment.

What the Senator has said about not doing something that has not been done before can be said with equal force about the European recovery program and, in fact, about the United Nations itself. The Senator's criticism that we have not done it before would apply to both of them.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I take exception to that remark, although very politely and kindly, because I think there is a marked distinction between our being part and parcel of arrangements of that sort, for which the Congress has made provision, and our saying to western Europe, in the form of a resolution, "We think you should have a unified, federated western Europe." I think those are two entirely different propositions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course they are different. However, from the point of view of the appropriateness of what we say, it seems to me the things we said in connection with the European recovery program—for instance, statements that the nations participating in that program must perform in certain ways, and demands on our part for such performance, and statements to the effect that continued support from us will be dependent upon such performance by them, and so forth—were suggestions which, although confined to the economic field, were themselves just as officious, in a way, as it may be said that my proposal would be. My proposal happens to be in the field of the political.

The only difference, it seems to me, is that probably the political is more important than the economic to the success of such plans over a period of time. In other words, basic to the success of the efforts of those people and to the success of our entire venture is some sort of political development. It is true that the argument as to relative importance is a little like asking whether one's heart or one's stomach is the more important. Nevertheless, some such development is necessary.

Our attempt has been to say that we must stay strictly out of the political; that we are willing to help in the economic field but not in the political field. For some reason or other, we have taken the position that the political field is untouchable. However, I think that is a mistake.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to state again what very deep sympathy I have with the ultimate objective the able Senator from Arkansas has in mind.

I wish to make two appeals to him in connection with his amendment:

In the first place, the Senator will observe that the Foreign Relations Committee has very scrupulously kept within the structure of the United Nations in drawing up this resolution. The United Nations undertakes no political jurisdiction of any nature. So it seems to me that to inject the idea of any sort of political advice into a resolution which is scrupulously attempting to confine itself to United Nations procedures would be to alter the fundamental character of this particular effort. That may mean to the Senator from Arkansas that the effort is too limited; but I respectfully submit to him that we have been undertaking to develop a very definite, cohesive theme in this resolution. From my standpoint and, I am sure, from the committee's standpoint, to inject the political factor, even in the nobly meditated aspect the Senator from Arkansas has in mind, would collide with the formula we are undertaking to develop.

I wish to make a second appeal to the Senator. I know perfectly well that many Senators would prefer a different text in many different areas in this resolution. The multiplicity of resolutions which we have before the committee on the subject is clear indication of that fact. But, Mr. President, if we undertake to amend the language of the resolution on the floor, even for the worthiest possible purposes, we shall soon be in the business of totally rewriting the resolution. By the time all the various Senators who have utterly conscientious ideas upon the subject have expressed their ideas in the form of amendments, we shall find ourselves confronting a perfectly hopeless net result. The net of that situation it seems to me is that I am entitled to make an appeal to the Senator not to ask us to set a precedent which opens the door to rewriting a resolution, every word of which has been carefully weighed for its impact and import before it was ever put down in black and white.

Furthermore, the simple six sentences which define the objectives of the resolution have passed an equally scrupulous scrunity on the part of the State Department itself. I would hesitate very much to attempt to have adopted any resolution which should be rewritten as the result of floor action which substantially alters the pending text.

My appeal to the Senator would be that inasmuch as he has made his position perfectly clear and inasmuch as the objective to which he addresses himself is a notable one to which many of us agree as individual Senators, yet an objective which is outside the jurisdiction of the Charter of the United Nations, my appeal to him is, first, that he not undertake to broaden the resolution in any such aspect, and second, that he not ask us to set a precedent for tearing the resolution apart. I hope he would be satisfied to have made the record and not press his amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the Senator to say that federation of Europe was outside the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I say the United Nations is not organized for the purpose of giving advice to anybody; on the contrary, it is organized under the express reservation of complete sovereignty, which is the sum total of political considerations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The federation of Europe, though, is not outside the contemplation of article 52. That is what I mean.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, no; it is not outside insofar as the Senator's inter-

pretation of the article is concerned and insofar as the interpretation of the Senator from Michigan is concerned; but I assert that any advice respecting political organizations is outside the scope of the United Nations Charter, and ought to be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senate, in adopting the resolution, is not exercising any power conferred upon us by the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see why that should restrict what we should say in the resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It does not restrict the Senator in the slightest. If he wants to open the resolution to an expression of the opinions of the diverse and sundry Senators who are the Members of this great body, he can offer an amendment advising the President on what he ought to do in respect to Jerusalem, he can offer a resolution in respect to what he ought to do in response to the growing demands that we cease to do business with Britain unless she unifies Ireland. The Senator can enter an infinitude of fields with his advice, if he wishes. I completely agree with the Senator that this is a free forum to that extent. But I am saying to the Senator that the resolution has a definite and specific and well-channeled objective, which is the purpose to try to point out ways and means for making the machinery of the existing United Nations institution work more efficiently. I say to him I believe, when he undertakes to give political advice to western Europe, even though I agree with his advice, I respectfully submit to him, that he has stepped far beyond the circumference of the essential purpose which the resolution is seeking to serve.

We cannot cure the whole situation in one resolution. But I beg of the Senator to permit us to attempt unhastily to deal with at least one fundamental phase.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator from Michigan does not misunderstand my purpose, because I certainly approve of the purpose of the whole resolution. I think the debate both on ERP and that which has taken place today, to the extent that it has caused a certain number of Senators each time, who had not spoken before, to express themselves, will serve at least part of the purpose which I had in mind.

But the substitute for this particular sentence, as I submitted it, does not specifically mention Europe. It does bring in the one term, of political unity, which I feel is contemplated by article 52. I do not know how it is possible to effect regional arrangements without some kind of political action. To me, it is inconceivable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a second?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is basing his argument and his reasoning for political unity on the ground that political unity is the only sure defense against aggression, is he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I based it on the ground that agreements in the economic or military field are transitory unless something having to do with the political relations is involved; that is, I was trying in my own mind to make the distinction between trade agreements and military alliances. They are all very well for, let us say, the next year or two, but they do not last. I hoped that as a result of this resolution there might be some change in the political relations of the European states.

Mr. HATCH. The thought that came to me as the Senator was discussing the resolution, was that paragraph 2 itself possibly does exactly what the Senator wants done, because it provides, if the Senator will examine it, for the progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements, for individual and collective self-defense. Would not that provide for the political unity of which the Senator speaks? Would it not be just as proper for those nations to get together for the sake of political unity and for defense against political aggression, as to unite for military self-defense?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe I said, before the Senator came in, that in view of what the Senator from Michigan said this morning, and of my own thoughts in the matter, I rather think it does; but there are many people who may not think so. Therefore it did not seem to me to be amiss to attempt to clarify it or make it more specific. That was the only purpose which the language which I suggested would have in this particular instance. I am glad that the Senator believes it is covered. I hope that will be the interpretation, because I do not want to upset all the plans of the committee or to challenge their greater wisdom. I recognize that their wisdom is greater than my own, because I know exceedingly little about these matters.

Mr. HATCH. I can give the Senator my interpretation of the clause now, namely, that there is but one limitation upon the regional arrangements recommended by this section. That limitation is that they must be within the past principles and provisions of the Charter. Political unity is authorized by the section just as much as is military unity, provided it is within the principles of the Charter. The article to which the Senator has referred, namely, article 52, has nothing in it which precludes such an arrangement as the Senator is suggesting. I think the Senator's suggested language might even confuse the situation, because it would seem to tell the people of Europe that they must unite. In that respect it would have a very bad effect. The resolution as drawn is sufficiently broad to cover everything the Senator wants, provided that what is done is within the principles of the United Nations Charter. I do not believe the Senator can read that article without realizing that it is left to the nations to get together and unite for political purposes against political aggression, just as much as they can unite against military aggression. I do not think the Senator's amendment adds anything to it at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to have that expression from the Senator from New Mexico. I hope that is the way the resolution will be interpreted. Even if my amendment is unnecessary for his understanding, I still feel it might well serve a useful purpose, so far as the Europeans themselves are concerned. I do not think this resoluton in any respect is undertaking to tell any foreign country what it shall do. It is purely advice of a very mild kind to our own Executive. It may be that one of the reasons why it is very appropriate at this time is the recent indication of the lack of cooperation, even as between the two Houses of Congress. There seems to be no understanding between the House and the Senate. I think the whole project is entirely justified and is a very appropriate and proper one. I did not mean to be critical. If I did not pay tribute to it, as some have, I had already assumed it. I think it is a very worth-while and worthy resolution.

Mr. HATCH. I will say to the Senator that I am not at all critical of the Senator's amendment or of the objective which he seeks. My objection is that it is unnecessary. The resolution as drawn is sufficiently broad to cover everything the Senator from Arkansas has in mind. Secondly, by adding the amendment which the Senator proposes we might seriously confuse the situation and not accomplish what the Senator desires. I am in accord with all that the Senator from Arkansas seeks to achieve, but I join in the expression of the hope that he will not insist on his amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, unless the countries in Europe achieve some form of confederation, I think all that we have done will be fruitless, and I do not intend to support any continuation of these programs in the future. This kind of approach is much more important than is any possible economic revival.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the debate today, and it is probably unnecessary that I should submit any remarks. I shall occupy the time of the Senate for only a short period.

The resolution, Mr. President, is the result and the fruit of months of careful research, study, and the weighing of all its implications, not only by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but by the State Department and those who have been engaged upon the United Nations activities and our relations thereto. The resolution represents a statement of what the Senate wishes to advise the President and what, in our minds, are the real objectives in our foreign policy with respect to the questions mentioned in the resolution.

Mr. President, the establishment of the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945 was a gigantic achievement. It will be remembered that after World War I the League of Nations, in a precarious existence, accomplished some things, but failed to accomplish many things which the world hoped it would accomplish. The deliberations of the Conference at San Francisco were not without difficulties. The questions which this resolution touches today were all more or less the subject of long debate, long consideration, and long deliberations by the Conference at San Francisco. Many of us have been somewhat disappointed in the activities, or the lack of activities,

of the United Nations Organization with regard to many international questions. But whatever are its shortcomings, whatever are its failures, whatever are the disappointments which it has suffered, I maintain that the United Nations is still a great organization. It has supplied an international forum in which questions may be discussed and brought to the attention of the public, and in which solutions must be sought.

Be that as it may, Mr. President, I think the peoples of the earth are aware of its existence and are cautious not unduly to come into conflict with the United Nations.

I desire only briefly to refer to the various matters touched upon in the resolution. In the preamble it is stated that the Senate reaffirms our policy to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations. Of course, that is our policy; of course, we want to maintain it; of course, we want the world to know of our position, and we want to keep the enthusiastic support of our people and of the agencies of our Government with that objective in view.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is now 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Lunch time has passed. I think the Senate is considering one of the most important matters that could pend before the United States Senate. I am disturbed by the absence of Senators from the floor during the important discussion by the Senator from Texas, the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wonder if he will yield while I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would not seek to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. I would feel better, Mr. President, if I suggested the absence of a quorum. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Maybank
Baldwin	Ellender	Moore
Ball	Flanders	Murray
Barkley	George	Pepper
Brewster	Gurney	Thomas, Utah
Cain	Hatch	Thye
Capper	Holland	Tobey
Connally	Ives	Vandenberg
Donnell	Lodge	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only 27 Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is not present.

Mr. HATCH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. The entire roll has been called, and the bells were rung. Senators have been advised that their presence was desired on the floor of the Senate, and if it is in order, I should like to withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw it, and that the debate may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would point out that in the absence of a quorum the request of the Senator is out of order, and that the roll call must be continued until a quorum is present.

The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FEAZEL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. REED, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. UMSTEAD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I had begun to make a statement when I was interrupted by the kind suggestion by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] of the absence of a quorum. I did not seek nor ask a call for a quorum, because I know how busy many Senators are in committee work and other work outside the Chamber.

Mr. President, I made some reference, and I repeat briefly, to the establishment of the United Nations at the San Francisco Conference. Whatever the feelings of disappointment many people in the United States now have respecting the United Nations, the establishment of the United Nations was an outstanding achievement. Before that we were more or less without guidance, except for the establishment of the League of Nations, which all Senators know had failed without our participating in its activities or its failure. But, Mr. President, after months of toil and effort, the United Nations charter was executed as the work of that conference.

The Charter, in essence, is a constitution for the guidance of the United Nations. Like our own Constitution, it is subject, of course, to modification and change in the manner set forth in the Charter. It could not be expected that it would spring forth in full maturity and in full strength at a moment. It is bound to be, if it succeeds, a matter of growth, a matter of development, and, while the United Nations has not achieved all its objectives, I think it has made a substantial contribution toward the peace of the world and toward international cooperation. It has at least furnished an international forum for the discussion of international quarrels and misunderstandings, and for the formation of an international public opinion in the direction of peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, rather than to resort to the sword and the battlefield.

Mr. President, the resolution which is before the Senate today, stripped down to its bare bones, is largely a restatement of the United States on becoming a member of the United Nations, and an expression of hope that we may be able to achieve other improvements in the structure of the organization and in its work.

In the beginning, of course, the resolution expresses the attitude of the United States toward the fundamental freedoms and international cooperation through the United Nations. Then, recognizing the paramount authority of the President of the United States in regard to international relations, the resolving section not only reaffirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace so that armed force shall not be used except in the interest of all the nations, but we advise the President of the United States. We do not undertake to instruct him. We do not undertake to make this resolution a statute for the conduct of the United Nations or the peoples of the world; but we advise the President of the United States that the people of the United States should particularly pursue the objectives within the United Nations Charter which are named in the remaining portion of the resolution.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it not probably a patent fact that, in view of recent utterances by the President of the United States with reference to the present Congress, any advice or counsel we might give him would fall upon deaf ears?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not believe that. I do not believe that any President of the United States—certainly none within my knowledge or recollection—is or has been indifferent to the views of the Congress or of the people.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Even if what the Senator from New Hampshire said were true—and with that I cannot agree—would that in any sense relieve Senators from their constitutional duty to advise the President on such subjects as are properly within their duty?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very wise and valid suggestion. In fact, it would not only not relieve us, but would put a compelling pressure upon us to exercise our function of advice to the President. If he errs, we should undertake to bring him back to the paths of rectitude which we so consistently pursue.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I appreciate the fine Christian attitude of the distinguished Senator from Texas; but let me point out, and hang in the sky above the Senate, the admonition that in view of the statement that this is the worst Congress ever in the history of the United States, any counsel or advice we might give to the present President of the United States

would be discounted probably 100 percent.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator from New Hampshire is somewhat superheated over that little political statement. I do not believe that any President of the United States is wholly indifferent to the views and sentiments of the Congress of the United States, especially if he believes that the views of the Congress are supported by the views of the people of the United States. Perhaps the President is wrong. Aside from anything he does, regardless of whether he is wrong or not, that does not relieve the Senate of its function and responsibility to perform its duties, irrespective of what the President may think or say.

Mr. President, what are the objectives which we suggest to the President to contribute to the solution of international problems through the United Nations?

(1) Voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members.

At San Francisco the question of the veto was one of the most difficult questions, and attracted more attention and was the subject of greater labor on the part of that Conference than any other single question. The veto as to the use of armed force was practically agreed upon by all the nations with the exception of a few of the smaller powers. When it came to the decision on this question the major powers were all in agreement. Great Britain indicated that she would not sign the Charter unless she had the veto on sending her troops into war by a vote of the Security Council. The Soviet Republics made a clear statement that they would not sign the Charter unless that provision were contained within it. The United States delegation made the statement for the record that it would not sign the Charter unless the veto were available to the United States, to prevent the United States from being sent into war against its consent. So, that part of the veto had the practical unanimity of the powers, with the exception only of some of the smaller powers. There was agreement on that point.

But we did not go far enough in defining the difference between the veto in such cases and the veto in cases involving peaceable settlements and other activities of the organization. The final result was that the veto was not made applicable to procedural questions; but there was no definition of procedural questions, as contrasted with other elements of peaceable settlement. So the great number of vetoes which have been recorded in the Security Council have not been on the question of armed force; they have not been upon the question of actual aggression; but have been upon questions of peaceable settlements.

What we propose in this resolution is that the President of the United States, acting through our representatives in the United Nations, shall seek to bring about agreements to abolish the veto in all matters relating to peaceable settlements. That does not disturb the veto with respect to questions of the use of armed force, or military activities.

Mr. President, there should be unanimous agreement on that objective. I am sure that the people of the country would readily agree to support our views and our activities in that behalf.

The next objective stated in the resolution is as follows:

(2) Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

The Charter provides, in article 52, chapter VIII, as follows:

Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action—

I wish to stress the words "as are appropriate for regional action." I do not wish to see regional groups formed which may weaken the parent body, the United Nations. But if there are matters which are local, which are peculiar to the particular region, there is no reason why the nations in that region should not form a regional arrangement, because in a sense the overriding authority is still there, and it would probably have the right to determine whether or not the action proposed was appropriate for regional action. Furthermore, it is provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities must be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

If kept within those bounds, regional arrangements could perform a very useful function. As I suggested a moment ago, I would not want to encourage the formation of regional organizations which might weaken or sap the energies of the United Nations itself, because our objective in establishing the United Nations was to establish a strong, purposeful, and wise central body to preserve the peace of the world.

In the Western Hemisphere, at Mexico City and at Rio de Janeiro, we have already established a regional organization for the Western Hemisphere. We had there the example of the Monroe doctrine, which without any sanction by an international body as such, but through the sanction of the governments of the earth, and in the League of Nations Charter, recognized the existence and authority of the Monroe Doctrine. So we are hopeful that if kept within those bounds, there can be no danger, but much benefit in the establishment of regional arrangements.

The Act of Chapultepec and the Act of Rio de Janeiro should strengthen the United States and all the other countries or the Western Hemisphere in their devotion to peace and in their determination that any act of aggression against any one of the nations of the Western Hemisphere shall be regarded as an act of aggression against all of them, and that they shall resist it to the maximum extent of their manpower and other resources.

The resolution further provides:

(3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

Mr. President, much stress has been laid upon the insertion there of the language "by constitutional process." I have no objection to the employment of that term, but it is unnecessary because the Senate cannot perform any function except through warrant of the Constitution of the United States. Anything that is not authorized by the Constitution is beyond our power; it is ultra vires.

Another important feature of this particular section of the resolution is that we want the countries which possibly may be associated in these regional and other collective arrangements to stand upon their own feet, to rely upon their own resources, to strengthen their own arms, and to sharpen their swords, instead of relying upon the strength and resources of the United States alone. I think that is an important aspect of the matter, and I think it should be encouraged to the limit of its possibilities.

One of the attractive features of the European Cooperation Administration, the administration under the Marshall plan, is that under it we require that the countries participating in that plan—and they agree to do so—shall exert themselves to the limit of their means in meeting the objectives of that plan and in bringing about a restoration of their own activities and resources.

The resolution further provides:

(4) Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

Mr. President, the right of self-defense is inherent; it does not depend upon any constitution or statute or international agreement. In the Charter of the United Nations it is specifically provided that anything which would impair the right of self-defense does not come within the jurisdiction of the United Nations. I read from the United Nations Charter on that point:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations—

And so forth and so on. So, Mr. President, the right of self-defense is not derived from something written on paper; the right of self-defense is inherent. It is true that the Charter broadens it from individual self-defense to collective self-defense, which presents another aspect of the matter, but, after all, even those cases must be referred to the United Nations for final action.

I read further from the resolution:

(5) Maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as provided by the Charter—

That has been one of the weaknesses and one of the failures of the United Nations, namely, its failure to provide an

armed force, not for aggression, not for war, but to maintain the authority of the United Nations and to see that its decisions are, wherever necessary, enforced by armed might. All efforts so far to bring about the formation of such an international police force have failed. We established a staff committee, which was supposed to make arrangements allocating to each nation its responsibility with reference to its quota of armed troops; but that committee has been delayed by some of its members to such an extent that it never has been able to establish the necessary requirements with regard to the creation of an armed force. Furthermore, Mr. President, the resolution provides—

and to obtain agreement among member nations upon universal regulation and reduction of armaments under adequate and dependable guaranty against violation.

The question of universal disarmament is a most difficult one. It will not be easily solved. It will never be solved to the satisfaction of all nations or all people.

We recall that following World War I, the United States participated in conference after conference—at Geneva and elsewhere—in an effort to bring about universal disarmament.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator refer to conferences for universal disarmament or conferences for regulation and reduction of armaments?

Mr. CONNALLY. The provision of the resolution is—

to obtain agreement among member nations upon universal regulation and reduction of armaments.

The conferences at Geneva and elsewhere were for the regulation and reduction of armaments; and the provision of the resolution to which I have just referred is in harmony with that purpose. Of course, we failed in all those endeavors.

More recently we have made a very serious effort in respect to the regulation and control of atomic energy; but we have failed in that because of the violent opposition and the delaying tactics of one of the members whose consent was necessary in order to make such regulation and control effective.

The sixth paragraph of the resolution deals with the—

review of the Charter at an appropriate time by a General Conference called under article 109 or by the General Assembly.

Mr. President, that is a necessary and vital part of the whole plan for the establishment of the United Nations. Every organism, every living thing, must have a program for its future life. By this paragraph of the resolution it is provided that the United Nations Charter can be amended and the United Nations organization can be modified in accordance with developments which make necessary such amendment or modification in the interest of the nations of the world which belong to the United Nations and in the interest of the people of the entire earth.

It is provided in the Charter that what we here propose shall be possible. We think that when the proper time arrives, there should be a review of the entire Charter by the agencies set up to bring about such review.

Mr. President, it may be said that these are rather far-flung objectives. Of course they are far-flung. The are far-flung because they encompass the peace of the entire world. They are far-flung because they encompass suggestions which the United States expects to make through its President and through its representatives in the United Nations as to how that organization may be improved and how it may meet the issues of the future.

So, Mr. President, I believe that the adoption of this resolution will tend to strengthen the hand of the President of the United States. I believe the adoption of the resolution will make an impression upon the United Nations itself and upon the member nations. I believe the adoption of the resolution by the Senate will have an effect in Europe and elsewhere, for the nations will conclude that the United States is still pushing and fighting for the United Nations organization as the solution for international problems.

Mr. President, the chief objective in the establishment of the United Nations was the attainment of international peace, the destruction of warlike aggression. That is still the chief objective, though there are incidental questions of political arrangements and alliances and economic arrangements. But in the magnificent objective of world peace and the crushing of aggression and the muzzling of ambitious militarists, the United Nations is the one hope of the earth.

One reason for saying the United Nations has not failed is that, but for its existence, there is no assurance whatever that we would not already have become involved in armed conflict since the closing of World War II. There have been occurring all over the world incidents which might have provoked armed clashes, but the United Nations was standing up with its counsel, with its warnings, with its policies, which have discouraged and, in my humble view, prevented war.

So, Mr. President, I commend the resolution to the attention of the Senate. It comes with the unanimous support of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It comes with the approval of the Department of State after months of study and research. It comes with the approval of those who have been intimately connected with the development of the United Nations organization since the gathering at San Francisco of many nations brought it into being. It comes with the approval of those who have followed and directed and aided in promoting the objectives of the United Nations to achieve the noble end which it has had in mind and upon which it is founded.

Mr. President, the resolution serves as a restatement, a reproclamation of the attitude of the Senate and of the Government of the United States toward the United Nations and toward the accomplishment of the splendid objectives of that organization. I hope the resolution will be adopted by a practically unanimous vote of the Senate, so that our representatives may feel that they have the support, the aid, and the inspiration of the Senate of the United States and of the people of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas, in the course of his very able address, referred to the failure of the United Nations to have succeeded in implementing itself with the armed force contemplated by the Charter. The staff of the Foreign Relations Committee has prepared a very interesting study of the reasons for that failure, and I think it would be very illuminating if it might be printed at this point in the RECORD. I make that request.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for having it printed.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REASONS FOR FAILURE TO DATE TO PROVIDE THE UNITED NATIONS WITH ARMED FORCES

In February 1946 the United Nations Security Council took the first step to discharge its obligation under the Charter to negotiate as soon as possible the special agreements called for by article 43, which would provide the United Nations with armed forces. The Council did this by directing the Military Staff Committee to consider that article from the military point of view and make a report on the subject. The work accordingly undertaken by the committee was delayed from early April until mid-September 1946 by the alleged unreadiness of the Soviet delegation to participate, despite repeated efforts of other delegations, with the United States in the lead, to get them to do so. Progress thereafter was slow because of the basic divergences between the views of the Soviet representatives and those of the other members.

In December 1946 the General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution which, among other things, urged the Security Council to accelerate the conclusion of the special agreements. In February 1947 all members of the Council except the Soviet representative, who abstained, voted to adopt a resolution which included a request that the Military Staff Committee, in partial fulfillment of the Council's directive of February 1946, submit not later than April 30, 1947, its recommendations concerning the basic principles which should govern the organization of the United Nations Armed Force.

The report which the committee accordingly submitted on that date revealed certain basic divergences between the views of the United States, China, France, and the United Kingdom, on the one hand, and those of the Soviet Union, on the other. The most important of these divergences are described in the appendix.

The Security Council debated the report of the Military Staff Committee in 11 meetings held from June 4 to July 15 of last year. This debate did not result in any apparent progress toward the reconciliation of the divergences of view. Moreover, the Soviet representative indicated clearly that his Government had no intention of modifying in any way the views expressed by the Soviet representatives in the Military Staff Committee report; and he made it plain that his Government considered acceptance of those views by the other members of the Security Council to be a prerequisite even to starting negotiation of the special agreements, which could not under the Charter be concluded without the concurrence of the Soviet representative.

On July 15, 1947, the Security Council suspended action on matters relating to article 43 in order to devote its full attention to the Greek question. Due to the pressure of other bsuiness the Council has not resumed its consideration of the subject.

This Government is currently considering means of overcoming the obstacles which the Soviet Government has placed in the way of providing the United Nations with armed forces.

APPENDIX

IMPORTANT DIVERGENCES BETWEEN VIEWS RELATING TO ARTICLE 43 OF SOVIET UNION AND OTHER PERMANENT MEMBERS OF SECURITY COUNCIL

The following are the most important of the divergences revealed by the Military Staff Committee Report of April 30, 1947, between the views of the United States, China, France, and the United Kingdom relating to the implementation of article 43 of the United Nations Charter and those of the Soviet Union:

(a) The Soviet Union insists that no permanent member, except by special decision of the Security Council, should be permitted to make available to the Council pursuant to article 43 any armed forces of a type not made available by each of the other permanent members or to include in the forces made available any component larger than, or different in composition from, the weakest component of the same type made available by any of the other permanent members. The United States, China, France, and the United Kingdom are unwilling to accept this restriction. They take the position that the objective in implementing article 43 should be to make it possible for the Security Council, by calling out armed forces made available to it by members of the United Nations, to constitute a balanced force capable of promptly taking effective enforcement action in any part of the world. They consider that, subject to that, each of the permanent members should make a comparable overall contribution to the armed forces made available to the Security Council on its call but that these contributions may differ widely as to the strength of the separate components, land, sea, and air.

(b) The Soviet Union insists that the forces made available on call shall be "garrisoned" within the frontiers of the contributing nation's own territories or territorial waters except for forces engaged in the occupation of ex-enemy countries or other activities authorized by article 107 of the Charter. This restriction is unacceptable to the other members.

(c) The Soviet Union insists that, unless otherwise specifically authorized by the Council, armed forces employed by the Council shall automatically be withdrawn to their own territories or territorial waters within a time limit of 30 to 90 days after they have carried out the task assigned to them. This restriction is also unacceptable to the other members.

(d) The Soviet Union insists that bases are not embraced in the "assistance and facilities" which members of the United Nations have agreed by article 43 of the Charter to make available to the Council on its call in accordance with special agreements to be concluded. This interpretation is unacceptable to the other members.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the resolution proposes to advise the President of the sense of the United States Senate upon certain important aspects of our foreign policy, particularly with respect to the United Nations. Before proceeding to the content of the resolution, Mr. President, I want to endorse very heartily the procedure of the United States Senate—the Congress as a whole for that matter, if it chooses to do so—giving its advice to the President upon matters vitally affecting our foreign policy.

I have some correspondence here exchanged in the late days of President Roosevelt's life, bearing directly upon that subject, which I think may be worthy of presentation at this time.

On the 28th of December 1944, I received a letter from President Roosevelt reading as follows:

DECEMBER 28, 1944.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLAUDE: I am enclosing copy of a note from an important constitutional authority who has been with us from the beginning.

He does not like what you said!

Always sincerely,

F. D. R.

It was not communicated to me at the time, but I subsequently learned who the author of the comment was, and I have before me a copy of that comment. I shall include in this recital a letter dated December 1944, to the President, reading as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 19, 1944.*

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I call your attention to two passages in Senator PEPPER'S speech in the Senate on December 18, 1944 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 9775–9776) announcing the extraordinary doctrine that the Senate has "a coequal responsibility with the President to determine what is the foreign policy of the Government," and that "under the Constitution we have a right to advise the President in respect to our foreign policy." This is a new doctrine which should be challenged at once by the President before it obtains a foothold in the minds of the public. I know of no constitutional right of the Senate to make a declaration of our foreign policy. It is a dangerous doctrine, and I trust that you will not allow it to gain countenance.

Your respectfully,

CHARLES WARREN.

The writer of the letter, Mr. Charles Warren, is a distinguished constitutional authority, unmistakably.

I wrote to the President at a later time, on April 5, 1945, in which I said:

I apologize for not having replied to your letter passing on to me a letter from "an important constitutional authority who has been with us from the beginning," taking exception to my remarks in the Senate during the debate on the confirmation of the assistant Secretaries of State. I had intended to discuss this matter with you personally and I am sorry there was not quite time enough when I had the pleasure of seeing you recently.

The writer in one instance was not quite accurate in his quotation. What I said was:

"Not only is it the duty and function of the Senate to have a coequal responsibility with the Executive in the selection of the Department of State, but by the provisions of the Constitution, which requires the Senate to lend its consent to the ratification of a treaty, we have also a coequal responsibility with the President to determine what is the foreign policy of the Government and of the people of the United States of America."

I meant, of course, insofar as our foreign policy was expressed in treaties, the Senate has a coequal responsibility with the President. That I think is sound.

The writer criticized a sentence also which he took out of the context of the following quotation:

"There is no doubt whatever that, in order that it may be done in the proper and constitutional way, the sentiment of the country will have to be declared abroad by the President. But, Mr. President, let us advise the President of the United States as to what his declaration of policy for the country and for Congress should be. Under the Constitution we have a right to advise the President in respect to our foreign policy. In the past, has not the Senate of the United States initiated advice to the Chief Executive as to what our foreign policy should be, although not invited to give such advice? We can speak only for ourselves, not for the Executive."

In volume II of Haynes' "The Senate of the United States" page 576, the author says:

"There is no question that the Senate has a right so far to initiate a treaty as to propose one for the consideration of the President."

The author cites as authority for this statement G. T. Curtis, Constitutional History, I, 579–81.

Haynes in this volume II, pages 576–580, refers to a number of cases, some old cases and some recent, in which the Senate passed a resolution advising the Executive to initiate or to take certain action in respect to foreign affairs. These are the instances which were the background of my statement.

Mr. President, here is a matter to which I should like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee:

Since I have been in the Senate I have done what I could to get the Senate to appreciate that it did have a joint responsibility with the President for our foreign policy and to stimulate it to discharge that responsibility fully.

The practice of the Senate too often and too long has been not to discharge fully its responsibility with the Executive respecting our foreign policy. I consider it to be the duty of the necessary party to the consummation of a treaty, to give the negotiating party, in this case the Executive, some dependable indication as to the general policy it will support before negotiations are undertaken.

I consider it also to be the duty of such a necessary party to advise the negotiating party, if its advice is required, even during negotiations, what its general views are and what in general it would do. On the contrary, the Senate has too often declined to take any such responsibility and has waited for the negotiations to be concluded, the conference to be broken up, with the settlement of world affairs of the greatest moment in suspense, and then has gone casually about the examination of the treaty negotiated by the Executive, treating it with little more earnestness or diligence than they would an ordinary bill.

If our constitutional provision is to remain as it is and the Senate is the final authority upon the ratification of treaties, the Senate has got to be more ready to give its advice than it has been in the past or our Government shall not have the power to make prompt decisions, which I believe to be so essential to a sound foreign policy in the modern world.

I, of course, recognized in my address and certainly had no intention to question Jefferson's opinion that—

"The transaction of business with foreign nations is Executive altogether."

I thank you for giving me an opportunity to clarify my remarks concerning this important subject.

Let me commend you most highly on the way you have in practice made a working team of the President and the Senate which we pray will give us as great a peace as shall be our victory.

Faithfully yours,

CLAUDE PEPPER.

Mr. President, I have here the President's reply, dated April 9, 1945, only 3 days before his death in that year:

WARM SPRINGS, GA., *April 9, 1945.*

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLAUDE: Yours of April 5 has been sent to me down here where I am getting a 10-day vacation—more for catching up with mail than for a rest.

I like what you say and it is perfectly clear that fundamentally you and I mean exactly the same thing. As a matter of fact, while in questions of foreign policy the President ought to do the spade work of negotiations and the original nominating of certain officers, a long experience leads me to recognize that the Senate ought to be consulted both on the policy and some of the nominations. Both you and I know that as a matter of practice too much consultation would slow up both matters.

What is needed is the removal of the political point of view on the part of some Presidents and many Senators. There are altogether too many instances throughout our history—some of them, even recent ones—completely unnecessary. I like to feel that we have really accomplished marvels in the matter of both our domestic and foreign policies in changing the point of view of a lot of people toward more liberal trends, not only here but throughout the world.

On the consummation of a treaty, I hope that the next trend of public opinion will recognize that under our own theory nations are coequal and therefore any treaty must represent compromises. We cannot jump to what we consider perfection if the other fellow does not go the whole way. He might think that his point of view was just as good or better than ours.

I do hope to see you one of these days soon. I will certainly do so as soon as I get back from the opening day of the San Francisco parley.

Always sincerely,

F. D. R.

I think it is a proper function of the Senate to give its advice upon our foreign policy.

I called the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a while ago to my statement, because I think the Senate should be willing to depart from precedent and be ready to give its advice or consent when it is required. Consider the position of President Wilson when he was confronted in Paris with the question of our signature to a security pact in France. We joined France and England in the matter but the Senate never acted on it. It is my opinion that it would not be unreasonable—indeed, modern exigency demands it—that the Senate should be willing at any time to act within a reasonable time upon any request for ratification, with or without reservations, or to reject a treaty or agreement submitted by the President. In certain important circumstances we should be prepared to give an answer before a conference should break up.

I feel that where there is a partnership, and both parties to it must act affirmatively before commitment of this country may occur, we must be willing to depart from the precedents of an easier and more relaxed past and be willing ourselves either to give the President advice when he seeks it, according to our best judgment at the time, reserving, as the Senator said, the right to change our mind when the matter of consent is proposed, if it be only advice that we give, or to give the President at an early date a complete answer if the demands of the situation require it.

So I approve of giving senatorial advice to our Chief Executive in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

We are all interested in the perfection of our peace organization. Every Member in this Chamber in his own way has helped in that enterprise to the best of his ability. We all want to see the organization achieve every possible element of perfection. We know it has been a long struggle, Mr. President, to try to establish some sort of an organization to keep the peace of parts of the world and of the world in general. Such efforts go back to antiquity, and the struggle continues to the present day. We reached a great height in the League of Nations after World War I. Too much praise and tribute cannot be paid to the pioneer in that effort, one of the greatest of all mankind, Woodrow Wilson, who led in that valorous effort. But the League of Nations, in time, according to the judgment of events, failed. One of the principal causes of the failure of the League of Nations was the fact that the authority, the prestige, and the power of that organization were undermined and destroyed by various collateral agreements, pacts, and understandings which were entered into by the member states. There was the Locarno Compact, and various other compacts, entered into by states outside the League of Nations organization, attempting to preserve peace by alliances rather than by collective security, thus undermining the foundations of the League of Nations.

Mr. President, the same kind of action would undermine the foundations of the United Nations. I believe, therefore, that when we see that such action is a threat to the success of the organization, we should not encourage by our advice or recommend a process that will inevitably have that effect.

So, Mr. President, I am particularly addressing myself to paragraphs (2) and (3) of the resolution. I will say, as a preliminary to my remarks on those two paragraphs, that I joined with other Members of the Senate in the authorship of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 24. That resolution said:

That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should immediately take the initiative in calling a general conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war.

Mr. President, I am in favor of an effective world organization. I am not, however, willing to throw away what we have, which, on the whole, is making a good record, the United Nations. I know that, sometime or other, there will be a world government, but I do not expect to live long enough to see it. Events will not rush with that momentum down the pages of history. I know that the human race has been going through a process of integration into various states, and eventually they will all be integrated into a vast, colossal, effective structure, and I say, humanity speed the day to save humanity's peace.

Mr. President, my opinion is that time and faithful adherence by its loyal members are the best friends, the best architects, the United Nations has. Therefore, I believe that whatever is a bypassing of the United Nations, whatever threatens to undermine its power or prestige, or authority, is a step backward, not forward, and that we would better support the organization we have, and let time and momentum sustain and succor its strength, rather than try to break it apart upon the rocks of perfection at the present time.

Mr. President, relative to paragraph (1) of the resolution, we all favor the elimination of as much as reasonable of the veto, although the United States itself has never been disposed to eliminate the veto. We have made only moderate recommendations relative to its qualifications. But to that extent I am in hearty accord. There is nothing objectionable about proposing that we enter into voluntary agreements to limit the exercise of the veto power. All of us want the organization to succeed as completely as possible.

However, Mr. President, I do ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point certain marked excerpts from an address to the United Nations on September 24, 1947, by the Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie, in which he points out, speaking of the conflicts and differences in the United Nations:

These conflicts and differences do not result from the rule of unanimity among the great powers. The veto issue is more of a symptom than a cause. Both the Security Council, where the rule of unanimity applies, and the General Assembly, where there is no such rule, are being hampered seriously in their work by these conflicts and differences. It is tragic that the United Nations, up to this time, has been able only to a limited degree to fulfill its great obligations in the economic and social fields.

Mr. President, I ask that certain excerpts from the address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM LIE'S ADDRESS TO UN

I was very happy when the President asked me yesterday afternoon whether I had something to say before the conclusion of the general debate. The fact that I have not spoken at this session until now does not mean that I do not have much on my heart.

First of all, I wish to thank the members of the General Assembly for the friendly words which have been expressed by several speakers in regard to myself and my colleagues.

I have taken full note of all the advice and the suggestions which have been put forward regarding the secretariat and will keep in mind every critical comment, since it is my determination constantly to try to

improve the administration and to provide a more effective service.

MUST HAVE PERMANENT HOME

The most important administrative task which awaits the General Assembly is to take a decision regarding the erection of new United Nations headquarters. The United Nations must have a permanent home without delay.

At this time, I wish to express my thanks and appreciation to the personnel of the secretariat which, during more than 18 months, has overcome all manner of personal and technical difficulties in performing its work.

I am aware that even the present program of international action through the United Nations places a burden upon those member states which are at present faced with serious foreign-exchange difficulties.

I am determined that the work entrusted to the organization shall be carried out in the most economical and efficient manner.

I may be permitted to make some remarks of a political nature.

First. The question of new members.

From the very beginning of our organization's activities the general principle of universality has been commonly accepted in regard to this matter.

I see no reason at the present time to deviate from the idea that all freedom-loving nations which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and are able and willing to carry out those obligations should be accepted into the United Nations.

Consequently, I express the hope that action may be taken at an early date—if possible during the present General Assembly—to bring into our organization those nations which are now awaiting admission.

Both in 1946 and 1947 I recommended to the Security Council that all applicants should be accepted as members. I feel at this time that the organization will be served better by having the present applicants as members, thereby imposing upon them the obligations and responsibilities of membership, than by allowing so many nations to remain outside.

FINDS UN SUBJECTED TO TEST

I turn now to the more general question of the political situation which exists in the world and has found such strong expression in the declarations of policy which we have heard during the opening general debate in this Assembly.

I called attention to this situation, as it affects the United Nations, in my annual report on the work of the organization.

It is perfectly clear to all of us that this situation is subjecting the United Nations to a serious test. The very cornerstone of the United Nations, big-power cooperation and understanding, is being shaken by open differences between the powers.

The peoples of the world, and many Governments as well, are shocked, frightened, and discouraged to find that those same nations which created the United Nations are so openly unable to agree.

I wish to state my emphatic opinion that this situation, no matter how strong the political differences may be, does not constitute a threat to the existence of the United Nations.

It does, however, hamper the activities of the United Nations and its ability to perform the duties laid down for it in the Charter. It cannot fail to hinder the United Nations in promoting peaceful relations, economic cooperation, and social justice.

I shall not go into the particular political questions which have been considered by the first General Assembly and by the Security Council. We all know that many of them have not been settled and that in many of the important matters—for example, the control of atomic energy—two parties are definitely at odds, even though both of them have the same interest in securing effective control.

These conflicts and differences do not result from the rule of unanimity among the great powers. The veto issue is more of a symptom than a cause. Both the Security Council, where the rule of unanimity applies, and the General Assembly, where there is no such rule, are being hampered seriously in their work by these conflicts and differences.

It is tragic that the United Nations, up to this time, has been able only to a limited degree to fulfill its great obligations in the economic and social fields.

Economic instability and confusion are rampant in most of the lands of the world. Millions of human beings are threatened by famine, and in by far the largest part of the world chronic malnutrition, lack of education, and lack of means to insure the public health are the rule.

Certain nations have made tremendous contributions to relieve need and to encourage economic stability in various areas of the world. Yet it is clear to everybody that, when all is said and done, and to an ever-increasing degree, the world is an economic unit, and that these requirements can only be fulfilled by full international cooperation.

In accordance with the Charter, the United Nations has acted upon this fact and has set up an apparatus which is designed to facilitate world economic cooperation.

SAYS ALL CAN WORK TOGETHER

The actual work is complicated by the fact that there are different economic and social systems in the world. Yet the war has proven that it is completely possible for states with different systems and different ideologies to solve great and even overwhelming problems by working together.

Today we are faced by many such problems, overwhelming in their difficulty. Are not millions of people in Europe alone standing before the immediate prospect of hunger? Is not a very large part of Asia afflicted with a miserable standard of living, hunger, and epidemics? Are not great masses of people in Central and South America awaiting the day when they, too, can find a better life?

The dire need of many peoples in the Near East and Africa is known to us all.

It would be a grave thing for humanity if political differences and political suspicion should deny the United Nations the power to accomplish its great humanitarian work. Yet, in actual fact, such is the danger today.

We must work constantly to moderate these differences and to alleviate these suspicions. They must not be allowed to split the world into blocs and to form tight groups of nations which stand, one against the other, within the United Nations itself.

Let nobody forget that the initiative in the founding of the United Nations was taken by the great powers, acting together.

At Yalta the leaders of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States declared:

"Our meeting * * * has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen, in years to come, that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible and certain for the United Nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our Governments owe to our peoples and to all the peoples of the world.

"Only with continuing and growing cooperation and understanding among our three countries and among all peace-loving nations can the highest aspirations of humanity be realized—a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, afford assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. Victory in this war and the establishment of the proposed international organization," it concluded, "will provide the greatest opportunity in all history to create, in the years to come, the essential conditions of such a peace."

"Signed: Winston S. Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and J. V. Stalin."

The background for the formation of the United Nations was the feeling of brotherhood and fellowship created among the Great Powers by the war. At the San Francisco Conference this feeling was so strong that it was possible to bridge very serious differences by fair compromise.

Many of those who listened to the discussions at that time will say that we have already gone far from the spirit of San Francisco.

Just as it was cooperation among the powers which created the United Nations, so it is disunity among them which today creates our greatest difficulties.

It is easy to find strategic, economic, and ideological differences which explain this disunity, but it is impossible, and it is intolerable to think, that these differences should ever be allowed to lead to war.

I do not believe that there is any nation or any government in the world that does not want to prevent another war.

The greatest difficulty lies in the fact that the Great Powers suspect each other or each other's intentions.

It is fear which is the greatest danger. Fear breeds hate, and hate breeds danger.

We cannot alter the fact that there are not only different nations but also different types of civilizations, different ideas, and different interests in the world. But the indispensable condition for peace is that nations with different social systems and different interests shall strive to live and to work together, side by side, in peace.

This must find expression in political negotiations which show a willingness to compromise.

Without such a will, without cooperation and agreement, let me emphasize that no mechanism for the maintenance of international peace and security, however perfect, can be effective.

I can only express the hope that the nations will find a way to return to the spirit of the preamble of the San Francisco Charter: "To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another, as good neighbors."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I also ask to have incorporated at this point in my remarks about a page and a half from an able address by a distinguished professor of Vanderbilt University, Prof. D. F. Fleming, professor of political science, having the same general tenor as the remarks of the Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This attitude and the frequent use of the veto by Russia has led to a mounting campaign in this country against the veto and even to a statement by Secretary Marshall that we will forego the veto except in extreme cases. Yet, if the Soviet Union should suddenly propose abolition of the veto tomorrow we would undoubtedly fly to its defense as the Palladium of all our liberties. We would join Churchill in concluding that the Soviets are not really dangerous while they are so combative, but would be should they seem to be cooperative.

Actually there would have been a tremendous uproar in the United States Senate over the UN Charter, and every probability of its defeat, if the veto had not been in it. The Senate has always gone to extreme lengths in insisting upon the principle of the veto. Its 10-year refusal to enter the

old World Court was an expression of almost pathological fear that someone might put something over on us, under the guise of legal proceedings in a court of law.

The abolition of the veto, if it were possible, would undoubtedly mean the departure of the Soviet Union from UN, but nothing constructive would be accomplished thereby. The veto is not the cause of the trouble. It is the symptom of the bitter great power rivalry which now makes all UN sessions an arena for the struggle of the Big Two. The situation has deteriorated so far that our Government has refused to admit the right of the Ukraine to represent the Slav block in the Security Council. In effect, our consent to the Ukraine's membership in UN is withdrawn. We consider it outrageous also that Gromyko should veto the admission of Italy to UN because we will not admit Soviet satellites—Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and outer Mongolia. We seem to fear that our present top-heavy voting majority in UN might somehow disappear. We are content to let the vote of Panama always cancel the vote of the Soviet Union in the General Assembly.

When UN was established, the veto was meant to be a means of maintaining unity among the Great Powers. It presupposed negotiation, compromise, and agreement among them on all issues before UN. Instead UN has become a forum in which the great powers prosecute each other and attempt to impose their wills upon each other.

In this struggle neither side can prevail. If disaster is to be avoided there will have to be compromise. The Soviet Union will have to learn to yield often to the views of the majority of UN members and the American-led majority will have to learn that attempts to impose solutions upon the Soviets, especially in matters which closely concern them, are impractical. Above all, it should be starkly apparent that the UN cannot coerce either the Soviet Union or the United States without precipitating a third world war, which would end western civilization over most of the earth.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I now pass on to the heart and core of the resolution, the phases of it embodied in paragraphs numbered (2) and (3), dealing with the regional organization. I ask that there be printed at this point in my remarks a report on the United Nations Conference by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., in which he spoke of the problem of reconciling in the United Nations Charter the international organization with the regional organization, particularly, that had been established already in the Western Hemisphere, known as the Chapultepec Act.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the past fortnight general agreement has been reached on a number of other important points. Taken together with changes previously agreed upon, these form the basis of proposals which are now being drafted, section by section, into the Charter.

I wish to point out what I consider to be the most significant of these changes.

The Security Council would be given additional powers to settle a dispute in its early stages and to stop preparations for war long before war actually begins.

The relationship to the World Organization of regional security arrangements like that contemplated in the Act of Chapultepec for the Western Hemisphere has been clarified by another provision.

The United States shared in the desire of the other American Republics to maintain the inter-American system within the framework of the World Organization. We also agreed that the World Organization must be supreme in matters of enforcement. World peace is indivisible. The World Organization must therefore have the right and the power to prevent or suppress aggression anywhere and at any time. This conviction was embodied in the proposal put forward.

At the same time that proposal strengthens the role of regional organizations in peaceful settlement of disputes. It reemphasizes the inherent right of self-defense and extends that right to a group of nations whenever an armed attack against one of them can rightfully be regarded as an attack against all of them until the world organization has taken effective action to restore peace.

The inter-American system is thus brought within the larger framework of the world organization. The United States intends to negotiate in the near future a treaty with its American neighbors which will put the Act of Chapultepec on a permanent basis, in harmony with the world charter.

The steps by which a final solution of this problem was achieved offer a good example of the advantages of effective collaboration. The original United States proposal was partly based on separate amendments previously proposed by France and Australia. It was submitted simultaneously to the five large powers and to the other American Republics. Mr. Eden and his British colleagues offered opinions which strengthened and clarified its meaning. A later suggestion from the Soviet Union resulted in a further improvement. Because many nations collaborated on this problem, we have emerged with a far better solution than any nation produced alone.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I also ask to have incorporated at this point a report to the President dealing with the same subject entitled "Regional Arrangements," in which the following appears:

The United States and the other American Republics have had a special interest in the maintenance of the inter-American system, which has demonstrated its usefulness in preserving the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere and in advancing its welfare. This system had been in process of development for more than half a century and had only recently, in March 1945, attained full maturity in the Act of Chapultepec. Moreover, various countries in Europe, especially since 1942, have made alliances in the interest of their own peace and security, and seven Arabic-speaking countries on March 22, 1945, formed the League of Arab States.

All of these countries, and others represented at the conference, individually and collectively, were deeply concerned with the problem of their return to security in a world which, for the second time within a generation, had been devastated by a great world struggle.

I ask that the indicated passages be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These nations could not be expected to abandon instruments of regional cooperation which they considered essential to their security, but they all recognized the necessity of laying the foundations of an organization which would give hope of maintaining peace on a universal basis. Hence the problem arose of integrating regional arrangements and agencies with the establishment of a universal security organization. Articles 51 to 54 of the Charter are designed to effect this integration.

THE DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS

The Dumbarton Oaks conversations faced squarely the issue of the relationship between regional arrangements and a general international organization. It was held imperative to give the proposed world organization genuine and over-all authority to deal with the problems of war and peace. At the same time the value of regional arrangements was clearly recognized. The principle was accepted that regional instrumentalities which promote peace and security, and which stimulate confidence in the success of collective security arrangements, will, if properly integrated within the general framework, serve to strengthen the organization itself and further its purposes. This was the genesis of chapter VIII, section C, on Regional Arrangements, of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

This section stipulated that nothing in the Charter should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agencies, provided they were consistent with the purposes and principles of the organization. It was recognized that regional organizations might play a constructive role in the settlement of local disputes * * * either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

Similarly the Security Council could utilize regional arrangements for enforcement action, provided that such enforcement action should be undertaken only when authorized by the Council and that the latter should be kept fully informed of all action taken or contemplated under regional arrangements or by regional agencies. It was recognized that the Council must have a general authority over regional security machinery in order to prevent such arrangements from developing independently and thus possibly pursuing different ends. In other words, this provision was intended to coordinate the functions of a regional grouping with those of a general organization, and at the same time establish the final authority of the latter.

* * * * *

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND PACIFIC SETTLEMENT

With respect to procedures for pacific settlement, the phrase "resort to regional agencies and arrangements" was introduced in paragraph 3 of chapter VIII, section A (art. 33 of the Charter) in order expressly to recognize that an appeal in the first instance to collective procedures of pacific settlement which are available to the members of a regional community is an appropriate method of peaceful solution, along with the standard means mentioned in the original text.

The modification introduced in Chapter VIII, section C, paragraph 1 (art. 52 of the Charter) constituted the addition of a sentence providing that the member states entering into regional arrangements or constituting regional agencies "shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council." It is also provided that the Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through regional arrangements or by regional agencies. To insure the paramount authority of the Council and its right to concern itself if necessary with disputes of this character, an additional sentence was added to this article in which it is stipulated that the foregoing provision "in no way impairs the application of articles 34 and 35." The first of these empowers the Security Council to investigate any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction, and the second provides that any state may bring to the attention of the General Assembly or the Security Council any dispute or any situation likely to lead to international friction.

These modifications make it clear that regional means of pacific settlement such as those provided for in the inter-American system, including the procedure of collective consultation, shall be given the fullest possible opportunity to attempt a solution of local disputes and that the Security Council is to encourage and facilitate such an attempt. It is definitely recognized nevertheless that there shall be no impairment of the authority of the Security Council to determine, at its own instance or at the request of a member or nonmember state, whether the dispute endangers international peace, or to proceed to take other measures should local remedies fail to settle the dispute.

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE PACTS

The problem of integrating the special mutual assistance treaties within the framework of the Charter was one of particular significance. In order to deal with proposed amendments relating to such treaties, which were designed to prevent a recurrence of the policy of aggression by the present enemy states, the four sponsoring powers and France introduced, and the Conference approved, an amendment of chapter VIII, section C, paragraph 2 of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which became article 53 of the Charter. In this provision an exception is made to the necessity for prior authorization of the Security Council for regional enforcement action in the case of measures against these enemy states pursuant to article 107 of the Charter, or in regional arrangements directed against a renewal of aggressive policy by the same states, until the international organization, on request of the governments concerned, is charged with preventing further aggression by such states. Article 107, which is dealt with in discussing "Transitional security arrangements" in chapter XVII of this report, sets forth the special and temporary responsibilities of the victorious powers for policing the enemy states.

The amendment has the same objective as article 107, since it seeks to insure that there shall be no relaxation in the measures of control against the possibility of a renewal of aggression by the enemy states in this war, pending the time when the Security Council of the United Nations is able effectively to assume that responsibility. Neighbors of Germany, especially, stressed that the future peace and security of the world must rest on the permanent destruction of German and Japanese militarism, and emphasized that there must be no lapse of control over the aggressors lest the tragic experience of the interwar period be repeated in the future.

As a result of the provisions of article 107, the Security Council will not be charged with the responsibility for the prevention of aggression by enemy states until the governments having responsibility for such action as a result of the present war decide to have this responsibility transferred to the organization and the organization decides to accept it. The United States Delegation agreed to the exemption of measures taken under these mutual assistance treaties from the general rule that no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authority of the Security Council, because this was in accord with United States policy toward the enemy states.

The phrase "governments concerned," as used in article 53, includes both the parties to regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of the enemy states, and the governments, including the United States, which are responsible for such action as may be taken under article 107 in relation to the same states.

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND DEFENSE

The amendment which exempted the application of enforcement measures taken under the special mutual assistance treaties from the control of the Security Council did not meet the issue presented by other proposed amendments designed to give greater autonomy to regional arrangements in enforcement action. This matter was one of direct concern to the United States and to the other American Republics. The problem was met by the adoption of an additional amendment of special significance to the inter-American system.

This amendment, which became Article 51 of the Charter, stipulates that the member governments have "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security." Such measures, however, are to be reported immediately to the Security Council, and do not "in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council * * * to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

In thus recognizing the paramount authority of the world organization in enforcement action as well as the inherent right of self-defense against armed attack pending the time when the Security Council undertakes such action, this article, with the other relevant provisions of the Charter, makes possible a useful and effective integration of regional systems of cooperation with the world system of international security.

This applies with particular significance to the long-established inter-American system. Under the Monroe Doctrine the United States has long recognized that an effort by non-American powers to extend their colonial or political systems into the American Republics would be a threat to our own peace and security. The Declaration of Lima in 1938 recognized, and the Act of Habana in 1940 emphasized, that all the American Republics share our concern in the maintenance of this principle. That hemispheric policy of self-defense against non-American powers was strengthened and extended by the act of Chapultepec to a policy of collective defense by all the American Republics against aggression by any state, either from within or outside of the Western Hemisphere. Under the Act of Chapultepec the American Republics declared that an attack upon one of them is an attack upon all. Under part I of the act this declaration of mutual assistance would be effective for the duration of the Second World War only.

The American Republics at San Francisco were particularly solicitous that the Charter of the world organization should not prevent this concept of collective self-defense from being integrated by permanent treaty into the American hemispheric system as contemplated by part II of the Act of Chapultepec. Article 51 of the Charter, above referred to, makes it clear that this can be done consistently with the Charter. Also the Secretary of State announced that it was, in fact, the intention of the United States Government to fulfill the hopes expressed in part II of the act. By public statement issued at San Francisco, he stated the intention of this Government to call a conference before the close of the year, to conclude, consistent with the provisions of the Charter, the permanent hemispheric treaty contemplated by part II of the Act of Chapultepec.

In conclusion, it may be said that from the point of view of the national interest of the United States, the provisions on regional arrangements adopted at San Francisco insure the preservation of the inter-American system based on the good-neighbor policy as an integral and valuable element of an effective collective security system on a world-wide basis. It is believed that this has been accomplished without establishing a precedent which might engender rivalry between regional groups at the expense of world security.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I also wish to have incorporated chapter 4, entitled "Some Controversial Issues," involved in the adjustment of the United Nations Charter, from the "United Nations Conference on International Organization," which represents this aspect of the question:

REGIONALISM VERSUS UNIVERSALISM

One of the earliest controversies of the conference turned around the question of whether the principal means of maintenance of peace and security should be the concern of regional groups of the world as a whole—or, in other words, regionalism versus universalism. Many countries, prior to the Conference, had already entered into, and were bound by, regional security agreements, providing for the use of force to prevent or halt aggression in specific areas. Examples of such regional agreements are the Act of Chapultepec for the inter-American system, and the Arab League.

I pause to emphasize that today one of these regional organizations, the Arab League, is engaged in an invasion and aggression upon the territory of another people recognized by the United Nations itself as entitled to immunity from such attack.

I ask that this chapter be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER IV. SOME CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

As the discussion developed at the San Francisco Conference, it became clear, on the one hand, that there were broad areas of agreement, and, on the other hand, that there were certain issues on which there was strong divergence of views. Examples of questions, around each of which there was considerable debate, were regionalism versus universalism, arrangements for revision of treaties, independence or self-government as the aim of trusteeship for dependent areas, the "veto" power of the permanent members of the Security Council, compulsory jurisdiction by the World Court, and future amendments of the Charter.

REGIONALISM VERSUS UNIVERSALISM

One of the earliest controversies of the conference turned around the question of whether the principal means of maintenance of peace and security should be the concern of regional groups or of the world as a whole—or, in other words, regionalism versus universalism. Many countries, prior to the conference, had already entered into, and were bound by, regional security agreements, providing for the use of force to prevent or halt aggression in specific areas. Examples of such regional agreements are the act of Chapultepec for the inter-American system, and the Arab League. The question was raised as to whether such arrangements were consistent with the proposed world organization.

As a result of discussion, it was agreed that regional agreements should be given a part in the world organization both with regard to peaceful settlement and, under certain conditions, for the enforcement of peace, provided that the acts and aims of the regional group were consistent with the principles and purposes of the United Nations. The Security Council will definitely encourage the development of peaceful settlement of local disputes through regional arrangements and, where appropriate, will use such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority—but no enforcement action may be taken under regional arrangements without specific authorization of the Security Council.

REVISION OF TREATIES

The Covenant of the League of Nations expressly provided not only for the registration of all international treaties between members, but, also, for machinery under which treaties might be reconsidered on the grounds that they were no longer applicable, or otherwise were unsuitable. Provision for registration of treaties is also included in the Charter, though, in order to avoid duplication, only those reached after the formulation of the United Nations organization need be so registered, as previous ones will have been registered with the League of Nations.

With regard, however, to the provision of machinery for revision of treaties, opinions differed in San Francisco. On the one hand, many felt that relations between nations should be flexible and subject to adjustment as circumstances changed, but, on the other hand, the inclusion of such a provision for reconsideration in the League Covenant had led to wholesale revisionist propaganda with regard to treaties resulting from World War I, and it was felt that repetition of such occurrences after World War II could only lead to instability and might endanger peace.

It was finally agreed, therefore, that no specific mention should be made in the Charter of arrangements for revision of treaties, although such revision might, of course, be recommended by the General Assembly in the course of its investigations of any situation requiring peaceful adjustment.

INDEPENDENCE OR SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR DEPENDENT AREAS

Careful consideration was given at the conference to the aims and objectives for the development of non-self-governing areas; on these there was, in general, agreement. As a result, a declaration regarding all non-self-governing territories was included in the Charter. In this connection it is noteworthy that this is the first international instrument in which nations have adhered to such a declaration on obligations toward the people of dependent territories.

A controversy centered, however, around the questions whether, in the international trusteeship system set up under the Charter, the aim should be to help those territories to become independent or self-governing. Some felt that complete independence should be the aim in all cases, others felt that this might not always be desired or desirable. Some dependent areas are so small that they might be worse off if independent than if they remained part of a larger aggregation of territories. The phrase "self-government" was finally chosen to define an objective, with the understanding that the term was all-inclusive and covered the idea of independence, if the people of a trust area so desired, and if they were ready and able to assume the responsibility. It was also understood that the term included the right of a people to choose some status other than independence, such as, remaining a part of a larger aggregation of territories, if they so desired.

COMPULSORY JURISDICTION BY WORLD COURT

Another difference of opinion concerned the statute of the International Court of Justice. Should it include provision for compulsory jurisdiction of disputes? If such a provision were accepted, any member joining the United Nations would automatically subject itself to the jurisdiction of the International Court on all questions which international law recognized as appropriate. The chief argument against compulsory jurisdiction was that a number of countries might not be able to accept the Charter if it contained this provision.

The Statute of the International Court, which is annexed to the Charter, does not provide for compulsory jurisdiction. It does, however, include an optional clause under which members of the United Nations may agree in advance to submit disputes to the Court for settlement. The hope was expressed that voluntary acceptance of this clause would gradually result in universal adherence to the compulsory principle. In some respects this aim is already on the way to achievement. In the case of the Permanent Court of International Justice associated with the League of Nations, 45 states had accepted compulsory jurisdiction. The Statute of the new International Court, as attached to the United Nations Charter, provides that members who have made declarations accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court associated with the League shall be deemed also to have accepted the same principle for the new Court.

VOTING

The most debated single issue of the Conference was the question as to how decisions should be reached in the various organs of the United Nations, particularly in the Security Council. On what organs and in what circumstances should it be possible to act by simple majority? When should there be a two-thirds favorable majority of members present and voting? And on what questions were the United Nations as a whole willing to accept the principle that there must be unanimous concurrence of the permanent members of the Security Council—China, France, Great Britain, the United States of America, and the U. S. S. R.?

The Charter, as finally signed, provided for different voting procedures which vary according to both the subject matter and to the organ which is dealing with the question. In the Assembly, on important questions, such as recommendations with respect to the maintenance of peace, election of members to various councils, admission of new members or suspension of the rights and privileges of membership of others, the working of the trusteeship system, and the approval of the budget, decisions for action require a favorable vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting. On other matters in the Assembly, decisions may be reached by a simple majority.

With regard to the Economic and Social Council and to the Trusteeship Council, however, all decisions may be reached by a simple majority.

But on the Security Council, while decisions on procedural matters may be approved by a majority of any 7 out of the 11 members, decisions on all other matters must be approved by the same number of members, including, however, the concurring votes of all 5 permanent members. One exception to the latter part of this rule was accepted, namely, that with regard to peaceful settlement of disputes, a party to the dispute must abstain from voting.

The clauses requiring unanimity of voting of the permanent members of the Security Council on certain questions have added importance because that Council has many special powers in addition to those dealing with the maintenance of peace; for example, it is responsible for recommendations for the post of Secretary General and recommendations for the admission of new members.

It was around the requirement that decisions on the Security Council must be unanimously approved by the five permanent members that the most intense debate of the Conference developed. This requirement was contested by many states as giving to any one of the five nations with permanent seats on the Security Council a power to veto decisions desired by all other nations.

The five major powers contended, however, that if world peace was to be maintained, those responsible for its enforcement must work in harmony and that the powers which would have the major responsibility of using armed forces to safeguard peace should have the right of veto over any step which might lead up to the use of such forces.

FUTURE AMENDMENTS

Considerable discussion developed over the question of how the Charter would be amended in the future. Many delegates who had been dissatisfied with decisions on the right of veto by permanent members of the Security Council hoped that at a subsequent conference it would be possible to modify the rulings. On the one hand, it was desired to have a stable Charter and so build up world confidence in the organization; on the other hand, there was a need to provide for adjusting the Charter as experience in working together developed.

The Dumbarton Oaks draft proposed that amendments should come into force if approved by two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified by the permanent members of the Security Council and a majority of the other members of the organization. Later, the sponsoring powers added the proposal that a general conference of the members of the United Nations might be held at a date and place to be fixed by a three-fourth vote of the General Assembly and that any alterations of the Charter adopted by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly should take effect, if ratified by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

Still later, the sponsoring powers accepted a further proposal by which a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly and a vote of any seven members of the Security Council would be enough to call such a general conference for consideration of amendments. They further agreed that if such a conference had not been held by the tenth annual session of the General Assembly, the proposal to call such a conference should automatically be placed on the agenda of that session and a conference should be held, if desired by a simple majority of members present and voting and the concurrence of any seven members of the Security Council.

CHAPTER V. THE CHARTER THE RESULT OF UNITED EFFORT

Most effectively, the preamble to the Charter summarizes the aims and objectives of the United Nations, and the note on which the conference ended, namely, determination to act together for the common good. It reads as follows:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

"To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

"To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends

"To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and

"To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

"To ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

"To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples—have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

In the drafting of the preamble, leadership came from an elder statesman, a representative of one of the so-called smaller powers, Field Marshal Jan Smuts. Delegates from many other nations also contributed ideas which should be incorporated in the text and

offered suggestions for phrasing. The final form was the work of many minds from many lands. Indeed, the whole Charter, as it emerged piece by piece from committee rooms, and finally appeared before the full Conference as one integrated plan, represented the joint work of many minds of many nations.

In discussions of what happened in San Francisco, many tend to think in terms of the main controversies between the principles sponsored by the inviting powers and those advocated by other nations. Such a concept gives only one side of the picture. In the following paragraphs will be given some examples of major contributions to the plan made by the smaller nations.

The fact that the Charter endows the General Assembly—the town meeting of the world—with broad powers was a contribution from the so-called smaller nations. They pressed the point that the General Assembly should receive and consider reports from the Security Council on measures adopted to safeguard international peace and security, and that they should receive and consider similar reports from other organs of the organization, as well as from the international agencies which may be brought into relationship with the general body.

Another contribution for the improvement of the general plan of the Charter, made principally by the smaller nations, was the raising of the status of the Economic and Social Council to be one of the primary instruments of the organization. The purpose of the United Nations is to avoid wars and to help the various states of the world to cooperate with one another in all spheres for the good of the people as a whole. In this field, clearly, the Economic and Social Council should take the lead and be one of the key organs. As a result of suggestions from different nations, its powers and functions were expanded.

A requirement that full employment for all men should be among its purposes, rather than the more limited objective of the high and stable level of employment, was another contribution. The importance of including the promotion of general standards of health throughout the world, and the extension of the phrase "international cooperation in cultural matters" to cover educational cooperation, were other contributions pressed by different so-called smaller nations. Finally, the inclusion of a pledge on the part of individual members to take joint and separate action to further the objectives of the organization, was the contribution of still another so-called smaller nation.

The Security Council has the final responsibility as to whether or not it is necessary to call upon the forces of the United Nations to enforce peace. The bulk of the forces will have to be supplied by the five permanent members of the Council—China, France, Great Britain, the United States, and the U. S. S. R.—nevertheless, each of the 50 nations must bind itself to be ready to supply contingents. Under the draft plan submitted to the conference, the Security Council could have called into use the military contingents of other nations without their having any voice as to the disposition of these forces. Hence, a modification of the plan was suggested by one of the so-called smaller nations, and accepted by the conference as a whole, under which, if it is found necessary to call on the contingents of a nation not represented on the Security Council, that nation will be entitled to attend meetings of the council to participate in decisions on the disposition of its forces.

The discussion and final acceptance of such modified arrangements is a good example of the fact that, although four powerful nations drew up the basic draft of the Charter, it was 50 nations—a combination of the four sponsoring nations and the 46 other nations—who worked out the final plan. Furthermore, as has been said, in spite of the fact that the final Charter could not have satisfied every nation on every point, it was a plan which all agreed to accept as the highest common denominator of the ideas of all.

As the curtain fell on the scene in San Francisco, machinery was set going to bring into being the organization which had been conceived. As the representative of each nation sat at the table to affix his signature to the Charter, he immediately followed that act by signing a second document bringing into existence the Preparatory Commission which was to meet later in London to arrange the practical details for the formal birth of the organization.

The significance of the Conference was summed up by President Truman when he said at the closing session: "The Charter of the United Nations * * * is a solid structure upon which we can build a better world. * * * It was the hope of such a Charter that helped sustain the courage of stricken peoples through the dark days of the war. For it is a declaration of great faith by the nations of the earth—faith that war is not inevitable, faith that peace can be maintained. If we had had this Charter a few years ago—and above all, the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask to have incorporated in my remarks at this point certain indicated passages dealing with the meaning and interpretation of article 51 of the United Nations Charter, appearing in a book entitled "The Charter of the United Nations: Commentary and Documents," by Goodrich and Hambro. I pause only to say that Leland M. Goodrich, one of the authors, is a director of the World Peace Foundation, and Edvard Hambro, the other author, is a director of the Department of International Relations of Christian Michelsen Institute, of Bergen, Norway. This book is of date 1946.

Mr. President, this work interprets the intended meaning of article 51 of the United Nations Charter. I ask to have the portions indicated printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Charter of the United Nations, Commentary and Documents]

Background of article: This article, although included in the chapter dealing with action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression, was adopted at the United Nations Conference as a part of the arrangement for harmonizing the operation of regional arrangements and agencies with that of the general provisions of the Charter. More specifically it was the outcome of careful study and consideration of the best means of fitting the system of the American Republics into the United Nations, with special reference to obligations which had been assumed at the Mexico City Conference under the Act of Chapultepec.

In the Dumbarton Oaks proposals it was provided that the Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority, but no enforcement action was to be taken under such regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

* * * * *

Right of "collective self-defense": The article goes beyond safeguarding the inherent right of self-defense. It introduces the words "individual or collective," thereby making it clear that the right referred to is not only the right of an individual state to take action if an armed attack occurs against it, but also that of a group of states to take action when any member of that particular group is the victim of an armed attack. The reason for the word "collective" is obvious. It covers a situation which might arise under a regional arrangement such as the act of Chapultepec or the peacetime agreement between the American Republics envisaged under part II of that instrument. It is to be noted, however, that whereas the act of Chapultepec refers both to acts of aggression and to threats of aggression, the provisions of article 51 are more restricted, applying only to "an armed attack."

Does the use of the word "collective" envisage exclusively action under a limited agreement such as the act of Chapultepec or does it also permit action by two or more states without any definite commitment in advance, simply on the basis of common interest in meeting successfully a common danger? There does not appear to be anything in the commonly accepted meaning of the word or in the record of discussions at San Francisco to exclude the second possibility. In fact, in thus safeguarding the right of collective self-defense the article provides the opportunity for members of the United Nations to act together in self-defense if any armed attack occurs and if the Security Council fails to take the measures necessary to maintain or restore peace. Such failure can conceivably occur since, by the terms of article 27, a decision of the Security Council must be concurred in by all the permanent members of the Council.

The article as a safeguard of the Monroe Doctrine: From the point of view of the United States, this article has an added importance in that it provides at least a partial basis for the continued application of a traditional policy of that country, namely, the Monroe Doctrine. It is probably open to some question whether under this article the United States enjoys the full freedom of action to implement this policy which it would enjoy were it not a member of the United Nations.

* * * * *

The question which arises under article 51 is whether by the terms of this article the United States reserves the right to take necessary measures to resist acts falling into the two categories above referred to in the exercise of the inherent right of self-defense which the article clearly recognizes within defined limits. The view has been expressed that there is nothing in the Charter which limits our right of self-defense or "that impairs the Monroe Doctrine as a doctrine which has been proclaimed, sustained, and recognized by the world as a doctrine of self-defense." It is possible to accept this interpretation if it means that in case the United Nations fails in its efforts to maintain peace and security, the United States would have the right to take necessary action in self-defense. It would, however, seem clear that by becoming a member of the United Nations and accepting the commitments of the Charter, even with the reservation contained in article 51, the United States will not be free to take certain measures in the exercise of self-defense which we have felt free to take in the past. It will be necessary, first of all, to give the Security Council a chance to deal with the situation and it will be only in case of an armed attack that action can be taken in advance of or apart from any action which the Security Council may see fit to adopt. Of course any permanent member of the Security Council can, if it wishes to take a noncooperative attitude, assure the failure of that body in the performance of its functions.

Effect on authority of Security Council: The final question to be considered in connection with this article is the amount of

effective control by the Security Council which remains. It is to be borne in mind that under the regional provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals no enforcement action under regional arrangements was to be taken without the Security Council's authorization. Article 51 clearly opens the way to the taking of such measures by individual states or groups of states acting in agreement where the individual state or the members of a group are engaged in resisting an armed attack. This power of independent action exists until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. In view of the fact that a decision of the Security Council requires the concurrence of all the permanent members of the Council, it thus becomes clearly possible for any permanent member of the Security Council to postpone the taking of such measures if it seems in its interest to do so. The theory of the article would appear to be that the Security Council will take measures which after a time will supersede those taken in individual or collective self-defense, or under regional arrangements. To maintain the principle of Security Council control and supervision, provision is made that measures taken by individual members in the exercise of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter. It becomes clear, then, that whether or not this article opens the way for wholly independent and autonomous action by members or groups of members, without effective control by the organ of the United Nations made responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, will depend in practice upon the good faith shown by members of the organization and their ability to cooperate effectively.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I call attention to these words:

It is to be noted, however, that whereas the Act of Chapultepec refers both to acts of aggression and to threats of aggression, the provisions of article 51 are more restricted, applying only to an armed attack.

Mr. President, it also is very apparent that it was never intended that article 51 should justify states in getting together and forming a military alliance, entering into a general agreement about concerted action in the common interest or against the common enemy, and to standardize the military equipment and provide for joint supply of their armed forces, or that one of the nations should assume the responsibility of doing it. It was never intended in the conception of the United Nations, in my opinion, that such an instrument as the act of Chapultepec should ever take place. Distinctly article 51 is limited in the permission it gives for the formation of regional agreements to regional combinations to resist an armed attack, yet the Act of Chapultepec goes far beyond that. Yet I pointed out here that the Chapultepec Act is an act under which these Western Hemisphere states have gotten together not only to combine against an armed attack, but also against aggression and to threats of aggression as well—language outside the permissive scope of article 51 of the Charter.

The second thing is, Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, that article 51, when one reads it, and as the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as I understood, conceded this morning, was intended to give authority for something like a spontaneous and instantaneous resistance to an armed attack on the part of an individual state or of collective states which had a common interest in the security of the victim. The language is:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations—

Now how long do they have the right to maintain this suo sponti initiative in resisting such attack? Here it is—

until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

It is not something which is intended to be made a permanent affair, as when it has long been anticipated in advance that there might be an armed attack and there is set up an elaborate scheme and plans for resisting it. This was something that might be necessary on the spur of the moment, as it were, where the attack might demand the necessity for the victim and those interested to mobilize and resist assault until the Security Council, by collective measures, could come to the aid of the victim.

I read further from article 51:

Measure taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Now, Mr. President, in the first place it was the United States of America and Western Hemisphere countries which were responsible for the establishment of this regional principle in the United Nations Charter. It was done to recognize the pan-American agreement that had already been entered into, the act of Chapultepec at Mexico City in 1945, earlier than the San Francisco Conference, and the various amendments to the general principle and policy of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. President, it was we who injected this regional exception into the principle of universality, and of collective defense—the principal objective, aim, and purpose of the United Nations organization.

Mr. President, paragraph (3) of the resolution provides:

Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

We are told that that is advice which we should give to the President. That, Mr. President, is no doubt predicated both upon article 51 and article 52 of the United Nations Charter. Article 52 provides:

ARTICLE 52

1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

2. The members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

4. This article in no way impairs the application of articles 34 and 35.

Mr. President, as an interpretation of the meaning of article 52, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in my remarks chapter VIII, entitled "Regional Arrangements, Article 52," to be found on pages 182 to 186 of the book to which I referred, Charter of the United Nations—Commentary and Documents.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER VIII. REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

ARTICLE 52

1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Reasons for inclusion: This paragraph lays down the general principle that "regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action" are permissible under the Charter so long as they are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The express acceptance of this principle in the Charter was apparently dictated by a number of considerations. In the first place it recognizes the undoubted fact that national interest and national capacity to exercise power effectively are governed, even in the era of air communications and travel by geographical location, distances, natural barriers, and economic and political development. The policies of states must take these fundamental factors into account and it would likewise seem to be prudent to base any international system on the admitted fact that states are less interested and less capable of influencing the course of events in some parts of the world than in others. In the second place, that fact of gradation of national interests has found expression in national policies. The Monroe Doctrine is a policy of the United States based on a recognition of our special concern with the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. The failure of the United States to join the League of Nations was in large part due to the belief that we were being called upon to assume commitments that far exceeded our interests in certain areas.

Finally, in the historical evolution of international organization for purposes of peace and security the first emphasis has been on cooperation between those similarly situated with respect to interests which are to be served by such arrangements. The treaties of alliance entered into before 1914 were limited to those who faced a common danger of attack. Under the Covenant of the League of Nations, regional arrangements were entered into such as the Little Entente, the Balkan Entente and the Locarno agreements.

Briand's proposal for European Union[1] was a more ambitious attempt along this line. In fact the League itself tended to be primarily concerned with the affairs of Europe. Reference has already been made to the development of an inter-American peace system. The League of Arab States is the latest example of such a regional arrangement.[2]

While these and other considerations can be advanced in support of recognition of regional arrangements in any global system for peace and security, there are undoubtedly other considerations, likewise based on historical experience, which point to the need for great caution in admitting such arrangements into a universal system. For one thing they have too often in the past been directed against particular states and have been the occasion for fear and suspicion instead of inspiring confidence and cooperation. Treaties of alliance were condemned by President Wilson as a weak reed upon which to base international peace and security. Furthermore, they tend to emphasize limited commitments, whereas modern war and the increasing interdependence of the modern world reduce the possibility of thinking in such terms. Recent experience has shown how war spreads to engulf all nations. It therefore becomes increasingly true that peace is indivisible. These considerations, therefore, point to the need of keeping commitments general, while limiting the application of the regional principle to the practical operation of peace machinery or the strategic use of enforcement measures in dealing with a threat to the peace or a violation of the peace.

Certainly this problem of regionalism was one of the most important faced at San Francisco. The exact nature of the balance that was struck and the way that balance is applied in practice may determine the future success of the organization.

Meaning of "regional arrangements": The exact meaning of "regional arrangements or agencies" is not made clear although it is suggested by the qualifying words which follow and by the place that these provisions had in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals that such arrangements or agencies will have to do with the matters covered by chapters VI and VII of the Charter. In the course of the discussions at San Francisco a proposal was made by the Egyptian delegation to introduce a definition of regional arrangements into this chapter.[3] The amendment proposed read as follows:

"There shall be considered as regional arrangements organizations of a permanent nature grouping in a given geographical area several countries which, by reason of their proximity, community of interests or cultural, linguistic, historical, or spiritual affinities, make themselves jointly responsible for the peaceful settlement of any disputes which may arise between them and for the maintenance of peace and security in their region, as well as for the safeguarding of their interests and the development of their economic and cultural relations."

This amendment was considered by the subcommittee of Committee III/4 and by the committee and was rejected on the ground that while it "clearly defined obvious legitimate and eligible factors for a regional arrangement" it probably failed to cover all the situations which might be covered by regional arrangements.[4] The phrase "regional arrangements" as used in this and other articles of the Charter obviously does have a wider scope than the Egyptian amendment would admit. In article 53, as we shall see, it is made to apply to mutual assistance treaties entered into between states which are wholly lacking in geographical propinquity or in the other common interests enumerated in the Egyptian proposal.

The question of extending the provisions regarding regional arrangements to include regional arrangements with regard to economic and social matters was discussed at San Francisco. The matter was not considered as coming within the competence of the committee concerned with the drafting of the provisions of this chapter.[5] The Committee on Economic and Social Cooperation decided against the regional approach to the matters with which it was concerned.[6]

Much of the comment on article 51 bears on the general question of the place of regional arrangements in the Charter system.

2. The members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

This paragraph was introduced at the United Nations Conference as a part of the compromise there worked out for fitting a system of regional agencies and arrangements into the general system. It is to be interpreted in relation to the provisions of article 33. Under article 33 the members of the United Nations undertake in the first instance to seek a solution of any dispute whose continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security by peaceful means of their own choice. A number of such peaceful means are listed including "resort to regional agencies or arrangements." Under the provisions of article 33, however, no particular order of preference is indicated.

The provisions of the paragraph under consideration, however, specify that members of the United Nations, entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies, "shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council." It thus gives priority to "resort to regional agencies or arrangements" so far as "local disputes" are concerned.

The term "local disputes" is apparently to be interpreted as referring to disputes which exclusively involve states which are parties to such regional arrangements. The paragraph requires that before these are brought before the Security Council by the parties to them, the parties are to make every effort to settle them under such regional arrangements. It places no obligations, however, upon the Security Council to refrain from action.

3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

This paragraph, on the other hand, obligates the Security Council to encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes, by such regional agencies as have been agreed to or set up by the parties. It specifies further that the Security Council is to do this either by encouraging the parties concerned to use such procedures or by direct reference of the disputes by the Security Council to regional agencies. This idea of reference of disputes by the Security Council to regional agencies seems to be a new one, not wholly in harmony with the procedures laid down in chapter VI of the Charter. Under the articles of chapter VI the Security Council only has the power to recommend directly to the parties procedures to be followed in the settlement of their disputes, or the actual terms of settlement. It is, therefore, difficult to see how the Security Council can actually refer a dispute to a regional agency except upon the agreement of the parties concerned. What is apparently meant is that when the Security Council has before it a local dispute, which has been called to its attention under the provisions of article 35, it is to refer the matter to the appropriate regional agency, if such exists, on the basis of the undertaking into which the parties have entered under paragraph 2, for such action as the agency in question is empowered to take under the agreement establishing it. See also the provisions of article 36, paragraphs 2 and 3, and comment.

4. This article in no way impairs the application of articles 34 and 35.

Under this article the power of the Security Council to investigate a dispute either upon its own initiative or upon the initiative of a state, whether a member of the United Nations or not, for the purpose of determining whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, is safeguarded. The absence of any reference to articles 36 and 37 raises the question whether the provisions of this article are intended to exclude any intervention by the Security Council for the purpose of recommending a procedure for settlement or for the purpose of recommending terms of settlement. The over-all responsibility placed upon the Security Council under article 24 for the maintenance of international peace and security, taken together with the specific provisions of articles 36 and 37, would seem to warrant the interpretation that under article 52 there is no intention to deny to the Security Council the power to exercise its normal functions, if it becomes clear that the dispute is not being settled by regional arrangements or by regional agencies and that there is a situation in which the maintenance of international peace and security is actually endangered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the gist of that is that it was never intended that these regional arrangements referred to in article 52 were to apply to other states than those which were members of the regional group, and that the aim and purpose was to enable and to encourage them to settle disputes among themselves on a local and regional basis, if possible and it was generally inferred, and the context discloses it was intended and contemplated that the arrangements referred to disputes of minor character and significance.

So, Mr. President, it appears that there has been a gross misunderstanding of what the Charter contemplated in articles 51 and 52, and the resolution before us today proposes to perpetuate and to enlarge the error rather than to arrest and to circumscribe it.

[1] League of Nations, Documents Relating to the Oragnization of a System of European Federal Union, Geneva, League of Nations Document 1930. VII. 4; Memorandum on the Organization of a Regime of European Federal Union Addressed to Twenty-six Governments of Europe, by M. Briand, Foreign Minister of France, May 17, 1930, N. Y., Carnegie Endowment, International Conciliation, special bulletin, June 1930.

[2] UNCIO, the Pact of the League of Arab States, signed in Cairo, March 22, 1945, Doc. 72, III/4/1.

[3] Ibid., Interim Report to Committee III/4 by Subcommittee III/4/A on the Amalgamation of Amendments, Doc. 533, III/4/A/9, May 23, 1945, p. 3.

[4] Ibid., Summary Report of Fifth Meeting of Committee III/4, June 8, 1945, Doc. 889, III/4/12, p. 1.

[5] Ibid., Interim Report to Committee III/4 on the Work of Subcommittee III/4/A, Doc. 835, III/4/A/5, p. 1; also Summary Report of Third Meeting of Committee III/4, May 15, 1945, Doc. 363, III/4/7, p. 1.

[6] Ibid., Summary Report of the Nineteenth Meeting of Committee II/3, June 4, 1945, Doc. 780, II/3/53, p. 3.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Regionalism's Contribution to World Peace," which is published in the book entitled "United Nations or World Government," compiled by Julia E. Johnsen. On the cover of the book appears The Reference Shelf, volume 19, No. 5.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGIONALISM'S CONTRIBUTION TO WORLD PEACE

An important effect of the United Nations Charter will be a new emphasis given to the principle of regionalism. For the United States this has special importance because of its bearing on the Monroe Doctrine. For the world it means the first realistic step toward a truly international community based on law. * * *

The provisions on regionalism contained in the Charter are based on three principles: (1) Encouragement of regional agencies as an important way of settling local disputes by peaceful means; (2) recognition that members of a regional group may legitimately make provisions among themselves for their collective security; (3) emphasis that the world organization retains paramount authority in all enforcement action in case of threats to peace.

1. Article 52, therefore, states that nothing in the Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international security as are appropriate for regional action. Specific encouragement is given to members of the United Nations who are parties to such regional arrangements to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such agencies or through such arrangements. And the Security Council itself is directed to promote the pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies.

2. Article 51 recognizes that nothing in the Charter impairs the "inherent right of individual or collective self-defense" if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. This recognizes the right of parties to a regional arrangement to make provisions among themselves for collective self-defense.

3. Article 53 states that no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council. Where exceptions are given, as in article 51, this is conditioned by the warning that such measures taken under the exceptions must be immediately reported to the Security Council, which retains at all times its full authority and responsibility to take any action it deems necessary in accordance with its powers under the Charter.

An exception of its own kind, and of a temporary nature, refers to mutual-assistance pacts which have been or may in the future be entered into and directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of Germany and Japan. This refers to armistice and treaty provisions made by the victorious powers to prevent the return of German and Japanese militarism. In these cases full freedom exists, as far as enforcement action is concerned, from the otherwise paramount authority of the Security Council.

What is a regional arrangement or a regional agency? The Charter does not define these vague expressions. Actually two entirely different types of systems seem to be embraced in the language of the Charter. One context refers to an organization, strictly speaking. Another refers to a purely military alliance. A true regional organization denotes the existence of a permanent center devoted to broad objectives of welfare and friendly relations. Its duration is perpetual because resting on permanent factors of geography, language, culture, etc. Its operation is continual because it works toward positive aims. The definition of regional arrangement which the Egyptians once proposed for incorporation into the Charter brings out this idea very clearly.

In this amendment regional arrangements would have been defined as "organizations of a permanent nature grouping in a given geographical area several countries which by reason of their proximity, community of interests, of cultural, linguistic, historical or spiritual affinities, make themselves jointly responsible for the pacific settlement of any disputes which may arise between them and for the maintenance of peace and security in their region, as well as for the safeguarding of their interests and the development of their economic and cultural relations."

Quite different from regional organizations are the traditional military alliances which the Charter also includes under the term "region arrangements." The pacts for mutual assistance against the defeated Axis are nothing new, although the Charter shrinks from calling them by their old names. These pacts do not constitute genuine regionalism. They are the outcome of fortuitous political circumstances and do not rest on positive factors but only on the need of military assistance. These alliances are for ad hoc security needs, and even when relatively permanent do not envision the solution of common problems, but only military aid or concerted military action when such problems can be solved only in war. Even when concluded for long periods they are an expression of the old order based on balance of power. In short, the inclusion of such alliances in the Charter is a purple patch and incompatible with the concept of international organization for peace. Fortunately the pacts to which these provisions apply will become obsolete in the course of time, with the passing of the peculiar political circumstances which called them into being.

The United Nations Charter does not create any regional organizations, but it accepts them where they exist and encourages the creation of others in the future; and it defines their position in the pattern of general world security. Of prime importance is this to the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere. The American Republics had long been developing a sense of solidarity which led at length to the Pan American Union.

With a view to further strengthening this solidarity, the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace issued, on March 3, 1945, the Act of Chapultepec. This consisted of declarations of reciprocal assistance and American solidarity. It declared the principle that every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against the other states adhering to the act. To carry this declaration further, the signatory states agreed to consider the establishment of a treaty establishing definite procedures to carry out this collective program of hemisphere defense.

But, meanwhile, the Act of Chapultepec constitutes a "regional arrangement" in the sense of the United Nations Charter. Its activities and procedures are to be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization. In addition to provisions for collective security, the juridical equality of all the members is affirmed. Also, it is affirmed that any difference or dispute between the American nations, whatever its nature or origin, shall be settled by the methods of conciliation, or full arbitration, or through international justice.

The Monroe Doctrine is essentially a doctrine of nonintervention in the affairs of the Americas by a non-American power. On examination of the Act of Chapultepec, it is clear that the Monroe Doctrine is not only preserved but strengthened. The provisions for collective security contained in the declaration of March 3 are clearly aimed at preventing the kind of intervention, whether military or political, which it was the aim of the Monroe Doctrine to prevent.

Obviously, however, the program of collective military action envisioned in its regional arrangement could be ineffective if the consent of the Security Council were required. Lacking one vote of the permanent members, say that of China, which has remote interest in South America, the whole hemispheric defense system could be paralyzed. For this reason article 51 of the Charter was inserted, regarding the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense.

The phraseology of article 51 is not clear, of itself, with regard to enforcement action through regional arrangements or regional agencies. The expression "collective self-defense" is new and vague. But the interpretations accepted at the San Francisco Conference leave no doubt that it referred particularly to the system of hemispheric defense set up in the Act of Chapultepec. Said Senator VANDENBERG: "We here recognize the inherent right of self-defense—whether singly or collectively—which permits any sovereign state among us, or any qualified regional group of states, to ward off attack pending adequate action by the parent body."

There is another regional system which deserves consideration. This is the League of Arab States which was set up on March 22, 1945, consisting of the Middle East states of Syria, Transjordania, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Egypt, and Yemen. This pact provides a definite pattern for the peaceful settlement of disputes among its members. Compulsory arbitration is a special feature. It also provides for consultation among the members in the event of a threat to the security of any member of the league. In proposing its definition for a regional organization, given above, the Egyptian delegation had its own league of Arab states particularly in mind. Another type of regional arrangement is the agreement concluded between Australia and New Zealand on January 21, 1944, providing for collaboration for defense and for cooperation in matters of common concern in the Southwest and South Pacific areas.

The political effect of such regional groups, operating to preserve peace independently of the power-minded Security Council of the general organization, will be one of the most significant phenomena to watch in the future. Taking the idea of regional organization envisioned in the Act of Chapultepec and in the League of Arab States, several promising developments can be expected. Regionalism's ideal is cooperation in the solution of common problems. In this respect it is no different from general world cooperation. But circumstances make it possible for the regional organization to aim at much more than the world organization can hope to achieve.

First of all, we find in the regional organization a genuine juridical equality of all the members. There are no states with privileges. This means that it possesses a juridical equality far beyond the political orientation of the United Nations. There is compulsory jurisdiction of the system's court. The spirit of collective security is so strong that every attack of a state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of any of the members is considered, ipso facto, an attack upon the other members. This is not true for the world organization. Regionalism is the breach through which the attack against the doctrine of ab-

solute sovereign can be more successfully made. Nations will surrender, and are surrendering, their jealously guarded prerogatives more willingly to a regional organization with which they have a sense of greater solidarity, than to a global organization.

In short, we find in the regional organization the features of a juridical institution for international security that are so obviously lacking in the United Nations. The progressive development of international law will be made more easy by the many precedents that will be set in the regional courts. A sense of solidarity that the world organization has yet to achieve may gradually permeate the world from the example of the regional organizations. Above all, the privileges which the regional systems now possess for settling their own disputes peaceably, and even to enforce them by sanctions, will in effect diminish the importance of the Security Council. The rise of regionalism in the decades to come may well mean a shift of the center of gravity from the power-minded Security Council to the more juridical institutions of regional organizations. This development, it should be noted, will take place within the general framework of the United Nations Charter whose merit it is to have recognized the role that regionalism can play in world peace.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this was all predicated upon the Act of Chapultepec, as I said.

Earlier today the able chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee found himself a little embarrassed when he used the word "pattern," the indication being that this followed the pattern of the Chapultepec Conference. Mr. President, it is not at all surprising that the resolution in respect to regionalism follows in fact the Chapultepec pattern and program. The purpose has been disclosed in all the discussion on this subject to further in this resolution the same purposes as are embodied in the Pan American agreement. I quote for example, from a New York Times magazine article written by Hamilton Fish Armstrong in September 1947. In the article Mr. Armstrong lays down the pattern for the resolution which is pending before the Senate this afternoon. Mr. Armstrong wrote:

But there is nothing in either the letter or spirit of the Charter to forbid members of the United Nations from agreeing, among themselves, in more explicit terms than those used in the Charter, to carry out the organization's principles and purposes, by more efficient methods than those that the Charter itself provides.

Indeed, article 51 of the Charter expressly reserves to members the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense in the event of armed attack against a member.

I skip a little bit and read further from Mr. Armstrong's article:

This agreement—

Contemplating such an agreement as is proposed in the pending resolution—

would come into operation if two-thirds of the signatories decided that collective action had become necessary under the Charter and if the Security Council failed to act. The two-thirds majority is the same as that required under the Rio treaty for hemispheric action.

Now, the Rio treaty and the Act of Chapultepec are one and the same, Mr. President. One implemented and carried out the other. So Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong in setting the pattern for this pending proposal indicated clearly that he had in mind the Act of Chapultepec and the Rio treaty, the hemispheric regional pact entered into in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the able chairman to the remarks attributed by him by Thomas J. Hamilton, of the New York Times, on October 6, 1947. The headline is "VANDENBERG says United States moves to pacts to circumvent veto."

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., October 5.—Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, says that the United States policy already is starting to move in the general direction of the use of article 51, the self-defense article of the United Nations Charter, to make possible protective actions that would not be subject to the veto.

I quote further from the same New York Times article:

Senator VANDENBERG, in response to an inquiry by the New York Times concerning his views on the Armstrong plan, authorized publication of the following letter, which he wrote recently to Mr. Armstrong:

"I think your article in the New York Times is splendid. Furthermore, I think it is practical in many of its aspects. I am not attempting to pass formal judgment on the details. What I do say is that I believe you have opened up a most constructive line of discussion.

"Indeed, we are already starting to move in the general direction you indicate.

"You are proposing the use of article 51 of the Charter as the basis for protective actions outside the jurisdiction of the veto. As you know, we did substantially this thing at Rio—and I think most successfully."

I continue to quote from the Senator's letter, which is incorporated in the article:

"I should also say that your idea is implicit in Secretary Marshall's opening speech to the General Assembly. I very frankly and publicly said several times that I think our 'Rio formula' invites emulation in the United Nations.

"All that you say about the veto is true.

"It was never intended at San Francisco that the veto should become a tool to frustrate all efforts to lay a firm basis for world peace and security. Neither was it intended that the veto should nullify the fundamental obligations of the United Nations and its individual member nations.

"I am sure there is a method to make substantial progress without attempting the preordained futility of Charter amendments. Your article, and Rio, and Marshall's speech, point the way."

That is the end of the Senator's letter. I continue reading from the article by Thomas J. Hamilton:

In his opening address to the General Assembly, Secretary Marshall also attacked the Soviet Union's vetoes in the Security Council—which now total 22—and proposed that the great powers renounce the use of the veto under chapter VI, applying to pacific settlement of disputes, as well as on the admission of new members.

I now come to General Marshall's address. Speaking to the House Foreign Affairs Committee when he appeared before that body on May 5, 1948, General Marshall made these pertinent remarks. I quote from page 624 of the Department of State Bulletin of May 16, 1948:

In recognition of the possibility foreseen in the Charter that an armed attack might occur upon a member of the United Nations despite the binding obligations accepted by every member to refrain from the threat or use of force against another state, the United States and the other American Republics concluded at Rio de Janeiro last year a treaty for individual and collective self-defense. Certain countries of western Europe likewise have organized themselves into a western union for their individual and collective self-defense. By such arrangement, under article 51 of the Charter and the articles providing for regional arrangements, constructive steps have been taken to bulwark international security and the maintenance of peace. Our intention to afford encouragement and support to arrangements made by free nations for the preservation of their independence and liberty has already been stated by the President in his message to the Congress on March 17.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that statement of the Secretary of State, to which I shall refer again in a moment.

I now refer to an article by Mr. Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr., on page 1B of section 2 of the Washington Post of last Sunday. A little further idea of what is involved here today is made very distinct and apparent. The article deals with the ERP. The title of the article is "Marshall Didn't Ad Lib at Harvard." The article shows how carefully the State Department prepared the ERP plan. Finally, after it was brought to the attention of certain Members of Congress and the President, Mr. Dean Acheson sent up a trial balloon in Mississippi, when he made a speech at the Cotton Council, to see what the reaction of the country would be. After all that had happened General Marshall, speaking at Harvard, used these significant words which led to the adoption of the Marshall plan after the formation of the organization of 16 European nations as a result of General Marshall's suggestion. It is not difficult to see how that happened. This is what General Marshall said in the pertinent part of his remarks:

It is already evident that, before the United States Government can proceed much further in its efforts to alleviate the situation and help start the Europeon world on its way to recovery, there must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part those countries themselves will take in order to give proper effect to whatever action might be undertaken by this Government. It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this Government to undertake to draw unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe. The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so. The program should be a joint one, agreed to by a number, if not all European nations.

Mr. Kuhn, in the article to which I have referred, says:

Ships are plowing the Atlantic with supplies to supplement Europe's own production

efforts. The new concept of economic cooperation is at work, and the pattern is being followed in the military field as well.

Now we are getting down to the heart of this resolution. The pattern is being followed in the military field as well. Listen to these ominous words last Sunday by Mr. Kuhn in the Post:

The Senate now has before it a resolution, unanimously approved by the Foreign Relations Committee, opening the door to American military help to a European union, precisely as the Harvard speech did in the economic field a year ago.

That is what is involved here today.

General Marshall, in the House appearance to which I referred a moment ago, said:

The United States Government is now considering the steps necessary to bring the National Military Establishment to the minimum level necessary to restore the balance-of-power relationships required for international security.

Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment to strike out subparagraphs 2 and 3 of the resolution. The fate of that amendment will determine whether or not I shall vote for the resolution. Those two numbered paragraphs, with the best intentions and motives—which, of course, I do not impugn—are carefully designed and brought forth as the predicate for a subsequent request of this Congress that we enter into a military commitment to western Europe comparable to the economic commitment to western Europe in the Marshall plan. This program has proceeded in an orderly way. General Marshall at Harvard issued a carefully thought out invitation to European nations to get together economically to try to improve their position, with the implication that we would help them if they made a good and fair start and entered into an agreement which we would accept, to accomplish that purpose.

They took us at our word. They got together as a group of 16 nations. They formulated an economic plan, and submitted it to us. We finally approved it; and already we have authorized over $6,000,000,000 for it over the next 12 months, and even the appropriation made by the House of Representatives provides for a large share of those authorized funds.

Some time ago we were told by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, for example, that the next phase of this matter would be military. We were told by General MacArthur, General Chennault, and General Wedemeyer, all of whom sent messages to the House committee when the China-aid program was being considered there, that communism could not be stopped in China without the use of military force; that it would not be enough to provide economic aid. Mr. President, there may be those who think that communism in Europe cannot be stopped by the Marshall plan alone; that if those countries are attacked and if their security is threatened, we must come to their aid by the use of military means.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment? I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's speech; I wish him to take all the time he wishes to take. I simply desire to point out that sooner or later we shall have to announce whether we anticipate having a call of the calendar this afternoon. I wonder if we can determine now how many Senators wish to speak on the pending resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall take only a little longer.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to find out what other Senators wish to speak on the resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am confident that I shall be finished in 15 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to take about 10 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to state my reason for supporting the resolution; I wish to make that plain.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator state how long he thinks he will take?

Mr. GEORGE. About 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to make some remarks on the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that it was our intention to have the Senate take a recess when the consideration of this resolution was concluded. We thought it would be possible to take a recess by 6 o'clock if we considered this resolution alone today. Under the circumstances, I wonder whether it would even be advisable to consider having the calendar called today.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senator will make some provision for a call of the calendar either this afternoon or in the morning. I have on the calendar a bill which is purely local in character, but it must go to the House of Representatives for some important amendments. Undoubtedly that is true in a great many other instances.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. Then I think we shall let the understanding remain as it is. In other words, we shall try to have a call of the calendar after the disposition of the United Nations resolution is determined in one way or another. Of course, we hope it will not be necessary to have a night session.

Mr. GEORGE. If I could agree with other Senators that all of us would shorten our remarks on the resolution, in order to permit the calendar to be called this afternoon, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that I do not intend to speak at any length.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. I merely wish to be able to inform Senators who inquire as to the possibility of there being a call of the calendar today.

Under the circumstances, I shall inform Senators that the intention is to have a call of the calendar today—if possible, by 5 o'clock.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in my judgment it will be utterly impossible to reach the calendar by 5 o'clock.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have quoted from various authorities. I wish to quote briefly from our ambassador to the United Nations organization. He testified on the same day when General Marshall testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I read now from page 630 of the State Department Bulletin of May 16, 1948; this is a quotation from Ambassador Austin's statement:

Third, we should strengthen the military posture of our friends. History is full of evidence that the weakness of the just increases the malice of the wicked. We have acted to strengthen the economies of friendly states; now let us act to strengthen their military position.

Mr. President, that statement is by the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations organization. I read further:

Fourth, we should promote associations of like-minded States within the framework of the United Nations. The Act of Chapultepec, the Rio treaty, and the Bogota charter for the organization of American states are significant advances in this direction. Similar important associations are in the process of formation. There is, for example, the economic organization established by the 16 Marshall-plan countries. The unified defense system of the five western European states is another act which strengthens the United Nations.

Mr. President, ever since the United Nations was established, nearly every act to bypass that organization has been referred to as a pillar of its strength and support. I realize the problems we have had to encounter, and I am sympathetic as to them; but some time there must come an end to the decentralization and the wreckage of the United Nations organization. There must come a time when we resolve, as Abraham Lincoln did, that we shall stand by the Union and shall not set up some other kind of organization to accomplish the purpose that is contemplated by the pending resolution.

Therefore, it is very clear, from the history of the resolution before us today and from the statements of numerous authorities of the highest import and character, that this resolution is the summation of a plan that has been carefully produced to prepare the Congress and the country eventually for a military alliance between the United States and western Europe. That is essentially what is involved here. This resolution is another step in that inevitable direction.

I voted to have the United States go to war after we were attacked at Pearl Harbor and after war was declared upon us by Hitler. Regardless of that, I would still have been prepared to have this Nation use its great power and strength to prevent western Europe from being overrun by a monster bent upon conquest. I have always supported Woodrow Wilson's decision to take this Nation into World War I, for the same reason. If any power—I care not who it might be—proposed to attempt a repetition of that course of conquest, I would be just as ready now to lend my support to stop it as I was to do what I could to stop Hitler's aggression—or as I would have been, if I had been a Member of Congress then, to support Woodrow Wilson in World War I.

But in World Wars I and II here is the difference between what we did and what this resolution by implication would commit us to do. In World War I and in World War II, we made a choice when

we had all the facts before us to go in. We did not have any alliance like the military alliances that bound European nations together and automatically committed them to war in case those alliances were invoked by a victim of aggression, in which case the parties to the alliance had no opportunity to make a choice as to whether the circumstances justified their taking action or not doing so. For example, Britain and France were allied with Poland before World War II. When Poland was invaded by Hitler, there was nothing for them to do but automatically honor their treaty and go to Poland's aid. That is what they should have done when Czechoslovakia was attacked by Hitler and dismembered by him.

But, Mr. President, I am not prepared to see this country, by implication or otherwise, commit itself to the defense of western Europe or any other part of the world in advance, without knowing the facts and circumstances and conditions that would lead us to the terrible mobilization of our mighty strength. That is what is involved here. Otherwise, why do we adopt the resolution? What is it intended to do, except to give encouragement to western Europe to form a military union and expect us to associate ourselves with it?

Let me read to the Senate paragraph 3 of the pending resolution. There are the things we advise the President to try to negotiate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator let me read this first? I will then yield.

Mr. President, paragraph 3 says:

> Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

That is very nearly the same as what General Marshall said at Harvard, Mr. President, on June 5, 1948. It would give the countries of western Europe at least an encouraging suggestion that, if they will get together and form an effective and cooperative military alliance and call upon us to support them, we will do it. If the question were presented to us, they would have this resolution, if it is adopted, to encourage them to believe that we would follow through on the military commitment as we have upon the economic commitment. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, am I to understand the distinguished Senator from Florida to say positively that that is what the resolution does, that it assures them that after they make such a military alliance among themselves, we positively will help them through an alliance with this country?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a man would be blind and ignorant had he not received that impression from all that has been in the press, from all that has been said by outstanding leaders in this country. What else is intended? What are we talking about today, except a military organization, a combination of the nations of western Europe? We have one in the Western Hemisphere. We are not trying to encourage one over here. We are not trying to encourage Russia and the countries in her sphere to set one up, are we? Of whom are we speaking, if not western Europe? Is it not designed to prepare the Congress and the country to follow through with our commitment to go to their help if attacked?

I want to be fair with the able Senator from Michigan, than whom I esteem none more highly. The resolution, in paragraph 3, does contain a qualification, "Association of the United States, by constitutional process." I do not mean to be understood to say that adoption of the resolution automatically commits us. The Senate at least would have to pass upon the commitment the way we approved ERP. But, Mr. President, after Secretary Marshall had spoken at Harvard, after the President of the United States had spoken to the world, after the State Department had no doubt been in contact with Europe, the matter was laid in our lap. We had to go through with that or repudiate, as it were, what had already been indicated to be the policy of the Government of the United States. I am saying, let us adopt the resolution in such form that western Europe and the world will take notice we do not intend it to mean an encouragement to western Europe that we will support them with a military alliance.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am not questioning what the Senator meant. I just wanted to be sure, because we were assured so many times this morning that there was no moral commitment, there was nothing about any commitment whatever, the sponsor said—it was simply urgent advice to the President of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Then why should we adopt the resolution? What is it for?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to finish the sentence——

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. I know the Senator is in the midst of an impassioned plea. In order to make sense out of this remark I would have to coordinate what the Senator is now saying with what the distinguished Senator from Michigan and the junior Senator from Massachusetts assured me so many times this morning, which was that there was no moral commitment, we were not bound in any way, that the resolution had no such implication.

I agree with the able Senator from Florida, that when the Senate of the United States passes these resolutions that it has in effect committed itself in advance in the same manner, as the Senator so ably outlined, as the President of the United States and General Marshall committed the Senate and the Congress to the Marshall-Bevin plan. Several illustrations of advance commitments were made this morning, one of them being that it was like authorizing committee authorization of a project. There is no actual commitment by the Appropriations Committee, but there is a moral commitment; that when the Appropriations Committee receives the request that it will make the appropriation. That is my contention.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is not the conclusion.

Mr. MALONE. I agree with what the Senator says.

Mr. PEPPER. This is the beginning of it.

Mr. MALONE. The remainder of it is a matter of form.

Mr. PEPPER. This is not the last chapter, it is the first chapter in the new military contract.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say further, I do not like to be so aggressive, because, after all, I am speaking on the Senator's time, but I must clear it up in my own mind. The resolution represents the first step in a commitment, not a definite commitment in itself. The matter could be debated again, but it is a definite foundation for the nations of Europe and the nations throughout the world, to whoever may make such a treaty with the United States, or with whom we may make such a treaty, following the resolution. They have the definite moral assurance from the United States Senate that we will follow through. That is my contention. It was my contention this morning. As I understand the Senator, that is exactly what he means.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Mr. President, listen to these words again of General Marshall, appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

> Our intention to afford encouragement and support—
>
> "And support"—
>
> to arrangements made by free nations for the preservation of their independence and liberty has already been stated by the President in his message to the Congress on March 17.

Everybody understood that what the President said was an intimation that if Europe would go through with this economic program, in economic and political unity, and then would prepare a military program of comparable unity, we were prepared to give them our support.

This is an expression of an indication of opinion on the part of the Congress that Congress will support the executive branch of the Government in the consummation of that program.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not want to break my promise to the Senate, which was that I would quit in 15 minutes. I have already exceeded it. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator. I have consumed much of his time. But what the able Senator has just said has been my contention right along. I am happy to see that the Senator agrees that the whole plan from the beginning is one of an economic and political one world, and not for western Europe only. The economic one world is to be brought about through appropriations of money by this Nation—by making up the trade-balance deficits of every nation in the world, each year, in cash. Then we have the so-called reciprocal trade agreements under which there is to be a frank division of the markets of the United States so that

they may sell the product of their low-cost labor here, to reduce the trade balance deficit each year. Thereafter, the International Trade Organization arrangement will come before this body for ratification—this organization includes 57 nations with 57 votes. We have one vote the same as the smallest nation. We frankly then meet once a year and divide the remaining production and markets throughout the world.

The three moves complete the job of dividing and averaging the production and markets of the world—then this political one world comes along in a natural manner.

I have no quarrel with any Senator who admits that the resolution is just another step in that direction and will be the eventual result.

Now, one final word. That is just as the Senator has suggested. I agree with the Senator in every word that he has said, that it is exactly what it means, it is a moral commitment and another step in the economic one world idea. I congratulate him for being frank in stating what the succession of events, including these resolutions are trying to do in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I also ask to have incorporated in my remarks at this point the marked provisions of the Act of Chapultepec and the State Department interpretation of that act, which we referred to in discussion this morning, which shows clearly that we assumed obligations of a mutual and reciprocal character with our fellow nations in the Western Hemisphere, similar to those we would be expected to assume in any agreement we may enter in any other part of the world.

There being no objection, the provisions from the Act of Chapultepec, together with the interpretation, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From report of the delegation of the United States of America to the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, Mexico City, Mexico, February 21–March 8, 1945]

VIII. RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE AND AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

Whereas:

The peoples of the Americas, animated by a profound love of justice, remain sincerely devoted to the principles of international law;

It is their desire that such principles, notwithstanding the present difficult circumstances, prevail with even greater force in future international relations;

The inter-American conferences have repeatedly proclaimed certain fundamental principles, but these must be reaffirmed at a time when the juridical bases of the community of nations are being reestablished;

The new situation in the world makes more imperative than ever the union and solidarity of the American peoples, for the defense of their rights and the maintenance of international peace;

The American states have been incorporating in their international law, since 1890, by means of conventions, resolutions, and declarations, the following principles:

(a) The proscription of territorial conquest and the nonrecognition of all acquisitions made by force (First International Conference of American States, 1890);

(b) The condemnation of intervention by one State in the internal or external affairs of another (Seventh International Conference of American States, 1933, and Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(c) The recognition that every war or threat of war affects directly or indirectly all civilized peoples, and endangers the great principles of liberty and justice which constitute the American ideal and the standard of American international policy (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(d) The system of mutual consultation in order to find means of peaceful cooperation in the event of war or threat of war between American countries (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(e) The recognition that every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of the American nations and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(f) The adoption of conciliation, unrestricted arbitration, or the application of international justice, in the solution of any difference or dispute between American nations, whatever its nature or origin (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(g) The recognition that respect for the personality, sovereignty, and independence of each American State constitutes the essence of international order sustained by continental solidarity, which historically has been expressed and sustained by declarations and treaties in force (Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(h) The affirmation that respect for and the faithful observance of treaties constitute the indispensable rule for the development of peaceful relations between States, and that treaties can only be revised by agreement of the contracting parties (Declaration of American Principles, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(i) The proclamation that, in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American Republic is threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation, using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable (Declaration of Lima, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(j) The declaration that any attempt on the part of a non-American State against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American State shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American States (Declaration XV of the Second Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Habana, 1940);

The furtherance of these principles, which the American states have constantly practiced in order to assure peace and solidarity among the nations of the continent, constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment;

The security and solidarity of the Continent are affected to the same extent by an act of aggression against any of the American states by a non-American state, as by an act of aggression of an American state against one or more American states;

PART I

The governments represented at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace—

Declare:

1. That all sovereign states are judicially equal among themselves.

2. That every state has the right to the respect of its individuality and independence, on the part of the other members of the international community.

3. That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act. In any case invasion by armed forces of one state into the territory of another, trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute an act of aggression.

4. That in case acts of aggression occur or there are reasons to believe that an aggression is being prepared by any other state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, the states signatory to this act will consult among themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take.

5. That during the war, and until the treaty recommended in part II hereof is concluded, the signatories of this act recognize that such threats and acts of aggression, as indicated in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, constitute an interference with the war effort of the United Nations, calling for such procedures, within the scope of their constitutional powers of a general nature and for war, as may be found necessary, including: Recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radio-telephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

6. That the principles and procedure contained in this declaration shall become effective immediately, inasmuch as any act of aggression or threat of aggression during the present state of war interferes with the war effort of the United Nations to obtain victory. Henceforth, and to the end that the principles and procedures herein stipulated shall conform with the constitutional processes of each republic, the respective governments shall take the necessary steps to perfect this instrument in order that it shall be in force at all times.

PART II

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace—

Recommends:

That for the purpose of meeting threats or acts of aggression against any American Republic following the establishment of peace, the governments of the American Republics consider the conclusion, in accordance with their constitutional processes, of a treaty establishing procedures whereby such threats or acts may be met by the use, by all or some of the signatories of said treaty, of any one or more of the following measures: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radio-telephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

PART III

The above declaration and recommendation constitute a regional arrangement for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action in this hemisphere. The said arrangement, and the pertinent activities and procedures, shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established.

This agreement shall be known as the Act of Chapultepec.

(Approved at the plenary session of March 6, 1945.)

[From Aspects of Current American Foreign Policy, by the Department of State]

The Charter of the United Nations provides that regional organizations which are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations shall have a role in the peaceful settlement of disputes, and it envisages the authorization by the Security Council of regional arrangements to undertake enforcement measures in specific cases. The Charter also provides that nothing in it shall impair the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. The United States is convinced that a stronger inter-American system will mean a stronger world system.

In the midst of World War II, the American Republics met at Mexico City to make common cause against the Axis aggressors and to dedicate themselves to the perpetuation of the solidarity achieved under pressure of war. Toward these ends, the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace (Mexico City, February 21–March 8, 1945) approved two far-reaching resolutions. The Act of Chapultepec (resolution VIII), growing out of the conference, provided for consultation regarding measures to be taken in case of any threat to or attack upon the territory, sovereignty, or political independence of any American state, and recommended the conclusion of a treaty establishing common-defense procedures for making effective the decisions reached in consultation.

The Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security (Rio de Janeiro, August 15–September 2, 1947) met to fulfill the promise of Chapultepec and the sanction of the United Nations Charter. Under the inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance, signed at Rio de Janeiro on September 2, 1947, 19 republics agreed that an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states, and each undertook to assist in meeting the attack. In event of such an attack, each state shall decide upon the immediate action which may be required of it in support of this obligation. This immediate mutual-defense action is to be followed by prompt consultation to determine more definitely upon collective plans. Possible collective procedures range from the recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions to the collective use of armed force. Consultative decisions are to be made by two-thirds vote and are binding on all ratifying states, except that no state shall be required to use armed force without its consent.

"The purpose of the treaty," said Secretary Marshall, "is to provide for the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. It lays down in precise terms the agreed action to be taken in case of aggression from without or of aggression within the hemisphere."

Article IX approved at Mexico City in 1945 proposed the reorganization, consolidation, and strengthening of the inter-American system and charged the Pan American Union with the task of preparing a draft charter for the consideration of the International Conference of American States at Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948. The governing board of the Pan American Union has now drafted and submitted to the member states for prior study a project of organic pact of the inter-American system. The principal task of the Bogotá conference will be to integrate the inter-American system so that it may more effectively cope with the pressing problems of peace and security.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, just this brief addition. How are we going to distinguish this kind of military alliance—that is what it really comes down to—from that old basic military alliance policy of the past, expressed in that iniquitous and odious policy of the "balance of power"? Remember the old policy has never kept the world's peace.

What is proposed? General Marshall said, Mr. President—he being a military man, it was not unusual for him to say it, much as I honor him—

The United States Government is now considering the steps necessary to bring the national military establishment to the minimum level necessary to restore the balance of power relationships required for international security.

Mr. President, we have gotten away from the principle of collective security to regionalism and military and economic commitments, and are again back to the principle of the balance of power as the only means to keep world peace. That is where we are today in the foreign policy of the United States. It is that policy that this resolution will implement, Mr. President. That is what was done yesterday when we passed the draft bill. We are establishing again a balance of power. I voted for the draft bill.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I again congratulate the Senator from Florida for his utter frankness. That is the proper way to discuss these questions. Then we understand each other. When we come to vote on a resolution of this kind, as we voted on the draft bill yesterday, we have a basis on which to form our commitments. I voted for the draft bill because the President of the United States stated that there is an emergency pending, and since he forms foreign policy, he is in a position to know about that. I offered an amendment which would provide universal military service training, which I believe to be necessary.

When we were debating the Marshall plan I said that, if we could not settle these world problems through the United Nations, the only possible thing we could do would be to build our Military Establishment and spearhead it by the Air Corps that could keep any belligerent nation on the ground.

The Senator from Florida is correct. If there is an alternative to the military mind and the balance of power, which we have never liked and which England has practiced for a century, we should certainly find it. I again want to congratulate the Senator for making his position entirely clear to the Senate. While at the moment I do not agree that the Senate should commit itself morally, or in any other way, in advance, or to urge the President of the United States or the State Department to do something which they may or may not want to do, because the two departments are entirely separate under our form of government. I respect the opinion of the Senator from Florida. I have tried all day to have a frank discussion and understanding of the implications of the adoption of such resolutions.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much. I voted for the draft bill yesterday. I do not believe the RECORD will show that, with the exception of voting for an amendment reducing the period from 5 to 2 years, as did a majority of the Senate, I voted for a single amendment designed to whittle it down.

Mr. President, I want America to be strong. I can vote for a strong America without being willing to accept the necessity of going back to the balance of power as the only way to preserve world peace. We talk about a United Nations military force, a police force, and we all want it. We all want disarmament, not unilateral disarmament. Of course we shall not be stupid enough to disarm ahead of any other nation. I am sure we are agreeable to disarm when others are willing to do so. I hope we will be prepared to take the lead in such a proposal. We all want to see an international police force. But how can we get it if the Western Hemisphere has bound itself into one mutual-defense pact? Western Europe has another one with its staffs, its military forces, its coordinated plans, and defense arrangements, and the Soviet Union has its peoples and groups regimented into a third regional system of defense. How can we ever have an international police force which will be large enough to command world-wide respect, with the world divided up into three armed camps? That is what I do not want to see, Mr. President. I want to see an international police force. I do not like to see rampant nationalism that keeps great forces mobilized and that constitutes a threat to world peace. I know how difficult it is to have an international police force which will have authority over one great power, let alone a great regional group of power and strength in one system. Yet this resolution says that is what we promote.

Paragraph 3 provides that it is that with which we are associating ourselves.

What will it mean, Mr. President? It will mean that instead of having threatening nationalism we shall have threatening regionalism, and instead of having collective security, we shall depend upon what is called regional security to keep world peace.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the United States of America might not wish to encourage too much the establishment of a second great regional system in another part of the world. I speak today as an American. What assurance have we, if we build up three great systems of regional power in the world, that we can preserve the peace? Over there is the western European group; over there is the Soviet group; and we are in the middle. The western European group may say, "At one time we will play with the American group, and at another time with the Soviet group." Either group could do the same thing with respect to the other two. I am not willing to predicate the peace of the world upon three great regional systems of military combinations. That is contrary to the principle of collective security, which was the basis upon which the United Nations was founded.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I again want to express my admiration of the Senator from Florida for the clear way in which he explains his position. There is no camouflage and no attempt to evade any question. Such straightforward discussions result in our having an absolute understanding before we vote. We are making the first departure in the Senate from the policy of keeping the legislative branch separate from the executive branch, in that we are for the first time making a definite moral commitment in advance. That means that when any kind of an agreement is submitted to the Senate, there may be included in it a military alliance which will compel us to send our troops when a nation says it is being attacked. That same nation may actually be the aggressor, but we have agreed to send troops when they are threatened, without any further commitment from the Senate at all. All of this may be done.

I am not complaining of the stand which the Senator is taking. I am trying to get the matter clear in my own mind. Under the Monroe Doctrine, which kept us out of a major war for more than 75 years following its adoption in 1823, we were the judge as to who was the aggressor and when we would go to war, whereas, under a commitment of this kind, it can be judged by the nation which is being attacked or which alleges that its opponent is the aggressor.

I want to make it crystal clear that, in my humble opinion, the Senate should not make an advance commitment until we know the nature of the agreement, and only then after a thorough discussion and reference to a committee, and full debate. Then if we decide to enter into such alliance, we are committed.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly subscribe to what the Senator has said.

Mr. President, reference has already been made this morning to the words of George Washington. I quote from his Farewell Address:

> It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it.

Of course he did not mean we should break the engagements we then had. That is worth repeating, it is worth having the Senate hear it, if I may say so, today:

> It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world.

Mr. President, that includes every portion of the world.

It is appropriate also that we should hear what Thomas Jefferson said in his first inaugural address:

> Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.

Hear those words, Mr. President, again, from Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural, "friendship with all the nations, entangling alliances with none."

Mr. President, that does not mean that we cannot enter into an organization like the United Nations. That is a world organization. That is not an alliance. But what is this regionalism but an alliance, with a limited number of foreign nations, with whom we will be pledged to engage to associate ourselves, whom we are supposed to encourage with our sentiments, if we should adopt this resolution?

Mr. President, it seems to me clear beyond any words that what Washington and Jefferson had in mind was embodied in the Monroe Doctrine. We declared that we would defend the Western Hemisphere, that we would regard it as an unfriendly act for Europe to try to establish its system in the Western Hemisphere. I am not at all sure we should ever have converted the Monroe Doctrine into the Act of Chapultepec, that we should obligate ourselves to do certain things as a result of action by two-thirds of the member states in this hemisphere, rather than upon our own initiative and good judgment.

But surely the effect of the pending resolution cannot be to maintain and strengthen the United Nations. On the contrary, it violates the principle of collective security, which is the very essence of the United Nations. It violates the counsel of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and other illustrious men of the long past. It weakens and endangers the progress we have been splendidly making in a world-wide organization holding out hope of security to all nations and all peoples against aggression, without entangling or permanent alliances. It commits us to the folly of a course which we can neither predict nor prophesy.

I shall in due course offer my amendment to strike out this dangerous core of the resolution, and believe that the safety of the country and the peace of the world demand the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at this point an article by Sumner Welles entitled "Trouble With Britain," from the Washington Post of last Tuesday, June 8, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TROUBLE WITH BRITAIN

(By Sumner Welles)

NEED FOR FIRST THINGS FIRST

An identity of purpose on the part of the United States and Great Britain is essential if the English-speaking peoples are ever to see that kind of a world order for which they have fought in two World Wars.

Notwithstanding Prime Minister Attlee's summary denial, the relations between the two countries have suffered serious damage.

What needs searching inquiry on both sides of the Atlantic is whether Palestine is not a symptom rather than a cause of this deterioration in Anglo-American understanding.

Both countries continue to assert that their policies are primarily directed toward the growth of the United Nations, so that it may afford security, freedom, and prosperity to all peoples.

In reality both countries are reverting to nationalism. They have sought increasingly to use the United Nations as an instrument to serve their individual interests rather than the interests of the international community. The policies of Britain and the United States, like those of Russia, are contributing to the breakdown of the United Nations. All three governments are following the examples set by the major powers after the First World War, when their shortsighted selfishness destroyed the League of Nations.

The $3,000,000,000 credit and the help now being given under the European Recovery Program have been granted Britain because we know that the British economy must be bolstered for the sake of world recovery. Yet during this same critical period the United States disrupted Britain's economic planning by canceling lend-lease without notice, attached conditions to the original credit which nullified many of its benefits, and is now inclined to employ ERP as a means of influencing Britain to shape her economic policies to suit American prejudices. To cap the climax, the House of Representatives has emasculated the Trade Agreements Act.

If Smoot-Hawley isolationism dictates American tariff policy, neither Britain nor any other democracy will recover.

At the same time that we are appropriating billions of dollars in order to further British recovery, we are simultaneously insisting upon a series of narrowly selfish measures which threaten to make our help of little, if any, lasting benefit. While we are paying lip service to the cause of economic and financial cooperation under the United Nations, in our bilateral relations with other countries we are frequently taking action which impedes international cooperation and stifles world recovery.

Although the nature of the harm which British policy has done to the United Nations is distinct, its extent is even greater. Mr. Bevin seems to be convinced that British interests will be better served by the reestablishment of a balance of power than by the construction of a world order that can guarantee collective security.

For this reason that close-knit federation of the 16 nations of western Europe which could be the most salutary of the results of the European recovery program has been blocked by British opposition.

In order to insure British domination of the Middle East, Mr. Bevin is determined that Cyprus must be kept from Greece and that the former Italian colonies of North Africa must not be returned to Italian administration, however much this might conduce to Mediterranean stability and world peace. These territories are to be British bastions.

For the same reason neither justice to the Jews nor the welfare of Palestine has had any weight with Mr. Bevin.

There is no sorrier chapter in the history of American foreign policy than the record of this country's policy toward Palestine. But British policy, impregnated as it has been by Mr. Bevin's bitter prejudices, has dealt the greatest blow yet struck at the structure of the United Nations. By the financial and military support she has given to the Arab States, by her efforts within the Security Council to condone their aggression and their defiance of the authority of the United Nations, the Britain of Mr. Bevin has done as much to lessen humanity's chances of attaining collective security as did the Britain of Sir John Simon a generation ago when she prevented the League of Nations from halting Japan's aggression against China.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter into a long discussion tonight. I merely wish to make clear my own position on the issue before the Senate.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will re-

call, I am sure, that I insisted very strongly, when the pending resolution was submitted, that in paragraph (3) it be restated that any association we would have with any regional pact or other collective arrangement should be by and through the approval of the Congress, that is, by constitutional process. The principle was already stated in the resolution, in the resolving clause, in fact, but I wanted it repeated. I do not say that I was the only member of the committee who did insist upon its repetition, but at least I did, and I thought it very important.

In the second place, I insisted—and I think the chairman will bear me out in this also—that the report of the committee itself should make it abundantly clear and plain that any recommendation the President might subsequently make should be brought back to the Congress to be dealt with through the constitutional process, and that under this process we would be free to examine or reexamine the matter submitted to us for our approval or our consideration.

I realized then, and I realize now, that when we call upon the President of the United States to do certain things, that is, to enter into negotiations with other member states in the United Nations, and urge that he should particularly pursue certain objectives which follow in the resolution, we do assume a moral responsibility. It is undertaking a high obligation and a high responsibility to treat whatever the President may be able to accomplish in response to our resolution with the consideration which it deserves. At the same time, I felt satisfied with the absolute assurance written into the resolution itself that the final approval with respect to any association or any regional organization, or other collective arrangement, should be for the Congress, with a definite statement in the report of the committee that we would have the reserved right to examine the association which we were asked to make.

Not only that, but as I read the resolution then and as I read it now, it does not necessarily mean that we are called upon to make a military alliance with the western European nations, or any other group of nations, outside the arrangements which we have already made in this hemisphere. The language is "association of the United States with such regional or other collective arrangement," based upon certain considerations which seem to safeguard and secure our interests.

I do not think it necessarily means that any President of the United States will, in response to this resolution, ask that the United States enter into a military alliance with western European nations or any other group of nations. It might be that we would associate ourselves with a regional organization of nations in western Europe, as we have done in the recovery program. It might mean that we would associate ourselves with such organization looking to the defense of the States in that organization. We might do that by extending aid. We might do it by furnishing certain things which they would be required to have in order to accomplish that feeling of security which would enable them to make the progress which we hope they will make in the recovery program which we are undertaking to aid.

At the same time, Mr. President, I was unwilling, and would now be unwilling, to vote for the resolution without the explicit, definite statement on the very face of the resolution, that it must come back to Congress for its approval and with a report which would explicitly declare that we might examine whatever was submitted to the Congress without embarrassment, and free to examine it, free to consider it.

I realize that we are not here using language in a vacuum merely for the sake of high-sounding and reassuring language. We expect the President to do something. The important sentences in the resolution are found in paragraph No. 1 where we call upon the President particularly to pursue the objective within the United Nations Charter:

> (1) Voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members.

I do not think that on reflection there could be any serious objection to that recommendation to the President. We were very careful to say that what we desired the President to do was to seek a voluntary agreement among the member nations to remove the veto from all questions—not from some questions—but from all questions—involving pacific settlements of international disputes. We did not go beyond that. We knew the danger incident to going beyond and asking the President to seek an agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving settlements of international disputes and situations. So we confined it to pacific settlements and with that I do not think there can be any quarrel.

It is of course beyond dispute, as I see it, that the Congress may appropriately ask the President, within the terms of the United Nations Charter, to examine—

> Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

I had some doubt, Mr. President, that the United Nations Charter itself contemplated that a regional arrangement with which we would be associated could stretch across the Atlantic Ocean, but I was dissuaded from that view by some rather pertinent observations made by those members of the committee who attended the Conference at San Francisco. I still think, however, that a very careful reading of article 51 and the following article 52, would indicate precisely what was meant and what was contemplated, that is to say, that regional arrangements might be had or other arrangements for collective defense might be made between any group of nations which felt the necessity of doing so, within the four corners of the United Nations Charter.

The third sentence to which I have already referred, was the one which gave me concern, because I felt if we called upon the President to pursue this particular objective, to wit:

> Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

That we were undertaking a high responsibility; that we were of course committing ourselves to regard, with that seriousness which it would deserve, any recommendation finally submitted by the President to us.

With the safeguards I have indicated appearing in the very language on the face of the resolution itself, I became convinced that Congress would be the final judge of the desirability, the advisability, of associating ourselves with any regional or collective arrangements by any group of nations. That, coupled with the explicit statement in the report on the resolution that we would have the right, without embarrassment, to reexamine it, finally caused me to reach the conclusion that we could not decline to take this step at this particular time, and, very largely, for the reason, I may say, that if some assurance to western European countries is necessary for their economic stability and development to the point where they may become strong, and be able to stand on their feet, I have no doubt that in a great crisis we would in any event give moral and actual military support to western Europe.

We have given support to Europe in two great conflicts. We have given military support to Europe heretofore. It is not something new. If at this particular time in the history of the world it should become evident that a military aggressor was about to take over western Europe, we certainly could not stand idly by. With the assurance that here in the resolution itself we, the Congress, reserved the final right to say what kind of association we would undertake, and what our obligations thereunder would be; with the explicit statement that when the time comes, we would reexamine the whole question to determine whether or not in our own economic condition we could undertake, and to what extent we could undertake, assistance to any group of nations in western Europe—feeling that way about it, I felt that the resolution was proper, and was entitled to my support. For that reason, Mr. President, I did support it.

I have no doubt that much of what the Senator from Florida said is true, and that the giving of military aid and assistance to the western European nations has been talked of in many places. I have no doubt of that. I was particularly anxious myself that we should not undertake a lease-lend program until the Congress had an opportunity to take a look at it, or that we should not enter into any military alliance of any kind, character, or description, without a right of Congress to take a look at it; but, indeed, I thought that under the terms of the resolution we would stand upon very firm ground. I have no doubt that any President of the United States

before asking the Congress to associate ourselves with a group of western European countries would certainly take due consideration of all of the grounds upon which he based his request.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a rather interesting commentary on the line of thought of the Senator from Michigan that not so long ago there should have been such ready acceptance of the idea of a Pan-American compact and a doubt about the geographical association of western Europe, which is approximately 3,000 miles nearer to us than are the southern countries of South America. So far as communications are concerned, it is very much easier to go to Europe than it is to go to South America. I think there is a failure to comprehend the revolution of the air age. Certainly, as the Senator points out, from the standpoint of our interests, if there is any justification for our fears, they are far greater with respect to danger from the east than from the south. So without expressing any opinion as to the wisdom of an ultimate regional compact of this character, I believe that so far as geographical or contact considerations are concerned, there is ample warrant for considering it. Obviously, a revolution has been wrought in this air age.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the two situations which the Senator very properly points out.

I wish to make one further observation. I am not so sure that we shall advance the cause of peace by the development of regional arrangements. The development of regional organizations which have any other purpose than a purely defensive one against an aggressor to the members of such organizations would certainly tend very strongly to weaken the United Nations Organization, and would certainly tend in time to the development of the balance-of-power theory between the organized regions.

At the same time, Mr. President, it is my feeling that at this juncture of world affairs, and in view of our effort to get Europe back on its feet and strengthen its economy, we would, if it became necessary, be willing to consider what aid we could properly give to the western European countries. That being true, it seems to me that the Congress is well within its rights and is taking a step which may properly promote our final and main objective by asking the President to look into this subject and see how far and to what extent western European nations may become associated. Whether we wish to do so or not, we must give some assurance that in the event of a great crisis arising again in the world, we shall not ourselves be able to escape responsibility for aiding the remaining free peoples of the earth, on whom we can depend with some degree of certainty, so that we may finally have some friends on whom we can rely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I shall not speak at length. I would if I thought I could change the minds of Senators or if I could prevent the adoption of the resolution in its present form. I feel very strongly about what is going on in this country. We are being driven, or led, or are drifting—whatever one may choose to call it—toward war and the extinction of life on this planet, in all probability.

I do not believe that the members of the Reichstag in Germany under Hitler, or, at least the majority of them, were vicious men. I believe that they felt that a time would come when they could reverse the trend which was going on. They felt at that time that it was unpopular to oppose Mr. Hitler and his militarization of the country, so they drifted on until finally it was too late to turn back. We are moving along.

Yesterday the Senate passed a draft bill by a vote of 78 to 10, as I recall. I have no doubt that today we shall adopt this resolution, stating that the Senate is in favor of regional agreements, bypassing and undermining the United Nations. The same thing happened in connection with the Greek situation. We bypassed and undermined the League of Nations. The same thing happened in connection with the Marshall plan—bypassing, undermining, and weakening the United Nations. This resolution is in keeping with the measures which have gone before it.

There was considerable talk today about the veto, making it appear that the Russians have been the only villains all the way through, in order to get the people throughout the rest of the world to go along with the anti-Russian military bloc. At the time I spoke on the Marshall plan I gave a résumé of the vetoes, and made some remarks relative thereto. I had the résumé printed in the RECORD. I think it is appropriate that those remarks, together with the résumé, should be reprinted at this point as a part of my remarks, and I so request.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIAN VETOES

(Speech of Hon. GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, March 10, 1948)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, we insisted on having the veto included as part of the United Nations machinery. Doubtless, we expected to use it if circumstances had been reversed. It is widely acknowledged that the UN Charter would never have been approved by the Senate had not the veto been included.

During the time the United Nations has been in existence, the Russians have used the veto 22 times. A great to-do has been made about this. I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to present me a list of these vetoes and the reasons the Russians gave for using the veto. I think it might be enlightening, if not to my colleagues, at least to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to run through this statement, which was prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service. It was very enlightening to me; it astounded me.

Veto No. 1 occurred February 16, 1946. It was a veto of a United States proposal that, in effect, would have dismissed Soviet charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon. The Russians vetoed this dismissal of the charges against Great Britain, giving as their reason disapproval of the wording of the proposal. The fact remains that the charges were pressed and Great Britain was forced to get out of Syria and Lebanon.

Veto No. 2 occurred on June 18, 1946. It was a veto of a resolution to refer the question of the Franco regime to the General Assembly. The Soviets vetoed that resolution. They maintained that the Security Council should order a world-wide break in diplomatic relations with Spain, instead of leaving the matter for the Assembly. Personally, I agree with them. Anything that can be done to embarrass Mr. Franco, I am in favor of, and I believe millions of Americans would take the same attitude.

Then on June 26, 1946, they used the veto for the third time, vetoing a British-Australian resolution to keep the Spanish question on the agenda without prejudice to the rights of the General Assembly. This was very similar to the previous veto. It was the same question, approached from a different angle. This makes two vetoes on the same question, and marks the beginning of what I believe was a western drive to discredit Russia as seeking to undermine the UN by a reckless use of the veto. I believe the western powers were equally guilty of undermining the UN by indulging in such tactics.

One June 26, 1946, came veto No. 4. It was a veto of a contention that the British-Australian resolution on the Spanish question was procedural and, therefore, not subject to vote. That makes three vetoes on this one question of Spain. In using the veto this time, the Russians justified their position by quoting from the San Francisco agreement, which stated that:

"The decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not a matter is procedural must be taken by a vote of seven members of the Security Council, including the concurring votes of permanent members."

The experts whom I have consulted assure me that the Russian contention had merit at least equal to the arguments of the proponents of the resolution.

Mr. President, veto No. 5 was on June 26, 1946, of a reintroduction of the previous resolution.

So that makes five times the Russians vetoed proposals calculated to get Franco off the hot seat. Frankly, I would have done the same.

What I want to point out is that when we kept putting the same proposition up to them over and over, the conclusion reached at least by those antagonistic to Russia was that the Russians were using the veto recklessly.

Veto No. 6 was on August 29, 1946, of a recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations. The U. S. S. R. maintained that admission could not be recommended because it did not have diplomatic relations with Transjordan. Regardless of whether there is any validity to that argument, I should like to point out that a number of speeches were made on the floor of the Senate at the time criticizing Great Britain for seeking admission to the UN for Transjordan because its government was so completely subservient to Great Britain.

The next two vetoes are identical with the one to which I have just referred—veto No. 7, of a recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations; and veto No. 8, of a recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations. We evidently knew that the Russians would veto

these two proposals, inasmuch as they were identical with the Transjordan question insofar as the nonexistence of diplomatic relations was concerned. Nevertheless, we put them forward and got those two extra vetoes—three on the same subject.

Veto No. 9 was on September 20, 1946, an American resolution calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece. The Soviet Union held that no charges had been brought against Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and that to name an investigating committee would cast a certain shadow on them as well as on Albania.

Mr. President, why did we not ask the United Nations to take over the whole Greek question in the beginning? That is what I wanted at the time. All we want to make of the United Nations is a part-time sweetie.

Veto No. 10 was on March 25, 1947, of a British resolution stating that the Corfu mine field could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities. The Soviet Union could not agree that the resolution represented the true situation in connection with the mine incident and again used the veto. I have not had time to plow through all the testimony, and I probably never shall. It is very voluminous. I have too many other things to do. It is a technical question on which I am not prepared to pass judgment or even to express an opinion. The veto was used, in any event.

Veto No. 11 was on July 29, 1947, of a United States resolution to maintain the Balkan Investigating Commission in power for two more years and to vest it with powers of conciliation as well as investigation. Russia vetoed this resolution contending that the Security Council had no power to compel any country to admit an investigating commission and that the resolution could only create additional complications. Of course this all goes back to the fact that we had already taken unilateral action in Greece, had bypassed the United Nations, and only wanted certain actions taken when it suited our convenience.

The next three vetoes, Nos. 12, 13, and 14, are identical with 6, 7, and 8, the question of admitting Transjordan, Ireland, and Portugal to the United Nations. The Russians had once vetoed these proposals. We evidently knew they would veto them again, but it added three more vetoes, six vetoes on one subject.

Veto No. 15 was on August 19, 1947, of a resolution introduced by Australia calling on Greece and Bulgaria, Albania and Yugoslavia to cease all acts of provocation and to enter into direct negotiations to settle the border proposal. If the United States had been included as one of the culprits in that resolution and the resolution had insisted that everybody get out and keep hands off and let the United Nations take over, then it would have been a good resolution in my opinion. As it was, Russia vetoed the resolution which in effect was very similar to two previous resolutions calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece. That makes three vetoes on one subject again.

No. 16 was on August 19, 1947, of a United States resolution fixing responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for Greek border difficulties and calling on these nations to cease aiding Greek guerrillas.

Well, that strikes me as the height of hypocrisy on our part when we are interfering in Greece 10,000 times more than anybody else, at least, if you judge by the money spent in interfering. The Russians vetoed the resolution, which was similar to three previous resolutions dealing with the same subject. That makes four vetoes on a similar subject again.

Veto No. 17 was on August 21, 1947, of a resolution to recommend the admission of Italy to the United Nations. Russia contended that Italy was not eligible for membership pending ratification of peace treaty, so they vetoed the resolution. I am assured by our experts that there was sound reasoning to support the Russian veto, although the issue was certainly debatable and there was merit on both sides.

Veto No. 18 was on August 21, 1947, of a resolution to recommend admission of Austria to the United Nations, and this compilation prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service says same as veto 17—that is the one we just mentioned on the admission of Italy. So another veto was built up against Russia identical with the previous one.

Veto No. 19 was on September 15, 1947, of a United States resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the Greek border problem and to make recommendations on its solution. U. S. S. R. contended that adoption of this resolution would be a confession of the Security Council's inability to solve the problem and an evasion of its responsibility. This resolution is a close relation of four previous resolutions which the Russians vetoed and makes five vetoes on one subject again.

Mr. President, in order to be consistent with my original stand on the question of Greece, namely, that the United Nations should have been given the whole problem, I would have vetoed all these myself until the United Nations took full charge of the whole problem of Greece, including border policing duties, and removed all outside interference. This made a total of five vetoes on the Greek question.

Veto No. 20, on September 15, 1947, was on the question as to whether the United States resolution above was procedural or substantive. Russia had vetoed similar resolutions previously and it was probably a foregone conclusion that they would veto this one which simply questioned their right to veto the resolution on the Greek border problem. But you see, Mr. President, it added one more to the number of vetoes chalked up against the Soviet Union, making six vetoes on this Greek question. All of them, of course, were given inflammatory headlines in this country.

Veto No. 21 occurred October 1, 1947, on a resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contended that it would at any time admit Italy, together with Finland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria at one time, but would never vote for any of them separately. I dare say, Mr. President, that Russia is as justified in seeking to have her friends admitted to the UN as is the United States or Great Britain.

On October 1, 1947, the same day as the twenty-first veto, came the twenty-second, on a resolution to recommend admission of Finland to the United Nations. The Russians did us a favor, it may appear. The notation opposite that entry in this summary prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service says, "Same as Veto 21." So by clever maneuvering we managed to get the Russians on record with 22 vetoes.

As I say, Mr. President, when I was provided with this documentation I was astounded to find that this alarming number of vetoes concerned only four issues. And if we look at the question candidly, it would seem to me that our position in relation to these questions could well be carefully examined.

I hope the Congress never decides to put the President at a disadvantage by following this procedure. It might reduce his popularity in the same proportion that Russian prestige fell last year because of this veto question, but I am afraid the Congress would wind up in nearly as bad shape as the United Nations now finds itself. I think this whole business reeks of power politics and is a significant testimonial to the way the United Nations has been kicked around by the various nations in an effort to gain selfish advantage rather than peace for the world.

Mr. President, I should like to insert at this point in my remarks a brief documentary study of the Russian vetoes.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet-stated reason for use
Feb. 16, 1946	1	United States proposal that, in effect, would have dismissed Soviet charges against Great Britain for having troops in Syria and Lebanon.	Disapproval of the wording of the proposal.
June 18, 1946	2	Resolution to refer the question of the Franco regime in Spain to the General Assembly.	U. S. S. R. maintained that the Security Council should order a worldwide break in diplomatic relations with Spain, instead of leaving the matter for the Assembly.
June 26, 1946	3	British-Australian resolution to keep Spanish question on the agenda "without prejudice to the rights of the General Assembly."	Same as in veto 2.
Do	4	A contention that the British-Australian resolution on the Spanish question was procedural and therefore not subject to the veto.	U. S. S. R. vetoes this contention on the basis of a San Francisco agreement which stated that: "The decision regarding the preliminary question as to whether or not * * * a matter is procedural must be taken by a vote of 7 members of the Security Council, including the concurring votes of permanent members."
Do	5	Reintroduction of previous resolution [veto]	Same as veto 4.
Aug. 29, 1946	6	Recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations	U. S. S. R. maintained that admission could not be recommended because it did not have diplomatic relations with Transjordan.
Do	7	Recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations	Same as veto 6.
Do	8	Recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations	Do.
Sept. 20, 1946	9	American resolution calling for investigation of frontier incidents along the northern border of Greece.	Soviet Union held that no charges had been brought against Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and that to name an investigating committee would "cast a certain shadow on them" as well as on Albania.
Mar. 25, 1947	10	British resolution stating that the Corfu mine field could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities.	Soviet Union could not agree that the resolution represented the true situation in connection with the mine incident.
July 29, 1947	11	United States resolution to maintain Balkan Investigating Commission in power for 2 more years and to vest it with powers of conciliation as well as investigation.	U. S. S. R. held that the Security Council had no power to compel any country to admit an investigating commission and that the resolution could only create additional complications.

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.—Continued

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet-stated reason for use
Aug. 18, 1947	12	Recommendation that Transjordan be admitted to the United Nations	Same as veto 6.
Do	13	Recommendation that Ireland be admitted to the United Nations	Do.
Do	14	Recommendation that Portugal be admitted to the United Nations	Do.
Aug. 19, 1947	15	Resolution introduced by Australia calling on Greece and Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia "to cease all acts of provocation" and to enter into direct negotiations to settle the border problem.	U. S. S. R. contended that nothing had transpired to alter its views on the Greek situation.
Do	16	United States resolution fixing responsibility on Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria for Greek border difficulties and calling on these nations to cease aiding Greek guerrillas.	U. S. S. R. pointed out that if action on the Australian proposal above [veto 15] was inacceptable, then this proposal "should be considered inacceptable even to a greater degree."
Aug. 21, 1947	17	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations	Russia contended that Italy was not eligible for membership, pending ratification of peace treaty.
Do	18	Resolution to recommend admission of Austria to the United Nations	Same as veto 17.
Sept. 15, 1947	19	United States resolution requesting the General Assembly to consider the Greek border problem and make recommendations on its solution.	U. S. S. R. contended that adoption of resolution would be a confession of the Security Council of its inability to solve the problem and an evasion of its responsibility.
Do	20	Whether the United States resolution above was procedural or substantive	See veto 4.
Oct. 1, 1947	21	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations	U. S. S. R. contended that it would at any time admit Italy together with Finland, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria at one time, but would never vote for any of them separately.
Do	22	Resolution to recommend admission of Finland to the United Nations	Same as veto 21.

Mr. TAYLOR. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an analysis of the last three vetoes, 23, 24, and 25.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Use of the veto in the Security Council by the U. S. S. R.

Date	Veto No.	Issue	Soviet stated reason for use
Apr. 10, 1948	23	Resolution to recommend admission of Italy to the United Nations.	See vetoes 17 and 21. U. S. S. R. agreed that Italy was eligible for membership but that she must be admitted simultaneously with 4 other enemy states: Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Finland.
May 24, 1948	24	Joint Chilean-Argentinian resolution to set up a subcommittee of 3 to hear charges that the U. S. S. R. had used the threat of force to bring on the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia last February.	Gromyko charged that the resolution was nothing but a new scheme for "investigation, investigation, investigation." He also charged that the Argentine plan was nothing but a hunt for more vetoes.
Do	25	A contention that the issue involved in veto 24 was procedural and therefore not subject to the veto.	See vetoes 4 and 20.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very often I am talking with people and telling them that I feel that it is possible for us to live in this world with the Russians, they bring up the question of the veto. A great to-do has been made over it. I do not believe there is a Member of this body who would say that Mr. Sumner Welles is a radical, a Russia lover, pro-Communist, or anything else of that descripton. Yet in the New York Times, in a book review, Mr. Sumner Welles has this to say:

> This bankruptcy of the Security Council has been due to no Soviet veto. It has been due exclusively to the policies of selfish and short-sighted expediency pursued by Great Britain, and still more by the United States.

I have never gone so far as to make a statement as strong as that of Mr. Sumner Welles in his new book. I have contended in the past, and I now contend, that the Russians are not entirely to blame; that we have deliberately badgered them into positions where they had to veto various things. The large number of vetoes has been used as a propaganda weapon to bolster the arguments of those who say that we must inevitably fight Russia, those who are forcing us into an armament economy, which can only end in enriching the monopolists, the cartelists, and the armament makers, and bringing us closer to an inevitable war. They have used these arguments and built them up artificially.

Now we have this resolution. Certainly I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Florida striking out paragraphs 2 and 3. It seems to me that paragraph 4 should also go out. It says:

> Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

Of course, that is merely another threat to say that we are ready to fight. Russia knows, without our reiterating it, that we are ready to fight any time we are attacked. I do not believe that we are in danger of being attacked. I have studied the problem carefully for years. I have read everything relative to Russia that I could lay my hands on. I have read the bad books as well as the good books—Out of the Night, and I Chose Freedom, and all the others, as well as the writings of the Dean of Canterbury. From reading all of them, I sincerely believe that we can get along with Russia; that Russia has many reasons for wanting peace. But I do not believe those who control the destinies of our country genuinely desire peace with Russia. I believe we are being led toward the destruction of mankind.

As I have said, if I thought it could stop this mad rush to war, I would go to any lengths. In fact, everyone knows that last fall I started to ride across the country on a horse—not for publicity for myself, but to try to warn the American people of what is being done to them. I care not for myself or my future what may happen to me. I should be very happy to renounce any further part in public life if I thought it would help in any way the cause of world peace.

So I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a brief item which I should like to bring to the attention of the country—not particularly to the attention of the Senate, but to the attention of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is an Associated Press dispatch:

> LONDON, June 11.—Lord Beaverbrook says he runs papers purely for propaganda.

Mr. President, the sooner the American people find out that at least approximately 90 percent of the newspapers of America are run by corporations and individuals purely for propaganda purposes, and not for the enlightenment of the American people, the sooner there may be some hope that the American people will look elsewhere to try to lear the truth and get this Nation back on the road toward supporting the United Nations and toward having some hope of maintaining world peace.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I voted for this resolution in the committee. Nothing that I shall say today will change in any degree my resolution and intention to support the resolution.

However, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the Senator from Florida and the interpretation he placed upon this resolution when he pointed out that certain paragraphs of it could well be interpreted—and as he did so interpret them—as providing for the creation of military alliances and the setting up in the world of the old balance-of-power theory.

I realize that to a large extent the interpretations placed by the Senator from Florida upon the resolution and its possibilities are well founded, if one would so interpret the resolution. If this resolution had within itself the effect of creating military alliances between the United States and the countries of western Europe, I could not vote for the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HATCH. I yield first to the Senator from Idaho, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, has the Senator from New Mexico seen the Baltimore Sun of today, in which there is a caption—

Legislation On List.

In other words, the reference is to the list of proposed legislation to be considered by the Congress at this session; and then follows a list:

1. Draft bill on which the Senate voted today.
2. Vandenberg resolution paving the way for military aid to anti-Communist nations.

So, even the press takes it for granted that that is the object of this resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not seen the newspaper article to which the Senator has referred, and I have no particular comment to make regarding it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator now yields to me, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no, Mr. President; I do not yield for that purpose. It is too late in the afternoon, it seems to me, to do that; and I am sure we now have on the floor of the Senate as many Senators—and probably more—as would be present if a quorum call were had at this time.

Mr. President, before I was interrupted by the Senator from Idaho, I had stated that if the resolution of itself and within itself authorized the creation of military alliances, I would not vote for it. Nothing in the article to which the Senator from Idaho has referred contradicts that statement by me, nor does it say that this resolution authorizes the creation of military alliances and reinstates the balance-of-power theory.

But it is true, Mr. President—and I would not deceive the Senate or the country—that under the terms of the resolution—and so far as I am concerned, it is so intended—the President of the United States is authorized to negotiate for regional arrangements with countries which are cooperating with us, and where the principle of mutual self-help prevails. I say frankly that it would be possible for the President to negotiate arrangements which would call for military assistance to those nations. I would be unfair to the Senate and I would be unfair to the country if I said otherwise, because it is true—and so far as I am concerned, it was intended to be true; for, unfortunately, in view of the disturbed and disordered conditions in the world today, it may well be that it will be necessary to enter into, with the free nations of the world that are fighting to preserve their freedom, an association and agreement by which we shall have to render them military assistance and aid.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that twice within the present generation we did that very thing—in the case of World War I and in the case of World War II—without any resolution or anything else of the sort; we did it on our own.

Mr. HATCH. Not only is the Senator from Texas absolutely correct as to past history, but he might as well have looked into the future and have said that if the same conditions arise again, if the integrity of the free nations of Europe is attacked by military might and strength, regardless of what we say today here on the floor of the Senate, again America will be forced to go into battle, and military assistance will be rendered. I make that prediction as to the future.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy that the Senator from New Mexico is also making his position very clear. I have no argument with any Senator who makes his position entirely clear on this matter. The question I have raised was whether it would be good policy to adopt this resolution, knowing that there is such a moral obligation to follow through and to approve any treaty that might be returned to us by the President or the State Department along the lines that are authorized in the resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to put into my mouth words I have not said.

Mr. MALONE. If I have misunderstood the Senator, I am very sorry. But I understood the Senator to say that when we adopt this resolution, we shall be directing and, in effect, authorizing the President and the State Department to make treaties along this line; and that after they are made, if they are in conformity with the resolution and with the direction of the resolution, then there will be some moral responsibility to ratify them.

Mr. HATCH. No; I have not said that. I have said that under this resolution we are advising the executive branch of the Government to enter into negotiations looking toward association with those nations of the Old World which have "such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid and as affect its national security."

That is the language of the resolution, and under that language I said—and I do not wish to be misunderstood—that a reasonable arrangement could be entered into by which we would authorize the giving of military assistance. I said that arrangement could be entered into by the executive branch of Government. I did not say there would be a moral obligation upon the Congress of the United States to ratify and confirm such an arrangement. There is a vast difference. I said I did not want the Senator from Nevada to put words into my mouth. I do not think there would be any moral obligation upon the Congress of the United States. It has been made as clear on the floor of the Senate as it is possible to make it. The chairman of the committee repeatedly said any arrangement must come to the Senate for approval and ratification. When it comes back as required by the Constitution, by the debate and by the understanding, it comes back for our consideration and final action on ratification. That involves not only the right but the solemn moral obligation of considering the arrangement to determine whether it is in accordance with what is best for our country. I want to state that so clearly that no nation in the whole world can misunderstand.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I did not misunderstand the Senator, but, should I make myself a little clearer, the purpose of the resolution is to encourage treaties.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. After we do encourage the treaties—and we have already, of course, through ratification of the United Nations Charter, made our policy very clear—now, to go further than that and to request that additional treaties be made, and outline approximately the trend they should take, then does the Senator agree with me that it establishes a basis for reasonable expectancy on the part of the President, the State Department, and the foreign nations that we will ratify such treaty? Senators may not like the treaties as presented, but the tons of propaganda go over the Nation that the Senate has already directed or requested that such treaties be made, so the public is led to believe that we have in effect rejected our own proposal, although it may be radically different from what the Senate had in mind. It establishes the basis for such talk, and it sells the people of the United States on something that the Senate may never have believed in the first instance. Nevertheless, it would be several months before the public learned the true facts, if, in fact, they ever did know what happened.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, of course any person may take any basis for an argument he pleases, but I may say this with appropriate modesty, in view of the fact that I shall retire from the Senate and will not be here after this session ends, that I believe when the Senate is confronted with a treaty it will consider first of all the welfare of the country, and will not base its decision in any way upon propaganda. I have that faith, not only in the Senate, but in our democratic process of Government. I am perfectly willing to leave it to future Congresses to meet questions as they arise.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator is entirely correct. He will find a fight put up on that basis, but I think he is also entirely familiar with the tons of propaganda that go out to influence public opinion, hanging on any prior action taken by the United States Senate, to influence the entire public and the Senate of the United States included; and it has, in the past, been very effective.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall not take long, but I should like to make this criticism of the resolution as I made it in the committee. I offered no formal amendment. One suggestion was in part accepted, and I think the committee members understand my position, that while I do not question perhaps the necessity for the resolution, and everything that may be done under it, yet I realized

that the argument which has been made on the floor by the able argument by the Senator from Florida would be made. I realized there would be people in the United States who would look upon the resolution with fear, who would say we were putting the stress on military alliance and military power and balance of power, and that we would even bypass the United Nations, as the Senator from Idaho just charged.

With none of those things do I agree, nor do I agree that those charges are true; I disagree with them all. But, Mr. President, I know full well that the hope and faith of America is not pinned to armed might. I know that the people of America want more than anything else to avoid war and to take no steps leading to war. The huge military developments that are going on within our own country entail an estimated expense of $12,000,000,000 for the national defense, which it has been said will within a year or two perhaps mean an expenditure of $20,000,000,000 a year in preparations for war. Throughout the country there are literally millions of people, among them the best citizens we have in America, who look upon all those preparations not as preparations for peace but as steps which will inevitably lead to war.

I myself believe, Mr. President, that no nation can rely upon military might to prevent war. I know that if military strength is built and maintained at a high level the nation that puts its faith in reliance upon those forces will eventually use them in actual warfare. Such is the history of the nations of the world. Men who dispute it would deny and dispute historical facts. I know my Nation is not warlike. Its chief hope is for peace. It has been the hope of the peoples of the world for thousands of years that war might be avoided and that peace might prevail.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate what the Senator says. It has always been to me an interesting historical fact that most of us were born in a century that knew no world-wide war. From 1815, when Napoleon yielded, to 1914, when the Kaiser challenged the British sea power, we had no world-wide war such as we have now witnessed twice. During that period Britain was dominant and so exercised her sea power as to preserve a period of comparative peace. I think that is a very valuable lesson, as I believe that America similarly, in this era, with proper preparation, might contribute to the preservation of peace in spite of inadequate armament with which we are all concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I quite agree with what the Senator from Maine has said, and I agree that a time in which there was peace in the world did exist, but only in part, for during that time a war was going on somewhere in the world. Hardly a year, hardly a day, has passed but what conflict has raged somewhere in the world, not always among and between major powers, but nearly always, somewhere in the world, armed forces have been on the march.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I add that it was during that century when Britain was dominant, not only in the military and naval sense, but also in the economic sense, that civilization made more progress than it had made in the previous 10 centuries? As to what lessons should be drawn from that, of course men might differ. I feel that, similarly, America can make as great a contribution if we wisely and prudently exercise the power which we so obviously possess.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, again I agree with the Senator from Maine. I find nothing in his statement with which to disagree. I hope we may wisely use the power of which we are possessed, so that peace may be maintained and that the world may progress. I venture the assertion that unless we wisely use that power—because for some reason providence has placed this great Nation in a position in which the power not only exists, but we are almost the only Nation in the world which can exercise the leadership which the Senator has in mind—unless we wisely use that power for peace and for progress, only catastrophe awaits all mankind. It is made more and more affirmative and positive that we, in our deliberations in the Senate, should consider most carefully and wisely every step we take in dealing with other nations.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the reason the nations of the world have failed in the past to avoid and avert war is because they have found no substitute for war. Always they have gone back to it. When treaties or agreements were broken, they have been compelled to enforce the treaty or agreement by an appeal to war. That has been the only method.

It has been the dream and the hope of many people throughout the ages that there might be a substitute for war. The only substitute for war that exists within us an individuals and within our Nation is the weight, the force, and the effect of law. Until law shall prevail among nations as among men, force and violence will still remain a power in the world.

I do not want a resolution which might be considered as laying down a foreign policy for this Nation, which might constitute a declaration of a foreign policy, in addition to the United Nations, and even, as someone has said, perhaps outside the United Nations—although I do not construe it in that way—and which might give the impression to the peoples of the world and to the people of our own country that we are relying upon regional arrangements to be backed up by military force. We forget that law, and law alone, is the only hope of avoiding war eventually.

Mr. President, I want Senators to listen to what I have to say, because the words I shall now use are words of wisdom, words of force. I should like to call attention to some features of the Charter which have received very little notice. I dare say they have been regarded generally as of little consequence.

The Security Council as established in the Organization may fail. Other branches of the international organization of the Charter may well fail. All may fail to accomplish the purpose which all of us hope will be accomplished. But there are some things in it which ought not to be passed over lightly. As one who has spent a long time at the bar in the study and in the administration of law, I attach great importance to the court to be established as the chief tribunal of the international organization.

Mr. President, surely there are not in America men who scoff at international law. I may say that there has been scoffing at the idea of world law. Men have said, "I do not believe in a world government. We cannot have world law." Men might say that the amendment I propose to offer looks toward the final objective of establishing law as the ruling force in the world, that it calls for establishing a world government. I do not know what men mean by "world government."

I know that every step taken under the United Nations is a step toward some kind of world-government. The establishment of law in the affairs of men can be accomplished without setting up a super-world state. It has become popular in some quarters to say, "Oh, you want a super-world-state." No one means that and no one believes in it. So, Mr. President, no American will scoff at international law. Our own Supreme Court has recognized and has given effect to the law of nations, which is but another term for international law, and has applied the principles of international law in the adjudications made by our own courts.

Mr. President, I want to read further:

It may well be—

Referring, now, to the General Assembly—

that it shall become the chief instrument under the Charter. While I shall not take time to discuss the whole Charter, I want to express my own firm belief in the establishment of the court as the high tribunal to which we may ultimately give compulsory jurisdiction as the leader of peoples and through whose consistent and continuous application of the law of nations a great code of international law may be built, and through an Assembly of the United Nations Organization as set up in the Charter, smaller nations, and, indeed, all peoples, may one day be able to make themselves felt in the affairs of nations.

Mr. President, when I began reading, I asked Senators to listen, because I was going to use words of wisdom, words of great eloquence. I am sorry that time does not permit me to read all of it, for one of the greatest speeches ever made in this body, at the time of the adoption of the Charter, contained the words which I have just read. They were spoken by the great Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who laid down the principle that through a General Assembly and through an International Court of Justice there might some day come a time when nations would live in a world of law.

Mr. President, I had the hope that the Senate of the United States would not say to the people of America, "We are wiling to adopt a resolution which lays down a policy which may be followed by our Government in years to come," and not even mention the hope, the faith, and the belief that some day law may prevail among nations, and force

and violence will be driven from the world.

Mr. President, I want to offer the faith and hope to the people of America and to the peoples of the world, that by the action we take in adopting this resolution, by setting up regional arrangements through which we hope to maintain the security and peace of the world by military alliance, we have not abandoned our faith and fundamental hope in the world of law.

Not only that, Mr. President, in another clause of the resolution something is said with which I agree so far as it goes, but which I feel falls far short of expressing the ideas and hopes of this country as to what this world must be if we are ever to have peace, for it is said in the resolution, "to obtain agreement among member nations upon universal regulation and reduction of armaments under adequate and dependable guaranty against violation."

Since the discovery of gunpowder, indeed before that, since the crossbow was first developed, there has been talk about the control and the reduction of armaments. They have never been controlled and they have never been reduced, but the constant progress of man has been to ever greater and larger armament, despite all the agreements entered into, until today the armaments possessed by the nations of the world, including our own, are the most dreadful ever possessed. Such implements of destruction were never conceived of as now exist, and yet we hear talk about controlling and reducing armaments.

Will there be any control of the atomic bomb if war comes? What becomes of agreements among nations when they are battling for their existence? It is said that poison gas was controlled by agreement. Poison gas was not used in the Second World War because it was not militarily efficient, though it was used in the First World War. It was not an agreement that prevented its use. If Hitler could have conquered England and our armies by the use of poison gas, would he have hesitated to use it? The answer is no. Nations of that kind, which may be going forth to conquer the world in the future, will not hesitate to use the atomic bomb or any other weapon which will accomplish their purpose.

Mr. President, I had hoped we might say to our own country at least, that we might dare to venture the opinion and express the hope, faint as it might be and futile as it might be, that we at least are looking forward to a time when nations will be ruled by law, when armaments of all nations will be abolished, and the only military might left will be that military strength left in the international organization to back up and enforce the law of nations. Until that time comes, so long as nations are permitted to arm, even though they agree to reduce armaments, there will constantly be hanging over mankind the threat of war, and as the world is now constituted from an armament standpoint, not only a threat of war, but a threat of destruction.

My hope is not pinned to any regional arrangement or military alliance, although I believe that as conditions exist in the world, the arrangements contemplated by the pending resolution may be effective, and may help to lead to that greater and fuller organization and complete understanding and cooperation and peace which the world must have.

The Senator from Idaho said he was not afraid of being attacked, that Russia was not going to attack us. My vote on this resolution in the committee and on the floor is not based on any fear of Russia, and it is not directed against Russia by any means. I understand, however, how countries in Europe which have been attacked, whose soil has run red with the blood of their citizens, not once but many times, can well fear attack. I can understand how some of those nations hesitated, as they did hesitate, to join us in cooperative measures such as the European recovery plan, lest they incur danger of attack upon them.

I can well understand how little Czechoslovakia, acting under orders, did not join the 16 nations, although she wanted to do so, trying to cooperate and preserve her own independence, all of which was of no avail. If I lived in those countries I would be afraid, and I would not hesitate to announce my fear, because past experience would have taught me.

I certainly do not stand on the floor of the Senate today, in the safety and security of our own land, which has never been overrun, and say, "There is no danger. We have nothing to fear." When my friends are in danger, when the institutions of their governments are in danger, when the rights of individual citizens are denied and they become enslaved by tyrannical power, I fear for my own country, and if adopting this resolution will give to those countries some of the courage which they need to fortify them to stand together, to maintain their own freedom and their own integrity and their independence, I am glad to vote for it, and I shall vote for it on that ground and for that reason, and I so voted in the committee.

Mr. President, regarding the amendment I offered, I wish to say that it is not too important. I have expressed something of my hope. I know the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has made a most valiant fight to bring about complete cooperation in the committee and in the Senate so that we may stand, without regard to party united on whatever policy we may have and upon which we may determine. If he thinks that the offering of this amendment will in any way hurt the resolution, which our committee unanimously reported, I shall not insist upon its adoption. I shall not even offer it.

Mr. President, I wanted to say these words. I repeat, the people of America do not pin their hopes and they do not pin their faith on any alliance, military or otherwise. The only hope the world has is in a strong collective organization of all the peoples of the world, with the substitution of law for war, and eventually complete and total disarmament of all nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to address the Senate, but I think that in its far-reaching effect this is one of the most important resolutions which has been before the Senate for some time. Therefore I do not think we ought to adopt the resolution by a mere viva voce vote, and I ask for the yeas and nays upon its adoption.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Butler	Hoey	Revercomb
Byrd	Holland	Russell
Cain	Ives	Saltonstall
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Cooper	Kem	Stewart
Cordon	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lodge	Tobey
Eastland	McClellan	Umstead
Ecton	McFarland	Vandenberg
Ellender	McGrath	Wherry
Feazel	McKellar	Williams
Ferguson	Malone	Wilson
Flanders	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	
Green	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may we have a decision upon my request for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I did not formally offer the amendments to which I adverted in my remarks. I now formally move to strike out paragraphs Nos. 2 and 3 on page 2 of the resolution. The paragraphs are as follows:

(2) Progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

(3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

Mr. President, I shall not comment further in addition to the remarks I made a few moments ago. I also subscribe to what the Senator from Kentucky said that this is a matter of great importance; and I think it only proper and fair that we should also have a yea and nay vote upon the amendment which I have offered. I therefore ask for the yeas and nays upon my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has asked for the yeas and nays upon his amendment. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

On a show of hands the yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is very seldom that I have asked my colleagues for yea-and-nay votes upon any proposals before the Senate. I generally have been rather considerate about such matters. I, in no sense of the word, wish to importune my colleagues at this time.

But I feel very strongly that if we are going to have a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the resolution, the amendment I have offered is deserving of a record vote. I do not know whether it is within the proprieties to ask for reconsideration of the action which resulted in denying me a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment, but I do very earnestly ask that there be a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment. I think we are entitled to such a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has again requested a yea-and-nay vote upon his amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would vote "nay."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 6, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—6

Kem	McKellar	Pepper
Langer	Malone	Taylor

NAYS—61

Aiken	George	Myers
Baldwin	Green	O'Conor
Ball	Gurney	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hawkes	Revercomb
Butler	Hickenlooper	Russell
Byrd	Hill	Saltonstall
Cain	Hoey	Sparkman
Capper	Holland	Stennis
Connally	Ives	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Thye
Donnell	Kilgore	Tobey
Downey	Knowland	Umstead
Dworshak	Lodge	Vandenberg
Eastland	McClellan	Wherry
Ecton	McFarland	Williams
Ellender	McGrath	Wilson
Feazel	Martin	Young
Ferguson	Maybank	
Flanders	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—29

Bricker	Lucas	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	McCarran	Smith
Brooks	McCarthy	Stewart
Buck	McMahon	Taft
Bushfield	Magnuson	Tydings
Capehart	Moore	Wagner
Chavez	Morse	Watkins
Fulbright	Murray	White
Hayden	Reed	Wiley
Jenner	Robertson, Va.	

So Mr. PEPPER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MALONE. I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is unavoidably absent on official business. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KEM (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who is unavoidably detained, and who if present, would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I, therefore, withhold my vote.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	George	Millikin
Baldwin	Green	Myers
Ball	Gurney	O'Conor
Barkley	Hatch	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hayden	Revercomb
Butler	Hickenlooper	Russell
Byrd	Hill	Saltonstall
Cain	Hoey	Sparkman
Capper	Holland	Stennis
Connally	Ives	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Thye
Donnell	Kilgore	Tobey
Downey	Knowland	Umstead
Dworshak	Lodge	Vandenberg
Eastland	McClellan	Wherry
Ecton	McFarland	Williams
Ellender	McGrath	Wilson
Feazel	McKellar	Young
Ferguson	Martin	
Flanders	Maybank	

NAYS—4

Langer	Taylor	Watkins
Pepper		

NOT VOTING—28

Bricker	McCarran	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	McCarthy	Smith
Buck	McMahon	Stewart
Bushfield	Magnuson	Taft
Capehart	Malone	Tydings
Chavez	Moore	Wagner
Fulbright	Morse	White
Jenner	Murray	Wiley
Kem	Reed	
Lucas	Robertson, Va.	

So the resolution (S. Res. 239) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1747) to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2721) to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3260. An act for the relief of Clarence S. Osika;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder; and

H. R. 6252. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WELCH, Mr. D'EWART, Mr. SANBORN, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. PETERSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DONDERO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. BEALL, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. ELLIOTT, and Mr. FALLON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended;

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia, as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments;

S. 1082. An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion;

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of James B. Walsh;

S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes;

S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; and

S. 2040. An act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 11, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho;

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1249. An act authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes;

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws;

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes;

S. 2201. An act supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State", approved April 7, 1938; and

S. 2215. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. O'MAHONEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. CHAVEZ conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanmious consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1607, House bill 6556, an act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. This is the Reprical Trade Agreements Act. The intention is to make it the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to to consider the bill (H. R. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, Saturday, the 12th instant, the unfinished business, House bill 6556, relating to the extension of the Reprical Trade Agrements Act, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1579. For the information of Senators, I will state that is the calendar number to which objection was made, which objection stopped the call of the calendar yesterday. I further ask unanimous consent that it shall not be in order to consider any measure preceding that bill on

the calendar or having a lower calendar number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF TEMPORARY HOUSING TO EDUCATIONAL AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Philadelphia Housing Authority recommending passage of the McGregor bill.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 2768

Resolution recommending passage of the McGregor bill (H. R. 5710)

Resolved, That the Philadelphia Housing Authority recommends the passage by the Congress of the United States, of the McGregor bill (H. R. 5710), under the provisions of which bill the Lanham Act would be amended so as to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner, upon application therefor, to convey to any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization, all right, title, and interest of the United States in any temporary housing constructed under the Lanham Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to United States Senators FRANCIS J. MYERS and EDWARD MARTIN, and the following Congressmen from Philadelphia: JAMES GALLAGHER, ROBERT N. MCGARVEY, HARDIE SCOTT, FRANKLIN J. MALONEY, GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR., and HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

THE RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted by 600 members of the United Jewish Community of Harrisburg, Pa.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT MASS MEETING OF THE UNITED JEWISH COMMUNITY, OF HARRISBURG, PA., WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1948

Whereas after 19 centuries of national homelessness, the Jewish people of Palestine has proclaimed and established the independent state of Israel; and

Whereas the Republic of Israel was created on the basis of a decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which on November 29, 1947, called for the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states; and

Whereas the Jewish displaced persons, still languishing in the camps of Europe, at long last will be enabled to emigrate to the new Jewish state and there rebuild their lives in a progressive and democratic community; and

Whereas the United States, the Soviet Union, the Union of South Africa, and other nations already have given official recognition to the Republic of Israel; and

Whereas the new-born Republic of Israel is now engaged in a critical struggle for survival, since it ruthlessly has been invaded and attacked by the armies of neighboring Arab states, who are bent upon the destruction of the Jewish state; and

Whereas the Jews of Israel are imbued with the highest ideals of democracy and are animated by the same high principles which guide Americans in their devotion to freedom and human rights: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the United Jewish Community of Harrisburg, Pa., extend our congratulations and heartfelt gratitude to the President of the United States for his immediate recognition of Israel and that we look forward to the early exchange of diplomatic representatives between the two countries; be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully call upon the President to translate our country's recognition of Israel into the practical and logical steps which the present situation demands, and that the United States immediately revise its arms embargo so that the embattled Jews of Israel may be given the opportunity to defend their lives—and their newly gained independence—against Arab aggression; be it further

Resolved, That the United States withhold further financial assistance from Great Britain as long as that government persists in providing monetary subsidies, military equipment and personnel to the Arab Legion and the other Arab forces now attacking Israel, and further persists in preventing Jewish immigration and flow of supplies to the Jews and generally impeding the peaceful establishment and development of the State of Israel; be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States delegation to the United Nations, United States Senators FRANCIS J. MYERS and EDWARD MARTIN, and to Representative JOHN C. KUNKEL.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Pittsburgh, in support of renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PITTSBURGH, PA., IN SUPPORT OF RENEWAL OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh comprises in its membership manufacturers, merchants, exporters and importers, rail, sea, and air transportation interests, bankers, insurance underwriters, and others concerned in the promotion and expansion of the Nation's foreign and domestic commerce. In 1926 the chamber's board of directors recognized the need for and established its present world trade council, the sole duty of which is to promote an interest in international trade and to serve as an advisory group for those engaged in the international exchange of goods and services.

Recommendations by the legislative committee for the world trade council to the chamber's board of directors resulted in this organization going on record favoring a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as written. We favor the principle of expanding world markets through reciprocal reductions in trade barriers achieved under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and the subsequent amendments which have been of great benefit to the economy of this country.

Such statistical and other evidence as is available indicates that the trade agreements were a definite influence in increasing both the export and import trade of this Nation. United States foreign-trade statistics show that exports from the United States to trade-agreement countries increased from 1934–35 to 1938–39 by 62.8 percent as compared with 31.7 percent for nonagreement countries, while imports during the same period from trade-agreement countries increased by 21.6 percent as against 12.5 percent for nonagreement countries. The increase of both exports to and imports from the trade-agreements countries was approximately double that for nonagreement countries.

The dire need of many foreign countries for United States economic assistance is being met in considerable part by the foreign-aid program recently adopted by this country. These countries depend primarily on the exports of their own goods and services to provide them with the necessary exchange with which to buy needed capital goods, raw materials, and foodstuffs from abroad. Their ability to export the volume of goods and services necessary to enable them to meet their requirements from abroad will to a large extent depend upon whether tariff rates and other trade barriers can be reduced to the level which will permit the required volume of exports. The amount of economic assistance which the United States will have to furnish to countries participating in the aid program of this country will in turn depend upon the extent to which such countries can meet their own requirements for foreign products by increasing their sales abroad. It is, therefore, vitally important to the United States that its reciprocal trade program be vigorously applied so as to help reduce the barriers to the expanding volume of exports which the economics of the aid-receiving countries so urgently require.

Such expansion in the exports of the aid-receiving countries is also necessary if these countries are to repay the United States for the loans and credits which it has extended to them in the past and contemplates extending to them under the aid programs. In order to make sure that it will be able to keep to a minimum the aid which it will have to provide in the form of grants and to obtain payment for that which is supplied in the form of loans and credits, the United States should reduce its own tariff rates to the minimum required for protection of efficient American producers.

After the present transition period during which countries participating in these agreements and in the foreign-aid program of the United States are helped back to a condition of economic health, foreign demand for the excess production of the United States, particularly its capital goods, may be expected to decline. When that time arrives, the United States will have need for every device which may be useful in enabling this country to hold and enlarge its foreign markets. The reciprocal trade agreements should then be very useful in helping the United States not only to retain as much as possible of its foreign markets for capital goods but to develop and expand outlets abroad for other American products, both of industry and agriculture.

The Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, therefore, strongly urges the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act substantially in its present form for a further period of 3 years.

Respectfully submitted.

J. K. B. HARE,
President.

JUNE 1, 1948.

TREATY OF EXTRADITION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Executive K, Eightieth Congress, second session, a treaty of extradition between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Washington on December 18, 1947. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the President's mes-

sage, together with the treaty, will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Chair hears none.

The message from the President and the treaty are as follows:

EXECURIVE K, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of extradition between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Washington on December 18, 1947.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) treaty of extradition with the Union of South Africa, signed December 18, 1947.)

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1948.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 7, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification if his judgment approve thereof, a treaty between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa providing for the extradition by each of the two countries of fugitives from the other country.

The relations of the United States and the Union of South Africa in regard to extradition are governed at the present time by the provisions of Article 10 of the treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom of August 9, 1842 (8 Stat. 572; 18 Stat., pt. 2 [Public Treaties], 315) and of the following conventions relative to extradition concluded between the United States and the United Kingdom: the convention of July 12, 1889 (26 Stat. 1508), the supplementary convention of December 13, 1900 (32 Stat. 1864), and the supplementary convention of April 12, 1905 (34 Stat. 2903). As between the United States and the United Kingdom, these provisions ceased to have effect upon the coming into force on June 24, 1935, of the treaty of extradition between the two countries, signed at London on December 22, 1931 (47 Stat. 2122). The provisions of the abovementioned treaty and conventions, however, were to remain in force, in accordance with Article 18 of the treaty of 1931, in respect of the self-governing Dominions and India until they shall have adhered to the treaty of 1931 or entered into other treaty arrangements with the United States concerning extradition.

The present treaty between the United States and the Union of South Africa is designed to replace the provisions of the treaty and conventions referred to above with a modern treaty of extradition in which the offenses declared to be extraditable are described with greater precision and comprehensiveness than in the several earlier arrangements.

Respectfully submitted.

G. C. MARSHALL.

The President of the United States of America,

And His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the seas, acting for the Union of South Africa,

Desiring to make more adequate provision for the reciprocal extradition of criminals,

Have resolved to conclude a treaty for that purpose, and to that end have appointed as their plenipotentiaries,

The President of the United States of America:

Robert A. Lovett, acting secretary of State of the United States of America; and

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, for the Union of South Africa:

Harry Thomson Andrews, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Union of South Africa at Washington;

Who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

The High Contracting Parties engage to deliver up to each other, under certain circumstances and conditions stated in the present Treaty, those persons who, being accused or convicted of any of the crimes or offences enumerated in Article 3, committed within the jurisdiction of the one Party, shall be found within the territory of the other Party.

ARTICLE 2

For the purposes of the present Treaty:

(a) the territory of His Majesty shall be deemed to be the Union of South Africa together with any territory at any time under the jurisdiction of His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa whether as mandated territory, protectorate, or otherwise, if said Treaty is extended to that territory under Article 14; and

(b) the territory of the United States of America shall be deemed to be all territory wherever situated belonging to the United States of America, including its dependencies and all other territories under its exclusive administration or control.

ARTICLE 3

Extradition shall be reciprocally granted for the following crimes or offenses:

1. Murder, or attempt or conspiracy to murder.

2. Culpable homicide or manslaughter.

3. Assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm; maliciously wounding or inflicting grievous bodily harm.

4. Any act done with intent to endanger the safety or lives of persons travelling upon a railway.

5. Abortion or attempted abortion.

6. Rape.

7. Indecent assault.

8. Unlawful carnal knowledge, or any attempt to have unlawful carnal knowledge, of a girl under sixteen years of age.

9. Abduction.

10. Procuration, i. e., the procuring even with her own consent of a woman or girl under age for immoral purposes or of a woman or girl over age, to become a common prostitute, or the procuring, by threats, intimidation or false pretences of a woman or girl to have unlawful carnal connection, provided that such crime or offence is punishable by imprisonment for at least one year or by more severe punishment.

11. Bigamy.

12. Kidnapping or man-stealing, including woman-stealing and child-stealing.

13. Ill treatment, neglect or abandonment of a child.

14. False imprisonment.

15. Robbery with violence.

16. Extortion.

17. Arson.

18. Malicious injury to property.

19. Burglary or housebreaking with intent to commit an offence.

20. Larceny or theft including embezzlement.

21. Receiving money, valuable security or other property, knowing the same to have been stolen, embezzled or obtained by false pretences.

22. Fraud by a bailee, banker, agent, factor, trustee, director, member or officer of any company, or the obtaining of money, valuable security or other property by false pretences.

23. Forgery or uttering what has been forged.

24. Counterfeiting or altering money, or uttering counterfeit or altered money.

25. Being in possession of any implement with intent to make counterfeit coin therewith or with the aid thereof.

26. Contraventions of the insolvency or bankruptcy laws.

27. Crimes or offences against any enactment relating to dangerous drugs, or attempts to commit such crimes or offences.

28. Bribery, i. e., the offering, giving, or receiving of bribes.

29. Perjury, subornation of perjury or knowingly making a false statement in contravention of a statute.

30. (a) Piracy by the law of nations.

(b) Revolt, or conspiracy to revolt, by two or more persons on board a ship on the high seas against the authority of the master; wrongfully sinking or destroying a vessel at sea, or attempting to do so; assaults on board a ship on the high seas, with intent to do grievous bodily harm.

31. Dealing in slaves.

Extradition is also to be granted for participation in any of the aforesaid crimes or offences.

ARTICLE 4

The extradition shall not take place if the person claimed has already been tried and discharged or punished, or is still under trial in the territories of the High Contracting Party applied to, for the crime or offence for which his extradition is demanded.

If the person claimed should be under examination or under punishment in the territories of the High Contracting Party applied to for any other crime or offence, his extradition shall be deferred until the conclusion of the trial and the full execution of any punishment awarded to him.

ARTICLE 5

The extradition shall not take place if the crime or offence is not indictable in the place where the person claimed is apprehended or if, subsequently to the commission of the crime or offence or the institution of the penal prosecution or the conviction thereon, exemption from prosecution or punishment has been acquired by lapse of time, according to the laws of the High Contracting Party applying or applied to.

ARTICLE 6

A fugitive criminal shall not be surrendered if the crime or offence in respect of which his surrender is demanded is one of a political character, or if he proves that the requisition for his surrender has, in fact, been made with a view to try or to punish him for a crime or offence of a political character.

ARTICLE 7

A person surrendered can in no case be kept in custody or be brought to trial in the territories of the High Contracting Party to whom the surrender has been made for any other crime or offence, or on account of any other matters, than those for which the extradition shall have taken place, until he has been restored, or has had an opportunity of returning, to the territories of the High Contracting Party by whom he has been surrendered.

This stipulation does not apply to crimes or offenses committed after the extradition.

ARTICLE 8

The extradition shall take place only if the evidence be found sufficient, according to the laws of the High Contracting Party applied to, either to justify the committal of the prisoner for trial, in case the crime or offense had been committed in the territory of such High Contracting Party, or to

prove that the prisoner is the identical person convicted by the courts of the High Contracting Party who makes the requisition, and that the crime or offence of which he has been convicted is one in respect of which extradition could, at the time of such conviction, have been granted by the High Contracting Party applied to.

ARTICLE 9

If the individual claimed by one of the High Contracting Parties in pursuance of the present Treaty should be also claimed by one or several other Powers on account of other crimes or offences committed within their respective jurisdictions, his extradition shall be granted to the Power whose claim is earliest in date, unless such claim is waived.

ARTICLE 10

If sufficient evidence for the extradition be not produced within two months from the date of the apprehension of the fugitive, or within such further time as the High Contracting Party applied to, or the proper tribunal of such High Contracting Party, shall direct, the fugitive shall be set at liberty.

ARTICLE 11

All articles seized which were in the possession of the person to be surrendered at the time of his apprehension, and any articles that may serve as a proof of the crime or offence shall be given up when the extradition takes place, in so far as this may be permitted by the law of the High Contracting Party granting the extradition.

ARTICLE 12

The extradition of fugitive criminals under the provisions of this Treaty shall be carried out in the United States of America and in the territory of His Majesty respectively, in conformity with the laws regulating extradition for the time being in force in the territory from which the surrender of the fugitive criminal is claimed.

ARTICLE 13

All expenses connected with the extradition shall be borne by the High Contracting Party making the application.

ARTICLE 14

His Majesty's Government in the Union of South Africa may accede to the present Treaty in respect of any territory at any time under the jurisdiction of His Majesty's said Government, whether as mandated territory, protectorate or otherwise. Such accession shall be effected by a notice to that effect given by the diplomatic representative of the Union of South Africa at Washington which shall specify the authority to which the requisition for the surrender of a fugitive criminal who has taken refuge in the said territory shall be addressed. From the date when such notice comes into effect, the said Territory shall be deemed to be territory of His Majesty for the purposes of the present Treaty.

The requisition for the surrender of a fugitive criminal who has taken refuge in the above-mentioned Territory shall be made by the appropriate diplomatic or consular officer of the United States of America.

Either High Contracting Party may terminate this Treaty separately in respect of the above-mentioned Territory. Such termination shall be effected by a notice given in accordance with the provisions of Article 15.

ARTICLE 15

The present Treaty shall come into force ten days after its publication, in conformity with the forms prescribed by the laws of the High Contracting Parties. It may be terminated by either of the High Contracting Parties by a notice not exceeding one year and not less than six months.

In the absence of an express provision to that effect, a notice given under the first paragraph of this Article shall not affect the operation of the Treaty in respect of the Mandated Territory of South West Africa, if notice of accession has been given under Article 14.

The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

On the coming into force of the present Treaty the provisions of Article 10 of the Treaty of the 9th of August, 1842, of the Convention of the 12th of July, 1889, of the supplementary Convention of the 13th December, 1900, and of the supplementary Convention of the 12th April, 1905, relative to extradition, shall cease to have effect as between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa.

In faith whereof the above-named plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed thereto their seals.

DONE in duplicate in the English and Afrikaans languages at the city of Washington this eighteenth day of December, 1947.

For the United States of America:
[SEAL] ROBERT A. LOVETT.
For the Union of South Africa:
[SEAL] H. T. ANDREWS.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before moving a recess until tomorrow, I should like to state, so that all Senators may be informed, that it is the intention to have the Senate convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow, if that meets with the approval of the Members of the Senate, the reason being that the full Committee on Appropriations will be writing up the Economic Cooperation Act appropriation bill, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and four or five other appropriation bills. So I think it will expedite the work if the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, June 12, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, June 12, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 11 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER

Harold H. Tittmann, Jr., of Missouri, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

William E. DeCourcy, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE CAPTAINS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE JUNE 3, 1948

Henry W. Hemple
Casper M. Durgin
Oliver S. Reading
Francis L. Gallen
John A. Bond
Cornelius D. Meaney
Augustus P. Ratti

TO BE CAPTAIN IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 1, 1948

Earl O. Heaton

TO BE CAPTAINS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1948

William M. Scaife
Robert F. A. Studds
Henry C. Warwick

TO BE CAPTAIN IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1948

Benjamin H. Rigg

TO BE COMMANDER IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE JUNE 3, 1948

Ronald R. Moore
Ralph W. Woodworth
Leo C. Wilder
Henry E. Finnegan
Charles M. Thomas
Charles Pierce
Thomas B. Reed
Jack C. Sammons
Robert W. Knox
H. Arnold Karo
Edgar H. Bernstein
George L. Anderson
Isidor E. Rittenburg
Kenneth G. Crosby
Glendon E. Boothe
Earle A. Deily
Leonard S. Hubbard
Philip C. Doran
Hubert A. Paton
Walter H. Bainbridge
Carl I. Aslakson
Paul A. Smith
John C. Bose
Riley J. Sipe
Samuel B. Grenell
Frank G. Johnson
William M. Gibson
Ralph L. Pfau

TO BE COMMANDER IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1, 1948

Alvin C. Thorson
Joe C. Partington
Ector B. Latham

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE JUNE 3, 1948

A. Newton Stewart
Max G. Ricketts
Clarence A. George
Robert A. Earle
Harry F. Garber
Karl B. Jeffers
John Laskowski
Ross A. Gilmore
Gilbert C. Mast
Fred A. Riddell
Ira R. Rubottom
Maurice E. Wennermark
Fred Natella
Jeremiah S. Morton
Robert A. Marshall
Edward B. Brown, Jr.
John C. Ellerbe
Maurice A. Hecht
John C. Tribble, Jr.
James C. Tison, Jr.
Edmund L. Jones
Kenneth S. Ulm
Clarence R. Reed
William C. Russell
Junius T. Jarman
Herman C. Applequist
William F. Deane
Edgar F. Hicks, Jr.
John C. Bull
Arthur L. Wardwell
Emmett H. Sheridan
Raymond H. Tryon, Jr.
Chester J. Beyma
Joseph E. Waugh
Dorland H. Konichek
Philip A. Weber
Paul Taylor
Horace G. Conerly
Charles F. Chenworth
Charles A. Schoene
William N. Martin
Harold J. Seaborg
Fair J. Bryant
Charles W. Clark
Glenn W. Moore

TO BE LIEUTENANTS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE JUNE 3, 1948

Don A. Jones
David M. Whipp
Francis X. Popper
Howard S. Cole
Harry D. Reed

TO BE LIEUTENANT IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 16, 1948

Raymond M. Stone

TO BE ENSIGNS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Hubert W. Keith, Jr., effective July 5, 1948.
Walter B. Hamstrom, effective July 6, 1948.
Dale E. Fisher, effective July 12, 1948.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Betty M. Means, Boligee, Ala., in place of J. D. Means, removed.

Arcaster Kimbrell, Fayette, Ala., in place of S. J. Sanders, resigned.

ARIZONA

Robert S. Collins, Superior, Ariz., in place of W. E. Ware, removed.

ARKANSAS

Edbert Jessup, Glenwood, Ark., in place of T. M. Coker, resigned.

Rayburn G. Smith, Harrisburg, Ark., in place of J. M. Simmons, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

John S. Hillery, Cathedral City, Calif., in place of E. E. Cobb, resigned.

Ruth Pugh, Cypress, Calif., in place of M. F. Inskeep, transferred.

Ella A. Dominguez, Olive, Calif., in place of T. H. Mieger, resigned.

Velma E. Mackey, Santa Ynez, Calif., in place of S. M. Fair, resigned.

Henry S. Fager, Waterford, Calif., in place of Jennie Root, resigned.

Adelaide C. Byrn, Windsor, Calif., in place of G. P. Johnson, retired.

COLORADO

Ernest J. Redmon, De Beque, Colo., in place of P. N. Cameron, resigned.

Philip Madonna, Keenesburg, Colo., in place of I. O. Martin, resigned.

Betty R. Ingram, Nederland, Colo., in place of M. C. Shellhaas, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Howard Macciocca, Derby, Conn., in place of J. J. Mahony, deceased.

GEORGIA

Sara L. Brinson, Wrightsville, Ga., in place of R. B. Bryan, retired.

ILLINOIS

Lloyd O. Huff, Blandinsville, Ill., in place of L. C. Mosley, resigned.

Clifford A. Walsh, Bourbonnais, Ill., in place of M. F. Senesac, resigned.

Albert O. Ledbetter, Marion, Ill., in place of D. C. Moss, resigned.

Ellwyn Barnett, Oakland, Ill., in place of W. A. Reeds, retired.

Michael A. Bernasek, Sparta, Ill., in place of J. V. Lessley, retired.

INDIANA

Henry Claude Steininger, Monticello, Ind., in place of T. V. Koontz, resigned.

IOWA

Jerome A. Bunkers, Granville, Iowa, in place of R. H. Fischbach, transferred.

KANSAS

E. Lucille Logsdon, Grenola, Kans., in place of E. C. Logsdon, deceased.

Marlin L. Ames, Long Island, Kans., in place of Loraine Champlin, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Inman J. Vining, Choudrant, La., in place of M. E. Kidd, deceased.

Robert Lee Trahan, Maurice, La., in place of C. D. Trahan, retired.

Hughes T. Young, Sicily Island, La., in place of T. L. Hardin, retired.

MAINE

Edwin C. Brown, Yarmouth, Maine, in place of E. C. Libby, deceased.

MARYLAND

Charles L. Brockmeyer, Glenarm, Md., in place of J. J. Ohler, deceased.

Edward C. Seipp, Pasadena, Md., in place of C. H. Chute, retired.

Edward V. Dorsey, Upper Marlboro, Md., in place of R. M. Buck, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Mary M. Blower, Grand Blanc, Mich., in place of E. M. Page, resigned.

Collins H. Luth, Niles, Mich., in place of F. C. Franz, resigned.

MISSOURI

Waldo E. Malone, Clifton Hill, Mo., in place of E. E. Essig, deceased.

Aubrey M. Gooch, Meadville, Mo., in place of W. E. Evans, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Lorin V. Jones, Auburn, Nebr., in place of R. E. Harmon, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Edmund O. Howell, Cape May Court House, N. J., in place of Jacob Garrison, deceased.

Elizabeth A. Philhower, Gladstone, N. J., in place of Remsen Howard, removed.

NEW YORK

Cornelius S. Ball, Rye, N. Y., in place of T. V. Ball, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Simon C. Sitterson, Kinston, N. C., in place of W. A. Mitchell, resigned.

OHIO

Roger W. Goertemiller, Verona, Ohio, in place of J. A. Ressler, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Ethel V. Hamrick, Avant, Okla., in place of E. E. Baker, resigned.

Omri B. Autry, Marietta, Okla., in place of O. B. Autry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OREGON

Farley J. Elliott, Bend, Oreg., in place of R. H. Fox, retired.

Victor Carl Black, Dallas, Oreg., in place of Tracy Savery, transferred.

Robert E. Ballard, McMinnville, Oreg., in place of W. G. Wisecarver, retired.

Albert R. McCall, Rainier, Oreg., in place of William Reid, resigned.

Loyal E. Smith, Sherwood, Oreg., in place of W. P. Fisk, transferred.

RHODE ISLAND

Edward J. Quinn, Barrington, R. I., in place of T. F. Burke, resigned.

Stephen H. Greene, Slatersville, R. I., in place of G. W. Jenckes, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Jerome R. Rueschenberg, Doland, S. Dak., in place of H. J. Gross, resigned.

TENNESSEE

George W. Sexton, Dover, Tenn., in place of A. L. Allison, resigned.

Y. Z. Pate, Rutherford, Tenn., in place of H. H. Taylor, Sr., deceased.

TEXAS

Wallace L. Rickaway, Blessing, Tex., in place of E. E. Walker, resigned.

Sims A. Palmer, Colorado City, Tex., in place of J. Y. Fraser, deceased.

Elmer E. Carruth, Elsa, Tex., in place of R. A. Wilson, resigned.

Wilson O. Dunn, Mauriceville, Tex., in place of V. L. Taylor, resigned.

Opal F. Roberson, Temple, Tex., in place of W. N. Roberson, retired.

Cleo M. Hagan, Yoakum, Tex., in place of J. M. Woolsey, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Clifford Lavender, Portage, Wash., in place of D. L. Armstrong, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Robert W. Howard, Cornell, Wis., in place of G. E. Shaw, resigned.

Hugo J. Quast, Granton, Wis., in place of O. A. Peterson, resigned.

Leone C. Mader, Gresham, Wis., in place of F. J. Mader, deceased.

Werner N. Schomaker, Marinette, Wis., in place of J. D. Cook, removed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in this sacred moment we pray that our souls may be awake to the real meaning of life through Christ our Saviour. In the anguish and moral struggle of this world, help us to listen to Thy teaching: Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose it shall preserve it. Do Thou rest our souls upon this sublime utterance, that there is no finding except by losing and no getting but by giving; upon this rock rests the superstructure of a life that is truly Christian.

Blessed Lord, we pray Thee to touch all hearts with Thy compassion, that in sharing our good fortune we may thus translate our creed into deed, and truly follow Thee. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of W. A. Knox, W. L. M. Knox, and Frank C. Morris, operating as Knox Lumber Sales Co., of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 1726. An act for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor;

H. R. 1655 An act for the relief of Elbert Spivey;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee;

H. R. 2273. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;

H. R. 2588. An act requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of the city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 2684. An act for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese-beetle quarantine;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Emeline Lartigue;

H. R. 3402. An act to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield;

H. R. 3883. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene;*

H. R. 3915. An act to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4032. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States;

H. R. 4688. An act to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery;

H. R. 4830. An act for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.;

H. R. 4874. An act to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county;

H. R. 5071. An act to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma;

H. R. 5112. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes;

H. R. 5147. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens;

H. R. 5174. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii;

H. R. 5344. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5758. An act to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 5808. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5891. An act to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto;

H. R. 5983. An act to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps;

H. R. 6073. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes;

H. R. 6110. An act to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6113. An act to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service;

H. R. 6114. An act to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6229. An act to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6368. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory;

H. R. 6489. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of lead; and

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946;

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3260. An act for the relief of Clarence S. Osika;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5888. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6252. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, for school purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 19. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors;

S. 20. An act to regulate the review of judgments and conviction in certain criminal cases;

S. 21. An act to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States;

S. 108. An act to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 826. An act to amend section 60 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended;

S. 850. An act to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 1884. An act to authorize an appropriation for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public-school buildings and facilities at Winnebago, Nebr.;

S. 2028. An act to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes;

S. 2286. An act to provide for nonreimbursable allocations on the Carlsbad Federal reclamation project;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyences of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all rights of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyance;

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2418. An act to amend the act of July 18, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control";

S. 2517. An act to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2670. An act to amend section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes; and

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 257):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, late Secretary of Labor.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, take a recess until 11 o'clock antemeridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended;

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments;

S. 1082. An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion;

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of James B. Walsh;

S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes;

S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; and

S. 2040. An act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6500) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5770) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1675) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2122) entitled "An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCFARLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the Act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Army.
2. Department of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of Agriculture.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labor.
6. Department of the Navy.
7. Department of State.
8. Department of the Treasury.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. National Archives.
11. Office of the Housing Expediter.
12. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
13. Veterans' Administration.
14. War Assets Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) entitled "An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

FIXING PRICE OF LIQUOR

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] brought before the House the bill (H. R. 6451) to legalize the fixing of prices on liquor sold in retail liquor stores here in the city, I objected to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey has a minimum resale prices law similar to the one proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. In looking over its May 27, 1948, price list, effective June 1, 1948, and comparing the New Jersey prices with those here in Washington, D. C., I find some very interesting figures. The State of New Jersey has an excise tax of $1.50 per gallon and the city of Washington a tax of 50 cents per gallon; so in comparing prices the tax in New Jersey is 20 cents per one-fifth over the Washington, D. C., prices. This 20-cent differential should be deducted from the quoted New Jersey price. Here are some prices: Gold Seal champagne, New Jersey, $4.28; with Washington price, $2.95. Paul Masson, New Jersey, $4.89; Washington, $3.39. Taylor's, New York, $4; Washington price only $2.95. New Jersey, J & F Martell imported brandy, $7.14; Washington price, $5.75. New Jersey, Old Overholt, $6.53; Washington, $4.70. New Jersey, Scotch Ballantine, $5.78; Washington, $4.39. On spirit-blended whiskies, New Jersey, $3.59; Washington, D. C., $2.59. Lord Calvert blended whisky, New Jersey, $4.67; Washington, $3.35. This is an illustration of what the Dirksen bill would cost the consumers of Washington, D. C., if the bill is approved.

Since then I have had a chance to further study the bill, and its implications. This is to serve notice on the membership that if the bill is called up again I propose to object to its consideration.

This is a bill designed to push up the price of liquor in this city, in favor of some 375 or more liquor dealers and against the public who consume liquor products. It is a price-fixing proposition against which I have continually contended since I came here. I certainly am not going to start in by supporting a bill which fixes the price of liquor for the retail liquor stores, who, to my certain knowledge, are getting along quite well financially. If you want to fix prices and give liquor dealers guaranteed profits, why do you not go into the grocery field and the drug field and the food field and every other field, including the production of primary foodstuffs on the farm? Well, Mr. Speaker, of course we do not want to get into a program of upping prices and guaranteeing higher prices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

THE LATE DR. JOSHUA LOTH LIEBMAN, RABBI, TEACHER, AUTHOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of most profound personal sorrow that I call the attention of the House to the death of Dr. Joshua Loth Liebman, of Boston, rabbi of the Temple Israel in suburban Brookline.

At 41, Dr. Liebman is taken from our midst. At that relatively young age, he was already nationally known as a radio speaker on the Voice of Israel program, and perhaps even better known to the Members of the House and to the country as the author of the No. 1 nonfiction best seller Peace of Mind.

Dr. Liebman was a sweet and gentle soul, a man with a great mind, touched with the sublime spirit. Only 6 months ago he married me at my own temple in New York City, so that the Members can understand the depth of my own feeling about his passing.

This great and distinguished spiritual leader, this fine American has been taken from our midst in the prime of life.

Dr. Liebman was born in Hamilton, Ohio, in 1907. After graduating from Hebrew Union College and after being ordained, he went to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem in 1930. Then he was called successively to the pulpit of the temple at Lafayette, Ind., and to the K. A. M. Temple in Chicago, where he served for 5 years, and was called from there to Temple Israel in 1939.

Dr. Liebman had the unique distinction of being professor of Jewish philosophy and literature at Andover-Newton Theological Seminary, a Protestant seminary.

Last fall he expressed his love for his own congregation by refusing to leave to go to the great Temple Emanu-El in New York City.

I would like to read as his finest epitaph and finest heritage the concluding phrase of an editorial in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, paying tribute to Dr. Liebman.

It says:

Death, which has ended his labors, will not end the power of his written word to guide and sustain men of all faiths.

I append the text of the editorial:

JOSHUA LOTH LIEBMAN

The extraordinary success of Joshua Liebman's Peace of Mind must have been due in part to the appeal of its subject and title, meeting as they did the groping need of a generation that had come through a depression and a great war, and had searched for inner quietness and found it nowhere. But unlike many books that are cleverly exploited to meet a popular need, this one had substance, and it revealed behind it an author of integrity and faith. Rabbi Liebman had himself passed through the doubts to which modern men seem peculiarly susceptible; he had explored the resources both of psychiatry and religion and in his own victory had found the wisdom, while still at a youthful age, to bring counsel and help to others. He had already become known to a large radio audience when the publication of his book brought him national fame.

It was the irony of his fate that in meeting the calls as a lecturer and preacher which then came to him he outreached his bodily faith: the inner serenity he had achieved and strove to impart to others could not save him from the blow which at 41 was to close all his exertions. He had turned down last year a call to the pulpit in Temple Emanu-El in this city, choosing to stay with the smaller congregation which he had led for almost a decade. But from this stage his influence reached out in wide circles; and death, which has ended his labors, will not end the power of his written word to guide and sustain men of all faiths.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was only a few weeks ago that Dr. Liebman was in Washington, and he was guest at an informal luncheon on the Senate side, at which I had the honor to be present.

He had a brilliant mind. He was a sweet and lovable character. He was an outstanding American and a great spiritual leader, respected by members and communicants of all other creeds. We in Greater Boston and in Massachusetts, whether Catholics or Protestants, had great respect and esteem for him. And of course his Jewish brethren had great respect and esteem for him. We communicants of the Catholic Church and all members of the various Protestant churches had a deep feeling of respect for the late Dr. Liebman. His passing is not only a sad one, particularly at his early age, but a serious blow to the forces of decency in the Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REEVES asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an address.

CAPTAIN YEAGER, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary for Air on yesterday announced that two American planes and three pilots have repeatedly flown much faster than the speed of sound since last October. The speed was reckoned in excess of 763 miles an hour.

The Secretary told a news conference the baffling sound wall had been pierced at Muroc Lake, Calif., by the rocket-powered Bell XS-1. He said it was flown by Capt. Charles E. Yeager, 25, of Myra, W. Va.

It is with considerable pride that I inform my colleagues that Captain Yeager resides in and is a native of Lincoln County, W. Va., one of the 11 counties comprising the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing.

In Captain Yeager the spirit of our rugged mountains is manifested in the fullest. His people spring from the wholesome colonial stock that settled on the western slope of the Alleghany Mountains early in the nineteenth century—the people who laid the foundation for the building of civilization that is not surpassed in all the world.

It is the stout heart of such men as Captain Yeager that created this Republic, made it secure by their creative genius, and by their courage and determination give us hope for the future.

The rocket-powered plane has a wing spread of only 28 feet and a gross weight empty of 4,982 pounds. The XS-1 carries 8,000 pounds of fuel for the few minutes its rocket motor operates. It was designed to reach 1,017 miles an hour at 40,000 feet and 1,700 miles per hour at 80,000 feet.

The pilots and the Air Force are to be congratulated.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, what makes a definition? In enacting law we can make a definition for that specific statute. The question frequently arises, What is a Communist? J. Edgar Hoover says a Communist is a person who seeks to overthrow this Government by force and violence. Nearly every Member of this House of Representatives has been called a Communist by any pressure group that does not approve of his vote.

What is a Communist? Can we define it? Someone said recently that a Communist was anybody who believed in community action.

May we have a definition, may we have help?

The gentleman from the Fourth District of West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS] has handed me two definitions which he has received as to what a Communist is: First, a Communist is a person who demands possession of the property of others without paying or working for it; advocates a centralized government which he hopes will support him in idleness and permit him to enjoy privileges he would deny others; second, a Communist is a person who wants his government to steal for him but not from him.

In Moscow, Russia, 2 years ago Congressman HORAN and I asked an interpreter from the University of Moscow the question: "What have you to say about religion over here and a policy of government?" The Russian interpreter answered, "We don't believe in God. We think." I said, "We trust God in our country and listen to His voice. Therefore, we think with clarity." She then stated that the government was supreme there and thought for its people.

If some of the peasants or workers there did any thinking, they were not allowed to express their thoughts. Whatever words or definitions may be used, we do know the history of communism and we further know that when people surrender any freedom to a centralized government in order to get things, they soon lose both freedom and things. As long as each citizen is the sovereign and the government serves and as long as no government directive is made to place shackles and fetters on a citizen, we need not fear the result. However, just as soon as the citizen's freedom is surrendered to government authority and the citizen's property is surrendered for government function, then constitutional and representative government have failed and the heritage of this country is gone.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Arthur Krock on President Truman from this morning's New York Times.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include newspaper articles and in the other the President's speech at Seattle yesterday.

INCREASE FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has recommended to the House for passage two bills adjusting salaries upward of the postal workers and those employed in the classified civil service partially to meet the present high cost of living. These bills are stalled in the Committee on Rules. They have not been reported to the floor of this Congress. This is the responsibility of the majority party, a responsibility that you on the majority side cannot dodge.

The people of the United States are conscious of the plight of the faithful public employees and the condition in which they find themselves. Many newspapers throughout the United States have editorially commented on this subject and have recommended these raises. The committee after long deliberation sent these bill to the floor. As far as responsibility for inaction is concerned, it rests with the Republican leadership of this House.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, as a first-termer in the Eightieth Congress, when I came to the session last January I was asked by newsmen and others what I felt to be the most important domestic problem confronting this Congress. I said that, to my mind, the number one problem which faced the people of the United States and this Congress was the housing problem. It is a problem which is tragic, it is that serious.

I was greatly heartened to hear that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday, and I do hope that a speedy rule will be issued so that this Congress may give consideration to this important legislation before we adjourn.

From some comments I have heard here by Members of this distinguished body I can see why a certain commentator in speaking of the housing situation said: "There is no housing shortage, it is merely a rumor started by the people who have no place to live."

May I now present some facts and figures on the current high cost of housing:

For more than a year there have been warnings from various quarters that housing prices were too high, and that if they continued to climb, builders would price themselves out of the market. Now it has happened. The Wall Street Journal for May 14 reports that thousands of new houses are standing empty because price tags are too big for the consumers' pocketbook. Following a survey of what is happening to home building in 16 large and small cities and towns, the Journal finds that house-hungry customers are staying away in droves and builders are talking about cutting back production.

The paradox of this situation, the Journal points out, is that the housing need is as great as ever. But every price boost has lopped off another group of customers until today the market is drying up.

Fantastic as it is to talk about cutting production of homes when we have a housing famine, it is logical that builders who cannot sell the houses they build will stop production. We have only so many families in this country who can afford eight, nine, ten, and twelve thousand dollar houses. The builders have been building for the highest-income families ever since the end of the war. They have not made more than a slight dent in producing houses even for families of middle income. As for low-income families who can afford only very low-rental housing, there are no commercial builders who have made even a pretense of supplying housing for this market.

Some Members of Congress are not unaware of where we have been heading. The House-Senate Joint Committee on Housing, which only recently finished a tour to investigate housing needs of the country, reported that residential building costs—always too high—had almost doubled since 1939 and that selling prices of existing houses rose even more. In 1947 they were selling at 130 percent above 1939 prices. This meant, the committee said, that a house which sold for $6,500 before the war was selling for $15,000. Those were 1947 figures. To make the story even more fantastic, add the Wall Street Journal's report that as of May 14, 1948, prices had risen 5 to 20 percent over a year ago. Can the American people afford present housing prices? The House-Senate Joint Housing Committee's report gave the answer when it reported that residential construction cost increases have exceeded cost-of-living increases since the end of the war.

What must we do? The authors of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and the Senate which approved it have given to the House an instrument in the form of a national housing policy that will provide private builders with tools to supply the crying need of the house-hungry middle- and low-income families; will give local governments financial assistance to clear slums; and will also help housing agencies to provide low-rent housing for low-income families living in slums who have not enough income to provide themselves with adequate shelter.

My constituents are urging me to act. I would be derelict in my duty if I did not fully support a good housing program for America. The Rules Committee would not be performing their duty if they do not give us the opportunity to vote this session upon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Once on the floor of the House, I confidently predict the bill will be enacted into law and we will be on our way to solving our most pressing domestic problem.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include as part of my remarks the rulings of the Supreme Court regarding veterans' preference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the gentleman from Minnesota who has just spoken that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out a very fine bill on veterans' housing which should pass, no matter what other housing bill is passed. Some 29 Members joined with me in introducing the same bill at the request of the American Legion. It is an amendment to the GI bill of rights and known as the Veterans' Housing Act.

I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, to include in my remarks, on which I have just received unanimous consent, the rulings and decisions of the Supreme Court regarding the veterans' preference law. I should like to state that in every instance the Supreme Court has ruled that veterans have the preference.

(The decisions referred to follow:)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(No. 560, October Term, 1947)

EARLE W. HILTON, PETITIONER, V. JOHN L. SULLIVAN, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, FRANCES PERKINS, HARRY B. MITCHELL, AND ARTHUR FLEMMING, MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION. ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(June 1, 1948)

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case raises questions concerning the relative rights of war veteran and nonveteran employees to retention in Government service when a program of reduction in the number of Government civilian employees makes it necessary for some to be chosen for discharge. The acute point of controversy is this: In the treatment of permanent-tenure civil-service employees, should qualified honorably discharged war veterans, merely because they are such, be retained in preference to nonveterans, even though those nonveterans have served the Government a substantially longer time than the veterans. The questions depend upon whether certain regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission are valid under a proper interpretation of controlling statutes.

The petitioner was for 12 years, from 1934 to 1946, a duly appointed permanent-status civil-service employee working in the Charleston Navy Yard. His work was of such high quality as to earn him an efficiency rating of "excellent." By successive promotions, he arrived at the responsible position of leading-man shipfitter at a basic wage of $12.08 per day. January 7, 1946, shortly after the posthostility reduction of governmental employees began, petitioner was demoted to a position paying $10.08 per day as part of a reduction in force. This demotion apparently was due in part to the fact that he did not have a veteran's preference. October

7, 1946, petitioner was notified that due to curtailment of work and funds it was necessary to eliminate certain positions in his competitive level and that, in accordance with civil-service regulations, his name had been reached for action. He was told that, if he approved, he was then to be placed in a 1-year furlough status rather than absolutely separated from service, because it hoped that conditions might justify his recall to duty within the year. He was also informed that his active service had already been terminated and that, unless sooner recalled to duty, he would be separated for reduction in force at the end of his 1-year furlough period.

The civil-service regulations said to require termination of petitioner's active service divide Government employees into three main groups—A, B, and C. Group A, which has the highest priority for retention, is composed of permanent employees; groups B and C are composed of employees with limited tenures of employment. Group A is divided into five subgroups, the first three of which are of particular importance here. These three subgroups are:

Subgroup A–1 plus (veterans of World War II) for a 1-year period after return to duty;

Subgroup A–1, veteran's preference employees with "good" (or higher) efficiency ratings;

Subgroup A–2, employees without veteran's preference with "good" (or higher) efficiency ratings.[1]

The result of these Commission groupings is that A–1 plus veterans have the highest retention priority; A–1 the second; and A–2, in which, not having a veteran's preference, petitioner is classified, has the third. Thus if these regulations are valid, every member of both subgroup A–1 plus and subgroup A–1 must be retained in preference to petitioner.

After receiving notice of his 1-year furlough, petitioner filed this complaint in district court for declaratory judgment, mandamus, and other relief. The defendants were the Secretary of the Navy and the members of the Civil Service Commission. The complaint charged that petitioner's demotion and furlough were the result of the Commission's regulations which prescribed retention priorities for veterans' preference employees in A–1 plus and A–1 over all nonveteran employees without regard to the longer periods of service of some of the nonveteran employees, including petitioner. The failure of the Commission to consider relative length of service in establishing these retention priorities was charged to be "unreasonable, arbitrary, and capricious, without statutory warrant, and contrary to the express provisions" of applicable statutes. The petitioner's prayer was that the Commission's A–1 plus and A–1 classifications be declared void, that the Secretary of the Navy be compelled to restore him to his original position as leading-man shipfitter, that the Commission be required to rescind the regulations and promulgate new ones in accordance with law, and that "such other and further relief as is just" be granted him. After answer and certain stipulations of fact, both parties moved for summary judgment and the Government's motion was granted. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia affirmed. (165 F. 2d 251.) Importance of the questions raised prompted us to grant certiorari. (333 U. S. —.)

First. While admitting petitioner's right to challenge the validity of subgroup A–1 in this action, the Government contends that he cannot challenge A–1 plus. The premise of this argument is that, even if A–1 plus were invalid, the veterans grouped in it would fall within subgroup A–1. We find no adequate support for this premise in the record. Veterans in subgroup A–1 plus could not qualify for A–1 unless they had efficiency ratings of good or better. But the language defining A–1 plus includes veterans of all ratings, even below good. And when the summary judgment in this case was rendered, 61 of the 118 veterans comprising A–1 plus had not been rated at all. True, the Government asserts that 60 of these veterans have now been rated good and the sixty-first member has resigned. But the potential membership of subgroup A–1 plus is not limited to those veterans who were in it when the case was tried. The classification provides for a continuing status of preference of 1 year for all returning veterans who left Government employment for war duty. There is no indication that additional war veterans qualified for classification under A–1 plus will not return to Charleston Navy Yard and reclaim shipfitter jobs in preference to otherwise qualified nonveteran employees. And the Government does not claim that this classification has been repealed or altered so that in the future it can include only those veterans who have an efficiency rating of good or higher. Under these circumstances we are unable to say that all members of A–1 plus could qualify or will be able to qualify as members of A–1. Therefore we cannot accept the Government's contention that petitioner's likelihood of injury from A–1 plus is too remote to justify his attack on it. If invalid, there is as much reason for his right to challenge this subgroup as for his right to challenge subgroup A–1.

Second. The Government finds support for subgroup A–1 plus in section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 885, 890, 50 U. S. C., section 308. That section provides reemployment rights to any person who under that act left a position other than a temporary one in order to perform training and service in the armed forces and who satisfactorily completed his training. It further requires that upon appropriate application after release from training, such person, if still qualified to perform the duties of his old job and "if such position was in the employ of the United States Government * * * shall be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay." Section 8 (c) also provides that a person so restored to his old position "shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration."

There appears to be little room for contention that there is ambiguity in the language that Congress selected to express its purpose to require the restoration of a former Government employee who entered the armed forces to his old position and to give him the right to retention for a year. The language is that such an employee "shall be restored" to his position or to one like it, supplemented by language that he "shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration." We have examined the legislative history of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 and find nothing whatever which faintly suggests that Congress intended its language to be less mandatory than implied by the words it used. The command in section 8 (b) (A) that the Federal Government rehire its returning veteran employees contrasted sharply with the requirement in section 8 (b) (B) that a private employer need not reemploy such a veteran when "the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so." This difference was noted by the congressional sponsors of the 1940 act, who thought that the Federal Government should set an example to private industry by providing jobs for all returning veteran employees.[2] Congress, having thus provided that the veteran who left a Government job must be reemployed, also required his retention by declaring that he should not be discharged within a year without cause.

Petitioner contends, however, that this court's interpretations of section 8 (b) (B) and section 8 (c) in *Trailmobile Co.* v. *Whirls* (331 U. S. 40) and in *Fishgold* v. *Sullivan Drydock & Repair Co.* (328 U. S. 275), require a holding that the regulations establishing A–1 plus are invalid. The Trailmobile case dealt only with the obligations of a private employer to veterans after the first year of their return to his employment, and our holding there is of no relevance here. In the other case, Fishgold, following his discharge from the armed forces, had been restored to his old position by his former private employer. Within 1 year thereafter temporary lay-offs became necessary on each of 9 days. Fishgold was laid off while nonveterans with longer service were continuously kept at work in accordance with a collective-bargaining agreement which required that "decreases" in the working force be based primarily upon "length of service." This court held that since Fishgold's lay-offs were temporary, he still retained an employment relationship, and thus had not been "discharged" within the meaning of section 8 (c). The statute was held not to require that when slack work compelled a private employer to lay off some workers temporarily a veteran restored to his job be given continuous work for 1 year after his reinstatement in preference to other nonveteran employees who under the terms of company employer-employee contract were entitled to such work by reason of their greater "length of service."

There are several reasons why we cannot accept petitioner's argument that the Fishgold case requires the invalidation of the A–1 plus classification. In the first place, we are here concerned with the 1-year retention rights of veterans restored under section 8 (b) (A) to their old jobs with the Federal Government, not, as in the Fishgold case, with the rights of veterans restored to jobs in private industry under section 8 (b) (B). We have previously pointed out that Congress in section 8 (b) (A) imposed a mandatory and unconditional reemployment obligation upon the Federal Government; in other words the section guaranteed that a returning veteran would get back his job with the Government. But section 8 (b) (B) imposed no such unconditional guarantee that a returning veteran would be reemployed by his former private employer. For that subsection does not require restoration of returning veterans to their former private jobs "if the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it unreasonable or impossible" to rehire him.

Thus Congress, evidently considering that there were significant differences in industrial and governmental employment practices and potentialities, imposed obligations to rehire returning veterans of a markedly different nature upon Government and private employers. It did not define the unreasonable or impossible circumstances that might relieve a private employer of the duty to rehire veterans, nor need we attempt to do so now. But it is plain that such circumstances might conceivably be such as seriously to affect, not only the reasonableness and possibility of rehiring, but also the reasonableness and possibility of retaining him for a full year's continuous work. For this reason, among others, interpretation of

[1] The remaining two subgroups of A, not involved here, are:

Subgroup A–3, veterans with efficiency ratings lower than "good."

Subgroup A–4, nonveterans with efficiency ratings lower than "good" (5 Code Fed. Reg. (Supp. 1945) sec. 12.303, now found in 5 Code Fed. Reg. (Supp. 1947) sec. 20.3 (a)).

[2] Hearings before House Committee on Military Affairs on H. R. 10132, 76th Cong., 3d sess. 80–82, 118, 235; 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11697.

section 8 (c)'s prohibition against discharge of a returning veteran must be made in light of whether he returns to a government-guaranteed or to a private nonguaranteed job. Therefore section 8 (c)'s prohibition against discharge by a private employer cannot be accepted as determinative of the scope of the congressional prohibition against discharge by the Government.

The foregoing distinction is illustrated by the fact that civil-service workers, unlike the private employees in the Fishgold case, are not confronted by a situation in which their employer, the Government, has an outstanding contract with them providing that they shall be retained in service in proportion to their length of service as reductions in force become necessary. Whatever seniority rights Government employees have when discharges or reductions in force are made depend entirely upon congressional acts and regulations issued in harmony with them. (See 37 Stat. 555, 5 U. S. C. sec. 652.) We have discovered no acts or regulations which can be construed to recognize a nonveteran's length of Government service as a factor sufficient to override the requirement of section 8 (b) (A) and section 8 (c) that a veteran must be restored to his old job with the Federal Government and cannot be discharged therefrom without cause for 1 year. Thus, unlike the employees in the Fishgold case whose private-employment, contract-derived seniority prevented their being laid off, petitioner has no comparable statutorily derived seniority rights to his job with the Government. Petitioner argues, however, that section 12 of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 390, 5 U. S. C., sec. 861), in effect amended section 8 and conferred retention rights upon him based upon his length of service. For the reasons we give below in discussing the validity of subgroup A–1, we think this contention is without merit.

Finally, the Fishgold decision held only that a temporary lay-off did not violate a veteran's right under section 8 (c) not to be discharged without cause for 1 year after he had been restored to his old job. Here the petitioner asserts that the statutory 1-year prohibition against discharge confers upon a reemployed veteran no security from a furlough for 1 year without pay, that such a furlough is not a "discharge" within the meaning of section 8 (c). The Commission has here treated a furlough of more than 30 days as the equivalent of a discharge. This is in accordance with prior governmental practice which has considered that the furlough of a veteran with military preference violates regulations providing that he shall not be "discharged or dropped" when "reductions in force are being made."[3] Moreover, section 14 of the Veterans Preference Act, which safeguards preference eligibles against administrative denial of their preference rights, specifically places furloughs and suspensions for more than 30 days without pay on the same basis as discharges. Thus, the common meaning of furlough in governmental practice is not the same as that which the Court in the Fishgold case found to be the meaning of "lay-offs" and "furloughs" in industrial parlance. To give this 1-year furlough any less meaning than the statutory word "discharge" would result in depriving Government employee veterans of the entire congressional guaranty of a year's retention in their old jobs. We hold that the furlough, if applied to veterans, would be a "discharge" within the meaning of section 8 (c). Consequently, the Commission acted within its statutory duty by providing veterans a preference against such removals by establishing subgroup A–1 plus.

Third. Petitioner strongly urges invalidity of subgroup A–1, which gives all permanent employee veterans with "good" or higher efficiency ratings retention preferences over all nonveterans, even over nonveterans with higher efficiency ratings and longer Government service. While conceding that under some limited circumstances veterans with "good or higher ratings" are granted preference by section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, petitioner argues that the section does not require but actually prohibits any preference for veterans over nonveterans which fails to give substantial weight to a nonveteran's longer Government service. The Government urges that the section requires an absolute retention preference for veterans who have the required efficiency ratings without regard to the fact that nonveterans may have had longer Government service. An alternative argument is that, whether absolutely required or not, the Commission's subgrouping is well within the power to promulgate rules and regulations specifically authorized by section 12. The question presented is, therefore, one of interpretation of the relevant language of section 12.

The part of the section on which petitioner particularly relies reads:

"In any reduction in personnel in any civilian service of any Federal agency, competing employees shall be released in accordance with Civil Service Commission regulations which shall give due effect to tenure of employment, military preference, length of service, and efficiency ratings: *Provided*, That the length of time spent in active service in the armed forces of the United States of each such employee shall be credited in computing length of total service."

Petitioner interprets this portion of section 12 as a congressional command that the Commission must invariably give "due effect" to length of service in determining what employees, whether veterans or nonveterans, shall first be discharged in a reduction-of-force program. In effect he argues that the above language provides no other "military preference" in civil service for a veteran employee over a nonveteran with greater "length of service" than that defined in the above proviso, namely, that the length of a veteran's Army service shall be credited in computing the length of his total Government service.

The part of section 12 on which the Government supports the Commission's recognition of a veteran's absolute retention preference without regard to comparative length of service of veterans and nonveterans follows immediately after that section's language on which petitioner relies, and reads:

"*Provided further*, That preference employees whose efficiency ratings are 'good' or better shall be retained in preference to all other competing employees and that preference employees whose efficiency ratings are below 'good' shall be retained in preference to competing nonpreference employees who have equal or lower efficiency ratings."

The Government interprets this proviso as a special withdrawal of the proviso-defined classes of veterans from the general terms of the first clause of section 12 relating to "length of service." It views this proviso as the congressional creation of classes of veterans' "preference employees"[4] who "shall," if they have the defined efficiency ratings, "be retained in preference to all other competing employees" without regard to length of service as between veterans and nonveterans. Thus, under the Government's interpretation, length of service would be given the "due effect" required by the first clause of section 12 by its consideration in the determination of retention preferences as between veteran and veteran and as between nonveteran and nonveteran. This interpretation of the proviso and the section, it is argued, would give meaning to all the language used in them, is plainly called for by the language, and harmonizes this portion of the act with all its other parts and with the act's broad purposes. The interpretation is compelled, so the Government argues, by the act's legislative history, particularly when the proviso and preceding clauses in the section are viewed in the light of a long series of prior congressional enactments and authorized Executive orders granting preferences in Government employment to veterans and their close relatives. We agree with the Government that in the light of the foregoing factors no other interpretation of the pertinent parts of the section can fairly be reached.

In 1876, 72 years ago, Congress passed a law which required any executive department when making "any reduction of force" to "retain those persons who may be equally qualified who have been honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States and the widows and orphans of deceased soldiers and sailors" (19 Stat. 143, 169; 5 U. S. C., section 37).[5] In 1912 Congress greatly strengthened the old 1876 policy providing that "in the event of reductions being made in the force in any of the executive departments, no honorably discharged soldier or sailor whose record in said department is rated good shall be discharged or dropped, or reduced in rank or salary" (37 Stat. 360, 413).[6] There is nothing ambiguous about this 1912 provision. It was an absolute command that no governmental department should discharge, drop, or reduce in rank any honorably discharged veteran Government employee with a rating of "good." Length of service in no way qualified preference given the veteran. And subsequent Executive orders not only recognized this provision as giving veterans an absolute preference,[7] but also extended the preference to veterans in the field service[8] and to positions not under civil service.[9]

Executive Order 4240 of June 4, 1925, as amended by Executive Order 5068 of March 2, 1929, provided, as does subgroup A–1 here, an absolute retention preference for veterans over nonveterans where the veterans' efficiency ratings were "good," and a similar absolute preference over nonveterans whose ratings were less than good if the veterans' ratings were equal to those of the nonveterans. And at the time of passage of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, there were 1943 civil-service regulations outstand-

[3] See 40 Ops. Att'y Gen. 115 (Sept. 20, 1946) 7, referring to Opinion, Attorney General Mitchell in 1929, interpreting Executive Order 5068, March 2, 1929. The substance of that order is set out in this opinion at p. 13.

[4] The act not only provides preferences for veterans but under certain circumstances grants preferences to veterans' wives, widows, and mothers. Sec. 2, 5 U. S. C., sec. 851, as amended by Public Law No. 396, 80th Cong., 2d sess. (January 19, 1948). See H. Rept. No. 1289, 78th Cong., 2d sess. 3.

[5] Disabled veterans had been granted employment preferences in 1865 (13 Stat. 571). This statutory policy was expressly preserved by section 7 of the Civil Service Act of 1883 (22 Stat. 403, 406), was carried forward in other acts, and has been repeated in a most comprehensive manner in section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

[6] It is of interest that this legislative expression, like the one before us, was a proviso in a section, and that the section as a whole had to do with the manner in which the Civil Service Commission should provide for efficiency ratings in relation to promotions, demotions and dismissals of civil-service employees.

[7] Section 7, Executive Order 3567, October 24, 1921.

[8] Executive Order 3801, March 3, 1923.

[9] Departmental Circular 146, U. S. Civil Service Commission, October 22, 1936.

ing [10] which granted veterans with permanent tenure and with a rating of "good" or higher, precisely the same absolute retention preference over nonveterans which is now afforded by subgroup A–1, here attacked as invalid. Consequently, a holding that veterans with a rating of "good" no longer have a retention preference over nonveterans with longer service, would mean that passage of the Veterans' Preference Act in 1944 narrowed the long-existing scope of veterans' preferences in case of reduction in force of Government personnel. The purpose of that act's sponsors and of Congress in passing it appears to have been precisely the opposite—to broaden rather than narrow the preference.

The Senate Civil Service Committee was told by the congressional sponsor of the measure that "this bill takes away no existing veterans' preference, either by statute or Executive order, but it does strengthen, broaden, and implement the veterans' preference policy heretofore in effect," and that it would "give legislative sanction to existing veterans' preference, to the rules and regulations in the executive branch of the Government." [11] A member of the Civil Service Commission, in explaining the bill to the Senate committee, called the proviso here involved the "heart of the section," [12] and stated that it "was substantially the same" as the 1912 act,[13] which, as before pointed out, provided for an absolute veterans' retention preference without regard to length of service.[14] And, in explaining the bill on the floor of the House, the sponsor and active proponents of the measure explained it as strengthening and broadening veterans' preferences then embodied in statutes and Executive orders.[15]

Not only did the friends of the Veterans' Preference Act explain to the Senate Committee on Civil Service and to the Congress the broad preferences the act would grant. Hostile witnesses graphically pointed out to the Senate committee what they deemed would be the unfairness of the act's effect if passed as written. One such witness representing The Civil Service Reform League said: "I think you ought to give consideration to * * * retention of veterans in civil service regardless of length of service. I do not think it is fair, a veteran be retained in service who has been in the service 6 months as against a person who has been in the service 25 years. I believe some distinction might be made, otherwise you would do a grave injustice to those people who have long years of service in civil service." [16] And another witness against the bill pointed out that under it nonveterans would "be the first to be laid off and the last to be taken on." [17]

Thus Congress passed the bill with full knowledge that the long-standing absolute retention preferences of veterans would be embodied in the act. Petitioner makes an appealing argument against this policy. But it is a policy adopted by Congress, and our responsibility is to interpret the act, not to overrule the Congressional policy.[18]

Affirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(No. 560, October term, 1947)

EARLE W. HILTON, PETITIONER, V. JOHN L. SULLIVAN, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, FRANCES PERKINS, HARRY B. MITCHELL AND ARTHUR FLEMMING, MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION. ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(June 1, 1948)

Mr. Justice Rutledge, concurring.

I concur in the result. But I do so without expressing opinion concerning the validity of subgroup A–1 plus of the regulations. That classification, as I understand it and the Court's construction of it, gives preference for retention for 1 year in governmental work to veterans of World War II over all others, including veterans of World War I, regardless of efficiency and length of service whether of the restored veteran or of his competitors. It may be that upon the sum of the legislation Congress intended to give so broad a priority to returning members of the military services. But if so, it is the one instance in which both efficiency and length of service have been absolutely disregarded. And it is at least possible, I think, to read the complex series of statutes bearing on the problem as not having been intended to go so far.

But I do not reach that question, because subgroup A–1 does take account of efficiency. It gives preference to veterans unless their efficiency rating is less than "good." No specific mention of length of service is made. But of efficiency and of length of service it might be found unauthorized under the statutory scheme,[1] one which takes due account of efficiency, which is not wholly unrelated to length of service, well might be sustained. And in that event the Commission's judgment that veterans with efficiency ratings of "good" or better should be preferred to all others could hardly be called arbitrary or in excess of the authority conferred.[2]

It is true that when petitioner was separated from service there were some 61 veterans classified A–1 plus, without efficiency ratings and in priority to himself.[3] But we are informed, and it is not disputed,[4] that 60 of these men now have received efficiency ratings of "good," and therefore fall into group A–1 in any event. The other of the 61 has resigned. Hence we are told, and this also is not disputed, that any order of the District Court purporting to require petition's restoration would mean that he is entitled to displace one of those veterans.

Since in my view regulation A–1 is valid, regardless of whether A–1 plus should stand, and since on the facts now before us regulation A–1 is sufficient to exclude petitioner from restoration at this time, I do not think he has made a sufficient showing to call forth the exercise of our discretionary power in this proceeding to require the Commission to reformulate the regulations. Upon the showing made the case is not one appropriate, in my judgment, for application of the discretionary remedy of a declaratory judgment.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(No. 560, October term, 1947)

EARLE W. HILTON, PETITIONER V. JOHN L. SULLIVAN, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, FRANCES PERKINS, HARRY B. MITCHELL, AND ARTHUR FLEMMING, MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(June 1, 1948)

Mr. Justice Reed, concurring.

I agree with the conclusions reached by the Court in this case. My disagreement with the opinion is limited to that portion of subdivision second which indicates that the rights of a veteran as to discharge after restoration to employment by the United States differ from the corresponding rights of a veteran restored to employment by a private employer.

The rights to retention of employment of both veterans are governed by the same subsection 8 (c) (54 Stat. 890). Section 8 (c) specifies the same conditions for retention of employment for all employees whether they are reemployed by the United States or by private employers.

---

[10] 5 Code Fed Reg. (Supp. 1943) sections 12.301–12.313. These regulations, like those attacked here, separated all civil-service employees into different categories according to their tenure, with permanent employees having the highest retention status. Thus all permanent employees, regardless of veteran's preference and of efficiency rating, enjoyed priority over all employees with limited tenures.

[11] Hearings before Senate Committee on Civil Service on S. 1762 and H. R. 4115, 78th Cong., 2d sess. 8–9.

[12] Id. at 29.

[13] Id. at 27, 29.

[14] Three veterans' organizations collaborated with the legislative sponsors in drafting the act. Hearings before Senate Committee on Civil Service on S. 1762 and H. R. 4115, 78th Cong., 2d sess. 8. A representative of one of these organizations stated to the committee: "This measure gives to honorably discharged veterans of World War I and World War II, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed. It provides, by law, a definite preference both in appointment and retention in Federal positions. While such a preference in many instances now exist by virtue of Executive orders and Civil Service Commission regulations, this bill gives such preference a permanent standing that cannot be changed except by congressional action. The bill, likewise, does not take away from the veteran any rights previously granted under any existing law, Executive order, civil-service rule, or regulation of any department of the Government, but prescribes by law additional preferences and confirms many now existing by regulation." Id. at 41–42.

[15] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3502, 3503, 3505.

[16] Hearings before Senate Committee on Civil Service on S. 1762 and H. R. 4115, 78th Cong., 2d sess., 33–34.

[17] Id. at 63, 65.

[18] It is worthy of note, however, that Congress, in recognition of hardships resulting from replacement of older government employees by veterans, has passed acts which grant special pensions to employees over 55 years of age who have worked for the Government for 25 years or more and who have been involuntarily separated from the service in reductions in force. (60 Stat. 939, Public Law No. 426, 80th Cong., 2d sess. (Feb. 28, 1948). See 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9201–9202, H. R. No. 2443, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 1, S. Rep. No. 1678, 79th Cong., 2d sess. 1–2.)

[1] Depending upon whether section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 890, 50 U. S. C. App. sec. 301), requiring restoration to employment and forbidding discharge without cause for 1 year, has been qualified by the later enactment of section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act (58 Stat. 390, 5 U. S. C., Supp. 1946, sec. 861), quoted in the Court's opinion, particularly in the second proviso. See note 2.

[2] The second proviso, cf. note 1, specifies that preference employees (i. e., veterans) with efficiency ratings of "good" or better shall be retained in preference to "all other competing employees," a designation certainly of the most comprehensive scope. The very terms of the section appear thus to place much greater stress upon efficiency ratings than upon length of service.

[3] The practice in relation to these positions has been to withhold efficiency ratings, in this case, for a period of 6 months, and then to award them on the basis of actual performance.

[4] Ordinarily, of course, rights are to be determined as of the time the interests involved are adversely affected. But it would seem hardly consistent with the legislative scheme that employees with deferred status could defeat the use of a reasonable period to determine the veteran's efficiency rating by actual performance. In any event, the discretionary declaratory judgment remedy should not be applied to oust preference employees entitled to priority over others, even though their status as preference employees is established after trial but before final disposition of the cause on appellate review.

Nothing has come to my attention that indicates to me a congressional purpose to grant to one more rights as to continuity of employment than to the other. The legislation as to both depended upon the same constitutional authority—the war power. I can see no reason to attribute to Congress an intention to guarantee public employment to a returning veteran regardless of the needs of the public service or to discriminate between equally deserving veterans. Compare *Fishgold* v. *Sullivan Dry Dock & Repair Corp.* (328 U. S. 275).

Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Jackson join in this opinion.

GOVERNOR WARREN HAS GREAT VOTE APPEAL AMONG INDEPENDENT VOTERS BECAUSE OF GREAT RECORD AS GOVERNOR AND COURAGEOUS STAND ON PUBLIC QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, within the next couple of weeks the Republican Party will select its Presidential standard bearer for the coming November election. At this time, I would like to say a word about the one whom I think will be the winner of the Republican nomination. I refer to the Governor of California, the Honorable Earl Warren.

Mr. Speaker, in 1946 there was conducted the greatest poll I ever heard of in the Nation. Mr. Warren entered the Democratic primary. He had been the governor during two very strenuous sessions of the legislature, in which there were some very bitter controversies. Mr. Warren had running against him the strongest Democrat that could be picked in California, Mr. Robert Kenny, attorney general. In this primary for the Democratic nomination, only registered Democrats could vote. Mr. Warren, a registered Republican, sought the endorsement of the California Democrats on his record as a Republican governor. He polled 593,180 votes. His opponent, the strongest man the Democrats could pick, polled 530,968.

At that time California had almost 3,000,000 new citizens who had come from every State in the Nation since 1940. The test was really a national test of Warren's drawing power in which 1,124,148 voters, all Democrats, from every part of the Nation participated.

It indicated his tremendous appeal to independent voters, who are not bound by partisanship, but who want the best man for the public service. Why this great appeal? Warren has the common touch; he is progressive; he is courageous, as shown by his fight for principles he believed right, despite strong legislative opposition; he is in tune with the problems of the day; he is an able executive as his record as Governor shows; he is the right age, in the middle fifties, with tremendous mental and physical vigor; he knows how to work with people, harmonize their differences and get results.

No candidate in the entire field has demonstrated so conclusively that he has the capacity to draw that 10 to 30 percent of the voters who cast the independent votes and who really elect the President.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

PAY RAISE FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] may I say I, too, would like to see a pay-raise bill passed in this session of the Congress for postal workers. I join with him in hoping and in believing that a pay-raise bill for postal workers will be passed by this House and by the Senate before the close of the session. The question arises, Where are you going to get the money?

I should like to tell you in my remaining time where we can get the money. The Appropriations Committee, one of the greatest, one of the most patriotic, one of the most competent Appropriations Committees probably in the history of this country, reduced the ERP bill a few days ago by $1,500,000,000. If the Members of this House who want to get benefits for some of our own people at home will back the action of the Appropriations Committee when that bill comes back from the Senate, we can get the money and have the money with which to give these raises to some of our own people. I am a little bit amazed to find at times when the Appropriations Committee that knows most about what should be done to trim this ERP bill, runs into trouble in being sustained by Members of the House. This House should sustain this committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by Dr. Wilfred I. King.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain extraneous matter.

PAY RAISE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois a moment ago suggested that salary increases for Federal employees would be possible if funds for the European recovery program were cut. Personally I believe that Federal employees are worthy of more consideration than the left-overs of European relief or recovery. Their case for relief from inflation is entitled to a hearing before this House. The only association I can admit between the measures for salary increases for Federal employees and the European recovery program is a similarity of initials—ERP—which could be "employees' relief program." Only 8 days remain for consideration of these measures. Will the Republican leadership permit it to come before the House?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6396) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 99]

Andrews, N. Y.	Herter	Peden
Banta	Johnson, Ill.	Ploeser
Bates, Mass.	Johnson, Okla.	Powell
Bloom	Johnson, Tex.	Reed, Ill.
Buckley	Kearns	Richards
Clark	Kee	Robertson
Clippenger	Keefe	St. George
Coffin	Kefauver	Scoblick
Coudert	King	Scott, Hardie
Courtney	Lane	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Ludlow	Short
Dawson, Ill.	Lusk	Smith, Maine
Dolliver	McDowell	Stigler
Fisher	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Gillie	Meade, Ky.	Thompson
Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.	Twyman
Grant, Ind.	Mitchell	Vail
Gregory	Morton	West
Halleck	Murdock	Whitaker
Harness, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.	Wilson, Ind.
Harris	Norrell	Wood
Hartley	Norton	
Harvey	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 361 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING COAST GUARD TO OPERATE AND MAINTAIN OCEAN STATIONS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, with House

amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WEICHEL, HAND, LATHAM, BLAND, and HART.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6396) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6396, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, June 10, the Clerk had read through section 2 of the bill.

Are there any further amendments to section 2?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LODGE:

Page 2, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

"(b) A person who (1) during World War II was a member of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland, (2) was honorably discharged from such forces, (3) resides in the British Isles upon the effective date of this act, and (4) has filed an application for an immigration visa with a United States consular officer in Great Britain prior to June 1, 1948. Section 3 (a) (2) shall not apply to persons coming within the provisions of this paragraph; or

"(c) A family dependent of any person coming within the provisions of paragraph (b): *Provided*, That the total number of immigration visas issued under this subsection shall not exceed 18,000. Section 3 (a) (2) shall not apply to persons coming within the provisions of this paragraph."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)"; and page 2, line 15, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane to the bill. It is an amendment to the immigration laws. Furthermore, the same amendment was passed on yesterday and ruled not to be germane.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place, if the same amendment was passed on yesterday, why was not the point of order raised at that time? If the point of order is valid today it would have been valid yesterday. In the second place, it is not the same amendment. The MacKinnon amendment provided that the entire 110,000 should be considered as displaced persons. This only applies to 18,000. The Clason amendment had to do not only with Poles but with members of all the armed forces which fought on the Allied side. I would also like to say that this is a question of the definition of the term "displaced persons" and to sustain the point of order would be tantamount to getting out a closed rule as to this particular section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that this amendment is germane to the bill and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, first I want to congratulate my good friend the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] not only for the statesmanlike measure that he has placed before this body but for the masterful way in which he has handled this bill on the floor.

I want to point out that my amendment does not remove 18,000 numbers from the 200,000 authorized under this bill but adds 18,000 to it.

I would like to point out that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said yesterday, as I recall it, that the Polish veterans are in no different category from the French who fought as members of the Maquis or the Italians who fought in a similar capacity. If I am not correct in that understanding, I would like to have the gentleman from New York correct me.

Now, there is this distinction, which I am surprised escaped the gentleman from New York, and that is that Poland is under the domination of Soviet Russia. They have a Communist government there, and that is not true in the case of France and Italy. The Poles are, therefore, persecutees. The French and the Italians are not. I think that is a very vital distinction. These displaced Polish veterans are displaced persons in every substantial sense of the word. Only in the technical sense that they are not registered with the IRO in Germany, Austria, and Italy are they not displaced persons.

If this amendment is not adopted, the 110,000 Polish soldiers in the British Isles will have been affected in the following way: Their chances of coming into this country will have been reduced by 50 percent over a period of around 42 or 43 years, because, contrary to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in the views he offers in the report, it is not a 13-year preemption, it is more like a 42-year preemption. You will be reducing the chances of immigration of these Polish soldiers by 50 percent over that period.

I think we are up against a very extraordinary dilemma here. We are considering not only persecutees from nazism but persecutees from communism. That is what makes the problem so very difficult. I believe we have to regard the Poles as a symbol of both persecutions. They were persecuted by the Nazis and they are now being persecuted by the Communists. We must be at least as concerned about present persecutions as we are about the persecutions of the past. This amendment says to these Polish veterans, "You served in the armed forces of the Republic of Poland. You were honorably discharged therefrom. You fought with us against a common foe. By your efforts countless American lives were saved. You are a persecutee in the most real and brutal sense. You desire to emigrate to the United States. You have filed an application for an immigration visa prior to June 1, 1948. Your relatives and friends have vouched for you. You meet our immigration requirements. So this Congress, by the adoption of this amendment, makes this gesture to you, a gallant wartime ally."

Many members of the Polish armed forces gave their lives and in so doing saved the lives of many Americans. The Polish armed forces fought in a common cause. But they have not reaped the fruits of a common victory.

Let us give this additional recognition to the cause of freedom. Let us do this in partial redemption of our solemn pledges and in partial atonement for the betrayal of Poland at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. Let us by this means reassure the Polish people as to our intentions and, in so doing, help ourselves to achieve the peace with freedom so devoutly desired by the American people.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can agree with almost everything my friend from Connecticut has said except the request that his amendment be adopted. I do not know whether I am entitled to be heard because I have talked a lot on this bill, but I do think this is a very important question. The gentleman has presented this in a way that would make you feel you should give these people special recognition, but that is not the point. This bill was brought to the floor of this House because we felt that, without interfering with or striking out our present immigration system, we should solve a problem, and that problem is the displaced-persons problem in Europe. I can recognize that these men are just exactly what the gentleman from Connecticut says they are—a fine group of people who fought on our side and no doubt would make fine citizens. But the important reason for bringing in a bill like this, of course, is to relieve the people over there in these camps, which have sometimes been called "concentration camps." They have no place to go, and no country where freedom is recognized. These Polish soldiers are in Britain. We are not undertaking to solve the problems of the British Isles. We recognize all of the good characteristics and qualities of these men who have been fighting on our side, but just as soon as you start to do this, then where do you land? Yesterday we voted down the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] which amendment undertook to bring in men—these men—who had applied under similar circumstances. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] would have brought them within the 200,000, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] would bring them in outside the 200,000, thus, of course, lifting the level. So I ask you, if we are going to have a bill which is going to

operate to cure a very serious problem, to pass it in such form that it will accomplish what the bill was originally designed to accomplish.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I might add, as I stated yesterday, and I would like to repeat for the benefit of those who were not here on yesterday, that we have worked long and hard on this bill. We have tried to be fair. As I stated yesterday, we have been trying the best we could to prorate this thing on the basis of the numerical strength now existing in the displaced-persons camps. The Polish people will not, under any circumstances, be discriminated against. The fact of the matter is that they constitute 31 percent of the 200,000 people who will be eligible to come in. So more than three out of every ten will be Polish who will be taken from these camps—Poles who do not have a haven of rest in Great Britain.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not a fact that in arriving at the figure of 200,000, we did so on the basis of a fair share of representation for all the countries involved. The minute we undermine that in the interest of a special group, then we impair our fairness to that extent.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. May I point out that they are a special group, because Poland is the only ally—the only United Nation, so to speak, which is behind the Iron Curtain which has been captured by Soviet Russia. There is no other ally in the same position.

Mr. FELLOWS. I can agree with that, but just as soon as we do this, then we are in a hopeless position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

All of us must agree that our expression of tribute to the brave people of Poland who fought so long and so hard to preserve freedom for the world must be more than mere words.

We in this Congress have the responsibility of assuming an active leadership in bringing about a return of freedom to Poland. A Republican Congress can help atone for the wrong our Government committed at the Yalta Conference.

As a sincere American I have a deep sympathy for the unfortunate plight of the displaced persons.

As a former member of the Armed Services, I want to express tangible evidence of our desire to help our former allies. I feel it to be urgent and just that the former members of the Polish armed forces should be included in that group on a preferential status.

It is time for us to give active recognition to the part these brave men and women played in achieving the peace which we are now enjoying and which thus far has been denied to them.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object, but I do hope we can finish with this bill within a reasonable time. After this, however, I will object.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, I was chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. With me there served Mr. MASON, Mr. REES, Mr. GOSSETT, and others. None of them can tell you that at any time I have made a mistatement. I want you to follow me exactly in what I am going to say. I first state and know positively that the Senate bill is much superior to the House bill. The reason is that it has a date set of December 22, 1945. That is the date of a declaration made by the President of the United States so far as displaced persons are concerned.

Now, here is the question of quotas. The Jewish people have a quota 23 percent under the House bill. The law provides that whatever quotas we have, the religious groups and minority races have a right to their quotas. The countries we are talking about now include Germany, Austria, Latvia, and what we call the central European states. In those central European states, including the German quota of 25,000, is a total of 39,000 within our law. Now, here are the figures:

In 1939 the Jewish immigration to America was 43,450; in 1944, 36,945; in 1941, 23,737; and so on. In other words, from the time the war started in Europe, the Jewish quota has been over 90 percent of all the quotas, yet the Presidential directive said plainly that only one-half of the immigrant quota should be used for displaced persons.

What I am attempting to show this House is—and it was proven yesterday—when there was an amendment brought in here to recognize certain Polish soldiers, every man of Jewish faith in this House voted against it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. That statement is not correct.

Mr. LESINSKI. I saw them on the floor.

Mr. SABATH. I was here and I voted for the amendment.

Mr. LESINSKI. Well, excepting the gentleman from Illinois. I apologize.

Now, in the quota in the House bill, I am going to go back to December 22, 1945. During that time the Immigration Department reports show that 450,000 immigrants came to this country. Of those, 302,000 were Jews. Of the other 150,000, 75,000 were on military missions.

In the House bill you are not only giving this quota for the Jews, the reason for that is not to bring in displaced persons; it is to bring in a hundred thousand Russian Jews, those of the type you had on your heels last week.

The reason you have this amount is because on December 22, 1945, there were only 15,000 Jewish refugees in the camps. That is the total, because the other 300,000 already had come to America.

As far as Polish immigration is concerned, starting with the year 1940, there were only 568 Poles; in 1941, 391; in 1942, 304; in 1943, 361; in 1944, 272; and in 1945, 145; and in 1946, 289. Those are the records.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the Polish quota today?

Mr. LESINSKI. Six thousand five hundred and twenty-four.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If only those few hundred have been coming in, could not these Poles come in under the regular quota?

Mr. LESINSKI. No, because the quota has been oversubscribed for the next 10 years. Most of the quota numbers have been given to people of the Jewish faith.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The figures the gentleman cited indicated only five or six hundred coming in here.

Mr. LESINSKI. I am giving actual figures of Polish immigrants against Jewish immigrants that are charged to the Polish quota, as printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, 1947.

Let us now take up the question of displaced persons. In 1946 we attempted to bring in from Mexico orphans who were sent there from the war zone. We were unable to bring them in because the State Department always told us that there were not sufficient quota numbers left, and yet, on June 30, 1946, 1,548 Polish quota numbers were bypassed and the State Department said that they had no quota numbers.

The President shall direct, the law says very plainly, that its provisions are supposed to be given priority as far as quota numbers are concerned, and that is something the State Department has not done.

In testimony taken in Detroit before a subcommittee at which were present the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] the State Department representatives said very plainly that they were told to assign 90 percent of all quotas to displaced persons of Jewish faith. That is in the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amnedment.

Mr. Chairman, I never thought the day would come when any Member of the House would make the kind of appeal that has just been made by the Representative from Michigan. Certainly, this is the last place in the world where anything even resembling an appeal to religious prejudice should even be whispered. The fact of the matter is that under our immigration laws there are no quotas according to religion; a quota is according to nationality. When, therefore, the Representative from Michigan talks about the number of Jews who came into this country he is doing it for the deliberate purpose of appealing to the

baser instincts of people who do not sit in the halls of the Congress of the United States.

I do not believe this Committee ought to adopt this amendment for the reasons that I stated on yesterday when I opposed another amendment which had as its purpose the accomplishment of the same thing. I think we would be rendering a great disservice to the English people if we would encourage immigration of people who are making a contribution to their export trade which means the dollars so necessary for their survival.

As I stated on yesterday, these Polish soldiers are being well provided for in England. The gentleman from Michigan, who spoke a moment ago, told me on yesterday in a private conversation that these men could not get employment because the British labor union would not permit them to work unless a British labor union member were given a job at the same time. I say to you that that is far from the truth, because you must bear in mind this fact, that in order to produce coal the British have very bravely created unemployment in other fields and have directed the unemployed workers in these other fields into the coal mines, into jobs that are today being held by many of these brave Polish soldiers.

I am entirely in sympathy with what the gentleman seeks to accomplish, but it certainly seems to me the way to do it is through an amendment to the immigration laws.

This bill is designed for one purpose and one purpose alone, namely, to get these concentration camps, and I use that term advisedly, off the backs of the taxpayers of America. I am of the opinion that if this bill is enacted into law and if these people, who will be carefully screened as they will be, come to the United States under the provisions of the bill other nations will do their full share toward locating these people to the end that these camps can be abolished within the 2-year period.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that because Great Britain has assumed an obligation to these Polish soldiers it lessens our obligation to them?

Mr. WALTER. They have a greater obligation. I think we may have a moral obligation although I do not say that we do. Bear this in mind, they can obtain employment in England and they are going to admit them and I know without question every inducement is being made by the inhabitants of the British colonies to bring these people into the colonies to do the kind of work that they have and that they cannot find people to do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to my friend from Pennsylvania that the amendment I have offered should not be considered in the light of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan. I do not consider his remarks germane to my amendment. My amendment stands on its own bottom. It does not affect this bill, it has nothing to do with the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALTER. I agree with the gentleman. One thing about the gentleman's amendment that appeals to me is the fact it would not disturb the equilibrium that the committee has worked out, but it seems to me we ought to reject every amendment because the adoption of this amendment would simply be an invitation for the offering of one amendment after another and if that happens I do not know where we will ever stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Michigan contained a tissue of misstatements, it is replete with the kind of veiled prejudice that is utterly unworthy of any Member of this House and I am not going to stoop to answer it. I refuse to share with him the mire and mud of such billingsgate.

As to the merits of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, I would say that in general it is meritorious, but it has no place in this bill. These Polish soldiers who fought valiantly under General Anders, now in England, are not stateless. The purpose of this bill is to aid those who are stateless, who have no roofs over their heads, who have no havens to which they can repair. It is to aid those who are languishing behind barbed wires, in compounds, in camps, not those like these Poles living comfortably in England.

As has been stated, these soldiers are gradually being assimilated into the British economy. They can secure jobs. Those in displaced-persons camps cannot secure gainful employment. There is no reason under the sun why these Polish soldiers could not embrace British citizenship, a citizenship that is denied those who are in the displaced-persons camps. There is a disposition of the Government of Britain to help these Poles in every way; also, this is a problem of Great Britain, if the Poles present any problem. Let Great Britain and/or her Dominions assimilate these Poles. The gentleman also eloquently stated that he wants to help those who are fleeing from communism and cannot go back to communistically dominated lands. I sympathize with those victims and want to say in that respect that there are many who are situated similar to those who fought under General Anders and who are now in England. For example, there is a specific date mentioned in our bill, April 21, 1947. Why was this date put in? It was the date that General Clay closed the camps to all other DP's who might be fleeing communism, to all other persecutees who sought asylum in the camps. At some time the gates had to be closed. General Clay set the date as April 21, 1947. Now there are many thousands of others who are clamoring for admission into these DP camps since April 21, 1947, more than a year ago, and they cannot get in. Their plight is exactly that of those of General Anders' army. There are many of those persecutees who fought with the Allies, just as General Anders' men fought with the Allies. We cannot help by this bill all those who are that unfortunate, all those who make a plea for succor, and those who make a plea for liberty, or security, or shelter. It cannot be done. This is a specific problem that we are attacking here, namely, the problem of the displaced persons with a view to closing all of these camps. These men covered by the amendment are not in the camps.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement, but I would like to point out to him that because of the adoption of the Stefan amendment, I think that what he has just said is subject to some revision.

Mr. CELLER. It is true that the Stefan amendment was adopted by this House. I reluctantly voted against the Stefan amendment. I deeply sympathize with those of Czech origin who are in that deplorable position as was exemplified by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. But that is no reason why we should open the doors further to all these others who are similarly situated. You just cannot do it. If you do it, you will never solve this problem properly and you will still have the annual expense of $1,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

OUR OBLIGATION TO THE POLISH SOLDIERS EXILED FROM THEIR NATIVE LAND BY THE INFAMOUS YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the argument made by the gentleman from Michigan was not germane to this amendment and I hope the House will see fit to judge this amendment on its own merits. There are sound and compelling reasons in support of this particular amendment that have not been stated.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH OTHER DP'S

The first point is that the persons it would admit would be in addition to the 200,000 provided in this bill. Thus this amendment will not interfere in the slightest degree with any of the decisions of the committee as embodied in the bill.

EXILED POLISH SOLDIERS ARE DISPLACED PERSONS

The second point is that these exiled Polish soldiers are displaced persons, and what is more compelling, they were displaced by action of this Government. In this particular bill we are dealing with a lot of people that need assistance because of the actions of governments other than the United States. If you will turn to page 2 of the report you will see that 20 percent of these people are from the Baltic Provinces. We owe no responsibility to them, that is at all comparable to the responsibility we owe to the people of Poland where our Government has gone back on the most solemn promises made to the Polish people, and I particularly refer to the promises made to the Polish soldiers who were fighting on

our side in armed forces under our command. Those men served under the promise that their native land was going to be returned to them. That is what was promised them by our Government.

Are they not entitled to some consideration in this immigration measure? Ukrainians. What obligation do we owe to the Ukrainians in comparison with our obligations to the Poles, yet on page 2 of the committee report on this bill it is stated that 12 percent of those who will be admitted are Ukrainians, and 4 percent are Russians. You add up the Balts, Ukrainians, and Russians who will be admitted and you see they amount to 36 percent of the bill. That is 72,000 Ukrainians, Balts, and Russians. For the life of me I cannot see that we owe any obligation to these people that is anywhere near to the obligation we owe the former Polish soldiers who are now exiled from their native land.

THIS IS AN IMMIGRATION PROBLEM

Thirdly, it is argued that these people should not be considered in this bill because we are dealing only with displaced persons, but these gallant soldiers are displaced persons in every sense of the word and it is proper to deal with them in this bill because it proposes solving the problem by immigration. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania says what you should do is amend the immigration laws, I say this bill is an amendment to the immigration laws. This is thus exactly where the problem should be met. If we were not solving the problem by an amendment to the immigration laws in such a way as to foreclose for all practical purposes any future possibility of these people ever being admitted to the United States, then I would agree that this is not the place to consider it. But such is the effect of this bill and this is the proper place to attempt to solve this very serious problem.

THESE POLISH SOLDIERS HAVE ROOTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Fourth, only 18,000 would be admitted by this amendment. That is not a large number; in fact, I consider it too small, but it is said "leave them in England. Why do they want to come here?" They do not want to stay in England because their roots here in the United States are superior. Here they have friends, here they have relatives. Four percent of the entire population of the United States is of Polish descent. That is why 18,000 out of 110,000 exiled Polish soldiers have a superior desire to come to the United States.

With 6,000,000 people of Polish descent in our Nation, and many of them fairly recent immigrants, it is only natural that a small proportion of them would want to come where they have friends and relatives. They have no roots in England, their roots outside of their own country are here, and they want to come here because this is the land of freedom. They want to come here for the same reason the other people of Polish descent came here instead of going to England.

I submit that these Polish soldiers have a claim far superior to the claim of 36 percent of the people that are being admitted by this bill. This is an amendment to the immigration laws and this is the proper place to deal with this problem.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, there are a great many of us who are opposed to this legislation who had no opportunity to speak. I think it is a mistake to try to shut off debate. I will take my time on some other amendment, but I do not like to see debate shut off on a measure that is of vital importance to the American people, more important to them than it is to the displaced persons.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, it has been brought out here in the statement by the gentleman who has just preceded me that the Fellows bill attempts to write new immigration legislation. That is not so for the simple reason that this bill was designed and prepared and was the result of a compromise over a period of a year to try to meet and to liquidate a specific problem. It has been pointed out here that this legislation changes the basic immigration laws of our Nation. It does not, in any sense of the word, change our basic immigration policy. I might point out to the Members of the House, that were it not for the war years we would have had under existing law, through normal immigration into this country, well over 900,000 immigrants from the various countries, who have a quota based on their nationality. Yes, these 900,000 immigrants would now be in the United States of America. We cannot look at this thing as if we were going to a ball game where we had a rain check where it can be used later, because the Congress of the United States in 1917 and 1924 enacted our present basic immigration laws and they had to be used each year or they were forfeited. The Fellows bill today seeks to admit those specified nationalities who are recognized in the bill to the extent of 200,000 and it mortgages their future quotas. It is just like a man borrowing on his insurance policy, he does so because he has an equity in it. Those countries, by the grace of the Congress of the United States, have been given a definite, specific quota, which has been set up over a period of many years. We are really not giving these people anything at all. We are merely mortgaging their future quotas. In the final analysis—they are paying for this loan in the form of a subsequent quota reduction. It has been suggested here that the Poles are not getting fair treatment. Let me explain to the House that they are getting fair treatment, because their quota for each year is 6,500, and as was stated by the good gentleman, Mr. LESINSKI, a few moments ago, their quota has been oversubscribed for 10 years, which is positive proof that our Government and our immigration officials have been eminently fair to the Polish people. Is there any doubt about it when you take into consideration that in this bill the Latvian quota is mortgaged to the tune of 65 years, the Estonian quota is mortgaged to the tune of 121 years, and the Lithuanian quota is mortgaged to the extent of 166 years? However, it is the best we can do under the circumstances. We seek to prorate these quotas on the basis of the existing numerical strength now in the camps. That is what we have been doing, working very hard to try to solve this problem and to try to be fair, reasonable, just, and equitable about the whole thing. I think it comes with poor grace to say that the Polish people are not being sufficiently recognized in this particular bill, because after all is said and done, I repeat, the Poles constitute 31 percent of the total number covered in this bill.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman know if the other body has the same provision that the gentleman is now discussing, which is contained in the House bill?

Mr. CHELF. Frankly sir, I am not familiar with that. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I have been far too busy trying as best I could to give to the House all of the facts about our own House version, because I am convinced we have a sound, and a fair solution to the problem.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman is saying a great many interesting things. It seems to me this is a modification of the immigration status of these armed forces Poles in Great Britain, because if my amendment is not adopted, their chances of emigrating to this country is diminished by 50 percent over a period of at least 42 years. Therefore, their status as potential immigrants to this country has been substantially altered.

Mr. CHELF. But the fact remains that we are reserving 50 percent for the Polish people on the basis of their 6,500 yearly quota and the same is true insofar as the Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian quota is concerned. If a given country's quota is considerably high, naturally the percentage will be greater—if it is small, such as the Balts quota—the 50 percent reserved for future immigration is correspondingly reduced. I urge that the amendment be defeated—we have a good bill—it is fair—do not load it down with amendments thereby insuring its defeat because if such happens there will be no relief for any nationality.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I believe my name is included on the list of Members to be recognized by the Chairman under the limitation of time. If the rules of the House permit, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] may have my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity I have had to speak on this bill. First of all, I would like to point out the situation pertaining to the Polish soldiers in England. Under this bill they are not considered displaced people. If any people in the world are really and truly displaced, they are the members of the Polish Army.

The impression has been created in the House that these soldiers are taken care of by England; that they were allowed to become English citizens and become a regular part of the British Empire. Now that is not the case. These Polish soldiers in England are under what we call the British Resettlement Act of 1947. That Resettlement Act of 1947 does not say to the soldiers that they can all become citizens of the British Empire. The Resettlement Act of the British Empire, 1947, merely says, in effect, that since you 140,000 soldiers do not have any place to go, we will provide for you in England and give ample opportunity for you to sort of take care of yourselves until such time as we can send you over to the Dominion of Canada, to Australia, and so forth.

So far, out of the 140,000 soldiers who were taken in under this Resettlement Act, merely for the purpose of holding them until they could be resettled elsewhere in other parts of the British Empire or in other parts of the world, only 28,000 have been resettled under the Resettlement Act of 1947.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, the gentleman must bear in mind that under that act they are guaranteed the minimum prevailing rates of wages in England.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes. But when they had that coal shortage in England, when England was freezing to death, when we were shipping coal to them, the British labor unions would not permit these soldiers to go into the coal mines and mine coal. They could not become members of the British labor unions. I wish I had time to point out other restrictions showing you that they have not been incorporated into the British Empire. They are being held until the time they can be resettled elsewhere.

Now, these boys could have gone over to Europe and put themselves in displaced-persons camps and become dependent upon our charity and upon our contributions to support them there, but these people had the stamina to say, "No. We do not want to become charges on the United States Government or any other government. We would rather settle somewhere where we can earn an honest nickel here and there and become self-supporting." Some of them are self-supporting, but there are restrictions in England. For instance, they cannot enter trade or business. A lot of these boys had money, believe it or not, because they served in the British Army and they got their mustering-out pay, but they cannot even invest their money in a British business enterprise. They cannot enter the colleges or universities of the British Empire. They are restricted. They are similar to your DP's in the DP camps in Europe, except that they are living in a country that has freedom.

I do not want any discrimination for or against any group. I think that in honest justice we ought to take in 18,000 of these boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time simply to protest the remarks made on the floor a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

I must say I am somewhat surprised. I would have expected remarks of that kind from some other Members, but not from him. I know the gentleman. I have served on committees with him for many years. I have a high regard for him and a great deal of respect. I would attribute his remarks to the fact that he is probably somewhat disturbed, which caused him to say things in anger that he probably now regrets.

I did not hear all of his remarks, but as far as I am personally concerned, I voted against the amendment he was talking about because I agreed with the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee, that all of these amendments, many of which may be good, would weaken the bill to such a point that it might not accomplish the desired purpose.

The committee should be congratulated on the great, in fact the noble work it has done in finally bringing a bill of this kind to the floor. I think the bill will pass but I do not believe that these amendments will help the bill. I know many Members on the floor here are voting for amendments because they want to weaken the bill. I do not say that about this particular amendment. I think the idea behind it is good, and I have a high regard for the Polish people. I have many of them in my district. I believe that the quota should be enlarged so that many deserving Poles can gain admission to this country, but I do not believe it should be done in this manner.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. It is my belief that too many amendments would weaken the bill but I am not trying to weaken the bill, I am not trying to reduce the number. This is in addition to the 200,000. My amendment would simply add 18,000 more; and I am not afraid of getting a lot of vital new blood in this Nation. That is the way America became great.

Mr. KLEIN. I am not afraid of it either; and I agree with the gentleman about admitting as many as possible, who would add to this country's greatness. But if we pass this amendment, there will be other good amendments as this is a good amendment. Too many amendments will weaken the bill. I specifically exempted the gentleman from my remarks. I think his amendment might serve a very useful purpose, but I think it should more properly come as a separate bill, or possibly in an amendment to the immigration laws enlarging the quotas, particularly with regard to the Polish quota.

That particular quota is so small, that tens of thousands of decent and honorable Polish nationals cannot come into this country, where they have relatives and friends anxious for them to join them and begin life anew.

But I repeat, it should not be done by amending this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for recognition in order to say again to my colleagues that in the adoption of the Fellows bill we are hugging to our bosom a thing that could ultimately sting us to death. In the adoption of this bill we are doing that which we know violates our understanding of that which is best for our country. We are simply augmenting the forces already in this country which are carrying on as the servants of the monster of the east. I say to you, sir, that 90 percent of the people we will admit under the Fellows bill have been thoroughly schooled and conditioned for the work of spreading the communism of Russia.

Now, as to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, I wish to make this observation, that the arguments I have heard advanced against it gives me the feeling that it probably has more merit in it than has the Fellows bill. I do not know what my position should be on the amendment but I do know that if it is people that we want to admit that can be assimilated and will contribute to the stability rather than to the instability of the country, then the amendment offers a better promise than does any other part of the bill. All these Polish soldiers could have been admitted to these DP camps had they so desired, but they preferred to try to make their own way rather than become dependents upon United States charity and for this they should be commended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment under discussion has much merit. It has for its purpose the admission into the United States of displaced persons, the Poles now in Great Britain who fought with the American Army in the late war and who by their unfailing loyalty to the cause of freedom have resisted communism and other totalitarian ideologies.

I realize the position of the committee that if the bars are let down and other

groups admitted under this law who are not in European displaced-persons camps, it will be difficult to maintain the plan of the committee in working out the details of this bill. However, with our great sympathy for the Polish Nation and conscious of the promises we made to it before the war, it seems to me that we can very well make this exception and admit these Poles who will not aggregate more than 18,000.

COLUMBIA RIVER FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. Chairman, in discussing displaced persons, I want to again call the attention of the committee to the displaced persons in the Pacific Northwest who have been flooded from their homes, many without any habitation left and who are certainly displaced in the sense that their normal homes have been destroyed. I am deeply grateful to my colleagues for supporting my resolution, House Joint Resolution 423, and the companion resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 231, which was passed unanimously by the House yesterday for the utilization of existing Lanham funds for providing stopgap or temporary housing for many of these victims in the Vanport and Vancouver areas. However, this is only temporary relief. There still remains the following important problems:

First, a long-range permanent housing program which will make it possible for these homeless citizens, most of whom are veterans, to acquire adequate housing at a fair consideration and within the limits of their means and within the shortest time possible. I am preparing legislation to cover this problem and most sincerely hope that it will receive the consideration of the Eightieth Congress before it adjourns.

The second problem to which I call attention is the making of grants to local jurisdictions to assist them in defraying the cost of repair or replacement of damaged or destroyed public facilities owned by them, emergency protection work such as repair of dikes and the restoration and operation of schools in areas where the Federal Government has heretofore established construction projects for the prosecution of the war which have held over into the postwar period.

Another problem is rendering assistance to farmers who have lost their homes, crops, feed, buildings, and farm facilities by reason of the flood and who are without means or credit to restore their lost property.

There is another serious problem in my congressional district, the Vanport area, occasioned by the destruction of the Vanport Extension Center, also known as Vanport College, which was being conducted by the higher educational system for the State of Oregon for the education of veterans under the GI bill of rights. The college buildings, as well as the housing of the students, were a part of the Vanport project and were owned by the Federal Government. They have now been completely destroyed. During the spring quarter 1,468 students were enrolled at the college, approximately 1,200 of whom were veterans. As I heretofore reported there were 18,700 residents in the Vanport district alone who have been completely routed out of their homes and have lost their personal property by reason of the flood disaster. The residential housing occupied by them was owned by the Federal Government and has been completely destroyed. Their temporary needs will be taken care of by the stopgap housing provided by the resolution which we passed yesterday. Dr. Stephen E. Epler, director of the Vanport Extension Center, made the following report on the conditions existing in this center occasioned by the flood:

INFORMATION ON VANPORT EXTENSION CENTER (VANPORT COLLEGE)

The campus of the Vanport Extension Center was located in the Vanport housing project which was destroyed by flood May 30. The buildings and equipment were lost in the flood. During the spring quarter the enrollment was 1,468 students of whom approximately 1,200 were veterans. Most of these veteran students were studying under Public Law 16 or 346.

A group of 25 to 35 college students and faculty were loading some of the college records into a truck at Columbia Hall when the break in the dike occurred. The break was approximately 200 yards away from this loading point. The students promptly drove or ran to their homes to save their families and to warn the other residents. Most of these lived in the fringe of apartment building nearest the dike-break which was also the farthest from safety districts. Their presence of mind in warning others, helping out the aged, the babies, and the sick was an important factor in saving thousands of lives. The students lost most of their belongings except the clothes on their backs, and some of them had to abandon their cars to the flood and wade or swim to safety. A large part of the faculty and administrative staff and their families also lived in Vanport in the flood area including the director, assistant director, dean of men, and dean of women.

Vanport Extension Center is part of the Oregon State system of higher education. It is essentially a junior college offering freshman and sophomore courses in most of the fields in which Oregon and Oregon State have professional schools. See attached folder for more complete information. The project has been in many ways a program of the Federal Government inasmuch as the land and buildings which were used were Federal Government property and a large part of the equipment, furniture, etc., for classrooms and offices were secured from the Federal Government surplus programs. Senator MORSE, Senator CORDON, and Congressman ANGELL are considered among the best friends of the college. They assisted in securing buildings, equipment, and furniture for the original set-up. The vast majority of the students were veterans who were able to attend college because of the Federal Government benefits given under the GI bill of rights. The percentage of veterans was almost as high the second year of operation as the first year, and it was expected that the percentage of veterans would continue high for a number of years.

SUMMER PLANS

Tentative arrangements have been made to use one of the Portland high schools for the regular summer session which we hope to begin on schedule June 15. This is possible because public school buildings are not used for classes in the summer. Other buildings must be secured to carry on the program in the fall. It is vital that these buildings be awarded now to have time to prepare them for opening in September. It is also vital that necessary equipment and furniture for classes, laboratories, and offices be allocated and secured now to insure fall opening. The other colleges and universities in Oregon have record enrollments and would find it exceedingly difficult or impossible to absorb the additional 1,500 to 2,000 students which plan to enroll at Vanport College in September. The larger schools in Oregon are located in smaller communities which are unable to provide enough housing to take care of the married students. Only 390 of the Vanport students were living in Vanport City. The remainder had housing in other parts of the Portland area. Thus, college facilities are needed in the area where most of these students already have housing.

BUILDING NEEDS

The amount of over-all space for a campus for 1,500 to 2,000 students should be 150,000 to 200,000 square feet. However, a program could be carried on with less space than that. The program at Vanport had approximately 50,000 square feet. Most necessary in building needs are classrooms and offices. The other important needs are scientific laboratories, space for auditorium, gymnasium, outdoor athletic fields, and cafeteria. If the classroom and office space were available immediately the other types of rooms and buildings could be added after the college is under way.

FURNITURE, EQUIPMENT, AND SUPPLY NEEDS

All types of equipment and supplies are urgently needed for classrooms and offices. Furniture and equipment for the other buildings mentioned above will also be needed. A partial list of the most critical equipment and furniture needs follows: 1,500 tablet armchairs; 180 office desks and chairs; 50 typing stands; 1,000 straight and folding chairs; 300 library tables; 100 typewriters; 46 file cabinets; 24 office machines (11 adding machines, 10 calculators, 3 dictaphones); 4 safes; 75 microscopes; 4 mimeograph machines; 1,000 lockers; 100 engineer drawing tables (large); stools for drawing tables; bookcases; desk baskets; athletic supplies for classes in football, baseball, basketball, gym, track, physical education.

Many of the students who lived in Vanport now feel bitter, because they believe that the residents of Vanport City should have been warned to evacuate. They feel the least the Federal Government can do is to make it possible for them to continue their college program with their own faculty and students in the Portland area in a safer location. In general the morale of the students is good and will be greatly improved if they find the Federal Government is aiding the college they helped to build to carry on.

The students and faculty are working together to rehabilitate themselves. A clothing exchange has been set up by students which has issued tons of clothing to students. Students are operating their own employment service and their own housing bureau. A group of faculty and students are in the process of organizing a cooperative nursery school to make it possible for mothers to recoup their losses. Another group of students are organizing a book bureau to secure textbooks and library books from students living outside the project and friends in Portland.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans taking instruction in Vanport College are being financed under the GI bill and the Federal Government has made it possible for the establishment and maintenance of Vanport Center and thereby providing the necessary instruction to these worthy veterans. It would be a tragedy in their lives if the facilities are not restored and provision is not made for carrying on this essential work so that their education will not be disturbed. The State of Oregon has utilized to the full all of its existing facilities for caring for these veterans

and it was necessary to establish this institution with Government cooperation in order to meet the important problem of education for the veterans. This great Government certainly, under the emergency of this tragedy will not fail to take the necessary action to restore the essential facilities needed to carry on this worth-while activity.

Our Government down through the years has never failed to respond to the need not only of its own citizens, but the citizens of other countries when great disaster and tragedies have overtaken them. I have had prepared a partial list of the instances in which the Federal Government has taken cognizance of these disasters and given relife, and I include as a part of these remarks for the information of my colleagues this partial list where the Federal aid has been given in disaster areas:

PARTIAL LIST OF ACTS PROVIDING FEDERAL AID IN DISASTERS

Act of May 8, 1812 (2 Stat. 730, ch. 79): Appropriation of $50,000 for provisions to be sent to Government of Venezuela for earthquake sufferers.

Act of January 24, 1827 (6 Stat. 356, ch. 3): Appropriation of $20,000 for relief of fire sufferers at Alexandria, D. C. (now Virginia).

Resolution of March 3, 1847 (9 Stat. 207, No. 10): Use of U. S. S. *Macedonian* and *Jamestown* for transporting contributions for relief of famishing poor of Ireland and Scotland.

Joint resolution of July 4, 1864 (13 Stat. 416, No. 76). Appropriation of $2,000 for relief of sufferers from explosion in cartridge factory at Washington Arsenal.

Joint resolution of March 17, 1866 (14 Stat. 351, No. 14): Appropriation of $2,500 for distribution among sufferers from explosion at Washington arsenal.

Joint resolution of February 22, 1867 (14 Stat. 567, No. 23): Use of public vessel for transportation of food and clothing contributed for relief of people of Southern States.

Joint resolution of March 29, 1867 (15 Stat. 24, No. 17): Charter of vessel by Secretary of the Navy for transportation of provisions to Wilmington, N. C., for distribution among destitute people of the South.

Act of April 23, 1874 (18 Stat. 34, ch. 125): Issue of food and army clothing to sufferers from overflow of lower Mississippi River; no amount specified.

Act of May 13, 1874 (18 Stat. 34, ch. 125): Issue of food and army clothing to sufferers from overflow of lower Mississippi River no amount specified.

Act of May 13, 1874 (18 Stat. 45, ch. 170): Appropriation of $190,000 for purchase of food and clothing for relief of sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River.

The President was authorized in his discretion to direct the issue of army rations, and clothing of patterns not then issued to the Army, to the starving and desitute people of the Tombigbee, Warrior, and Alabama Rivers, who had been rendered destitute by the inundation of their homes in the valleys of said rivers. (May 28, 1874, Res. 9, 18 Stat. 287).

Joint resolution of April 28, 1880 (21 Stat. 594, No. 27): Loan of 500 tents to Governor of Missouri for relief of tornado sufferers.

Joint Resolution of May 4, 1880 (21 Stat. 806, No. 30): Issue of 4,000 army rations for relief of sufferers from cyclone at Macon, Miss.

Joint resolution of February 25, 1882 (22 Stat. 378, No. 6): Appropriation of $100,000 for purchase and distribution of subsistence stores for sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River and tributaries.

Joint resolution of March 10, 1882 (22 Stat. 378, No. 8): Use of Army hospital tents for shelter to sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River; no amount specified.

Joint resolution of March 11, 1882 (22 Stat. 378, No. 9): Use of Government vessels for transportation and distribution of rations and supplies for sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River and tributaries; indefinite appropriation.

Joint resolution of March 21, 1882 (22 Stat. 379, No. 12): Appropriation of $150,000 for furnishing food for sufferers from floods in Mississippi River and tributaries.

Joint resolution of April 1, 1882 (22 Stat. 379, No. 16): Appropriation of $100,000 for purchase and distribution of subsistence stores for sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River and tributaries.

Act of April 11, 1882 (22 Stat. 44, ch. 77): Appropriation of $20,000 for purchase of seeds and distribution among sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River and tributaries.

Joint resolution of February 12, 1884 (23 Stat. 267, No. 9): Appropriation of $300,000 for purchase and distribution of subsistence stores, clothing, etc., for sufferers from overflow of Ohio River and tributaries. Use of Army tents for shelter to sufferers. Use of Government vessels for transportation and distribution of supplies.

Joint resolution of February 15, 1884 (23 Stat. 268, No. 12): Additional appropriation of $200,000 for same object (Ohio River, etc). Not exceeding $110,449.67 of moneys heretofore appropriated was made available for expenditure in improving navigation by repairing damages caused by floods in the Sacramento and Feather Rivers (Dec. 21, 1889, Res. 4, 26 Stat. 668).

Act of March 31, 1890 (26 Stat. 33, ch. 58): Appropriation of $25,000 for purchase of 2,500 tents to be loaned to State authorities for use of sufferers from floods in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

Joint resolution of April 25, 1890 (26 Stat. 671, No. 16): Appropriation of $150,000 for purchase and distribution of subsistence stores for sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River and tributaries. Use of Government vessels for transportation and distribution of supplies.

Joint resolution of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 475, No. 57): Loan of Army tents to mayors of St. Louis, East St. Louis, etc., for tornado sufferers; no amount specified.

Joint resolution of April 7, 1897 (30 Stat. 319, No. 9): Appropriation of $200,000 for purchase and distribution of subsistence stores for sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River and tributaries and Red River of the North.

Joint resolution of June 9, 1897 (30 Stat. 221, No. 14): Reappropriation of $10,000 (remaining under resolution of April 7, 1897) for purchase and distribution of subsistence stores and payment of transportation, for sufferers from overflow of Rio Grande near El Paso.

Act of May 13, 1902 (32 Stat 198, ch. 787): Appropriation of $200,000 for procurement and distribution of provisions, clothing, medicines, etc., for destitute people of French West Indies (eruption of Mount Pelee).

Joint resolutions of April 19, 21, and 24, 1906 (34 Stat. 827, 828, Nos. 16, 17, 19): Appropriation of $2,500,000 for purchase and issue of subsistence, quartermaster's and medical supplies for sufferers from San Francisco earthquake and fire.

Act of January 18, 1907 (34 Stat. 850, ch. 154): Distribution of provisions, clothing, medicines, etc., among sufferers from earthquake and fire in Jamaica; no amount specified. (Also 35 Stat. 387, sec. 7, S. 27–1908.)

Joint resolution of April 30, 1908 (35 Stat. 570, No. 17): Use of Army tents, provisions, and supplies for relief of sufferers from cyclone in Southern States; no amount specified.

Joint resolutions of May 11, 1908 (35 Stat. 572, No. 20): Appropriation of $250,000 for procurement and issue of subsistence and quartermaster supplies, medicines, etc., for sufferers from cyclone in Southern States.

Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 251, ch. 191): Allowance of $600 for expenditures by naval station pay director and $150 by Marine Hospital Service, for care of sufferers from fire at Chelsea, Mass.; additional authorization of hospital care, up to $3,600.

Act of January 5, 1909 (35 Stat. 584, ch. 7): Appropriation of $800,000 for procurement and distribution of provisions, clothing, medicines, etc., for suffering and destitute people of Italy (Messina earthquake).

Act of May 13, 1910 (36 Stat. 367, ch. 232): Distribution of tents, blankets, etc., among sufferers from earthquake in Costa Rica; no amount specified.

Joint Resolution of May 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 633, No. 19): Appropriation of $1,239,179.65 for tents, rations, etc., for sufferers from floods in Mississippi and Ohio Valleys.

Act of August 2, 1912 (37 Stat. 1286, ch. 273): Payments totaling $17,577.99 to be made to certain persons, etc., on account of losses sustained in Allegheny River flood.

Act of August 26, 1912 (37 Stat. 597): Appropriation of $30,000 to reimburse Revenue Cutter Service for relief of sufferers from volcano near Kodiak, Alaska.

Same (p. 601): Appropriation of $4,500 for mileage of Army officers and contract surgeons in connection with relief of flood sufferers in Mississippi and Ohio Valleys.

Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 919): Use of $18,173.69 of funds appropriated May 9, 1912, to reimburse Quartermaster Corps and Medical Corps for relief of flood sufferers in Mississippi, Ohio, and Green River Valleys.

Act of October 22, 1913 (38 Stat. 211): Appropriation of $5,000 to reimburse Life-Saving Service for rescue and relief of flood sufferers in Middle West.

Same (p. 215): Appropriation of $654,448.49 to reimburse certain Army appropriations for relief of sufferers from floods, tornadoes, and fires in Mississippi and Ohio Valleys, Peach Tree, Ala., and Nebraska.

Same (p. 216): Credit of $42,431.75 to certain Army accounts for expenditures for relief of flood sufferers in Mississippi Valley. Appropriation of $130,940.38 to reimburse naval appropriations for relief of flood sufferers in Ohio and Indiana, and on Ohio and Mississippi River and tributaries.

Joint resolution of November 15, 1913 (38 Stat. 240, No. 15): Use of unexpended balance under act of August 26, 1912 (first provision cited above) for relief of sufferers from storm in northern Bering Sea.

Act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. 681, § 13): Appropriation of $200,000 for relief of sufferers from fire at Salem, Mass.

Joint resolution of February 15, 1916 (39 Stat. 11, ch. 28): Loan, issue or use of tents, provisions, and supplies of Quartermaster's and Medical Departments for relief of sufferers from overflow of Mississippi River and tributaries; no amount specified.

Act of April 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 50, ch. 70): Supply of Army tents, cots, blankets, etc., for sufferers from fire at Paris, Tex.; no amount specified.

Joint resolution of August 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 434, ch. 267): Appropriation of $540,000 for relief of flood sufferers in Southern States, including issue of seeds and Army supplies and supplying employment for destitute persons.

Joint resolution of August 24, 1916 (39 Stat. 534, ch. 404): Last preceding provision to apply to West Virginia also.

Joint resolution of June 8, 1921 (42 Stat. 19, ch. 17): Issue of subsistence and quartermaster supplies to persons suffering from overflow of Arkansas River and tributaries in Colorado; no amount specified.

Act of May 28, 1924 (43 Stat. 195): Expenditure from naval supply account of is-

sues for relief of earthquake sufferers in Japan; no amount specified.

Act of February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 963, ch. 297): Credit of $6,017,069.03 in Army accounts for issue of supplies, etc., for earthquake sufferers in Japan.

Joint resolution of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1252, ch. 478): Credit of $8,548.27 in Army accounts for issue of quartermaster stores for relief of sufferers from cyclone at La Grange and West Point, Ga.

Act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1285, ch. 547): Credit of $10,575.58 in Army accounts for issue of quartermaster stores, etc., for relief of sufferers from fire at New Bern, N. C.

Act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1286, ch. 548): Credit of $4,582.33 in Army accounts for issue of quartermaster stores for relief of sufferers from cyclone in northwestern Mississippi.

Act of February 9, 1927 (44 Stat. 1065, ch. 89): Issue of $936.62 quartermaster stores for flood relief work in Texas.

Act of February 14, 1927 (44 Stat. 1097, ch. 136): Issue of $1,775.80 Army stores for relief or sufferers from fire at Astoria, Oreg.

Act of February 28, 1927 (44 Stat. 1251): Loans, etc., up to $253,000 to owners of crops and livestock damaged or destroyed by Florida hurricanes.

Act of February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1792 ch. 213): Determination of losses to property owners near Hatch and Santa Teresa, N. Mex., by overflow of Rio Grande; an appropriation of $75,000 authorized.

Joint resolution of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1067 ch. 46): Authorization of $6,000,000 for rehabilitation of agriculture, $2,000,000 for schoolhouses and $100,000 for purchase of seeds, etc., in Puerto Rico, following hurricane of September 1928.

Joint resolution of February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1306 ch. 318): Loans for purchase of seed, fertilizer, etc., in storm and flood-stricken areas of Southeastern States; $6,000,000 authorized—appropriated in deficiency act of March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1635).

Joint resolution of May 17, 1929 (46 Stat. 3, ch. 5): Loans under resolution of February 25, 1929 above, in respect of storms between that date and May 17.

Joint resolution of March 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 78, ch. 68): Loans to farmers in storm and drought-stricken areas of 15 States—for purchase of seed, etc., extended to include tractor fuel, etc., by resolution of April 24, 1930 (46 Stat. 254); $6,000,000 appropriated under act of March 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 99) for carrying into effect provisions of joint resolution of March 3, 1930.

Act of March 12, 1930 (46 Stat. 84, ch. 77): Appropriation of $1,660,000 to aid State of Alabama in construction of roads, etc., damaged by floods in 1929.

Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 386, ch. 336): Appropriation of $506,067.50 to aid State of Georgia in construction of roads, etc., damaged by floods in 1929.

Act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 489, ch. 368): Appropriation of $805,561 to aid State of South Carolina in construction of roads, etc., damaged by floods in 1929.

Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 865): Appropriation of $1,000,000 to be expended by the Puerto Rican Hurrican Relief Commission for repair work, etc.

Act of December 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 1032, ch. 21): Loans for purchase of seed, fertilizer, etc., in drought and storm-stricken areas of the United States; $45,000,000 authorized. (This amount was appropriated by joint resolution of January 15, 1931 (46 Stat. 1039, ch. 40); an additional $20,000,000 was appropriated by act of February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1160).)

Act of February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1276): Appropriation of $2,000,000 for loans to farmers in Southern States for loss of crops due to storm and drought.

Joint resolution of March 23, 1933 (48 Stat. 20, ch. 5): Loans by Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorized for repair of damage by earthquake in 1933. (Amended by act of May 29, 1933 (48 Stat. 99), to include, in addition to earthquake, damage by fire, tornado, or cyclone in 1933).

Federal Emergency Relief Act of May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 55 and 351), under which grants were made to States for relief purposes, including disaster relief.

Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works (title II of National Industrial Recovery Act, June 16, 1933, 48 Stat. 195, 200), under which many grants were made to State and local governments for rebuilding public buildings and works damaged by floods, hurricanes, and other disasters.

Act of April 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 589, ch. 121): Loans authorized to be made by Reconstruction Finance Corporation to nonprofit corporation for repair of damages caused by earthquake, fire, flood, etc., in 1933 and January and February 1934. (Amended by act of July 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 505, ch. 421), to include damage caused by catastrophes in the "years 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936"; further amended and superseded by the act of April 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1232), to repair damages caused by catastrophes occurring in 1935 and 1936).

Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1056), $525,000,000 for drought relief in stricken agriculture areas for emergency purposes.

Not to exceed $8,000,000 of moneys theretofore or thereafter appropriated was made available for expenditure by the Federal Works Administrator as an emergency relief fund in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways which he found, after investigation, had been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or landslides (June 18, 1934, ch. 586, sec. 3, 48 Stat. 994; June 8, 1938, ch, 328, sec. 4, 52 Stat. 634).

Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts, 1935 to 1943 (49 Stat. 115 and 1608; 50 Stat. 352, 809; 52 Stat. 809; 53 Stat. 507, 578, 927; 54 Stat. 611; 55 Stat. 396; 56 Stat. 634), under which large sums of moneys were used over a period of 8 years on numerous disaster projects approved by the President for emergency aid; the largest projects were for the excessive floods in the Ohio and Mississippi River areas and the New England and Eastern States in 1936 and 1937, and the New England disaster in 1938. In meeting these disasters, the usual sponsor contributions were not required.

Act of February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19, ch. 10): Disaster Loan Corporation created to provide loans necessary because of floods or other catastrophes in 1937. (Amended by joint resolution of May 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 211, ch. 275), to include catastrophes during 1936 and 1937; further amended by act of March 3, 1938 (52 Stat. 84, ch. 40, Public, 438), to include the year 1938; and further amended by act of March 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 510, ch. 4 (d)), by increasing the capital stock of the Disaster Loan Corporation from $20,000,000 to $40,000,000 and extending the applicability of the act to catastrophes during 1938, 1939, and 1940, and further extended by act of June 10, 1941 (55 Stat. 248), to catastrophes occuring between 1936 and 1947).

Act of March 5, 1938 (52 Stat. 93): Use of War Department appropriations to meet emergencies caused by flood of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in 1937 authorized.

Act of March 15, 1939 (53 Stat. 513), as amended by act of May 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 631): Appropriation of $5,000,000 for rehabilitation of forest lands damaged by the hurricane of September 1938, in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York.

Act of June 30, 1939 (53 Stat. 984), authorizing a grant of $35,000 to the State of Minnesota for direct relief to citizens of counties of Anoka and Hennepin made destitute by tornado in those areas.

Act of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 542): Fifteen million dollars appropriated for the fiscal year 1944, for assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943. (Balance made available until June 30, 1945 by act of May 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 224, ch. 201).)

Not to exceed $10,000,000 of moneys theretofore or thereafter appropriated was made available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads as an emergency relief fund in the repair or construction of highways and bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways (including secondary and feeder roads) which he found, after investigation, had been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or landslides. (July 13, 1943, ch. 236, sec. 7, 57 Stat. 563.)

There was appropriated the sum of $120,000 as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for repairing damage to and checking erosion on the Bayocean Peninsula, in Oregon, caused by a storm in January 1939, in order to provide adequate protection to property on such peninsula and in Tillamook, Oreg. (March 2, 1945, ch. 19, sec. 2, 59 Stat. 21.)

The Secretary of War was authorized to allot from existing appropriations not to exceed $2,000,000 in any one fiscal year in rescue work or in the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood. (August 18, 1941, ch. 377, sec. 5, 55 Stat. 650, as amended July 24, 1946, ch. 596, sec. 12, 60 Stat. 652, title 33 U. S. C., sec. 701n.)

Act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 948), authorizing appropriations of $1,300,000, $10,000,000, and $25,000 for loans and grants to provide emergency relief for victims of seismic waves which struck the Territory of Hawaii in April 1946.

The sum of $15,000,000 was authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by recent floods, or which may be threatened or destroyed by later floods. (Public Law 102, 80th Cong., approved June 23, 1947.) An amendment was introduced on November 20, 1947, during the Eightieth Congress to insert in the aforementioned act an authorization of $3,000,000 to be expended in accordance with the provisions of such act.

Act of July 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 422), which made surplus personal property available for use by State and local governments to alleviate damage, hardship, and suffering caused by flood or other catastrophe.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the United States has a real obligation to these valiant Polish soldiers; merely because Great Britain has assumed responsibility for them does not lessen the responsibility of America toward them.

By admitting some of them to the United States we can atone in a small manner for the betrayal of their native country of Poland.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the Lodge amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering not just the Fellows bill but the Fellows bill with the Stefan amendment in which we have agreed to admit several thousand Czechoslovakian patriots. I feel that the United States has a particular obligation to Poland. On the altar of expediency the representatives of our Government sacrificed the liberty of Poland. Polish liberty was the reason for the starting of World War II and it ended up with the loss of Poland's liberty.

If we are not willing to recognize that these 18,000 soldiers who have been proven in the fire as being opponents of the Communist government that is now in Poland, a satellite government—that is the type of people they are. We owe a great debt to Poland and if we discriminate against them in favor, for example, of Czechoslovakian patriots we are doing the Poles a great injustice.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement and I would like to point out that these men will make very good material for our armed forces.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I heartily agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LODGE. We can do with men like that.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. There is another point I would like to bring out. Immediately after the war 16,000 of these boys with close relatives in the United States of America filed applications, but they were denied admission to the United States of America at that time because our State Department policy was we must not take them in for fear of arousing the ire of Russia and they were not permitted to come into the United States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The remarks made by the gentleman in his address a few minutes ago was that every one of these Polish soldiers might be in these DP camps in Germany or wherever you find them, having gone there as others have gone for the purpose of qualifying themselves as beneficiaries under such an act as is now being considered.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman, because they are men who are willing to fight and die for liberty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] allowing the admission of 18,000 Polish soldiers in addition to the authorized number of displaced persons under the bill. The argument that these individuals do not come under the category of diplaced persons to me simply does not make sense. The thoughts as expressed by Members of the House that they are not now in concentration camps in Europe certainly by no stretch of the imagination cannot class these men who fought for freedom as not being displaced persons. Granting that the majority of these Polish soldiers are now in England does not in any way take away their legal status as being stateless persons. It must be remembered that the fight for freedom started with the attack on Poland by Hitler in 1939 and all during the many years of that terrible war Polish fighting men fought on until the end. The fight to bring members of the Polish Army to this country is not new. Several years ago while I was a member of the Committee on Naturalization and Immigration, a resolution was brought before the committee recommending the admission of these soldiers to the United States. They are the type of men we want here. They will make splendid citizens and in a great measure, by their admission, will rectify the wrong done Poland at Yalta by our Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the remarks I made yesterday in support of the Clason amendment are as forceful in support of the pending amendment. As a matter of fact, if I thought the Lodge amendment could have been brought up at that time and debate not be limited, I would have made my remarks in support of the Lodge amendment; however, I made them in connection with the Clason amendment because fundamentally the question is the same. I want to reiterate as strongly as I can this amendment is based on justice, it strengthens the bill, and in no way weakens it.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment proposed by my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE]. A number of speakers have already expressed themselves favoring this proposal and the opponents of this amendment have, likewise, had their say. But, Mr. Chairman, may I invite your attention to the very glaring fact that many of the opponents have admitted that the proposal is meritorious and openly have asserted that the only reason why they oppose the addition of this amendment to H. R. 6396 is the fact that they are opposed to any and all amendments to the bill that has been presented for the consideration of the Whole House on the State of the Union so very eminently and capably by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], in his extended opening speech under general debate. I hope that when we vote upon Mr. LODGE'S amendment, that they who have conceded the merits of the proposal, and have so expressed themselves, that they will, in the meantime, give the matter further consideration and will join us in voting for it when the vote is called.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extent my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, with full respect to my colleagues who have so ably argued against this bill to admit displaced persons, I am entirely unable to accept their reasoning and conclusions.

To be sure, there are humane and philosophical considerations involved in this question which have their roots deep in the immigration policy of this Nation since its very inception. America as a great dynamic democracy has served as the traditional place of refuge for the homeless, the oppressed, the lowly, the persecuted, and all those seeking to escape from the ruthlessness and cruelty of despotic governments. We have been proud of this fine tradition and the Nation has profited immeasurably from the influx of genius, lovers of freedom, and the millions of fine, industrious, patriotic people who came to us fleeing persecution and hardship and who have contributed so magnificently through sterling citizenship, loyalty, and devotion to their adopted country.

Not only our immigrants, but their sons and daughters, born on American soil, brought up in American communities, educated in American schools, trained in the ways and methods of democracy, have become leaders in many fields of endeavor, have risen by virtue of their own merit to high posts of distinction and achievement.

It is regrettable that any scintilla of racial discrimination should enter into our efforts to enact a suitable, effective, displaced-persons measure. I deeply deplore the fact that racial questions have been raised in connection with our consideration of the bill because if this bill is to be effective, if it is to carry out in any appreciable degree the high objectives which its sponsors, this Congress, and the American people have in mind for it, there can be no suspicion of any effort or intent to administer this bill except with fullest respect for, and fair, just, impartial treatment of the various classes of persons we seek to assist by this legislation.

Who is there in this Congress or indeed in the Nation so unfeeling, so unsympathetic, so cold-hearted as not to be deeply moved by the plight of the Jewish people of Europe upon whom such unspeakable persecution and suffering has been visited during more than the last decade. And who could honestly question their many fine contributions to the Nation?

Who can be unmindful of the gallantry and sacrifice and intrepid loyalty of the Pole who was the first to face the brutal Nazi hordes and to bear the cruel blows of blitzkrieg and ruthless liquida-

tion? A noble people steeped in liberty, devoted to freedom, passionately attached to democracy, of honest, industrious traits, whose sons have served so faithfully and well in war and in peace in protecting the Nation and building its prosperity. We are under great debt to these people at home and abroad.

And our Lithuanian friends, whose rich historical attachment to free institutions is so glorious, whose contributions to America so noteworthy.

And the German with his great heritage and immeasurable contributions to our country, his loyal citizenship second to none, his industry and genius in the arts of peace and unquestionable fidelity in war.

And the Italian, of classic culture and background and dynamic qualities as fine, loyal American citizen and steady effective worker in every field of American enterprise at every level.

And the French and the Greeks and the other races and nationals which comprise America. They all have great merit and virtue. They are all entitled to our consideration and assistance insofar as it is possible and practicable for us to consider and assist them.

It must be kept in mind—and I fully recognize it—that this bill is limited to the displaced persons as such. It was not and is not intended to amend the present immigration laws. But there is no logical reason why this body cannot amend the pending bill to perfect it and make it more applicable to the problems of the many displaced persons of various nationalities so as to work justice, equity, and humane treatment for those who are driven from pillar to post in Europe and who seek the opportunity to come to the United States to better their status, gain a decent livelihood, and become worthy citizens of our free Nation.

This bill, despite assertions to the contrary, does not alter the immigration laws or policy of the United States. In fact, it supplements and broadens the policy without in any material or substantial manner changing the laws.

Practically every religious group in the country favors this bill. The moral consensus of our people supports it. The historical practice of our Nation sustains it. American tradition from time immemorial upholds it, and there can, in my opinion, be no question concerning the ethical, moral, and social basis for the speedy enactment of this measure. It is a call upon the conscience of America, an appeal to our humanity, a plea to our Christian fellowship. I not only support but I plead for its passage. This House will do honor to its great traditions by passing this bill without delay.

Let me compliment the distinguished and very able gentleman from Maine, my amiable and esteemed friend [Mr. FELLOWS] whose brilliant and discerning statesmanship has to such a large degree shaped and advanced this meritorious legislation for his splendid, painstaking, and extremely able work.

I will vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] to conclude debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I should like to stir up the minds of the Members and take them back a year. Just 1 year ago at this time we were engaged in hearings on what was then known as the Stratton bill. As a matter of fact, the heavy volume of hearings which has been distributed among the Members applies principally to the hearings held on that bill.

At the outset of this question the matter we had to determine was what would be considered a fair share or quota of the United States. If you will recall the argument made in those days, it was that the United Nations could not be sustained and upheld unless we threw our moral weight and support back of it and as one of the best evidences of that we were to take our fair share of these displaced persons.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] appeared before us on the first day of the hearing, I questioned him on this very point. At that time he had fixed the number as 400,000 as our fair share. The testimony developed that there were 800,000 of these persons in these camps.

Then I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON], "Do you think it is fair to the United States of America to take 400,000, or exactly one-half of these displaced persons, when there are 55 or 56 other nations signatory to the United Nations Charter?" He replied that that would be a matter for the committee to work out, and on that basis we began seeking to determine what would be a fair share for the United States to take.

The next consideration was this: We all knew that with the disturbed condition in this world at this date that there could be no letting down of the bars on immigration, but this was a problem which had arisen out of the World War, the matter of taking these displaced persons and of cutting out these camps that were costing the taxpayers of the United States $100,000,000 a year.

Then the next question that arose was: Who should be the ones to come in and in what proportion? That is when our difficulty arose, and after much discussion we fixed upon the number of 200,000. We had earnestly hoped in presenting this bill before this body yesterday and today that that number would remain at that fixed level. The line was broken by the passage of the so-called Stefan amendment, which now, in substance, cuts in on that 200,000.

The next thing you must determine is this: Are you going to proceed on the basis of a stationary level of 200,000, or are you going to boost it, elevate it for every particular group that wants a certain percentage to come in? Yesterday the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] suggested 110,000; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] somewhere in the neighborhood of 40,000, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] today has ably presented his case for 18,000. Well, if we take this group and that group, you are bound to elevate your ceiling; there is no getting away from it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. In the gentleman's judgment, would it have been possible for the Committee on the Judiciary to act favorably on a bill which would have provided for the admission of more than the number that are provided for in this bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely not.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what if anything has the United Nations done to work out a solution by which all these displaced persons would be absorbed by the various countries of the world?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to answer.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman will turn to the committee report, he will see that the International Refugee Organization has had this matter under consideration since January last, and that great progress has been made in the locating of these people throughout the 16 nations that are parties to it.

Mr. BUSBEY. But what have they done? What have they accomplished?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this is what has been accomplished. Mr. Tuck, head of the International Refugee Organization, testified that in this resettlement program, 234,453 disabled persons have emigrated to 12 countries, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Italy, France, the Netherlands, Peru, and many others. Already Britain has taken 50,000, or a little less, and Belgium has taken, specifically, 27,000.

Mr. BUSBEY. In other words, they have not done anything to get these people distributed proportionately around the world.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; they have. I am reading the figures.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, they have already taken in 200,000, because they have reduced the number from 1,037,404 to 836,989 from January 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948, which shows definitely that they have reduced it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LODGE) there were—ayes 46, noes 57.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. LODGE and Mr. FELLOWS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 57, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMERICAN SEAMEN ANSWER COMMUNISTS

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in the May 28 issue of the West Coast Sailor's newspaper there appears a letter from Harry Lundeberg, of the Seaman's Union, addressed to Communist Party head, William Z. Foster, which letter is, I think, so basically sound in its tenor that it should be called to the attention of the Members of this House. The letter is as follows:

SAILORS' UNION OF THE PACIFIC,
San Francisco, May 20, 1948.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER,
Chairman, Communist Party, United States of America,
New York, N. Y.:

We are in receipt of your communication dated May 7, 1948, and also a copy of a letter to William Green from the Communist Party.

In these letters you appeal to us and to William Green, as head of the American Federation of Labor, to help the Communist Party in its fight for legal existence and constitutional rights which the Mundt bill (H. R. 5852) supposedly would destroy, according to you.

We think you have a hell of a nerve appealing to a bona fide American trade-union for help in view of the scabby disruptive tactics employed by your so-called political party against the American trade-union movement and against the United States as a whole.

All through your letter you refer to fascism, stating that your party is anti-Fascist. Who are you kidding? There are no bigger Fascists than the Communists. The only difference between Stalin and Hitler is that Stalin went Hitler one better.

You state in your letter that when the Communist Party was outlawed in Nazi Germany, the trade unions and other organizations of the people were soon smashed. Who the hell do you think you are kidding again? It was the Communist Party that joined hands with the Nazis to break up the Socialist Party and the trade-union movement in Germany. These are facts that any bona fide trade-union member knows. Don't try to propagandize people who know the score.

As a matter of fact, our organization classes the Communist Party as an enemy of the working class. As far as we are concerned, they can take the whole scabby, stinking Communist Party and kick it in the middle of Siberia and let it have a taste of Uncle Joe Stalin's slave camps.

At the present time there are 15,000,000 innocent trade unionists and political prisoners in Siberia being starved and beaten to death by Joe Stalin's Cossacks. It is our considerate opinion that this is a fit place for the American Communist Party, its stooges, its fellow travelers—long-haired ones, short-haired ones—and what have you; and as far as you are concerned, you and your finky Communist Party can—

Here there appears some salty seaman's language which probably should be omitted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but with which I heartily concur. I shall be glad to show it to interested Members. The letter continues as follows—

and that goes for Joe Stalin, too.

And P. S.: Do not send any of your phony propaganda to our union because it will go the same way as all of it has gone before: Filed and flushed out.

HARRY LUNDEBERG,
Secretary-Treasurer, Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

Congratulations to Mr. Lundeberg for what might be called a forthright statement.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, everybody seems to be more or less familiar with this bill, and it seems to me perhaps we could save time if I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment, section by section.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, there are a great many of us here who have had no opportunity to speak on this proposition. I shall object at this time to the request made by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ross:

Under section 2 add the following as subsection (c):

"(c) a person who is a native of Italy and who would have been eligible for admission to the United States under all United States immigration laws at any time during the 10-year period prior to June 30, 1948, under the accumulated unused Italian quota for that period: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3, section 5 and section 6 of this act shall not be applicable to displaced persons as defined in this subsection: *Provided further*, That the number of immigration visas issued under this subsection shall be divided equally between the fiscal years 1949 and 1950."

Subsection (c) shall become subsection (d).

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. I regret to have to do this, but as I understand the gentleman he is seeking to pick up the unused quota of Italy.

Mr. ROSS. In effect, that is what this amendment would do.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, it is not germane to the bill or to the section under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ross] desire to be heard?

Mr. ROSS. Briefly, yes, Mr. Chairman.

As I interpret this bill and understand it, it is a bill to admit certain displaced persons. Those displaced persons are defined in the measure. Any person, as I understand it, who would fall in the category of displaced persons, within the definition in this bill, would be eligible for admission. Certainly, in my opinion, if the previous amendment which was submitted was held to be germane, then this amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DONDERO). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered does not affect the question of displaced persons as described in the bill but does direct attention to the immigration laws. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if it had been adopted, would admit to the United States during the next 2 years 34,275 Italians who were unable to come to this country during the years when Italian immigration was suspended. Its approval would have in no way altered our basic Italian quota. It would just pick up that number which could not come to this country during the war years, and would carry out the provision of identical bills which have been introduced by eight distinguished Members of the House this year. I realize that technically this amendment would not be germane; however, I believe it to be of such vital importance to our national interest that it should have been considered by the Congress today.

A great number of Italians now in Italy can truthfully be called displaced persons in the true sense of the phrase. During the war industrial plants and entire villages and cities were destroyed in Italy, making homeless thousands of Italians who are roaming around Italy with no place to anchor. The large cities of Italy have become overpopulated because of these homeless displaced Italians.

When Italian immigration was suspended, some 34,000 were denied admission to the United States through no fault of their own. Had it not been necessary to suspend the Italian quota, sons, daughters, and parents would have joined their families and would now be living in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this could truthfully be called an emergency measure. With world conditions being what they are today, and particularly with respect to Italy, it is absolutely essential that the United States as the leader of the moral forces of the world who are fighting the expansion of the communistic system take the lead in relieving the cities of Italy of part of their overpopulation. Principally because of the influence of the United States and because of the material aid sent to Italy, communism was beaten back in the recent Italian elections. I believe history will record the outcome of this election as being a most decisive victory in the fight against the totalitarian forces of communism.

But this was only a victory. The cold war to impose communism on the Italian people is still raging. As the most powerful nation on earth we cannot relax our efforts to assist Italy in combating the communistic menace to freedom and liberty.

For the United States to open its arms and welcome this relatively small number of Italians would indicate to the Italian people that our interest and friendship goes far beyond, and is much deeper than, just furnishing them with advice, dollars, and material aid. This humanitarian gesture on our part would, I am sure, cause the other nations of the world to open their doors to additional Italian emigrants.

By permitting these additional Italians to come to the United States, we will do a great service to our Nation's economy. The growth, prosperity, and progress of the United States have always been associated with a growing population. American-Italians have made a great contribution to the development of our Nation. Although the Italians have made notable successes in the fields of science, art, and other professions, they are primarily workers and builders. America needs in our construction industries the labor which these Italian immigrants would supply.

The huge building program we intend to put into effect, the absolute necessity

of our increasing our production of steel, and above all, the expansion of our Military Establishment, will render the lack of manpower so acute that we will of a necessity have to make recourse to foreign labor.

By allowing these few additional Italians to come to the United States, we will demonstrate to the Italian people and to the world that we are sincere in our desire to aid those nations who are willing to stand up and fight for the preservation of freedom.

I have stated that identical bills similar to this amendment have been introduced by eight Members of the House, and I do hope that they will receive early consideration by the Judiciary Committee and by the House.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk. There are two portions of it, Mr. Chairman, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together, because they are related to one another.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

Amend H. R. 6396 on page 2 by inserting after the semicolon in line 14, the following: "notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 4 of part II set forth in annex I of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, the term 'displaced person' shall also include a person of German ethnic origin, who prior to April 21, 1947, was transferred or fled to Germany or Austria from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia, provided that such person is otherwise qualified as a displaced person under the provisions of this act."

And further amend H. R. 6396 by striking out the period on page 3 in line 14, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and inserting after the semicolon the following: "*Provided*, That for the purposes of this subsection persons of German ethnic origin who are referred to in paragraph 4 of part II of annex I of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization shall be included as one of such elements or groups; and *further provided, however*, That the number of such persons to whom visas may be issued shall not exceed 100,000."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill. In a word, it provides that those of German ethnic origin, regardless of their place of birth, shall be admissible under our quota laws. Our quota laws are based upon the theory of national origin, and that the place of birth governs the quota. This amendment would change the theory of our immigration laws and provide that ethnic blood would determine the quota rather than place of birth.

For that reason the amendment is not germane to this bill which has for its purpose the solving of the displaced-persons problem regardless of quotas.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard briefly in reply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is no reference whatsoever in my amendment to quotas. There is merely a reference to the definition as contained in the Fellows bill of the International Refugee Organization. It merely pertains to the description of displaced persons. There is no attempt to alter the immigration laws whatsoever. It merely pertains to the definition of displaced persons.

The Chair will note that in the bill as it is presented to the House the description of a displaced person refers to the definition contained in the IRO. My amendment merely affects that section of the bill and is not an attempt to alter the immigration laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that the language of the gentleman's amendment does apply to displaced persons.

The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I should like to preface the remarks I am about to make by a question addressed to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Does the gentleman from New York believe that this measure should in any way be based upon racial discrimination? Can the gentleman answer that?

Mr. CELLER. We have a provision——

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is the answer "No"?

Mr. CELLER. The answer is "No."

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] has stated that the problem here is one of solving the problem of the DP's in Europe. The DP's, generally speaking, are people who have been driven from other countries, mostly into Germany. There are some in Austria, some in Italy, but the great bulk of them are in Germany.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. I believe the gentleman seeks to cover under his amendment possibly 7,000,000——

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I will get to that.

Mr. FELLOWS. They are actually free in Germany now, they are not in the IRO camps.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I may point out that some are in the camps, if the gentleman please; and I will come to the IRO if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

The committee will note that on page 2, line 5, and continuing therefrom is the definition of displaced persons; but there is this sleeper in that provision: The definition of displaced persons is the definition contained in the constitution of the IRO. Therefore I think it becomes important to ascertain what the definition is.

The definition of a displaced person in the IRO constitution excludes therefrom all persons of German ethnic origin, whether German nationals or members of German minorities in other countries who have been or may be transferred to Germany from other countries.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Not at this point; I will later.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, under this displaced-persons bill, having in mind that there are about 11,000,000 people who have been driven into Germany out of the 12,000,000 people all told, only those who are not of German ethnic origin would qualify. Therefore, nobody of German ethnic origin may be a displaced person under this measure. Now, that is racial discrimination, and as the gentleman from New York answered me a moment ago, he did not desire that this bill be based on racial discrimination.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Not just now; I will yield later.

The gentleman has said that this is a compromise bill. Yes; we could compromise on certain matters in order to make a practical bill, but we cannot compromise on principle, we cannot compromise on the basis of racial discrimination. Of the ten or fifteen million people who have been driven into Germany, many of them and their ancestors have lived in these other countries—Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, for centuries, many with their families, yet if they have any German blood in them they are disqualified.

Many of these people are good farmers, the type of people we need to bring into this country, yet we are discriminating against 90 percent of them when we use the IRO definition; and all that my amendment does is to do away with racial discrimination. For expediency, we sacrificed principle at Yalta and Poland lost her liberty. We sacrificed it at Potsdam, we sacrificed it in Yugoslavia, and we sacrificed it for expediency by selecting Tito instead of Mihailovich, and Yugoslavia lost her independence. If we sacrifice principle in the DP bill by discriminating against all people of German blood we are liable to lose Germany to Russia.

We cannot base this measure on expediency, we cannot base it upon racial discrimination. In all fairness these people in central Europe should be considered. Many of them are in concentration camps there. We cannot completely exclude them on the basis of racial discrimination. If we do we are aping the Nazis. We are holding out for the principle of race superiority.

This question goes deeper than the question of expediency or compromise. This question goes to the very roots of our theory of government. It sets up the principle of admission into our country of a class of people from displaced-persons camps, but would exclude everybody of a certain racial ethnic background. If America stands for anything it is against racial discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the purpose of the gentleman's amendment and, so far as that is concerned, it is good; but, as the gentleman indicated, we are

trying to stick to principle. One of the principles, as I view it, is this: The nations adopted—we subscribed to it—the IRO constitution, and this is the definition given in that constitution.

I have no objection to these people. I think they would make a great contribution to our country. But if we are going to open this question up again, which involves some 11,000,000 people, if we are going to amend this bill, it would be more economical for us to dig up the *Mayflower*, refit it and repaint it, and all of us go back to Europe.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is it not true that the people who are primarily in Germany, 10 to 15 million of them, who have been driven into Germany, are the people who are creating the greatest difficulty in there for our Government?

Mr. FELLOWS. It could be.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is it not true that it would be better to consider them as a whole rather than one-tenth of them and discriminate against all of those who have a German ethnic background?

Mr. FELLOWS. Against what countries are you going to charge the quota?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. This is not a question of quota.

Mr. FELLOWS. It is; because you are going to charge it against the land of their birth, not Germany.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Why do we base the bill on racial discrimination?

Mr. FELLOWS. We do not.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Why do we have this discriminatory definition in it?

Mr. FELLOWS. We have adopted the IRO constitutional definition, the IRO definition of "displaced persons." We do that for the reason it solves the question we are trying to solve. These people are fine people, but they are in the economy of Germany.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is right. It solves it by discriminating against everyone of German ethnic background.

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not think so.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the people who would be covered by this amendment are the so-called Sudetan Germans?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Their exclusion from the definition under IRO was because of the fact they had been considered quislings of the Nazis, therefore outside of the IRO set-up?

Mr. FELLOWS. I did not have any part in deciding that. I am not able to answer the question.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Is it not likewise true that they are the same people who were sent into Czechoslovakia by Hitler to assist in taking over Czechoslovakia?

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman means by that they were the agents of Hitler sent in there to help take over Czechoslovakia?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. The people who instigated the disorder in Czechoslovakia which furnished the excuse for Hitler to move in there.

Mr. FELLOWS. If that is true, and I do not know whether it is true, the answer to the gentleman's question a few minutes ago might be different, if they were people connected with Hitler, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania implied.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman knows that is not true as to the great bulk of these people.

Mr. FELLOWS. There is no question about that.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Furthermore, subsection (c) line 15 of page 2 would disqualify anybody who was a Nazi.

Mr. FELLOWS. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, these people throughout that area were divided into two camps; they were either Fascists and Nazis or Communists, were they not? Now then, if these people are Communists, according to the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it is all right to bring them in here.

Mr. FELLOWS. Oh, no; it is not.

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman from Mississippi knows that I feel just the way he does about communism.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not talking about the gentleman from Maine; I said the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Now, the Communists are the ones who overran Czechoslovakia; they are the ones that overran Poland, and they are the ones now plotting the destruction of this Government.

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not think communism, if that is the word the gentleman used, takes over any country. I think it is a band or group of Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. They are all sponsored by the Cominform. These countries are full of them, and they are trying to ease them into this country for the same purpose.

Mr. FELLOWS. Well, that may be true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have been worried in recent days over the prospects of much desirable legislation being lost in the rush for adjournment on June 19. I am, because of this worry, more than happy that the displaced-persons legislation has been brought to the floor for debate.

I honestly believe this is "must" legislation. We would be false to our duties as Representatives, false to our heritage as Americans, if we failed to enact this legislation.

We are positive that ours is the best system of government yet devised by man. We urge all other peoples to adapt their systems to come into line with our firm belief in the liberty and dignity of the individual man. We have argued and pleaded with the heads of other nations. We have poured out the cream of our youth, we have expended our resources in a most magnanimous fashion. We are now committed to a costly program to help other peoples reconstruct their societies. Above all these things in importance is the concrete evidence of our sincerity which the enactment of this legislation will afford.

We know there are hundreds of thousands of persons praying that they might live to see the day when this promise of a home shall become a fact. They and their kinfolk will be inspired to great efforts in the defense of freedom and liberty by this act of ours.

A great deal has been said in this House about the charitable features of the displaced-persons legislation. A great deal has been said about the traditional welcome we offer to all oppressed peoples. I need not repeat those sentiments. In addition—there is the cold, hard fact that we do ourselves and our system of democracy a great deal of good by this legislation. We show to all the world that we are in truth champions of freedom and that we shall aid all those who rally to our cause.

I have no fear that this group of unfortunate people will do our system harm. I am confident of the screening process which will be employed and I am confident these people will become valuable and fine citizens of the United States. It has been said here that some undesirables may sneak in. I am not too much worried on that score.

We are a great Nation and a strong one. I am certain the American people are alert to the dangers of subversive ideologies and will soon root out and brand the one or two foreign agents who may make their way to this country under the guise of displaced persons.

I would like to see this legislation provide for the admission of many Poles and Italians who are homeless because they championed the cause of liberty and justice.

There are many brave Poles who fought for our cause during the war and who now are threatened with death or exile if they return to their homeland. These will make valuable citizens of our country.

There are many Italians who can contribute valuable services to the United States if the provisions of this legislation are broadened. There are unused quotas which could be made available to these Italian people. To do that would be merely providing admission for many who would have come in the normal course of events.

I am happy to support this legislation and I sincerely hope it will not be hamstrung by provisions which are too restrictive.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in endeavoring to fashion a definition of displaced persons the American representative to the International Refugee Organization, together with all the other representatives, came to the inevitable conclusion that the Volkdeutsche, which is the subject of the pending amendment, could not be deemed displaced persons. See the definition of displaced persons in the constitution of IRO—Appendix 1, annex 1, paragraph 1, pages 66–67–68, of the Displaced Persons Report issued by the Senate March 2, 1948. Why were they not the concern of the International Refugee Organization? Because they were the spearheads of the German civilian advance into the countries Hitler overran. They were the ones who were sent forward to fertilize the ground for Hitler's coming. They became the gauleiters and quislings in Norway and Holland and Poland and Russia and Czechoslovakia. They were the ones that were in the advance of Hitler's armies and made possible, through their fifth-column activities, the victories of Hitler.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Inasmuch as the gentleman from Mississippi has completely misunderstood the attitude of the gentleman from Pennsylvania I would just like to interject at this point that my own feeling with respect to the inclusion of Communists in this bill is as antipathetical as his own, but that I likewise object to the inclusion of those who were the followers of Hitler as the beneficiaries of this bill.

Mr. CELLER. And these are the people who are the subject of this amendment and who were, in the main, the advance agents of Hitler.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I will be more gracious than the gentleman from Wisconsin. He refused to yield to me but nonetheless I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman maintain that those people whose ancestors resided in these other countries for three, four, or five centuries were all agents of Hitler?

Mr. CELLER. I would say that the Volkdeutsche, those of German ethnic origin, regardless of ancestry, who were born in Czechoslovakia, Holland, Denmark, and Norway, to a major portion were adherents of nazism and were the agents of Hitler. Some were, of course, innocent of nazism. Most were not. They became the Nazi aristocracy and SS Guards. They shared some of the guilt for the bestialities and the sadism that was encouraged by Hitler in Czechoslovakia, in Norway, and in the various countries that were finally overrun by the Nazis. Certainly, we cannot extend an invitation to that kind of people to come into this land. I do not want the Communists to come in, and with equal force I say I do not want the Nazis or Nazi followers to come in. These Volkdeutsche are Latvians, Poles, Czechs, and Russians of German origin who before the war enjoyed the same rights as their compatriots of Czech descent, or the Poles of Polish descent, and so forth. When the Nazi machine went into high gear most of these Volkdeutsche jettisoned the countries in which they lived and became the spearhead of the Nazi fifth column which succeeded in dismembering Czechoslovakia, facilitated the Reichswehr blitz of Poland, and seriously handicapped the Russian war effort in the Volga region. These Volkdeutsche outdid the Germans in persecuting the conquered people. They were infuriated with the job of herding Nazi victims in sealed-door trains and taking charge of crematoria. Those are the men and women you are trying to help by this amendment.

Read the hearings of the war criminals' trials at Nuremberg; read the Army war records, and you get a feeling of revolt against these Volkdeutsche. Most of them, judging from these records, are guilty of crimes against humanity.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has shown much concern over the problem of rehabilitation of European countries and the problem of the displaced persons.

In this connection, many matters have come to my attention which I think should be brought to the attention of the House of Representatives.

This particular matter which I have in mind refers to the problem of the expellees. There are no doubt Members of this Congress who have some question as to just who are expellees and what their problems are and what solution might be offered for these problems.

To that end, and in explanation, I would like to make the following statement:

Expellees are the people of German nationality or German ethnic origin who, at the end of the war, were driven from their homes in East Prussia, Silesia, Pomerania, the Sudetenland, Hungary, Transylvania, and so forth, into the borders of the Reich proper as constituted by the Potsdam agreement of 1945 and split into four zones—American, British, French, and Russian.

An official census has never been undertaken. According to United States Government sources, the figures as of November 1946 are as follows: American zone, 2,904,000; British zone, 3,193,000; French zone, 50,000; Russian zone, 3,912,000; Berlin, 37,000; total, 10,096,000. According to statisticians, this figure had grown to about 12,000,000 by December 1947.

According to impartial observers, most of them active in relief work, the lot of these people is pitiful. Because of Germany's economic condition, most of them are unemployed. The tuberculosis rate and the child-mortality rate are tremendous; the former 1 to 45, according to British health authorities. Germany, always overpopulated, is even more so today. It is estimated that 70,000,000 people live in a territory which has shrunk to less than half the size of our State of Texas.

No provisions whatsoever for these expellees are contained in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, successor to UNRRA. In fact, it is explicitly stipulated that people of German ethnic origin, whether German nationals or members of German minorities in other countries, are excluded from the activities of IRO. The IRO constitution was adopted by the Senate of the United States and signed by President Truman on July 1, 1947, without any changes whatsoever.

The true history of these millions of expellees has not yet been written, I know. As a matter of fact, there has been a concerted drive by certain groups to keep it from the American public. These people were driven from their ancestral homes—with just what they could carry on their backs—on a few hours' notice. This was done with the more or less tacit approval of the western democracies. Morally, we failed completely. From the standpoint of an enlightened self-interest, we have failed again. Soviet Russia and her satellites have dropped the problem into our laps and so far we have done nothing to solve it. We have not yet learned the first lesson of history; that it is the intolerable pressure of people living in a confined space which creates aggression and warfare. This is especially true of overcrowded central Europe which has always been unable to feed her own people and had to depend on tremendous imports to avoid famine.

It is estimated that among these expellees there are at least 3,00,000 people who lived outside the borders of the Reich of 1938. Over 2,000,000 came from Czechoslovakia, the rest from the Baltic States, from prewar Poland, from Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Rumania. These people had settled there hundreds of years ago. They spoke an often old-fashioned German. Otherwise, there was no kinship whatsoever with the people in Germany proper. These peasants and artisans from Swabia, Saxony, and other parts of the Reich were given land by the Hapsburg emperors in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries along the eastern and southeastern borders of the old empire to serve as a bulwark against Turkish aggression and to Christianize these outposts. They were hard-working, practical, and often prosperous people, which may well be the principal reason for their expulsion. It is only natural that they felt the constant pressure of the Slav millions all around them and that their separate language and customs as well as their prosperity should have aroused the prejudice and envy of the rest of the population. This has happened to other races and peoples in the course of history. And it has often been considered a crime by those who were envious of success.

To solve this immense problem will take many decades. The United States could contribute by giving the expellees who are of German ethnic origin—but not German citizens expelled from the eastern provinces of the Reich—the same status as enjoyed by the displaced persons. As far as all expellees are concerned, the United States delegates to

IRO, vigorously assisted by Congress, should bend all their efforts toward the goal to admit all expellees to the benefits to be derived from IRO. As far as the expellees of German ethnic origin are concerned, the United States and British occupation authorities should appoint a commission composed of experts in agriculture, handicraft, industry, mining, and so forth, to make a census of these people with their special skills. In a Nation such as ours, where the number of farm workers decreases from year to year, there should be ample opportunity—benefiting our entire agriculture life—for vigorous, hard-working farmers with a tradition of tilling the soil successfully for hundreds of years. For an outstanding example one need only look at the prosperous farms in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, where many a German settled a generation or more ago to become an efficient American farmer and a good American citizen. Also, among these expellees of German ethnic origin there are famous glass blowers from Bohemia, clever cabinetmakers, experts in husbandry, chemists, foresters, and many, many others who—in line with an enlightened selective immigration policy—could and would contribute much toward making this land of ours richer and more prosperous.

All Americans have the fullest sympathy for the displaced persons who live a life of sorrow in the camps of central Europe. They should be given help and admittance into the western nations in accordance with a carefully conceived plan. The lot of the expellees is just as hard and just as undeserved. Moreover, their number is much greater. I ask for them the same that may be given to other displaced persons, as far as selective immigration and the work of IRO are concerned.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] where he gets his facts about these people being Nazis and followers of Hitler. If he can prove that statement, I would like to have his answer.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I will give the gentleman a half a minute to prove that statement to me if he can.

Mr. CELLER. The records of the war will show that, and the records of the various congressional committees will indicate that.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. You are not proving to me that your statement is correct.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I yield.

Mr. DORN. In that connection, the gentleman from New York is talking about these men and women being Nazis and Fascists. They have provisions in the bill for screening. If you are going to screen Communists, certainly they can screen Fascists and Nazis.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has made a very able presentation and has offered a fine amendment. I hope the committee will go along with it, and that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I have spent a great deal of time in my office and in committee preparing myself on this matter. I sincerely regret that the chairman of the committee does not see fit to grant me more time to complete my statement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

This will probably be my only opportunity to speak on this bill. I am unalterably opposed to its passage. I believe you are getting ready to bring into this country, through these concentration camps, a gang of well-trained Communists, representatives of the Comintern, who will spread out over this country for the purpose of plotting the overthrow of this Government.

As a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I have seen these people come before the committee. They have always said how they have been persecuted. When I make that statement, I always think of those two Eislers who were here plotting to overthrow this Government—but they said they were persecuted; that they were refugees from persecution. Yet, they were putting in their time planning the overthrow of the Government of the United States and the destruction of our Christian civilization.

Ninety percent of the members of the Communist Party in this country are members of racial-minority groups. Sixty percent of them are immigrants who have come here from Europe and are spending untold millions of dollars in every State in the Union plotting the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

The Communists have men right now in these concentration camps for the purpose of getting them in here as spies. They do not want to work. They never have worked. If they wanted to work, they would get out and help rebuild Europe. What they want to do is to come here and tear down America. This amendment goes in the right direction. I am not of German descent. I probably have fewer people of German descent in the district I represent than any other Member of the Congress of the United States. But we have some fine people here who are of German extraction.

In fact we have about 25,000,000 people in this country who are of direct German descent. I saw their boys don the uniform and go into the war to fight for this country in the late war. Thousands of them gave their lives in that conflict.

I am unalterably opposed to legislation that denies to them, who are now being persecuted by the Communists as no people on earth have ever been persecuted, the same privileges you give to racial minorities, many of whom are hand in glove with Stalin and his Communist satellites.

Oh, they say some of them followed Hitler. Whom did you expect them to follow? They had to follow either Hitler or Stalin. Those people who were moved up into Russia, those Nordic people from Germany and Austria, have been wiped out—liquidated, murdered, if you please. Those Christian people have been destroyed, millions of them. If you are going to pass a bill to let in a little group here, infiltrated with men who have been trained in the art of atheistic communism, dedicated to the destruction of this Government, you had better pass no bill at all.

I shall support the pending amendment; I think it is right.

Then I shall vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, on five different occasions since March 2, 1948, I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD irrefutable proof from the widest and most respectable sources throughout the country indicating the desirability of the enactment of this legislation, and demonstrating that a large majority of the American people are in favor of it. A brief radio talk by me on the subject last month brought unanimous approval. Not a single communication was received by me setting forth any opposition to the bill.

The name calling addressed to these poor unfortunates who are seeking admission to this country is most unbecoming of any American. History teaches us that the downtrodden and the oppressed have always been the foremost exponents of freedom and democracy.

The latest communication that has come to me on the subject, urging the enactment of the Fellows bill we are now considering, and objecting to the bill of the other honorable body of this Congress as "an affront to the Christian principles of brotherhood of man and the freedom of conscience" was issued by Walter Van Kirk, secretary of the international justice and good will department, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; Canon Almon Pepper, director of the department of Christian social welfare, National Conference of Protestant Episcopal Church; J. M. Dawson, public relations secretary, Baptists of the United States; Stanley Stuber, director, Baptists World Relief for the Northern Baptist Convention; R. E. Diffendorfer, executive secretary, Board of Missions of the Methodist Church; Ray Gibbons, director, Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches; and E. Granham Wilson, general secretary, board of national missions, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

This is a good time to recall to mind the words inscribed upon the Statue of Liberty:

"Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!" cries she
With silent lips, "Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

Let us leave aside for a moment the humanitarian and religious principles that should urge our favorable consideration of this legislation and look upon it from the strictly selfish viewpoint of the effects of this bill upon our domestic economy.

The argument has been raised in opposition to this bill that our economy cannot stand for the admission of these aliens, that it would disrupt our housing situation, and that it would throw out of employment American citizens.

There is still ringing in my ears the cry of the Members of this Congress that the way to bring down prices and to beat the cost of living was not price control but more production, and the only way that we could get more production was for labor to produce more. Labor cannot produce more unless you have the labor with which to produce. Employment is at the highest level this country has even known. There are few if any persons willing to work who cannot find work today.

Let me cite to you some very respectable and substantial authorities in support of my statement that all of these refugees can be absorbed into our economy to its benefit and to the benefit of the entire Nation.

In Minnesota, Republican Governor Youngdahl appointed an interfaith council which made a survey and reported that Minnesota would take 9,000 displaced persons of all faiths, and offered financial assistance, employment, and housing.

In Iowa, the secretary of state, the Farm Bureau, the CIO, and the AFL, in cooperation with various church groups, report that Iowa has room for 9,000 displaced persons in urban areas and 16,000 displaced persons in rural communities, as agricultural workers, carpenters, teachers, nurses, technicians, and skilled workers.

Prof. George W. Hill, reporting for Wisconsin, advises that his State is ready to receive more than 3,000 families or upward of 10,000 displaced persons.

Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, of North Dakota, tells us that his State can accommodate more than 5,000 displaced persons, giving them homes and employment, and in South Dakota, 3,000 displaced persons can immediately be settled to the advantage of the State.

Gov. Millard F. Caldwell, using a survey of the State Chamber of Commerce, advises that Florida can take 10,000 displaced persons who can be absorbed in the textile garment and chemical industries, and as agricultural workers for dairymen and tobacco growers as well as trained nurses and domestic servants.

Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, advises that his State can absorb its full quota of displaced persons that may be admitted during the next few years, indicating that his State needs labor of various types in industry, in agriculture, and as domestic servants.

The late Governor McConaughy reported that his State of Connecticut will make every effort to do its share in absorbing these displaced persons and prepare them for assimilation. He said the State can find prompt employment for 1,000 women and for many men in skilled trades, as well as in agriculture and in general industry.

Republican Governor Dewey, of New York, states that after a year's study by his department of labor he is convinced that the State of New York can absorb 50,000 displaced persons in industry and agriculture. He says New York alone can use most of the 3,000 farmers now receiving assistance in the United States zone in Germany.

The economy of our country can only gain from the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I detect an undercurrent of feeling being stirred up, unfairly, by some Members of this House in an effort to sabotage this bill. It is best typified by the statement inserted in the remarks of the Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on May 19, 1948. In revising his remarks, after leaving the well of the House, he said that his information is that 75 percent of the members of the Communist Party in this country are Yiddish and that 60 percent of them were born in foreign countries and that the FBI files will bear that out.

If the statement had been made on the floor, I would have challenged it then and there.

The statement is as libelous as the forged and fraudulent Protocols of Zion.

The FBI files do not contain a word to sustain his statement. I have here the letter of J. Edgar Hoover as director of the FBI saying that his files contain no such facts. I took the trouble to inquire from the Un-American Activities Committee and was advised that it had no such information.

The fact is that in the over-all Communist movement Jews are outnumbered 50 to 1. At another time I will place in the RECORD the names of the leaders of the American Communist movement, which show how few Jews are in their midst. No person, Christian or Jew, professing a belief in God can be a Communist.

Also, bear in mind, that of the displaced persons in all the European camps only 20 percent are Jews and most of them want to go to the new state of Israel.

If you must think along religious lines, remember that 80 percent of the persons to be helped by this bill are good, decent Christians.

I conclude with these words from the last chapter of the New Testament: "And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, in an effort to agree on a limitation of debate, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, we all know that this bill is a compromise between the proponents of the Stratton measure to admit 400,000 DP's, and those who want to keep our immigration barriers up. To me it appears to be a surrender to certain selfish minority pressure groups in this country. It is nothing more or less than an opening wedge driven at the very heart of our immigration laws, and I believe that if we continue to pass such measures it can possibly mean the eventual destruction of the United States.

I had always entertained the idea that it was the duty of the Congress of the United States to legislate for the welfare of the American people. And yet not one time during the entire 2 days' debate on this bill have I heard one single Member take this floor and attempt even to make an effort to show that this bill was, even by the farthest stretch of the imagination, in the interest of the American people.

I represent the people of the great State of Mississippi. I do not represent Poland, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Bizonia, or any other country. Because I do not believe this is a bill in the interest of the American people whom I represent; I am not going to support it.

The mistaken impression seems to have become prevalent abroad that the United States is a gigantic charitable institution, dedicated to a policy of gratuitously feeding and clothing the entire world. Furthermore, it has become apparent that these people consider our country to be an asylum, or international eleemosynary institution, in which every refugee, malcontent, political, economic, and social misfit may take haven who finds himself unable or unwilling to apply his efforts and talents to the building of his own country.

They seem to think that we owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to those whose very lives were saved by American boys only 4 or 5 years ago.

Personally, I do not think we owe them any kind of obligation. If there is any obligation, they owe it to us, and that obligation is to stay over there and rebuild their own country. They should do it themselves, and not ask the United States for any more help than is absolutely necessary.

To lower our immigration barriers is to invite the entry into our country of Communist agents and fellow travelers, and no amount of screening will keep them out. Time and time again it has been demonstrated that in spite of the safeguards we have set up under our present laws to screen out revolutionary agitators, our efforts have been thwarted either by administrative inefficiency, misinterpretation of law, or weaknesses in the law. It is my belief that there is no way to screen out these subversives, for perjury means nothing to them; otherwise, how do we account for the entry of the Eislers, the Bittelmans, and the Williamsons and all the rest of that gang with which the Committee on Un-American Activities and the FBI have had to deal?

In our zeal to right the wrongs of the world, Mr. Chairman, let us not subordinate our better judgment to such emotional humanitarianism. It is true, certainly, that some of those in the DP camps are splendid people, who could and would undoubtedly contribute much to the social and economic progress of our country.

Admitting that to be true, is it not also true that their talents are much more

painfully needed in the rebuilding of the countries of Europe, which is being financed by the United States?

It is an indisputable fact that the countries of France, England, and Russia own and control more than one-half of the entire land surface of the world, much of which is virgin, capable of profitable development. How does it happen that we have the displaced-persons problem shoved down our throats in the light of these undeniable facts?

We have spent more than $17,000,000,000 since the close of the war in various rehabilitation schemes, intended to set the world back on the path to normalcy. We have recently committed ourselves to spend an additional $17,000,000,000 to rehabilitate the countries of France, England, and western Europe.

The American taxpayer is digging deep into his pocket in order that these countries might share the economic blessings of our people.

Yet no word has come from the State Department, or from the President, to suggest that in return for these considerations, the displaced-persons problem should be shouldered by those countries which we recently saved from destruction, and whose rehabilitation we are financing.

In the past, we have accepted a larger number of immigrants than any other nation in the history of the world. Certainly that entails no obligation on our part to accept more.

While it is true that our country was built by immigrants, and has become known as the melting pot of the world, let us not forget that those who came here earlier found a wilderness, and built a country out of it. Those who desire to come here now that the country is built, are not coming to build, but to tear down. They are, in fact, running out on a building job that needs to be done in their own country.

It is significant that every other country in the world has exhibited extreme reluctance to accept these displaced persons as immigrants. Would this be true if they were desirable raw material for citizenship? Many other countries need immigrants—they are begging for them. But they very wisely want the right kind of immigrants; otherwise they would be asking for these DP's.

In an item which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday, February 24, 1948, it was shown that the American military authorities are very much concerned over the crime rate existent in DP camps.

I quote from this news item, which originated in Berlin, and was distributed by the Associated Press:

> The United States Army warned displaced persons in west German camps today that they are getting a bad reputation abroad because of their crime rate. It urged them to cooperate in a law-enforcement drive. The Army's warning * * * said most DP crimes are committed by a minority. It appealed to law-abiding elements to report and apprehend criminals.
>
> German and military government public safety reports frequently have blamed displaced persons for a crime rate disproportionate to their numbers. Black marketing and theft head the list of crimes.

Are these the kind of people that we want to take into the United States? Listen to this, taken from a confidential report to the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, formerly known as the Truman committee:

> In summing up the security aspects of the displaced persons question, it must not be overlooked that the Germans must gaze with some bewilderment upon the conditions the United States permits to exist; and the behavior of the displaced persons themselves appears to be a strange expression of gratitude for the hospitality which they are receiving from the Americans.

In commenting upon the situation at Babenhausen, one of these camps, this report says:

> These persons are for the most part penniless, and do not desire to work, but expect to be cared for, and complain when things are not as well done as they think they should be. Mr. Goldman, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Director of the camp, said that he had not been able to get more than 400 of the 3,000 to do any work, even fixing up their own dwelling space. When he did get any work out of them, it was because of offering special inducements, such as extra cigarettes.
>
> It is very doubtful that any country would desire these people as immigrants.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the real test that should be applied to this bill is: Is it in the interest of the general welfare of the people of the United States of America?

I have the deepest compassion for those who have been driven out of their homes by war. But that has been one of the natural consequences following every war, and I fail to recognize an obligation on our part to take these people to our bosom. The war was not of our making, and I do not feel that we should be held responsible for its aftermath.

We have been most generous and charitable in our treatment of these persons, as well as the rest of Europe. Because we are a humanitarian nation, we have suffered years of impositions at the hands of these Europeans.

If we owe these people an obligation, then do we not by the same token owe the same obligation to those millions of Chinese whom the war caused to become displaced? What about the displaced persons of South and Central America, of India, of the other nations who fought on our side? Why discriminate against them?

If there was ever a time in the history of our great Nation when we should throw additional safeguards around our borders, it is now. Remember, it is our duty to legislate for the welfare of our people, and I hope that the Congress will keep this in mind when this bill is presented for final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is a sad day for the United States of America. The measure before us, as the debate will show, has, perhaps for the first time, definitely projected into congressional discussion the serious and dangerous issues of races. I fear the Congress and Nation may rue this unfortunate occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Wisconsin. I regret it because he is a friend of mine and because I admire very much many of the things he does. However, I think it must be opposed on one salient ground, and though he will not agree with me, I hope that he will recognize the reasonableness for this ground of opposition.

The salient point is that the people the gentleman desires to affect are not in the displaced-persons camps, are not being considered as displaced persons, and that this is a displaced-persons bill. There is no escaping that point and it is decisive.

It has been asked here: Why should we pass this bill in the interest of the people of the United States? I should like to remind the gentleman from Mississippi that the very question has been debated here, and I would like to summarize it now.

First, we are passing this bill in the interest of the people of the United States because it represents our answer to a great moral issue—an issue arising in the liquidation of the war. We are taking the position of not driving people back to countries where they are in legitimate fear of persecution, religious, or political. By taking this side of the issue while the Soviets have taken the other we reaffirm one of the most essential elements in our national security—our moral leadership of the world.

Second, it saves us money, because we are obligated now to the tune of about $100,000,000 a year in our international Refugee Organization contribution, and other overhead costs of our occupation forces attributable to the DP camps.

Third, because we can get good people for settlement in the United States who will make excellent citizens.

There has been a great deal of testimoney on this floor from members who have been to the DP camps and who have seen that we can get high-grade immigrants from these camps. Those are the essential reasons why we are confining this bill to the displaced persons and why we call it a displaced persons bill.

I would like to point out that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will cut exactly in half the effort we are making to help in the solution of the displaced persons problem. We would be taking 100,000 out of 11,000,000 ethnic Germans. Eleven million who are not in the DP camps and were never regarded as DP's, people who have gone back to Germany or Austria where they are with people of their own ethnic origin. I do not think it is particularly right either, that in the character of generous Americans we should so quickly forget that many ethnic Germans in the countries the Hitler hordes overran, were often members of the celebrated fifth column who actively supported the Nazi program.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yesterday when the gentleman was speaking I asked him the question whether or not he believed that this bill should not be based in any respect on racial discrimination. Having that in mind, and the answer of the gentleman from New York, is it not true that this bill, if not amended, is based upon racial discrimination?

Mr. JAVITS. I disagree with the gentleman completely. The bill is based upon an effort to deal with the DP problem and within the confines of that problem under the bill there is no discrimination whatsoever. On the contrary, the bill is very carefully drawn to see that there is no discrimination.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does not the definition of "displaced persons" exclude the inclusion of Germans of ethnic origin?

Mr. JAVITS. That is the very point, it does. They are not DP's.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to participated in the debate on the general issues of this bill. I expect to vote for the bill.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin does broaden the bill, I think, but in doing so, it seeks to correct one of the gravest mistakes that has ever been made in the policy of the United States. It seeks to wipe out one of the greatest blots on our postwar measures.

The amendment would make it possible for displaced people who are of German ethnic origin to be included among the people to be admitted if they qualify under the general conditions of the bill. They would still be screened, they would still come under the quota requirements, but it would wipe out the denial to people of German ethnic origin which exists solely by reason of a discriminatory racial definition in the IRO charter.

We have heard a great deal about displaced persons, eight hundred and some thousand of them in these camps, where we have 70 percent of the responsibility. We have heard little in America about the 10,000,000 people, our displaced persons, the "expellees" whom we shoved out of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and other countries when we were playing Stalin's game.

These people for whom the gentleman from Wisconsin speaks are not Communists. These are the people whom Stalin pushed out, and whom we helped him to push out, often on 24-hour notice, and told them to take their little bag and get on the train. They were shoved into Germany, not into the DP camps, but onto the general economy which we feed.

Last fall I saw some of the empty villages of Czechoslovakia and some of the idle farms those people had left; I also saw these people over in Germany, crowded into houses already filled to overflowing, piled onto an economy not able to feed the folks already there.

All the gentleman from Wisconsin does is say, "Let us make this bill correct part of our own mistakes in the postwar period. Let the people who happen to be of German ethnic origin qualify under the terms of the bill, the same as any others."

The ancestors of many of those people lived in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, or Austria for 200 years. If any of these people were recent migrants and were Hitler agents, they would be disqualified under the general screening process set up by the bill.

These are our displaced persons, where we have 100 percent of the responsibility of trying to keep the German economy alive. In the DP camps we have a responsibility but it is a 70-percent responsibility, a shared responsibility. We do help ourselves if we give some of these people a chance to support themselves and to contribute to our production in the United States.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be adopted. If there is anything wrong with the bill on the basis of what many people have said here, this will help to correct it.

Personally I am going to vote for the bill, but this amendment will help cure the thing of which some of you have complained.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this displaced-persons bill because I believe this bill, first, will be beneficial to the United States. If I know it, I never vote for a piece of legislation regardless of how much propaganda is put out in favor of it if I think it is not to the best interest of our country. I have tried to think and vote American and for the interest of America in this Congress, and I shall continue to do so.

If this bill is seriously amended in the Senate when it comes back to the conference, I will vote against it. I do not favor the Senate bill, and I certainly was unalterably opposed to the first bill introduced in this House some months ago which provided for letting into this country 400,000 displaced persons.

Mr. Chairman, under our normal immigration laws 153,000 persons, even if this bill is not passed, can be admitted each year into the United States. The immigration laws have been so weak and so badly administered that many of the wrong types of people have been coming in. If this bill passes it will not admit one extra person over and above the immigration quotas now set to come into this country. I am going to vote for this bill because there is a rigid code of restrictions and screening set up in the bill that will permit us to admit no more, but a better quality of foreign citizenship than if the bill was not passed.

For instance, this bill states in substance that those who administer this act, or anyone connected therewith who conspires to violate the strict regulations of the act in the admission of people to this country, are subject to a fine of from $500 to $10,000, and to imprisonment from 2 to 10 years in the penitentiary. It sets up health standards; it bars Communists or fellow travelers; it says what percentage of different races can be admitted, and it provides that through State organizations jobs and living quarters must be found and be certified by State and other units before these people can be admitted. It seems every safeguard and precaution necessary was written into the bill.

Bear in mind that this bill will not increase our intake of foreign citizens into this country by a single person, yet, at the same time it will permit us to keep out the undesirable and only take those who can be assimilated and for whom there are living quarters available in this country.

If 100,000 come in this year under this bill, then only 53,000 extra persons can come in under the regular normal immigration quotas. We will still be admitting 153,000 people a year but under the most careful restrictions which are written into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, our Government has been spending about $100,000,000 a year to feed and care for those in the displaced persons camps in Germany, Italy, and Austria. Many of the people who will come in have relatives over here who will take them into their homes. The best of them who are physically fit and able to work are allowed to come out of those camps to their friends and relatives in this country. They will be sustaining here and we will save several million dollars by getting rid of them as our boarders at our expense in these countries.

There are still 800,000 displaced persons this and the past administration has agreed to help take care of along with other nations of the world in these camps. Through the International Relief Organization other nations have agreed to take a part of these displaced persons into their countries. Within the past 2 years or a little longer other nations have taken 280,000 of these people out of the displaced-persons camps. If we are to keep commitments already made with the other nations of the world which have been agreed to by the State Department and this administration, it would seem to me that inasmuch as the agreements have been made that we, in a way, are obligated as a Nation to keep the understanding our officials made when they committed this country to become a member of the International Relief Organization. The thought has been repeatedly expressed on the floor of the House during the debate, that if we make this move the administration, through the State Department and our officials, the International Relief Organization is to insist that other nations follow our example and begin at the earliest possible date to liquidate these displaced-persons camps by taking their pro rata share. If the action we take here today will stimulate other nations in this effort and it may, we might be able within the next 2 years to see these displaced persons all out of these camps, distributed to the other nations of the world so that, so far as our country is concerned, we could close up shop, and get out from under the

payment of about $100,000,000 a year that our taxpayers have had to bear in providing 70 percent of all of the costs of keeping these people in those displaced-persons camps.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that many people will not understand why we should, as they will say, allow more people to come into this country. The facts are that it does not allow more people to come in during any 1 year. It gets those who do come in off of the backs of the taxpayers and the very strict screening of those who do come in under the formal set-up of this bill insures a better grade of immigrants than would come in if this bill was not passed.

I have studied the legislation and sought all possible information before I finally made up my mind that I could support this bill. I am confident that this legislation will not only be helpful to those who are brought out of these displaced persons camps but that it will save us several million dollars a year and will admit into this country a better type of immigrants in no larger number than under our immigration laws we would be compelled to take if this bill is not passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may become properly oriented and know just where we are, let us take a moment to review. The bill before you on page 2 describes displaced persons. I am reading this for the sake of accuracy. The bill states as follows:

Who is registered by the International Refugee Organization, according to the definitions of displaced persons and refugees set forth in annex I to the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, except clause (b), paragraph 1, section A, part I thereof—

Which except, by the way, applies to the Spanish Republicans and does not apply in this particular case—

to which the United States has adhered (Public Law 146, 80th Cong.).

The point I make first of all is that we have joined the International Refugee Organization, which was set up by the United Nations, and through the other body, we have become a party in the support of that Organization. That Organization has defined who are displaced persons and who are not. We will now take up their definition of who are not displaced persons. You will understand that all through this measure, we are dealing with displaced persons.

In annex I, part 2, they say:

Persons who will not be the concern of this Organization.

I begin with (4):

Persons of German ethnic origin, whether German nationals or members of German minorities in other countries who (a) have been or may be transferred to Germany from other countries; (b) have been during the second World War evacuated from Germany to other countries; or (c) have fled from or into Germany or from their places of residence into other countries other than Germany in order to avoid falling into the hands of the Allied Armies.

There are your three definitions of these groups which the International Refugee Organization will not consider as displaced persons.

I refer again to the bill. Under subsection (c) of section 2, I read:

The term "displaced person" shall not include any person who is or has been a member of, or participated in, any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

Can anyone deny that these 11,000,000 people have not been hostile to the United States and have not participated even in armed forces against the Government of the United States? So at the very outset, you are excluding them under the definition, either of the International Refugee Organization, or the terms of this bill. The next point is this: You have a ceiling of 200,000. You have 11,000,000 people grouped under this particular classification. If we were to support and adopt this amendment, that will carve out exactly 100,000 from that 200,000. You cut it in half.

Now, where are you? I come back to this basic fundamental factor: Are you going to keep on boosting and elevating and pyramiding up and up and up your numbers which we said would be a reasonable number, 200,000? Or are you going to permit so much to be carved out here and so much carved out there and in the final analysis carve out everything?

There is the story. I leave it with you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 52, noes 70.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. FELLOWS and Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 68, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] because I think it is sound and fair. I also supported that offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Both amendments are eminently justified.

I should like especially to discuss the one proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. In my district of Nebraska, the folk of Czechoslovak ancestry are sturdy, patriotic citizens, active in community life and loyal to our great Republic.

The Czechs and Slovaks of Nebraska are farmers, editors, lawyers, clergymen, businessmen. They are honest. They stay out of trouble. Their families are healthy and hard working.

Nebraska, being one of the youngest of the 48 States, naturally has many so-called nationality groups, who homesteaded to the Western States where they could settle free land and become good Americans. We of the Cornhusker State know that most immigrants who came to our territory successfully integrated themselves into the American way of life.

Now Congressman STEFAN asks that our Nation open its gates to at least 25 percent of the 10,000 to 12,000 Czechoslovak political refugees who preferred to leave their homeland rather than submit to Communist domination. These people, now in the American zone of Germany as well as in British and French zones, have not even the status of displaced persons, and are not included in help given through the International Refugee Organization.

Yet they, of all nations overrun by the Communists after World War II, had the courage to stake their faith in democracy against remaining in their own nation under totalitarianism.

Yes, I support Mr. STEFAN'S amendment to the Fellows bill. These people have the stuff it takes to make genuine, working Americans.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) During the two fiscal years following the passage of this act a number of immigration visas not to exceed 200,000 may be issued without regard to quota limitations for those years to displaced persons as quota immigrants, as provided in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That—

(1) they are qualified for admission for permanent residence under all United States immigration laws not inconsistent with the provisions of this act;

(2) visas issued pursuant to this act shall be made available to each element or group among the displaced persons as such elements or groups were segregated or designated for the purpose of being cared for by the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948, in the proportion that the number of displaced persons in such element or group bears to the total number of displaced persons, it being the purpose of this provision to insure that no discrimination in favor of or against any such element or group among the displaced persons shall occur.

(b) Upon the issuance of an immigration visa to any displaced person as provided for in this act, the consular officer shall use a quota number from the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the Act of May 26, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current at the time or the next succeeding year in which a quota number is available: *Provided*, That no quota shall be so used by more than 50 percent in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That unmarried minor orphan children classifiable as displaced persons under this act may be issued special nonquota immigration visas.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS:

On page 2, line 20, strike out the words "during the two fiscal years following the passage of this act" and insert "whenever the governing body of the International Refugee Organization shall certify to the United States that other nations by similar action have accepted for resettlement their fair share of displaced persons in numbers sufficient to resettle all eligible displaced persons."

Page 2, line 23, strike out the word "those" and insert the word "two."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the able and beloved chairman of the subcommit-

tee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] stated that the purpose of this legislation was to solve the DP problem in Europe. I respectfully submit that the bill so far does not solve it, but if this amendment is adopted it will solve it.

Just a year ago I was author of the bill providing for United States participation in the IRO, International Refugee Organization. I was much interested in this problem because I had been on the committee to inspect the German concentration camps as they were overrun by the American forces toward the end of the war in Europe. I had deep sympathy for these victims of the Nazis. I had great hopes for this new organization under the United Nations which undertook the care and disposal of DP's as an international obligation and recognized that it was not our obligation alone, merely because we had liberated these people from slavery. I came to the floor here and I said that if the United States took the lead the other nations in the world would follow in assuming the burden of this international obligation. To my great disappointment I find a year later that although we have done our part, other nations have not followed our leadership. We do not yet have an IRO, we merely have a PCIRO, a provisional committee for IRO; unless there has been a change in the last few hours, sufficient nations have not yet joined to permit the constitution of IRO to go into full effect, its constitution requires participation by 15 nations as a minimum. To date there are only 14 members. Its full budget has not been subscribed.

Here is an instance when the United States takes the lead in international cooperation, and other nations do not follow, but sit back and let Uncle Sam do the job.

I am fearful this DP bill will be another instance of the same kind, and that other nations, instead of assuming their fair share, will leave it up to us. The IRO passed a resolution on January 20 asking each nation to assume its fair share, but no satisfactory results have been obtained as yet from the members, or from those who should be members but are not.

All my amendment does is to provide that this bill shall go into effect whenever and as soon as sufficient nations have assumed their fair share under similar circumstances so that we may clean up the DP problem in Europe all at once.

By taking such action we offer to cooperate with the rest of the world in settling this problem now. Is there any chance of doing that? In the ERP legislation we had a provision for the Administrator to contact nations in order to secure their cooperation in resettling the DP's. We are considering legislation with reference to economic aid to South America. Every time so far we have made the mistake of not asking commitments from other nations while we are needed. This time if we ask their help, on a problem which is theirs as much as ours, when they are asking our help on their problems, we may get somewhere. The practical situation is that we have the dollars, the other nations need the dollars; they have the need for immigrants to help solve their manpower problems, but we do not need immigrants here. They need them in order to solve their postwar problems all over the world. By my amendment we do not say, "You take them all." We say, "We will take our fair share whenever the rest of you agree to take yours." By taking that simple step I think we can give Hallam Tuck, the able and distinguished head of the IRO, and Lewis Douglas, our distinguished American representative, something with which to get action out of these other nations in order to solve this problem once and for all instead of making this another case where Uncle Sam goes ahead and nobody follows. If we say, "We will take 200,000 for the next 2 years," while the other nations sit tight, then we may find that 2 years from now we will be asked to take 200,000 more, while the nations asking our cooperation in military and economic matters sit back and do nothing. They may sit back on this problem on which we want their cooperation and say, "Let Uncle Sam do it," unless we put some two-way cooperation into this law.

I believe that by adopting this amendment we will take a forward step in insuring that we carry out the principles that we have adopted this spring: International cooperation is a two-way street; we want to help those who help themselves and help each other and help us. Here is a chance for other nations to undertake their part of an obligation that is not just ours but theirs, too. It is not an American obligation; it is an international obligation. In world leadership we must not only take the lead, but make sure we have some followers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, would be to strike out all after the enacting clause. That is one way to kill the bill.

The first question is whether or not Congress can pass a law provisionally dependent upon the action of some foreign government. That is a good legal question for the gentleman from Ohio to be thinking about, because I am not able to answer it.

If this is establishing any precedent, I got my idea from the gentleman from Ohio, who sponsored ERP. He did not advocate authorizing the expenditure of money in Europe on any conditions before they could receive it. That was not the gentleman's idea at that time. He told us then, "This is the hope, this is the future; we are going to extend to the people of Europe this hope, this flower," or whatever it was. I studied the gentleman's speech, and that is where I got this reply.

He has repented, evidently. This amendment would destroy the bill, because, of course, if we are going to wait until the other nations in Europe do something, it will be a long time. How many years, he does not say, because only 14 nations have joined the International Refugee Organization. Yet, we are going to wait, according to his amendment, until they agree to do certain things. They have already taken or agreed to take approximately 200,000 of these people. I wish he would put in here the date when that agreement would be made; in other words, it is dependent upon tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow. But I got this argument out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the speeches of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that we are going to Europe and we are going to give hope and peace and joy, and we are not going to confine it or tie it down to any accomplishment before it becomes effective, because it then will defeat its own purpose. I am replying in his fashion; I have read the gentleman's speeches recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The precedent came from the distinguished gentleman who sponsored ERP with great ability, and with the admiration of all of us. I hope that if there are any others here who do not want to destroy this bill, they will vote with care what the effect of this amendment would be. There is no time in the future when this can become effective if legally we can pass legislation like this proposed amendment, which I think we cannot do. So I am asking that the amendment be voted down, because I believe it is necessary that we have some legislation; and I believe H. R. 6396 will solve the problem. Note, now, if we do not pass it, then what? The law now in effect, coupled with the President's directive, written by Judge Rosenman, somebody has said, will continue to bring in displaced persons with preference to this group or that group. So, if we do not have this bill, we will continue to do it as we are doing it now—bringing in displaced persons under a system that does not give the screening that this bill will do, and under a system that does not operate fairly with relation to race or creed or color.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has asked a question that I would be delighted to answer. On page 9 of the able report of the committee are found these words:

> It is the intention of the International Refugee Organization to implement at an early date the resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 17 and December 15, 1947, under the terms of which many nations have been urged to accept a "fair share" of nonrepatriable eligible displaced persons.

On page 9 of the bill I find in section 6 this language:

> To procure through the United States representative to the International Refugee Organization the cooperation of other nations.

So that the bill already provides what I have suggested, except it does not make it compulsory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill now before us. The Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee has worked with extreme diligence and patience for many months to bring before the House a workable, practical, and humane measure, and during that period of time I have on many occasions consulted with the members of the subcommittee and have cooperated with them to the best of my limited ability, and when time permitted. Personally, I would like to have a measure somewhat more liberal in its terms, but I realize that insurmountable obstacles might have arisen to any measure extremely liberal in its terms, and thus the displaced persons would have been denied any relief whatever.

I have no fear of the capacity of the United States to absorb without any difficulty 200,000 immigrants. In fact, I believe we could very easily absorb twice that number. It is my conviction that the passage of this bill by the House will help immeasurably toward relieving a sad situation, and I am proud to vote for this humanitarian cause, believing as I do that immigration has been of invaluable assistance in making the United States the great democracy it has become. Immigrants to this country have helped to make the United States the leading nation in production and in finance, as well as the mightiest Nation ever to exist in war, as well as in peace. Of course, many other nations have already done much to help relieve the distressful displaced persons situation, and for this all of us should be, and are, duly grateful. I hope no crippling amendments, such as the Vory's amendment, will be accepted by the House, and that the bill will pass with a resounding majority.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt this amendment we make our solemn action dependent upon a resolution of some foreign body, the International Refugee Organization, because this amendment states that the bill shall not be effective unless the International Refugee Organization passes a resolution determining what countries shall take displaced persons, the fair number of displaced persons, and the place of resettlement of displaced persons. Who shall be the judge of what is a fair number? The country of resettlement? The type of refugee? We have lost authority if we say that the International Refugee Organization shall be the determining factor, shall be the judge as to all these important factors. Also is it constitutional for one action to depend upon the will of some other body? I doubt it.

Suppose they say it is fair for the United States to take 1,000,000 displaced persons, or 500,000 displaced persons, shall that determination supersede what we do here? Who is to be the judge, I repeat, of what is a fair share? Our jurisdiction is gone. So I should think on that basis alone there is no merit to this amendment.

We have made great progress, I say to the gentleman from Ohio, with reference to the actual, not potential, but actual, resettlement of the displaced persons. I have before me a report appearing in the New York Times of May 23, 1948, which states that the displaced persons already settled, that is, actually resettled, are 225,446; awaiting resettlement 850,000. The article goes on to say that Britain has taken upward of 50,000 displaced persons. In the supporting data in the article we read that Great Britain has been selecting refugee workers at the rate of some 5,000 or more every month. We have taken only about 32,000 under the quota system. Belgium has taken over 27,000. France has been taking 16,000. Then the supporting data reads that the French Government was recruiting only miners, but has widened the recruitment to other categories, namely, agricultural. Canada has taken over 50,000. Australia, New Zealand, Switzerland, Sweden, and The Netherlands have all taken a fair share and are willing, according to this article, to take many more. I would say that we are making fair progress in that regard. There is no need for the gentleman's amendment.

General Marshall appeared before the committee and made this statement:

> Very speedily after the end of hostilities the western allied armies repatriated to their countries of origin 7,000,000 persons who had been brought into Germany by the Germans. For the most part, they were western Europeans, French, Belgian, Dutch, and citizens of prewar Russia.

This is a gigantic task. It cannot be done overnight, but I would say that we are well on our way. The greatest impetus would be given if we passed this bill, with other nations to follow the trail the United States has blazed.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. In connection with what the gentleman has just stated, there has been a definite, concrete effort and a real accomplishment made in the total reduction of DP's in camp because from January 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948, these so-called other countries, members of the United Nations, have reduced the number of DP's substantially to the tune of 200,000. In all of our investigations in the 200 camps that we investigated last year we found that each and every camp leader, who was equivalent to the town's mayor, who was elected by the DP's and who incidentally, for the first time in their lives had an opportunity to vote through a secret ballot—to elect their mayor to represent them—stated to me, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], and all the rest of us that several nations had recruiting teams in their camps from time to time who were soliciting DP's to immigrate. Unfortunately though these representatives from England, Belgium, Canada, and France were chiefly interested in securing the young, healthy, unmarried men to work in their mines and to settle on farms. There is no hard core yet as a result of this attempt to skim off the so-called cream of the crop, but we must act soon so as to be able to select via a careful screening the type of persons desired, such as farmers, doctors, registered nurses, domestic servants, and so forth, which we have a demand for at the present time.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has raised a very important issue. I think it is so important that nobody should attempt to pass it over lightly. He ought to know more about, or at least as much about, the International Refugee Organization as anybody in the House of Representatives, having been the author of the legislation by virtue of which it has been set up. He says in effect that when the legislation setting up the International Refugee Organization was passed it was understood that all or practically all of the nations of the world would become members of the International Refugee Organization. It no doubt was intended that this organization would take no official action until the organization had been perfected. And no doubt it was intended that this organization would be perfected as soon as possible.

He says they have not done what they agreed to do. He is asking that they do what should have been done. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] whether enough member nations have joined up to make it a workable organization. In other words is it officially organized? Has a majority of the nations agreed to participate?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. I asked the gentleman that question.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, 14 nations have joined. A minimum of 15 is required to make it go into effect. Seventy-five percent of the budget has been subscribed, which is the minimum. However, it is still operating under a provisional committee because it has not officially gone into effect, not through any fault of the United States, but through the fault of other members of the United Nations who have failed to join this organization, which was sponsored by the United Nations.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Very well. I leave it to you, my colleagues, whether this International Refugee Organization has been completely set up? Has it a right to function? If adherence by 15 nations is a prerequisite to its becoming effective, then it would surely follow that if only 14 nations have adhered then the Organization has not been legally put

together. Section 2 of the bill defines who are eligible to be considered under this bill. There are two categories of persons that may be entitled to consideration under the bill. One group is set out in subsection (a), another group is set out in subsection (b). It is to this group that I wish to refer. This group, however large the number may be, must be registered by the IRO. That assumes that the International Refugee Organization shall have been put together legally and in full compliance with the law. It now develops that it has not been put together legally. Then it naturally follows that any action taken by an organization that has not been put together legally cannot function legally. Therefore, it would seem to me that without this amendment any thing that is done by this organization could be successfully contested in the courts as to its legality. How can this organization make any selections?

Mr. Chairman, I again repeat, this bill should not be passed because this is not the proper way and I also say that the acts of the International Refugee Organization will not be legal because it has not been legally constituted. All this proves that the proposed legislation is faulty and should be defeated for that reason, and for the further reason that it does not solve the problems resulting from the establishment of the refugee camps. At the expense of repetition, let me say again that this is a relief problem which should be handled in the countries and cities where it is found. The United States has surely done her part. This bill should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], which is now pending, should not be voted down without understanding just what is intended and what the effect of the amendment would be. The amendment is testing out the good faith of the advocates of the adoption of the pending bill who claim that the DP's present a troublesome problem. But let it be remembered that the bill is no solution of the problem. The adoption of the Vorys amendment, it is believed, would probably bring about the solution of the whole question at one and the same time. These DP camps will never be closed by treating the matter in piecemeal fashion as is being done in the Fellows bill.

You heard the statement made yesterday that no promise could be given as to when, if ever, these camps would be closed.

It is true, as has been said, the cream of the camps keeps skimmed off, but there will be no permanent reduction of numbers as long as they stay open.

Under this bill we take out 200,000 inmates. On tomorrow the population of the camps probably will be increased to the extent that it is diminished by this bill.

Reference was made this morning to Polish soldiers. Every one of the Polish soldiers in England could be in these camps at this time if they had wanted to become dependent upon the charity of the United States. This problem will never be solved as long as these camps stay open.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member of this body, down in his heart, is conscious of the problem of these displaced persons in the camps in Europe. I am sure that each and every one of us want to do what we can to find a solution. If you want to give the United Nations a chance to live and try to do a job in straightening out the troubled affairs of this world, you will then support the Vorys amendment.

This amendment goes further toward solving the real problem that is confronting us today than the bill itself. It is giving everybody an equal chance to come in and participate, and does not exclude other countries.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] spoke about the fact that additional people in the DP camps will be recruited, as soon as you take 100,000 or 200,000 out. He is absolutely correct. If you pass this bill without putting in the Vorys amendment and making it a part of the bill, you are not solving the problem. That is what we are here to do.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. COX. You will never get a solution of this problem until you liquidate those camps.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is right. You will have to liquidate those camps, and you must have a program and not go at it in a half-hearted or slipshod manner. You must include the procedure or policy that was established under the United Nations, the International Refugee Organization. Give it a chance to work by making these other countries come into line in the International Refugee Organization.

This problem could have been solved by now if the IRO had performed its duties in an efficient manner. Each country then would take its proportionate share of displaced persons.

If this amendment is adopted I will gladly give this bill (H. R. 6396) my wholehearted support. For the sake of the people in the DP camps I ask the Members to adopt the Vorys amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the International Refugee Organization Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Let us not get off base on our facts. The IRO is in business. The big nations are all members. France joined a few months ago. The IRO is spending $115,000,000 a year, and is actually running the DP camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy. The head of the IRO is William Hallam Tuck, a very distinguished American. Yes; the IRO is very much in business and is a very active organization.

I am opposed to this amendment and for one reason. Let us be realistic. We have all heard of motions to recede and concur, motions to strike out, motions to strike out all after the enacting clause, and motions to recommit. This is a motion to inter. If the Committee passes this motion, it inters this bill, because it defers, for years possibly, any United States resettlement program for DP's until the time when the last inhabitant of a DP camp will have been resettled.

I would like to call attention to the fact that when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] eloquently advocated the resolution to have the United States join the IRO on this floor, he did not tell the House that the DP problem would be disposed of in 1 year. He said, according to my best recollection, the best one can say, is that it looks like it ought to be disposed of sometime around 3 years.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield briefly.

Mr. VORYS. I told this House that if we took the lead other nations would follow. I regret to say that so far they have not followed in sufficient numbers.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry that just is not the fact. The other nations have taken more DP's than we have. It has been stated on the floor and not denied that Great Britain with 30 percent of our population has taken 60,000 DP's this year; that little Belgium is taking 30,000; that France is taking over 50,000; that Canada is taking 15,000; that Australia is taking 7,500. All the United States is doing in this bill is catching up with the parade which has gone by it, and for the first time is proposing to take its fair share which it has not been taking.

Also this bill admits free of the quota unmarried minor orphan children who are DP's. It follows in this report from the bill H. R. 2466, I offered in March 1947, and which was also offered by the junior Senator from New York in the other body, to admit war orphans for adoption by United States citizens free of the quotas.

I believe that the committee should decisively turn down this amendment, for a vote for this amendment will be a vote against the bill, it will be a vote to inter the bill. This amendment is a motion to inter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my intention to discuss this bill because I had been anxious to see us arrive at some solution of this DP problem, but as I have listened to the debate I have been forced to the realization that the bill before us is not a practical solution of anything.

I think that the Vorys amendment is the first practical suggestion that has been made in connection with this problem today. It proposes to get some assurance of help from the other nations

before, not after, we have signed their note. Certainly the bill that has been discussed for the last 2 or 3 days has not one practical merit to recommend it. It is based on assumptions without a single proven or provable fact from which to start.

The gentleman from Kentucky on yesterday told us what delightful and useful people we could get from these camps. A few minutes ago he told us how he was in Europe last summer and visited 200 camps, in every one of which he says he found teams from all the other nations of Europe there recruiting DP's who had experience and training as miners, farmers, and factory operators. That includes everybody that the other nations thought they wanted in their country.

That is an example of the impractical thing we have had presented to us—a proposition where we know that all of the people qualified to do the kind of work that we are told they will do are being recruited by somebody else. Then we are told that we would have some sort of an intangible "screening" and that we would get some very desirable people who we are to assume would be farmers, miners, and mechanics. We were told that these other nations were going to cooperate with us. As a matter of fact, we know that the other nations are looking after their own interests just as we should. Why should we indulge in any such silly assumption? Why should we not face the facts and trade with these other nations while we have something to trade with?

Now, just what kind of cooperation have we had from this International Refugee Organization? It makes no difference to me whether it is legally established or not, the practicalities of the thing are what I am thinking about. This organization of nations which the proponents of this bill want us to believe will assume all the burdens of this problem if we will but take a part of these people, is the same organization which just a few weeks ago ruled against allowing 50,000 of these displaced persons to go to Guatemala. Guatemala has unpopulated lands. She wants immigrants, but she properly wants to know that the people that are coming there are the kind of people who will probably fit into the Guatemalan way of life. They, therefore, asked that the people who might come to their country be of religious belief similar to the religion of Guatemala. What was wrong with that? Was it not simply using a little common sense? What did this organization that is supposed to do so much for us do? It very self-righteously decided that if Guatemala was going to try to decide what kind of immigrants it wanted that none of them could go and that the United States should keep right on supporting these people who could just as well as not be supporting themselves. That is an example of the lack of common sense in this program.

Let me call your attention to another impractical and unfair situation. This bill charges the 200,000 DP immigrants to the regular immigration quotas of the various European countries. On its face that sounds fair enough. It looks as if all it does is to bring some people into this country sooner than they would otherwise get here, but what of the thousands of other Europeans who have been waiting for years to be able to join relatives and friends in the United States? What of the brothers and sisters and nieces and nephews who have had their names on the lists all this time waiting for their turn to come to the United States of America? The proponents of this bill have conveniently forgotten all about these people and their friends and relatives in the United States. I think that these people have a right to consideration also, but this bill overlooks entirely the practical injustice of running 200,000 newcomers ahead of those who have complied with the existing laws and filed their applications in regular order. I just do not believe in elbowing people out of their place in line, but that is just what this bill does.

I want to see this problem treated in a way that will dispose of it, not in a way that will perpetuate it. The bill as written will leave us with the whole problem of supporting displaced persons in Europe. It will simply run a part of them in ahead of the regular quota immigrants who have been waiting their turn and will leave us running the so-called camps in Europe where we will immediately get 200,000 new customers. The Vorys amendment would assure a final liquidation of these camps and an assignment of all the people now occupying them. It goes down the line trying to do the sound, sensible thing. I hope we may adopt this amendment and thereby do something sensible instead of passing a bill that has absolutely nothing except theoretical assumptions to recommend it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I insisted on this identical amendment in the subcommittee, but the Immigration Service did not want it because they wished to act unilaterally. It seems to me it is shameful for us just to continue in the hope that other nations will cooperate and will do their fair share.

Here is a clipping from the Washington Star of May 13 of this year in which it is stated that—

> Guatemala proposed to take 50,000 DP's and settle them in a very fertile valley. They attached this condition, that these DP's remain in that valley for 5 years.

What happened? This IRO organization rose up and said: "No; we will not let you impose any conditions whatsoever on the admission of DP's," and they have refused to let Guatemala have 50,000 of them.

Unless we have some certainty of dealing effectively with other nations we will continue to be the dumping ground. They talk about our not taking our fair share. Such perversion of the truth makes me a little bit sick. Nobody knows for sure just how many we have taken and are taking. This bill admits that 15,000 are here illegally and proposes to legalize their entry over and above the 200,000 to be admitted under the bill. We have already received a million or more refugees from other countries since the war. Now we are being asked to take more. We are being asked to take the ones the others do not want. We have already done more than our fair share.

Unless we have some means of compulsion and unless it is written in this bill you will not solve the problem of the DP camps; and it ought to be solved with at least some thought of fairness to this country.

I urge you to vote for the Vorys amendment because it is a sound, a practical, an honest, and a cooperative approach to the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I shall take this brief time simply to let my constituents know where I stand on this proposition. The greatest crime a person can commit in these days in the eyes of the international emotionalists is to be for our own country's welfare. The time has come when we have got to do some pretty sound thinking if we are to preserve the great heritage of liberty. I know that we sent the flower of American manhood abroad. They went over there and fought for this country and probably fought against many of those who sympathized with the enemies and now want to come over here. Now we propose to replace the 300,000 who are buried over there in Europe with these refugees who are the culls after the other countries have taken what they want of them.

These other countries, praiseworthy as it may be to take these refugees, are in a little different position than we are. England lost hundreds of thousands of men in the First World War. She lost a large number in the Second World War. Canada had some of her villages stripped of men until there was not a man left in them. They need men. France lost a million men in the First World War defending Verdun under the slogan, "They shall not pass." She needs men. Australia lost heavily. It needs men. But how are we fixed?

Mr. Chairman, we have a shortage of houses in this country to such an extent that our boys are crawling into any kind of a rat hole they can get with their wives and children; yet we propose to crowd them out and let in these people of questionable worth to this country.

I am against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if we must have this bill, let us add this amendment to it. I am certainly in wholehearted accord with the purpose of this amendment, but I would go even further. It would appear to me, in view of the fact that we have recently voted several billion dollars to go to the rehabilitation of Europe, and have, in a sense, committed ourselves to $17,000,000,000 over a period of the next few years for their rehabilitation, that the least these countries could do in return would be to take this DP problem and work it out among themselves. I don't think they

have a right to ask the United States to shoulder it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] a few moments ago, made a statement in refutation of my statement, in which he said that we owed an obligation to these people; that it is our duty to take them into the United States. It is hard for me to think along those lines. When I consider that we left 300,000 American boys buried in foreign lands, and the soil of Europe was fertilized with the blood of American soldiers to save the necks of these very people, it is inconceivable to me that we could be under any kind of obligation to them. If any obligation lies, it is owed to us!

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is adopted, and I hope the bill is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything that my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has just said. He is one of the victims of this war, and he knows whereof he speaks.

Talk about us owing an obligation to the riffraff of the old world that is pouring in upon our shores trying to undermine and destroy everything for which we stand. They owe us more than they will ever pay; more than they will ever pretend to pay.

This slurring of America through the so-called Voice of America turned out to be that same element trying to discredit the United States in the eyes of the other nations of the world.

Let the other countries take their share of these people.

I live in a country that lost a war one time—the War Between the States. Our people came home all shot to pieces. Nobody came to their relief.

I am talking about the Confederate soldiers, and God bless them, as fine soldiers as ever lived and as fine citizens as the world has ever seen. They came home and went to work. They did not go into camps and beg somebody to come and take them to some other country.

I say, by all means, this amendment should be adopted, and if you are not going to vote for this amendment, then do not go back and tell your people that you even tried to do justice.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has said, remember that you are here to protect the United States of America. There has been too little said about the American people here; there has been too little said about the welfare of the United States; there has been too little said about the protection of our own country. I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], I shall vote for this amendment and then I intend to vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 75, noes 93.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VORYS and Mr. FELLOWS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] had carried, I would have supported this bill. His amendment, in my opinion, offered the only effective solution to this distressing problem of displaced persons.

The amendment proposed was that this bill should become effective whenever the Governing Board of the International Refugee Organization should have certified to the United States that other nations, by similar action, had accepted for resettlement their fair share of displaced persons in sufficient numbers to resettle all eligible displaced persons.

In other words it would have required the other nations to take their fair share of displaced persons, thus settling the problem once and for all.

But the present bill does not offer such a solution. If the United States should take 200,000 displaced persons as suggested by this bill, the problem would still remain unsolved as there would be left approximately 630,000 persons in DP camps.

That the distinguished and able gentleman from Ohio was sincere in his effort to completely solve this problem in one concerted action is evidenced by the fact he is the author of the law making the United States a participant in the International Refugee Organization.

While no one can be unmindful of the distressing situation confronting these displaced persons, we should not be expected to solve the problem alone.

We must take into consideration there are countries which suffered severe manpower losses both in World War I and World War II where they now need men badly. There are still other countries which are not as fully developed as our own where there is more room for expansion and where there is no housing shortage.

It is no more than fair and equitable, if we are willing to do our part that other nations of the International Refugee Organization assume their fair share of the responsibility.

If this bill is passed we would be solving less than one-fourth of the problem, and would probably be asked to accept additional thousands of displaced persons at a later date—after the most desirable have already been resettled.

Remember this. Every Member of Congress receives numerous requests from American citizens to help in bringing over relatives from Europe. Every time you use a quota number for a displaced person, to that extent you retard the possibility of getting relatives of American citizens into this country.

It seems to me it is no more than fair and just that we ask the other countries to share with us in working out this humanitarian problem by cooperating in finding a solution once and for all, and not in piecemeal fashion. We should not be asked to do the entire job alone. After all, it is about time we think of the United States before assuming all the burdens of the world.

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) During the first two fiscal years following the passage of this act the Attorney General is authorized upon receipt of a fee of $18, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts, to record the admission for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States of any alien in the United States, if such alien entered the United States prior to March 15, 1948, is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, and is determined to be a displaced person residing in the United States as defined in this section: *Provided*, That the number of displaced persons permitted to remain permanently in the United States pursuant to this section shall not exceed 15,000. Upon the adjustment of status of an alien as provided for herein the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was a quota immigrant at the time of entry, reduce by one the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current or next succeeding year in which a quota number is available, but not more than 50 percent of any quota shall be used for this purpose in a given fiscal year: *Provided*, That quota deductions provided for in this section shall be made within the 50 percent limitations contained in subsection (b) of section 3 of this act.

(b) When used in this section, the term "displaced person residing in the United States" means a person who lawfully entered the United States as a nonimmigrant under section 3 or as a nonquota immigrant student under subsection (e) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 47 Stat. 607; 54 Stat. 711; 59 Stat. 669; 8 U. S. C. 203), and who is a person displaced from the country of his birth or of his last residence as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and who is unable or unwilling to return to the country of which he is a national because of persecution or his fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania: On page 4, line 10, after the words "prior to", strike out "March 15, 1948," and insert in lieu thereof the words "April 1, 1948"; and on page 5, line 14, after the word "country", insert the words "against whose quota he is chargeable, or."

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is very simple. It changes the date on page 4 from March

15, 1948, to April 1, 1948. The purpose of it is to make easier the administration of the act. It is my understanding that the immigration laws are administered on an annual, semiannual, and quarterly basis. This amendment would put the administration of this act on that basis and make the effective date the 1st of April, that is, the end of the quarter.

The second amendment on page 5 is likewise, as I conceive it, a clarifying amendment. The immigration laws are administered on the basis of country of birth. This clarifies the intention that the persons to be admitted under this section would be admitted and charged against the quotas of the countries of their birth as provided in the immigration laws.

May I ask the chairman if he would be willing to accept these two amendments?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. You would not be changing the other provisions of law with reference to the 50-percent provisions?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. No. This has no effect on the 50-percent provision or anything else. It simply charges them to the country against which they would normally be charged.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I must confess I am not aware of the technical implications of this amendment. I wonder whether the gentleman has cleared this through the Immigration and Nationalization Service.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I discussed it with the committee before presenting the amendments.

I did not receive from the chairman any assurance one way or the other. That is why I am asking at this time if he has any objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. I understand it is all right as far as that is concerned.

As far as I am personally concerned, I will be glad to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. The preferences provided within the quotas by section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155–156; 47 Stat. 656; 45 Stat. 1009; 8 U. S. C. 206) shall not be applicable in the case of any displaced person receiving an immigration visa under section 3 of this act, but in lieu of such preferences the following priorities, without priority as between classes specified in priority (a), shall be granted to aliens and their families dependents in the consideration of visa applications:

(a) First. Aliens qualified as farm laborers, physicians, dentists, medical nurses, household, construction, clothing and garment workers; or aliens possessing educational, scientific, or technological qualifications.

(b) Second. Aliens who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law.

(c) Third. All other aliens classifiable as displaced persons under section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. Any person, other than a relative as defined in subsection (b) of section 5, or any recognized voluntary agency in the United States desiring to assist a displaced person to enter the United States under this act shall be required to file a suitable and proper bond, approved by the Attorney General, undertaking and assuming to save the United States or any State or Territory or subdivision of either from expense in the event such immigrant should become a public charge, such obligation to be enforceable in the courts of the United States, by suit brought in the name of and by the proper law officers of the United States or of any State or Territory or subdivision of either upon which the burden falls in the event such immigrant becomes a public charge: *Provided*, That the admission of such alien shall be a consideration for the giving of such bond: *And provided further*, That applicants for admission shall be approved for settlement in the particular State or Territory to which they are destined only in accordance with the settlement opportunities and numbers certified to the Coordinator by the chief executive officer thereof.

SEC. 7. Quota nationality for the purposes of this Act shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; 8 U. S. C. 212) and no displaced person shall be issued an immigration visa if he is known or believed by the consular officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws, with the exception of the contract labor clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136), and that part of the said Act which excludes from the United States persons whose ticket or passage is paid by another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly; and all persons covered by this act shall be exempt from paying visa fees and head taxes.

SEC. 8. (a) That there shall be appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, an official to be designated the Coordinator for the Resettlement of Displaced Persons (hereafter referred to as the "Coordinator"), to serve at will in the Executive Office of the President at a salary of $10,000 per annum.

The duties of the Coordinator shall be—

(1) to perform or oversee the performance of the administrative functions necessary for effectuating the provisions of this act, including thorough screening of all applicants;

(2) to make rules and regulations, requisite for the effectuation of the provisions of this act;

(3) to report to the Congress semiannually on the operations carried out under the act, including the rate of immigration thereunder, the manner of selection of, and distribution of opportunities to immigrate among the displaced persons, and the resettlement of such persons having regard both to questions of economic opportunity and housing and to geographic distribution;

(4) to coordinate and assist in the task of resettlement of such displaced persons in the United States, its Territories, or possessions;

(5) to consult and cooperate with the various State agencies established to deal with resettlement and with such voluntary agencies actively participating therein as shall register with and be approved by the Coordinator for that purpose;

(6) to procure through the United States representative to the International Refugee Organization the cooperation of other nations, particularly the members of the International Refugee Organization, in the solution of the displaced persons problem by their accepting for resettlement a relative number of displaced persons, and to expedite the closing of the camps and terminate the emergency; and to report to the Congress on the extent and effectiveness of efforts made by other countries toward an early solution of the displaced-persons problem by resettlement of such persons within those countries.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appointed by the President an Advisory Board on the Resettlement of Displaced Persons, to consist of representatives from the Departments of State, Defense, Justice, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, the Maritime Commission, and the Veterans' Administration and any other interested agency of the Government which may be designated as such by the President. The Coordinator shall consult with the said Advisory Board in carrying out his functions under this act, but all supervision of, and instructions issued to, diplomatic and consular officers of the United States in connection with the performance of their duties under this act, shall be coordinated with the Director General of the Foreign Service of the United States in accordance with section 201 of Public Law 724 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

(c) Within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to the Coordinator or as may be allocated to him by the President, the Coordinator may employ necessary personnel without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provisions for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purpose of this act. The Coordinator, however, shall use such statistical information, fiscal personnel, and other general business services and facilities as may be made available to him through other established Government departments and agencies. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 9. Except as provided in this act, no preference or priority shall be given to any person after June 30, 1948, because of his status as a displaced person.

SEC. 10. Any person who knowingly violates or conspires to violate any provision of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000, and shall be imprisoned not less than 2 nor more than 10 years.

Mr. CELLER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read in toto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 5.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 6, line 3, after the words "farm laborers", insert "miners."

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 2, line 22, after the word "exceed", strike out "200,000" and insert "202,000."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the equilibrium of the bill, as worked out by the committee.

On yesterday we adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], which provided for the admission of 2,000 liberty-loving Czechs who were willing to leave their homeland and abandon their jobs and possessions rather than live under the yoke of a Communist dictatorship. If the records made in the United States by those of Slovak ancestry is any indication of the kind of citizens any of the 2,000 affected by the Stefan amendment will make, we should be very happy to welcome them to our shores. They are among the finest people I know and they have contributed much to the strength of our great land. Of course, the adoption of the Stefan amendment means subtracting 2,000 from the 200,000 that the committee in its wisdom felt necessary for us to accept in order to do our full part in this program. The adoption of the amendment under consideration will simply mean that the people provided for under the Stefan amendment will be very definitely earmarked and the admission of those people will in no wise affect the orderly working out of this entire program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, all eyes are turned to us on the legislation before us, H. R. 6396, known as the displaced-persons bill. It is a much-discussed question all over the world, and, reading the bill and the committee report, I am satisfied and pleased that such a bill finally was drafted to give those displaced persons, not of their own displaced persons, not of their own choice, a new outlook in a better world and urge for its passage.

On VE-day it was estimated that there were over 8,000,000 displaced persons in the western countries of Europe. The record shows that the western Allied armies have repatriated over 7,000,000 of these persons, sending them back to their native countries. Primarily, they are natives of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland, each of the Curzon Line now under the Russian control, and the new Poland, which is wrapped up and controlled under communistic domination.

H. R. 6396 would entitle these people to emigrate into the United States, with provisions that everyone would be screened and that they would not be a burden when and if they would reach this side of the ocean. This bill has safeguards against subversive persons and immoral types. Also, it provides penalties for offenders, which the present immigration laws do not have. With these restrictions, I am satisfied that we will be able to select and pick the most deserving applicant.

We, as a great Nation and in a great measure, accepted a world leadership, must do our part toward those unfortunates in rehabilitating them and making them useful and law-abiding citizens of this country. I am sure that we want to do our part and share in this problem of adjustment in this postwar era. If we do take in these 200,000 people that the bill provides for we will be doing a big part in solving a grave situation, and I know that other countries will follow. They are looking to America and are believers in democracy, and they are not all communistic, as one would think today. They are people that would return to their former homes, but do not dare, for they would be put in concentration camps, or, worse, put to death.

As you know, many heroic efforts were performed in the last war by our allied soldiers all over Europe. They would be a real asset to our country, for they are predominantly farmers, craftsmen, technicians, and skilled workmen, who represent the element that is most desired in our country. America should avail herself of the exceptional qualities of this human material, so well deserved in democracy's struggles for a better world. They should be given every consideration not only for humanitarian reasons, but for reasons of both our national economy and our national defense.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have purposely refrained from addressing the Committee on H. R. 6396 because I was anxious to get all information possible right up to the time when the House would take final action on this important measure. Since the introduction of the so-called Stratton bill, I have sought to familiarize myself with the perplexing problem as to how best to deal with so-called displaced persons. Although I was not on the subcommittee presided over by my esteemed colleague, Congressman FRANK FELLOWS, of Maine, several times I sat in on the hearings. Then, too, the full Judiciary Committee heard some of the leading witnesses, including Secretary of State George C. Marshall and then Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson.

At this time may I compliment the subcommittee on the complete coverage of this phase of our immigration problem growing out of the war. It is a high privilege to serve on the Judiciary Committee as I have now for some years. First, under the chairmanship of our honored leader and one of the great constitutional lawyers of this day, Hatton W. Sumners; and now under the genial and affable chairmanship of Congressman EARL C. MICHENER, of Michigan. While speaking of the high degree of fraternal brotherhood on the Judiciary Committee we recall with sorrow the passing of several of our colleagues during past years. At the moment we contemplate with regret the voluntary retirement of two of our Democratic colleagues, Messrs. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and CRAVENS, of Arkansas; and the involuntary retirement of Congressman CHADWICK, of Pennsylvania, and GWYNNE of Iowa. Although these two last gentlemen sit on the Republican side, I have no hesitancy in stating my high regard and respect for them. There has never been any partisanship in our committee.

While I am naturally sympathetic toward suffering humanity regardless as to race, creed, or residence, I cannot let the eloquent pleas of those who favor the enactment of this bill to draw me from the course which I feel in duty bound to follow. As evidence of my sympathy for those who have suffered as a result of the global war, I have voted for relief for both friend and foe. I have voted for the full amount provided for in the European recovery program or Marshall plan, and both publicly and privately have supported the various movements to provide necessities for the confused, homeless, suffering people all around this globe. When I heard my young colleague the gentlemen from Kentucky, Congressman CHELF, present his argument yesterday the words of Agrippa to Paul came to my mind when he said, "Almost thou persuadest me."

We must be realistic now, even more than ever, as we seek to reestablish the equilibrium of the world. I would be the last to cast aspersions on those in the displaced-persons camps. No doubt the more thrifty ones have left the camps of their own accord, as they are free to do. Even if I could convince myself that these additional persons should be permitted to enter the States, I know that there are not sufficient homes for them. After these many months since the shooting war ceased, a number of our gallant sons on whose bodies can be seen battle scars, are without homes. Many of these young veterans, some of whom married just as they embarked for foreign service and many upon returning home, for no cause of their own, have not yet been able to find homes, however humble. Not until last night was the bill providing facilities and means for additional homes reported out of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and before it becomes law many hurdles will have to be crossed. While most every person who is able and willing to work is profitably employed these days, nevertheless, there are numbers out of work and the bringing of additional people from other countries would tend to create unemployment.

All of us are familiar with the fact that independent and unbiased investigations have revealed that there are too many people already within our gates who are not Americans at heart and do not believe in our free democratic form of government. The screenings provided have proven ineffectual. We cannot jeopardize our own lives and the lives of our children beyond the point of safety.

It is a strange paradox that while we represent only about one-sixth of the earth's population and occupy only about one-seventh of the earth's inhabitable land, we are at this time supporting or have supported in the immediate past, practically all of the entire world.

When I find myself in disagreement with those of my colleagues who have spoken and worked for the enactment of this measure, I examine my views with greater care. I have heard all of the testimony and the arguments and cannot convince myself that this legislation is in

the best interest of my country at this time.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding with respect to this legislation. There appears to be a feeling that the passage of this measure will break down our quota system. The author of this bill has explained at the beginning of this discussion. I quote a part of his statement:

I believe this question of displaced persons should be settled * * * without injuring or destroying our traditional quota system of immigration. This is accomplished by the terms of H. R. 6396. The 200,000 who will be brought in under this bill will be charged to the quotas, after being first carefully selected and screened.

He further states, and I quote:

The people brought in under this bill are not in addition to but in place of those who would come in under the immigration laws and the President's directive of December 22, 1945.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we now have quotas that were established by this Congress in 1924 that permit a certain number of people to come to the United States from various countries each year. It is contemplated that the persons included under this legislation shall be charged to those quotas. It is hoped that by the screening and the selection required under this legislation there should be better regulation than is now being done in case of the many thousands who have been coming to our country in recent years. One of the great criticisms against those who are charged with the administration of the present law is that there has been too much carelessness on the part of some of our officials in permitting the immigration of too many persons who cannot, and do not want to be assimilated into the American way of life. It seems to me that with the warnings indicated in this debate, that officials who are charged with the administration of this act will be extremely careful to see that only those who are worthy will be permitted to come to America for permanent residence.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, our attention has been called to the fact that there are approximately 1,000,000 displaced persons in three countries in Europe; 850,000 of these are in Germany. Most of these are in the American zone.

Our Government is presently spending at the rate of $130,000,000 a year to maintain the camps where these displaced persons are located. Our officials in charge of the problem do not seem to be able to get out from under this responsibility that we assumed after the war was over. It is a tough problem. If the legislation is not approved the immigration problem will be more difficult. There will be less screening and selection than under this legislation. The bill provides that the principle of national origin expressed in the quota system is not to be destroyed. It provides safeguards against subversives. The selection and screening should further protect our country in this regard. We are assured that these persons shall not be admitted to localities where there is not adequate housing. I should add there are specific provisions to protect against communism. This bill also provides severe penalties for conspiracy for violation of the act, being punishable by fine of $10,000 and imprisonment up to 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have a problem on our hands that we have got to deal with whether we like it or not.

The adoption of this legislation will not solve the displaced-persons problem. It is hoped that it will help to some extent. In view of the situation in which we are involved it seems to me that it is for our interest to accept the recommendation of the committee in charge of this legislation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a number of statements about the size and character of the lobby supporting displaced-persons legislation.

I have no interest in defending this or any other lobby. But when it is attacked for the purpose of discrediting the legislation itself, I think it only proper to say that I would favor fair legislation on this subject no matter who else supported it.

And furthermore, I see no excuse for making general statements about the lobby itself when all the pertinent information about it, its backers and its resources are a matter of detailed official record in this House.

Under unanimous consent, I am including in the RECORD at this point an exhaustive analysis of the displaced-persons lobby prepared from official records by an impartial agency—the Congressional Quarterly.

And I hope that this information will serve to eliminate further grandiose generalities and unfounded insinuations on the subject.

The principle of admitting displaced persons to the United States has been endorsed by 120 national organizations. They include the American Legion, American Veterans Committee, AFL, CIO, General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters, Farm Bureau, Americans for Democratic Action, and National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The Legion originally opposed DP admission, but now supports limited entry. In addition, there are 103 local citizens' committees on displaced persons.

The first meeting out of which the committee grew was held in Washington, December 20, 1946. It was attended by such persons as Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, wartime OSS Director; Marshall Field; Leon Henderson; A. Philip Randolph; Edward R. Stettinius, former Secretary of State; Henry B. Cabot; Beardsley Ruml, of Macy's; William S. Paley, chairman of the board of the Columbia Broadcasting System; Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time and Life; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt; former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts; Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of New York; Basil O'Connor, chairman of the American Red Cross; Earl G. Harrison, former immigration commissioner; David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Thomas K. Finletter; Jacob Potofsky, of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; Lessing J. Rosenwald; Walter F. White, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; former Democratic National Chairman James A. Farley; Charles P. Taft; and Dr. Daniel A. Poling.

Among those who have been reported as contributing $500 or more to the committee (with the exact amount not specified) are:

Lessing J. Rosenwald and Edith G. Rosenwald, of Jenkintown, Pa., each of whom has made three separate contributions of more than $500.

Max Ascoli and Marion R. Ascoli, of New York. Mrs. Ascoli made three contributions of more than $500. She is a sister of Lessing Rosenwald.

Marshall Field three contributions of more than $500.

Herbert Lehman, former Governor of New York and former UNRRA Director, and Mrs. Lehman. He made two contributions. In addition, a contribution of between $50 and $500 was reported from Lehman Brothers.

Barry Bingham, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

John J. Raskob, treasurer of the committee and New York financier, who has made two contributions of more than $500.

B'nai B'rith, two contributions of more than $500.

Sam A. Lewisohn, New York financier.

Joseph M. Proskauer, New York lawyer and president of the American Jewish Committee.

Loeb Foundation.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers, two contributions of more than $500.

International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

John Hay Whitney, New York financier.

Mrs. Felix Warburg.

Warner Brothers.

Nelson A. Rockefeller.

John D. Rockerfeller, Jr.

Eddie Cantor.

Cornelius N. Bliss, New York banker.

Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., of Wilmington, Del., president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Thomas J. Watson, president of International Business Machines Corp. Watson is down for one contribution of $500 and one of between $50 and $500.

In addition, for the second quarter of 1947, the committee reported separately contributions from 217 persons and organizations of between $50 and $499. These donations totaled $21,340, an average of $98.75. Contributors in this bracket included:

Nathan Straus, former United States Housing Administrator and now president of radio station WMCA in New York.

Howard Lindsay.

Beardsley Ruml.

Samuel Goldwyn.

Dan Golenpaul, producer of the Information Please radio program.

Joseph C. Grew, former Under Secretary of State and Ambassador to Japan.

Walter S. Mack, Jr., president of Pepsi-Cola Co.

Arthur S. Meyer, chairman of the New York State Board of Mediation.

Moss Hart.

Arde Bulova, chairman of the Bulova Watch Co.

Nicholas M. Schenck, president of Loew's, Inc.

Mrs. Francis Biddle, wife of the former Attorney General.

Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend the chairman and other members of this committee for the splendid work they have done in connection with H. R. 6396. After reading the committee report and after analyzing this bill, in my opinion it is far superior to the legislation recently passed by the other body.

The Senate bill, no matter what the intent, discriminates against certain minority groups, and many of the provisions of the bill are inequitable. The House bill on the other hand remedies those inequities and to a large extent is

as fair and reasonable as can be expected in dealing with this difficult problem.

The record indicates that there are some 800,000 displaced persons still occupying the camps of Europe. These homeless and stateless people are symbolic of one of the cancerous situations affecting Europe. I am sure that many American citizens do not realize that we are paying nearly $150,000,000 a year to sustain these unfortunate people. Unless we pass this measure, we shall continue year after year, as a humanitarian measure, to give relief to these needy people. Therefore, it seems to me, in order to relieve the American taxpayer from this tremendous burden, this Nation should assume the leadership in dissolving these displaced-persons camps as rapidly as possible. In order to accomplish this objective, it then becomes necessary to provide a haven within this Nation under the quota set forth in the bill.

I sincerely trust that those charged with the responsibility of administering this program will take every precaution in properly screening those displaced persons who come into this country. During debate some Members have said that there are Communists among them. Other Members have said that some of them rendered active aid to the Nazis. In my opinion the overwhelming weight of the evidence indicates that the majority of the people in these camps have sufficient character, industry, and mental attitude to become good American citizens.

I do not believe that the magnitude of restoring the millions of displaced persons following the termination of hostilities of World War II has been fully understood. For instance, it is not generally known that the Allied nations have repatriated nearly 7,000,000 of displaced persons since the end of the war. It is only these remaining 800,000 that create the problem which confronts us today.

In addition to the great saving to the American taxpayer, there is an issue which is of such magnitude and is so basic that it transcends the financial burden of which I have just spoken. There is a tremendous moral issue involved in the passage of this bill.

By way of explanation, I should like to point out that this moral issue brings into open and direct conflict the Soviet policy as distinguished from the American policy. The Soviet Union has demanded that we force repatriation of these displaced persons to their native lands. If we should accept that policy hundreds of thousands of these people would be forced to return to their native land which is behind the iron curtain. To date we have rejected the Soviet solution to this problem. The American policy is incorporated in this bill and is consistent with all of our poltical, social, and humanitarian precepts. We are perfectly willing to aid each and every individual in the displaced-persons camps who desires to return to his native land voluntarily but we shall not compel them to return. This bill then is an implementation of the American policy. If these unfortunate people do not or cannot return to their native lands, we are assuming our part of a job under the Charter of the United Nations to join with 14 or 15 other countries in attempting to solve this problem by voluntary agreement between the countries. It is the hope of many of us that in the near future, after having witnessed an example of the leadership of this country, other nations will assume their responsibility under the Charter by admitting a certain quota into their respective countries.

Again, permit me to commend the committee for a reasonable solution of a difficult problem. It is my hope that the Senate will accept this bill as it passed the House.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6396) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 637, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENKINS of Ohio) there were—ayes 153, noes 53.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 289, nays 91, not voting 49, answering "present" 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—289

Abbitt	Bland	Celler
Albert	Blatnik	Chadwick
Allen, Calif.	Bloom	Chapman
Andersen H. Carl	Boggs, Del.	Chelf
	Boggs, La.	Chenoweth
Anderson, Calif.	Bolton	Church
Andresen, August H.	Boykin	Clason
	Bradley	Cole, Kans.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bramblett	Cole, Mo.
Angell	Brophy	Combs
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cooley
Arnold	Buchanan	Corbett
Auchincloss	Buck	Cotton
Bakewell	Burke	Crawford
Barrett	Butler	Crosser
Bates, Ky.	Byrne, N. Y.	Crow
Bates, Mass.	Byrnes, Wis.	Cunningham
Battle	Canfield	Curtis
Beall	Cannon	Dague
Beckworth	Carroll	Davis, Tenn.
Bender	Carson	Davis, Wis.
Bennett, Mich.	Case, N. J.	Dawson, Ill.
Blackney	Case, S. Dak.	Dawson, Utah
Deane	Isacson	Murray, Wis.
Delaney	Jackson, Calif.	Nicholson
Devitt	Jackson, Wash.	Nixon
D'Ewart	Jarman	Nodar
Dingell	Javits	Norblad
Dirksen	Jenison	Norton
Domengeaux	Jenkins, Pa.	O'Brien
Dondero	Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara
Donohue	Jones, Ala.	O'Konski
Doughton	Jones, N. C.	Patteron
Douglas	Jones, Wash.	Peterson
Durham	Jonkman	Pfeifer
Eaton	Judd	Philbin
Eberharter	Karsten, Mo.	Phillips, Calif.
Ellsworth	Kean	Plumley
Elsaesser	Kearney	Potter
Elston	Kearns	Potts
Engel, Mich.	Keating	Poulson
Engle, Calif.	Kee	Powell
Fallon	Kelley	Price, Ill.
Feighan	Kennedy	Rains
Fellows	Keogh	Ramey
Fenton	Kersten, Wis.	Rees
Fernandez	Kilburn	Reeves
Flannagan	Kilday	Regan
Fletcher	King	Rich
Fogarty	Kirwan	Riehlman
Folger	Klein	Rockwell
Foote	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Forand	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Fuller	Larcade	Ross
Fulton	Latham	Russell
Gamble	Lea	Sabath
Garmatz	LeCompte	Sadlak
Gary	LeFevre	Sadowski
Gavin	Lemke	Sanborn
Gearhart	Lesinski	Sasscer
Gillette	Lewis, Ky.	Scoblick
Goff	Lewis, Ohio	Scott, Hardie
Gordon	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gorski	Lodge	
Graham	Love	Seely-Brown
Granger	Lucas	Shafer
Grant, Ala.	Lyle	Sikes
Gregory	Lynch	Simpson, Ill.
Gross	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Gwinn, N. Y.	McCormack	Smathers
Gwynne, Iowa	McCowen	Smith, Va.
Hagen	McDonough	Snyder
Hale	McDowell	Somers
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGarvey	Spence
	Mack	Stefan
Hall, Leonard W.	MacKinnon	Stevenson
	Madden	Stratton
Hand	Maloney	Sundstrom
Hardy	Mansfield	Talle
Harless, Ariz.	Marcantonio	Taylor
Hart	Martin, Iowa	Thomas, Tex.
Havenner	Mason	Thompson
Hays	Mathews	Tibbott
Hedrick	Meade, Ky.	Tollefson
Heffernan	Meade, Md.	Towe
Hendricks	Merrow	Trimble
Heselton	Michener	Vorys
Hess	Miller, Conn.	Vursell
Hill	Miller, Md.	Walter
Hinshaw	Monroney	Weichel
Hobbs	Morgan	Welch
Hoeven	Morris	Whitaker
Holifield	Morrison	Wigglesworth
Holmes	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Hope	Muhlenberg	Wolcott
Horan	Multer	Wolverton
Huber	Mundt	Woodruff
Hull	Murdock	Youngblood

NAYS—91

Abernethy	Gossett	Rayburn
Allen, La.	Griffiths	Redden
Andrews, Ala.	Harrison	Reed, Ill.
Banta	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Barden	Hoffman	Riley
Bell	Jenkins, Ohio	Rivers
Bennett, Mo.	Jennings	Rizley
Bishop	Jensen	Rogers, Fla.
Bonner	Johnson, Ill.	Sarbacher
Brehm	Kerr	Schwabe, Mo.
Brooks	Landis	Schwabe, Okla.
Brown, Ga.	Lanham	Scrivner
Bryson	McCulloch	Short
Buffett	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Bulwinkle	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Burleson	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Busbey	Mahon	Stanley
Camp	Manasco	Stockman
Chiperfield	Meyer	Taber
Clark	Mills	Teague
Clevenger	Murray, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Colmer	Norrell	Vinson
Cooper	Pace	Wheeler
Cravens	Passman	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	Patman	Whittington
Dorn	Phillips, Tenn.	Williams
Elliott	Pickett	Winstead
Ellis	Poage	Wood
Evins	Preston	Worley
Gathings	Price, Fla.	
Gore	Rankin	

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

Cox

NOT VOTING—49

Allen, Ill.	Harvey	Ploeser
Buckley	Herter	Priest
Clippinger	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Coffin	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Tex.	Rooney
Coudert	Keefe	St. George
Courtney	Kefauver	Sheppard
Dolliver	Lane	Smith, Maine
Fisher	Ludlow	Stigler
Gallagher	Lusk	Thomas, N. J.
Gillie	McMahon	Twyman
Goodwin	Macy	Vail
Grant, Ind.	Miller, Calif.	Wadsworth
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	West
Harness, Ind.	Mitchell	Wilson, Ind.
Harris	O'Toole	
Hartley	Peden	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Peden against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Cox against.

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Vail against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Clippinger against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. St. George with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Halleck with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. Keefe with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. McMahon with Mr. Richards.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Courtney.

Mr. Coffin with Mr. Harris.

Mr. Ploeser with Mr. West.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mrs. Lusk.

Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Ludlow.

Mr. KUNKEL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the rule, House Resolution 637, the Clerk will report the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I offer the following motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2242 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in the bill H. R. 6396.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which the House bill was passed will be vacated and the bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the New York Times on the death of the Honorable Peter McGinnis.

THE RECORD—STOP, LOOK, LISTEN

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I believe our people should know the true facts concerning the past and what present activities might lead to, and I am quoting briefly from a recent editorial:

In the 1940 Presidential campaign, Roosevelt promised Americans "again, and again, and again," not to send their boys into foreign wars. He got the third term for which he had been plotting since 1937 or 1938.

Safely reelected, he set about stepping up his push toward war. Shortly after New Year, 1941, the drive began to jam the lend-lease bill through Congress—a plan which Roosevelt swore would buy peace for us by supplying the allies with war materials so that they could go on fighting the Germans. The bill became a law March 11, 1941.

There followed a long dispute as to whether the United States Navy should or should not convoy lend-lease shipments to Britain. What happened was that Roosevelt, without a by-your-leave to Congress, set the Navy patrolling the North Atlantic fairly early in 1941.

Even this failed to provoke a shooting war in the Atlantic with Hitler. Adolf had other fish to fry, since he was then meditating his attack on Russia which took place June 22, 1941.

Roosevelt at the same time was warming up his campaign of provocation against Japan. If Hitler would not fight, Tojo might. How well this drive succeeded is a matter of history. Following Cordell Hull's November 26, 1941, ultimatum, Japan attacked us at Pearl Harbor.

Let us connect present activities with past performances. Mr. Truman has said time after time, and I quote from his first address to the Congress:

I call upon all Americans to help me keep our Nation united in defense of those ideals which have been so eloquently proclaimed by Franklin D. Roosevelt. I will support and defend those ideals with all my strength and with all my heart.

Then again in his Hyde Park address, he stated, and I quote:

In the aftermath of a global war the overall task is difficult. But it can be stated simply; it is to carry forward the underlying principles and policies, foreign and domestic of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, are we going into another war? Beware Americans, we must not let history repeat itself. We must take time to stop, look, and listen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances, in two of them to include newspaper editorials.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the American Aviation Daily.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from today's Chicago Daily Tribune entitled "How We Earned His Hate."

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two news items.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. James A. Hilliard, national historian of the Philippine-Pacific War Veterans.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the president of the Superior Steel Co.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. FORAND) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he previously made today and include liquor prices.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

AUTHORIZING CREDIT IN CERTAIN ACCOUNTS OF UNITED STATES PROPERTY AND DISBURSING OFFICERS UNDER THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1747) to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That payments made prior to July 1, 1942, out of moneys appropriated under the provisions of the National Defense Act, for the support of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia which now stand disallowed or would hereafter be disallowed, but for this act, by reason of lack of adequate or correct supporting vouchers and documents, are hereby ratified and validated as to the United States property and disbursing officers making the same, in such amounts only as are found and determined by the Comptroller General of the United States to be without substantial evidence of fraud or criminality or of timely knowledge of such fraud or criminality on the part of the United States property and disbursing officer involved and to have been actually expended in good faith or under bona fide contracts (1) for services which in fact have been rendered or (2) for facilities which in fact have been furnished to the United States and its agencies including the National Guard; all items so found shall be passed to credit in the accounts of the property and disbursing officers involved, and any settlement based thereon shall not be reopened as against any such officer in the absence of new evidence of fraud or criminality: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit recovery from any payee of public moneys illegally or erroneously paid to such payee or to preclude the recovery from any such property and disbursing officer or his surety of any balance found due the Government under a settlement made as herein provided.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DONDERO, CUNNINGHAM, MCGREGOR, BEALL, WHITTINGTON, ELLIOTT, and FALLON.

LESTER L. ELDER

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3500) for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,183.49" and insert "$808.49."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE S. OSIKA

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3260) for the relief of Clarence S. Osika, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,738.60" and insert "$9,879.85."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why was this amount increased over the House bill?

Mr. FOOTE. Subsequent to the passage of the bill additional expenses were incurred and the Senate included in the bill the amount which makes up the difference. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the author of the bill, is here, and I believe he can explain it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a claim resulting from an accident which occurred in 1944 when a Navy plane crashed in a small town in my district. The claimant was standing in front of his home and a portion of the plane struck his leg, severely injuring him, an injury from which he has not yet recovered. The Navy, in making its report on the bill, stated he was being allowed payment for loss of wages while he was hospitalized. It later developed, after the House passed the bill, that the Navy had neglected to include in its report loss of wages during the second period of hospitalization, which loss amounted to $2,700, and additional medical expenses incurred since the introduction of the House bill. In addition to that I may say to the gentleman that this man's injury has not yet healed. The claimant will suffer additional medical expenses from now on. The doctors cannot tell how long it will take the injury to heal, because the bone is still sloughing off in that leg. The Navy agreed to send a representative to the Senate committee to correct its original statement. The amount is deemed by the Navy to be fair.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2721) to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "and shall operate and maintain pool levels" and insert "and, to the maximum extent possible without causing damage to levee and drainage districts, adjacent railroads and highways, farm lands, and dam structures, shall generally operate and maintain pool levels."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WELCH, D'EWART, SANBORN, MURDOCK, and PETERSON.

CONSTRUCTION AT NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 2 of the House engrossed amendment, lines 15 and 16, strike out "one hundred and fifteen duplex houses (two hundred and thirty family units)" and insert in lieu thereof "housing facilities for two hundred and thirty families";

On page 2 of the House engrossed amendment, line 20, strike out "Jersey City" and insert in lieu thereof "Lake Denmark";

On page 8 of the House engrossed amendment, line 23, after the word "unit", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That in any case in which the construction at any station of family quarters having a net floor area in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet is prohibited by the provisions of the foregoing proviso, an equal number of family quarters having a net floor area not in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet may be constructed at such station and any funds saved as a result of the construction of such smaller family quarters or as a result of the succeeding proviso may be utilized to construct family quarters having a net floor area not in excess of one thousand and eighty square feet at any Navy station scheduled for retention in the permanent Military Establishment";

On page 10 of the House engrossed amendment, line 6, strike out "$91,949,950" and insert in lieu thereof "$92,932,600";

On page 10 of the House engrossed amendment, line 8, strike out "$116,532,953" and insert in lieu thereof "$116,756,900".

And the House agree to the same.

GEORGE J. BATES,
L. C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
LANSDALE G. SASSCER,
OVERTON BROOKS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with amendments, and that the House agree to the same.

The original authorizations for the construction of public works by the Navy for the fiscal year 1948 were contained in H. R. 3314 and S. 1675, companion bills, which were introduced in the House and Senate last year. Both of these bills were favorably reported by the Committees on Armed Services. As reported, the House bill would have authorized a total expenditure of $251,955,200 for the construction of public works by the Navy and the Senate bill, a total of $239,955,200. The difference of exactly $12,000,000 between these two figures represents the cost of the proposed airfield at the United States Naval Academy. This project was included in the House bill but had been deleted by the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1675 subsequently passed the Senate without amendment and hence would have authorized the expenditure of the sum just stated, namely, $239,955,200.

Although H. R. 3314 provided for the expenditure of an equal sum, plus $12,000,000 for the airfield, no further action was taken on this bill by the House. In lieu thereof, a new bill, H. R. 6341, was introduced, which reduced the total authorization in the House bill from $251,955,200 to $209,689,500. By this action an apparent saving of $42,265,700 was effected by the House. The actual saving effected amounted to $39,753,200. The difference of $2,512,500 between these two figures was attributable to the deletion of the project for the construction of a Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey at a cost of $2,500,000, which has been authorized by separate legislation, and also to the deletion of a minor project costing $12,500 at Morro Bay, California, for which there no longer is a need.

The actual saving of $39,753,200 was brought about by the omission from the new bill of a number of specific projects which were included in H. R. 3314 and which also remained in S. 1675 as it passed the Senate. The projects eliminated were selected by the Navy as being of lesser priority than those retained in the new bill. The reduction of $42,265,700 in the total authorization represented the sum total of the estimated cost of these individual projects which were omitted, plus the cost of the Monterey and Morro Bay projects.

During the consideration of H. R. 6341 by the House an amendment was adopted consisting of two provisos the legal effect of which is as follows:

1. To prohibit the use of funds authorized in this bill for the construction of family quarters having a net floor area in excess of 1,080 square feet per family unit; and

2. To require that all family quarters constructed with these funds be of the multiple type or apartment type except under certain specified conditions which would warrant a departure from this policy.

The practical effect of this amendment would be to permit an additional saving because of the limitations as to the size and type of dwellings which may be constructed. H. R. 6341 originally contemplated the construction of 365 detached and semidetached family units of varying sizes. By resorting to the multiple or row type of construction and by limiting the net floor area of all units to a maximum of 1,080 square feet, the same total number of family quarters can be provided at an estimated saving of $1,206,597.

An amendment was also adopted by the House reducing the figures for total authorizations for continental and overseas construction by the amount of the savings which would have accrued through the limitations on housing described in the preceding paragraph.

Following the passage of H. R. 6341, the Senate bill, S. 1675, was taken from the Speaker's table and was amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting in lieu thereof the language of the House bill.

The House conferees insisted upon the retention in the bill of the project for the construction of an air field at the Naval Academy for flight indoctrination purposes. The House view prevailed.

The Senate receded from its insistence upon the restoration in the bill of authorizations totalling $39,753,200 which had been deleted by the House.

The Senate receded from its disagreement with the provisos adopted by the House which would prohibit the construction of housing with a net floor area in excess of 1,080 square feet and which would require that dwellings be of the multiple type.

The Senate insisted, however, that the resulting savings of $1,206,597 which will be effected by these provisos be made available for the construction of additional family units of the smaller size and multiple type at naval installations scheduled for retention in the permanent Military Establishment. It is estimated that $1,206,597 will provide for the construction of 63 additional units of this type. The Senate took the position that the critical shortage of family housing makes it mandatory that the funds resulting from these economies be utilized to provide additional housing. The Senate view prevailed and, accordingly, the conferees agreed to accept the House amendment to the Senate bill with the following amendments:

1. An amendment in the form of a new proviso which will give effect to the intent of the conferees that savings resulting from the operation of the two House provisos be made available for additional construction at permanent stations.

Under the House amendment to the Senate bill it was contemplated that the Services would be permitted to substitute an equal number of units of the smaller size for such units of larger sizes as were orignally planned. In the interest of clarity the new proviso restates the legislative intent in this regard in addition to providing that savings may be utilized at any permanent station.

2. Two technical amendments required to correct the total authorizations for continental and overseas construction in order to restore the savings of $1,206,597 which were deleted from the total by the House amendment to the Senate bill. These two amendments merely raise the figures $91,949,950 and $116,532,953 to $92,932,600 and $116,756,900, respectively.

Two additional amendments were also agreed to by the conferees.

1. The first of these is a technical amendment to the language authorizing the construction of family quarters at the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif., as passed by the Senate and amended by the House, the bill provides for the construction of "115 duplex houses (250 family units)." The conferees agreed to strike out this language and to substitute in lieu thereof the following: "housing facilities for 230 families." This amendment is necessary to bring this authorization into conformity with the House proviso requiring that all family quarters be of the multiple-type or apartment-type.

2. The other amendment referred to relates to the project in the bill which reads as follows:

"Naval ammunition depot, Jersey City, N. J.: Liquid fuel rocket test laboratory; $306,000."

The conferees agreed to strike out the words "Jersey City" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "Lake Denmark." This change was requested by the Navy Department because arrangements have now been made with the Army whereby additional suitable land at Lake Denmark will be made available to the Navy. This will permit the laboratory to be located in a less congested area than the Jersey City Depot. No change in the amount of authorization is involved.

GEORGE J. BATES,
L. C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,
LANSDALE G. SASSCER,
OVERTON BROOKS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

STANDARDIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRICES

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 638 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 638) provides for the consideration of H. R. 6248, a bill reported favorably by the Committee to stabilize the prices of agricultural commodities and for other purposes.

Basically, the bill provides for a continuation of price-support programs by the Department of Agriculture with certain refinements and improvements over the present programs.

The present price-support programs came into being early in the war principally because of the urgent need for increased quantities of food and fiber to meet war and essential civilian needs. To assure the production of the necessary amounts and kinds of agricultural commodities needed to prosecute the war and to maintain our economy at home, price-support programs were devised whereby assurances were given to farmers that if they would produce the things needed they would be protected against ruinously low prices, by being assured, in the case of commodities receiving price support, of approximately 90 percent of the parity price. In general the price-support programs were designed to give farmers of the Nation protection similar to that given to industry. The principal difference being that in most instances industry was protected through specific contracts which guaranteed a profit on the undertaking, while farmers were assured of a market within the framework of the parity concept.

I do not think I need to remind the Members of this House of the great benefits which have been received under the agricultural price-support programs. These programs have been almost universally acclaimed as the very heart of a sound agricultural economy. This has been demonstrated in actual practice. Throughout the entire war and postwar period the farmers of the Nation have responded magnificently to the demands placed upon them and have supplied us with the food and fiber necessary to win the war and they are presently providing the food which is proving to be the key in developing a lasting peace.

I think I might well say at this point that the farmers have continued to produce in the face of the most adverse circumstances. They have been dividing their farm machinery equipment with the other peoples of the world, and making their old equipment do. During the war when the boys were gone, they got along the best they could with any kind of help that they could get. This country certainly owes a debt of gratitude to the farmers of this country for the great job that they have done. We have already witnessed the effectiveness of food in the so-called cold war. Up to now, food has been the principal factor in the maintenance of the democracies in western Europe. The agricultural price-support programs which would be continued in effect by this bill have played a major part in obtaining the food production which has been so vital to the welfare of the Nation. One of the greatest but frequently overlooked benefits which the American people have derived from the agricultural price-support programs is that they have aided materially in checking the inflationary spiral by assuring at all times an adequate food supply. Just pause to consider how high the cost of food would have been without these programs at a time when we are consuming, on a per capita basis, approximately 15 percent more food than we did before the war. At the same time while we are consuming more food domestically, we are exporting approximately five times more food than we did during the prewar years. Only through these support programs, which have given confidence to the farmers, would we have had produced the food to meet this great demand, and without the increased production the pressure on prices would have been tremendous. Another important but little-known fact concerning these price-support programs is that they have been conducted without cost to the taxpayer. To be sure, losses have been incurred on some commodities, but these losses have been offset by profits on others. Since the inception of the price-support programs, the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture, the unit of the Department under which these programs have been conducted, shows a net gain of $52,400,000 on its operations exclusive of consumer subsidies it paid during wartime price control. This gain is after the payment of all overhead operating expenses, and interest costs, and after setting aside a reserve to absorb any losses on commodities on hand and not yet sold. The gain on price-support programs on cotton alone have exceeded $235,000.

The present price-support programs were scheduled to terminate 2 years after the first day of January immediately following the announcement of the termination of hostilities in the present war. This period will end on December 31 of this year. This 2-year period of mandatory price support was originally provided to give producers an opportunity to make readjustments in production. Since the issuance of the President's proclamation announcing the termination of hostilities, events have taken place which have changed drastically the agricultural outlook from what it was at that time. The domestic and foreign demand for most argicultural commodities has been so great that producers have not had the 2-year period to readjust production to peacetime conditions as was contemplated in the original law establishing price support. It has been necessary since the announcement of the termination of hostilities not only to maintain production but in many instances to increase production to meet the demand occasioned by the various foreign-aid programs coupled with high domestic consumption. Only last week this House authorized an appropriation of approximately $6,000,000,000 to carry out various foreign-assistance programs. No one at this time can state with certainty what the impact of that program will be upon our domestic economy but we can be certain it will be very great. It is imperative, therefore, that we keep in readiness the tools by which we may obtain the production necessary to assure at all times the kinds and amounts of food at fair prices needed to meet our domestic requirements and at the same time carry out the obligations we have assured in foreign fields. The present bill will provide the price support necessary to obtain maximum protection of essential commodities and at the same time sufficient flexibility and authority are provided to permit such adjustments, either in the level of support or in the amounts of the less essential commodities which may be produced and marketed, as may be necessary to bring about a reasonable balance in the supply of food and other agricultural commodities with the changing levels of demand. The enactment of this bill will give farmers the assurance they need so that they can with confidence make their plans for the future.

I believe the Committee on Agriculture has acted wisely in developing a practical and sound bill for continuing price supports for agricultural commodities until such time as conditions will permit the working out of a long-range farm program. The conditions confronting the world today are almost as uncertain as they have been at any time during the war. The full impact of legislation such as the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 upon our domestic economy is still unknown. Food stocks

throughout the world are still at extremely low levels and are likely to continue so for some time. This bill is designed to fit these unsettled conditions. It will keep the tools which have been used so successfully in full effect and at the same time provide sufficient flexibility to enable changes to be made both in support level and in production goals and marketing regulations with respect to commodities in more plentiful supply so as to bring about an orderly shift to a peacetime basis without damaging any segment of our economy. It is a sound and sensible bill and it will provide a price-support program which meets the conditions as they exist today.

The resolution provides 1 hour of debate on the bill and waives points of order against it. I am sure that the vast majority of you recognize the value and urgent necessity for this legislation, and I urge you to vote for this resolution providing for its consideration.

This bill, as I understand, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, no one who has made any study of the past periods of our history in respect to its economic stability can successfully dispute the fact that when we have a healthy agriculture in this country, when agriculture is prosperous, we have a healthy and prosperous industry and a healthy and prosperous business. This bill is absolutely as necessary now as it was in the days when the late lamented Congressman Steagall, whom we all knew and loved, fostered this idea. He was the daddy of it. These conditions with which we are confronted today I think demand that this bill have our full support.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. In view of the high prices of food, which we have today, in view of the high prices that the consumers in the cities must pay for food today, is not this bill just a guaranty for a continuation of the high cost of living to the consumers in the cities?

Mr. RIZLEY. On the contrary, it is a guaranty to the consumers that the cost of living will not go higher and higher. If we do not have these support prices, the farmers will not be able to produce, and there will be such a scarcity of food that I hesitate to say how high the prices might go.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It is fine to assure the farmer high prices for his goods, but what assurance has the consumer in the city that the prices are not going to be too high? In other words, you are taking only half of the problem here. You are looking after the farmer but you have no price control in this measure. There is nothing in this measure to protect the consumer against high prices.

Mr. RIZLEY. I may say to the gentleman, of course, in industry and in business buring the war, and if we get into another war we will continue it, there was a guaranteed cost of production. We are continuing to increase from time to time the wages of the laboring men, and I am for that; but if the farmers are to continue to produce they must have some assurance that they are going to get at least 90 percent of parity for their products. No one should be more interested in this bill than the consumer. The consumer is going to have to depend on the farmer, after all, if he expects to get food and if he expects to get clothing.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. How is the American farmer going to produce enough food to feed the city people of this country and meet our obligations abroad unless he can make enough money to pay his debts and keep going?

Mr. RIZLEY. The question answers itself.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. In connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, is there anything in the minimum-wage law for labor that is calculated to help the farmer meet his cost of living?

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly not and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman could not have made a truer statement than when he said that agriculture could not have accomplished all that was expected of it in wartime had it not been assisted by this price-support program. Is not the exigency and the emergency just as great now with the various programs we have to meet both at home and abroad?

Mr. RIZLEY. I certainly think so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma on his splendid statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I should like to question the gentleman a little along the line raised by the gentleman from Michigan. As the gentleman from Oklahoma knows, I have been in this body for 6 years and have supported every farm program that has been brought before this House.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman has a fine record in that respect and I am sure he is going to support this bill too.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am in somewhat of a quandary, though, about supporting this program in view of the fact I have no farms in my district and the people in my district are paying 97 cents a pound for ordinary beef.

Mr. RIZLEY. I may say to the gentleman that I hesitate to think what they might have to pay without a price-support program. The gentleman comes from one of the greatest agricultural States in the Nation, the State of California. I have heard him boast before our committee many, many times that his State was perhaps the outstanding agricultural State in the Union. He, of course, represents not merely his small city district in Los Angeles, but he speaks for the farmers of California as well.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But the gentleman will agree with me that California also is a great consuming State with its population concentrated largely in two great cities; and we have had a 42.8 percent increase in the price of food over conditions under OPA.

Mr. RIZLEY. May I interrupt my friend to say that there is no telling how much the people in his State would be paying for food had not the farmers been able to produce abundantly.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Is it not a fact that this very bill guarantees the food that the consumers in Michigan and California must have?

Mr. RIZLEY. We think so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If you want eggs, if you want meat, if you want food products under present conditions, how can they be obtained if the farmer does not have a support price. This is the only way we are going to get production.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman from Colorado is one of the able members of the Committee on Agriculture who has been active in that connection ever since I have been in Congress, 8 years. I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am happy to yield to my able colleague from Oklahoma, who I have found always to be the friend of agriculture.

Mr. MORRIS. I think the program has worked out well in the past and that this continuation, if it is continued, should be a continuation of the program. It has to be sound for the farm population and for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. MORRIS. I think the gentleman has made a very splendid argument.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. COX. As usual, I find myself in agreement, generally speaking, with the view of my distinguished friend from Oklahoma. He continues steadfast in his loyal and devoted support of the cause of the people who toil. I understand that he is soon to leave this House. By his so doing we will sustain a real loss. Not only do I have a very genuine regard for the gentleman but also I hold him in deep affection and look upon him as one of the substantial men of this body, one of the real patriots of Congress.

Mr. RIZLEY. I sincerely thank the gentleman from Georgia for his very kind words. I know of no one in this House that is more able and intense in his devotion to the cause of agriculture and to the maintenance of true American Jeffersonian democracy for all of our people.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not true that a price-support program is the finest in-

surance we can find for abundant production?

Mr. RIZLEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. HARDY. From the consumer's standpoint, does it not follow that abundant production is the greatest insurance the consumer can be provided against exorbitantly high prices?

Mr. RIZLEY. The consumer cannot eat unless he has something to eat. This program insures there will be supplies of food and clothing.

Mr. HARDY. And abundant supplies guarantee against exorbitantly high prices?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. When this program was inaugurated we had accompanying it a price-control program. One went along with the other. Now we have no price-control program. What is going to be the inflationary effect of this legislation in the absence of a price-control program? I think the House should concern itself with that problem in dealing with this legislation.

Mr. RIZLEY. This legislation deals with a continuation of price support for agricultural products.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In answer to the gentleman from New York, when he makes the statement they have not any other support, I am sure he does not realize we have the minimum wage of 40 cents an hour and that 90 percent of parity does not provide any farmer with any more than 40 cents an hour. So far as support is concerned, if prices are too high everyone realizes that the President and the executive department of this Government control the prices at wholesale levels. They have the power, the authority, and the money. If prices are too high they should go down to the White House and call on the gentleman there and ask for control of prices.

Mr. RIZLEY. I know of no Member of Congress who is a greater advocate of all of the things that are good for American agriculture than the gentleman from Wisconsin who has been a very valuable member of the Agricultural Committee for many years. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will this guarantee the farmers in my district the ability to buy food for their poultry so that we can sell poultry and eggs again the same as we did for years? The price of feed is so high now from the western farmers that we cannot buy feed for our chickens.

Mr. RIZLEY. I may say to the gentleman that the farmers are one class of people who always have to take into consideration drought, pestilence, chinch bugs, green bugs, boll weevil, hog cholera, foot-and-mouth disease and a hundred other things that may destroy his crops before he can harvest and get them in the granary. It is not like industry, business or labor. No one can guarantee there is going to be a crop. I may say further to the gentleman that support prices is the best guaranty my friend can have that if we have a season in which the farmers in the great sections that produce hay, grain, and feed can produce them, we will have an abundant supply so that he can feed his livestock and feed his chickens.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am from a city district and my people have been suffering from high prices of food. That is nothing new. We all know that. Is it not a fact all of these commodities are very much higher than the support price and the way to support prices and get the work done is to keep them high; that is, on a base beneath which they cannot go?

Mr. RIZLEY. Most of the prices are above the support prices. I do not know what is going to happen tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. All this bill does is to say: "You continue to produce and we will guarantee if your prices get down lower than 90 percent of parity we will step in and pay the difference so that you can continue to produce and we will see that you are paid up to 90 percent of parity."

Mr. JAVITS. This is designed to keep prices high. The farmer has a base beneath which he cannot go and he is bound to keep them up.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. As a matter of fact, this support-price program will insure full-scale production and in the long run will lower the price of commodities. Recently the price of wheat has gone down considerably, but the price of bread has not. The price of hogs has gone away down. The price of meat has not.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that I have been with the gentleman from Oklahoma many times in agricultural meetings where it was explained very thoroughly that if the income of the farmer could be multiplied seven times you would have a national income that would insure the factory workers of America more dollars than the farmer makes, and would further insure full employment. The factory pay roll and the farmer's income go hand in hand, and so when my friends in the cities talk about high prices for farm products we want you to know that your consumer supply of food, and your industrial workers' good wages, and full employment are absolutely dependent on the income the farmer collects from the crops he raises and the prices he receives for his products.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Is there not danger when you make prices in Washington too high that you will price commodities off the market? I am thinking of peanuts and apples and potatoes at the moment.

Mr. RIZLEY. I do not think the gentleman will contend that this bill could bring about the results which my good farmer friend from Pennsylvania is apprehensive.

Mr. GROSS. Is there not such a thing as having parity prices too high and stimulating production and continuing surpluses?

Mr. RIZLEY. I do not believe the existing law or the parity formula provided herein will result in the condition the gentleman describes.

Mr. GROSS. Well, just think for a little while and you will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This bill is for the purpose of obtaining full production and, of course, will defeat inflation and high prices and it will encourage the farmers and guarantee them a fair price, and that would certainly help the city people as well as the farmers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suppose my friend is very anxious that we, who represent city districts, in properly looking after the farmers in our districts, would do so by supporting this bill; is that correct?

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, my friend knows that I expect his support of this bill. He has always done so, and I hope he will continue to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the observations about price control are correct. On the other hand, we have this bill before us, and it serves a very useful purpose in our national economy, and it is my intention to support the bill. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has been very adroitly making an argument so that those of us who represent city districts should support the bill. Many times in the past those of us not representing farm districts voted to save the farmers of the country. I am sure that when the vote is taken that those of us living in city districts will show our constructiveness by again voting for the passage of the bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extension of the New Deal legislation, and I want to congratulate some of you gentlemen, for again you have proved that you are in favor of legislation that you have criticized and assailed in days gone by. This relief legislation was necessary at that time because of the farmers, due to the unfortunate Republican maladministration, received very little for their crops. People were out of employment and could not even buy at the then low prevailing prices. But, today, the farmer really does not need this encouraging and support-price legislation because prices are higher today than what was then sought

by many of you who strenuously fought for parity prices.

Today nearly all agricultural products are way above parity. Consequently I do not know why this legislation is necessary. It will extend price support up to 1950.

Surely, notwithstanding the failure and the unfortunate lack of legislation by the Republican majority in the interest of the people of the country, I feel that there is no danger that the prices of agricultural products will go down. I do not blame some of you gentlemen representing agricultural districts for wanting higher and higher prices for the farmers. Formerly you insisted that higher prices were necessary in order to stimulate the farmers to produce more. The fact is that the farmers have made greater profits in the last 6 years than ever before in the history of our country. Most of them have paid off their mortgages and have more money in the bank than they ever dreamed they would have. So I do not see why this legislation is necessary.

I realize that some of the things we are trying to legislate for in the interest of some of the products like cotton, tobacco, rice, and even peanuts are of great benefit to the growers of these products, and the legislation may also benefit some of the growers of the other two major products, corn and wheat. However, I believe that the wheat and corn growers feel that they are receiving such a high price, a price that they never even remotely anticipated to obtain for their corn and wheat, that they do not ask for this legislation at this time. They feel that in view of the fact that you have repealed price control they do not have the nerve to come here and ask for price supports on the products they grow.

If you gentlemen who are advocating this legislation would be fair you would say to yourselves that in view of conditions, in view of the high cost of living, that has gone up nearly 50 percent in the last 18 months since the Republicans came into power, we should not do anything that would cause these high prices to continue going higher, as they have from month to month. You do not seem to realize that it is impossible for the ordinary man to maintain himself and his family, because of the high cost of food and the high cost of the necessaries of life. But it seems to me there is a certain amount of selfishness and I realize, of course, there is some selfishness in all of us. I am also selfish to the extent that I should like to bring down the high cost of living for the wage earners and the people of lower incomes. I have spoken frequently against the unfair high prices. I have voted to help the farmers when they needed my help. I remember when the prices of corn, wheat, and cotton were about 25 percent of what they are now, and the farmers could not exist under Hoover's administration, and their farms were being foreclosed and taken away from them. I, in conjunction with others, advocated legislation to help the farmers, but I never dreamed that the situation would develop to such a point that the farmers would receive not only twice as much but four or five times as much for their crops as they did then and that they would insist on still further increasing prices, to such an extent that the wage earners of this country would find it extremely difficult to exist on the wages they are receiving.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, who has always been very interested in his district and in the farmers of the country.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does not believe that this particular legislation contributes to the high cost of living, does he?

Mr. SABATH. I believe that we are guaranteeing the prices so that they will not go below 90 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. That is at some future date.

Mr. SABATH. This is a stimulant, and it will assure the farmers of a higher price. Consequently the people, the tradesmen, and the manipulators of these agricultural products who handle these articles wholesale, and who manipulate the market will see to it that the prices will remain high. There is no immediate sign that the prices are going to come down because we were in hopes—I was not, I will admit—but instead of adopting legislation that would reduce high prices, you gave the manufacturers and the industrialists the privilege and right to voluntarily control prices. You made the people believe that you would keep your promise to arrest the increased cost of living, yes, to bring about reduction in prices. I did not have that confidence. I know these birds, and I know what they would do. They did just what I feared they would do. They started to increase prices instead of reducing them, and if you had had the interest of the consumers at heart, you would not have given them the right to fix prices in their own interest and against the interest of the consumers. As it is, prices today are higher than ever before, and it makes it almost impossible for people of low income to live or even exist.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows the prices now being received will not be affected by the legislation now under consideration, because this legislation only provides a floor below which commodity prices may not go.

Mr. SABATH. In view of that statement, I might say that they may not go below a certain level because we will guarantee the prices. If this guarantee would not be forthcoming, the prices might come down so that the cost of living would be reduced generally.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is true, and I believe the gentleman will agree that the Congress passed the Taft-Hartley bill, the purpose of which was to cripple organized labor so that they could not maintain by collective bargaining the floor under their wages, and it wrecked price control so that there is no ceiling on the price of food, and so that the price of food could go up and their wages could go down. Now they say they must guarantee production by putting this floor under the price of farm commodities. Is it not true that before this New Deal legislation, this so-called support for farm prices, was ever started that we had more than enough food in America, and that there was an abundant surplus of food for everybody, and that food was cheaper—much cheaper in relation to wages than it is now?

Mr. SABATH. There is no question the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is no floor under employment for labor. There is no floor under labor's take-home wages. Now, when the farmers get a surplus of food products why should they not suffer the same results under the free-enterprise system? Let us let this competitive system work in production as the Republicans have legislated in the fields of distribution and consumption.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for propounding that inquiry to me. His views coincide with mine. What I want to say, in addition to what the gentleman stated, is that there has been a general demand throughout the Nation, and we promised the laboring people that we would bring about a floor on wages, namely, a 65 or 75 cents per hour minimum wage, but no legislation has been brought in by the Republican majority and I doubt very much whether it will be brought in during the remainder of this session.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think we have a 40-cent minimum wage law which has a purchasing power of about 23 cents on today's market, and there has been no move on the part of the Republican Party to bring out a 75-cent minimum wage bill.

Mr. SABATH. Well, it was promised, but nothing has been done, and I do not expect anything to be done, as I have said, by the Republican House.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to congratulate the gentleman for the fine statement he has made. I am very much in agreement with everything he has said so far. I, as well as the gentleman from Illinois, for many years have supported these farm programs. I agree with the gentleman it was right to try to help the farmer when prices were depressed and the farmer needed that aid and assistance, and we did come to the aid and assistance of the farmers, but I cannot agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] when he says that we should continue to do this, because I think times have changed. There is no need of this aid and assistance to the farmers. They are getting too much money for the goods they produce. The first problem before the Nation today is the high cost of living, and that is the problem that should be tackled first, and not to come in here and present on this floor today, when prices are the highest in the history of this Nation, a bill which will continue the high prices to the consumers. Our people who live in the cities cannot meet the prices. We have to do something to

reduce prices. This would be a better time to talk about price control and reduction in the cost of living. That is why I will be compelled to vote against this bill at this time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman would advocate a reasonable minimum wage for the workingman, would he not?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is this not simply providing for a reasonable minimum wage for the man who works out in the hot sun?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, but the farmer is receiving much greater compensation in proportion to the wages of the ordinary wage earner. I am glad of the fact that the farmers have been extremely prosperous. Not only have most of them paid off their mortgages, but they have money in the banks. I am told that in many communities the local banks refuse to accept any more money that the farmers are bringing in for deposit. They do not need relief. But the wage earner, because of the outrageously ever-increasing cost of living is much more entitled to have legislation enacted guaranteeing a 75 cents per hour minimum wage scale. He needs aid. He needs assistance. We owe it to ourselves that we should help cut those who need our help and not those who do not need it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. He has yielded to you twice. He should yield to me.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman's question on the minimum wage increase is beside the point, because the very gentlemen who are supporting the support of farm prices have not brought out and probably will not vote for a 75-cent minimum wage. So that question is purely academic.

Mr. SABATH. That, I wish to say, is indeed unfortunate, and it is not due to any lack of effort on my part. In that connection may I say—and I want to conclude—that I exceedingly regret that many of these gentlemen who will be benefited, or whose farmers will be benefited under this price-support program, who have had our support and aid at all times when it was needed and many times even when it was not needed, very seldom do I see them or hear them vote with us on matters that are actually in the interest of those who need our aid and assistance and cooperation. I hope—and I have requested this of you many times—that many of you whose constituents will be the beneficiaries of this legislation will occasionally vote with us when we are trying to help the wage earner, the consumer, and the general public. They need our aid more so than do the farmers at this time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because he always has something of interest to say.

Mr. GAVIN. Permit me to make an observation. I am sorry to see that the distinguished gentleman is in sharp conflict with our former majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on policies here today.

Mr. SABATH. Never mind that; what is the question, please? Time is running.

Mr. GAVIN. I merely asked the gentleman to yield to permit me to make an observation. The gentleman talks like a free enterpriser here today, an advocate of the system where supply and demand govern price; and it is such a contrast to the policy of killing hogs and plowing under of crops, that I find it difficult to reconcile.

Mr. SABATH. I will explain it to the gentleman. I am for free enterprise but unfortunately the gentleman and most of those on his side are misled in their thinking about free enterprise, for we actually have no free enterprise under today's conditions due to legislation by the gentleman's party in the interest of the trusts and combines who control production as well as prices, and who force small-business men and manufacturers out of business, thus actually destroying free enterprise.

I am for free enterprise. I want to give the little fellow a chance, an opportunity to exist and to live; but these big combines for whom you legislate day in and day out, and these big interests that are taking up the time of this House and the gentleman and his associates are doing all in their power to safeguard, protect, and aid them notwithstanding that they make millions and billions in profits. But the gentleman's party never finds time unfortunately to help the needy and deserving people who should have their support.

REPUBLICANS SUGGEST PEOPLE EAT LESS TO COMBAT HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. Speaker, the remedy suggested by one of the Republican candidates for the Presidency to combat the high cost of living was for the people to eat less. Of course, that gratuitous remark was not necessary for the people of low incomes or even of medium incomes. That might apply to those whom the Republicans have at all times aided to accumulate greater profits and who are responsible for the present high cost of living. Today the Republican candidates, instead of being interested in feeding the people with food, are feeding them with the fear of communism and more communism. What a lot of bunk, and this is because their record has been and is such that they cannot go before the American voters and discuss their accomplishments in the interest of the people. If the Republicans had not originally emasculated price control and later bludgeoned the President to yield to their vicious demands, the prices of food would not have increased up to 50 and 60 percent since the Republicans came into power.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Mississippi, I observe, wants to ask me a question and I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], because he always has something worth while to suggest.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my friend for his compliment and I am sure he is not in the position of the Greek bearing gifts, either, when he says it.

The gentleman who has been such an ardent supporter of the so-called New Deal——

Mr. SABATH. I have been and I am proud of it.

Mr. COLMER. Which was responsible for this program in the beginning, certainly is not going to be inconsistent now and oppose its continuation?

Mr. SABATH. No; I am not going to oppose it in the hope that you direct representatives of the farmers will not persist in aiding the big farmers and the manipulators to continue in their avariciousness in boosting to unnecessary heights the cost of their products because this legislation, though it may aid them temporarily, may bring about such a reaction that may be destructive to the present favorable conditions. In that connection, may I call your attention to the fact that about 20 years ago the prices of farm products were continually dropping and that we appropriated $500,000,000 for the purpose of steadying the market and prices. When the $500,000,000 was expended, shortly thereafter there was a still greater drop in the prices of farm commodities. Cotton then sold at 6 cents a pound, wheat at 29 cents a bushel, corn at 23 cents, cattle and hogs at 3 cents a pound on the hoof, and the remainder of the farm products dropped to extremely low prices. Consequently, I advised and urged the farmers and their friends not to persist, by artificial means and through Government price support, to hold the prices way above parity prices that have continuously increased the cost of living to such an extent that many people were obliged to reduce their consumption because the earning power of the consumers made it impossible for them to buy sufficient food to properly feed their families and themselves.

As conditions exist today, unless wages are increased and people are able to continue to buy sufficient food, the prices of farm products and other commodities are bound to go down. We then may find a repetition of the conditions that brought about the crash in 1930, which continued, unfortunately, until President Roosevelt and the Democratic Congress took courageous action to alleviate conditions, putting millions of unemployed to work, which enabled them again to purchase enough food to live decently. Consequently, it is of great importance that an increase in wages be provided the wage earners, which is bound to enure to the benefit of the farmers and to the country in general.

Mr. Speaker, all I am trying to bring home to you gentlemen whose constituents will be the beneficiaries under this legislation is that once in a while you should show some reciprocity or show some consideration to us who always at all times support you in your legislation in the interest of the farmers and our country. I admit that when the farmers are prosperous it is good for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I would like without any bias to ask the gentleman a question. I assume that the gentleman as a Democrat backs up President Truman's policies.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, do not bring in politics, please.

Mr. FULTON. I mean policies, not politics.

Mr. SABATH. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. FULTON. How can the gentleman explain that President Truman, the leader of his party, wants to hold prices down, on the one hand, by price control, then, as I understand it, favors this legislation to push the prices up, on the other hand? How can those two situations be reconciled?

Mr. SABATH. He deals with the masses, he deals with the consumers of this country. He wants to be fair and just, and that is the reason he is urging and has demanded price control and other legislation that will protect and safeguard these people who are not represented somehow or other by the majority.

Mr. FULTON. How can he control them, then push the prices up?

Mr. SABATH. It is because he feels he should continue to live up to the New Deal principles, he still feels prices are higher than was expected and higher than the parity that was urged. He feels there will be no harm done by this legislation. Now, I have not consulted with him, but I know he means well, and that he has the interest of the country at heart, not that I agree with him on everything. However, I know that he wants to do what he can to help the masses, the ordinary people, especially the white-collar class, the wage earners, the small-business men, and the actual dirt farmers who need our help and assistance.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill to extend the price-support program on agricultural commodities shall have my support. Earlier in this session I introduced a bill which would extend the existing support prices at 90 percent of parity.

This bill before us today would call for support prices for cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts, and milk and its products at 90 percent of parity. It also calls for support prices for a considerable list of other commodities. It is my understanding that a committee amendment will be offered which will specifically fix the support price on hogs, poultry, and eggs at 90 percent of parity also. I shall support this committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot permit farm prices to sink to a disastrously low level. This program will prevent that from happening. It is not only desirable but it is absolutely necessary to the well-being of this country that we do not have a farm depression.

In addition to the effect upon our general economy this program should be enacted for the benefit of the individual farm families of the country. The men and women and their children who toil 10, 12, and 15 hours a day, take the risk of drought, floods, hailstorms, grasshoppers, and other destructive forces, are entitled to receive a fair price for their products sold in the market place. Business and industry have certain methods available to support their prices. Labor is protected by the wage-and-hour law and by the mass action of collective bargaining. Our economy cannot move forward unless agriculture is assured of its fair share of the national income.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support this measure.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

PARITY

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, at the outset of the current session of the Congress, I introduced a bill known as H. R. 5179 which, among other things, provided for extending the farm price-support program for 4 years. While my bill differs in some aspects from the proposal which the resolution now under consideration will make in order, I intend to support the best legislation that can be passed in the House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the price-support program merely establishes a floor based on parity below which a farmer need not sell his products. It is well to remember that this thing called parity is the keystone of our present farm program. For more than 20 years the attainment of economic equality for agricultural producers has been one of the major objectives of the Congress. Among the earliest attempts to correct the farm products price situation by legislation were the McNary-Haugen bills which were introduced during the period 1924–28. Briefly, these bills would have permitted higher domestic than export prices for farm products that enter into foreign trade. Another attempt to correct the disparity between the prices of farm and nonfarm products was made in 1930 by the creation of the Farm Board. From these earlier legislative efforts, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 was evolved in which the relation between farm and nonfarm products was adopted as the measure of the economic welfare of farmers. It was in this act that the term "parity" was first defined and it has been redefined in various laws enacted since then—sometimes as parity income, sometimes as parity price. Stated simply, however, the parity principle means that the farmer will receive a price for his product which will give it an exchange value, for things the farmer needs to buy, equivalent to that in a specified base period.

There are three steps in computing the parity price of a given commodity:

First. The base price of the commodity is determined by averaging the prices of that commodity during the base period.

Second. An index of prices paid by farmers is determined. To calculate the index number, some 86 items used in family living and 94 items used in farm production plus interest per acre on farm indebtedness and taxes per acre on farm real estate are combined in a weighted index. This procedure gives an over-all index of prices paid by farmers.

Third. The final calculation of a parity price is determined by multiplying the base price by the index number of the current period.

Thus, parity is a changing rather than a fixed-price concept in that it shifts from month to month. There have been many proposals for revising the present formula. And, frankly, I believe the subject should be thoroughly explored. I have in mind, particularly, the desirability of reexamining the relationship between prices of various agricultural commodities. The present formula freezes relationships that existed in the base period, and in several instances, at least, the relationships appear to be out of line. But this is not the hour for discussing modification of the parity formula.

Mr. Speaker, during and since the war the majority of farmers have not been particularly concerned about support prices for the obvious reason that the prices of most agricultural commodities within the scope of the program have been above parity. However, the recent fluctuations in the grain market have directed public attention increasingly to the price-support system.

Although the system was originally intended to bolster prices of certain basic farm commodities at a time of deep agricultural depression when farm surpluses were acting as a price depressant it developed during the war years to be a means of encouraging expanded production. The need for expanded production is no less acute in this postwar period. The world is still short of food. We must plan our production in order to obtain a maximum harvest. We must assure the producers in advance of a ready market and a fair return for their produce. We cannot promise farmers that unfavorable weather conditions will not destroy their crops, but we can offer them an incentive to maximum production. Price-support legislation does not guarantee a farmer full parity price for his products, but it does establish a floor under which he need not sell the products covered by the program. Surely this price-support program is the best available protection the American people have against the inflationary effect of a short crop.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge every Member of this body to ponder the significance of the war posters that all of us remember so well: "Food will win the war and write the peace."

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain communications in the speech he will make when the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a list of the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control projects as agreed

upon by the conferees on the civil functions appropriations bill.

The matter referred to follows:

PROJECT AND AMOUNT ALLOWED BY CONFEREES FOR CONSTRUCTION

Flood Control

Arizona: Holbrook	$30,000
Arkansas:	
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	8,200,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	14,000,000
Carden's Bottom drainage district No. 2	700,000
Conway County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 8	390,000
Conway County levee district No. 6	33,000
Crawford County levee district	600,000
Little Rock	310,300
Little Rock to Pine Bluff	400,000
Narrows Reservoir, Little Missouri Basin	2,800,000
Nimrod Reservoir	75,000
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	750,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La	1,000,000
West of Morrilton	500,000
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, Ark. and La	760,000
California:	
Folsom Reservoir	1,000,000
Isabella Reservoir	2,500,000
Los Angeles County drainage area:	
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	200,000
Sawtelle-Westward	400,000
Los Angeles River Channel	4,138,000
Lopez Flood Control Basin	
Merced County stream group	935,000
Pajaro River	185,000
Prado Dam	263,500
Pine Flat Reservoir	3,500,000
Sacramento River minor tributaries	500,000
Ventura River	800,000
Cherry Valley Reservoir	600,000
Farmington Reservoir	250,000
Colorado:	
Cherry Creek Reservoir	7,000,000
Colorado Springs	605,600
Creede	159,700
Georgia:	
Allatoona Reservoir	8,000,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	7,700,000
Macon	200,000
Idaho:	
Heise-Roberts area	351,000
Lucky Peak Reservoir, Boise River	500,000
Illinois:	
Coal Creek drainage and levee district	700,000
Degognia and Fountain Bluff drainage and levee district	240,000
East St. Louis and vicinity	1,000,000
Farm Creek Reservoirs	2,500,000
Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	64,000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district	730,000
Harrisonville and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	323,500
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas, and Kerton Valley drainage and levee districts	617,000
Mounds and Mounds City	884,000
Prairie Du Rocher and vicinity	900,000
Stringtown-Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	730,000
The Sny Basin	1,500,000
Wood River drainage and levee district	1,500,000
Reevesville	651,000
Indiana:	
Cagles Mill Reservoir	$1,500,000
Cannelton	640,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek section	1,000,000
Jeffersonville-Clarksville	235,000
Levee unit 8	243,000
Muncie	78,000
McGinnis levee	420,000
New Albany	1,050,000
Shufflebarger levee	420,000
Iowa:	
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo	750,000
Coralville Reservoir	700,000
Council Bluffs	886,000
Denison	52,000
Dry Run	320,000
Elkport, Turkey River	30,100
Missouri River agricultural levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to mouth, Iowa, Nebr., Kans., and Mo	8,000,000
Missouri River, Kensler's Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak	700,000
Red Rock Reservoir	1,000,000
Little Sioux River	200,000
Kansas:	
Fall River Reservoir	4,400,000
Kanopolis Reservoir	48,000
Kansas Citys, Mo., and Kans	7,000,000
Wichita and Valley Center	490,000
Kentucky:	
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn., and Ky. (See Tennessee.)	
Covington	900,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	200,000
Dewey Reservoir	2,071,000
Louisville	4,000,000
Newport	1,800,000
Taylorsville	80,000
Uniontown	350,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir	12,400,000
Maysville	400,000
Ashland	420,000
Hawesville	200,000
Louisiana:	
Aloha-Rigolette area	500,000
Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou	34,700
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir. (See Arkansas.)	
Bayou Teche and Vermilion River	600,000
Mermentau River	1,000,000
Pineville	60,800
Shreveport	1,000,000
Jonesville	268,000
Lake Pontchartrain	900,000
Maryland:	
Savage River Dam	400,000
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgely, W. Va	500,000
Massachusetts:	
Birch Hill Reservoir	100,000
Chicopee	256,000
Holyoke	755,000
Springdale	315,300
Michigan:	
Mount Clemens	284,000
Minnesota:	
Lac Qui Parle Reservoir	113,200
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers	1,000,000
Missouri:	
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)	
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Iowa.)	
Clearwater Reservoir	1,182,100
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff	153,400
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.)	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth, Iowa, Nebr., Kans., and Mo. (See Iowa.)	
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)	
Perry County Nos. 1, 2, and 3	800,000
Montana:	
Forsyth	$74,200
Nebraska:	
Bartley	96,000
Harlan County Reservoir	8,000,000
Indianola	13,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to mouth, Iowa, Nebr., Kans., and Mo. (See Iowa.)	
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak. (See Iowa.)	
Omaha	2,400,000
New Hampshire:	
Blackwater Reservoir	231,000
Franklin Falls Reservoir	150,800
West Peterboro Reservoir	600,000
New York:	
Almond Reservoir	1,808,200
East Sidney Reservoir	3,000,000
Elmira	1,000,000
Lancaster	40,000
Montour Falls	1,130,000
Mount Morris Reservoir	3,000,000
Olean	733,000
Syracuse	1,100,000
Whitney Point Reservoir	57,700
Portville	400,000
North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	9,000,000
North Dakota:	
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)	
Baldhill Reservoir	784,500
Beulah	87,000
Garrison Reservoir	26,000,000
Hazen	35,500
Mandan	334,000
Homme Reservoir	478,300
Ohio:	
Berlin Reservoir	204,300
Burr Oak Reservoir	239,400
Cincinnati	285,000
Delaware Reservoir	1,494,900
Dillon Reservoir	1,500,000
Massillon	1,500,000
Muskingum River Reservoirs	1,200,000
Portsmouth-New Boston	2,407,300
West Fork Reservoir	1,000,000
Big Walnut Creek Reservoir	600,000
Oklahoma:	
Canton Reservoir	700,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	500,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir	7,000,000
Great Salt Plains Reservoir	125,000
Hulah Reservoir	2,000,000
Kaw	102,000
Oklahoma City floodway	500,000
Polecat Creek	750,000
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	2,800,000
Wister Reservoir	3,900,000
Arkansas River Basin (see also Arkansas.)	
Oregon:	
Amazon Creek	67,000
Arlington	35,000
Coquille River	93,000
Detroit Reservoir	3,500,000
Dorena Reservoir	3,000,000
Fern Ridge Reservoir	155,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	5,000,000
Mill Four drainage district	22,000
Multnomah drainage district No. 1	83,800
Nehalem River	15,000
Umpqua River and tributaries	116,000
Willamette River (bank protection)	500,000
Milton Freewater, Walla Walla River	300,000
Pennsylvania:	
Conemaugh River Reservoir	7,875,000
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir	1,700,000
Latrobe	146,000
Loyalhanna	276,200
Johnstown	402,000
Punxsutawney	1,428,100

Pennsylvania—Continued	
Sunbury	$1,390,600
Williamsport	1,900,000
York	203,100
Youghiogheny River Reservoir	299,200
South Dakota:	
Fort Randall Reservoir	18,000,000
Hot Springs	175,000
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr. and S. Dak. (See Iowa.)	
Oake Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	2,000,000
Tennessee:	
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	9,000,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. (See Kentucky.)	
Texas:	
Benbrook Reservoir	3,200,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla. (See Oklahoma.)	
Grapevine Reservoir	3,300,000
Hords Creek Reservoir	280,000
Lavon Reservoir	2,800,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)	
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway	4,000,000
Texarkana Reservoir	3,350,000
Whitney Reservoir	4,000,000
Brady	300,000
Belton Reservoir	500,000
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	500,000
Utah: Redmond	125,000
Vermont: Union Village Reservoir	1,500,000
Virginia:	
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C. (See North Carolina.)	
Philpott Reservoir	2,000,000
Washington:	
Diking and improvement district No. 4	70,400
Mud Mountain Reservoir	543,700
Tacoma	650,000
Mill Creek	400,000
West Virginia:	
Bluestone Reservoir	5,713,800
Parkersburg	2,450,900
Point Pleasant	800,000
Cumberland, Md. and Ridgley, W. Va. (See Md.)	
Snagging and clearing	1,000,000
Emergency bank protection	1,000,000
Planning	3,318,000
Subtotals	
Preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies	5,000,000
Maintenance of completed work	3,220,000
Salaries, office, Chief of Engineers	570,000
Emergency repairs	1,000,000
Transfer to U. S. Geological Survey	375,000
Transfer to U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service	100,000
Total, flood control, general	339,491,100
Flood control, general emergency fund	3,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	61,000,000
Emergency fund, tributaries of Mississippi River	500,000
Flood control, Sacramento River, Calif	1,750,000
Total, all flood control	405,741,100

Planning funds of $3,318,000 are agreed to. In the conference report, the following amounts are earmarked for the projects listed:

To be used	
Whitter Narrows, Calif	$50,000
Farmington Reservoir, Calif	45,000
Lucky Peak, Idaho	90,000
Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr	250,000
Eufaula Reservoir, Okla	400,000
Bear Creek Reservoir, Pa	200,000
West Fork Reservoir, W. Va	60,000
Total	1,095,000
Not to be used	
Toronto Reservoir, Kans	−$30,000
Tuttle Creek, Kans	−35,000
Boswell Reservoir, Okla	−30,000
Hugo Reservoir, Okla	−30,000
Pudding River, Oreg	−29,000
Gathright and Falling Spring, Va	−35,000
Total	−189,000

The balance of planning funds is to be allocated by the Corps of Engineers to projects included in their justifications.

Rivers and harbors

PROJECT AND AMOUNT ALLOWED BY CONFEREES FOR CONSTRUCTION	
Alaska: Wrangell Narrows	$1,038,400
California:	
Crescent City Harbor	500,000
Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors	253,000
Napa River	865,000
Sacramento River	250,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay	900,000
Connecticut:	
Bridgeport Harbor	100,000
Clinton Harbor	61,800
New Haven Harbor	1,200,000
Norwalk Harbor	75,000
Stamford Harbor	45,000
Greenwich Harbor	71,400
Delaware: Delaware River, N. J., Pa., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea	500,000
Florida:	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam	3,000,000
Hollywood Harbor (Port Everglades)	376,000
St. Johns River, Jacksonville to Lake Harney	255,100
St. Johns River, Jacksonville to the ocean	800,000
St. Josephs Bay	378,400
Tampa Harbor	500,000
Savannah Harbor	1,020,000
Illinois:	
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (Exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn.)	1,000,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers	9,000,000
Iowa: Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa	3,000,000
Louisiana:	
Calcasieu River and Pass	500,000
Waterway from Empire, La., to the Gulf of Mexico	250,000
Intracoastal Waterway, Apalachee Bay, Fla., to the Mexican border section, (New Orleans district)	2,000,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La	1,159,600
Maine: Portland Harbor	1,300,000
Maryland:	
Baltimore Harbor and Channels	871,400
Black Walnut Harbor	28,000
Duck Point Cove	26,000
Lower Thoroughfare, at or near Wenona, Deals Island	28,600
Maryland—Continued	
Pocomoke River	$6,000
Town Creek	32,500
Massachusetts: Fall River Harbor	750,000
Michigan:	
Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River	225,000
Grand Traverse Bay Harbor	109,500
Keweenaw waterway	75,000
Manistee Harbor	255,500
St. Marys River	3,000,000
Minnesota:	
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (Exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn.) (See same project under Illinois.)	
St. Paul Harbor	199,600
St. Anthony Falls	1,000,000
Two Harbors (Agate Bay)	500,000
Missouri: Missouri River, mouth to Kansas City	2,000,000
Montana: Missouri River at Fort Peck	3,700,000
New York:	
Black Rock Channel and Tonowanda Harbor	193,000
Buffalo Harbor	500,000
Hudson River	269,000
New York and New Jersey Channels	2,200,000
Wilson Harbor	300,000
North Carolina: Cape Fear River, at and below Wilmington	1,264,500
Ohio:	
Cleveland Harbor	2,000,000
Ohio River, open channel work	199,500
Oregon:	
Columbia River at Bonneville	500,000
Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg	775,000
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg	326,000
Longview Harbor	154,000
Coos Bay	1,500,000
McNary Lock and Dam, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash	22,000,000
Saquina Bay and Harbor	109,400
Pennsylvania:	
Monongahela River (Lock 2)	1,000,000
Schuylkill River	1,295,000
Rhode Island: Wickford Harbor	95,000
South Carolina:	
Charleston Harbor	178,000
Winyah Bay	856,600
Texas:	
Brazos Island Harbor	325,000
Houston Ship Channel	500,000
Neches-Angelina Rivers	1,818,100
Sabine-Neches waterway	480,000
The Intracoastal Waterway, Apalachee Bay, Fla., to the Mexican border section (Galveston district)	2,119,000
Trinity River, channel to Liberty	750,000
Virginia:	
Broad Creek	32,700
Cranes Creek	7,500
Hoskins Creek	25,000
Norfolk Harbor	108,000
Washington:	
Columbia River at Baker Bay	60,000
Olympia Harbor	187,000
Willapa River and Harbor	74,000
West Virginia: Morgantown Lock and Dam, Monongahela River	3,000,000
Planning	1,924,000
Subtotal, construction and planning	90,412,100

Maintenance	$51,000,000
Operating and care	20,000,000
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies	2,050,000
Removing sunken vessels	300,000
Survey of northern and northwestern lakes	300,000
Prevention of deposits in New York Harbor	350,000
California Debris Commission	12,000
Salaries, office, Chief of Engineers	540,000
Printing for River and Harbor Board	40,000
River and Harbor Board expenses	400,000
Beach Erosion Board expenses	160,000
Work under sec. 3, Rivers and Harbors Act, Mar. 2, 1945	300,000
Transfer to U. S. Geological Survey	125,000
Transfer to Fish and Wildlife Service	1,000,000
Subtotal, maintenance, etc	76,577,000
Total	166,939,100

Planning funds of $1,924,000 are agreed to. In the conference report the following amounts are earmarked for the projects listed:

Alabama-Coosa River	$290,000
Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla	500,000
Buford Dam, Ga	400,000
Calumet-Sag, Ill	200,000
Total	1,390,000

The balance of planning funds is to be allocated by the Corps of Engineers to projects included in their justifications.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep this debate on the level it belongs, it might be well to spend a few minutes going into the history of this thing.

The first price-support program in the United States was probably in the twenties, when the Federal Farm Board was created and when some $500,000,000 was appropriated. The money was used largely to support the price of wheat. It ended up, of course, as we all know, with about a 50-percent loss to the Government, though the answer is that, the wheat farmers had the money, anyway, but the United States Treasury was out some $250,000,000.

Then we drifted along until we had the advent of the so-called New Deal. Under the support program as then set up, there were only five crops involved, and there was a provision to support prices at 52 to 75 percent of parity. Like many of these things that we get into arguments about, being honest about it, we must admit some of this is due to world conditions, even at that time; and the situation being as it was, none of these programs had a chance to demonstrate their exact value or what they could accomplish.

Then we followed along up until shortly before we entered into World War II. Then we had the Committee on Banking and Currency under the Stabilization Act set up a support program, the members of the committee being the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. CRAWFORD]. It was purely a bipartisan approach, and they set up this legislation of 90 percent of parity.

There is no use reviewing what we accomplished during the war. We did two things. There was probably no piece of legislation that ever stimulated production of agricultural products like the Steagall amendment. Why? Because these farmers know what the answer is for overproduction. They have been through many years of it. People would like to think that we had it pretty well solved in 1939, but we had in 1939 54-cent wheat, 5-cent hogs, and 8-cent cotton; in other words, we were bogged down in pretty near as bad shape as we were in 1932. But, in 1939 when we adopted this new set-up, the third thing we tried to do in connection with supporting prices in this country—and you will have to admit that with all of the mistakes that possibly have been made, and you and I probably have made many of them—but I think that every man that was here when Marvin Jones administered this program feels a sense of commendation much more than he was recognized for during the war years. With all due respect to Mr. Anderson, I have always observed, but I may be wrong, that he did not spend as much time on this program as he did on some other programs, and I think the program has not worked out so effectively; it has been subject to more criticism than any other. But, that is not the fault of the law; that is the fault of the administration of the law. I want to call this to the attention of my good friend from Illinois, when the bill was introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the commodities that had the 90-percent support were the ones that were in the original program put through in 1933 or 1935, or whatever it was, and that is corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. That has been modified since in this bill or will probably be modified on this floor. I just recite that little history to show the constructive attempt that has been made in connection with this support program.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this price-support program based on parity to insure the farmers of this country a floor below which prices of farm products cannot fall. The basic principle behind this bill is sound. It has been proven to be sound. But it is strange, to say the least, that the leadership brings to the floor of the House such a bill at this time.

The farmers of the country are not in trouble today. The price of food is at an all-time high. The latest BLS figures show that the cost of living in April of this year was even higher than it was in January.

Our concern for the farmer today is unwarranted. There is certainly no imminent danger of surplus food on the farms and falling farm commodity prices.

The very real problem that does confront us, and with which we should be most concerned, is whether or not the city consumer can continue to buy enough food under present prices to maintain a balanced diet and keep the farmers prosperous.

If we were to have an economic bust in the country, then indeed the farmers would be in real trouble—as would everyone else. And then indeed this parity-price-support program would be helpful to him. But surely we are not going to proceed recklessly and permit economic disaster to overtake us.

Mr. Gallup, over the radio on Wednesday night, told listeners that his recent poll disclosed that the chief concern of voters today is not Russia but the high cost of living and housing—crowded living quarters are making life unbearable for so many people.

Of course, some of us know before Mr. Gallup took his poll that the high cost of living is the issue of greatest importance to the American people, and that housing is a very close second to the high cost of living.

I have been deeply concerned, as you know, about the rising cost of living, not only as it affects our domestic problems but as it affects our international problems as well.

I made a study of the prices of food in Canada, which I now call to the attention of the House. I inserted it in the Appendix of yesterday's RECORD. It is a study of how price controls were handled in Canada. I found this information very interesting because Canada is so much like us as far as their wealth and natural resources and agricultural production, and so forth, are concerned.

They, too, have been exporting foods. In certain commodities they have exported more in proportion to their production than we have. Canada, as you know, had price control. Canadians wanted to remove those controls, just as we did. But they went about it in a very systematic and orderly way. They removed in 1947 practically all controls on foods and services except on sugar and rent. They retained their price-control machinery, however, while the Government very carefully watched to see what was going to happen to prices. When the price of food began to shoot up, they reimposed price controls at once. As a result, the Canadians have been able to check the rising cost of living.

As you will recall, I made a comparison of food prices before and after price controls were taken off and reported to the House 6 weeks ago. I have now compared our food prices with the Canadian food prices. You will find that the American people are paying 10, 15, or 20 cents more, item per item, than the Canadians, and that meat today is twice as high, or even two and a half times as high in this country as it is in Canada. I urge the Members to study this Canadian report. It is really very revealing. It appears in the Thursday, June 10, 1948, RECORD.

I think you will find illuminating the fact that, whereas the cheapest store in Washington sold 10 pounds of flour for 89 cents, in Canada the average price for the best grade of flour in Montreal was

60 cents. This same average price held throughout the Dominion.

Butter was 72 cents in Canada; in the United States it was 93 cents a month ago. Grade A large eggs were 49 cents a dozen in Montreal on May 12, 1948. In Washington a month ago they were 65 cents a dozen in the cheapest store. Three pounds of round steak were $1.50 in the Dominion—$1.51 in Montreal. In Washington they were $2.76. And so on through every item for which we have comparable figures.

Members of this House will be particularly interested to note that in a large city in Canada, where prices are generally higher than in rural areas, lamb fores shoulder roasts were selling for 29 cents a pound. In Washington, D. C., the price of leg-of-lamb roasts on April 26, 1948, varied from 69 to 79 cents a pound. Shoulder roasts were approximately 59 cents a pound. Shoulder lamb chops were 39 cents a pound in Canada; in Washington shoulder chops varied from 69 to 79 cents a pound, and loin and rib chops from 89 cents to $1.25 a pound. Steak in Montreal was under 60 cents. In Washington it varied from 89 cents to $1.25.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I have said many times before, that this Congress must act to check inflation if we are to keep our economy sound and make good on our commitments abroad.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], I ask unanimous consent that he may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ISSUANCE OF LAND PATENT TO CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN HAWAII

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6252) to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, after "Lots", insert "117."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file the reports on the bills H. R. 5464, H. R. 4962, H. R. 451, H. R. 4159.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a very fine article by Bernard Baruch regarding what the United States has done for the world during the war and since. I find the cost is $284. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that it may be included.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Illinois State Journal.

STABILIZING PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6248, with Mr. ANDERSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, it would be very interesting to go into a general discussion of the high cost of living, the price of agricultural commodities, the income of farmers compared with the income of the rest of the population, and all that sort of thing, but I will not take the time to do it now. I believe my time can better be employed by explaining as briefly as I can just what this bill does. That is what I will proceed to do at this time.

This bill extends the provisions of various price-support programs, some of which have been in effect since the 1938 AAA Act, and others which were inaugurated during the war period.

I want to briefly go through the bill, section by section. Section 1 (a) deals with the basic commodities, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, cotton, and peanuts. It provides that prices on those commodities shall be supported at 90 percent of parity until June 30, 1950.

I might explain it is not intended to support the price of crops grown or produced in 1950, but the extra 6 months is added in order to take care of the marketing of crops which are grown in 1949.

The 90-percent provision applies to all farmers who cooperate in the program, provided marketing quotas have not been disapproved by producers.

Another change which the bill makes, as compared with the previous law, is that under this bill the method of price support not only includes loans but also purchases, and other market operations on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation, thus giving an opportunity to put into effect a broader program than would otherwise be the case.

Section 1 (b) deals with what are known as Steagall commodities. These are the commodities which are covered by the so-called Steagall amendment which was a part of the stabilization act passed during the war, and which provided in effect that as to those commodities upon which the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator might ask farmers to increase production, a support price of not less than 90 percent of parity would be put into effect.

In this bill as reported we provide with one exception that in the case of Steagall commodities the price support for the period between December 31, 1948, and June 30, 1950, shall be not less than 60 percent of parity rather than not less than 90 percent as is the case at the present time.

The exceptions in this bill as to the Steagall commodities are on milk and its products. These are to be supported at 90 percent of parity. That is the only exception contained in the bill which you have before you, but the Committee on Agriculture has directed me to offer a committee amendment which will include along with milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs as commodities to be supported at not less than 90 percent of parity with the further provision that potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, shall be supported at not less than 90 percent.

Another provision contained in this bill and which is not included in the present law is this—and I quote:

In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

That provision will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to impose production goals and marketing regulations upon commodities which are in overproduction or threatened overproduction; in other words, it will give him some authority to deal with a situation like the potato situation with which we have been confronted for the past 3 years.

Section 1 (c) extends price supports on wool.

Section 1 (d) is an extension of a provision in existing law which provides that agricultural commodities, other than those included in the provisions of sections 1a, 1b, and 1c, may be supported through lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture to the extent that funds are available for that purpose. In the case of those commodities we have included the provision that the Secretary of Agriculture as a prerequisite to support shall require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations. This affords some control over actual or anticipated overproduction.

Section 2 simply provides that from any funds available to the Department of Agriculture or any agency under its direction for price support or surplus disposal the Secretary is authorized to use such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1.

Section 3 is a restatement of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted by section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act. It broadens the present section 22, which I am sure most of you know authorizes the President upon a certain showing being made to put into effect an import fee or an import quota upon those commodities the importation of which renders ineffective or materially interferes with a price-support program. At the present time there are in effect import quotas upon certain types and kinds of cotton and upon wheat and wheat flour. As far as my recollection goes, there are no quotas on other commodities at this time. You can very easily see the reason for the provision. There is no logic and no reason in supporting the price of an agricultural commodity in this country if we are going to permit that program to be rendered ineffective by imports.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman from Kansas has made a very clear explanation of this bill. I want to assure him, in the first place, that I certainly intend to support this measure. But we have this situation in New Jersey. We have six so-called basic commodities, three of which probably are basic—wheat, corn, and cotton. Then we have added peanuts, rice, and tobacco. That is very nice and very fine for the sections that are interested in those crops.

What are we going to do in this bill or in the long-range program in connection with fruits and vegetables, asparagus, tomatoes, garden truck and such which is raised in my State of New Jersey and which supplies incidentally those commodities to the tables of two of the largest cities in America? I am wondering how they fare under this program and whether the gentleman considers this program is entirely equitable with respect to those crops. I know the gentleman is concerned because I discussed the matter with him. Of course, I know one of the difficulties is that those crops are perishable and it is hard to handle them under a parity program, but I would like some assurance from the gentleman that this bill or some subsequent legislation is going to take care of the farmers in New Jersey as well as the farmers of the Middle West and South.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has asked me a very pertinent question and one that I know is of general interest to the producers of such crops as fruits and vegetables in all sections of the country. It is certainly a proper question to be asked at this time. The gentleman himself has pointed out that one of the difficulties in carrying out a loan or purchase program on such commodities is that they are perishable. However, I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that in my opinion there is just as great an obligation on the part of the Government to protect the producers of those commodities he mentioned as there is to protect the producers of the basic commodities. The fact it cannot be done in the same way is no reason why we should not attempt to support and maintain the prices of those commodities insofar as there are means available to do so. I think the answer to the gentleman's question is not to be found in a price-support program identical with those on storable commodities, because that would not be practical, but I think it is to be found in efforts which may be made and devices which may be used to expand the consumption of agricultural commodities; by the more extensive use of marketing agreements, and in the stop-loss support at a lower percentage of parity than 90 percent.

In this bill today we are seeking to taper off wartime price support and build a bridge to a comprehensive long-range program. Certainly the question which my good friend from New Jersey raises is one which must be given every consideration in the working out of such a program.

The immediate effect of this bill is merely to extend an existing program which does not, except in a few instances, cover the commodities to which the gentleman from New Jersey refers.

Mr. HAND. I am very thankful to have the gentleman's assurance.

Mr. Chairman, under permission previously granted me in the House, I am extending at this point in the RECORD telegrams and other communications relating to this subject:

BRIDGETON, N. J., *May 30, 1948.*

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAND: The organization of which I am secretary, the New Jersey-Pennsylvania Cooperative Tomato Growers Association, representing tomato growers in the New Jersey-eastern Pennsylvania area, favor a system of Government support similar to that employed by the six so-called basic commodities. We feel that it is very important to the economy of the country that farm income be maintained in line with other segments of our economy. This support set-up, which is substantially a method of keeping supply within demand, seems to us to be the only remaining approach to what has heretofore been a chaotic condition. As you may know, our organization, in conjunction with growers groups from California, Utah, Indiana, and New York State, have been strongly resisting cuts of substantially $4 per ton on can-house tomatoes. The only weapon growers have at their disposal is not to grow. It seems a crime against humanity that farmers working together country-wide must create a condition of scarcity to the detriment of the consumer in order to achieve cost of production. To us it seems only wise that American agriculture should be kept in a position of preparedness, just as important to America as our Army, Navy, and 70-group Air Force. If it is fair for the Government to grant the United States railroads an increase on freight rates and run our fertilizer prices up $5 per ton, is it too much to ask the Government to give us a hand? Organized agriculture is rapidly learning the methods of other economic groups, and we feel that Government's place as an arbitrator in the future will be very necessary for the well-being of all in America. In the Aiken bill we feel that the door should be left open for organized fruit and vegetable growers to write their own program for the acceptance or rejection of the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department. We ask for your support in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH G. HANCOCK.

BRIDGETON, N. J., *May 30, 1948.*

Congressman T. MILLET HAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Bringing to your attention the thinking of fruit and vegetable growers in State regarding S. 2318; large number of commodity organizations and county boards of agriculture have gone on record in favor of price support for fruit and vegetables because of the poor economic position of these commodities. We strongly feel they should have the same treatment in any long-range agricultural bill as the six basic crops. We are now working on an amendment to cover this. However, if bill is brought on floor of Senate and passed before our amendment is presented, wish to present it to House and conference committee.

KENNETH S. ROBERTS,
President, Cumberland County Board of Agriculture.

BRIDGETON, N. J., *May 30, 1948.*

T. MILLET HAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Bringing to your attention the reaction of the New Jersey Cooperative Asparagus Growers Association, Inc., regarding S. 2318. This organization with a large number of other State organizations have gone on record in favor of price support fruits and

vegetables. In 1947 processed asparagus growers took a 45-percent cut in price. This is ruinous and will drive an $8,000,000 raw-product commodity out of State. In 1948 this association was able to get for growers one-half cent increase which merely covers increase cost over 1947. We strongly feel we should have the same protection in any long-time agricultural bill as six basic crops. Vegetable growers now working on an amendment to cover this. However, if bill is brought on floor of Senate and passed before our amendment is presented, wish to present it to House and conference committee.

GEORGE N. SHILLINGSBURG,
Secretary.

VAUX HALL FARMS,
Bridgeton, N. J.

HON. T. MILLET HAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your letter I feel that it is very necessary to start a long-range agricultural program. We who produce the so-called nonbasic vegetables, etc., feel that we should have the right to decide and to have some protection similar to that given the basic products. I insist that we should lock the door before the horse is stolen and not do what we did after the last war—let everything go down for agriculture too fast—and, of course, drag everyone along with us. I feel that if we can keep our economy more nearly on a level, we can avoid the terrific spectacle of the last depression.

You see, we are taking a $4 per ton cut on tomatoes. Our costs are 15 percent higher. Labor and management will not accept any cut, so what? The only alternative we have is to abandon acreage and that means that those who are not at fault may suffer.

I feel that the Aiken bill is in the right direction, but a long way from perfect. I trust you will use your best efforts.

I am enclosing a letter sent to the membership of the tomato growers after a 3-month battle, which will show you what we are trying to do for ourselves.

Sincerely,

HOWARD B. HANCOCK.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I have listened to the reference the gentleman made to the potato crop. What provision is made after January 1949, for the support of the potato crop?

Mr. HOPE. The provisions of this bill extend price support on all the Steagall commodities of which potatoes is one, until June 30, 1950, at not less than 60 percent of parity. The amendment which will be offered as a committee amendment provides that as to potatoes produced in 1948 there shall be a support price of 90 percent of parity, notwithstanding the fact that they may not be sold during the calendar year 1948. Potatoes produced in 1949 will have a support price of not less than 60 percent of parity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall of course support this bill. Our committee spent a great deal of time in working on this measure and while the result is not satisfactory in all details to everyone, it does represent a good cross section of the views of the Members of the committee. I hope also it will meet in large measure with the approval of those engaged in farming and ranching throughout the United States.

One provision, Mr. Chairman, which in my opinion this Congress should accomplish is to include the cost of farm labor in the parity formula.

Much has been said during this session of Congress about modernizing the parity formula used as a yardstick in determining price supports for farm products. Fundamentally any serious consideration of bringing the parity formula up to date is out of place until Congress has made provision for including the cost of farm labor in the parity calculations. Certainly the farmer is entitled to the cost of labor in figuring the cost of things he buys because labor costs have increased faster for him than the price of things he sells. During the 5-year base period 1910–14 the average cost of farm labor was $1.16 per day without board. On April 1, 1948, Mr. Chairman, that cost had increased to $4.45—almost 4 times the cost in the base period.

At a comparison the price wheat averaged was 88.4 cents during the base period and on April 15, 1948, that price had increased to $2.29 per bushel—not quite 2.6 times the base period. The price of cotton on April 15 was 3 times the price during the base period. Price increases on most other farm crops run mostly in the same range—from 2½ to 3 times the base period but farm labor is 4 times more costly than during the base period.

The cost of labor is the largest single item entering into the cost of production but gets no recognition whatsoever as an item of expense in figuring parity prices. Farm labor is hard and exacting work—it requires experience and training—and good judgment is required in all farm operations and work.

If farmers are to compete with factories and other employers for hired labor they must have some way of meeting that competition. They cannot compete when the cost of labor has increased 4 times and the prices of their products have increased only 2½ or 3 times. Farmers must be in a position to continue their production of food and fibers. They must get equitable and fair prices in the future. Congress has adopted a policy of maintaining the purchasing power of the products from our farms on a basis of the purchasing power during the base period.

Farm prices simply cannot be maintained on a fair basis, Mr. Chairman, without the cost of farm labor being included in the determination of parity prices for farm products.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am indeed sorry that so few Members are present at this time. I had hoped that some of the Members from the city districts would be present because I am afraid that they do not understand the nature of this piece of legislation. Let us get a few things straight. There is no connection in the world between the price-support program and the price-control program. We had the price-support program long before we ever heard of the price-control program.

Now, as to the price-support program: Prior to its adoption, in order to place the farmers upon an equality with the other segments of our society, we adopted what is known as the parity concept. The parity concept only attempted to give to the farmer's dollar the same purchasing power that the laboring man's dollar and the consumer's dollar and the industrialist's dollar enjoyed. Under the parity concept, remember this: If wages go down, the price of farm products go down proportionately. If the industrialist's dollar goes down, the farmer's dollar goes down proportionately. If the consumer's dollar goes down, the farmer's dollar goes down proportionately. It was only an attempt to give the farmer's dollar the same purchasing power enjoyed by the consumers and the industrialists and the laboring people of America.

Another thing. While the parity concept was fine, and a great step in the right direction, it was meaningless because the farmers had no way of organizing to keep farm prices at parity. The laboring man has his organization. He organizes and selects a representative to bargain collectively for him. He deals collectively through a representative, and he is able to protect the wage scale.

The industrialist has always been able to take care of himself, but here were the farmers, disorganized, and, so far as protective prices, helpless. It was impossible for them to organize, and consequently the farmers had no say-so on how their farm commodities were priced.

The next step we took was to put a support price of 90 percent under the farmer's dollar. We said through this support-price program, "Mr. Farmer, we are going to see to it that your dollar will never go below 90 percent of the purchasing power of the other dollars of America." That is right. I want the city Representatives and the Representatives of labor districts to know this. Since these two programs were inaugurated, many representatives of the consumer interests and the laboring interests have appeared before our committee, and they have been interrogated time and time again as to whether they thought the price-support program was a sound program and should be continued. I have never heard a representative of labor or a representative of the consumer groups of America question the soundness of the support-price program. On the other hand, every one of them endorsed it 100 percent.

Now it seems from some of the arguments we have heard this afternoon that there are those who couple up the farm price-support program with the price-control program. The price-control program has no place in this picture. You cannot connect a price-control program with a farm price-support program. There is no way in the world you can, because they are based upon entirely different concepts. I am not here to discuss a price-control program. We are not called upon at this time to discuss such a program. Whether it is right or whether it is wrong does not enter into this piece of legislation. Let us keep our eye on the squirrel and consider this piece of legislation for what it is worth.

I dare say there will not be a representative of the consumers or the labor groups, when they understand this piece of legislation, that will come up here and vote against the farm price-support program, because I know they want to treat the farmers of America fairly. They have in the past gone along with us on every piece of farm legislation, and I know they will continue to do so. It is the only program that enables this Government to see that the farmers of America are given a square deal, and I know they want to see this done.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The statement was made on the floor throughout the afternoon that the farmers of the country were rolling in money; that they had paid off all their mortgages; and that the country banks, where the farmers bank, are just full of money. Is it not a fact that more than 7,000,000 people in the last 7 or 8 years have left the farm and moved to town because of the more lucrative employment that has been found in the city, Mr. FLANNAGAN? They have moved there for two reasons: First, because they find life more agreeable in the cities. You know you do not have 8-hour workdays on the farm, and then, too, most farms do not have modern conveniences. In the second place, due to the high wage scales prevailing in most cities, they can make more money. Since you raised that question, I want to call attention to another thing: The farmers are not rolling in money. Many have not paid back what they owe on the debts that accumulated over the years. Do not forget that for years and years, ever since I can remember—until here recently—the farmers of America fed the people of this country at a loss. That was the reason they found themselves in such a plight in the early thirties when we saw farm prices go down to practically nothing; until they were burning corn in some sections because it was a cheaper fuel than coal, and, too, they did not have the money to buy coal; and thousands upon thousands of farms in America were being sold at public auction for a mere pittance because the farmers did not have the money to redeem their farms, nor could they find any place to borrow the money. I hope this legislation will have the unanimous support of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the continuance of price support for farm products until June 30, 1950. Unless they are extended by the action of this Congress price supports will terminate December 31, 1949. To permit this vital part of the farm program to expire on that date would be a calamity. I would prefer that price supports be extended through a much longer period than that provided for in this bill, but I realize that the members of the Committee on Agriculture have agreed on this extension as a compromise of their differences on the subject, and I earnestly hope this bill will become a law before the sine die adjournment of this Congress.

MILK, HOGS, POULTRY, AND EGGS

It is proposed to continue until June 30, 1950, the support price in the amount of 90 percent of the parity price of the basic farm products. Among those not classified as basic products for which a support price of 90 percent of parity is provided by this bill as the support price are milk and milk products. The decision of the committee to provide for 90 percent of parity as the support price for milk and its products is justified by economic conditions and is a commendable provision of this bill. An amendment will be offered, and I hope adopted, to include the other nonbasic commodities as hogs, poultry, and eggs in the classification of products entitled to a support price amounting to 90 percent of their parity price.

SUPPORT PRICE FOR TOBACCO

As the Representative of the largest burley tobacco producing district in the world I have observed closely the effect of this price-support plan on the welfare of tobacco growers and the economy of my own State of Kentucky, in which tobacco is the principal money crop and the chief source of income. Other plans have been proposed, but I am in favor of continuing the present plan which has been tested by time and experience and proved eminently satisfactory and highly beneficial to the tobacco growers of this country. The same reasons that cause burley tobacco growers to want a continuance of this price-support plan apply with equal force to the growers of dark air-cured and fire-cured tobacco in western Kentucky and Tennessee, because under the terms of the Clements Act of 1945 the price support of those types of tobacco is based on the price support of burley tobacco. Experience has proved the wisdom of adhering to this plan.

AIKEN BILL

A bill has been reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture that would change the definition of parity price and the present system of computing price-support loans at 90 percent of parity. That bill would set up a variable period for computing parity in lieu of the fixed-base period now in effect. It would establish a sliding scale of price supports in lieu of the constant 90 percent of parity as the yardstick by which the support price is now measured. It would substitute for the plan which has brought stability to tobacco markets and prosperity to tobacco-producing areas a changing, shifting price-support plan that would be in effect, a flexible yardstick for the measurement of price supports. Under the terms of the Senate bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], price supports could range from 60 percent of parity with a large crop to 90 percent of parity with a small crop. In a year of large production and consequently declining prices the price support would decline also and be of little, if any, benefit to the growers at the time price support is a necessity to the hundreds of thousands of people dependent upon tobacco for a livelihood. In years of a short crop when prices would naturally be high the support price would be higher also, but that would be of benefit to few, if any, growers, because with the short crop and high price growers would not want price-support loans and would have no occasion to avail themselves of the loans provided by law. It is true that under present conditions the sliding scale of flexible price supports would result in a comparatively high support price based on the variable definition of parity, but the flexible yardstick for computing price support could in some years bring disaster to tobacco growers who through the long years of depending upon tobacco as their principal source of income have suffered economic disaster many years.

This tobacco program has met successfully the test of experience through the years since the Congress established it. The present price-control plan, consisting of 90 percent of parity, is a vital element of the entire tobacco program and ought to be continued indefinitely. There is grave danger in making drastic changes in a plan that has worked so well and in disrupting a program that has brought unexampled benefits to the several States in which tobacco is a major farm product.

TOBACCO GROWERS AGREE ON PROGRAM

Upon my suggestion a group of representatives of flue-cured, burley, dark air-cured, and fire-cured tobacco growers, representing all types of tobacco participating in the production-adjustment program and all States producing those types of tobacco, met at the Ambassador Hotel in Washington, D. C., on April 23, 1948, and formulated plans for the continuance of the tobacco program, which they presented at a public hearing, which I had arranged with the Senate Committee on Agriculture for April 24, 1948. At that preliminary conference this representative group of tobacco growers and farmer spokesmen agreed on five primary policies, which on the following day they presented to the Senate Committee on Agriculture as follows:

First. Continue the present method of computing normal supply of tobacco in determining the amount of the national quota.

Second. Continue the present definition of parity price.

Third. Continue price-support loans at the present percent of parity, in accordance with present law.

Fourth. Continue section 2 of Public Law 163, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 28, 1945. This section applies to the support level for fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco.

Fifth. Provide for marketing quotas for types of tobacco now under quota and for Virginia sun-cured tobacco.

WANTS QUOTAS NOTWITHSTANDING FORMULA

The only point in that program not already included in the present law is

the suggested provision that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to proclaim marketing quotas and call for a referendum of growers upon the expiration of present quotas and for the inclusion under quotas of Virginia sun-cured tobacco, regardless of the present statutory formula. That means that we are united in advocating that upon the expiration of the present quotas, the Secretary shall call for a referendum of growers of all types of tobacco now under quota, and that he include in that proclamation the producers of Virginia sun-cured tobacco, which is produced in a comparatively small area in the State of Virginia, is marketed in one warehouse at Richmond, Va., and is used for the same general purposes for which the dark fire-cured tobacco of western Kentucky and Tennessee is used. That type of tobacco has never been able to come within the requirements of the statutory formula for the proclamation of quotas by the Secretary of Agriculture. For the benefit of its producers and for the protection of the producers of the competing dark-fired tobacco, it ought to be a part of the quota system.

Precedent for quotas regardless of the statutory formula was the act of Congress in July 1943, in the midst of World War II, when quotas were abandoned on all other farm products, and it became apparent that quotas on burley and flue-cured tobacco would be abandoned also. It was obvious that during World War II, with high prices prevailing, the lure of 40 to 45 cents per pound for tobacco would induce the wholesale spreading of burley territory outside the Burley Belt, which would result in economic ruin to the entire burley-producing section of this country in the aftermath of war. There was no need then for quotas for dark air-cured or fire-cured tobacco. They would have been included if the growers had so desired or the economists of the Department of Agriculture had thought quotas desirable. There was little demand for those types of tobacco, but there was an unprecedented demand for burley and flue-cured tobacco, the basic ingredients in the American type of blended cigarette, for which there existed an enormous domestic demand and which was being supplied in huge quantities to our armed forces in every part of the world. Our unofficial tobacco committee in the House of Representatives determined to enact a law providing for the continuance of burley and flue-cured quotas regardless of the statutory formula. The bill was introduced by me, was enacted into law, and saved the burley section from economic disaster similar to that which befell it following the First World War. The unanimous decision of the growers' conference on April 23, as stated at the hearing the following day, was that the theory of the act of July 1943 ought to be writen permanently into the tobacco program.

WE WANT TO KEEP PRESENT PROGRAM

The five points enumerated above represent the best thought of the tobacco growers of this country and if adhered to would constitute a long-range tobacco program that would be the best assurance of a fair price for the principal product of the soil and the toil of hundreds of thousands of farm families whose principal money crop is tobacco. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended was the basis of our national farm program. Its operation in the field of tobacco has proved to be the most successful and beneficial farm program in the history of the country. The fixed base period for computation of parity has been tried and proved successful. Ninety percent of parity as the support price of burley and flue-cured tobacco has successfully met the test of experience. The support price for dark-fired tobacco, amounting to 75 percent of the support price of burley, and the support price of dark air-cured tobacco, amounting to 66⅔ percent of the support price of burley, as provided by the Clements Act of 1945, have already saved the growers of those types from disastrously low prices. The continuance of this support price of 90 percent of parity is equivalent to an insurance policy to protect tobacco growers from a recurrence of economic collapse and financial ruin such as followed the First World War. Let us continue this price-support plan, which is our best defense against the bankruptcy and ruin which brought want and woe, desperation and despair to the tobacco growers of this country before this price-support system was enacted into law.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 1 be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Section 1 of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed through any instrumentality or agency within or under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, by loans, purchases, or other operations—

(a) to support prices received by producers of cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts harvested before December 31, 1949, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which the crop is harvested. The price support authorized by this subsection shall be made available as follows:

(1) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

(2) To cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn, at the rate of 75 percent of the rate specified in (1) above.

(3) To noncooperators (except noncooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 60 percent of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

All provisions of law applicable with respect to loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall, insofar as they are consistent with the provisions of this section, be applicable with respect to loans or other price-support operations authorized under this subsection.

(b) To support until December 31, 1949, a price to producers of commodities with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture by public announcement pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended, requested an expansion of production of not less than 60 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor nor more than the level at which any such commodity was supported in 1948. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this subsection if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for the commodities referred to in (a) hereof.

(c) Sections 1 and 3 of the act approved August 5, 1947 (Public Law 360, 80th Cong.), are amended by striking out in each section the date "1948" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the date "1949."

(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsections (a), (b), and (c) hereof) shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of other agricultural commodities not covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c) to a fair parity relationship with the commodities included under subsections (a), (b), and (c), to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the commodities covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c), and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6248, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for June 12 and 14, on account of official business.

To Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. SMITH of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for the remainder of the week, on account of death of his sister.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a brief analysis of H. R. 6879, introduced yesterday by me, the substance of which I shall seek at the proper time to offer as a motion to recommit H. R. 6777, the social security bill. My bill is a combination of the principal features of bills introduced previously by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the analysis of H. R. 6879 is as follows:

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF H. R. 6879

Section 1: Short title—Social Security Act Amendments of 1948.

Section 2 is a statement of the goals to be achieved by social insurance against the risks of old age, disability, and death.

Section 3: In order to make the law clear and easily understood this section contains a complete revision of title II of the Social Security Act dealing with old-age and survivors insurance. The new section adds to the present provisions amendments which would extend coverage, liberalize benefits, and provide disability benefits for totally disabled workers. A brief analysis of the redrafted sections of title II follows:

PRIMARY INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 201 (a) (1) lowers the retirement age from 65 to 60 for the insured female workers.

Section 201 (a) (2): After June 1949 provides monthly benefits for insured workers beginning with the seventh month after the onset of total disability.

Section 201 (a) (3) permits certain insured workers who are totally disabled on or before January 1, 1949, to draw disability benefits on July 1, 1949.

Section 201 (a) (4) authorizes the Federal Security Administrator to grant up to $25 a month for an attendant for disabled workers who require such service.

WIFE'S INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 201 (b) (1) lowers the age at which the wife of a retired worker can draw benefits from 65 to 60 and provides for payment of benefits to a wife under that age if she has a child entitled to a child's insurance benefit.

Section 201 (b) (2) sets the wife's benefit at one-half the primary benefit, the same as in the existing law.

DISABLED HUSBAND'S INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 201 (c) (1) (2) provides a benefit at 65 for the totally disabled husband of a woman worker receiving primary insurance benefits. The disability of the husband must have existed for at least 6 months.

Section 201 (c) (3): The disabled husband's benefit will be one-half of his wife's primary insurance benefit.

CHILD'S INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 201 (d) (1) reenacts present provisions for paying a child's benefit when a worker dies or retires and adds a provision for paying a child's benefit when a worker is receiving disability benefits.

Section 201 (d) (2) (3) provides benefits for a totally disabled child after the age of 18; regular children's benefits are terminated at age 18.

Section 201 (d) (4), in the case of a deceased wage earner, increases the benefit for one child to three-fourths of the primary insurance benefit of the worker, and provides that the benefit for the second and subsequent children shall be one-half the primary insurance benefit, the latter provision being identical with present law.

Section 201 (d) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) sets up the rules for determining when a child is dependent on the wage earner. These rules permit the payment of benefits on the wage record of the foster parents who have had the child in their care for a substantial period of time and liberalize certain other provisions for the payment of benefits on the wage record of a mother or step-parent who actually supported the child.

WIDOW'S INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 201 (e) (1) (2) lowers the age from 65 to 60 at which a widow can draw benefits upon her deceased husband's wage record.

DISABLED WIDOWER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 201 (f) provides a monthly benefit at age 65 for a totally disabled widower who has been disabled since the wife's death. Such benefit is equal to three-fourths of the primary insurance benefit.

MOTHER'S INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 201 (g) (1) (2) (3) changes the title of the benefits payable to a widowed mother with an entitled child in her care from "widow's current insurance benefits" to "mother's insurance benefits" and adds a benefit payment for the unremarried divorced wife of the wage earner who has such a child in her care and has been supported by the wage earner up to the time of his death. The new provision for the unremarried divorced wife in effect enables the mother to continue to personally care for her child instead of being forced to take employment upon the wage earner's death. This is designed to aid the child.

PARENT'S INSURANCE BENEFITS

Section 201 (h) (1) (2) lowers the age from 65 to 60 at which a dependent female parent may draw monthly benefits on her child's wage record. Other provisions are the same as present law, such as the benefit for a parent being one-half the wage earner's primary benefit.

Section 201 (h) (3) provides for the payment of a parent's benefit to a dependent foster parent where the relationship has existed since the child was 15.

LUMP-SUM DEATH PAYMENTS

Section 201 (i) provides for the payment of a lump-sum benefit upon the death of every insured worker. Previously lump sums were not paid when monthly benefits were payable for the month of death.

APPLICATION FOR BENEFITS

Section 202 (a) establishes new provisions for the computation of benefits which would increase payments by approximately 50 percent. The first part of this increase is accomplished by a change in the benefit formula itself which is increased from 40 percent of the first $50 of average monthly wage to 40 percent of the first $75 of average monthly wage and from 10 percent of the average monthly wage above $50 and up to $250 to 15 percent of the amount above $75 and up to $400 of average monthly wage. The minimum primary insurance benefit is increased from $10 to $20 a month. Individuals who earn 6 quarters of coverage after 1948 may compute their average wages either from 1937 or from 1949. This latter change will greatly increase benefit levels for newly covered workers and men and women who had long periods of noncoverage because they were in the armed forces during the war. Periods of disability also will be excluded from the computation of benefits.

REDUCTION AND INCREASE OF BENEFITS

Section 203 (a) (b) increases the maximum dollar limit on family benefits from $85 to $150 a month and raises the minimum amount below which family benefits will not be reduced from $20 to $40. This section deletes the maximum limitation on family benefits, which now provides that benefits may not exceed twice the primary insurance benefit. These changes, combined with the changes in section 202, will serve to substantially increase the adequacy of family benefits.

Section 203 (c) (d) (e) increase the amount which a beneficiary may earn in covered employment without losing his benefit payments from $14.99 a month to $40 a month except that a blind individual may earn $50 a month and still receive payment. Similar deduction provisions apply to self-employment.

Section 203 (f) eliminates the work clause after the claimant has attained the age of 70.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

Section 204 adds to the present requirements for determining when an individual is insured and therefore when benefits are payable on his wage record the alternative that he will be considered fully insured if he has 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 calendar quarters preceding the quarter of death or retirement. This will allow newly covered workers to become eligible for retirement benefits with 5 years of employment.

ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

Section 205 provides for the adjustment of old-age disability and survivors' benefits in case noncontributory benefits are also payable to the individual. Provisions are designed to prevent duplication of payments under title II and workmen's compensation, Veterans' laws and the like.

NATIONAL SOCIAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Section 206 in effect reconstitutes present provisions governing the trust fund and its management and maintenance.

BENEFITS IN CASES OF DECEASED WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Section 207 reenacts section 210 of the present law.

COVERAGE PROVISIONS AND DEFINITIONS

Section 208 (a) increases the wage base on which benefits can be paid and taxes assessed from $3,000 to $4,800 a year and extends coverage under the law to all self-employed persons except farmers.

Section 208 (b), (c), and (d) covers on a compulsory basis several new areas of employment including domestic service, active service in the armed forces, and certain additional small groups such as certain TVA employees, employees of Army Post Exchanges, etc. Service for nonprofit organizations also is covered compulsorily except that service for churches and religious orders are not covered in this way but may be covered by voluntary election of these employers. Services by clergymen and members of religious orders, however, cannot be covered. Agricultural labor, farmers, railroad employees, and certain minor groups would continue to be excluded. Coverage of employees of States and localities could be acomplished under agreements provided in section 209; 208 (e) to (n) reenact the definition of terms in the present law and add a definition of certain terms such as "American employer" and "disability" which are necessitated by additions made by this bill.

VOLUNTARY COMPACTS FOR COVERAGE OF STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

Section 209 authorizes the Federal Security Administrator to enter into agreements with States to extend coverage to the employees of States, political subdivisions of States, and their instrumentalities. These agreements cannot cover members of existing retirement systems unless at least one-half of the members of such a system favor entering such an agreement.

SECTIONS ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

Sections 210–214 reenact present provisions governing the administrative procedures under the OASI system. Certain minor and technical changes have been made.

DETERMINATION OF DISABILITY AND REHABILITATION OF DISABLED INDIVIDUALS

Section 215 authorizes the Administrator to conduct medical examinations of claimants for disability benefits. If a claimant refuses an examination or reexamination payments will not be made.

Section 215 (b) provides that the Administrator may furnish medical, surgical, or institutional rehabilitation to beneficiaries drawing disability benefits if such rehabilitaton will enable the dependent to return to

gainful work. Grants under this subsection are limited to 2 percent of disability payments; however, these small expenditures should result in substantial saving to the trust fund.

PROVISIONS OF EXISTING LAW WHICH REMAIN IN EFFECT

Section 216 protects any beneficiary who might otherwise suffer a loss of benefit rights under the terms of this bill. For such individuals the existing law would continue to apply.

NATIONAL SOCIAL INSURANCE POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Section 217 creates a Council composed of representatives of employers, employees, the public and the Federal Security Administrator to advise the Administrator on questions of general policy and administrative operations. The Council would be required to make findings and recommendations concerning the administration of the act, coverage, adequacy of benefits in relation to living costs, financing, and the like.

DECLARATION OF POLICY ON NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT

Section 218 declares it to be the policy of Congress that the traditional tax-exempt status of nonprofit institutions shall not be altered in any way by their coverage under the Social Security Act.

WAIVER OF EXEMPTION BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Section 219 amends the Internal Revenue Code to permit institutions or agencies, organized and operated by a religious denomination for charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes to waive their exemption from social-security taxes and bring their employees under the act. This waiver would not apply to services performed by clergymen or members of religious orders. Any such waiver would run for a minimum of 7 years before it could be revoked. If a waiver of tax immunity was revoked such a waiver could not be renewed in the future.

TAX ON EMPLOYMENT

Section 220 amends the Internal Revenue Code to levy a tax on self-employment income covered by the law at a rate of one and one-half times the current employee rate. The total tax rate on self-employment therefore would be 1½ percent in 1949, 2¼ percent in 1950 and 1951, and 3 percent in 1952 and thereafter.

Section 4 (a) amends the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to bring the employees of the Production Credit Associations under the Social Security Act.

Section 4 (b) amends the Federal Farm Loan Act to extend social security coverage to National Farm Loan Associations.

Section 5 (incorrectly numbered 4 in the bill) adds a new title to the Social Security Act, title XIV, which would establish a comprehensive public welfare program of assistance and welfare services for families, adults, and children. Specifically the new title would replace the present assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act with the following:

First. Federal financial aid would be available not only for the aged, blind, and dependent children as at present, but for all needy persons.

Second. Welfare services for adults, families, and children could be included in the public-welfare program, and child-welfare services could include foster care, temporary institutional care, and services needed to supplement home care.

Third. Federal financial aid would be extended to the States on a basis ranging from 50 to 75 percent of total costs, depending on the relative per capita income of the States.

Fourth. Standards of assistance would be determined by the State on a basis of individual need and resources but in such a way as to assure equitable treatment to persons in similar circumstances throughout the State. Standards of assistance would be left to the States without maximum limitations specified in the Federal act.

Fifth. Persons requiring medical care would be able voluntarily to enter public medical institutions, other than those for tuberculosis or mental illness, without loss of assistance if the institutions met standards established by the State.

Sixth. Welfare agencies would be authorized to make payment for medical care rendered assistance recipients and other needy persons directly to the individual or institution furnishing such care.

Seventh. Residence requirements and required transfer of property to the State during the lifetime of an assistance recipient would be prohibited.

Eighth. Administration through a single agency at each level of government would be required.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPUBLICAN TAX REVISION BILL SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will, I understand, take up H. R. 6712, the revenue revision bill. On May 26, 1948, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means announced to the press that—

> A general tax revision was promised to the American public in the last congressional election and this bill is the fulfillment of that promise.

Mr. Speaker, if all Republican promises are kept in the same manner, then we can be certain that a Democratic Congress will be selected to comply with the recommendation of the President in his most recent message on the state of the Union:

> When the present danger of inflation has passed we should consider tax reduction based upon a revision of our entire tax structure.

The Secretary of the Treasury, however, cooperated as fully as permitted in trying to assist the committee in drafting a bill to make a number of technical corrections in the Internal Revenue Code. It was the understanding in the Committee on Ways and Means that, first, no change should be made that would result in substantial loss of revenue; and, second, nothing of a controversial nature would be included in the bill.

What has been the result? H. R. 6712 includes a number of relatively unimportant changes recommended by the Treasury Department, as well as several constructive changes suggested by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The theme of the revenue revision bill, however, is fixed by a few special relief provisions for upper-bracket taxpayers. The melody of the revenue revision bill of 1948 will not even be heard by the 48,000,000 taxpayers under $5,000. Indeed, the bad features of H. R. 6712 in many instances appear to be an exclusively designed "surtax shelter" for the wealthy.

The Knutson income tax reduction bill did grant to the millions of low-income taxpayers a small crumb of relief that now is being rapidly consumed by the fires of inflation. Meanwhile, well-to-do taxpayers are feasting on their increased take-home pay, while they respond to the advertisements of the trust companies to rearrange their estates to avoid payment of estate and gift taxes, as permitted under a provision hidden away in the so-called across-the-board income tax reduction bill. How many of the 50,000,000 income taxpayers know about—and how many would approve—the 30-percent reduction in estate taxes before anything at all is done about the high wartime excise taxes on movies, toilet goods, and handbags? Or before anything really is done toward reducing income taxes upon the vast majority of low-income taxpayers.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the rich are having an income-tax feast—thanks to the Republican Eightieth Congress. But they are not yet satisfied. The greedier groups have plied and pressured for even sweeter relief—and this time they do not even want to let the highly burdened millions at the bottom even to come into the dining room to watch them eat.

Let me be more specific about the lavish luxuriant loopholes which this bill would create. The following are some of the more rustic of the surtax shelters:

First. Family partnerships created during the war to enable taxpayers to allocate incomes to members of their family, and thereby avoid the higher surtaxes, would be validated retroactively to 1940 by overruling two decisions of the Supreme Court. In other words, after the Government has safely protected the revenue in the courts and has caught these tax dodgers, the Congress now proceeds to approve what they have done.

Second. Corporate executives who elect to take part of their salary in the form of options to buy stock at less than market price will, under the bill, be allowed to escape surtaxes, and to pay a maximum capital gains rate of only 25 percent on that part of their salary.

Third. The present protective tax to prevent corporations from being used as a depository for avoidance of surtaxes by their stockholders would be weakened by increasing the burden of the Government in proving its case.

Fourth. The net operating loss carryover and carry-back would be liberalized to the point that a corporation with an income in prior years actually would be given a "net operating loss deduction."

Fifth. Another Supreme Court case holding that a corporation cannot evade the capital-gains tax by fictitiously selling its assets through its stockholders would be reversed.

Sixth. Estate- and gift-tax amendments would largely wreck what has been left of the structure of these taxes by the Revenue Act of 1948. When a man of sufficient wealth with a wife and family of three children can, in not unusual circumstances, pass on to his beneficiaries a guaranteed estate of some $1,000,000, as indicated in one of the examples in the attached memorandum, without payment of any estate or gift taxes whatever, it will be apparent what has become of our death-tax system.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD a memorandum discussing more fully

the most objectionable sections of this bill:

OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS OF H. R. 6712

SECTION 125, SURTAX ON CORPORATIONS ACCUMULATING SURPLUS

This section of the bill would undermine the effectiveness of section 102 of the Code, which is designed to prevent taxpayers from using closely held corporations to avoid individual income taxes. Stockholders could easily escape individual surtaxes if corporations could with impunity accumulate earnings and profits without making periodic dividend distributions. In order to provide minimum safeguards against this practice, the Code imposes a penalty tax on corporations accumulating earnings and profits beyond the reasonable needs of the business. The tremendous accumulations of undistributed profits out of the unprecedented earnings of recent years reveal that this provision has hardly inhibited accumulations for legitimate business need. At best present law permits imposition of the penalty tax only in the most flagrant cases of avoidance.

Present law recognizes the fact that corporate officers are in a favored position in the matter of establishing corporate needs. Accordingly, it places on them the burden of demonstrating the legitimate needs of business when the Government asserts a penalty tax for improper accumulation of surplus. The bill would weaken this very limited guard against tax avoidance by shifting to the Government the burden of proving that accumulations were not for the reasonable needs of the business. It would also make the penalty tax inapplicable to capital gains of the corporation even though they were accumulated for the very purpose of avoiding surtax on the shareholders.

Instead of strengthening section 102, which is already too frail a barrier against accumulations, this amendment would make section 102 even less effective against tax avoiders. Indeed it invites avoidance and practically assures its success.

SECTION 129, GAIN OR LOSS IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN CORPORATE LIQUIDATIONS

At the present time, when the value of many corporate assets has skyrocketed in the currently inflated market, many owners not unnaturally desire to sell out their interests at the top of the market. But 25 percent of the corporation's windfall profit is taxable as a capital gain upon sale in the course of liquidation. A favorite scheme for avoiding the corporate tax on capital gains has been to liquidate the corporation's assets into the hands of the stockholders, whereupon the stockholders purport to sell the assets in their individual capacities. The Supreme Court has partially closed this loophole. The committee proposal would overrule the Court.

There are various methods of eliminating the administrative problems which these tax avoidance schemes have produced. The simplest equitable solution would be to tax the corporate gain to the corporation, whether the assets were formally sold by the corporation or the stockholders. The committee, quite consistently with its general policy, ratifies and approves heretofore unsuccessful tax-avoidance efforts by permitting corporate liquidation sales free of corporate capital gains tax.

SECTION 136, NET OPERATING LOSS DEDUCTION, PERCENTAGE DEPLETION, TAX-EXMPT SECURITIES RETURNS

This provision of the bill modifies the net operating loss provisions to provide a 1-year carry-back and a 5-year carry-over of net operating losses. The proposed carry-over provision extends the period within which business losses can offset business gains. This change helps new business enterprises as well as businesses with fluctuating income, and it is generally agreed to be desirable.

The bill, however, makes a further change in the net operating loss provision which has nothing to do with the extension of the carry-over period. It fundamentally alters the method of computing the net operating loss deduction. Under present law a tax-exempt interest, the excess of percentage depletion over cost depletion, intercorporate dividends and the full amount of capital gains. This confines the benefits of carry-backs and carry-overs of net operating losses to businesses with real economic losses. The bill eliminates the requirement that net operating losses be reduced by tax-free income before being used to offset taxable income. As a result, those who enjoy the benefits of percentage depletion in excess of their actual cost and those who receive tax-exempt interest will be permitted to take net operating loss deductions where there are in fact no real losses. The provision would thus depart from a principle which has been recognized ever since the net operating loss deduction was first adopted in the Revenue Act of 1918. Instead of extending additional benefits to tax-exempt interest and percentage depletion, the existing exemption with respect to these items should be reexamined.

SECTION 137, STOCK OPTIONS

Corporation executives are often given the option to buy stock in their corporations at bargain prices in lieu of compensation. Under this section, if an executive exercised his option and sold the stock after holding it for 3 years, he would pay only a capital gains tax on the difference between the sales price of the stock and the original option price. Of course, the spread between the option price and the higher market price when the executive acquires the stock is just as much compensation as any ordinary salary payment. This means that a taxpayer who would ordinarily be taxable at a rate of 50, 60, or 70 percent would be taxable at a 25-percent rate on this additional compensation. If the stock were held until death, the compensation would completely escape income taxation.

This provision would give highly paid corporate executives an opportunity for tax avoidance comparable to those provided by this bill for other wealthy taxpayers. The provision is surrounded with apparent restrictions, but in practice they would not curtail the abuses that would arise. This new loophole in the income-tax structure would inevitably lead to additional inroads on the surtax system by other groups.

As an example of the combined tax savings which this provision and the already enacted 1948 act would provide, consider an executive with a net salary (before exemptions) of $50,000. Prior to this year he would have paid a tax of $38,300 on an additional income of $50,000, realized on the exercise of an option to purchase stock in the corporation. The tax has already been reduced to $29,200, or 24 percent, by the Revenue Act of 1948. This provision would reduce the tax by another 43 percent to $12,500, for a total 67 percent reduction this year. This sort of carefully selective tax reduction is reckless in its disregard of elementary fairness to taxpayers who continue to be burdened with most of the heavy war-imposed taxes.

SECTION 142, FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

This provision would recognize for income-tax purposes partnerships formed by taxpayers with their wives, children over 21 years of age, and other close relatives. In most of the partnerships which have previously failed to meet the existing standards the so-called partner's only contribution to the partnership consisted of capital received as a gift from the original owner for investment in the business. This amendment is retroactive to all years after 1940.

This provision is nothing less than ratification of tax avoidance schemes which have heretofore been successfully frustrated by the courts.

The retroactive feature of this provision would legalize some of the flagrant attempts at tax avoidance during the war. It would restore, tax-free, to a few taxpayers a substantial portion of their inflated wartime profits and would invite others to take advantage of this method of tax avoidance in the future. The Revenue Act of 1948 has established income-tax equality among families by permitting a 2-way split of incomes between husbands and wives. This bill would legalize four-, five-, and six-way splits among family members and would upset the equalization accomplished by the Revenue Act of 1948. It would provide another surtax shelter for high income-tax payers.

The revenue loss from this provision will be substantial. First, it would involve the payment of large refunds of taxes already collected and spent for wartime needs. Second, the revenue loss will increase quickly as taxpayers become aware of the advantages of the new loophole.

The following example illustrates the large potential tax savings: Prior to this year a married businessman with two children and an income of $100,000 paid $62,300 in taxes. The Revenue Act of 1948 has already reduced this tax to $45,600, or by 27 percent. If the taxpayer divided the profits in four equal parts between himself, his wife, and two children, the tax would be reduced by this provision by another 18 percent to $34,400, or total reduction this year of 45 percent. such possibilities for tax avoidance would weaken, and might eventually discredit, the income-tax system as the fairest method of producing large amounts of revenue.

SECTION 202, TRANSFERS TAKING EFFECT AT DEATH

This provision is designed to sanctify certain well-known tax avoidance schemes.

Since 1916 the estate-tax statute has contained a loophole closing provision which taxes gifts intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after the donor's death. The plain purpose is to reach testamentary arrangements which are, in substance and effect, the same as wills because the donor withholds possession and enjoyment of his property until after he dies. One type of arrangement is particularly appealing to tax avoiders. For example, a wealthy donor may create a trust which provides that the income is to be accumulated during his life, that the trust assets should be paid over to his wife at his death, but that if she dies first, the propery is to be disposed of as he may direct. Under present law the trust assets would, of course, be subject to estate tax when the donor died and the assets were finally paid over to his wife. Under the proposed law this scheme and others of similar ilk would be well nigh free from estate tax. Avoidance is condoned rather than condemned.

SECTION 203, PROCEEDS OF LIFE INSURANCE

Under existing law insurance purchased by the insured on his own life is included in his taxable estate. The basic purpose of this provision is, of course, very clear. Life insurance is inherently testamentary and, like any testamentary arrangement, is intended to benefit the insured's family after his death. In the absence of the present law, wealthy individuals might—as they once did—pass on large portions of their wealth through the form of life insurance without paying an estate tax. The proposed amendment would permit precisely this result. In fact, this amendment, when coupled with the large gift tax exemptions and exclusions already provided by the Revenue Act of 1948 would permit taxpayers to leave very large estates

without paying either an estate tax or a gift tax.

For example, a 40-year-old married man with three children could make annual tax-free gifts of $6,000 each to his wife and children for the payment of life-insurance premiums. These premiums would provide $900,000 worth of life insurance. If at death he left a net estate of $700,000 to his wife, in addition to his insurance estate of $900,000, the estate tax would be $73,300, or 65 percent less than the $206,900 tax due on the $1,600,000 net estate under existing law.

Moreover, if the insured's estate, over and above his life insurance, were $120,000, one-half of which was left to his wife, there would be no tax at all. Thus an estate of over $1,000,000 would pass entirely free of all estate and gift taxes.

SECTIONS 205 AND 252, EXCLUSION FROM ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES OF AMOUNTS PAYABLE UNDER CERTAIN EMPLOYEE PENSION PLANS

Corporations are permitted under existing law to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid into pension plans for the benefit of employees. Highly paid employees over a period of years can thereby build up pensions and death benefits which could be purchased from a private insurance company only at substantial cost. When a person dies owning a private contract for payment of pension and death benefits to survivors, the value of the contract is included in his gross estate.

Section 202 of the bill would exempt from the estate tax the transfer of pension and death benefits by wealthy employees to their beneficiaries under such plans.

The interest of an employee in a stock bonus or profit-sharing plan would also be exempt from estate taxation.

For example, a man with a net estate of $1,000,000, who had $100,000 in stock that he had bought through his broker would be taxed on the entire million. His neighbor, also a millionaire, but a corporate executive who has acquired $100,000 of company stock under a profit-sharing plan, could transfer the entire $100,000 to his wife free of tax, and would include only the remaining $900,000 in his gross estate. The difference in estate taxes would be $32,000, assuming the taxpayer did not claim the marital deduction.

Of course, this loophole since the passage of the Republican Revenue Act of 1948, which gutted the estate and gift taxes, would be of benefit only to married persons with an estate of more than $120,000. A similar recommendation was made by the special tax-study committee in its report filed with the Committee on Ways and Means on November 4, 1947, on the ground that since "most working people today have little means to provide for widows or dependents in any other way, the joint and survivor annuity is very popular." As the minority special tax-study committee report points out, however, "obviously, the 'working people' have no estate or gift tax problems, for they lack sufficient property to be troubled. The majority's purpose is to provide special gift and estate tax exemption for those in the high brackets."

Section 252 of the bill would provide a corresponding tax avoidance possibility under the gift tax.

SECTION 253, GIFT-TAX EXCLUSION FOR FUTURE INTERESTS

For administrative reasons the gift law contains a so-called annual exclusion so that donors will not have to report such comparatively trivial gifts as Christmas presents. Despite this limited objective the exclusion is now so generous that a married man may in any one year give $6,000 to any one of any number of donees without paying a gift tax. This amendment would permit him to give away an additional $6,000 each year without incurring any gift-tax liability. For example, if a donor had three children, he might give each child $8,000 year after year without being troubled by the gift tax. Nor have we exhausted the possibilities, for, apart from the annual exclusion, a married man may transfer $60,000 free of gift tax.

This amendment speaks for itself. Those who are already paying less tax than they should will be asked to pay still less. Evidently a $6,000 annual gift-tax exclusion per donee is considered quite insufficient for the well-to-do, but a $600 personal income-tax exemption is considered quite enough for the poor.

Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1948, the Under Secretary of the Treasury advised the Committee on Ways and Means, in a letter addressed to the chairman, of the views of the Treasury Department with regard to the bill in its present form. The Under Secretary wrote in part as follows:

The bill contains a large number of provisions, many of which have merit. However, a number of important provisions in the bill would provide taxpayers with opportunities to avoid taxes in ways that are not consistent with the equitable application of the tax laws.

* * * * *

Representing the Treasury, I opposed these measures in hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, but they were nevertheless adopted by the committee. If the objectionable features are removed by the House or the Senate, we feel that you will have an acceptable bill.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in my remarks the complete text of the letter from the Under Secretary of the Treasury:

MAY 26, 1948.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that you have introduced today the proposed revenue revision bill, H. R. 6712, which has been in the course of preparation in your committee for some time. For that reason, I believe that you may want to have the views of this Department upon this legislation.

The bill contains a large number of provisions, many of which have merit. However, a number of important provisions in the bill would provide taxpayers with opportunities to avoid taxes in ways that are not consistent with the equitable application of the tax laws.

From the standpoint of the Treasury Department, the most seriously objectionable provisions in the bill include the following:

1. Family partnerships and, in particular, the retroactive feature;
2. Treatment of stock options—giving capital gain treatment to this form of compensation;
3. Weakening section 102—the penalty tax on unreasonable accumulations of corporate profits;
4. Changing the base for determining net operating loss deductions so as to extend the tax benefits of tax exempt income and percentage depletion;
5. Extension of special income tax exemption for military personnel;
6. Tax-free sale of corporate assets;
7. Partial exemption for transfers intended to take effect at or after death;
8. Proposed exclusion on contemplation of death;
9. New treatment of life insurance under the estate tax;
10. Gift tax exclusion for gifts of future interests;
11. Estate tax exemption for deceased members of the armed forces;
12. Inadequate treatment of corporate reorganizations and distributions;
13. Several minor items.

Representing the Treasury, I opposed these measures in hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, but they were nevertheless adopted by the committee. If the objectionable features are removed by the House or the Senate, we feel that you will have an acceptable bill.

In regard to the net revenue effects of the bill, we find that it is not feasible to prepare specific quantitative estimates. Not only is it not possible to predict at this time to what extent taxpayers would avail themselves of the tax-saving opportunities afforded under the bill, but in most of those cases in which the provisions of the bill would give retroactive relief to taxpayers, the information available to us is inadequate for the preparation of reasonably reliable estimates.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. M. WIGGINS,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The clear implication of this letter is that, if the present bill should be passed by both Houses of Congress in its present form, the Treasury Department would recommend that it be vetoed by the President.

Accordingly, in the interest of saving the constructive features of H. R. 6712, a motion to recommit will be offered at the proper time to strike the sections that I have discussed, which include most of the provisions objected to by the Treasury, as well as a number of less controversial but important inequities in the present bill.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in my remarks the draft of the proposed motion to recommit:

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ——— moves to recommit the bill H. R. 6712 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Strike out section 110, beginning on page 24, line 19, and ending on page 26, line 11;

Strike out section 115, beginning on page 31, line 11, and ending on page 32, line 12;

On page 37, line 8, insert "(A)" before 85 percent.

On page 37, line 9, after "adjusted net income" insert "computed without regard to the net operating loss deductions provided in section 23 (s), or (B) 100 percent of the adjusted net income computed without regard to such deduction, whichever is the lesser."

Strike out section 124, beginning on page 40, from line 4 down to and including line 13;

Strike out section 125, beginning on page 40, line 14, and ending on page 43, line 18;

Strike out section 128, beginning on page 49, line 1, and ending on page 51, line 22;

Strike out section 129, beginning on page 52, line 1, and ending on page 55, line 8;

Strike out section 131, beginning on page 57, from line 4 down to and including line 7;

Strike out all of section 136 after the heading, from page 58, line 23, down to and including page 65, line 18, and insert the following:

"(a) Amendment of section 122 (b): Section 122 (b) of such code (relating to amount of carry-back and carry-over) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Amount of carry-back and carry-over:

"'(1) Net operating loss carry-back:

"'(A) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1949: If for any taxable year beginning

after December 31, 1941, and before January 1, 1949, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-back for each of the two preceding taxable years, except that the carry-back in the case of the first preceding taxable year shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the net income for the second preceding taxable year computed—

"'(i) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), and

"'(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such second preceding taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

"'(B) Loss for taxable year beginning after 1948: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-back for the preceding taxable year.

"'(2) Net operating loss carry-over:

"'(A) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1949: If for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the two succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of the second succeeding taxable year shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the net income for the intervening taxable year computed—

"'(i) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsections (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), and

"'(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss, to any net operating loss carry-back, or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the net operating loss for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, shall be reduced by the sum of the net income for each of the two preceding taxable years computed for each such preceding taxable year—

"'(iii) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6); and

"'(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction without regard to such net operating loss, to any net operating loss for the succeeding taxable year, or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

"'(B) Loss for taxable year beginning after 1948: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the five succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of each of such succeeding taxable years (other than the first succeeding taxable year) shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the sum of the net income for each of the intervening taxable years, computed—

"'(i) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), and (4); and

"'(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for each intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss, to the net operating loss of any succeeding taxable year, or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

For the purposes of the preceding sentence the net operating loss for any taxable year shall be reduced by the amount, if any, of the net income for the preceding taxable year computed—

"'(iii) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), and (4); and

"'(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such preceding taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).'

"(b) Rule for application of section 122: Section 122 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) Law applicable in computing gross income, etc.: In computing the ne operating loss deduction for any taxable year, the gross income and deductions of any other taxable year involved in such computation, and the exceptions, additions, and limitations (provided in subsection (d) in effect for such taxable year) with respect to such gross income and deductions, shall be determined under the law applicable to such other year.'

"(c) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941, and the amendment made by subsection (b) of this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940.

"(d) Carry-overs in the case of certain reorganized railroads: Subsection (c) of the first section of the act of July 15, 1947 (Public Law 189, 80th Cong.), entitled 'An act to allow a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code' is hereby amended by striking out 'three instead of two' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one more than that prescribed in the Internal Revenue Code'."

Strike out section 137, beginning on page 65, line 19 and ending on page 77, line 11;

Strike out section 141, beginning on page 86, line 23 and ending on page 87, line 10;

Strike out section 142, beginning on page 87, line 11 and ending on page 93, line 9;

Strike out section 202, beginning on page 102, line 10 and ending on page 103, line 23;

Strike out section 203, beginning on page 104, from line 1 down to and including line 11;

Strike out section 204, beginning on page 104, line 12 and ending on page 105, line 12;

Strike out section 205, beginning on page 105, line 13 and ending on page 106, line 18;

Strike out section 213, beginning on page 126, line 7 and ending on page 127, line 8;

Strike out section 252, beginning on page 128, line 13 and ending on page 129, line 14;

Strike out section 253, beginning on page 129, from line 15 down to and including line 23;

Strike out section 311, beginning on page 144, line 10 and ending on page 145, line 6.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a memorandum discussing more fully the most objectionable features of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

CLARENCE F. LEA AND ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time on Monday of this week for the purpose of giving the Members of the California delegation an opportunity to express their sentiments concerning the two retiring Members of our delegation, Mr. LEA and Mr. ELLIOTT. In contrast to the usual procedure of saying nice things about Members after they have passed away, I feel it would be well to say something in their presence of what we think of their record and what they have done for the Nation and the State of California, for these two men are still living and they have served their country well and honorably and with distinction. They are retiring voluntarily.

It certainly is not necessary for me to say much about either one of these gentlemen except my own opinions, because they are so well known to the Members of the House and to the people of the State of California.

I first met AL ELLIOTT as a member of the Tulare County Board of Supervisors back in 1933. He was a rugged individualist then and expressed his opinions in the same positive and direct terms as he always has here in Congress. His sincere interest and his direct and rugged approach to every question and issue on which he expressed himself left no doubts about where he stood.

You would have to be deaf, dumb, and blind if you did not understand him. He fought openly and hard for what he believed in. He is a typical westerner who shoots straight from the hip. His loyalty and devotion to the Nation and his district is hard to equal.

He was interested in flood control, reclamation, and agriculture in general. He is a man of the soil, having lived all his life on the ranch. He has always been interested in helping the unfortunate by encouraging them to help themselves.

During the Seventy-ninth Congress he conducted a one-man investigation of housing conditions in southern California at his own expense in order to become familiar with the need of better housing for the rapidly increasing population in that part of the State.

He has fought long and hard for water in the Central Valley area of California. Against great odds he has made his views known.

AL ELLIOTT is not retiring from Congress because he is old, worn out, or weary; he is still a vigorous young man. He has been in Congress for 10 years and evidently thinks it is time for someone else to carry on while he takes up his chores on his own ranch. He is leaving a difficult job for his successor to fill if he works at it as long and as hard as AL ELLIOTT has. We will miss his frankness, his honesty and his rugged western spirit. But we would not forget the fine record he has made here, of which he and his family and the people of his district can be proud.

I can recall my first knowledge of CLARENCE LEA years and years ago. As a young man in California, CLARENCE LEA was the exemplar of congressional representation in my opinion and in the opinion of many, many people in the State of California at that time.

He has lived up to such a reputation all during the 32 years he has served here. Even before he came here he had a distinguished public record as a district attorney in his county and, certainly, his knowledge of legislation and the manner in which he has advocated the fundamental principles of good government on every occasion and the courtesy and the pleasantness of his personality, have been

impressed upon the Members of this Congress for 32 years, leaving an indelible record on the history of the Nation.

I am sure all of us regret seeing Mr. ELLIOTT and Mr. LEA leave the Congress. But we want them to leave with a good taste of the sentiments of the California delegation, the members of which are present to express their views.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with mixed emotions. Personally, it is going to be a matter of tremendous regret to see CLARENCE LEA and AL ELLIOTT leave this Chamber. I am happy in a way that they are going, because each of them after years of hard service to the Government we all love has earned a long vacation.

The work of the Congress, however, will suffer, the business of the people will feel this loss, because both of these gentlemen are experienced legislators, gentlemen who have demonstrated day after day in the performance of their public duties their very great efficiency, their breadth of mind, their disinterested purpose in serving their country's needs.

So, I am sorry that they are leaving; sorry because of my country's loss, and because of the personal loss of their admirable association. On the other hand, I am happy they are going, because I know it is to have a well-earned rest and an escape from responsibility; a rest, indeed, that they have earned. We rejoice that they will be able to enjoy it.

Behind all this is a warm and long-sustained friendship. As we trudge our weary way down life's pathway we make few real friends. Chance acquaintances, passing acquaintances, business associates, yes, many, but few who worm their way into your heart, win their place therein to long abide. Of both AL ELLIOTT and CLARENCE LEA I can say that they are such men.

So I say to each of them, dear friends, may your days which are spent beyond this friendly circle, the greatest fraternity, if you please, to be found anywhere on the face of the earth, be enjoyable ones. May happiness ever attend you, and may success be your reward at every turn. For I know of none more deserving of the kindly consideration of their fellow men.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to have this opportunity to come to praise Caesar and not to bury him. I think it is fitting and proper that we should give our tributes to our colleagues from California while they are still here to enjoy them. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve with men like CLARENCE LEA and AL ELLIOTT. I remember when I first came here 10 years ago, a brand new, green pea freshman Congressman, one of the first men who took me under his wing and showed me the way around the Capitol and how to get things done was CLARENCE LEA, the dean of the California delegation. I do not believe that I have had more friendly relations with any Member of the House than I have had with CLARENCE LEA. Clarence is a registered Democrat and I am a registered Republican, but I know that CLARENCE LEA first of all is an American. Political affiliation and partisanship has never been a part of his make-up. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve with him.

As to AL ELLIOTT, there is a diamond in the rough. There is one Member of the House who does not need this microphone to have his voice heard and get things done. He knows how to drive through to the meat of the coconut and to the heart of the problem, and to get things accomplished in a short period of time. Like myself, Al is a farmer. We have worked closely together on the delegation. We have had grand relationships, and I take this opportunity to say to both CLARENCE LEA and AL ELLIOTT, Godspeed and success in all of your chosen endeavors.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I had no advance notice that the colleagues of Mr. LEA and Mr. ELLIOTT were going to say a few words about them today, but I am very happy that I happened to be here. I am not qualified to make any ringing speech in their behalf, but I say with all earnestness that both of these gentlemen during their service here in the House were held in high esteem not only by the Democratic members of the California delegation but by the California members on the Republican side as well, and by each and every Member of the House and, I might say, also every employee on Capitol Hill who came in contact with them.

The services rendered by Mr. LEA are historic. When he was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one of the most important committees in the House, during the trying years of the war when so much very important legislation was before that committee, he at all times remained his cool, calm self. He never acted in any manner which indicated intense partisanship, or, in fact, any type of partisanship. He was most courteous at all times. I do not know of any chairman that ever had more success in steering important legislation through the House than our revered and honored friend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. I wish for him and his family the very finest years of life that may possibly come to them, and the finest of everything that he and they could possibly wish.

As for Mr. ELLIOTT, he has always appealed to me. I have been on very friendly personal terms with him at all times. I remember particularly the information he used to give me about how he operates his ranch in California, and the amusing and interesting details of what happened to the various animals, and how he took care of them, and various other things like that. As has been said by so many other speakers, everyone knew at all times where AL ELLIOTT stood. He certainly has the respect of all the Members of the House.

I am very well pleased that I happened to be on the floor this afternoon, and I think that perhaps we should even hold a special session to do honor to these two great characters, who are a credit to the Congress of the United States and to their country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Both of our friends from California [Mr. LEA and Mr. ELLIOTT] are leaving this body and the Congress voluntarily. While we thoroughly respect the judgment they exercise, we are very sorry that they have felt constrained to exercise that judgment, because both of them could have continued to be Members of this body, being highly respected by the people of their districts, based upon the sincere and conscientious service they have rendered the people of their districts and the great State of California, as well as the people of the country generally.

I have known both of them during my 20 years of service. Mr. LEA antedates me in this body in point of service. Naturally, as former majority leader for 6 years and now as the minority whip, my association with them, as with all other members of my party, has been very close.

The service of Mr. LEA speaks for itself, as does the service of our friend, Mr. ELLIOTT. Both are very strong characters, men of strong convictions. They have different ways of expressing their strong convictions. However, Mr. LEA, in that quiet way that is his, and Mr. ELLIOTT, in the dynamic manner that he has of expressing his thoughts, his sentiments, and his views on any public question. The important thing is that they are both men of strong convictions, men who voted in accordance with the dictates of their judgment and their conscience. They are both men who, as previous speakers have well said, have made their place in the history of our country as a result of their service in this body. They both leave this body with the respect of their colleagues, regardless of party affiliation. I know it will be a source of pride and happiness to them and to their loved ones in the years to come to know that while they served in this body they gave everything they had in the best interests of our people, and that although perhaps at times Members may have been in disagreement with them, their views in disagreement were respected by their colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who have preceded me in expressing regret that they are leaving us, but respecting the considerations which prompted them in arriving at that decision.

May God bless them with many more years through the journey of life, and may the happiness, joy, and pleasure that all men of wholesome mind look forward to be theirs.

They have performed their service well in this body. I know they will continue to take an active interest in public affairs in the future. I am not going to say good-by to them; because I expect to see them again. But so far as this body is concerned, it is good-by.

You leave us with the friendship, esteem, and respect of all your colleagues.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several years ago one of our colleagues in addressing the House during memorial exercises for our departed colleagues suggested that it might be better to say kind and nice things about our colleagues during their lifetime. To this sentiment I heartily agree.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore a great pleasure today for me to say a few words about two of my colleagues from California, whom I have known since I came to Congress.

CLARENCE LEA, the dean of the California delegation, should really have his biography written so we might know more intimately about his great work in the Congress. His work will forever live in the annals of the debates of the Congress and in the reports of the committee hearings of the House of Representatives. His imprint is on many important bills

I can only talk today very briefly about one of his characteristics which I think is outstanding, and that is the independence that Mr. LEA has displayed in his congressional service. In my 6 years in Congress I have never noticed a vote cast by Mr. LEA which was not based on principle. Frequently he departs from the party line and votes, as he always does, to express his own convictions. To show you how the people of California appreciate such an individual, I want to recount something to you. Mr. LEA has presented his name 16 times to the electors of the First Congressional District of California for a seat in the House of Representatives. The first time he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination alone. In the next 15 times he presented his name on the primary ballot of both parties, which, under California law, he had the right to do. Fourteen out of those 15 times, he received both nominations, and in each case received a majority of the votes in each party primary. It illustrates that the people of California appreciate a man who serves them and who exercises his own judgment in trying to work for measures which he thinks will bring about the greatest public welfare.

I can best illustrate what I have said by briefly recounting to you my conversation with one of my brothers who is a constituent of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. He has been a lifelong Republican. I said, "Who do you support for Congress in this district?" He said, "I have always voted for Mr. LEA." He said, "I like the way he votes. He attends to our business, when we have business with him. Everybody here thinks he is the right man to send back."

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] never has been a rabid partisan. He lifts himself above blind partisanship and considers the welfare of the country rather than the welfare of the party. Intense partisanship and statesmanship seldom mesh. I believe I can truthfully say that Mr. LEA's conduct in the House displays statesmanship.

It is encouraging to know that that kind of service receives the approbation of the constituents of the man involved. It is also a tribute to their intelligence and their discrimination that a man who exhibits the independence of thought and action that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] has exhibited, is so welcomed by his constituents that in practically every case where he has presented his name they have returned him by the vote of both parties.

TESTIMONIAL TO THE HONORABLE CLARENCE FREDERICK LEA, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AND DAISY A. LEA

MAY 23, 1948.

GREETINGS: The entire membership of the California delegation, their wives, the members of the California State Society in Washington, and a number of friends, wish to take this opportunity of expressing their admiration and affection for you.

Your service to California and to the Nation should be a source of pride to you.

Your faithfulness to the California State Society in Washington has endeared you to all of us.

God bless you and keep you. May your memories be happy ones.

Hon. John J. and Carol Allen, Hon. Jack Z. and Frances Anderson, Admiral H. G. and Edith B. Bowen, H. B. and Betty Blanchard, Hon. W. W. and Sue Bradley, Hon. Ernest K. and Lois Bramblett, Iris M. Bray, Jack and Zaida Bryson, Jewel Buckles, Mrs. Walter C. Burke, Francis C. and Helen H. Brown, James J. and Ruth Boyle, Irene Caldwell, Jane Callahan, Madalyn E. Callahan, Boyd Comstock, John M. Costello, Elmer Dean, Philip S. and Irma Fay Dodson, K. H. Donavin, Mary Donlin, Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas, Senator and Helen Downey, W. C. Early, Hon. A. J. and Jessie Elliott, Annette C. and Grace Enever, S. L. Kuykendale, Walter J. Little, Karl D. and Vera H. Loos, W. Bruce Macnamee, Frank and Frances Marsh, Mildred W. Martin, Hon. Gordon and Catherine McDonough, George and Dixie Meredith, Col. Frank and Portia Miller, Hon. Geo. P. and Esther Miller, Pherne Miller, Dorothy Morrison, James and Louise Musatti, Stanlus Z. Natcher, Hilda G. Nelson, Hon. Richard and Patricia Nixon, Herbert C. and Judy Parker, Hon. John and Dorothy Phillips, Roland and Alice Pierotti, Hon. Norris and Erna Poulson, Charles H. Purcell, Frank P. Randolph, Gertrude Jay Scott, Hon. Harry R. and Kay Sheppard, John J. Sirica, A. E. and Olive Stockburger, Grace Spinelli, Admiral Mahlon S. and Dorothy Tisdale, Ann Trittipo, Gregory S. and Frances K. Vaitses, Alex and Cebelle von Hafften, E. A. Voss, Wm. E. and Edith Warne, Hon. Richard and Sarah Welch, Carl and Helen Wheat, C. J. S. and Zillah Williamson, Roberta B. Winkler, Winnifred Winn, Harold Wright, Hon. Clair and Hazel Engle, Gen. E. A. and Nancy Evans, Hon. Charles K. and Jeanette Fletcher, Warren and Lorania Francis, Ed. D. Fugitt, Geo. M. Fuller, Dr. Justin K. and Virginia Fuller, Hon. B. W. Gearhart, Wm. S. and Anita Hammell, Dorothy Harper, Hon. Franck R. Havenner, Robert and Audrey Hays, Lucretia Hibner, Hon Carl and Wilberta Hinshaw, Betty Holifield, Hon. Chet and Vernice Holifield, Mary Hornbeck, Edward Hyatt, James C. and Dorothy Ingebretsen, Hon. Donald L. and Shirley Jackson, Hon. Leroy and Elizabeth Johnson, Ronald and Dorothy G. Ketcham, Hon. Cecil and Gertrude King, Fred King, Senator and Helen Knowland, Arnold Kruckman,

I wish to say a word now for my friend ALFRED J. ELLIOTT. He was born in the Third Congressional District. As some of my colleagues have said, he is a sturdy individualist. He will fight for what he thinks is right. He takes care of his people. He sees that the things he believes they ought to have are gotten, if there is any way to get them. We have differed on some minor things, but I certainly admire his courage, I admire his frankness, and I admire the way he works.

Mr. ELLIOTT is one of those examples that we have in America in such great numbers, not only in public life but in private life, of a man who started from the very bottom of the political ladder, and by hard work, by intelligence, by diligence, by consistency, and by courage worked up to the top. He has not had the benefit of the formal education that most of us in Congress have had, yet I doubt if there is any individual Member who could do more for his constituents than Mr. ELLIOTT has done for his constituents in the lower San Joaquin Valley.

I want to recount one thing that I think will become the law of this land that was initiated by Mr. ELLIOTT. The Bureau of Reclamation, of the Department of the Interior, when they began to develop the Central Valley, proceeded to invoke the 160-acre limitation to the land that would receive waters by virtue of the Central Valley project. He knew, and I know, and every man who lives in California, and has studied the problem, knows that that limitation was never intended to apply to a situation like we have in the Central Valley of California. So he started to work. We passed the Elliott rider on an appropriation bill. It never passed the other body. To this day we are trying to get that exemption made from the reclamation laws, assuming that the principle applies to a situation like we have in the Central Valley of California, which I doubt very much. I predict that before many years have passed the work started by Mr. ELLIOTT to eliminate the 160-acre limitation from the Central Valley project will be made the law of the land.

With these few remarks, I wish to say that I wish these men success and happiness. I am glad they are both in the vigor of their physical health. I am sure they will have many, many happy days in the years to come. I wish them every joy and pleasure that life has to give to men.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the two gentleman who are being honored here today are Democrats. They have voluntarily retired from the Congress of the United States. I assert, and I say it as a fact, that if either Mr. LEA or Mr. ELLIOTT had sought the nomination of the Democratic Party in California in their districts this time, each of them would have received the nomination; and, in my opinion, also the nomination of the Republican Party, by overwhelming majorities.

Mr. LEA is a man who endears himself to every young and new Congressman.

I recall when I came here, 31 years of age, and feeling pretty green, notwithstanding the fact that I had for some 8 or 9 years been district attorney in my home county. Because our districts border each other for some three or four hundred miles in northern California and because Mr. LEA has been so admired and respected by my people, I was told the first man I should see when I got to Washington was Congressman CLARENCE LEA, the dean of the California delegation. When I landed at Union Station I did not even stop to check my bags until I had gone to the phone booth and phoned CLARENCE LEA. His kindness and personal attention and friendship on that occasion will never be forgotten. Since then I have had many occasions to be grateful for his friendship and for his guidance. He has made the way much easier for me in the years that I have been here in Congress. In the early stages of my career he helped me consistently on committee assignments and in the making of the hard decisions which young Congressmen have to make.

I regret very much to see him leave the Congress of the United States and I regret that notwithstanding the fact that I know after 30 years of service Mr. LEA is entitled to take some time off and to enjoy a few years out in California. I know that he will find much happiness and much contentment.

There is a great deal of legislation which I could mention to which Mr. LEA has attached his name and which will go down to his credit in the records of the Congress of the United States. There is one piece of legislation, however, which he initiated on which the task has not been finished. I hope when it is finished that proper credit is given to Mr. LEA for the fact that he started the initial fight to change the electoral system of the United States. The legislation which he proposed has been considered by the Judiciary Committee of the House and by other committees and I believe some day will be enacted as the law of the land. In all probability that legislation will be the finest monument to Mr. LEA of all he has done in his years of service here in Congress.

With respect to my good friend ALFRED ELLIOTT, also a Democrat, I feel that he has a quality which is more important in public service than any other. I rate a man in public service on three qualities and in this order: He must, first, be honest; he must, second, be courageous; and he must, third, be able and intelligent. If he is not honest he is dangerous just to the point that he is courageous and intelligent. If he is honest and able without being courageous then his honesty and ability do not serve the public interest because he does not assert his capabilities. Mr. ELLIOTT, in my opinion, is one of the most courageous men I have ever seen in public life. He is a man who says what he thinks. The high esteem in which he is held on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber is due to the fact that he says what he thinks, and people who hear him say what he thinks know that he thinks that honestly. That is the reason that in this House, time and again, in my experience, men on both sides of the aisle have been willing to follow his leadership in the position he has taken on public questions. It is regrettable we do not have more men of his caliber in the Congress of the United States today, men of that type of courage, because it is that type of courage we need in the era through which we are passing at this time.

I am sorry Mr. ELLIOTT is leaving. He has not been here 30 years as has Mr. LEA, but I have reason to believe that his people will miss his services in this Congress. I know there are some jobs to be done which he would like to see finished, one of them being to see water coming down the Kern-Friant canal to give additional impetus to farming and irrigation in the south San Joaquin. We will go ahead—and promise him to try to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, these men, CLARENCE LEA and ALFRED ELLIOTT, are great, experienced, and able champions. The little humble people of this Nation can feel safe by their firesides in the evening when they know that men like CLARENCE LEA and ALFRED ELLIOTT are on guard under this Capitol dome—against those elements which, for their own ends, would turn over the established systems, political and economic, under which we live. They are retiring from their posts, and it is a loss to this Nation, as well as their districts. No new man will take their places or even dent the sands upon which they have so substantially imprinted their efforts and accomplishments in this Congress.

These men are my friends. I am happy for this opportunity to acknowledge my indebtedness and say my thanks. They have befriended me so much and so often I could not mention it all here. But I am sure that when I have completed my service in Congress and look back over the path along which I have come—as they do now—there will be two milestones which will stand out along the way, ALFRED ELLIOTT and CLARENCE LEA. I am as grateful to them for our associations and our friendship as their people and this Nation should be for the service they have rendered.

As our friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] said, we are not saying goodby to these gentlemen because we know that we will hear from them again and that we will see them again; but they leave this Congress with the highest esteem and respect and friendship that I believe any men in the California delegation ever had.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert following my remarks a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Bill Warne, in tribute to Mr. LEA:

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 9, 1948.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CLAIR: Through you, I want to join the thousands of friends of the Honorable and Mrs. CLARENCE F. LEA in wishing them tranquillity and happiness in their retirement from the Washington scene. As a Californian and a long-time admirer of Mr. LEA, I am proud of the 32 years of service, through two great wars and now well into the second reconstruction period, that he has rendered the Nation, our State, and his district. May God bless him and Mrs. Lea.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure, and I consider it a great privilege to add a few words of appreciation and praise for the fine qualities of service and Americanism which have been so much a part of the long and distinguished tenure in public office, Representatives CLARENCE LEA and ALFRED ELLIOTT.

Both of these able and distinguished legislators are many years my senior, and it may be somewhat presumptuous for a very junior Member of the body to attempt a small tribute. When CLARENCE LEA first came to the Congress 32 years ago, I was literally an infant, and when Representative ELLIOTT took his oath of office in the Seventy-fifth Congress, the thought of ever becoming a member of this great forum had never entered my mind.

Measured in terms of years it is entirely possible to compute the service of these two distinguished gentlemen to the minute and the second, but in terms of what they have both contributed to the State they have represented so ably and to the Nation to which they are so deeply devoted, there is no adequate yardstick. One can only say, quite humbly and quite sincerely, that they have ever placed the welfare of their Nation above the welfare of party interest and the dignity of America above the indignity of personal aggrandizement.

Likewise, the loss to this Nation in the retirement of these two public servants is truly a loss of no small magnitude. Today, our country and the world has need of men who combine the virtues and the human characteristics of the two fine gentlemen to whom their fellow delegation members today pay a small tribute.

We wish them well as they leave these halls. We who remain to carry on the work are indebted to them because they have left American footprints that go in a straight line and will be easy to follow.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the pleasure of being associated with the two gentlemen from California whom we now honor as long as several other Members of the California delegation, but in the time that I have known them I have come to regard CLARENCE LEA and AL ELLIOTT as two mighty good Americans—excellent Californians and desirable shipmates.

While some might think that my fundamental political philosophy should differ materially from that of these gentlemen who are on the Democratic side of the House, I have discovered that that is the case only in a rather minor way as most of us from California seem to have about the same slant on national mat-

ters and upon what is best for the Nation as a whole. The truth of it is that I have sometimes thought Mr. ELLIOTT and Mr. LEA to be good Republicans, or vice versa one might even conclude that I could be a Democrat of their persuasion, but, of course, I should far prefer to see them follow the symbol of the elephant than to have me trailing along behind the long-eared donkey.

We in the California delegation are going to miss CLARENCE LEA and AL ELLIOTT. The people of California are going to miss CLARENCE LEA and AL ELLIOTT. Yet, they have served their country well and certainly can be subject to no criticism in their determination to retire voluntarily from the political field for the present. I know that their constituents in California, in fact all Californians, will receive them with open arms and will heartily welcome them back into the community life of the neighborhoods in which they live.

On the part of the people of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, and on my own part, I wish them long life, happiness, and prosperity, but even more, I hope and trust that they will continue to give to the people of their State and of their community, the full benefit of the wisdom they have displayed as Members of this great legislative body.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, CLARENCE LEA and I came to Congress back in April 1917. I think our first vote was on the resolution declaring that a state of war existed between this country and the Central Powers of Europe. During all of those years we have been the best of friends, and in that friendship there has been no middle aisle. Mr. LEA's retirement is not only a loss to Congress, it is also a loss to the great State of California and to the country at large. He is an able legislator. As chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce he wrote many pieces of beneficial legislation now on the statute books. In our friendship and long acquaintance I found him to be tolerant, understanding, and friendly. To me his departure from this body, unless I should decide, as is possible, to join him in retirement, will be a deep personal loss.

The same may be said about the other distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]. While our paths have not crossed as many times, perhaps, as have Mr. LEA's and mine, yet I am sure that the Members of Congress have been impressed with his outstanding service in this body and his devotion to the great State that he has so ably represented, and to his country. He has frequently displayed a spirit of independence when it so happened that he differed with the views of the leadership on his side of the aisle. I sometimes feel that some of us are at times perhaps too partisan. That is something we should all guard against, because after all we are only animated by one purpose, and that is to render the greatest possible service to that glorious country we all love and which has done so much for us.

May I express the hope that these two distinguished sons of California will carry back with them into retirement a sense of having performed their duties with outstanding fidelity and ability. I can only pray that the future will hold nothing but happiness, good health, and long years for them. May their long and faithful service here ever be a source of satisfaction to them as they sit under the spreading branches of the tree of life and watch the ever-changing hues of California's valleys and hills.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, not only California but the entire United States will be losing the services of two outstanding legislators when our esteemed colleagues, CLARENCE F. LEA and ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, retire at the end of this year. Their records of achievement are spread throughout the records of Congress and what words I might say are needless because their achievements will remain in the minds of the many Members of Congress far longer than what few statements I can make here.

I join with the balance of the membership in wishing both of them all the good wishes and happiness possible while they are enjoying themselves in good old California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, criticizing Congress, individually and collectively, is a privilege which every American has and one which is exercised frequently as we know particularly well. I hope that some of those who have gone so far in their criticism of Congress—that they see nothing but bad in this body and its Members will have the opportunity to read the remarks which are being made today concerning our colleagues Mr. LEA and Mr. ELLIOTT. I think that in reading the very eloquent and moving tributes to these two men by their colleagues in the House, a person could not come to any conclusion but that the House of Representatives is a great body and that these two Members who are retiring after years of unselfish service, stand for the very best in American life.

Here are men who have conviction. Here are men who have courage. Here are men who are willing to stand for what they believe is best for their country regardless of personal, political or partisan consideration. Here are men who have humility, who despite their years of service and their standing in the House, have always had time and patience to devote to the problems of new Members.

It is a great privilege to join wholeheartedly in the sentiments that have been expressed today, and to wish, with the rest of my colleagues, Godspeed to two men who have done so very much for their State and for their country.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the nicest memories I will always have of the Eightieth Congress will be the memory of the pleasant associations I have enjoyed with the gentlemen from California, the Honorable CLARENCE LEA and the Honorable ALFRED ELLIOTT.

I envy AL ELLIOTT his ability to express the thoughts of an honest, courageous mind exactly in the manner in which he thinks them.

I envy CLARENCE LEA the quiet, constructive manner in which he accomplishes his high purposes and leaves no trace of rancor.

Each of my colleagues has served the Nation well. Each has ably represented the great State of California. I regret that neither will return to give further service. Their services will be missed.

By fortunate coincidence Mrs. Lea and Mrs. Allen have come to know each other well. An enduring affection for Mrs. Lea has naturally developed and will be another of the pleasant memories which we will carry with us.

I wish for each of my distinguished colleagues a most pleasant and prosperous life in the years to come.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRAMBLETT].

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, there have been many eloquent, well-deserved tributes today paid to Mr. LEA and Mr. ELLIOTT. I want to say that as a Member of the California delegation serving his first term in Congress, it has been an inspiration to have had the fine counsel and guidance of Congressman LEA and Congressman ELLIOTT. I look forward to many additional years of close association with both of them, and know that their district, State, and Nation will miss their excellent representation. The Congress will miss them from the floor of the House.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER may be extended at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from California and from all the other States of the Union in wishing good fortune and future happiness to my two California associates, Representatives CLARENCE F. LEA and ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, who are voluntarily retiring from the House of Representatives at the close of the present session of Congress.

The fact that both of these men have been repeatedly elected by their constituents to represent them in this National Legislature is convincing proof of the esteem and confidence which they enjoy among the people whom they have served so long here in the National Capitol.

More than 30 years ago, when I was appointed secretary to the late United States Senator Hiram W. Johnson, I first met Congressman LEA. At that time he had just been elected to the House of Representatives from the First Congressional District of California. In the more than three decades which have

elapsed since that time he has been returned to his seat in the House at every successive election. Very few men are still here who served with him in those critical days of the first war. During his lengthy service he rose to positions of high honor in Congress. As chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he carried the responsibility of making the great transportation system of the United States function efficiently during World War II, and the record he made then is one of which he can well be proud throughout the remainder of his life.

Mr. ELLIOTT was elected by the people of the lower San Joaquin Valley of southern California to important public offices before he came to Congress. His repeated reelections to this body are proof of the high regard which the majority of his people entertain for him.

In company with all of my fellow Members of the House who are present today, I wish both of these gentlemen health, happiness, and prosperity in whatever pursuits they may engage in in the future.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen of the California delegation may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, as well as all other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, this time has been taken, so that Members of the California delegation, and perhaps others, may express their feelings concerning the retirement, at the end of this session, of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]. Last February, when I learned of the decisions of these two friends of mine, I included a few paragraphs in the weekly column I have written, for more than 16 years, for the papers of my own district. I refer briefly to them now.

The State of California will suffer a loss, with the ending of this session, which few Californians realize now. Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA announced more than a year ago that he had decided to retire. I made a special trip to San Francisco, to attend a dinner given him by farm leaders, shortly after that announcement. He said his reasons were his age, and the conclusion of 32 years of continuous service in this House. I do not need to say here that he could have had reelection and renomination by both parties, as long as wanted.

A few weeks later, Congressman ALFRED J. ELLIOTT announced he would not run for reelection. His reasons were personal. Some Members here today know them.

CLARENCE LEA was born in Lake County, graduated from Stanford, studied law, and served as a district attorney before coming to Congress. AL ELLIOTT was born in Yolo County, and has been a successful farmer and livestock raiser all his life. For 19 years he has been the manager of the Tulare County Fair. He speaks a language which often could not be printed in full in this family journal, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but which was understood, even in the darkest days of the New Deal, by the regulators, the theorists, and the double-talkers, of Washington's bureaucracy.

Each man had his earned and recognized place in the congressional picture. California will lose the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. When the present minority was the majority, CLARENCE LEA was the chairman of that committee. It was CLARENCE LEA who went to the White House, under Republican or Democratic Presidents alike, respected, liked, and listened to, as spokesman for the delegation.

It was ELLIOTT'S knowledge of agriculture, and of the procedures of the House, as well as his universal friendships, to which Californians constantly turned. He is the senior minority member of the Committee on Public Works.

The delegation will lose two Democratic members, but the Republicans will regret the loss as much as their own party will regret it. Time may be a great healer, but I rise to remark that time may also be a great disturber, and in this instance will lay a heavy hand on California, as the Eightieth Congress ends. The future will show what these two men have meant to the State. They will be sorely missed, and by none more than by this present speaker.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join in this tribute to our two colleagues.

I have not had the opportunity of knowing the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] as well as I know the other gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], but I have observed his conduct here in the House and this has demonstrated clearly both his ability and his sincerity. He has served well and faithfully. He merits this expression of appreciation from his colleagues, as well as the appreciation of the people of his district.

I have had the opportunity of serving with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is unnecessary for me to refer to his long and most valuable service on that committee. That fine record is known to us all. But I do want to express my personal appreciation for the privilege of having been associated with him. It has meant much to me and I have benefited greatly because of it. The outstanding contribution he has made in such an able and constructive manner to the work of Congress and to the history of this country, his courtesy, friendliness, and constant adherence to the very finest qualities of a gentleman in every sense of the word have endeared him to all of us. We all regret deeply that he is leaving us. This country and this Congress need men of his high character and intelligence, yet we all acknowledge that he is entitled to be relieved of the burdens of public office after such a record of excellent and faithful service. Personally, I hope we will have the privilege of seeing him back here frequently.

I want to congratulate the people of the First District of California for their excellent judgment in selecting and retaining him as their Representative in Congress for so many years and to wish him every happiness for the future.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on which the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] has served 27 years, I would not be responsive to my sincere feeling if I did not make a few comments about Mr. LEA.

Several years ago I visited the Capitol of North Carolina. As I recall, the motto of the State of North Carolina which can be seen in the Capitol is "To Be Rather Than To Seem." It occurs to me this language fits Mr. LEA perfectly. Certainly there is nothing artificial about him. He is a true man in every respect. I do not wonder why this is so. Some months ago my wife and I were privileged to be in the Lea home for dinner one evening. In the quietude of that home I had the opportunity to hear Mr. LEA discuss some of the things he feels are most important in the life of a human being. Particularly impressed was I concerning his comments in connection with the fact that he and his charming wife had just finished reading the Bible again in a very thorough way. His remarks emphasized how basic are the truths which have actuated his life and his work. A little while after the evening to which I have referred, it was the privilege of our committee to visit the Mount Wilson Observatory in California. Mr. LEA and I, after having observed what can be seen by looking through the telescope on Mount Wilson, walked away together. I remember he commented that seeing what he had seen only served to emphasize to him the greatness of the God we serve and to strengthen his faith in that God.

Although there was never a legislator in the history of our country in my opinion who was more constructive, competent, conscientious, and wholesome than Mr. LEA and who has made greater and more lasting contributions to the welfare of the people of this Nation than he, yet his strongest forte in my opinion is not as a legislator. His strongest forte is as a true, clean, upright and righteous man. We read in the Bible, "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." Mr. LEA's work and contributions could not be less than the very best for in his heart only the very highest, most noble, pure and honorable sentiments live.

We all shall miss Mr. LEA, we shall never forget his true friendship, his high principles, and his great contributions. We wish for him and Mrs. Lea the greatest joy and happiness which can come to two of the most deserving and ideal people who ever lived.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, in a sense it is said that this is a voluntary retirement of the Honorable ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, of California. It is in that it is a matter of choice with him and not in keeping with the desires of his fellows in this body or his constituency at home.

I take advantage of this privilege as a Member to make record, so far as words will allow, of my great regard for the ability, integrity, and standing of AL ELLIOTT, whose qualities I have had opportunity to observe for more than 6 years. Soon I came to appreciate the

great service Mr. ELLIOTT was rendering to the Congress and to the Nation in the exercise of his splendid faculties to the welfare of the United States in trying times. I would not make comparisons, but I am compelled to give it as my opinion that we have lost, in his separation from congressional life, one of the most valuable Members in that body. At all times he has been active, but at no time willing to impose his opinions in a thoughtless way.

Membership in this body has been with him a recognition of a duty the privilege imposes. In addition to his splendid service as a faithful Member of this House and his many important committees, he has, when occasion demanded his splendid abilities, met every responsibility of membership in the Congress of the United States. Oftentimes, in critical hours, when measures seemed to hang in the balance, I have seen him take the floor of the House and, fortified by the high esteem as to ability and honesty in which he is held by the Membership, apparently turn the tide in favor of measures designed and required to meet the necessities of the hour and the occasion. I am just grateful that circumstances did not call him from the service at an earlier time. In retrospective realization of the need for ability and honesty in the last 6 years, and in remembrance of the great service he has rendered during that time, I am minded to express thanks and appreciation that he remained with us until these crucial days had passed. We shall, nevertheless, miss his splendid service in the important but less crucial days to follow.

I entertain the hope that, notwithstanding his separation from immediate activities of the House of Representatives, we may have his advice and counsel in meeting the responsibilities yet devolving upon Members of the Congress. It must be true, also, that the recollection of the wise, faithful, and important service he has rendered will of itself aid us, who remain ,in the performance of our duties as the days may require.

In conclusion, I wish to express to him my sincerest good wishes for his health, his happiness, and many successful years in the days to come, and California and this Nation will, as the years go on, miss the devoted services of the Honorable ALFRED J. ELLIOTT.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the circumstances, the retirement of the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, of California, from public service, at this critical period, is deplored not only here in the Nation's Capitol, but throughout our great State of California, and particularly will the loss be felt among those of us of the California delegation of which Mr. LEA was the esteemed dean. I am certain I reflect the sentiment of the entire membership of the House when I say there is universal regret that he is leaving the Congress. He is one of the most lovable and companionable of men and his service here reflects credit on himself, his country, and his constituency. It is quite a tug at the heart strings to have such a man leave the long and intimate associations which are inevitably developed in the daily duties of the House and the committees.

Mr. LEA has served 3 decades and 2 years in this body during the critical periods of both World Wars—a laudable period of service not to be equalled by many men during our country's history. It has been a notable period in the annals of the Nation and the world, and he has had a large part in its history.

His has been an exceptional career. He has promulgated no "isms"; he has championed no forlorn causes; he has led no crusades; he has not been stampeded by the veering winds of passion and sentiment which from time to time sweep the Chamber. He has kept his feet on the ground and his head above the miasma of partisanship and personal interest and sectional prejudice.

In the committee especially his work has been invaluable. His wise counsel, his mature experience, his discriminating judgment have exercised a stabilizing influence on the deliberations of the committee.

There is only one consolation, and that is that we have this opportunity to express our regard and affection for him before he leaves. He is leaving while it is yet day, while the sun is still high, and while there are still ahead of him many fruitful years.

We wish for him and his devoted wife health, happiness, and prosperity, and enjoyment of the continued satisfaction of duty well performed.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, when the Eighty-first Congress convenes next January there will be a new member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee sitting on the Democratic side of that committee.

He will be appointed to take the place left vacant by the voluntary retirement of the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, of California. With all due respect to the new committee member I can say that it will take him many years of hard work before he can hope to fill in all respects the chair formerly occupied by Congressman LEA. That spot in our affections which is reserved for Congressman LEA is one no one else will ever fill.

Mr. LEA's retirement is a real loss to the House of Representatives but doubly so to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Both as a member of that committee and as its chairman he established a reputation for statesmanship and as a legislator. Many of the bills reported favorably by that great committee bear the name of CLARENCE LEA. These laws will stand as monuments to his long and faithful service as a Representative from the First District of California.

As the Representative of the First District of Connecticut I join with my colleagues in wishing for the Representative of the First District of California and his fine wife many years of well-earned retirement in the State he loves so much and served so well.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am expressing the sentiments of every Member of the House when I express my own deep personal regrets over the fact that our distinguished colleague, Mr. LEA, from the First District of California, has decided this year to retire from Congress.

Our colleague has served continuously since the sixty-fifth Congress and for 14 of those terms he was the nominee of both the Democratic and Republican parties.

Even before coming to Congress, CLARENCE LEA had made a distinguished record as a lawyer and as district attorney of Sonoma County, Calif. His legal training and his studious habits made him one of the truly great legislative Members of the Congresses in which he has served.

For many years he was a member of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and for 10 years served as chairman of that important committee.

It would be interesting to note the many, many important bills of which he was the author which became law and are now the law of this country; not only legislation reported out of his own committee but by other committees as well.

Mr. LEA was universally respected and admired; his scholarly temperament and his gentlemanly and courteous manner endeared him to the membership of the committee and earned him the respect, which he deserved, of every Member of Congress.

It was my pleasure to visit a portion of Mr. LEA's district a little over a year ago. Having viewed that beautiful country, I can understand his desire and that of his good wife to retire to the restful and picturesque beauty of their homeland.

In his retirement, I extend to Mr. LEA, and to Mrs. Lea, my felicitations for every happiness.

I join with his thousands of friends and constituents in honoring CLARENCE LEA for the gentleman that he is and the great treasure that he has of a long, useful, and honorable public life.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest as well as one of the ablest Members of Congress is my distinguished friend and colleague from California [Mr. LEA]. While we respect the reasons which prompt him to voluntarily retire, we regret his decision. At anytime, but particularly in these trying days, the country can ill afford to lose the services of such an able, experienced, and courageous statesman.

It was my pleasure, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, to serve as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee under the chairmanship and leadership of Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA. During this time I learned to love and admire his sterling qualities. He is a man who shuns publicity and is moved by the still small voice. His virtues are many and his leadership constructive. My estimation of him is that he is a Moses with his leadership and humility; he is a Robert E. Lee with his character and meekness; he is an Abraham Lincoln with his friendship and honesty; he is a St. Paul with his service and Christianity.

The Nation and the Congress will miss his leadership and his colleagues will miss his companionship.

I know that my colleagues join me in extending to him our very best wishes for every future happiness and success.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many Members on both sides of

the aisle in expressing regret over the voluntary retirement of the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, of California. It was my pleasure to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with him for several years. Industry, integrity, and ability have marked his record of service. In his departure from public life the Nation, the State, and his own district will lose a valuable public servant whose place will be hard to fill. He has my best wishes for health, happiness, and prosperity which he so richly deserves.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of deep regret that I learned that the Honorable CLARENCE LEA did not plan to return to the House of Representatives.

It has been my pleasure to serve with the distinguished gentleman from California on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for 6 years. During 4 years of that time he was chairman of the committee, and during the Eightieth Congress he was the ranking Democratic member.

In all of that service I, along with other members of that great committee, have come to rely on his judgment and to share a high regard for his legislative ability, his fair and impartial consideration of all matters before the committee, and his intense interest in adopting proposals in the public interest.

It is doubtful if there is any other person in the Congress or in the Nation who has made a more thorough study of our national transportation system than Mr. LEA. He has been a pioneer in the field of legislation to develop a great air-transportation system in the United States, and that experience began immediately following the First World War.

To every type of legislation covering the wide scope under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. LEA has brought a wealth of knowledge growing out of a long experience, and his counsel on the committee will be greatly missed, even as his services in the House of Representatives.

I am sure all of us join in wishing for him and Mrs. Lea the very best the future has to offer as they return to the State of California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, and fellow Members from California, it is indeed a pleasure to be here and not in a redwood box to hear such fine things said about CLARENCE and myself this afternoon. Although I am leaving Congress, there is still much work to be done on the Central Valley project. I know the California delegation still has a great job to do. Although I am leaving Congress, if this work on the Central Valley project is not finished within the next 2 years I will pick up three or four additional western words and be back here in the House of Representatives somewhere, some time, some place, although it may not be in the position of a Congressman, but I will find my way into the Halls of the Congress somehow. During my years of service I have used various words not found in the dictionary. But, nevertheless, they had meaning and sometimes produced results. After all, results are what we are after. I want to sincerely say it is a pleasure to have served in this body. I have served with a great bunch of men and women. They are people of good standing from various walks of life who have been selected by the majority of the people in their districts. We all have enemies. I have had them. If you did not have enemies it would not be a pleasure to serve here. I like people to gig me, and I like to gig them. There are lots of gigs left in me. I hope that you can all get along better in my absence. I know it is going to be a pleasure for me to be home. I know it will be a pleasure for CLARENCE, too. Being a much younger man, I expect to catch a lot more fish in the next 2 years and kill a lot more game than CLARENCE. I repeat, I want to thank each and every one of you, who have expressed yourselves so kindly, from the bottom of my heart for the fine things you have said. But if you guys lay down on this Central Valley project, and if you do not complete it and take out a lot of the bugs that are in it, I will be back here with some new words that will string from here clear down to the White House every time I say them. The word "dilly-wacker" will be a mild one when I get back the next time. Thank you a lot for having had the pleasure of serving in the House with you fine gentlemen.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for the tribute my colleagues have paid to me this afternoon, I feel so especially because of the high respect and affection that I have for my colleagues who have spoken.

Someone long ago said, no man is poor if he has one good friend. I believe in that.

Another philosopher long ago said the applause of a single individual is a circumstance in the life of any man.

As I am leaving here and looking back over the years that are gone, I think, as I will in the years to come, of the magnificent men with whom I have served in this House. I have known many of them and many of them have had an important place in my life. As I depart I recognize the fact that my life has been greatly enriched because of my associations in this House. I will from time to time scan over the RECORD and renew my memories. I will observe with interest the progress of my colleagues in this House. I can assure you that I will find pleasure in your success, in any services you may contribute to our State and the Nation.

I regret the departure of Mr. ELLIOTT from this body. He is young and has much less reason to leave than I. I respect his judgment. But I know in his leaving our State is losing a positive influence in this Capitol of very great value and of splendid value to the Nation.

I remember the first time I came to this House. The welcome I received meant much to me. I will cherish it to my last day. One of the first men I met was Champ Clark. He invited me into his chambers. We sat there talking for a considerable while and finally I said, "I am taking too much of your time. I must be going." He said, "No. You stay right where you are. We got to get acquainted and there is no better time than right now."

Then he took me over by that door, where he introduced me to Joe Cannon, a remarkable man. There were two Joe Cannons. The original Joe Cannon, the aggressive, able, partisan leader; and then the Joe Cannon that I knew, matured and ripened and softened with the wisdom and kindness of years. He well played the role of father to this House. One thing I admired about Joe Cannon was his friendship for the young man. The youngest Member who came down in this well and made a speech was listened to by Joe Cannon with just as much attention as the man with the strongest influence in this House.

When I was introduced to Joe Cannon he put one hand on my shoulder, gave me a hearty handshake, and said, "God bless you, young man. You have come to the Congress at just the right age in life. I hope you will stay here a long time and be useful."

I am sure no man ever made a better speech to a new Member of Congress than Joe Cannon made to me.

Finally, when all his years here were passed and he was retiring from Congress, I remember the day that William Rodenberg came in that door with Joe Cannon; arm in arm they walked down this aisle while the House stood in reverence, and then they disappeared out of this door to the left of the Speaker's rostrum. Joe Cannon, after all his long years, had left this House forever. Joe Cannon and Champ Clark remain in my memory as two old oaks that characterize the 32 years I have served here.

The world has been good to me. It was a great day when I came here with a certificate of election in my pocket and stood out there and looked at this Capitol—to me the temple of this Republic. I can say candidly that I never felt more humble in all my life as I did that evening. I never felt my responsibility more seriously. I looked upon that magnificent dome and thought of the many great characters who had served beneath it to the glory of our Nation. I wondered if there was a useful place there for me. But I soon learned there is a place in this Congress, in every committee of this Congress, for the Member who is willing to give an industrious and constructive service. Every committee will welcome such a man.

Two thousand have served in this House since I came. About 1,570 of my colleagues have completed their service here and have gone. I am to join them now. I am not leaving this House with any discontent, with any cynicism, or with any arrows to fling at this institution. On the contrary I leave here with great respect for this institution.

I served under six Presidents, under nine Speakers.

It was my first day in Congress when Woodrow Wilson stood on that platform and delivered his war message. It was there he said there is now one course that is not open to us and that is a course of

submission. Then there was a tremendous ovation. It was the response and expression of America that characterized our Nation at that hour. Since that time America has taken her place as the giant of this world, carrying the greatest of responsibilities and facing perhaps the greatest opportunities that any modern nation ever faced. What an appeal to the man of character and patriotism in this House to respond to that opportunity of this Republic and the world.

If I looked at this situation just from my own standpoint, measured by what the world has done for me, I have had what I might be pleased to call success. I know, however, that is not the test. The real test of my value is what I have done here for this Government of ours.

Shortly after I was elected I told the people who elected me that it was not such a great thing to be elected to Congress, but that if the elected person could go to Congress and perform a useful purpose it would be a great thing. In this Nation of 145,000,000 people even a little thing done for their benefit is a great thing. It is a great thing to have that opportunity. That privilege has been mine all these years. I value it beyond measure. I am not leaving here with any disappointment or bitterness toward Congress. On the contrary, I think this is the greatest political institution of America. The splendid character of the men with whom I have served gives me assurance that Congress is the one institution above all others to which the people of America must look for the security of their destiny. Congress is a human institution. Manifestly, it has its weaknesses. But its faults are only such qualities as induce human conduct everywhere. To a certainty, the people of this Nation can realize that in the selection of their Congressmen they are going to get the kind of government they support. No worse; no better. We who serve in Congress may be unworthy of our places. But our positions are worthy of any man. This is an institution that is worthy of any man. No man has abilities of character or intellect beyond the needs of this House. This institution is worthy of all the best are able to give.

I had a debate between my head and my heart as to whether I should leave this Congress. I was reluctant to go from a work I have so cherished. My head prevailed. So I am going away with that heart clinging to the welfare of this Congress, and beyond it. I hope and expect that in the years to come I will still enjoy that happiness that comes from doing useful things.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred, as follows:

S. 20. An act to regulate the review of judgments and conviction in certain criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 21 An act to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 108. An act to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 826. An act to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 850. An act to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1844. An act to authorize an appropriation for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public-school buildings and facilities at Winnebago, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2028. An act to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2286. An act to provide for nonreimbursable allocations on the Carlsbad Federal reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all rights of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyance; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2418. An act to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2517. An act to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen José Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2670. An act to amend section 10 of the act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of W. A. Knox, W. L. M. Knox, and Frank C. Morris, operating as Knox Lumber Sales Co., of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 1726. An act for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor;

H. R. 1855. An act for the relief of Elbert Spivey;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee;

H. R. 2273. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;

H. R. 2588. An act requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of a city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 2684. An act for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese beetle quarantine;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Emeline Lartigue;

H. R. 3402. An act to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.;

H. R 3641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield;

H. R. 3883. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene*;

H. R. 3915. An act to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4032. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States;

H. R. 4688. An act to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery;

H. R. 4830. An act for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.;

H. R. 4874. An act to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county;

H. R. 5071. An act to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma;

H. R. 5112. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include

an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes;

H. R. 5147. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens;

H. R. 5174. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii;

H. R. 5344. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the Act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5728. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5758. An act to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 5770. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5808. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5891. An act to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto;

H. R. 5983. An act to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps;

H. R. 6073. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes;

H. R. 6110. An act to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6113. An act to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service;

H. R. 6114. An act to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6229. An act to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6355. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6368. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory;

H. R. 6489. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of lead;

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended;

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments;

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 1082. An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion;

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of James B. Walsh;

S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes;

S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia; and

S. 2201. An act supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1938.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of W. A. Knox, W. L. M. Knox, and Frank C. Morris, operating as Knox Lumber Sales Co. of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 1726. An act for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor;

H. R. 1855. An act for the relief of Elbert Spivey;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee;

H. R. 2273. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;

H. R. 2588. An act requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of a city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles;

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 2684. An act for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese-beetle quarantine;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Emeline Lartigue;

H. R. 3402. An act to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.;

H. R. 3433. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield;

H. R. 3883. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene;*

H. R. 3915. An act to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4032. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States;

H. R. 4688. An act to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery;

H. R. 4830. An act for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.;

H. R. 4874. An act to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county;

H. R. 5071. An act to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma;

H. R. 5112. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes;

H. R. 5147. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens;

H. R. 5174. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico, and Hawaii;

H. R. 5344. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5728. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5758. An act to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 5770. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5808. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care

of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5891. An act to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto;

H. R. 5983. An act to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Service, Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps;

H. R. 6073. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes;

H. R. 6110. An act to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6113. An act to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service;

H. R. 6114. An act to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act;

H. R. 6229. An act to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6355. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6368. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory;

H. R. 6489. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of lead;

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Veterans' Affairs Administrator to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 12, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1642. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Harry Fuchs against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1643. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 28 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6860. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANDIS: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 6527. A bill to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LOVE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6641. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 2309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORTON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Senate Joint Resolution 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; without amendment (Rept. No. 2310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2311. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SADLAK: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6411. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in furtherance of national safety aginst traffic and other accident hazards; without amendment (Rept. No. 2312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 451. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; without amendment (Rept. No. 2313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4159. A bill to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 2314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4435. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4962. A bill to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; without amendment (Rept. No. 2316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 5464. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6868. A bill to amend section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, with respect to widows of certain deceased Coast Guard personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CLASON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6501. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 6883. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of bridges on county roads in the flood-damaged areas of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 6884. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 6885. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6886. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6887. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6888. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 6889. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to Southern Counties Gas Co. of California, a perpetual easement for a natural-gas line over lands within Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6890. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 6891. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 6892. A bill to increase World War I and II disability and death compensation and pension rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 6893. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. J. Res. 424. Joint resolution to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of rodent control in

the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. J. Res. 425. Joint resolution to eliminate the requirement that mail addressed to patrons of cities and villages contain a specific street address number; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 214. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward extending the existing railroad system between the Territory of Alaska and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 662. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6656; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 663. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6079; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 664. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6439; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 665. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4073; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 666. Resolution creating a select committee to attend the meeting of the Parliamentary Congress for the Constitution of a United States of Europe; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 5219 of the United States Revised Statutes relative to levying taxes on national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 6894. A bill for the relief of George M. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6895. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 6896. A bill for the relief of Marie Cataldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 6897. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Shockley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6898. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 6899. A bill for the relief of W. M. Tindal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2087. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of St. Cecelia's Parish Resettlement Committee, of San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of legislation to permit the entry of a reasonable portion of such displaced persons into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2088. By the SPEAKER: Petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2089. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging passage of pending legislation in Congress exempting pensioned Government employees from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 12, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, as we pray for the Members of this body, its officers, and all those who share in its labors, we remember that Thou wert never in a hurry and never lost Thine inner peace even under pressure greater than we shall ever know.

But we are only human.

We grow tired.

We feel the strain of meeting deadlines, and we chafe under frustration.

We need poise and peace of mind, and only Thou canst supply the deepest needs of tired bodies, jaded spirits, and frayed nerves.

Give to us Thy peace and refresh us in our weariness, that this may be a good day with much done and done well, that we may say with Thy servant Paul, "I can do all things through Christ, who gives me strength." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 11, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 9, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 314. An act for the relief of Robert E. Lauritzen;

S. 1771. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Powell town site, Wyoming, Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the James S. McDonald Post, 5054, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Powell, Wyo.; and

S. 2060. An act for the relief of Edgar Wikner Percival.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. ROHRBOUGH had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, vice Mr. CUNNINGHAM, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1747. An act to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946;

H. R. 3260. An act for the relief of Clarence S. Osika;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder; and

H. R. 6252. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the New Jersey State Bar Association, Trenton, N. J., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1988, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Vergil D. McMillan, of Washington, D. C., relating to his claim for damages against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TARIFF COMMISSION ON OPERATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a preliminary draft of parts IV and V of the Report of the Tariff Commission on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, together with chapter 6 of part III, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2686. A bill to establish the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1610).

By Mr BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2551. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to

Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1611);

H. R. 2352. A bill to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees; with amendments (Rept. No. 1612); and

H. R. 6457. A bill to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1613).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6705. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1609).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 2706. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 1614); and

H. R. 5750. A bill to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1615).

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6481. A bill making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1616).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 12, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended;

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments;

S. 1082. An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion;

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of R. Walsh;

S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes;

S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

S. 1747. An act to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 2040. An act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2856. A bill to incorporate the Federal Civil Service War Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 2857. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arizona to Lillian I. Anderson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 39, line 25, after the word "Secretary", insert the following: "; payments (not to exceed the average per pupil cost in the State where construction is in progress) to school districts as reimbursement, while projects are actually under construction, for the instruction of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and of contractors engaged on such projects: *Provided*, That a tuition charge of $25 per semester shall be charged and collected by the Bureau of Reclamation for each such dependent attending such schools."

Mr. O'MAHONEY also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6705, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—PRINTING OF HOUSE BILL 5888

On motion of Mr. COOPER, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, be printed showing the Senate amendments numbered.

JOSIAH W. BAILEY

[Mr. BYRD, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute prepared by him to the life, character, and public service of Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARTER GLASS

[Mr. BYRD, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute prepared by him to the life, character, and public service of Carter Glass, late a Senator from the State of Virginia, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. BROOKS, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute to the late Senator John Thomas, of Idaho, by Senator BUTLER, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. BROOKS, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a transcript of the memorial service of Senator John Thomas, of Idaho, at Gooding, Idaho, November 15, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT CONNECTICUT DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator LUCAS at the Democratic State Convention at Hartford, Conn., on June 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERALISM AND THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Constitutional Liberalism and the Taft-Hartley Law, delivered by him at Asbury Park, N. J., June 11, 1948, at the convention of the American Federation of Musicians, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOUNDATION OF THE REPUBLIC—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Foundation of the Republic," delivered by him at the annual banquet of the Treasurers' Association of Virginia, at Lynchburg, Va., on June 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EVOLVING ROLE OF CONGRESS IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY BENJAMIN V. COHEN

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Evolving Role of Congress in Foreign Affairs," delivered by Benjamin V. Cohen before the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia on April 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—ARTICLE BY GOV. EARL WARREN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "My Plan for Health Insurance," written by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, and published in Look magazine for June 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Is Up to the Senate To Enact a Sound Trade Bill," published in the Baltimore Sun of June 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT BEFORE THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered on June 11, 1948, by Senator TAFT before the Union League Club of Philadelphia, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered by him at Richmond, Va., on May 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—ARTICLE BY HEBER H. RICE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Behind the Iron Curtain," written by Heber H. Rice, of Huntington, W. Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION ON MUNDT-NIXON BILL—STATEMENT OF LEON HENDERSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Leon Henderson setting forth the views of Americans for Democratic Action with reference to the Mundt-Nixon bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

MUNDT-NIXON BILL—STATEMENT OF AL FISHER, SEATTLE, WASH.

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Al Fisher, secretary of the Washington State CIO Council, 84 Union Street, Seattle, Wash., with reference to the Mundt-Nixon bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is House bill 6556, which, under the unanimous-consent order entered yesterday, has been temporarily laid aside for the call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as there is to be a call of the calendar, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Feazel	McClellan
Barkley	Ferguson	McFarland
Brewster	George	McGrath
Bridges	Green	McKellar
Brooks	Gurney	Malone
Butler	Hatch	Martin
Byrd	Hawkes	Millikin
Cain	Hayden	Moore
Capper	Hickenlooper	Morse
Chavez	Hill	Murray
Connally	Hoey	O'Conor
Cooper	Holland	O'Daniel
Cordon	Ives	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Downey	Kilgore	Reed
Dworshak	Knowland	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	Langer	Robertson, Wyo.
Ecton	Lodge	Russell
Ellender	Lucas	Saltonstall
Smith	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Sparkman	Thye	Williams
Stennis	Tobey	Wilson
Taft	Umstead	Young
Taylor	Vandenberg	
Thomas, Okla.	Watkins	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the order of the Senate the calendar will be called for the consideration of unobjected-to bills, beginning with Calendar No. 1579.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 784) to provide maternity leave for Government employees was announced as first in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6116) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the request of a Senator who is compelled to be absent I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CLAIMS FOR LOSS OR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY DEPOSITED BY ALIEN ENEMIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 29) to authorize payment of claims based on loss or damage to property deposited by alien enemies, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after "1707", to insert "the possession of which property was not prohibited by law prior to said promulgations"; in line 5, after the word "ancestry", to strike out "with local police authorities"; in line 13 after the word "prescribe", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided further,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Attorney General to pay or settle any claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property which had been used for espionage or other illegal purposes on or before December 7, 1941."; and in line 22, after the word "Any", to insert "decision or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay in an amount not in excess of $1,000, when accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and final settlement, any claim against the United States arising on or after December 7, 1941, for damage to, or loss or destruction of, personal property, the use, operation, possession, custody, or control of which was prohibited by proclamation No. 2525, dated December 7, 1941, and proclamations No. 2526 and No. 2527, dated December 8, 1941 (55 Stat. pt. 2, pp. 1700, 1705, and 1707), the possession of which property was not prohibited by law prior to said promulgations and which was deposited by alien enemies or United States citizens of Japanese ancestry in the manner provided in the regulations promulgated by the Attorney General on February 5, 1942, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 844; 28 C. F. R. 30.1–30.16): *Provided,* That the damage to or loss or destruction of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and that the claim is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may by regulation prescribe: *Provided further,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Attorney General to pay or settle any claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property which had been used for espionage or other illegal purposes on or before December 7, 1941.

SEC. 2. No claim shall be considered unless presented in writing within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Any decision or settlement made by the Attorney General under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe shall be final and conclusive, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General may report such claims as exceed $1,000 to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 5. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under this act are hereby authorized.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE

The bill (S. 2772) to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the service, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (d) and (e) of section 2 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 888; 38 U. S. C. 13a), are amended to read as follows:

"(d) To transfer to the Service without charge, rental, or reimbursement such necessary equipment as may not be needed for other purposes, and furnish the Service such services and utilities, including light, water, and heat, as may be available and necessary

for its use: *Provided,* That reasonable charges, to be determined by the Administrator, shall be paid annually by the Service for the utilities so furnished.

"(e) To employ such persons as are necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Service, and to pay the salaries, wages, and expenses of all such employees from the funds of the Service. Such personnel shall be excluded from the determinations and reports required by section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U. S. C. 947), with respect to personnel ceilings. Personnel necessary for the transaction of the business of the Service at canteens, warehouses, and storage depots shall be appointed, compensated from funds of the Service, and removed by the Administrator without regard to civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided,* That such employees shall be subject to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, the Civil Service Retirement Acts, and laws administered by the Bureau of Employees Compensation applicable to civilian employees of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 888; 38 U. S. C. 13a), is amended by adding a new subsection (k) at the end thereof as follows:

"(k) To authorize the use of funds of the Service when available, subject to such regulations as he may deem appropriate, and without regard to the provisions of sections 3639 and 3651, Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (31 U. S. C. 521, 543), for the purpose of cashing checks, money orders, and similar instruments for the payment of money presented by veterans hospitalized or domiciled at hospitals and homes of the Veterans' Administration, and by other persons authorized by section 3 of this act to make purchases at canteens. Such checks, money orders, and other similar instruments may be cashed outright or may be accepted in payment for merchandise or services, and the difference between the amount of the purchase and the amount of the tendered instrument refunded in cash."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 889; 38 U. S. C. 13c), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. To finance the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Service there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such amounts as are necessary to provide for (a) the acquisition of necessary furniture, furnishings, fixtures, and equipment for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of canteens, warehouses, and storage depots; (b) stocks of merchandise and supplies for canteens and reserve stocks of same in warehouses and storage depots; (c) salaries, wages, and expenses of all employees; (d) administrative and operation expenses and premiums on fidelity bonds of employees; and (e) adequate working capital for each canteen and for the Service as a whole. Amounts heretofore or hereafter appropriated under the authority contained in this act, as amended, and all income from canteen operations become and will be administered as a revolving fund to effectuate the provisions of this act, as amended."

INVESTIGATION BY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS OF INSURANCE CLAIMS

The bill (S. 2807) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for certain investigation reports in connection with insurance claims was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of April 3, 1948 (Public Law 473, 80th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to contract for the services of firms, corporations, or associations to furnish investigation reports in connection with claims for benefits under contracts of insurance entered into pursuant to laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Payments under such contracts for services may be made from moneys now or hereafter appropriated to the Veterans' Administration for administrative expenses."

TRANSFER OF PORTION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER AT LOS ANGELES TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2773) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. This bill was recommended by the Veterans' Administration. Its purpose is to permit the Veterans' Administration to transfer approximately 34 acres of land located at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State for the use of the University of California to establish a medical center. This deed will reserve to the United States all interest in and to any oil, mineral, or fissionable material in said land, and will revert to the United States if the land ceases to be used as a research and medical center.

The Veterans' Administration has no further need for the premises covered by the bill and has ample room for any possible future development of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles on other portions of the land which they presently occupy.

It will be to the best interest of the Veterans' Administration to have a medical school and research center established in close proximity to the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles. I may say that it has been the policy of the Veterans' Administration to locate the hospitals near medical centers for obvious reasons.

The medical school has agreed that if transfer is made it will provide a consultation staff for patient care, research, and training; give qualified members of the staff of veterans' hospitals in this area part-time clinical appointments in the medical school; and make its research equipment and graduate medical training available to the Veterans' Administration hospitals at Sawtelle and Birmingham.

The land was acquired by the Veterans' Administration in 1930. It is now estimated that the value of the land would be approximately $800,000, from which it receives a rental of about $3,000 a year as it has been leased to a commercial organization for the past 10 years. The lease may be canceled upon 90 days' written notice.

Benefits which will be derived from the establishment of a medical center are of far greater value to the Veterans' Administration than its present rental of $3,000 a year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I shall not object to consideration of the bill, because I think it represents a very sound policy, and is in a very real sense a proper, forward-looking procedure. I think we will receive more than the value of the property from the use to which it is to be put.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

There is in the Committee on Finance House bill 6716 covering the same matter, and I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of the House bill, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6716) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to House bill 6716, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the word "any", in line 1, on page 2, it is proposed to insert the words "oil, mineral, or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6716) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2773 will be indefinitely postponed.

PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR CHRONIC AND TROPICAL DISEASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3889) to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, in section 1, line 10, after "hypertension", to insert "myocarditis"; on page 2, after "nerves", to strike out "functional disorders of the nervous system" and to insert "encephalitis lethargica residuals"; in line 11, after the word "dysentery", to strike out the comma and "amebic or bacillary"; in line 12, after "filariasis", to strike out "fungus diseases; leishmaniasis" and insert "leishmaniasis"; in line 14, after "fever", to strike out "oracontiasis (or dracontiasis)" and insert "dracontiasis"; in line 15, after "plague", to strike out "relapsing fever"; in section 2, page 3, in line 11, after "dysentery", to strike out the comma and "amebic or bacillary"; in the same line, after "filariasis", to strike out "fungus diseases"; in line 13, after "fever", to strike out "oracontiasis

(or dracontiasis)" and insert "dracontiasis"; and in line 14, after "plague", to strike out "relapsing fever."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3889) was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2279) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is not on the floor and I understand he is preparing an amendment. I ask that the bill may go over until the Senator arrives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ISSUANCE OF FREE PASSES TO TIME INSPECTORS OF RAILROADS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2192) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to agents of carriers subject to part I of such act, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "officers", to strike out "agents", and insert "time inspectors", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (7) of section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "its officers, surgeons, physicians, and attorneys at law," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "its officers, time inspectors, surgeons, physicians, and attorneys at law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act."

AMENDMENT OF THE CANAL ZONE CODE

The bill (S. 2829) to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in chapter 1 thereof three new sections Nos. 16 to 18, and reading as follows:

"16. Acquisition or construction of structures, equipment, and improvements: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized, within the limits of available funds, to purchase or otherwise acquire equipment, and within the Canal Zone to purchase or otherwise acquire, construct, repair, replace, alter, or enlarge any building, structure, or other improvement, when in his judgment such action is necessary for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, or civil government of the Panama Canal or Canal Zone.

"17. Claims for losses of or damages to property: Authority is hereby conferred upon the Governor of the Panama Canal, or his designee for the purpose, to consider, adjust, determine, and settle claims for losses of or damages to property arising from the conduct by the Panama Canal of authorized business operations, or arising from the maintenance, operation, improvement, or enlargement of capacity of the Panama Canal or from the sanitation or civil government of the Canal Zone: *Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply to claims cognizable either under section 10 of this title, as amended, or under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

"Any award made to any claimant pursuant to this section shall be payable out of any moneys appropriated or made available for the maintenance and operation, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone; and the acceptance by the claimant of any such award shall be final and conclusive on the claimant, and shall constitute a complete release by the claimant of such claim against the United States.

"18. Disaster relief: In the event of emergency arising because of disaster or calamity by flood, hurricane, earthquake, fire, pestilence, or like cause, not foreseen or otherwise provided for, and occurring in the Canal Zone, or occurring in the Republic of Panama in such circumstances as to constitute an actual or potential hazard to health, safety, security, or property in the Canal Zone, the Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to expend available funds and to utilize or furnish materials, supplies, equipment, and services for relief, assistance, and protection."

SEC. 2. Chapter 4 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, which chapter is now entitled "Business Operations" and consists of sections 51 and 52 of said title 2, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 4—BUSINESS OPERATIONS: SALES AND SERVICES

"Sec.
"51. Authorization for establishment and operation of various facilities.
52. Organization and conduct of any such facilities by Panama Canal as 'business operations.'
"Sec.
"53. Receipts from such operations, sales, and services; expenditure and reinvestment; reports.
54. Exception of Canal Zone Postal Service.

"SEC. 51. Authorization for establishment and operation of various facilities: (a) In connection with the operation, maintenance, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, the President is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate through the Panama Railroad Company or otherwise, docks, wharves, piers, drydocks, shops, yards, marine railways, salvage and towing facilities, dredging facilities, construction facilities, fuel-handling facilities, motor-transportation facilities, civil air terminals, power systems, water and sewer systems, warehouses, storehouses, hotels, a printing plant, living quarters and other buildings, and any other necessary facilities and appurtenances, for the purpose of providing, at reasonable prices, fuel, electric power, water, equipment, supplies and materials generally, repairs, labor transportation, quarters, space in buildings, wharf and like services, hotel and restaurant services, and services generally, including recreational services, and for the purpose of assembling, assorting, storing, repairing, and selling scrap and other byproducts of manufacturing and shop operations, and materials, supplies, and equipment purchased or acquired for the construction, improvement, operation, maintenance, sanitation, or civil government of the Panama Canal or Canal Zone and which are obsolete, unserviceable, or no longer needed. The sales, services, equipment, supplies, and materials hereinbefore referred to may be made or furnished to vessels, to agencies of the Government of the United States, to the Panama Railroad Company, to employees of the Government of the United States or of the Panama Railroad Company, and to any other governments, agencies, persons, corporations, companies, or associations eligible to make or receive such purchases, services, supplies, or materials under the laws prevailing at the time and the policies heretofore or hereafter adopted consistently with such laws.

"(b) In the event the President has heretofore elected, or shall at any time hereafter elect, to maintain and operate through the Panama Railroad Company any of the facilities and appurtenances referred to in this section or section 52 of this title, theretofore maintained and operated by the Panama Canal, the President is authorized to transfer to the Panama Railroad Company all or as much as may be determined to be necessary of the personnel, property, records, related assets, contracts, obligations, and liabilities of or appertaining to the said facility and its appurtenances, and such transfer shall be deemed to have been accepted and assumed by the Panama Railroad Company without the necessity of any act or acts on the part of the said corporation except as otherwise stipulated in provisions of law applicable to the said corporation.

"52. Organization and conduct of any such facilities by Panama Canal as 'business operations': The President may cause any or all of the facilities and appurtenances referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) of section 51 of this title to be organized and conducted by the Panama Canal as 'business operations,' and in such case the aggregate net profit if any accruing from the conduct of such business operations shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

"53. Receipts from such operations, sales, and services; expenditure and reinvestments; reports: The moneys received by the Panama Canal from the operations authorized by sections 51 and 52 of this title, and from pilotage, quarantine, immigration, and like services, from rentals, from damage claims, and from any and all other sales made and services rendered, but not including tolls, taxes, court fees, or fines, may be expended or reinvested under the several heads of appropriation for the Panama Canal, without being covered in the Treasury of the United States except as provided in section 52 of this title; but, except as otherwise provided in this section, such funds shall be subject to the provisions of law relating to public funds of the United States. Monthly reports of such receipts and expenditures shall be made to the President and annual reports shall be made to the Congress.

"54. Exception of Canal Zone Postal Service: The provisions of sections 51 to 53 of this title shall have no application to operations of the Canal Zone Postal Service."

SEC. 3. Title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 1 of chapter 6 thereof a new section No. 85 and reading as follows:

"85. Special training of employees: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized, within the limits of appropriations made therfor, to provide for special training in the United States or elsewhere of any employee of the Panama Canal when in the judgment of the Governor such special training will be of material benefit to the work of the Panama Canal and the special training of such employee would be more advantageous than the hiring of other available personnel having the specialized skill or experience desired. During the period of such special training the employee may be paid his regular compensation and his travel expenses in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Sub-

sistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, subject to recovery by the United States of such costs or an equitable portion thereof, as determined by the Governor, in case the employee fails to complete such training or is separated from the service except for reasons beyond his control within 1 year following the completion of the period of training."

SEC. 4. Title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 3 of chapter 6 thereof a new section No. 124 and reading as follows:

"124. Employees injured prior to September 7, 1916; appliances; lump-sum payments: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to purchase artificial limbs or other appliances for persons who were injured in the service of the Isthmian Canal Commission or of the Panama Canal prior to September 7, 1916, and to make payments in lump sums not exceeding the amounts authorized by the act of September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, ch. 15), to alien cripples who are now a charge upon the Panama Canal by reason of injuries sustained while employed in the construction of the Panama Canal."

SEC. 5. Title 6 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in chapter 27 thereof a new section No. 906 and reading as follows:

"906. Clothing and money for discharged prisoners: On the discharge of a prisoner from any penal institution in the Canal Zone such prisoner may, in the discretion of the Governor of the Panama Canal, be furnished with such suitable clothing as may be authorized by the Governor, and an amount of money not exceeding $20."

ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY JUSTICE WITHIN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2401) to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 3, line 7, after the word "served", to insert "not less than 4 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Kem amendment to the draft legislation was agreed to and the courts-martial system is now a part of the draft bill, I think the bill now before us requires some explanation. The bill was reported by the Committee on Armed Services prior to the passage of the selective-service measure. I think the passage of this bill is necessary, for in case the selective-service bill does not pass with the Kem amendment in it, then the bill before us would give to the Air Corps the same courts-martial system articles of war the ground forces now have. So in order to make it possible that the Air Corps have some system of courts martial, the bill before us should be passed, so the legislation will be in effect in case the selective-service measure does not pass with the Kem amendment in it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 9, after the word "retirement", to strike out "or if recalled to active duty from the retired list upon release from active duty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Air Force the office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force. The office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be occupied by the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among qualified officers of the United States Air Force, for a term of 4 years. The Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be charged with supervising the administration of military justice in the United States Air Force and the performance of such other legal duties as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 2. The Article of War and all other laws now in effect relating to the Judge Advocate General's Department, the Judge Advocate General of the Army, and the administration of military justice within the United States Army shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force with respect to the personnel thereof, and all references in such laws to the Department of the Army (War), the Army of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Army (War), the Judge Advocate General, Assistants Judge Advocate General, and officers of or assigned to the Judge Advocate General's Department shall be construed for the purposes of this act, as referring to, and vesting like authority, duties, functions, and responsibilities in, the Department of the Air Force, the Air Force of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, and officers of the United States Air Force designated by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, as judge advocates, respectively: *Provided*, That until the expiration of the transfer period prescribed by section 208 (e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.), the jurisdiction conferred hereby may be exercised with respect to personnel of any component of the Department of the Army who may be under the command and authority of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 3. Any Officer of the United States Air Force who shall have served not less than 4 years as the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall, upon retirement be advanced on the retired list to the highest active duty grade held while so serving and shall receive retired pay computed upon such higher active duty grade.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent the prosecution, punishment, mitigation, or other action, by the United States acting through appropriate officers of either the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force as to any offense made punishable by the Articles of War committed prior to the date of this act by any person subject to military law, and either of those departments may enforce or mitigate any penalty, forfeiture, fine, or liability, heretofore adjudged against such person.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

The bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wishes to ask me a question about the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I was asked by some constituents of mine regarding the bill. They had some interest in the industry. I thought they had discussed with the Senator from Oregon an amendment which would protect their particular situation. I should like to ask the Senator to explain what the bill does. I reserve the right to object, or ask that the bill go over until I hear the Senator's explanation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senate bill 2830 is one of the most important bills the armed services have presented to the Senate for consideration. The bill has the unanimous approval of the Armed Services Committee as the result of very thorough and extensive hearings which we have held on the Texas City tin smelting plant. I think I can summarize the situation very briefly.

There is a serious shortage of tin in this country. The Texas City plant, which is financed by the RFC, and which, under contract with the Government is under the operation of an American-Dutch company, has been smelting the low-grade ores of Bolivia, which are the most accessible low-grade ores to the United States. We are satisfied from our hearings that it is necessary to continue the present arrangements because the particular company that has the contract with the RFC has access to these low-grade Bolivian ores. Unless we make use of this arrangement, members of the Armed Services Committee are convinced that we shall not have access to the low-grade Bolivian ores. There is a tremendous shortage of tin. It is a strategic material which we need to stockpile for our national defense and security. Therefore, after the hearings, when private concerns were given full opportunity to have their position made known on the record—and a long judicial record was made at the hearings—the Armed Services Committee concluded, after full discussion in the committee, and by unanimous vote, that we should continue the identical RFC contract arrangement we presently have for a period of 5 years. A shorter period, which was recommended by some of the private companies, in the opinion of the committee, would jeopardize our access to the Bolivian ore, because Bolivia already, not knowing whether or not we are going to continue this arrangement, has been in negotiation with some other countries for access to this ore, and has already contracted a certain supply to Argentina. Argentina does not have a single smelter of any size that can make use of the ore, which shows very clearly that she is going to stockpile it, apparently for international trade relations.

All I can say to the Senator from New Jersey is that the committee is satisfied that the claims of all private interests in this country have been judicially considered by our committee, and although he will find in his State, as well as perhaps in some other States, private tin concerns which would like to have the Government guarantee them a certain subsidy and turn the operation of the Texas City smelter over to some American concern at this time, and then

subsidize that concern, we are convinced that that would not be economically sound. It would jeopardize our access to the Bolivian ores. Therefore we have taken the position that in the interest of national security we should continue this arrangement with the American-Dutch Co. for another 5-year period.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator be willing to let the bill go over until the end of the calendar? I should like to send to my office for an amendment which I propose to offer.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from New Jersey in any way I can. I hope, if it is possible, if we have any difference of opinion on this question, that he and I, along with other members of the Armed Services Committee, can reach an agreement in the next hour or hour and a half. I say to the Senator most sincerely that I believe this particular bill is one which certainly should be passed by the Congress before adjournment. It must go to the House for action. Therefore I think it is very important that action be taken today.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to submit to the Senator a proposed amendment, which I shall send for immediately.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that bill goes to the foot of the calendar.

The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

ATTENDANCE OF UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS BAND AT NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF MARINE CORPS LEAGUE, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The bill (S. 2064) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to 25, inclusive, 1948, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is the same as Calendar 1614, House bill 5036. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5036) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2064 will be indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF PROBATION SYSTEM FOR UNITED STATES COURTS

The bill (H. R. 2766) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARATOGA NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 5822) to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY HILL

The bill (S. 1693) for the relief of Henry Hill was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An identical bill is House bill 4298, which is in the Committee on the Judiciary. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from further consideration of House bill 4298.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4298) for the relief of Henry Hill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1693 will be indefinitely postponed.

CLAIMS OF OWNERS IN CONNECTION WITH SITE OF CAMP WHEELER, GA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4663) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners in fee simple of the land leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the owners in fee simple of the land leased by them to the city of Macon, Ga., and subleased by the said city to the United States for use by the Army as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga., for damages for the breach, if any, of their respective leases to the city of Macon: *Provided*, That in the determination of such claims the damages allowed, if any, shall be limited to the amounts to which such fee owners would have been entitled under the terms and provisions of their said leases for the city of Macon: *And provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the lack of privity of contract between the United States and the said fee owners and not otherwise to affect any rights of the parties.

And insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render monetary judgment upon the several claims (1) of the city of Macon with respect to lands owned by the city and leased by the said city to the United States for use by the Army as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga., for damages for the breach, if any, of its leases and the owners of leasehold interests, except the city of Macon, in and to lands leased by them to the city of Macon, Ga., and subleased by the city to the United States for such use. In the determination of the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and of leasehold interests in lands leased by them to the city of Macon and subleased by said city to the United States, the damages allowed, if any, shall be limited to the amounts to which such owners would have been entitled under the terms and provisions of their leases to the city of Macon: *Provided*, That claims of fee owners and leasehold owners, excepting the city of Macon, relating to the same property shall be joined in one action and the amount of damages allowed, if any, shall not exceed the amount that could have been recovered had all the interests in such property been vested in one party. The claims of the city of Macon with respect to lands owned by it shall be determined under the terms and provisions of its leases of such lands to the United States. This act shall be construed to waive the lack of privity of contract between the United States and the said fee owners or between the United States and the said leasehold owners; to waive the requirement of such leases to the city of Macon of notice by the lessor to the city in order for claims of restoration to be asserted, and to waive the immunity from suit of the United States in favor of the parties and with respect to the claims described in this act, but not otherwise to affect any rights of the parties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga."

ESTATE OF JOHN DEIMAN

The bill (H. R. 3114) for the relief of the estate of John Deiman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LORRAINE MALONE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1412) for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after words "sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lorraine Malone, of Gallup, McKinley County, New Mexico, the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as a result of a collision, approximately 4 miles east of Safford, Graham County, Ariz., on November 13, 1944, between an automobile driven by her and a United States Army truck, which had been parked in the nighttime on the pavement of United States Highway No. 70: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAYWARD O. BRANDON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2359) for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$358.62" and insert "$259", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hayward O. Brandon, of Philippi, W. Va., the sum of $259. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Hayward O. Brandon against the United States for wages for overtime work performed during 1941 as an employee of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WITH DISABILITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following amounts:

(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

(a) has a wife but no child living, $15;

(b) has a wife and one child living, $25;

(c) has a wife and two children living, $32.50;

(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $40;

(e) has no wife but one child living, $10;

(f) has no wife but two children living, $17.50;

(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $25;

(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $12.50 for each parent so dependent.

(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 percent, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

SEC. 2. That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

(a) has a wife but no child living, $12.

(b) has a wife and one child living, $20;

(c) has a wife and two children living, $26;

(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $32;

(e) has no wife but one child living, $8;

(f) has no wife but two children living, $14;

(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $20;

(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $10 for each parent so dependent.

(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 percent, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

SEC. 3. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

SEC. 4. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and veterans regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this act.

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2820) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the bill was recommended by the Veterans' Administration and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The purpose is to permit the Veterans' Administration to transfer 430 acres of undeveloped prairie land to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for a public park and for golf-course purposes. This land has not been used for the past 15 years, except that it has been leased for grazing purposes. The land was given to the Veterans' Administration by the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., and this bill would permit returning the land to the city, which plans to spend approximately $160,000 for its development.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ERNEST L. GODFREY

The bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. M. C. LEWIS

The bill (H. R. 1222) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. W. DELOACH

The bill (H. R. 5330) for the relief of W. W. DeLoach was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERNEST F. LUTZKEN

The bill (H. R. 3007) for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER VANDAHL AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2916) for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rice Talbot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUDICIAL CODE AND JUDICIARY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I shall attempt to comply with the suggestion and the request of the Senator from New Mexico.

The purpose of this bill, which is a very extensive one, is to codify and revise the laws relating to the Federal judiciary and judicial procedure. In addition to these very important purposes, Mr. President, the bill has as its further purpose the enactment into positive law of those laws so codified and revised.

The Senator from New Mexico will recall——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I remember now, and I know what the Senator is speaking about. So far as I am concerned, I shall need no further explanation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator what was done with the provision of the bill dealing with the Tax Court.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the House of Representatives placed into this bill a tax-court provision. It was considered with great care, I think it is just to say, by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Extensive hearings were held, at which various controversial matters, and particularly one controversial matter relating to the Tax Court, were heard. As a net result of the facts so developed, it was concluded by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee that it was advisable to withdraw from House bill 3214 all provisions by which the Tax Court would be placed under the judiciary. Consequently, Mr. President, included among the 80 amendments which are embodied in this extensive bill are quite a number which have the effect of withdrawing the House provisions incorporating the Tax Court under the Judicial Code.

Does that answer the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is quite satisfactory.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia and Mr. MILLIKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has asked the question which the Senator from Virginia had planned to ask. I was happy to hear the reply from the Senator from Missouri.

The bill presents this codification as a thoroughly expert codification of existing law; does it not?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, that is not quite an accurate statement to this extent: In codifying and revising, it was felt essential in some instances—as, for instance, in the matter of habeas corpus—to redraft the provisions of the statute. We had the advantage of knowing what the judicial conference of senior circuit judges, of whom the Honorable John J. Parker, I think, is the head, had decided as to what should be done with respect to that particular subject. That is but one illustration of various changes that have been made.

It would take considerable time to state all the changes; but I may say that the purpose of this bill is primarily to revise and codify and to enact into positive law, with such corrections as were deemed by the committee to be of substantial and noncontroversial nature.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia, who still is on his feet.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, all I inquired about was the codification. I understand that it was done by experts; and it is a splendid job. The only item into which I wished to look was the one the committee has eliminated.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Virginia is quite correct.

There was assembled a staff of experts who, in my opinion, are real experts. They are identified in the House committee report. In addition to that, the House had the advantage of an advisory committee composed of outstanding men with years of practical experience at the bar and on the bench. In addition to that, Mr. President, the committee had the advantage of the conference to which I have referred, with which Judge Parker is connected, and also had the advantage of the experience and observations of the Judicial Conference Committee on the revision of the Judicial Code, appointed by the Honorable Harlan Fiske Stone, late Chief Justice of the United States, the chairman of the committee being Judge Albert B. Maris, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the third circuit. I wish to pay tribute at this time to Judge Maris' assistants and collaborators for the spendid work done in this connection.

Mr. President, I desire to read three sentences from the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, which I think in justice should be placed in the RECORD, namely:

> The work of revision was greatly facilitated and advanced through the cooperation of a committee of Supreme Court justices appointed by the Chief Justice. This committee consisted of the late Chief Justice Stone and Associate Justices Frankfurter and Douglas. It was most cooperative in the solution of problems of concern to that Court.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if I am not trespassing upon the time rule, in view of the fact that there are approximately 80 amendments to this bill, unless some Member of the Senate desires to separate some one or more of them which he thinks should be separately considered, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in my own time I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that I had risen to ask a question, but the statements the Senator has made have answered it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

Page 1, strike out:

"13. Tax Court ..... 271"

Renumber items 15 to 23, inclusive, as follows:

Old No.	New No.
15	13
17	15
19	17
21	19
23	21

Page 5, section 48, in the eleventh line, immediately after "Fort Worth,", insert "Jacksonville."

Page 28, section 118, in first line of subsection (b) under heading "Middle District", strike out "Blair," at end of line; in second line of subsection (c) under heading "Western District", insert "Blair," immediately before "Butler."

Page 35, section 127, in second paragraph of subsection (a), immediately after "Alexandria,", insert "Newport News."

Page 38, section 133, at bottom of page, after "Indiana", under—

"Northern ..... 1"

insert—

"Southern ..... 1"

Page 44, strike out, near bottom of page, "Chapter 13—Tax Court" and all that follows thereafter to bottom of page.

Page 45, strike out all of this page.

Page 46, at top of page, after "Chapter," in chapter heading, strike out "15" and insert "13."

Page 48, near top of page, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "17" and insert "15."

Page 49, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "19" and insert "17."

Page 51, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "21" and insert "19."

Page 55, at top of page, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "23" and insert "21"; section 451, second paragraph, fifth and sixth lines thereof, after "Customs Court," strike out "the Tax Court"; section 451, fourth paragraph, after "Customs Court," strike out "Tax Court."

Page 56, in third line from bottom of page, after "Columbia", insert "and"; in second line from bottom of page, strike out "and the Tax Court of the United States."

Page 64, near top of page, strike out:

"57. Tax Court ..... 911"

In item 59, strike out "59" and insert "57."

Page 64, section 603, in second line of section 603, immediately after "salary of", strike out "$9,376.50" and insert: "$7,500."

Page 66, section 605, second paragraph, fourth line, after "Customs Court", insert "and"; and after "Claims" strike out "and the Tax Court."

Page 67, in third line from top of page, after "Appeals", strike out "the Customs Court, the Tax Court, and all other courts of the United States established by act of Congress" and insert "and the Customs Court."

Page 67, section 631, in subsection (a), fourth line, immediately after "parks" insert "Big Bend, Crater Lake."

Page 68, section 632, in the fifth line, strike out "civil actions and."

Page 74, section 752, after last line on page, insert "The chief judge of a district court having five or more district judges may also appoint an assistant secretary."

Page 76, after last line on page, insert "furnished in criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons allowed."

Page 78, section 792, in subsection (c), third line, immediately after "findings of fact", insert "and recommendations for conclusions of law."

Page 81, commencing near top of page, strike out the chapter heading "Chapter 57—Tax Court" and all that follows thereafter down to but not including "Chapter 59—General provisions applicable to court officers and employees"; near middle of page, after "Chapter" in chapter heading, strike out "59" and insert "57."

Page 82, strike out:

"Each clerk of court and his deputies, and each employee of the Tax Court designated in writing for that purpose by the chief judge of such court, may administer oaths and affirmations and take acknowledgments."

And insert:

"Each clerk of court and his deputies may administer oaths and affirmations and take acknowledgments."

Page 84, near top of page, strike out:

"97. Tax Court ..... 1621"

Page 86, near middle of page, strike out "1294. Tax Court decisions"; immediately following the above, renumber item "1295" as "1294."

Page 87, near middle of page strike out "§ 1294. Tax Court decisions" and the three lines following immediately thereafter; at middle of page, strike out "§ 1295" and insert in lieu thereof "§ 1294"; in line following immediately thereafter, preceeding "Appeals" strike out "(a)"; strike out the last six lines on this page.

Page 92, lines 11 and 12, after the word "courts," strike out "including the district courts for the Territories and Possessions of the United States" and insert "together with the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone and the District Court of the Virgin Islands."

Page 97, section 1402, in subsection (b), first line, after "Any", strike out "tort claim action" and insert "civil action on a tort claim."

Page 104, section 1504, after "district" in second line, strike out "court in tort claims cases" and insert "courts in civil actions based on tort claims."

Page 105, section 1583, in third line, immediately after word "same", insert a comma; in fourth line, immediately after word "chargeable", strike out the comma and insert "and."

Page 105, near bottom of page, strike out the chapter heading "Chapter 97—Tax Court" and all that follows to bottom of page.

Page 106, strike out the first two lines on this page.

Page 107, near bottom of page, strike out "1696. Tax Court; service."

Page 108, preceding chapter 115, strike out: "§ 1696. Tax Court; service" and the two lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 115, under chapter 119, strike out "1826. Payment of Tax Court witnesses."

Page 116, below middle of page, strike out: "§ 1826. Payment of Tax Court witnesses" and the seven lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 120, at middle of page, strike out "1930. Tax Court."

Page 125, near middle of page, strike out: "1930. Tax Court" and the seven lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 130, section 2072, add the following sentence at end of last paragraph: "Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary nothwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 130, section 2073, add the following sentence at end of last paragraph: "Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 133, at bottom of page, strike out: "167. Tax Court procedure---------- 2551"

Page 134, at top of page, renumber items 169, 171, and 173 as follows:

Old No.	New No.
169	167
171	169
173	171

Page 134, preceding section 2241, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 153, strike out "2244. Finality of determination; rehearsing" and insert "2244. Finality of determination."

Page 136, section 2244, strike out all of section 2244 and insert:

"§ 2244. Finality of determination.

"No circuit or district judge shall be required to entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the detention of a person pursuant to a judgment of a court of the United States, or of any State, if it appears that the legality of such detention has been determined by a judge or court of the United States on a prior application for a writ of habeas corpus and the petition presents no new ground not theretofore presented and determined, and the judge or court is satisfied that the ends of justice will not be served by such inquiry."

Page 137, section 2253, in first line of section strike out "circut" and insert "circuit."

Page 138, section 2254, strike out all of section 2254 and insert:

"§ 2254. State custody: remedies in State courts.

"An application for a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted unless it appears that the applicant has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, or that there is either an absence of available State corrective process or the existence of circumstances rendering such process ineffective to protect the rights of the prisoner.

"An applicant shall not be deemed to have exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, within the meaning of this section, if he has the right under the law of the State to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented."

Page 143, section 2401, strike out all of subsection (b) of section 2401 beginning "(b) A tort claim" and concluding "final disposition of the claim." and insert:

"(b) A tort claim against the United States shall be forever barred unless action is begun thereon within 1 year after such claim accrues, or unless, if it is a claim not exceeding $1,000, it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within 1 year after such claim accrues. If a claim not exceeding $1,000 has been presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within that period of time, suit thereon shall not be barred until the expiration of a period of 6 months after either the date of withdrawal of such claim from the agency or the date of mailing notice by the agency of final disposition of the claim."

Page 147, section 2414, in first line, strike out "final" and insert "Payment of final."

Page 150, section 2503, in line 12, immediately following the word "Commissioner", insert "and when directed by the court his recommendations for conclusions of law."

Page 155, strike out all of this page.

Page 156, strike out all of this page.

Page 157, commencing at top of page, strike out all preceding the chapter heading "Chapter 169—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals procedure"; in the chapter heading "Chapter 169—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals procedure" strike out "169" and insert "167."

Page 158, near top of page, in the chapter heading, after "Chapter", strike out "171" and insert "169."

Page 161, near top of page in the chapter heading, after "Chapter", strike out "173" and insert "171."

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, strike out "2676. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure applicable", and renumber items "2677" and "2678" as items "2676" and "2677", respectively.

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in item 2679 of analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, strike out "2679. Attorneys' " preceding "fees" and insert "2678. Attorney."

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, renumber items "2680" and "2681" as "2679" and "2680", respectively.

Page 162, third line of page, immediately preceding "actions", insert "civil."

Page 162, section 2674, in fourth line of section 2674, strike out "for punitive damages" and insert "for interest prior to judgment or for punitive damages.

"If however, in any case wherein death was caused, the law of the place where the act or omission complained of occurred provides, or has been construed to provide, for damages only punitive in nature, the United States shall be liable for actual or compensatory damages, measured by the pecuniary injuries resulting from such death to the persons, respectively, for whose benefit the action was brought, in lieu thereof."

Page 163, sections 2676–2678, strike out all of section 2676 and renumber sections 2677 and 2678 as follows: section 2677 as section 2676, section 2678 as section 2677.

Page 163, section 2679, in catch line, strike out "2679" and insert "2678", strike out "Attorneys' " and insert "Attorney"; in fourth line of section, strike out "2678" and insert "2677"; in sixth line of section, strike out "attorney's " and insert "attorney."

Page 163, section 2680, in catch line, strike out "2680" and insert "2679."

Page 164, section 2681, in catch line, strike out "2681" and insert "2680."

Page 165, strike out all of section 2, consisting of first six lines on this page, and insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Chief Justices of the United States Courts of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the Court of Claims, and the presiding judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, in office on the effective date of this act, shall be the chief judges of their respective courts.

"(b) The provisions of title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, of the United States Code, set out in section 1 of this act, with respect to the organization of each of the several courts therein provided for and of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall be construed as continuations of existing law, and the tenure of the judges, officers, and employees thereof and of the United States attorneys and marshals and their deputies and assistants, in office on the effective date of this act, shall not be affected by its enactment, but each of them shall continue to serve in the same capacity under the appropriate provisions of title 28, as set out in section 1 of this act, pursuant to his prior appointment: *Provided, however,* That each circuit court of appeals shall, as in said title 28 set out, hereafter be known as a United States court of appeals. No loss of rights, interruption of jurisdiction, or prejudice to matters pending in any of such courts on the effective date of this act shall result from its enactment.

"(c) The sum of $7,500 specified in this act as the salary which the Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall receive, and the sum of $7,500 specified in this act as the salary which each commissioner whom the Court of Claims may appoint shall receive, shall each respectively be that basic compensation on which shall be computed and paid the additional basic compensation mentioned in section 521 of the act of June 30, 1945 (ch. 212, 59 Stat. 301), as amended by the act of May 24, 1946 (ch. 270, sec. 6, 60 Stat. 217).

"(d) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the provisions of section 14 of the act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 358, 58 Stat. 663), are not hereby repealed."

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert:

"SEC. 36. Section 1141 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The circuit courts of appeals and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction to review the decisions of the Tax Court, except as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code, in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions of the district courts in civil actions tried without a jury; and the judgment of any such court shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari, in the manner provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.' "

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert:

"SEC. 37. Section 6 of the act approved August 7, 1946 (ch. 864, 60 Stat. 903), is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 6. Whenever any claimant under this act is dissatisfied with the action of a department or agency of the Government in either granting or denying his claim, such claimant shall have the right within 6 months to file a petition with the Court of Claims or, if the claim does not exceed $10,000 in amount or suit has heretofore been brought or is brought within 30 days after the enactment of this amendatory act, with any Federal district court of competent jurisdiction, asking a determination by the court of the equities involved in such claim; and upon the filing of such a petition, the court,

sitting as a court of equity, shall have jurisdiction to determine the amount, if any, to which such claimant and petitioner may be equitably entitled (not exceeding the amount which might have been allowed by the department or agency concerned under the terms of this act) and to enter an order directing such department or agency to settle the claim in accordance with the finding of the court; and thereafter either party may appeal from the decision if it was rendered by a district court or petition the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari if it was rendered by the Court of Claims, as in other cases. Any case heretofore brought in a district court under this section may, at the election of the petitioner to be exercised within 30 days after the enactment of this amendatory act, be transferred to the Court of Claims for original disposition in that court.'"

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert the following section:

"SEC. 38. The provisions of this act shall take effect on September 1, 1948."

Page 173, at bottom of page, renumber "SEC. 36" as "SEC. 39", and in the first line, immediately after the word "Statutes", insert "of the District of Columbia, Revised Statutes of the United States."

Page 178, near top of page, strike out:

Do..	231	275-281, 286, 287, 289-296, 298-300	36	1164-1169	28	411, 412, 413, 415-417, 418, 423, 424, 430-434, 441-443

And insert:

Do..	231	275-281, 286, 287, 289, 290, 292-296, 298-300	36	1164-1169	28	411, 412, 413, 415-417, 418, 423, 424, 430, 431-434, 441-443

Page 186, in list of acts on this page, strike out:

1939—Feb. 10	2	1100-1105, 1110-1121, 1130-1133, 1141-1145, 3741, 3744, 3745 (b) (c) (d)	53	158-165, 460, 461	26	1100-1105, 1110-1121, 1130-1133, 1141-1145, 3741, 3744, 3745 (b) (c) (d)

Page 187, in the list of acts on this page, strike out:

1942—Oct. 21	619	V	504	(a)	56	957	26	1100

And the column headings immediately above and below such line.

Page 188, in the list of acts on this page, strike out:

1944—Feb. 25	63	V	503	58	72	26	1114

And the column headings immediately above and below this line.

Page 189, in acts for year 1945, strike out:

1945—May 3	106	I	I (part)	59	[38] 127	26	1102, note
Do..	106	II	213	59	134	28	530a

And insert:

1945—May 3	106	II	213	59	134	28	530a

Page 189, in acts for year 1946, strike out:

1946—July 5	541	IV (part)	....	60	[47] 477	28	296a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	....	60	[48] 478	28	412a

And insert:

1946—July 5	541	II (part)	....	60	[46a] 460	28	604a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	....	60	[47] 477	28	296a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	....	60	[48] 478	28	412a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	....	60	[48a] 478, 479	28	374b

Page 189, in the list of 1946 acts on this page, strike out:

July 31...	704	1	60	716		26	1102 (c)
						28	5, 213, 241, 296, 301, 324
					D. C. Code		11-202, 11-203

And insert:

July 31	704	1 (part)[51a]	60	716		28	5, 213, 241, 296, 301, 324
					D. C. Code		11-202, 11-203

Page 189, strike out the ruled line at the end of the schedule of repeals and insert:

1947—May 15...	55	1-4	61	91, 92	16	158a-158d
Do...	57	.....	61	92	16	403c-5

Date	Statutes at Large					U. S. Code	
	Chapter	Title	Section	Volume	Page	Title	Section
1947—							
July 9	211	II	(part)	61	[51a] 290	28	604a
Do..	211	IV	(part)	61	[52] 303	28	296a
Do..	211	IV	(part)	61	[53] 304	28	412a
Do..	211	IV	(part)	61	[54] 304, 305	28	374b
Do..	211	IV	(part)	61	[55] 306	28	530

Date	Statutes at Large				U. S. Code	
	Chapter	Section	Volume	Page	Title	Section
1947—July 11	224	....	61	310	28	184
July 23	300	1, 2	61	409	28	374c, 374d
Aug. 1	446	1	61	722	28	931

United States Code

Title:	Section
17	101 (f)
17	102
17	103
17	110
17	111

Page 189, in footnotes at bottom of page, strike out all of footnote No. 38.

Page 189, in footnotes at bottom of page, after and underneath footnote No. 46, insert:

"[46a] Third proviso in paragraph commencing 'Fees of witnesses', said proviso ending on page 461."

After and underneath footnote No. 48, insert:

"[48a] The two provisos in the paragraph commencing near the bottom of page 478 and ending on page 479."

Page 189, bottom of page, after and underneath footnote No. 50, insert:

"[51] All of this section except the words: 'That the following salaries shall be paid to the several judges hereinafter mentioned in lieu of the salaries now provided by law, namely:', the words 'To each of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States at the rate of $15,000 per year', and the words 'That all of said salaries shall be paid in monthly installments'. All of the foregoing quoted words shall remain in full force and effect."

"[51a] Third proviso in the paragraph commencing 'Fees of witnesses' appearing on this page.

"[52] First proviso in the paragraph headed 'United States Customs Court' appearing on this page.

"[53] Only the following words in the sixth full paragraph appearing on this page: '$5 per day, not exceeding three days for any one term of court'.

"[54] The two provisos in the paragraph commencing near the bottom of page 304 and ending on page 305.

"[55] All of the second paragraph appearing on this page."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I take it that the action which has been taken means that the bill has been passed, including the amendments reported by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 3214, Calendar 1608, was passed. I do so in order that we may still hold control over the bill until I make a certain check.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

AMENDMENTS TO PETROLEUM CONTRACTS

The bill (S. 1857) to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is identical with House bill 4659, Calendar No. 1615. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, and will be now considered. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4659) to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4659) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1857 will be indefinitely postponed.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6759) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, because the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] on Tuesday of this week objected to the consideration of this bill, reserving the right to object, I ask to be recognized for 5 minutes under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has objected to the consideration of House bill 6759, which is an act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia. Because the Senator from South Carolina is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, although not a member of its fiscal subcommittee which bears the primary responsibility for offering legislation to raise revenues required to maintain public services in the District, I know that his objection is both honest and well-intentioned; but I feel impelled to point out to him and to other Members of

the Senate, and emphasize that great harm will fall upon our Nation's Capital if the revenue measure in question fails of passage.

House bill 6759 provides for a 2-percent retail sales tax and an individual income tax to be paid by those who live in the District of Columbia and earn incomes of $8,000 or more during the year. It is estimated that the sales tax will produce approximately $13,000,000 annually, and that our proposed income-tax provision will provide $1,000,000 more than is being secured from a prevailing individual income-tax statute.

The Senator from South Carolina opposes this revenue measure because (A) he feels that a sales tax falls most heavily on the little fellow who cannot afford it; and (B) because he believes that the Federal Treasury should make a more substantial annual contribution to the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, the members of the fiscal subcommittee can sympathize with the Senator's objections, but I, in speaking for them, think those reasons for objecting are unsound, unrealistic, and cannot be sustained.

For several years the fiscal subcommittee has endeavored to work out a formula to result in a larger Federal contribution. No agreement has yet been reached on a formula, and the committee will be in no position to ask for larger Federal contributions until a defensible and agreed-upon formula is devised.

The Committee on the District of Columbia agrees with the Senator from South Carolina that a sales tax will require that those possessed of low incomes must pay part of the tax. The committee has spent months in trying to uncover other substantial sources of tax revenue, so that a sales tax might not be required. The committee has seriously recommended the sales tax because no other substantial tax revenues, with one exception, are available within the District of Columbia. That one exception is provided for in existing law. The Commissioners of the District are required by law to secure any deficits from an increase in real property taxes. If the sales tax fails of passage and if Federal employee pay raises are approved by the Congress, it will likely be necessary to increase the present $2 real property tax to $2.75.

If this becomes necessary, there is very sound reason to state that the so-called little fellow will suffer more than if he is required to live under a 2-percent sales tax which excludes foods and medicine.

In support of this contention that under prevailing circumstances a 2-percent sales tax is less onerous and less burdensome to this community than a 75-cent real property tax increase, I shall offer an example.

Mr. President, because of the importance of this subject to those of us within the District of Columbia Committee and to the community itself, when my allotment of 5 minutes has expired, I shall ask permission to complete within 5 minutes on the next bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is close enough to that deadline at the moment, so that without objection his time will be extended pursuant to his request.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the status of the bill? Is there an objection to it?

Mr. CAIN. The status is precisely this: On Tuesday, the Senator from South Carolina said he objected.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I understand.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator has since told me personally that he has found no reason for removing his objection. For that reason it becomes important to the Senate, in our opinion, that the facts be spread on the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Will there not have to be a decision made on Calendar 1610, House bill 6759, before proceeding to the consideration of the next bill? If there is no objection, should that not be done first?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is an objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington will proceed.

Mr. CAIN. To repeat one sentence, I may say that in support of the contention that under prevailing circumstances a 2-percent sales tax is less onerous and less burdensome to this community than a 75-cent real property tax increase, I offer the following example: Let us take a family with an income of $3,000 which is purchasing a modest home assessed at $6,000. At the present rate of $2 per hundred the tax upon this property would be $120. To raise the same amount of revenue as it is estimated will be produced by a 2-percent sales tax, by an increase in the tax upon real property, the real property tax must be raised to $2.75 per hundred. At this rate the tax upon the $6,000 home would be $160, or an increase of $40 per year over the present tax. If this same family is living in a rented home, and thousands of them do, among those whose annual incomes are $3,000 a year or less, there is every reason to believe that their rent would be increased by the same $40.

The other side of our revenue picture is precisely this: In the lower-income group more than two-thirds of the family income is spent on foods and medicines, rent if they do not own their home, or payments on their home if they are buying it, together with interest and taxes, medical expenses, gas and electricity, and other services and items not subject to the sales tax. It has been estimated, based upon statistics on consumer expenditure distribution compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that a family with an income of $3,000 would only pay $16 a year in sales taxes under a law such as is here proposed. Since a 2-percent sales tax, and a 75-cents-per-hundred increase in the real-estate tax will produce substantially the same amount of revenue, and the burden of the former tax on the $3,000-per-year family is but $16 as contrasted with the burden of $40 under the latter tax, it is plain that the real-estate tax is far more oppressive upon the low-income group than the sales tax.

The District of Columbia employs approximately 18,000 workers, about 8,000 of whom are classified. If Federal pay-raise legislation is approved the 8,000 workers will automatically be entitled to any general increase. The remaining personnel, or about 10,000 employees who, from any viewpoint, are equally deserving of pay-raise consideration and who are likely to be denied these indicated increases if the community lacks sufficient revenue to meet such an obligation. Every school teacher, every fireman, and every policeman is an unclassified worker in the District of Columbia.

I think it completely proper and very true to say that no member of the District of Columbia Committee was enthusiastic over recommending a sales tax.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GEORGE BATES, holds in the House of Representatives a position similar to mine. As chairman of the fiscal subcommittee, he has been an articulate and forceful opponent of sales taxes for the last 30 years, but he, too, recommended to the House a sales-tax measure which was passed by the House. In speaking for our committee, Mr. President, I defend and encourage the imposition of a sales tax within the District of Columbia as the only conceivable present-day solution for a financial impasse which directly or indirectly confronts everyone in the District.

I have informed our leadership of the situation which confronts the District. They know that an objection has been made to passage of the revenue measure in question. They have indicated they will somehow find time through which the financial problems and considerations of this community can be debated, between now and next Saturday, on the floor of the Senate. I want to suggest to the Senate that, if it becomes imperatively necessary to set aside time for the affairs of the District of Columbia, however important they are—and they are important—that some of the national problems which plague us and are of concern to every Senator, will be neglected or abused. What a great pity that would be.

In conclusion I express the hope that the Senator from South Carolina will find it possible to rely on the judgment of those who have labored for months in an effort to be reasonable and realistic over the involved fiscal entanglements of the Nation's Capital. Unless they are straightened out through the passage of House bill 6759, as amended, those entanglements will become the more confused and difficult of solution in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the body of the RECORD at this point of my remarks an editorial on the subject of a sales tax, from this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALES TAX

Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina defended his action in blocking Senate consideration of the District sales tax on the ground that the tax falls most heavily on the "little fellow who cannot afford it." A very convincing reply to that familiar complaint

was given by Representative DIRKSEN in course of the House debate on the District revenue bill. "No matter what the tax is," he said, "it constitutes a burden upon the individual or upon the family; and you cannot dissociate one tax from the whole pattern and then make comparisons with them." In other words, the assumption that the revenue needs of the District can be met by increasing real-estate taxes—the certain consequence of a failure to enact sales tax legislation—is false. For, as Mr. DIRKSEN pointed out, every Government worker and every family that buys a house has to pay the increased taxes. Moreover, every increase in real-estate taxes leads to rent increases that are felt by rich and poor alike.

Real-estate taxes have recently been sharply increased and another substantial increase will follow unless alternative revenues from taxation are found. That may not happen during the coming fiscal year, if Congress delays action on pay increases for Federal and District employees. But Representative BATES declares that the budgetary deficits that lie ahead would just about double the tax burden on property owners within a 2-year period unless new sources of revenue are found.

The type of sales tax proposed for the District exempts foods and medicines from the tax, thereby greatly minimizing its impact on low-income families. And, as a compensatory offset for families with moderate incomes, the House bill also restricts payment of District income taxes to persons, domiciled in the District or residing here at least 7 months, whose incomes exceed $8,000.

The District has to raise additional revenue somehow, and the sales tax is a good, dependable revenue producer. In the form proposed, it is probably the least burdensome kind of tax that could be devised for the purpose of budget-balancing. Incidentally, the low-income families, whose outlays will be increased somewhat by payment of sales taxes, will be the chief beneficiaries of a revenue-raising plan that will help to pay for community services that contribute to their own well-being.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS ON CERTAIN PROJECTS DURING THEIR CONSTRUCTION STATUS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6028) to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this bill is identical with Calendar 1534, Senate bill 2638, to which an objection was made, and I may state that the Senator who made the objection is perfectly willing that this bill shall be considered. I offer as an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute Senate bill 2638 as amended by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior, giving due consideration to the temporary nature of the requirements therefor, is authorized to make such provision as he deems to be necessary and in the public interest for the education of dependents of persons employed on the actual construction of projects or features of projects, by the Bureau of Reclamation, in any cases in which he finds that by reason of such construction activity, an undue burden is, or will be cast upon the facilities of the public-school districts serving the areas in which construction is being undertaken, and to pay for the same from any funds available for the construction of said projects: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into cooperative arrangements with local school districts wherein such features are situated to contribute toward covering the cost of furnishing the educational services required for such dependents, or for the operation by those school districts of Government facilities, or for the expansion of local school facilities. Such cost incurred hereunder shall be charged to the project concerned and shall be repayable in the same manner and to the same extent as are its other costs of construction.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall furnish to the Congress each year, on or before the 3d day of January, a report on all activities undertaken during the preceding fiscal year pursuant to the provisions of this act, together with such recommendations with respect to problems relating to it as he shall think appropriate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2638 is indefinitely postponed.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT TO CERTAIN MOTHERS OF VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5508) to amend the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, on page 1, in line 9, after the word "or", to strike out "legally."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN RAILWAY POSTAL CLERKS

The bill (H. R. 5272) relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF AIR CARRIERS FROM CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS

The bill (S. 2460) to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether this bill is in line with the change in the law relating to overtime compensation, or whether it merely relieves the carriers completely without changing the law.

Mr. HAWKES. It does not change the law covering the employees at all. It merely transfers the costs of overtime pay from the air lines to the Government, thereby bringing it into line with all other forms of international traffic excepting steamship lines. It does not affect the overtime pay law in any way.

Mr. BALL. In my opinion, the overtime pay law should be amended.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, at the moment.

Mr. BALL. Do I correctly understand that it applies the same privileges to air carriers that are accorded to other carriers?

Mr. HAWKES. That is exactly correct, except that steamship lines are not affected. These air lines are required to maintain Sunday and holiday schedules whereas the steamship companies can control their schedules.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am constrained to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS IN ACQUIRING SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4244) to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. He is very vitally interested in the proposed legislation. It deals with a class of veterans who are referred to as paraplegics. They are men who have been ruined for life. I say that advisedly. They are paralyzed from the waist down. Their sex powers are incapacitated forever. They live in wheel chairs the greater part of the day. They are pathetic cases, and I think beyond question they have a first claim upon the interest and support of the Congress.

What this bill proposes to do is not only to supply them with the means of getting about, with wheel chairs, but to assist them in obtaining homes in which they can live in comfort, even as you and I. These homes have certain equipment, such as ramps instead of stairways. They have appliances in the bathroom by means of which these men can move themselves in and out of the bathtub.

The bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is a component part of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. That bill, after many vicissitudes, has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. It is not assured that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will yet become law. We hope and pray it will. We shall do all we can in this branch of the Congress with reference to it, but, pending the uncertainty with regard to the passage of the bill by the House, these men came before the committee in their wheel chairs, not only once, but three times, talked with the committee about the

matter, and asked us, in our judgment and wisdom, to give them a separate piece of legislation and to pass this bill, so that if and when the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill shall become law, this bill can be stricken because of being a duplicate piece of legislation. These men are up against a situation which you and I have never dreamed of, and we should provide adequate housing for them.

The bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency not only once, but twice. I will gladly defer to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who will support what I am saying in his own right.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to say a word, Mr. President, in support of what has been so properly and ably advanced by the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. TOBEY].

A paraplegic section was included in the housing bill recently passed by the Senate as the result of an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate and adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The bill (S. 1969) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows: "The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and suplementary field work and observation of public health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and administration, through field work and observation of public health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos to be so designated."

SEC. 2. Section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended by adding thereto a subsection numbered (f) and reading as follows:

"(f) Any Filipino who has commenced training or instruction prior to June 30, 1950, as provided in this act, shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, be entitled, insofar as facilities are available, to receive the full course of training or instruction as prescribed by the head of the bureau or agency concerned, and funds appropriated under the authority of this act shall be available for such training or instruction. The number of trainees to be trained each year, as prescribed by the several sections of this act, refers to the number of trainees who may be designated each year by the President of the Philippines and not to the total number of trainees receiving training or instruction in any one year."

OPERATION OF GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

The bill (S. 2341) to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory was considered, order to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 491), is amended by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed $150,000."

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The bill (H. R. 4114) to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VOLUNTARY ADMISSION AND TREATMENT OF MENTAL PATIENTS AT ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The bill (H. R. 6289) to provide for the voluntary admission of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO STANDARDS OF MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION FOR HOSPITALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6339) to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act, title VI, so as to restore to eligibility to participate in Federal grants for hospital construction under those provisions, a State which has ceased to be eligible for such grants because of its failure to enact, prior to July 1, 1948, legislation requiring compliance with standards of maintenance and operation by hospitals receiving such grants. Under present law, States which have not enacted such legislation by July 1, 1948, are permanently barred from thereafter participating in the benefits of the hospital-construction program. The bill would restore such a State to eligibility upon enactment of such legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2782) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to say that this bill is to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. It has been agreed upon between the heads of the railroads and the heads of the various railroad labor unions. It incorporates some of the provisions desired by the railroads. It contains provisions for increased pensions for the railroad men. It has the unanimous approval of all the railroad labor people, as well as of the railroads themselves. A similar bill passed the House unanimously a few days ago. I suggest that the Senate consider House bill 6766.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6766) to amend the railroad retirement Act of 1937 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2782 is indefinitely postponed.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

The bill (H. R. 5820) to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERNSHIPS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 2793) to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is the same as Calendar No. 1630. Without objection, the House bill 6234 will be substituted for the Senate bill and will be now considered.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6234) to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2793 is indefinitely postponed.

ASSISTANCE IN THE RECRUITMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2767) to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, on page 2, line 5, after the word "recruitment," to insert "not later than June 30, 1949", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the Secretary of Labor, in carrying out his responsibilities to maintain a farm placement service under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, is authorized to recruit foreign workers within the Western Hemisphere and workers in Puerto Rico for temporary agricultural employment in the continental United States and to direct, supervise, coordinate, and provide for the transportation of such workers from such places of recruitment to and between places of employment within the continental United States and return to the places of recruitment not later than June 30,

1949. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums for the administration of the program authorized by this section as the Congress may deem necessary.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the establishment of a working capital fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, $2,500,000, such fund to be used only for the payment of expenses for transportation, lodging, and subsistence in connection with the temporary migration of foreign agricultural workers from foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere, and workers from Puerto Rico, to and between places of employment within the continental United States and return to the place of origin. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the employers utilizing such workers shall be required to reimburse such fund to such extent and in such manner and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may by regulation or otherwise prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RATES OF PAY AT FIELD INSTALLATIONS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2794) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, to strike out the period and insert a colon and the words "*Provided*, That in no case shall the range of rates prescribed for the position be lower than the range of rates prescribed for the same position by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284), as amended (38 U. S. C. 693), is amended by adding at the end thereof a paragraph to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C. 661 and the following), or any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to prescribe the rates of pay for the following positions at Veterans' Administration installations in the field: (1) Hospital attendant, (2) dental mechanic, (3) orthopedic mechanic, and (4) positions classified in the crafts, protective, and custodial service pursuant to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That in no case shall the range of rates prescribed for the position be lower than the range of rates prescribed for the same position by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1333) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is not in the Senate Chamber at the moment.

Mr. WHERRY. My attention was directed elsewhere. What is the calendar number?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar No. 1634.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been asked to have this bill go over on behalf of several Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RESEARCH IN DENTAL DISEASES AND CONDITIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6726) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a bill similar to the pending bill, S. 176, was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and passed by the Senate during the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, rather than send the bill to conference, desires to make certain amendments to the House bill which is now on the calendar. I, therefore, ask for the consideration of a number of amendments, nearly all of which are technical in nature. These amendments are necessary in view of the fact that many of the section numbers, subtitles, and so forth, are identical with similar section numbers and subtitles contained in the heart-research bill, S. 2215, which was approved by this body a few days ago and which has been sent to the President for his approval.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that the amendments make the bill substantially the same as the bill passed by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is correct. I call attention to one amendment which is necessary in order to make available to the Public Health Service the funds necessary for the construction of suitable and adequate buildings for the Dental Research Institute. The House left that out for special reasons, since it was necessary to have a special rule if provision for an appropriation were to be inserted. The amendment will make the bill similar to the bill heretofore passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey offers several amendments, which will be stated.

The amendments were stated by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

On page 2, line 12, after the word "cancer" insert "heart."

On page 2, line 14, beginning with "insert—", strike out down through and including the word "by", in line 17.

On page 2, line 17, strike out "406" and insert "415."

On page 2, line 19, strike out "Part B" and insert "Part C."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "411" and insert "421."

On page 2, line 25, strike out "412" and insert "422."

On page 4, line 9, strike out "413" and insert "423."

On page 4, line 10, strike out "412" and insert "422."

On page 4, line 14, strike out "414" and insert "424."

On page 4, line 17, strike out "of the Public Health Service Act."

On page 5, line 2, strike out "414" and insert "424."

One page 5, line 8, strike out "412" and insert "422."

On page 6, line 10, strike out "413 (b)" and insert "501 for carrying out the purposes of this part."

On page 6, line 23, strike out "415" and insert "425."

On page 7, line 5, strike out "416" and insert "426."

On page 7, line 12, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)."

On page 8, line 24, after the comma insert "the National Advisory Heart Council,".

On page 9, after the comma at the end of line 4, insert "Heart."

On page 9, after the comma at the end of line 10, insert "members of the National Advisory Heart Council,".

On page 10, line 3, after "Council", insert "or, with respect to heart diseases, recommended by the National Advisory Heart Council,".

On page 10, line 12, after "Council", insert "or, with respect to heart diseases, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Heart Council,".

On page 10, between lines 16 and 17, insert a new section as follows:

"RESEARCH FACILITIES

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $2,000,000 for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable and adequate site or sites, selected on the advice of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, in or near the District of Columbia for such buildings and facilities, and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities. The amount authorized to be appropriated in this section shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, supervision of construction, and other administrative expenses incident to the work: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Agency shall prepare the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts, and supervise construction."

On page 10, line 18, strike out "5" and insert "6."

On page 10, line 20, strike out "(l)" and insert "(m)."

On page 10, line 21, strike out "(m)" and insert "(n)."

On page 10, line 22, strike out "(m)" and insert "(n)."

On page 10, line 24, strike out "(n)" and insert "(o)."

On page 11, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive.

On page 11, line 8, strike out "(d)" and insert "(b)."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be acted on en bloc. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for

other purposes; which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if he would be willing to insert an amendment which is approved by the Bureau of the Budget, approved by the Army, and is considered by the Governor of Massachusetts and the Boston Port Authority essential to the city of Boston. It relates to deepening the channel which oil tankers use. Because of the increased draft of oil tankers, they cannot get up the channel now except at very full tide, and on that channel is the public utility which furnishes all the electric light for Boston, and other facilities. I understand there are other amendments which the Senate must consider, but I should like to know if the Senator will accept the one I have indicated, which has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and of the Army.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I will say at the outset that I am representing the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works. I am merely chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, Dams and Electric Power, which has already reported to the main committee, and our report has been received by the full committee and approved.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that this bill is not considered as an omnibus bill, but it is intended that next year the Committee on Public Works will study seriously the projects presented, beginning early in the session, and submit to this body a real omnibus bill. The pending bill merely covers emergencies, that is, cases where life and property are endangered, and which call for a relatively small authorization, covering a specific unit which could be constructed by itself, becoming a part of the main unit if the whole project were later authorized, or which would be helpful and serve its purpose by itself if the whole project were never authorized.

I personally do not object to any project any Senator may suggest. The only point I would make is that this is a relatively small bill, the House has held it to small proportions purposely, and I am informed there will be some difficulty in conference if we go outside the policy which has been followed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I understand from the Senator that there will be a comprehensive bill next year, when there will be opportunity to include all reasonable authorizations for improvements of the character I have discussed?

Mr. MALONE. While I am only one member of the subcommittee, the question has been discussed, and what the Senator has said has been the general conclusion, that such a bill will be taken up, and then all meritorious projects can be considered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill now before the Senate is an emergency one, to cover cases where health or property conditions are involved?

Mr. MALONE. That was what was intended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under those circumstances, I shall not offer the amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question first comes on the amendments of the committee, which will be stated.

The Clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Works was, under the heading "Title I—Rivers and Harbors," at the top of page 4, to insert:

Winyah Bay, S. C.; in accordance with the report on file in the Office of the Chief of Engineers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 4, to insert:

Gulfport Harbor, Miss.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 20, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 6, to insert:

Harrison County, Miss., shore protection; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 8, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 19, to insert:

Mississippi River at Fort Madison, Iowa; House Document No. 661, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

Port Wing Harbor, Wis.; House Document No. 668, Eightieth Congress;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 4, to insert:

Oswego Harbor, N. Y.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 10, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 104. In the prosecution of the work for the improvement of Bayou Carlin, La., in accordance wtih project adopted by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, the Chief of Engineers is hereby authorized to protect the piers of the railway bridge crossing Bayou Carlin at Delcambre, La.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 24, to insert:

SEC. 105. That the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors passed since June 25, 1938, shall be compiled under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers and printed for use of the Department of the Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 106. That not to exceed $5,000 annually of the funds appropriated for rivers and harbors shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment in amounts approved by the Chief of Engineers of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meetings of the congresses and of the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 107. The dam site known as Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River authorized in the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, shall hereafter be known as the Chief Joseph Dam, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of Foster Creek Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name Chief Joseph Dam.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 21, to change the section number from "104" to "108."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 5, to change the section number from "105" to "109."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Flood Control," on page 11, after line 12, to insert:

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

The plan for flood protection on the Lackawaxen River, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 113, Eightieth Congress, first session, and there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,150,000 for partial accomplishment of that plan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 19, to insert:

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project for local flood protection at Wilkes-Barre and Hanover Township, Pa., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, in accordance with House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, is hereby modified to provide for raising a portion of the river front section of the protective levee to provide a uniform degree of protection throughout its length at an estimated cost to the United States of $250,000 and subject to the conditions of local cooperation prescribed for that project in the act approved June 22, 1936.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 5, to insert:

JAMES RIVER BASIN

That preparation of plans or construction shall not be undertaken on the Gathright Reservoir and the Falling Springs reregulating dam on Jackson River, Va., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 207, Eightieth Congress, first session, until completion of review of the project to determine the desirability of its construction at the present time, and a finding of the proper local contribution on the basis of benefits to be derived for water supply, pollution abatement, and other conservation purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 17, to insert:

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

The project for Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930, as amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the first phase of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1948,

subject to the conditions of local cooperation prescribed therein, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $16,300,000 for partial accomplishment of said plan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$300,000."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the Senator from Nevada. Has the increase proposed in the committee amendment been approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. Each one of the projects reported by the committee has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but in this particular case the increase over the House bill is due to a necessary raise in the structures over the river which have been authorized.

Mr. WHERRY. Does this particular item have a Budget estimate? I am not clear concerning the item. If it is proposed to earmark a certain amount of money for a specific project I wish to know whether the Bureau of the Budget has authorized it, and if it has also provided an estimate.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that the amount of $200,000, which was allowed by the House, was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The increase of $100,000 to a total of $300,000, has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but is necessary due to the change in the plan already authorized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 13, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 17, to insert:

The Chief of Engineers is authorized to construct, as an emergency measure, bank protection and control works at Bradens Bend, Okla., in accordance with plans on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of $1,000,000 as a part of the multiple-purpose plan for the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946, and the authorization for appropriation for the Arkansas River Basin is hereby increased accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 19, to insert:

RED RIVER OF THE NORTH

The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Red River of the North drainage basin, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota as set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 24, 1948, is approved and there is hereby authorized the sum of $2,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of that plan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 14, to insert:

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The project for bank protection on the Missouri River from Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, authorized by the act approved August 18, 1941, is hereby modified and extended upstream to include Miners Bend and vicinity, South Dakota and Nebraska, in accordance with plans on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 22, to insert:

The projects for flood control and other purposes in the South Platte River Basin, Colo., Wyo., and Nebr. as set forth in House Document No. 669, Eightieth Congress, second session, are approved and there is hereby authorized the sum of $3,000,000 for partial accomplishment of these projects.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 16, to insert:

WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control, navigation, and other purposes approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28 1938, is hereby modified to provide for the installation of hydroelectric power-generating facilities, including the construction of a re-regulating dam, at Detroit Reservoir on the North Santiam River, in accordance with plans on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Lower Mississippi River," on page 18, line 5, after the word "following", to strike out "item and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly" and insert "items."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, at the beginning of line 7, to insert "(a)", and in line 12, after the word "Congress", to insert "and the authorization for the Lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 14, to insert:

(b) The Devils Swamp project at Baton Rouge, La., at an estimated cost of $2,000,000, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 17, to insert:

(c) The project for improvement of the L'Anguille River, Ark., at an estimated cost of $5,100,000 is hereby approved substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated August 22, 1947, and the authorization for the Lower Mississippi River project is increased by $2,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 19, to insert:

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The comprehensive plan for the Rio Grande Basin as set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 5, 1948, and in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation dated November 21, 1947, all in substantial accord with the agreement approved by the Secretary of the Army and the Acting Secretary of the Interior on November 21, 1947, is hereby approved except insofar as the recommendations in those reports are inconsistent with the provisions of this act and subject to the authorizations and limitations set forth here.

The approval granted above shall be subject to the following conditions and limitations:

(a) Construction of the spillway gate structure at Chamita Dam shall be deferred so long as New Mexico shall have accrued debits as defined by the Rio Grande compact and until New Mexico shall consistently accrue credits pursuant to the Rio Grande compact;

(b) Chifio Dam and Reservoir on Rio Grande shall be excluded from the Middle Rio Grande project authorized herein without prejudice to subsequent consideration of Chifio Dam and Reservoir by the Congress;

(c) The Bureau of Reclamation, in conjunction with other interested Federal agencies, is directed to make studies to determine feasible ways and means of reducing nonbeneficial consumption of water by native vegetation in the flood plain of the Rio Grande and its principal tributaries above Caballo Reservoir; and

(d) At all times when New Mexico shall have accrued debits as defined by the Rio Grande compact all reservoirs constructed as a part of the project shall be operated solely for flood control except as otherwise required by the Rio Grande compact, and at all times all project works shall be operated in conformity with the Rio Grande compact as it is administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission.

In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall be governed by and have the powers conferred upon him by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, except as is otherwise provided in this act or in the reports referred to above. This act shall be deemed a supplement to said Federal reclamation laws.

Approval is granted to the Secretary of the Interior subject to the limitations of the authorizations approved from time to time for the prosecution of this plan to acquire in the name of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, any or all of the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District outstanding when such authorizations are approved at such prices and on such terms and conditions as he shall deem necessary or proper for the protection of the investment of the United States and to retire those obligations on such terms and conditions as he shall likewise deem proper or necessary.

The Secretary of the Interior, in entering into a contract or contracts for the repayment of the reimbursable construction costs of the Middle Rio Grande project, now estimated at approximately $18,000,000, shall vary that amount to reflect changes in the estimates of those costs occurring prior to the date of the contract or contracts and in so doing may, if need be, extend the repayment period beyond 40 years to permit payment of costs in excess of the present estimate.

Subject to the limitations of authorizations approved from time to time for prosecution of this plan, approval is granted to the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by purchase or donation, agricultural lands owned by the State of New Mexico within the Middle Rio Grande project at prices, on terms, and with titles satisfactory to him and to develop those lands substantially in the manner outlined in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation referred to above. Lands so acquired shall be resold or leased by the Secretary to actual settlers for agricultural purposes under rules and regulations prescribed by him which rules and regulations shall set out the prices and terms of such sales and leases, the qualifications required of purchasers, and lessees, and other matters relating to the disposition and use of these lands, and shall provide a preferred right to purchase or lease any tract of such land to otherwise qualified persons of the following classes in the order here set out, purchasers in any class being preferred to lessees in that or any other class:

(1) The former owner or owners of such tracts, if his or their title thereto was divested by reason of sale for taxes to the State of New Mexico.

(2) Honorably discharged veterans of World War II who are the sons or daughters of the former owner or owners of such tract, if the title of said former owner or owners was divested by reason of sale of taxes to the State of New Mexico.

(3) The sons or daughters of the former owner or owners of such tract other than those referred to in (2) if the title of said former owner or owners was divested by reason of sale for taxes to the State of New Mexico.

(4) Honorably discharged veterans of World War II other than those referred to in (2).

(5) Persons other than those referred to in the clauses above. Any deed executed by the Secretary in favor of any person described under (4) or (5) shall provide that any person described under (1), (2), or (3) shall have the right to purchase any land conveyed by such deed, within a period of 10 years after the execution thereof, by (a) paying to the owner the amount or amounts actually paid by him as consideration for such deed and for the actual cost of improvements on such land plus interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on such amount or amounts, and (b) assuming any obligations of the owner to the Secretary with respect to such land. Any lease executed by the Secretary under the provisions of this section to any person described under (4) or (5) shall, by its terms, expire not later than 5 years after the date of its execution. The preferred rights provided for by this section to purchase or lease any land shall continue to be applicable until such land is finally disposed of by the Secretary; but the right of any lessee or purchaser to enter into possession shall be subject to any rights under any prior lease executed by the Secretary. Moneys accruing from the sale or lease of said lands shall be covered into the reclamation fund in the Treasury.

In the administration of the provisions of this act all water in the Middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico shall be deemed to be useful primarily for domestic, municipal, and irrigation purposes.

Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or abrogating in any way the laws of the State of New Mexico in which the Middle Rio Grande Valley lies, relating to the control, appropriation, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right therein.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to abrogate or impair existing obligations of the United States or any agency thereof, including obligations to furnish water for irrigation and obligations to any Indian or tribe or band of Indians whether based on treaty, agreement, or act of Congress.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $3,500,000 to be expended by the Department of the Army for the partial accomplishment of the comprehensive plan for the Rio Grande Basin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 17, to insert:

Two Mile Creek, Oreg.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 18, to insert:

Aroostook River and tributaries, Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 19, to insert:

Beaver Creek, Lincoln County, Oreg.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 20, to insert:

Skinner Creek, at and in the vicinity of Mannesville, N. Y.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 22, to insert:

Steinhatchee and Fenholloway Rivers, Fla.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 23, to insert:

River Rouge and tributaries, Mich.

The amendment was agred to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 8, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$65,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. MOORE. I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, following line 4, immediately after the heading "Arkansas River Basin", it is proposed to insert the following:

The second paragraph under the heading "Arkansas River Basin" in the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Engineers is authorized to provide in the Canton Reservoir on the North Canadian River 107,000 acre-feet of irrigation and water supply storage (including approximately 69,000 acre-feet for irrigation and 38,000 acre-feet for municipal water supply for Enid, Okla., to be utilized in accordance with section 8 and section 6, respectively, of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (Public 534, 78th Cong.)), upon the condition that when siltation of the reservoir shall encroach upon the flood-control allocation the irrigation and water supply storage will be reduced progressively unless provision is made to raise the height of the dam or otherwise provide compensatory storage for flood control on the basis of an equitable distribution of the costs among the water users and other beneficiaries of conservation storage, as determined at that time."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MALONE. The committee accepts the amendment, since there is no charge under it to the Federal Government. It is simply a matter of water use.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I submit an amendment which has been approved by the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 108 of the bill as reported, it is proposed to insert the following:

Quilcene Bay Harbor, Wash.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALONE. I accept the amendment for the Committee on the same basis as the previous amendments have been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to ask special attention from the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. As is known from the debate had previously in the Senate, the bill relating to the Fort Sumner irrigation district is a most important measure, and one which ought to be enacted at the present session of the Congress. I realize that under the 5-minute rule I cannot discuss the matter adequately, and that there will be no chance to have that amendment adopted, unless the Senator from Texas will withdraw his objection.

In that connection I want to appeal to the Senator from Texas, to his reason, for he is a reasonable man, to his fairness, because he is a fair man, and to read a letter I have just received dated the 10th of June 1948, from the Commissioner of Irrigation and Reclamation regarding this particular project, and concerning floods which have recently occurred in that area. I ask the Senator's attention to the letter. It is addressed to me and is as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR HATCH: For your information I am quoting herein a paragraph from a communication which has just been received from the regional office in Amarillo, Tex., concerning the recent floods on the Pecos River.

"Although information indicates that cloudburst storms were more general below than above Alamogordo Dam and Fort Sumner Diversion Dam, both Fort Sumner and Carlsbad interests were very concerned at the time of the flood about the safety of those structures, as indicated by numerous communications received by this office during and shortly after the storm. We are well aware of the precarious situation regarding the Fort Sumner Diversion Dam as well as the insecurity of Alamogordo Dam because of inadequate spillway capacity. Had the storm centered between Alamogordo Dam and Fort Sumner instead of around Roswell, Fort Sumner Diversion Dam would undoubtedly have failed."

That ends the communication from the regional office. I make the appeal to the Senator from Texas because I know that in good faith he thinks that this measure should not be passed because he wants a compact between the States.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will not object to the amendment. It has already passed the House and been reported by our committee, and the emergency needs are great. I assure the Senator from Texas that if he will agree to the amendment today and let it be attached to the public works bill, I will do everything in my power, and the officials of my State will cooperate with the officials of the State of Texas, in trying to get an adequate, reasonable, and fair compact between the States.

The objection to the bill, if maintained, will place in serious jeopardy not only the diversion dam at Fort Sumner, but the structure at Alamogordo Dam which if destroyed will cause an outlay of millions of dollars, and total destruction of crops and valuable farming land. I

make the appeal to the Senator from Texas and shall offer the Fort Sumner project bill as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico in all kindliness has placed me in a very embarrassing position. I do not like to object to this amendment, but we have had the bill before the Senate, and the Senate rejected the bill, on my objection, it is true. But, Mr. President, I hold in my hand a report from the Bureau of the Budget which not only does not approve the project, but disapproves it. I shall put the report in the RECORD.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Pecos River is an interstate stream. We do not get a drop of water out of the Pecos until it comes down through New Mexico. We have endeavored to secure an interstate compact with regard to the diversion of these waters. On two occasions the engineers and others agreed on a compact, and New Mexico refused to ratify it. Once the legislature refused to ratify it. On another occasion the Governor vetoed the compact. We are endeavoring to get a compact. We want to be fair to New Mexico. In the present Congress I have agreed to two reclamation bills involving New Mexico, one in connection with the Rio Grande, involving a large sum of money, and the other on this particular river, the Pecos. I have agreed and made no objection to the Carlsbad project, involving a large amount of money. But, Mr. President, the Budget Bureau points out in its letter that this project would require 70 years to pay back the money.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption? I know he has only 5 minutes, and I shall not take long.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The objection of the Bureau of the Budget is that the time of payment is spread over 70 years. I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas to the fact that other bills have passed the Senate containing identical provisions, and objection has not been made.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not responsible for the fact that objection was not made. The Budget Bureau not only points out that it would require 70 years to pay back the money, but it also points out that it does not believe that the financial condition of the district is such that it could meet the payments. The Bureau of the Budget opposes the bill. In all fairness, I hope the Senate will not agree to this amendment. This is an unusual way to legislate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator is going to object, I shall withdraw the amendment, because I will not place the Senate in the embarrassing position of voting on an amendment until it can be adequately explained and debated. If it is the purpose of the Senator from Texas to object to the amendment, is it?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is.

Mr. HATCH. I withdraw the amendment. I again give notice that I hope, before the Senate adjourns, sometime, somehow, we may have an opportunity thoroughly to explain all the details of this project. The amendment is now withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I dislike to make this objection, but I hold in my hand protests against the bill, signed by all the Texas water engineers and others, and signed by the Governor of my State, insisting that I object, and insisting that until a compact is made with us for the fair division of those waters, we shall not increase the allocation up the stream, which will prevent water coming down into the Red Bluff Dam for the use of Texas. I regret it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we shall not be interested in a compact after our projects are destroyed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from New Mexico has placed on me the entire burden of this matter, but I am representing the State of Texas on this floor, and I cannot ignore the well-thought-out objections which I hold in my hand, which have been made by the water commissioners and the engineers of my State, and the Governor of my State, against this project. So I shall have to object to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the objection of the Senator from Texas is not to the bill, but he is objecting only to the amendment to which reference has been made.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is all. I am not objecting to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the amendment is quite lengthy. I shall be satisfied to have the amendment printed in the RECORD at this point, and I shall be glad to explain very briefly what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be printed at this point in the RECORD, and the Senator from Florida may proceed with the explanation.

The amendment of Mr. HOLLAND was, on page 6, after line 9, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 103. The proposed work of improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee to the Anclote River, Fla., House Document No. 371, Seventy-sixth Congress, as authorized in the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945, is modified to the extent herein set forth, and the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers is authorized to utilize in the area affected such of the following routes as may be determined feasible by the Chief of Engineers, with the approval of the Secretary of the Army, namely, Route 1, generally paralleling the coast from Venice Bay to Lemon Bay as heretofore authorized in the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945; Route 2: Run east from the junction of Little Sarasota Bay and Casey's Inlet Channel, along the south side of Venice Bay, to a point just west of the Seaboard Railroad right-of-way; thence south to Alligator Creek; thence southwest to Lemon Bay; Route 3: Run east from the junction of Little Sarasota Bay and Casey's Inlet Channel, along the north side of Venice Bay, to the old canal right-of-way; thence east along the old canal right-of-way to the divide in section 3; thence south to Alligator Creek; thence southwest to Lemon Bay; Route 4: Cut an inlet from the open Gulf to Route 1 (H. Doc. No. 371, 76th Cong.) in the vicinity of south end of the airport, with the necessary protecting works and jetties, thence along present Route 1 to Lemon Bay: *Provided*, That the cost to the United States shall not exceed the cost of the original route.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there is a part of the Intracoastal Waterway which passes through the village of Venice, on the west coast of Florida. Difficulty is being experienced in placing the canal where it was designated to go. Under the provisions of this amendment, three alternate routes are authorized, in addition to the original, not displacing the original one, with the condition that private interests shall see that it costs the United States Government no more. It leaves it to the engineers either to locate the canal at the original site, or at any of the three alternate sites, all subject to the condition that the United States Government be not caused any additional expense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire what canal the Senator is discussing?

Mr. HOLLAND. The intercoastal canal which runs south from Tampa along the coast to Fort Myers. It has no relation to the cross-State canal, I can assure the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the amendment merely allows discretion to the Army engineers in the choice of routes. The only limitation is the already authorized amount of money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the flood-control bill, House bill 6419, as passed by the Senate, be reprinted with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXEMPTION OF AIR CARRIERS FROM CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of Calendar 1619, Senate bill 2460. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has withdrawn his objection, and I should like very much to have the bill considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2460) to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees overtime services, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (46 Stat. 715, as amended; U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1451), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 644 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1644) and the provisions of section 7 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, the provisions of this section, sections 450 and 452 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 1450 and 1452), and the provisions of section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 267), shall not apply to the owner, operator, agent, or consignee of an aircraft (as defined in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended) engaged in overseas or foreign air transportation (as defined in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended) under published schedules: *Provided further*, That the extra compensation of customs officers and employees assigned to the performance of inspectional services in connection with traffic on aircraft operated by an air carrier (as defined in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended) which is payable on the basis prescribed by section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, as amended, shall be payable by the United States without reimbursement by the applicants for such services or any other person.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF WAR-HOUSING PROJECT TO STATE OF FLORIDA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2322) to provide for the sale of a part of war-housing project No. Fla-8252-1 to the department of public safety of the State of Florida, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended (known as the Lanham Act), the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to sell, and to convey by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in that part of war housing project No. Fla-8252-1 described in section 2 of this act to the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida for use as the site of a patrol station and school of the Florida highway patrol.

SEC. 2. Except as hereinafter provided, the property authorized to be sold and conveyed by the first section is more particularly described as follows: All that tract or parcel of land lying and being situated within the corporate limits of the city of Panama City, Bay County, Fla., beginning at the point where the center line of Moody Avenue intersects the northeasterly right-of-way line of State Road No. 30; thence northeasterly with said center line to a point in the north line of Bryan Avenue; thence northerly at right angles to said north line of Bryan Avenue to a point on the south line of North Bay; thence with said North Bay line westerly until it intersects the aforesaid northeasterly right-of-way line of State Road No. 30; thence southeasterly with said right-of-way line to the point of beginning; subject to any easements for that portion of Moody Avenue and Bryan Avenue included in the above description; including the building known as Community House, three barracks buildings and four detached one-family dwellings Nos. 1935, 1937, 1939, and 1941; including all utilities, lines, pipes, connections, sidewalks, curbs, driveways, and parking areas thereon. The Administrator is authorized in his discretion to exclude from such sale and conveyance the dwelling structure No. 1941 situated upon such tract or parcel.

SEC. 3. (a) The sale and conveyance authorized by this act shall be made upon payment of a consideration equal to the fair market value of the land and improvements situated thereon, or the apportioned cost to the Federal Government of the land and improvements situated thereon, each as determined by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, whichever is the less: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from such consideration a sum equal to 50 percent of that portion of the consideration so determined which is attributed to the portion of such tract or parcel conveyed for use as a school of the Florida Highway Patrol.

(b) In the event of the exclusion of the dwelling structure No. 1941 from the sale and conveyance authorized by this act, the consideration prescribed by subsection (a) of this section shall be reduced by a sum equal to the fair market value of such structure, off site, as determined by said Administrator.

SEC. 4. (a) In the sale and conveyance authorized by this act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to reserve to the United States, and its successors in title to lands contained in war housing project No. Fla-8252-1, the right to use all utilities and facilities ancillary thereto situated upon the tract or parcel to be conveyed, for such time as such utilities and facilities may be needed for use in connection with the housing situated on such lands.

(b) In the event of the exclusion of the dwelling structure No. 1941 from such sale and conveyance, said Administrator is authorized to make such sale and conveyance upon condition—

(1) that the grantee permit said Administrator, or any person designated by him, to enter upon the premises conveyed at any time within 1 year from the date of conveyance of such property for the purpose of removing said structure from the premises; and

(2) that there shall be reserved from such sale and conveyance such right of ingress and egress as said Administrator shall determine to be necessary to preserve to the several occupants of said structure continued right of occupancy thereof until such removal.

(c) The sale and conveyance authorized by this act shall be made by said Administrator upon condition that the grantee agree that, for a period of 1 year from the date of the conveyance, no occupant of any dwelling transferred by such conveyance shall be evicted from (or denied the continued right of ingress to or egress from) such dwelling without having first been given 90 days' written notice to vacate, except in case of an eviction based on the grounds that the tenant is committing a nuisance or otherwise violating an obligation of his tenancy.

(d) The provisions of section 313 of such act of October 14, 1940, as amended, shall not be applicable to the property conveyed pursuant to this act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the bill simply authorizes and directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to convey by quit-claim deed to the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida a portion of a temporary war housing project situated in Panama City, Fla., for use as the site of a patrol station and school of the Florida Highway Patrol. It is not the intention, nor does the legislation authorize the Government to give this property away. The bill provides that the purchase price of the property to be conveyed shall be determined by the Housing Administrator on the basis of its fair market value or its cost to the Federal Government, whichever is lower. The portions of the property to be conveyed to the public safety department of the State of Florida for the use of the Florida Highway Patrol consist of three barracks buildings and a community house which are no longer used. They are to be used for training purposes by the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the bill is exceedingly sound in principle. The Federal Government will get something for its property. I do not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERMINATION OF RETIREMENT SYSTEM OF OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2692) to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, on page 2, after line 9, to strike out:

(b) In the case of each officer or employee of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency who is a member of the retirement system of that office, the United States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be credited to his individual account in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to that amount which would have been in his account from his own contributions and interest thereon, had he been subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, during the period for which he has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the period covered thereby shall be allowable service for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, but such amount shall not be less than the amount of such employee's accumulated contributions and interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement fund of the Comptroller's Office at the time of its termination.

(c) In the event that the amount deposited to an employee's credit on the above basis is in excess of the amount which would have been to his credit had he made the contributions required for allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May

22, 1920, as amended, currently during the same period of time for which he has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's Office, plus interest thereon, such excess amount shall be applied to any other deposits or redeposits required of such employee under section 7, 9, or 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, covering periods of allowable service for which said employee did not have creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's Office, or, if he has no such additional allowable service, the excess shall be applied to the purchase of an additional annuity under the provisions of section 10 of said act: *Provided*, That any additional voluntary contributions made by an employee to the retirement fund of the Comptroller's Office or any required employee contributions made by an employee to said fund for any periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, shall in any event be treated as excess deposits and applied as above provided.

And insert:

(b) In the case of each officer or employee who is a member of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the United States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be credited to his individual account in the civil-service retirement and disability fund an amount equal to such employee's accumulated contributions and interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the time of its termination: *Provided*, That in the event that such amount is in excess of the amount which would have been to his credit had he made the contributions required for allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, as amended, currently during the same period of time for which he has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, plus interest thereon, such excess amount shall be applied to any other deposits or redeposits required of such employees under sections 7, 9, and 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, covering periods of allowable service for which said employee did not have creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, or, if he has no such additional allowable service, the excess shall be repaid to such employee in cash: *Provided further*, That no part of said sum credited to such employee's individual account shall be applied to any period of allowable service prior to August 1, 1920, or to periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, for which periods no deposit shall be required, as provided by section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; nor shall deposits be required for any periods of time prior to June 1, 1936, for which such employee has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, in excess of the amount of such employee's accumulated contributions plus interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the date of its termination.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence after the first proviso of the second paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statues, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 12, sec. 481), is amended by deleting the comma after the words "whose compensation" and striking out the words 'including retirement annuities to be fixed by the Comptroller of the Currency" and deleting the comma following those words.

SEC. 2. (a) The United State Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain the amount of the gross assets in the retirement fund of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized and directed to cause to be transferred all such assets to the Secretary of the Treasury to be entered on the books of the Treasury Department to the credit of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

(b) In the case of each officer or employee who is a member of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the United States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be credited to his individual account in the civil-service retirement and disability fund an amount equal to such employee's accumulated contributions and interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the time of its termination: *Provided*, That in the event that such amount is in excess of the amount which would have been to his credit had he made the contributions required for allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, as amended, currently during the same period of time for which he has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, plus interest thereon, such excess amount shall be applied to any other deposits or redeposits required of such employee under sections 7, 9, and 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended covering periods of allowable service for which said employee did not have creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency or, if he has no such additional allowable service, the excess shall be repaid to such employee in cash: *Provided further*, That no part of said sum cerdited to such employee's individual account shall be applied to any period of allowable service prior to August 1, 1920, or to periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, for which periods no deposit shall be required, as provided by section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; nor shall deposits be requried for any periods of time prior to June 1, 1936, for which such employee has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, in excess of the amount of such employee's accumulated contributions plus interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the date of its termination.

SEC. 3. (a) In the case of an officer or employee who, prior to the effective date of this act, shall have been retired on annuity under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's Office, the annuity shall be paid out of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund and shall be increased effective on the first day of the third month following the month in which this act is enacted by 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser: *Provided*, That each such annuitant may, prior to the effective date herein prescribed, elect to retain his or her present annuity in lieu of the increased annuity provided by this subsection and name his wife or her husband to receive upon his or her death one-half of his or her present annuity but not to exceed $600 per annum during the remainder of the life of such surviving wife or husband and upon the death of such survivor no further annuity shall be due or payable: *Provided further*, That the amount payable in the event of the death of the annuitant either to his nominated beneficiary or estate, in the form of a lump-sum payment or survivor's annuity, shall not be less than the amounts which would have been payable under the applicable rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's Office.

(b) In the case of any officer or employee who was a member of the retirement system of the Comptroller's Office and who, prior to the effective date of this act, terminated his employment with that Office and elected to receive a deferred annuity at age 65, under the applicable rules and regulations of the retirement system of that Office, such annuity shall be payable out of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund beginning at the age of 62 years. Otherwise his rights shall be determined and the annuity computed as though this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 4. In the case of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency who withdrew his accumulated contributions from the retirement fund of that Office upon leaving its employ, said officer or employee or former officer or employee of such Office shall be entitled to the same allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to which he would have been entitled if he had never been a member of the retirement system of the Comptroller's Office, subject, however, to the payment of the deposits required under said act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins at least 30 days after the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STAMP COMMEMORATING TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

The bill (S. 2739) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 5-cent air mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.

PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN SENIORITY RIGHTS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 4964) to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASED PAYMENT TO SURVIVING CHILDREN OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided in part I, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"Widow but no child, $70; widow with one child, $94; widow with two children, $112 (with $15 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $54 (or both), $30 each."

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any veteran or the dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in part I of this regulation, if the disability or death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while engaged in extra hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) while the United States is engaged in war."

SEC. 3. Paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided for in part II, paragraph I hereof, shall be enttiled to receive compensation at 80 percent of the rates specified for such dependents in paragraph IV, part I hereof, as now or hereafter amended."

SEC. 4. The increases provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the second month following the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes."

JURISDICTION OVER FORT DES MOINES VETERANS' VILLAGE, IOWA

The bill (H. R. 6188) to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF SILAS MASON CO., INC.

The bill (S. 2217) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine on the merits and to render, in accordance therewith, judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States which are embodied in the petition of the said companies filed in the Court of Claims May 1, 1939, as amended February 14, 1940, and therein docketed as No. 44,659, excepting from such jurisdiction, however, the claims set out as causes of actions Nos. 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, and 31 in the said petition and excepting therefrom that part of the claim set out as cause of action No. 14 in the said petition for which judgment was rendered by the court in No. 44,659 on October 1, 1945, in the amount of $1,099.80. The Court of Claims is directed to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the said claims notwithstanding any prior determination, any statute of limitation, or any abandonment of, nonconformance with, or deviation from the protest and appeal provisions and procedure of the said contract, including but without limitation to article 15 of the contract and paragraph 14 of specifications No. 570 involved in such claims, and without regard to any provisions of the said contract or specifications purporting to confer finality upon the decisions of questions arising under the contract by any officer of the United States.

SEC. 2. Adjudication of the said claims by the Court of Claims is directed to be made without reference to the decision by the court in the case of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States on October 1, 1945, No. 44,659; but the court shall consider as the evidence in such suit any and all evidence heretofore taken by the parties in the said case of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States; and the court may use as a basis for its findings of fact the report of its commissioner, Ewart W. Hobbs, filed January 11, 1944, upon such evidence subject to the exceptions thereto filed by the petitioners and by the defendant United States both on May 1, 1944.

SEC. 3. Any suit upon such claims brought under the provisions of this act shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

WILLIAM NALLY

The bill (H. R. 4566) for the relief of William Nally was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3934) to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid-treatment centers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2755) to amend the act of June 11, 1946, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PEPPER and other Senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE AND TRAINING PERFORMED BY POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2730) to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, on page 1, beginning in line 3, to strike out:

That section 25 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after *"Provided, however,* That"; and (b) by inserting before the period at the end of such section a comma and the following: "and (b) in the case of employees who have been separated from the field service of the Post Office Department to comply with a war transfer to another department of the Government for the purpose of receiving training preparatory to military duty, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding such transfer as well as the time engaged in such training and in military service shall be construed as allowable service and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in such training and in military service for each year of such service."

And insert:

That section 25 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended by adding to the last sentence *"Provided,* That in the case of employees who have been separated from the field service of the Post Office Department to transfer under war service regulations to private industry or another department or independent establishment or agency of the Federal Government, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding such transfer as well as the time engaged in military service shall be construed as allowable service and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended by adding to the last sentence *"Provided,* That in the case of employees who have been separated from the field service of the Post Office Department to transfer under war service regulations to private industry or another department or independent establishment or agency of the Federal Government, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding such transfer as well as the time engaged in military service shall be construed as allowable service and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service."

SEC. 2. Any person who prior to the enactment of this act received any amount the payment of which is authorized for the first time by this act is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any such amount; and in the audit and settlement of the amounts of any postmaster, or of any other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, such amount shall be considered to have been authorized. Any amount heretofore credited to the employee or refunded by him to the United States on account of any such overpayment shall be repaid out of any money available for the payment of salaries of employees in the service in which he is employed.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect as of July 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1988) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources was announced as next in order.

Mr. TOBEY and other Senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1955) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That it is the intention of the Congress in enacting this act to provide for the acquisition of sites and preparation of plans for such Federal public buildings as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner of Public Buildings acting under the supervision of the Federal Works Administrator (with the concurrence of the Postmaster General where his Department is involved), in order that the Public Buildings Administration may be prepared to start the construction of such public buildings outside the District of Columbia when the economic conditions and the availability of materials, equipment, and manpower become such that the construction of such public buildings may be undertaken without adversely affecting the public welfare and economic activities of the Nation.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioner of Public Buildings, under the supervision of the Federal Works Administrator, is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, lands or interest in lands as sites or additions to sites for Federal public building projects previously authorized and for such new projects as may be selected in the manner designated in this section, and to cause to be prepared plans, drawings, and specifications for such projects. When buildings to be used in whole or in part for post-office purposes are involved, the Federal Works Administrator, under regulations to be prescribed by him, shall act jointly with the Postmaster General in the selection of towns or cities in which buildings are to be constructed and the selection of sites therein, and in the preparation of plans, drawings, and specifications for such projects. The Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General (where his Department is involved) shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive revised report of all eligible projects and their limits of cost when in excess of $200,000, without regard to the time in which they may be undertaken, which shall be printed as a public document. When the estimated cost of a project does not exceed $200,000, the limit of cost shall be determined by the Commissioner of Public Buildings. Selection of projects for the purposes of this act shall be made by the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General from the revised report and they may also select such other projects not included in the revised report which in their judgment are economically sound and advantageous to the public service: *Provided*, That in making such selections they shall endeavor to distribute the selected projects equitably but not necessarily uniformly throughout the country with due regard to the comparative urgency of projects in various sections of the country: *Provided further*, That the limits of cost specified in such revised report shall govern for the purpose of establishing the designs and plans for the project but such limits of cost may be adjusted upon the basis of price levels prevailing on the date of the award of the first major construction contract. The total estimated cost of the sites and plans for the projects to be selected under the provisions of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $32,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

(b) The Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General (where his Department is involved) shall from time to time, but not less frequently than every 2 years, submit to the Congress revised reports showing the location and approximate accommodations of all public building projects throughout the United States and its possessions which they may deem necessary to be constructed for efficient public service, such reports to indicate the limits of cost for each building or project and to serve as a backlog of public improvements from which new building projects may be selected within the limits of such legislative authority as the Congress may enact from time to time to serve the public needs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States welcomes the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States, and wishes the association unparalleled success in its sixth conference; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary General of the Inter-American Bar Association.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION

The bill (H. R. 238) for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE OF NAME OF SITE OF FOSTER CREEK DAM, WASH., TO CHIEF JOSEPH DAM

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 229) to change the name of the site of Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State to Chief Joseph Dam was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the dam site known as Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River shall hereafter be known as the Chief Joseph Dam, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of Foster Creek Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name Chief Joseph Dam.

CONSOLIDATION OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE WITH THE COAST GUARD

The bill (H. R. 239) to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF PARCEL OF LAND TO UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

The bill (S. 2676) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, when Calendar 1655, Senate bill 2676, was called I believe the Senator from Oregon raised objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. BUTLER. I wonder if the Senator would withdraw his objection for a moment, until I can make a very brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I will withdraw the objection to permit an explanation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for a maximum of 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I do not think it should take me over 1 minute to convince the Senator from Oregon that he should withdraw his objection permanently.

The bill simply authorizes the Interior Department to convey to the University of Minnesota a small tract of land given to the State of Minnesota by the city of Duluth, comprising a total of about 5 acres. One-third of an acre, of the entire 5 acres, was originally covered by a financial transaction. The remainder was donated by the city of Duluth. The State now desperately needs this piece of land for the University of Minnesota. There is no money involved—there are many precedents—it has the approval of the Department of the Interior, and it has the very earnest endorsement of the Senators from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to add briefly to the statement the Senator from Nebraska has made. As he said, most of the property was originally donated to the Federal Government by the city of Duluth. It has been closed for about a year, and the structures on the 5 acres are rapidly deteriorating. The Department of the Interior has no use for it, whereas the junior college of the University of Minnesota needs it immediately for the housing of some 30 additional members of the faculty who are being added next year. As soon as per-

manent housing can be built, it is planned to use the ground for laboratory space. I strongly urge the Senator from Oregon to withdraw his objection to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is not pleasing to me, as an alumnus of the University of Minnesota, to object to the bill, but I shall have to object to it unless the sponsors thereof are willing to accept the following amendment, to be inserted at an appropriate place in the bill: "*Provided*, That the State of Minnesota shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I previously mentioned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon offers the amendment which he has stated.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I accept the amendment. I do not know whether the university has any funds available with which to buy the land; I do not know what the appraised value would be, but we shall endeavor to work it out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the Regents of the University of Minnesota, a body corporate, organized and existing by virtue of the constitution and laws of the State of Minnesota, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those parcels of real property located in the county of St. Louis, Minn., which were formerly operated as a Federal fish-cultural station, and more particularly described as follows:

All that part of sections 5 and 8 in township 50 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian, which is bounded as follows: Beginning at a point in the westerly shore of Lester River, three hundred feet southeasterly from the center line of the Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railway track measured on a line at right angles to the line of said railroad track, thence southwesterly parallel with said railroad track six hundred and fifty-six feet, thence southeasterly at right angles with the line of said railroad track to the shore of Lake Superior, thence northeasterly along the shore line of Lake Superior to the mouth of the Lester River, thence along the westerly shore of Lester River to the place of beginning, containing six acres of land, more or less, together therewith all of lots 9 and 10 in block 7 in Lester Park first subdivision, according to the recorded plat thereof, but subject to the right-of-way for highway purposes as conveyed by deed dated February 7, 1945, recorded on March 13, 1945, at 3:30 o'clock postmeridian, in book 765, page 47, in the offices of the register of deeds in and for Saint Louis County, Minnesota: *Provided*, That the State of Minnesota shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes, under the rule, to propose a unanimous-consent request before the next bill on the calendar is called.

There are three very important appropriation bills which require the attendance of the entire membership of the Appropriations Committee in the committee today. They are the Department of Interior appropriation bill, the Government Corporations appropriation bill, and the Economic Cooperative—the Economic Cooperation Administration appropriation bill. Of course the membership of the committee cannot attend the meeting for that purpose in the committee and also be in the Senate Chamber advantageously this afternoon.

I have been advised by the distinguished chairman of the committee handling the bill for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that it will be impossible to obtain a vote on that bill today. Because of all the work that has to be done in the Appropriations Committee on the various bills now before the committee, in order to make it possible to report the bills and have them ready for consideration by the Senate, I am now proposing—and I state this carefully, so that all Members of the Senate may be informed; and some Senators are very anxious about the matter, I may say—that the Senate enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that a final vote be had on the unfinished business, which is the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act, both on all amendments thereto which are germane to that proposed legislation, and on the bill itself, at an hour certain on Monday.

I say now for the benefit of the Senate that it is our intention to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock on Monday.

The distinguished Chairman of the Finance Committee has suggested the hour of 4 o'clock on Monday. I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, and that suggestion is acceptable to him.

If that is agreeable to all Members of the Senate, then I would suggest that the time be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the measure, and that a vote be had at that time.

Mr. GEORGE and Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know that I would be willing to consent to have the vote taken by 4 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. Then will the Senator name the hour he would prefer?

Mr. GEORGE. Probably we should be able to vote by 5 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Is there other proposed legislation to be considered this afternoon?

Mr. WHERRY. Probably there will be a veto message to be read. If the proposed agreement is entered, we might thereafter take up the Treasury and Post Office supplemental appropriation bill and any other measures we can reach.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Virginia was anxious to speak about this matter; and he wished to speak today, I understand. I wonder whether the proposed agreement will be acceptable to him.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, it will be perfectly agreeable to me to speak on Monday, provided I may be assured that I may speak for as long as 40 minutes. I have been interested in this subject for many years, as perhaps the Members of the Senate know, and I should like to be assured of being able to have as long as 40 minutes in which to speak.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the proposed request is agreed to, then if the Senator from Virginia cannot obtain 40 minutes from the opponents, I shall see that he obtains 40 minutes from the proponents.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I amend my request, so as to provide that the vote be taken at 5 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to observe that the measure which is the unfinished business is one of the most important measures to come before the Congress. Do I correctly understand that it is proposed that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock Monday—when, of course the Senator from Colorado necessarily will take a certain amount of time to explain the bill—and that then we shall have available for debate on this important measure only the time from 11 o'clock until 5 o'clock on Monday?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, so far as the proponents of the measure are concerned, that is more than sufficient time. If any shortage of time should develop, the proponents—as has already been demonstrated—will try to be reasonable and to yield more time.

I urge the Senator not to object, because we have found by experience that when we enter into such agreements, we make better time, rather than if we proceed without any sort of limit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I realize the correctness of what the Senator from Colorado has said, and I know he is always generous and fair in his allotment of time. So I shall not object; but I wish to say that I think the proposed course is unwise, and that the urgency of adjournment does not warrant the slight consideration which is proposed to be given to a bill of the import of this one—in other words, to devote only a few hours of debate to a bill which not only is very important to our

domestic economy, but is a part and parcel of our relations with other nations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to modify the unanimous-consent request so as to include a provision that the time for the proponents be in charge of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the chairman of the Finance Committee, and the time for the opponents be in charge of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have no intention of making objection to the request which has been made by the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I think the RECORD should show that the difficulty which the Senator from Nebraska experienced in pronouncing the name "European Cooperation Administration" is a perfect demonstration of the fact that the Members of this body are utterly unable to give adequate attention to the matters which are before us. The Senator began his statement with a declaration that this afternoon—at 2 o'clock, I believe—the Committee on Appropriations is to meet to consider the Interior Department appropriation bill and the appropriation bill to implement the work of the European Cooperation Administration. Both those measures are of the greatest importance.

The Interior Department appropriation bill, as it has been presented, now contains a legislative provision——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, of course I have been proceeding under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall take this time in my own time.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That appropriation bill contains a provision which runs directly contrary to the decision of the Supreme Court in the Robert Morss Lovett case, by making an attempt through a legislative rider on an appropriation bill to remove executive officials.

There are numerous other considerations—as, for example, reductions in the appropriations for the Bureau of Mines—to which it will be utterly impossible for the Senate to give the consideration which they deserve; and all of this occurs because our friends on the other side of the aisle are determined that the Congress shall come to an end on the 19th of June, a week from today. We are driving through without regard to the welfare of the people of the United States, in order that the political convention may be held in Philadelphia next week.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have the question put on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to waiving the rule requiring a quorum call? The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I really think there should be a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we had a quorum call when we began consideration of the calendar a little while ago.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How long ago was that?

Mr. WHERRY. About an hour and a half ago.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Members of the Senate have been in and out of the Chamber since then.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, I shall not object. I suppose that would be out of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to waive a quorum call before entering into the unanimous-consent agreement request by the Senator from Nebraska? Without objection, the roll call is waived. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request preferred by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

CHICKAMAUGA AND CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The bill (H. R. 5936) to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE OF NAME OF CHOPAWAMSIC PARK

The bill (H. R. 6246) to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUAN BERRAR

The bill (H. R. 5655) confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing 139.62 acres, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERMISSION FOR MINING LOCATIONS

The bill (H. R. 2867) to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO RICHMOND, FREDERICKSBURG & POTOMAC RAILROAD CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4455) to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Was there an objection to the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is requesting an explanation.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the bill authorizes the sale by the Federal Government of about 5 acres of land lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. It is mostly swamp land of no value to the Federal Government, but it can be put to use for railroad yard purposes. The interests of the Government have been fully protected. The Government will realize the appraisal value from the sale of the property.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE TO WYOMING OF LANDS IN PARK COUNTY

The bill (S. 1821) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. May we have an explanation?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, before I address myself to the bill, may we have the amendments stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 4, after the word "issue", to strike out "an unrestricted" and insert "a"; in line 5, after the word "for", to insert "the east half of the northeast quarter"; and in line 7, after the word "Wyoming", to insert "subject to any existing lease or leases:".

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, this bill authorizes the conveyance to the State of Wyoming of 80 acres of school section 36 in the Elk Basin oil field. Wyoming, as in the case of other States, received from the Federal Government, at the time of its admission into the Union, all sections numbered 16 and 36 within the State. The State issued an oil-and-gas lease on the 80 acres in question in 1915. The area was drilled, oil has been developed and produced on the 80 acres. Royalties to the amount of approximately $19,000 have been paid by the operating oil company. In 1944 the Government sued the State and its lessee. On June 2, 1944, the United States Supreme Court, disregarding the rights created in the land by Congress, according to the surveys, as well as disregarding the exigencies of Wyoming, for highly technical reasons decided the Government should prevail. Section 3, article 4 of the constitution provides:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States.

As a matter of fact, of right, and of justice, the State is entitled to the entire section numbered 36. However, under the circumstances and in order that its own existing lease contract may be recognized, the State is now willing to accept the 80 acres.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over until I have an opportunity to study it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FORT VANCOUVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The bill (H. R. 5957) to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The bill (H. R. 5889) to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS IN ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 6239) to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 225) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In respect to Calendar No. 1665, Senate Joint Resolution 225, there is an identical joint House resolution (H. J. Res. 411) before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Without objection, the committee will be discharged from the further consideration of the House joint resolution and, without objection the House joint resolution will be considered.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 411) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 225 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with regard to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 225, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1607) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 225) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the resolution, without amendment, do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 225 authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue, during 1948, a special 3-cent postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature.

Many famous men and women have come out of Kansas since those days long ago when Kansas Territory was the bone of contention between the abolitionists of the North and the pro-slave people of the South. Among that group was the man whose name will occupy a large place in the history books of all nations—William Allen White.

Of all the illustrious sons and daughters of this unique Kansas Commonwealth, Will White is regarded as a thoroughly typical representative. The ideals of freedom which men died to defend in the early Kansas days were part and parcel of William Allen White. He spoke the Kansas language naturally and eloquently so that it was heard around the world. He interpreted the Kansas ideal to his fellow citizens within and without the State so completely that the name of his town, Emporia, was recognized wherever English is spoken.

Journalism in early Kansas flourished as naturally as did the sunflower on her plains. Even in the fifties, immigrants brought with them in their covered wagons fonts of type, loads of paper, and hand presses, from which grew vigorous, free type journalism. In White this gift of journalism reached its culmination.

There was in him, as in those who went before him, a tendency to flamboyant metaphor, a vigor of expression. Humor when humor was fitting, and a zest for fighting that were typical of this State. He also had an epigrammatic wit, a human understanding—which only the great in heart have—and a familiarity of style tempered with unfailing good taste as well as a resourcefulness in journalistic battle.

Will White was reared in a pioneer world where the buffalo and Indian still roamed. He died in a world standing on the brink of the atomic age. It had changed greatly in those 76 years, and so had he. He changed from a rock-ribbed conservative to a militant liberal. And scarcely a week in all of these years passed without White's telling Kansas through the much-quoted Emporia Gazette what he thought about things. Kansans know him as one who was truthful and courageous in his political views. He had an important part in Presidential politics, in Kansas and the Nation. Quite a while before Herbert Hoover was openly in the race for President, Mr. White called a Republican caucus held under the trees in the grove alongside Will's home in Emporia. The shrewdest politicians of the State were there to look Hoover over for the first time. It was agreed that Hoover should be the next Republican nominee for President and the program later was carried through.

But, if Kansas made Will White, he in turn helped, as no man of his generation, to make the State become what it did become in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Without him, much of the State's color, daring, and liberality would have been missing. The great traditions on which Kansas had been founded were in his blood and his was the typewriter that interpreted for a new generation many of the ideals that had been a pillar of fire by night to that older generation who had settled this new land of privation and trouble.

His friends have created a foundation which bears his name in order that his beneficent influence may not be lost to future generations of Americans. The William Allen White Foundation activities will be geared in with those of the William Allen White School of Journalism and Public Information which has been established at his alma mater, the University of Kansas. Together these two organizations will seek to strengthen the principles which guided his life, principles of moderation, tolerance, kindness, and integrity—those principles which guided and made this Nation great.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the call of the calendar, with the exception of one bill which went to the foot of the calendar.

MAINTENANCE OF A DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when this bill was called a short time ago, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] asked to have it go to the foot of the calendar until he could discuss the matter with me. We have had that discussion, and I am privileged to notify the Senate that the Senator from New Jersey has withdrawn his objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2830) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry," approved June 28, 1947, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1949," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1954."

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate takes a recess at the conclusion of today's session, it recess until next Monday at 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF JURORS

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary I wish to make a request. On Wednesday, June 9, on a call of the calendar, the Senate passed the bill S. 19, relating to the fees and expenses of jurors. At that time it was not known that the House had previously passed a companion bill (H. R. 945) which bill had been very recently referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 945 and that it be considered and passed. I also ask that S. 19 be recalled from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the motion to recall Senate bill 19 from the House will be entered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 945 and that it be presently considered by the Senate?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 945) relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask the consent of the Senate that the Committee on Appropriations may file, during the recess of the Senate, between today and the time of convening on Monday, any appropriation bills it may have ready, and that it may also file any notices of motions to suspend the rule of the Senate for the purpose of considering legislative matters on appropriation bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act."

SEC. 2. When used in this act, the term "displaced person" means—

(a) a person who was on April 21, 1947, and is upon the effective date of this act in Italy or the United States, British, or French zones or sectors in Germany or Austria and who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States and is unable or unwilling to return to the country of which he is a national because of persecution or his fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions; or the person who has fled as a direct result of persecution or fear of persecution developing from the overthrow of the government of his country of origin since April 21, 1947;

(b) a person who is registered by the International Refugee Organization, according to the definitions of displaced persons and refugees set forth in annex I to the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, except clause (b), paragraph 1, section A, part I thereof, to which the United States has adhered (Public Law 146, 80th Cong.), and who entered Italy or the United States, British, or French zones or sectors in Germany or Austria, on or before April 21, 1947, midnight;

(c) the term "displaced person" shall not include any person who is or has been a member of, or participated in, any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) During the two fiscal years following the passage of this act a number of immigration visas not to exceed 202,000 may be issued without regard to quota limitations for those years to displaced persons as quota immigrants, as provided in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That—

(1) they are qualified for admission for permanent residence under all United States immigration laws not inconsistent with the provisions of this act;

(2) visas issued pursuant to this act shall be made available to each element or group among the displaced persons as such elements or groups were segregated or designated for the purpose of being cared for by the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948, in the proportion that the number of displaced persons in such element or group bears to the total number of displaced persons, it being the purpose of this provision to insure that no discrimination in favor of or against any such element or group among the displaced persons shall occur.

(b) Upon the issuance of an immigration visa to any displaced person as provided for in this act, the consular officer shall use a quota number from the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the act of May 26, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current at the time or the next succeeding year in which a quota number is available: *Provided*, That no quota shall be so used by more than 50 percent in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That unmarried minor orphan children classifiable as displaced persons under this act may be issued special nonquota immigration visas.

SEC. 4. (a) During the first two fiscal years following the passage of this act the Attorney General is authorized upon receipt of a fee of $18, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts, to record the admission for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States of any alien in the United States, if such alien entered the United States prior to the effective date of this act, April 1, 1948, is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, and is determined to be a displaced person residing in the United States as defined in this section: *Provided*, That the number of displaced persons permitted to remain permanently in the United States pursuant to this section shall not exceed 15,000. Upon the adjustment of status of an alien as provided for herein the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was a quota immigrant at the time of entry, reduce by one the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current or next succeeding year in which a quota number is available, but not more than 50 percent of any quota shall be used for this purpose in a given fiscal year: *Provided*, That quota deductions provided for in this section shall be made within the 50-percent limitations contained in subsection (b) of section 3 of this act.

(b) When used in this section, the term "displaced person residing in the United States" means a person who lawfully entered the United States as a nonimmigrant under section 3 or as a nonquota immigrant student under subsection (e) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 47 Stat. 607; 54 Stat. 711; 59 Stat. 669; 8 U. S. C. 203), and who is a person displaced from the country of his birth or of his last residence as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and who is unable or unwilling to return to the country against whose quota he is chargeable or of which he is a national because of persecution or his fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions.

SEC. 5. The preferences provided within the quotas by section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155–156; 47 Stat. 656; 45 Stat. 1009; 8 U. S. C. 206), shall not be applicable in the case of any displaced person receiving an immigration visa under section 3 of this act, but in lieu of such preferences the following priorities, without priority as between classes specified in priority (a), shall be granted to aliens and their family dependents in the consideration of visa applications:

(a) First. Aliens qualified as farm laborers; miners; physicians; dentists; medical nurses; household, construction, clothing, and garment workers; or aliens possessing educational, scientific, or technological qualifications.

(b) Second. Aliens who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law.

(c) Third. All other aliens classifiable as displaced persons under section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. Any person, other than a relative as defined in subsection (b) of section 5, or any recognized voluntary agency in the United States desiring to assist a displaced person to enter the United States under this act shall be required to file a suitable and proper bond, approved by the Attorney General, undertaking and assuming to save the United States or any State or Territory or subdivision of either from expense in the event such immigrant should become a public charge, such obligation to be enforceable in the courts of the United States, by suit brought in the name of and by the proper law officers of the United States or of any State or Territory or subdivision of either upon which the burden falls in the event such immigrant becomes a public charge: *Provided*, That the admission of such alien shall be a consideration for the giving of such bond: *And provided further*, That applicants for admission shall be approved for settlement in the particular State or Territory to which they are destined only in accordance with the settlement opportunities and numbers certified to the Coordinator by the chief executive officer thereof.

SEC. 7. Quota nationality for the purposes of this act shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; 8 U. S. C. 212) and no displaced person shall be issued an immigration visa if he is known or believed by the consular officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws, with the exception of the contract labor clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136), and that part of the said act which excludes from the United States persons whose ticket or passage is paid by another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly; and all persons covered by this act shall be exempted from paying visa fees and head taxes.

SEC. 8. (a) That there shall be appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, an official to be designated the Coordinator for the Resettlement of Displaced Persons (hereinafter referred to as the "Coordinator"), to serve at will in the Executive Office of the President at a salary of $10,000 per annum.

The duties of the Coordinator shall be—

(1) to perform or oversee the performance of the administrative functions necessary for effectuating the provisions of this act, including thorough screening of all applicants;

(2) to make rules and regulations, requisite for the effectuation of the provisions of this act;

(3) to report to the Congress semiannually on the operations carried out under the act, including the rate of immigration thereunder, the manner of selection of, and distribution of opportunities to immigrate among the displaced persons, and the resettlement of such persons having regard both to questions of economic opportunity and housing and to geographic distribution;

(4) to coordinate and assist in the task of resettlement of such displaced persons in the United States, its Territories, or possessions;

(5) to consult and cooperate with the various State agencies established to deal with resettlement and with such voluntary agencies actively participating therein as shall register with and be approved by the Coordinator for that purpose.

(6) to procure through the United States representative to the International Refugee

Organization the cooperation of other nations, particularly the members of the International Refugee Organization, in the solution of the displaced persons problem by their accepting for resettlement a relative number of displaced persons, and to expedite the closing of the camps and terminate the emergency; and to report to the Congress on the extent and effectiveness of efforts made by other countries toward an early solution of the displaced persons problem by resettlement of such persons within those countries.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appointed by the President an Advisory Board on the Resettlement of Displaced Persons, to consist of representatives from the Departments of State, Defense, Justice, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, the Maritime Commission and the Veterans' Administration, and any other interested agency of the Government which may be designated as such by the President. The Coordinator shall consult with the said Advisory Board in carrying out his functions under this act, but all supervision of, and instructions issued to, diplomatic and consular officers of the United States in connection with the performance of their duties under this act shall be coordinated with the Director General of the Foreign Service of the United States in accordance with section 201 of Public Law 724 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

(c) Within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to the Coordinator or as may be allocated to him by the President, the Coordinator may employ necessary personnel without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provisions for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purpose of this act. The Coordinator, however, shall use such statistical information, fiscal personnel, and other general business services and facilities as may be made available to him through other established Government departments and agencies. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 9. Except as provided in this act, no preference or priority shall be given to any person after June 30, 1948, because of his status as a displaced person.

SEC. 10. Any person who knowingly violates or conspires to violate any provision of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000, and shall be imprisoned not less than two nor more than 10 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. KILGORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 169)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 110, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, because it would permit an important segment of the economy to obtain immunity from the antitrust laws, and would do so without providing adequate safeguards to protect the public interest.

This bill would authorize exemption from the antitrust laws for any carrier acting in concert with one or more competing carriers in the establishment of rates and related matters, if the Interstate Commerce Commission approves the procedural agreements under which such action would be taken. The Commission would be required to approve these agreements if it should find that exemption from the antitrust laws would be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy."

Under this bill private carrier associations and rate bureaus, free from the restraints of the antitrust laws, could exercise broad powers over most forms of domestic transportation, including railroads, trucks and busses, water carriers, pipe lines, and freight forwarders. Carriers could agree privately among themselves upon the rates to be filed with, or withheld from, the Interstate Commerce Commission. Acting through these bureaus, groups of carriers could exercise a powerful deterrent influence upon the filing by an individual carrier of proposed rates which might benefit the public.

The exercise by private groups of this substantial control over the transportation industry involves serious potential harm to the public. Transportation rates affect the cost of goods as they move through each phase of production—from raw materials, through finished products, to the consumer. Power to control transportation rates is power to influence the competitive success or failure of other businesses. Legislation furthering the exercise of this power by private groups would clearly be contrary to the public interest.

My disapproval of this bill does not signify opposition to carrier associations as such, or to all of their present functions. Many of their activities are useful and desirable. However, this legislation is not necessary for the continuation of such activities.

No legislation giving a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws should be enacted unless adequate alternative safeguards are provided for the public interest. This measure fails to provide such safeguards. Even the limited safeguards incorporated in the bill as originally passed by the Senate are omitted from the bill in its present form. It would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve any agreement which it finds to be in furtherance of the national transportation policy. This is a vague and general standard and is manifestly neither adequate nor appropriate as a criterion for waiving the protection afforded the public by the antitrust laws.

Furthermore, the Commission would be placed in the position of applying this general criterion to the basic procedural agreements without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint actions which would be taken thereunder. Nevertheless, the exemption from the antitrust laws would extend to these subsequent actions without the necessity of further Commission approval. It would extend, moreover, even beyond the parties to the basic agreement to any "other persons" who participate in such actions.

Even though transportation rates are subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the public interest nevertheless demands that the general national policy of maintaining competition continue to be applied to this industry. Our present transportation policy contemplates a pattern of partial regulation, within the framework of which the pressures of competition will remain substantially effective. Regulation cannot entirely replace these competitive pressures. It can guard against some of the potential abuses of monopoly power, but it cannot be an effective substitute for the affirmative stimulus toward improved service and lower rates which competition provides. By sanctioning rate control by groups of carriers, this legislation would represent a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition. This, I believe, would be a serious mistake, with far-reaching effects on our economy.

Antitrust cases are now before the courts challenging some of the very activities which would be covered by this bill. Pending judicial clarification of the issues raised in these proceedings, it would be inappropriate to provide the immunity proposed by this bill.

I have repeatedly urged upon the Congress the necessity for a vigorous antimonopoly program. This bill would be inconsistent with such a program.

For these compelling reasons, I find it necessary to withhold my approval from the measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1948.*

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wanted to ask unanimous consent to consider the President's veto message today. I have discussed the subject briefly with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and I am agreeable to having the message considered on Wednesday of next week.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that will be satisfactory.

Mr. REED. I think all Senators should have notice to make arrangements to be present, if they are interested enough to vote. I should not wish to take up a matter of this importance without having both sides given an opportunity to be present.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] if the Treasury and Post Office

supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 6758, is ready for consideration?

Mr. CORDON. I am about to report the bill. It is ready for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. CORDON. From the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, with amendments, House bill 6758, making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1608) thereon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6758.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6758) making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported by the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Holland	Russell
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Capper	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	Malone	Vandenberg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Feazel	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	O'Conor	
Hatch	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the report on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill is rather an unusual report from the Committee on Appropriations, in that the committee does not recommend any changes, up or down, in the amounts in the bill as passed by the House. The only change recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is the deletion from section 301 of the bill of that portion which is known as the Keefe rider. The portion recommended for deletion is as follows:

or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947—

And the language on page 13—

or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

The following statement gives the figures of the amounts carried by the bill:

Amount of bill as passed the House and reported to the Senate:	
Treasury Department	$190,538,755
Post Office Department	57,875,500
Total	248,414,255
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates for 1949:	
Treasury Department	196,519,275
Post Office Department	158,686,100
Total	355,205,375
The bill is under the estimates for 1949:	
Treasury Department	—5,980,520
Post Office Department	—100,810,600
Total	—106,791,120

Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In title III, general provisions, on page 12, line 19, after the word "violence", it is proposed to strike out "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 13, line 7, after the word "violence", to strike out "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of subsection 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon to comment on the provisions in the bill concerning the refunding of internal revenue collections. It is my understanding, from the House report, that the bill now provides, in accordance with the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget, that the Internal Revenue Bureau may make refunds as they become necessary, without the necessity for any special appropriation therefor in dollar terms.

Mr. CORDON. Refunds are made following the practice which had existed prior to last year.

Mr. McMAHON. This is the appropriation, is it not, which last year in the Treasury bill was reduced by some $900,000,000?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Which was afterward restored by supplemental deficiency appropriations?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And now the House and the Senate are agreed that the necessity for refunds is so great that the Treasury Department may be permitted to make such refunds in accordance with the law.

Mr. CORDON. I think the experience of the 1948 bill demonstrated that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand correctly that by reason of the authority granted last year a special survey was made with respect to the administration of the Internal Revenue Bureau and that certain recommendations were made by those who conducted the survey?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Have those recommendations, or a summary of them, been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CORDON. They have not, for this reason: The report now available is the report of a special committee appointed by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The committee has not acted on the report of the special committee, although the report of the special committee which did the investigating is available. For that reason the Senator from Oregon felt that he should wait until the committee to which the report was made has acted on the report which came to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was it before the subcommittee when it acted upon these various measures?

Mr. CORDON. It was. It is one of the bases, as a matter of fact, I may say to the Senator, for the supplemental estimate which came down and was before the subcommittee. That, however, was all in the portion of the bill heretofore passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I observe that a reduction of about $106,000,000 was made by the House in the appropriation for the Post Office Department below the budget estimate. Was there not some statement in the House report to the effect that there would be no objection on the part of the committee to the consideration of deficiency appropriations if they should turn out to be required?

Mr. CORDON. It is my understanding that the House took the view, and so reported, that with reference to those items the appropriation should be deferred until experience indicated what the amount should be. The Postmaster General in his letter to the Senate committee concurred in that position. He said:

I believe that it may be necessary to provide additional funds for the fiscal year, but I believe this conclusion to be sound—

Referring to the conclusion of the House committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6758) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CORDON, Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. HAYDEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

FEDERAL COURT DECISIONS ON REGULATION OF TRADE PRACTICES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without additional amendments, Senate resolution 241, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 241) submitted by Mr. CAPEHART on May 20, 1948, and previously reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry into (1) the existing legislation concerning Government policy affecting the activities of the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission and the impact of these policies as interpreted by the Supreme Court with particular relation to the basing point or freight equalization system of pricing and the impact upon small and large business and upon the consumers of the United States of the maintenance or discontinuance of said system; and (2) into the status of business enterprise in the United States, seeking to determine the extent and character of economic concentration and the effect of such concentration, and the status of free competitive business enterprise as affected by transportation and Federal trade regulations.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1949.

SEC. 3. The purposes of this resolution directly affect the welfare of broad segments of our population whose special knowledge and particular interest require full consideration in the investigation. To insure access to such knowledge and interest, the committee shall consult with persons representing industry, agriculture, labor, and consumers' problems.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it may deem advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate resolution 248 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 248), submitted by Mr. WHERRY on June 3, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress (providing for a study of the problems of American small business enterprises), as supplemented by Senate Resolution 153 and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, is hereby increased by $50,000.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 236, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 236), submitted by Mr. REVERCOMB on May 17, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 137, of the Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947 (providing for a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system), is hereby continued until March 1, 1949, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $50,000.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 244 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 244) submitted by Mr. BUTLER on May 26, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 148, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 25, 1947, authorizing the Committee on Public Lands (now the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) to make a study and investigation of any matter referred to it, is hereby increased by $25,000.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS BY CHAPLAIN OF SENATE DURING EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 237, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 237), submitted by Mr. WHERRY on May 18, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 2,500 copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress, be printed and bound for the use of the Senate.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR OVERTON

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 243, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 243), submitted by Mr. ELLENDER on May 20, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 149, ENTITLED "OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE"

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 250 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 250), submitted by Mr. MILLIKIN on June 4, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 149, current session, entitled "Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance" for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF NONCURRENT AND OBSOLETE CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, House Concurrent Resolution 204 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I will say that the concurrent resolution simply provides for cleaning up and disposing of surplus material in the folding room. Similar resolutions have been adopted in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof, in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the

usual manner at any time before September 1, 1948.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding rooms at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives Establishment, Bureau of American Republics, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 10 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

PRINTING OF THE MONTHLY PUBLICATION ENTITLED "ECONOMIC INDICATORS"

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. 226) to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators." I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The estimated monthly cost for the printing of the document referred to in the joint resolution is $1,355. The added 1,000 rate is $69.90. The yearly cost, therefore, is estimated at about $17,000. The Superitendent of Documents will sell copies to public and cost will, therefore, be reduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 226) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Joint Committee on the Economic Report be authorized to issue a monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators," and that a sufficient quantity be printed to furnish one copy to each Member of Congress; the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate; the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; the libraries of the Senate and House, and the Congressional Library; 300 copies to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; and the required number of copies to the Superintendent of Documents for distribution to depository libraries; and that the Superintendent of Documents be authorized to have copies printed for sale to the public.

STUDY OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without additional amendment, Senate Resolution 223, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, submitted by Mr. THYE on April 15, 1948, which had previously been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "date," to strike out "but in no event later than"; and on page 2, line 6, to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$6,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete investigation of all problems related to foot-and-mouth disease and its incidence in neighboring countries.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report of its findings to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and to travel, and authorize its assistants to travel in such places as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $6,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PACIFIC ISLAND POSSESSIONS AND TRUST TERRITORIES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without additional amendments, House Concurrent Resolution 129, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 129) which had been previously reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 4, line 11, after the word "advisable", to insert "the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words", and in line 14, after the word "committee", to insert "which shall not exceed $50,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF STUDY OF NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 249 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 249) submitted by Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. PEPPER), on June 4, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized and directed through the Subcommittee on Health of the said committee to—

(a) continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto which have been referred to the said subcommittee, which study shall be primarily concerned with ascertaining the full extent and nature of existing national health problems and the action, if any, which the Federal Government should take in relation to said problems.

(b) consult, in the course of such study, with Federal agencies administering health and related programs, with such other legislative committees of the Senate as are concerned with related matters, and with such other agencies, organizations, or persons as the subcommittee may desire to consult;

(c) report to the Senate not later than March 15, 1949, the results of the study, together with such proposed legislation, if any, and such other recommendations as the subcommittee may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. (a) The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through the said Subcommittee on Health, is authorized to sit and act at such times and in such places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to employ such consultants, clerical, and other assistance; to procure such printing and binding; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures within the limits below set forth, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The expenses incurred under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ACCEPTANCE OF INVITATION TO MEETING OF EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION IN BERMUDA

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, House Concurrent Resolution 201, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 201) was considered and agreed to.

INVESTIGATION BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, last night the authority of the Committee To Investigate War Expenditures expired

under a series of extensions that had gone on for several months. So the activities of that committee, which extended through the war period and during the period following the war have now ceased.

During the past year in which the Senator from Maine acted as chairman of the committee there developed certain public controversies which attracted considerable attention in the public press concerning which I have never heretofore made any statement other than during the immediate occurrences. In justice to the Members of the Senate who are naturally concerned with a record of these affairs it seemed to me that before the chapter was finally closed with the conclusion of the work of the committee, it would be appropriate that there should be incorporated in the RECORD of the Senate somewhat of a history of the affair, if it may be called such, for the purpose of future reference, so that if any question ever arises at any time there may be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement in summary form of what transpired in connection with an event which during its occurrence attracted very considerable public attention.

On January 27, 1947, the Senate voted to extend for 1 year the authority of the special committee of the Senate known as the Senate War Investigating Committee.

On January 29, 1947, at the first meeting of the committee following the extension of its powers the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] presented a complaint, received as he has stated, from sources entirely outside the committee or its staff and from outside Washington, concerning the conduct of aircraft procurement with particular relation to certain contracts with the Hughes Aircraft Co. under which there had been paid by the Government approximately $40,000,000, and for which it was alleged there had been received by the Government at that time no delivery of any flyable plane.

The complaint was referred in the customary course to the staff of the committee, then under the direction of George Meader, Esq. Francis Flanagan, a member of the committee staff for the preceding years under the Democratic administration, was assigned to the investigation.

The next that I, as chairman of the committee, heard of the matter was on Sunday morning, February 9, when I was in Kansas City and was called on the telephone by Howard Hughes, the sole owner of the Hughes Aircraft Co. from the Carlton Hotel in Washington. Mr. Hughes stated that he had come to Washington and would like to talk with me as early as convenient.

The upshot of our conversation was that I flew back to Washington on Sunday and saw Mr. Hughes at my office the following Monday morning.

Mr. Hughes requested an immediate hearing in his matter by the full committee, and an executive session to hear Mr. Hughes was arranged for Tuesday morning, February 11.

Meanwhile Mr. Hughes had arranged for an executive plane of the Trans World Airline to fly the chairman to Huntington, W. Va., on Monday evening to keep a long-standing speaking engagement for a Lincoln birthday banquet, and on Tuesday evening Mr. Hughes personally flew the chairman to Columbus, Ohio, for a similar Lincoln Club banquet and arranged for an executive plane of Trans World Airline to fly the chairman back to Washington.

No thought of impropriety was apparently in the mind of anyone at the time as to these flights, as executive planes are apparently used rather freely in this fashion for the convenience of all concerned without more thought of obligation than is involved in the hospitality that is dispensed rather freely here in Washington.

At the executive hearing, full transcript of which is available in the committee records, Mr. Hughes exhibited no concern about the investigation. On the contrary, he suggested that the committee send its investigators out to Los Angeles to get whatever records they desired as the simplest and quickest way of clearing up any questions as to what had gone on.

Two weeks later Mr. Hughes telephoned the chairman from Los Angeles to inquire when the staff members would be out and also when the committee might come out to see the situation at first hand. There was still no evidence of concern about the investigation.

Not until 2 weeks later when the investigators had begun to uncover records of excessive expenditures for questionable entertainment of various Government officials was there any indication of concern about the investigation on the part of Mr. Hughes.

At that time there developed resistance to the securing of certain records and at the recommendation of the committee counsel and in accordance with usual procedure a meeting of the committee was called and a subpena was ordered to issue calling for the production of the desired records. The subpena was never actually served as Mr. Hughes thereupon yielded to the request of the investigators to secure photostats of the records in question.

The foregoing is important in connection with appraising later developments.

Mr. Hughes subsequently charged that at a luncheon on February 12 it had been proposed to him that the investigation would be dropped if Mr. Hughes would consent to a merger of Trans World Airline with Pan American Airways.

I trust it is not necessary for me to say to the Senate that the charge is absolutely false.

Waiving any possible senatorial immunity, I took the stand under oath before the Senate subcommittee in charge of this investigation under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to deny the charge immediately and categorically.

Any such suggestion is a lie made out of whole cloth.

The utter impropriety of any such proposal is readily apparent. The utter impossibility of carrying out any such undertaking is apparent to anyone familiar with committee procedure, particularly in a case wherein the Senator from Michigan was the moving party and was in complete charge of the investigation. The utter improbability of such a bald proposal by one with 25 years' experience in public life as a Governor, a Representative in Congress, and a Senator to one whom he had actually known for only 2 days and to one who appeared at the time in no way concerned or disturbed about the projected investigation, is rather readily apparent.

However, since no witnesses were present at the time of the alleged proposal and no supporting evidence offered one must test the probabilities by the credibility of those concerned and by the subsequent conduct of the parties.

Howard Hughes testified under oath that he and his concerns had made no profit out of the war.

I should like to read the exact statement as it appears in the report, No. 440, part 3, as presented to the Senate by the subcommittee and the full committee. The Senator from Michigan was in charge of the conduct of the investigation and the presentation of the report. I quote from page 25 of the report:

> Mr. Hughes in his testimony before the committee indicated that his company made little or no profit during the war years. He gave the following testimony on this point in public hearings on August 8, 1947, in reply to questions by Senator O'CONOR:
>
> "Senator O'CONOR. Now, referring for a minute to the $200,000,000 war contracts in general: I am not interested in any particular personal data, but I should like to ask you whether in the aggregate you realized a profit or suffered a loss as a result of those contracts.
>
> "Mr. HUGHES. Well, I can say this: That is, I have studied my books and records carefully. When I say my books and records, I mean my own books and records and the records and books of every company in which I am interested. And I have carefully analyzed the entire situation and am prepared to say on oath that neither my companies nor I made a profit as a result of the war.
>
> "In fact, we lost a considerable amount of money. Now, let me amplify that.
>
> "Senator O'CONOR. Go ahead. I thought you had finished.
>
> "Mr. HUGHES. My companies and I may have had a small profit, all told, at the end of the war, and for the war years, but that was less than it would have been if we had continued on nonwar operation. And I can say further that the principal profit, if there was one, at the end of the war, stemmed from the operation which we had been conducting before the war, namely, the production of nonwar supplies."

That is the end of the quotation from the record of the testimony of Mr. Hughes. The committee report continues:

> Available records indicate that the Hughes Tool Co. did make a substantial over-all profit during the years that it was working on war projects.

In other words, the committee came to the conclusion that Mr. Hughes' statement under oath before the committee, which he said was the result of very careful examination of his records, was entirely unsupported by the facts.

The committee report continues:

> An examination of Federal income tax returns reveal that during the years 1942 through 1946, the total net profits, after deductions and before taxes, of the various

divisions and subsidiaries of the Hughes Tool Co.—

Which is entirely owned by Mr. Hughes—

amounted to $15,526,000. According to the profit and loss statements furnished by the Hughes Tool Co., this total included a net profit of $2,385,112.77 on the operation of the aircraft division. In addition to the F-11 and HK-1 projects, that division was also engaged in the manufacture of aircraft parts and equipment during the years in question.

In order to obtain more complete information on the financial status of the Hughes Tool Co., the committee requested information from the Bureau of Internal Revenue concerning the tax status of that corporation. The Bureau of Internal Revenue advised the committee that representatives of that Bureau examined the Federal income-tax returns of the Hughes Tool Co. for the years 1940 through 1946. Previous to the committee's inquiry, the technical staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue at Houston, Tex., had set up additional surtaxes for the years 1941 and 1942, in the amount of $2,418,921.56. In addition, field representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue at Houston—

This is action taken after the committee's request—

have now recommended an additional tax deficiency for the years 1942 through 1946, inclusive, in the amount of nearly $6,000,000.

The total tax deficiency of the Hughes Tool Co., which has been recommended by field representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the years 1940 through 1946 now amounts to almost $8,500,000. The committee appreciates that these preliminary determinations by representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue are subject to complete review and possible revision by the Bureau itself and by the courts. Final determinations on these pending tax matters by the Bureau of Internal Revenue or the courts may eventually alter the present profit position of the Hughes Tool Co. for the years in question.

Mr. President, I cite the complete record on that matter in order to be completely fair to Mr. Hughes and to his statement. But I call attention to the fact that it is an extraordinary divergence in viewpoint when, upon the investigation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the representatives of that Bureau find profits during the war years of more than $15,000,000, on the basis of Mr. Hughes' company's own returns; and yet he himself, in his testimony before the committee, stated that he had made practically no profit during the war.

The Senator from Michigan asked for this investigation by the Internal Revenue Bureau of the United States Treasury. They reported Hughes' profits during the war years of something over $15,000,000, and a tax liability of over $8,500,000.

Meanwhile, in further considering the credibility of Mr. Hughes as a witness, which is the matter we are concerned with here—and certainly a lapse of memory to that extent, in view of his careful statement, is at the least extraordinary—the Hughes Tool Co., which is entirely owned and controlled by Howard Hughes, and the Hughes Aircraft Co., a division of the Hughes Tool Co., and 5 of its leading officials have been indicted by the United States Department of Justice for war frauds in the amount of more than $500,000 in the acquisition of airplanes from the War Assets Corporation. That bears further on the question of the character and the scope of their operations.

The committee report, prepared under the direction of the Senator from Michigan, goes at great length into the various dealings of Howard Hughes and his company with the Government during the war, and copies of the report are available upon request. I shall not comment further on that report.

The later history of this affair also affords interesting evidence as to the credibility of this fantastic charge by Mr. Hughes.

Six weeks after this proposition was alleged to have been made to Mr. Hughes by the chairman, Hugh Fulton, Esq., former counsel of the committee, called on the chairman as—and I quote his phraseology—"a friend of both parties," and suggested that the investigation might be so handled as to avoid its more lurid aspects, and dispose of the matter rather quietly, to the advantage of all concerned, and that otherwise there might be disclosures that would be very embarrassing to the chairman.

The chairman called in his secretary and dictated the following statement to Mr. Fulton, to avoid any misunderstanding. I quote now the memorandum made by my secretary at the time, in Mr. Fulton's presence:

April 3, 1947. Conversation between Senator BREWSTER and Hugh Fulton in Senator BREWSTER'S office.

I do not like your attitude in regard to committee reports.

This is the chairman speaking to Mr. Fulton.

You say there may be a report without a hearing. Now I want it distinctly understood that hearings will be held and reports will be gotten out in accordance with those hearings. I cannot say that one person will not be called. It may be that Snyder and Hughes and Jones or the whole list may be called and I do not like your repeated statements to the effect that you assume such and such will be done in the committee.

That is the end of the quotation.

This was a most unusual procedure in the experience of the chairman, and it illustrates very clearly the unusual character of Mr. Fulton's conversation.

Immediately thereafter, the chairman, being on the point of leaving that night for Cairo, for the convening of the Interparliamentary Union—and Mr. George Meader, counsel, being out of town—dictated a letter to George Meader, reciting Mr. Fulton's call and the puzzling conversation, and stating that—

It seemed to me—

That is, to the chairman—

that Mr. Fulton went rather far.

And that Mr. Meader had best be careful in any contacts, and also to protect and preserve any records.

In this connection, it later developed that the records of the first investigation by the committee of the Hughes situation, at the time when Mr. Fulton was counsel, had disappeared from the files; and it was only by telephoning Mr. Justice Harold H. Burton, in Switzerland, that a copy was obtained from the Burton files, inasmuch as Mr. Justice Burton, then Senator Burton, had been designated by Mr. Truman, then Senator Truman, as a member of the committee to look into the Hughes affair, when it was first brought to the attention of the committee some 4 years before.

Thereafter, Mr. Fulton called on Mr. Meader, representing himself now as counsel for Mr. Hughes, and, after repeating some of the same advice, suggested that Mr. Meader should be careful to let the chairman make all decisions as to procedure in the further conduct of the investigation.

I quote now from Mr. Meader's report to the chairman, upon the chairman's return from Cairo. I have a complete copy of the memorandum here, but I shall read only one paragraph on page 6:

Fulton stated that his only reason for discussing the matter with me—

This is the memorandum of George Meader, counsel—

was to apprise me fully of all the circumstances and to caution me that in the event of a hot public controversy, I should bear in mind that I might be in the thick of it, with brickbats flying. I stated I was fully aware of all the possibilities, but appreciated his thoughtfulness in calling them to my attention.

Fulton stated that it would be his objective to "contain" the investigation to consider matters of public contracts, without getting into the sensational aspects of the matter, and advised that he hoped I would take an attitude—

This, to me, is a very significant statement—

of simply doing my work and making full information available to Senator BREWSTER, but not advocating or advising whether the committee should or should not proceed with the investigation, leaving that decision entirely to Senator BREWSTER.

I made no comment upon this suggestion, and Fulton asked for none.

Mr. President, it seems to me that is a most illuminating statement made by the former counsel of this committee. The propriety of his appearance in this affair, which had been under investigation twice during the period when he was counsel for the committee—and for which periods the records bearing on this matter had apparently disappeared—I shall leave to anyone to judge; but the significance of his proposal to the counsel of our committee that he should be very careful to let all decisions in the matter as to whether we should proceed or should not proceed be left up to the chairman of the committee—contrary to the usual practice in which the counsel of the committee has always formulated his conclusions from his investigations and recommended whether or not action should proceed—furnishes very clear evidence that if that statement of George Meader, the general counsel of our committee, is correct, there was apparently very much in the mind of Mr. Fulton, in making the proposal, the thought that they might later be able to fix upon the chairman responsibility for any proposals either to proceed or not to proceed. It is a most interesting indication of the mental operations of those who were, at this point, in April, concerned with the con-

duct of the case. I have quoted from the 8- or 10-page report Mr. Meader made, which I found on my return from Cairo.

Whether or not this proposal was designed to furnish a foundation for any later charge that the chairman had taken action to accelerate or delay the investigations for ulterior motives is something I must leave to others to consider.

On returning from Cairo the chairman promptly named a subcommittee to handle all further details of the investigation in accordance with usual committee practice, and named the Senator from Michigan as chairman of the subcommittee, and all responsibility for the conduct of the investigation thereafter rested with the subcommittee.

Shortly thereafter, in May 1947, Mr. Noah Dietrich, of Houston, president of the Hughes Tool Co., the parent corporation, and Mr. Tom Slack, counsel of the corporation, came to see the chairman, the Senator from Maine, at his office in Washington. They were told of the surprising aspects of Mr. Fulton's call and were referred to the Senator from Michigan as chairman of the subcommittee, in full charge of the investigation.

Shortly thereafter Mr. Fulton was dismissed as counsel for Mr. Hughes, presenting a bill for $20,000, which was settled for $10,000.

These various episodes have been recited as revealing rather clearly the endeavor to put pressure on the chairman of the committee to divert or dilute the investigation as it uncovered the evidence of more than $160,000 spent in entertaining Government procurement officials and the refusal of the chairman to be a party to any such proceeding.

Whether or not the Senator from Michigan was justified in his original complaint, and whether or not the conduct of the investigation by the subcommittee under the direction of the Senator from Michigan and its subsequent report criticizing very severely the relations of Howard Hughes with Government officials was warranted, is not here for discussion. The records speak for themselves.

I desire to add that the very difficult problem presented to the subcommittee in this situation is fully appreciated by the chairman, who was concerned in the matter of how they should handle the situation. The hearings subsequently proceeded. Mr. Hughes appeared, and the subcommittee was confronted with the very delicate problem of what attitude it should take regarding the charges which Mr. Hughes had then publicized in the press, whether or not they should take cognizance of the charges and hold a hearing, or whether the subcommittee should rule they were irrelevant to the immediate proceeding and decline to hear them. On that score, I am not myself prepared to express an opinion as to what was wise and best. I think the episode serves very excellently as a laboratory case in the problems which are presented, and for that reason may be of value for any future situations of this character that may arise.

I should like it to be completely clear that the only action I took in the matter when Mr. Hughes ultimately made the charges was to notify the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Michigan, that I would be completely governed by whatever he and the other members of his subcommittee deemed best. They considered it in executive session, at which I was not present, and the subcommittee subsequently advised that they had decided to hear Mr. Hughes' charges and would hear me. I had indicated I was quite prepared to be bound by whatever they should decide; that I would waive any questions of Senatorial immunity which might perhaps be involved, and that I would be glad to appear before them as a private American citizen to answer charges of this character, without any other protection than is accorded to a citizen in such cases.

Subsequently the committee asked me to appear. I appeared and answered categorically all the questions which were asked, and denied categorically, under oath, the charge which had been made and which is here involved.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from New Mexico permit me to finish first?

Mr. HATCH. Very well. When the Senator from Maine finishes, I shall ask to be recognized.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say at this point that I appraised the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], as he was the ranking minority member of the committee, and I felt that appropriate courtesy required it, that I expected to discuss this matter. I very much appreciate his attendance here, and also that of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who was likewise a member of the committee and, I believe, of the subcommittee concerned with the matter.

I appeared, and, as I say, testified under oath in answer to questions asked. Subsequently as a result of some differences of opinion which arose in connection with the testimony of Mr. Hughes while he was before the committee, it was decided by the subcommittee to drop all the question as between Mr. Hughes and the chairman. I want to quote from that, as I think I could be characterized as an innocent bystander in the matter at that point.

Mr. Hughes discussed this matter with the committee, in their session and these are quotations from the record. After the committee had advised him as to the procedures which would be followed, Mr. Hughes finally stated to the committee:

I feel that we have had a fair presentation of this matter right now, and I am willing to drop it.

Later in the testimony he again said:

I am willing to drop the whole matter right now and proceed with your investigation tomorrow morning.

Again he said—and this is taken verbatim from the record:

I earnestly suggest that we drop the whole matter right here.

Again he said:

I am very willing to drop the whole matter right now and go ahead in the morning.

The reference was to other phases of the investigation.

I put that into the RECORD in order that it may be clear that Mr. Hughes was heard, so far as he and the committee could agree was expedient, in order that no question might arise as to whether the subcommittee was properly considerate of his position.

What should be done in a case of this character, I shall not here discuss. It does serve, as I say, as a laboratory case in similar procedures. Following this, as Mr. Hughes had stated that he proposed also to refer the matter to the Attorney General—and this appeared as a statement in the public press—I accordingly wrote to the Attorney General assuring him, and I shall quote from my statement, that if these charges were made to the Attorney General, I did not care for any embarrassment to be occasioned to him and the investigation. I quote:

I will welcome and invite the most thorough exploration of this charge by the Attorney General, in justice to all concerned.

Subsequently, since it appeared that Mr. Hughes did not make charges to the Attorney General, some question arose in his mind as to procedure, and he asked me whether or not I would agree to withdraw the suggestion as to investigation. In order to clarify the situation completely, I desire to incorporate in the RECORD at this point the complete transcript of my correspondence with the Attorney General, so that for all future time there may be no doubt as to my precise attitude, since there have been some misrepresentations in the public press, undoubtedly inadvertently. A complete record of the correspondence printed at this point will demonstrate that, from beginning to end, my position did not change. The final quotation is from my letter of October 29, 1947:

May I respectfully state that my position today is the same as it was when I gave my statement to the press on August 1, to wit: that if you do receive charges and if you desire to investigate those charges, I would welcome and invite their most thorough exploration.

Mr. President, I ask that the complete correspondence be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1947.

Hon. TOM CLARK,
Attorney General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I enclose copy of statement which I have given to the press as a result of certain statements reported in the press as emanating from Howard Hughes.

I shall be at your service at any time in this as in all other matters.

Very truly yours,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

STATEMENT

AUGUST 1, 1947.

If there were a word of truth in the charges now being made by Howard Hughes they should have been presented to the Attorney

General last February at the time of the alleged proposal.

One does not wait 6 months where a blackmail charge is involved.

I will welcome and invite the most thorough exploration of this charge by the Attorney General in justice to all concerned.

After Hughes finds time to respond to the subpena of the committee and tells his story under oath, I shall be most happy to waive all committee and Senatorial privileges and appear before the committee as a plain American citizen under oath.

After 25 years in public life as a State legislator, as Governor of Maine, and as a Member of the House and Senate for the past 12 years, I have long since learned that the life of public men must be an open book.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., October 13, 1947.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: At our conference on Saturday last I assured you that I would speak to the Attorney General promptly, and then communicate with you immediately thereafter, concerning your desire to withdraw your request for an exploration by the Department of Justice of Howard Hughes' charges against you, which request was contained in your statement of August 1, 1947, forwarded to the Attorney General with your letter of August 2, 1947. The press of business has prevented the Attorney General from seeing me. However, I am just writing this note to assure you that I will communicate with you just as soon as I have been given the opportunity to discuss this matter with the Attorney General, which I feel certain will be before the end of this week.

It was good of you to give me your time.

Very sincerely yours,

IRVING R. KAUFMAN,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., October 21, 1947.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: My letter, dated October 13, advised you that I would communicate with you shortly concerning your suggestion to withdraw your request for an exploration by the Department of Justice of Howard Hughes' charges against you, which request was contained in your statement of August 1, 1947, forwarded to the Attorney General with your letter of August 2, 1947.

You will recall that I advised you, in our conference of October 11, that the Attorney General was willing to comply with your wishes in the matter of your request to explore Hughes' charges, and that if you desired to have the inquiry commenced immediately, without waiting until the completion of the hearings, the Attorney General would comply with your request.

Your suggestion has received full consideration. It is our opinion, that in view of the fact that the suggestion for exploration by the Department of Justice of Howard Hughes' charges against you originated with you, and in view of the further fact that the exploration had not as yet commenced, because of the Attorney General's intention not to interfere with the pending hearings and to await the completion of the hearings, as expressed in his letter to you of August 7, that the privilege of withdrawing is yours. If you, therefore, will advise us by letter that it is your desire to withdraw your request for an exploration by the Department of Justice, as more specifically set forth in your statement of August 1, 1947, forwarded with your letter of August 2, 1947, the exploration requested by you will not be undertaken.

Very sincerely yours,

IRVING R. KAUFMAN,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

OCTOBER 29, 1947.

Hon. TOM CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On August 1, 1947, a statement purporting to emanate from Howard Hughes was carried in the public press. A copy of a portion of this statement is attached hereto as exhibit 1.

In reply to this publication, I gave to the press a statement, a copy of which is hereto attached and marked "Exhibit 2."

You will observe that in the published statement of Mr. Hughes, he states that he proposed to present his complaint to you as Attorney General for investigation. You will note that in my public statement I stated that I would "welcome and invite exploration" of his charge by you.

Thereafter, Mr. Irving Kaufman, Assistant Attorney General, called upon me and, after a conversation, sent me the letter of October 13, copy of which is hereto attached as exhibit 3. In this letter the Assistant Attorney General seems to have assumed that I had initially requested you to undertake an investigation of the charges made in the original Hughes article. Obviously, as you will observe from the attached exhibits, this is not the case. The person suggesting an investigation by you was Mr. Hughes, not I, and what I clearly stated was that I would welcome and invite a thorough exploration by you.

In Mr. Kaufman's letter of October 21, the idea apparently persists that I had requested you to investigate these charges, whereas I was advised by Mr. Kaufman that Mr. Hughes had made no charges to you nor asked you to investigate any.

May I respectfully state that my position today is the same as it was when I gave my statement to the press on August 1, to wit: that if you do receive charges and if you desire to investigate those charges, I would welcome and invite their most thorough exploration.

Cordially yours,

OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, during the hearing there were considerable reports of a very sensational character which I have no doubt Members of the Senate and the public generally will recall. There later came to my knowledge information which seemed to me to add considerably to an understanding of the situation which prevailed. This information was in the shape of a report of an address at a meeting of a public relations group in Los Angeles, Calif., which was not reported in the public press, but which purported to be an account of how the situation was handled at the time by those in charge of public relations. It seems to me it has considerable significance in connection with understanding how these matters may develop and also in serving as a basis for the procedure by future committees and their chairmen in case situations of this character develop. The information came to me through the medium of one who was present at the meeting, a gentleman whom I had met only once before and who was in no way connected with any of the parties concerned and was in no way connected with any of the industries concerned. I have every reason to consider the report of the statement of the vice president in charge of public relations for Mr. Hughes at that time a reliable one. At least, that is what it purports to be.

Mr. President, I think we are all amateurs in the development of the matter of public relations. This is a very interesting document as showing how those questions can be handled. So I shall read it for the benefit of the RECORD and of the Senate as purporting to be an accurate account of how the Hughes' affair was handled:

At a meeting of the Public Relations Group, an informal luncheon group, held at the Chamber of Commerce building on September 11, 1947, at noon—

This was in Los Angeles—

the scheduled speaker was Charles MacVarish, who was introduced as vice president and western manager of the Carl Byoir Public Relations firm.

The first item of conversation between Mr. MacVarish and those of us sitting near him was perhaps a compliment to Pan American. He seemed to be anxious to learn the identity of the person handling the public relations end of Pan American. I told him I did not know, but referred him to Roy Waggoner, who heads the local office of Allen's Press Clipping Bureau and who knows practically all the publicity and public relations men in this area.

Roy replied that it was some Mexican by the name of Vallenio or something like that.

Then MacVarish turned to me and he began to give me a preliminary outline of his talk. He said that his firm was not too proud of the part it was obliged to take in this Brewster-Hughes affair. He said that he knew Senator BREWSTER over a period of 20 years, ever since he had been a reporter on the Boston Transcript. His personal opinion of the Senator, through all these years, was not too flattering. He stated that the purpose of the whole Carl Byoir strategy was to single out Senator BREWSTER as "the single instrument" primarily because they had been informed that Elliott Roosevelt was to be "the single instrument" of the committee's attack.

He claimed that they had worked for 3 months to gather data and were in a position to attack Senator FERGUSON, whom MacVarish knew from his Detroit newspaper days, and Senator MCCARTHY or MCGRATH (I don't remember exactly which). It seems that MCCARTHY or MCGRATH had been in the service with MacVarish and MacVarish called them both his "friends." But they did not want to attack the whole committee for several reasons. First, it would make Howard Hughes appear as a man who was agin everybody." Second, it would have cast mud at the whole committee and the Senate and 140,000,000 people.

That is a rather interesting comment upon attacks on the Congress as involving the people.

This would have turned the public opinion against Hughes. Third, Howard Hughes had about 1,500 single-space typewritten pages of notes which he wanted to read at the hearing. They had the dickens of a job to shut him up.

This, Mr. President, purports to be a quotation:

"Mr. Hughes is a rugged individualist and a Texan," he remarked, "and it is no easy job for a public relations agency to handle him as a client."

At 1 o'clock sharp he proceeded to give his talk to the audience. He spoke for a half hour and then invited questions which took another half hour. This I know was an unusual occurrence, because it has been the strict practice of this group to curtail their sessions immediately at 1:30 p. m., instead of at 2 p. m. which occurred in this instance.

He started in by explaining several routine methods of operation by which the Byoir Agency kept informed of daily doings in its various regional offices. It seems that the Washington bureau issues a daily mimeograph, Washington Roundup, which is supposedly read every day by employees and other officers.

He then swung into the Brewster committee hearing. He claimed that at the outset they were informed by their Washington office that their purpose was to get Elliott Roosevelt, and that it was possible that Howard Hughes would be called to testify. For 3 months thereafter they dug into the Hughes end of it and prepared voluminous data. Howard Hughes had informed them that he was only slightly involved in the whole matter, but they took no chances nevertheless.

The first resentment against Senator BREWSTER, he stated, arose when they learned he was bound on summoning two respectable girls—one a swimmer and the other engaged to an Army officer—to testify before the committee.

I interpolate at this point that I had no knowledge whatsoever of any subpenas which were or were not served in connection with these girls, or the other witnesses concerned, so that if this is an accurate statement, their resentment was directed entirely against the wrong man.

The second resentment came when Howard Hughes, who was informed that he would not be called for 3 weeks, was called about 2 weeks earlier.

I might again say this was a matter entirely outside my control. I was neither consulted nor concerned, and had no part in the determination as to the time when Howard Hughes would be called. So here again, if this is accurate, I was an entirely innocent party in the activities of the committee.

The statement proceeds:

Then they got mad and decided to get after Senator BREWSTER for fair.

He said they laid a trap for Senator BREWSTER and he walked right into it. Instead of pointing direct accusations at him, which he could deny and sue them for libel afterward, they simply asked him: "Did you or did you not, etc., etc.?" Of course, he stated, the Senator being under oath was compelled to answer and so they were able to evade any direct responsibility for his statements.

Rather ingenious. I was very happy to be under oath, and to answer, then or at any time, any questions of any character. The statement proceeds:

Howard Hughes was boiling to fire "the whole book" at the entire committee, but the Byoir people had sensed or learned that there had been "a family fight" within the Republican faction of this committee. MacVarish added: "We did not want to have them all gang up on us and preferred to let the ammunition go at Brewster himself."

I do not know about the so-called factions, or whether or not any such thing existed, because I was not a member of the subcommittee, and not active at all in its deliberations. The statement continues:

The real headache came later, he stated, when they learned that Hughes promised the Hearst newspapers a day-by-day account of the whole affair. MacVarish shuddered because of his fear that the other newspaper editors would become incensed and he spent most of his time trying to explain the thing away with the managing editors of the Los Angeles Times, and other newspapers. Also, they tried to harness Hughes by "censoring" his copy in advance.

He admitted that Howard Hughes was the sort of client which a good public-relations agency could do well without. (We are sticking to him mostly because of his prestige value.)

I do not know whether they are still sticking to him or not.

"Every time he goes into a Hollywood night club with a girl—and he has plenty of them—and we see a columnist mentioning this visit the next day, I get the jitters."

He claimed that the Byoir agency had fired several clients during the past few years, specifically mentioning Kaiser-Frazer and Reynolds Metals. "These clients seem to think our primary job was to get them plenty of free publicity. They did not realize that we could earn a retainer by advising them primarily on policy, and by keeping their names out of the public press at times. Such clients who wish to see their names in print too frequently are bound to ruin themselves. We do not like to see them ruin themselves. Publicity should not be an end in itself but merely a tool to accomplish a definite end."

I proceed with the report:

He sounded rather apologetic about the that most of the flattering letters that came whole Brewster-Hughes affair and claimed to the agency afterward were from leftist, radical, and other screw-ball groups. He also read a few critical comments, such as the article by George Sokolsky which accused them of undermining public faith by resorting to the old game of ridiculing Congress. He tried to exonerate this whole business by putting the blame squarely upon the shoulders of Senator BREWSTER (and, in passing, on Senator FERGUSON).

The questioning turned primarily to the matter of the gigantic wooden airship. One man asked if it would really fly and another man asked the cost of moving it to the oceanside. MacVarish ducked the first question by a joking remark, and answered the second by stating that it cost only $82,000 to move the ship from hangar to shoreline. He said that to build it at the oceanside would have cost about a half million for hangar and land additionally.

He then cited the cost of other new ships, built at Lockheed and Glenn Martin, to show that Hughes' ship was built at a reasonable sum.

He claimed that the fight between TWA and Hughes arose from the fact that Jack Frye and others were ex-pilots who didn't know what to do with the tremendous millions which the Government poured on them. Howard Hughes was given a $135,000 house in Virginia by Jack Frye, which recently sold for a much lower figure. It was only when Howard Hughes' comptroller reorganized TWA that it began to emerge above water.

I may add that it does not seem to have gotten very much above water yet, because I think that at latest report it was losing around eight to ten million dollars a year, and appealed to the Government for a $10,000,000 loan last month. The statement proceeds:

That was why Hughes fired Jack Frye.

I do not know anything about the merits of those statements or those controversies.

With all these millions pouring in, TWA tried to overexpand and to reach all over the world. In this manner, Pan American came into the picture. As for spending the money on parties, Pan American has done considerably more than Howard Hughes ever did.

There again, I do not know anything about the parties, as I have not been present at parties of the character described here, or others. That was covered rather fully in the testimony before the committee in response to questions.

Someone asked him where John Meyers was today and he replied that Meyers was in Italy getting married to Jane Thompson. He blamed Hughes for giving off-the-cuff information to various special writers, who caught him off guard, regarding the whereabouts of John Meyers. He admitted, on questioning, that John Meyers was still on the Hughes pay roll.

With this the luncheon broke up at 2 p. m.

I think it should be clear that Johnny Meyers was not General Benny Meyers. They were two quite distinct individuals.

I immediately gave a copy of the report which I have read here to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], as the chairman of the committee conducting the investigation, when it came to my attention in September—this was about a month after the conclusion of the first series of hearings—believing that he should have the information.

Subsequently, however, a very interesting episode developed as a result, apparently, of this report. Shortly before or at the time the subsequent hearing commenced in November, I received a call from a friend in New York, who stated to me over the telephone that he had been approached in this matter by Byoir, and he was considerably concerned at the developments, and wished me to advise the Senator from Michigan of the information which he had received. This was the first I knew about anything that was developing at that time.

I learned subsequently that the Senator from Michigan had summoned Mr. MacVarish, who is named here, to appear before the committee. I did not know it prior to that time.

I should hesitate a little in speaking about this matter if it were not that the following morning I received from New York, in the mail, a complete transcript of this conversation, verifying in detail exactly what had been said to me, and I again immediately communicated this information to the Senator from Michigan. I read this subsequent memorandum, which was in November, on November 6, I believe, which came to me from New York, detailing the telephone conversation which I had on that day:

I understand that Flanagan has talked to Carl Byoir, and Carl has promised to have Charles MacVarish, of his western office, ready for a meeting tomorrow morning, November 7, 1947, without the necessity of a subpena.

Let me say that this gentleman who communicated with me represented that he had gotten this information from Carl

Byoir. That can, of course, be verified, if it becomes matter of consequence.

I feel it would be extremely prejudicial to you personally and to the party to put MacVarish on the stand.

The statements attributed to him were not stenographic notes of a conversation. MacVarish is in a position to deny them in whole or in part.

If he makes the statement that the sole purpose of the investigation was a political one, in order to get Elliott Roosevelt, he will be asked by one of the Democrats on the committee, where he got this information. MacVarish will then reply, "From Carl Byoir, who is present in the room." Carl will then state that Senator FERGUSON made the statement to him that he was anxious to get Elliott Roosevelt; that the purpose of the investigation was a political one; and he would like to get Carl's help in getting dope against Elliott Roosevelt. Carl will further add that he sent him to three different sources.

Perhaps at this point I should read Colonel Roosevelt's statement in connection with that last statement. This is the statement of Col. Elliott Roosevelt before the committee at the time of the hearing, when his investigation was practically completed. This has a significant bearing on the suggestion that there was any prejudice in the affair so far as Colonel Roosevelt was concerned. I quote now from the record of the committee hearing, with Col. Elliott Roosevelt testifying:

I wish to make a public statement to all of the members of this committee; I naturally supposed that Senator FERGUSON and Senator BREWSTER being the heads of the subcommittee and the committee of the whole, naturally had released this information to the public press; but I understand clearly from their statements to me that they were unfamiliar with that. The only thing that I will do now is to amend my charges of politics against them (Senators FERGUSON and BREWSTER) and their integrity, and all of the Senators who are members of this committee.

I would like to state my public thanks to the very fair treatment which I have received from the Republican and Democratic members of this committee. You have given me an opportunity to speak fully, frankly, and freely, and I will tell you that I am willing to cooperate with this committee in every way to expose anything of any nature which might enable you to carry out the announced purpose of this investigation.

That is Colonel Roosevelt's statement on the affair at the conclusion of his testimony and of the other developments of the hearings.

I now resume with a quotation from the statement I received in the mail concerning the telephone conversion.

In my opinion, the bad press received in the early summer on the Hughes investigation was due to the ineptness and stupid way in which the committee acted, particularly the way in which HOMER FERGUSON conducted the hearing. He should have advised Mr. Hughes that the hearing had nothing to do with his press agent's expenses; whether they were tax deductible or not was up to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. FERGUSON should have further stated that if Senator BREWSTER was in favor of a unified air service abroad, that was his prerogative.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. From what memorandum is the Senator reading?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is the memorandum I received from New York, from a friend who was communicating with me, as the result of the conversation with Mr. Byoir over whether Mr. MacVarish should be put on the stand November 7.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] become acquainted with the contents of this letter or memorandum?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Does he know that the Senator would present it to the Senate?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I communicated its contents to him immediately on it being presented to me, and he said there was nothing to it so far as he was concerned, and I think the entire conduct of the investigation showed it. I cite it as another illustration of what was the apparent attempt to bring pressure on the chairman of the subcommittee; having failed in their attempt to get me to call off the investigation as they saw it, with their threats against me, they now proceed against the Senator from Michigan, chairman of the subcommittee. I continue to read:

If Mr. Hughes objected to a unified air service, he should raise his objections in another committee. If Senator BREWSTER took airplane trips or automobile rides with officials of TWA or Pan American or any other company, that also was his business.

I am not indicating any opinion on this matter. I am simply repeating what this gentleman reported.

Senator FERGUSON should have stated that the sole purpose of the committee was to investigate what happened to $40,000,000 of taxpayers' money. Senator FERGUSON might have gone further and explained that the committee was investigating such matters with a view of determining whether or not legislation should be enacted, and if so, what kind, to prevent any waste of Government funds in the future. He might well have added, "Mr. Hughes, this investigation may reflect great credit on you; we are not accusing you of anything, we merely want to get the facts on what happened to $40,000,000 of taxpayers' money."

I think it is perfectly evident that that is precisely what the Senator from Michigan did say repeatedly, as I understood it. He made clear what was the object of the investigation.

By his conduct, Senator FERGUSON let the onus be placed on you unjustly. There is the inference and rumor, and I suppose resentment, that publicity was given out by Carl Byoir at the start of the investigation, which took the play away entirely from the purposes of the investigation.

If Carl Byoir goes on the stand, he can definitely prove under oath that the publicity given out as to Johnny Meyers' expense accounts, etc., was given out by employees of the committee itself, and not by the Carl Byoir organization. This would bring the whole matter again to the attention of the press. There would be more photographs of expense accounts, beautiful girls' pictures, etc., and your name would be dragged out in a way detrimental to you.

I am not pleading to you because of any fear that Carl Byoir may have as to the consequences of a rehash of last summer's episode. He has the best publicity organization in the country, and can take care of himself.

I am a friend of Carl's. He has done a great deal for the Republican Party to my certain knowledge in the last few years, and can be of inestimable value in the future to you and the Republican Party. He did his utmost to prevent last summer's fiasco.

If we want to get Elliott Roosevelt, many details can be arranged to make it a sure-fire case. In my opinion, this should be handled by you in some other committee.

I appreciate the suggestion.

It can be difficult if Senator FERGUSON or you lose your tempers and try to get even with Carl Byoir for the stupid manner in which last summer's affair was handled by the committee itself.

That is to me a very interesting commentary as to the operations of a public-relations firm. I may simply add that I reported this immediately to the Senator from Michigan, and he governed himself as he thought best. I think that the final results of the investigation speak for themselves as to whether or not he and the other members of the committee handled the matter with a competency and a character worthy of the great traditions of the committee on which they were serving at that time.

So much for the Hughes phase of this affair, and I apologize to the Senate for taking its time for a discussion of it, but it seemed to me very appropriate that there should be a record in the files in order that there should be no doubt in any future references to this matter of any kind as to exactly what transpired.

One might go on at very great length respecting all the aspects of this affair, but it does not seem to me now to be required.

I now desire to refer somewhat more briefly to one other aspect of this matter which has been reverberating through the press since that time as the result of the notice which the Senator from Maine seems to have attracted from one of our more prominent columnists. I have never made it a practice to reply or to comment upon attacks of this character, but since it has resulted in repeated discussion of this matter, and since it seems to have some aspects of malevolence, I think it perhaps has an appropriate place in a statement by me of this matter.

This concerns the stories which have appeared from time to time in the column known as the Washington Merry-Go-Round, which I am happy thus to publicize, written by Drew Pearson. I may say that there is always a certain aspect of flattery in the amount of attention given in this column, since it has a very wide circulation, and throughout a public career of 25 years, with all the vicissitudes that it necessarily represents, I have always comforted myself with the thought that men do not shoot arrows at dead lions. So I appreciate the amount of attention Mr. Pearson has thought this humble Senator from Maine was worthy of. I have also derived some consolation from the fact that whatever portion of his space is filled up with discussion of the Senator from Maine is not taken up with a discussion of other Members of the Senate, or with the discussion of other problems and persons who might be similarly afflicted.

I also have always derived some philosophical comfort from Calvin Coolidge's statement that he did not care what they said about him so long as they did not tell the truth.

A rather profound truth was uttered long ago—and I am going back very far in history to Socrates, who embraced about all human wisdom—who was once asked by a young man who was in his class in philosophy what was the penalty for being a liar. He replied, "Not to be believed when you tell the truth." That is the penalty for being a liar.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I did not catch what the Senator said. His face was turned away.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator refer to my quotation from Socrates?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I said that several thousand years ago Socrates had uttered a very profound truth, which has great relevancy here. When a young man in his philosophy class asked him what was the penalty for being a liar he replied, "Not to be believed when you tell the truth."

Mr. Drew Pearson recently published the following statement in his column:

> Senator BREWSTER has accepted free Pan American airplane rides all over the map (Senators are forbidden by law to accept free railroad rides).

"All over the map" covers a great deal of territory.

Mrs. Brewster and I have flown approximately 50,000 miles on Pan American Airways, and every mile of that travel has been paid for at commercial rates, in an amount exceeding $5,000—mostly out of our own pockets, without reimbursement from the Government even for my portion of the expense, although at least half my time was devoted to Government business.

Flying in this country in private or executive planes is a widely developed practice, and is accepted without question and has been for many years. In my own observation Cabinet officers and many other Government officials of high and low degree, and members of the House and Senate have seen no impropriety in rides of this character.

Perhaps the best evidence of this was the entirely casual manner in which Howard Hughes flew me to keep two Lincoln Day speaking engagements without anyone giving the matter a second thought until many months later when he sought to make capital out of it.

I have personally flown in at least 25 to 50 private or executive planes in recent years, and the field is constantly expanding as flying becomes more common. I do not think I have ever been alone in these flights.

Concerning my advocacy of a community company for American commercial aviation overseas, I do not think anyone is in doubt as to my stand.

I am happy to leave to others the defense of the present tragic situation of our overseas air-lines with the tremendous subsidies that are constantly adding to the burden on the United States Treasury.

It should be clear, however, that the proposal of a community company to combine all American interests overseas did not originate with me, but has been long and earnestly advocated as the only practical solution of the problem by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who has a considerable claim to the title of legislative father of American aviation. The Senator from Nevada based much of his opinion upon the fact that every other country in the world operating foreign air lines has adopted a similar solution after a period of trial and error with other systems.

The plan of a community company was also supported in the committee vote on this matter by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], now chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and by nine other Senators on the Committee on Commerce.

The latest bill proposing a community company was sponsored in the Senate by the majority leader [Mr. WHITE], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, having jurisdiction of all matters concerned with commercial aviation, and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], from the other side of the aisle, as well as by myself.

The only personal interest of any character that I have ever had in the air business developed 3 years ago when I learned that the investment counsel handling Mrs. Brewster's affairs had invested for her account in 200 shares of stock of the American Airlines, whose policies I was most vigorously opposing. On learning of this I suggested the desirability of eliminating any interest by Mrs. Brewster in air lines or aircraft companies in view of my very active interest in aviation matters in the Senate.

That comprises the statement of my relationships with air lines and air companies.

To come to a more personal matter, I have been a little puzzled by the apparent malevolence of Mr. Pearson in recent months, until I thought back a little while. Formerly, in the 10 or 12 years I have been here, I had rather complimentary references from Mr. Pearson. He used to refer to me as "the forthright Senator from Maine, courageous, hard-hitting," and so forth. I was always portrayed rather generously, sometimes to an almost embarrassing extent.

However, during the past year, these attacks of various kinds have developed upon me, with all the cunning and skill he commands—and it is very considerable. I have a very wholesome respect for his tenacity and ingenuity in presenting half-truths in order to fortify whatever views he takes, sometimes walking a very tight rope between situations, as he did in certain recent cases which he discussed. It so happens, for instance, that in connection with the petroleum picture, with which I have been concerned, involving Arabian oil, I think he entirely agrees our purpose is very patriotic, although he never refers to me. From his standpoint he and I are in accord.

In connection with the Moore-Rizley bill, which was a recent episode which he used in an attempt to denounce certain Members of the Senate because they voted for that bill, characterizing it as a utility measure, he devoted an entire column to discussing the question. His attack was directed primarily at the junior Senator from Maine, but he entirely neglected to state that the Senator from Maine voted against the Moore-Rizley bill, which was exactly what Mr. Pearson would consider the proper kind of a vote. I cite that as an indication that he is able so to present a situation as to leave implications which are utterly unwarranted by a full disclosure of the facts. There have been several other instances of the same kind.

I come now to what I think perhaps Mr. Pearson would describe as a possible motive for this attitude. I am not going to say that it is the reason for it. I think that if he were in a similar position, however, he would be quite confident in so explaining it.

It so happened that a year ago this June a nomination was sent to the Senate for a position on the Federal Communications Commission. The nominee was Representative Robert Jones, a Republican Member of the House from Ohio. According to the stories—I think Mr. Pearson so stated—this was supposed to have been done upon the recommendation of Mr. SAM RAYBURN, former Speaker of the House and present minority leader. Whether or not that is true, I do not know, but I think that was what Mr. Pearson stated.

At any rate, Mr. Jones' nomination came before the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. Pearson made some very serious charges against Mr. Jones—charges which, if substantiated, undoubtdly would have cast serious doubt on the propriety of confirming his nomination. Considerable commotion was caused, as Mr. Pearson commands a very considerable press. The chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, my colleague from Maine [Mr. WHITE], appointed me as chairman of a subcommittee, together with two other members, to hear the charges. We promptly got in touch with Mr. Pearson. We asked him to appear and present any evidence he had. We brought witnesses from Ohio at his request, to substantiate the charges against Mr. Jones. A full and fair hearing was held, at the end of which the charges seemed to be completely discredited by the character of the witnesses and by their evidence. One of the witnesses, I think, testified to the fact that he had killed three men in the course of his career—of which he seemed to be rather proud—another testified that he had been confined in an insane asylum; another testified that he knew nothing about the affair.

That was the nature of the evidence and of the witnesses who appeared.

At the conclusion of the hearings, at which opportunity was given to the witnesses to substantiate the charges, the subcommittee unanimously reported to the full committee that Mr. Jones' nomination should be confirmed. The full Committee on Interstate and Foreign

Commerce considered the matter. It had been widely reported in the press. The full committee, likewise unanimously, reported the nomination to the Senate for confirmation; and when the nomination came up on the Executive Calendar in the Senate the nomination was confirmed by the Senate without a single dissenting vote. There was no discussion of the nomination. I, as chairman, simply presented the matter to the Senate; and the evidence was so overwhelming that there was not even discussion on the floor of the Senate.

I suspect that if Mr. Pearson were presenting a case of that character, probably he would present it in somewhat this language: That the gentleman who had made the charges—in that case Mr. Pearson—had been utterly unable to substantiate them, and that the Senate by a vote of 96 to 0 had determined that Mr. Pearson was a liar. That was the conclusion which could be drawn, and I am sure it would be no exaggeration, if Mr. Pearson were on the other end of the line, and not on the receiving end. However, I am not going to say that, as I do not think any good is gained by bandying about language, for the facts and the events speak for themselves. I am simply going to say that apparently Mr. Pearson was either very much mistaken or was entirely unable to present the evidence which would support his charges.

However, I think perhaps there is some warrant for fighting fire with fire, so I shall ask that another writer be permitted to characterize Mr. Pearson, in terms that he seems to think are warranted, by presenting a rather complete symposium of opinion from various distinguished persons as to how they would characterize Mr. Pearson. I myself do not indulge in these epithets, and I do not substantiate these, any more than Mr. Pearson is compelled to substantiate many of the statements he makes or to vouch for the care with which language may be used, as these columnists seem to be rather generous with language when they begin operating.

This is an excerpt from a chapter of the book Washington Squirrel Cage, 1948 edition, by Morris A. Bealle; the chapter deals with Mr. Drew Pearson. I shall not quote the chapter at length, but it has value as enumerating different instances in which Mr. Pearson has made very serious attacks on men in public life. I think the list is interesting and significant.

The first was his attack on General Patton; the next was his attack on General MacArthur; his next attack was on the Navy air arm; his next attack was as to certain alleged drunken orgies at Walter Reed Hospital by the nurses and patients; his next attack was on Governor Dewey, whom he attacked very bitterly; his next attack was on Governor Bricker, of Ohio, now a Member of the Senate. His next attack was upon John Foster Dulles. That attack was so bad that the Washington Post was obliged to apologize for the character of the material it contained. His final attack was upon the conduct of the American troops in Japan.

This chapter of the book enumerates these different instances. It goes on to give somewhat of a biography of Mr. Pearson and a recital of his activities and his procedures. Finally it gives quotations from various men in public life who have characterized Mr. Pearson in language which they thought was warranted. The only one the writer of the books omits is President Roosevelt, who I think used very strong language of a similar character.

The first quotation in this part of the book—and I shall ask to have this portion inserted in the RECORD—is by President Truman. This is what he had to say, according to this book:

President Truman: Pearson is one columnist in Washington who wouldn't have room on his breast if he got a ribbon for every time he's been called a liar. He is the author of a vicious statement.

Next:

Ex-Secretary of State Hull: The truth is not in him; he is a pathological liar.

The next statement is by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and I think he spoke these words on the floor of the Senate:

Senator MCKELLAR of Tennessee: Pearson is an infamous liar, a revolving liar, a pusillanimous liar, a lying ass, a natural-born liar, a liar by profession, a liar for living, a liar in the daytime, a liar in the nighttime; a dishonest, ignorant, corrupt, and groveling crook and skunk.

That is rather strong.

The next statement quoted in this book is by Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey:

Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey: Pearson is a blackguard who, by insinuations and outright lies, tried to destroy public confidence in the Navy's air arm. The scoundrel didn't have the guts to take a plane ride with a man he said got his wings by fraud.

The next statement quoted in the book is by former Representative Jones, of Ohio, to whom I have referred; he is now a member of the Federal Communications Commission:

Congressman Jones of Ohio: Pearson makes his living by blackening characters. He is a smear columnist, a professional character assassin, and the author of false and vile insinuations.

I may add, in connection with the Jones episode, that Mr. Pearson is an applicant for the franchise for the great radio station in Baltimore, which is supposed to be worth from $500,000 to $1,000,000. Mr. Pearson is attempting to take the franchise away from the company that has had it for many years and has built up its value. The decision as to whether that license shall be granted to Mr. Pearson is in the hands of the Federal Communications Commission. If Mr. Pearson were not involved in this matter, but if other persons were involved, it would not be difficult to imply that his attacks upon Mr. Jones in connection with his attempts to prevent the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Jones to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, revealed perhaps a very intimate relationship to what might be the decision in the pending application regarding the station in Baltimore. Again I am simply applying the Pearson technique to the circumstances in which Mr. Pearson now finds himself.

Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers Union, is also quoted in the book to which I have been referring. His statement is rather interesting, because Mr. Reuther seems not to fall in a category of persons whom Mr. Pearson ordinarily would condemn. This is what Mr. Reuther has to say:

Pearson is not only a chronic liar but a fool.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is quoted as follows:

Pearson is a liar and a disgrace to the newspaper profession.

The book also gives the following quotations:

Senator TYDINGS of Maryland: Pearson is a scoundrel. In the last war the only powder he ever smelled was in the presence of ladies on the windward side of the parade ground. I would call him a perpetual, chronic, revolving liar. He has been engaged in the gentle art of blackmail * * * has been guilty of trying to buy public influence * * * has been affiliated with the great gambling rackets of America * * * kept a deposit box containing thousands of dollars until the recent Treasury drive against income-tax evaders.

General MACARTHUR: There is no truth in Pearson's statement that I fired General Eisenhower as my chief of staff in the Philippines before the war. The facts are quite the contrary because, as my chief of staff, General Eisenhower performed splendidly, as he always does.

The Washington Post: Drew Pearson wrote a column about John Foster Dulles which the Post, in the best judgment of its editors, deemed a personal attack, unfair on the face of it. The Post did not print this column. For the same reason the Post has omitted parts of all of Pearson's columns in the past.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the complete chapter from which I have just quoted be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that similar excerpts from the same book, the Washington Squirrel Cage, 1948 edition, by Morris A. Bealle—and in this case the chapter entitled "Oil and World War III"—be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, that concludes what I have to say about this matter.

I appreciate the consideration of the Senate in permitting this statement. I trust it may conclude what has been an unfortunate affair, one that I have refrained from bothering the Senate with heretofore, and I trust I may never have occasion to bother the Senate with it again. But it does complete in the RECORD what it seems to me is relevant material bearing on a possible misunderstanding of the case and will enable future Senators in the conduct of investigations to know somewhat the ways in

which these affairs may be conducted, and the things with which they need to be concerned.

EXHIBIT A

EXCERPTS FROM A CHAPTER OF THE WASHINGTON SQUIRREL CAGE, 1948 EDITION

(By Morris A. Bealle)

Washington's New Deal smear bund wouldn't look natural without Drew Ananias Pearson. Should America's No. 1 prevaricator get run over by a truck his place in journalistic jezebeldom would indeed be hard to fill.

Pearson's accuracy assays at only about 25 percent, his main effort being concentrated on getting a smidgeon of truth in each calumny and relying on that to carry it through.

NINE OLD SMEARS

As a smear-bund operative he doesn't even take off his hat to New York's Night Club Commando. His outstanding smears of recent years have been:

1. His attempt to destroy General Patton before the invasion of France started. In columns and broadcast he said Patton would never be given another Army command as the result of what turned out to be a routine slapping of a psycho soldier—something the surgeons would have done if Patton had not gotten there first.

2. His attempt to destroy General MacArthur, and have him removed from the Pacific command. Success in this move might have prevented the recapture of the Philippines with such a small loss of life.

3. An attempt, by lies and insinuations to destroy the public's confidence in the Navy air arm—then and now our first line of defense.

4. Claim that the nurses and patients of ward 32, Walter Reed Army Hospital, were engaged chiefly in carrying on drunken orgies.

5. A vicious canard 4 days before the 1944 election stating that Governor Dewey was a draft dodger. Actually Governor Dewey was not only above military age but exempt as a State executive official.

6. A canard on the Republican candidate for Vice President, Governor Bricker, of Ohio, 4 days before election, distorting the Governor's effort to get Army service as a chaplain when he had been turned down for combat service because of a low pulse rate.

7. A vicious diatribe against John Foster Dulles, the Dewey foreign affairs expert, which was so rotten that even the New Dealing Washington Post refused to print it and publicly apologized for using Pearson's "stuff."

8. Going from the disgusting to the ridiculous, Peason tried to emulate the Winchell sewer-level gossip by "accusing" a 7-month-old Scottie pup, visiting the White House, of having let Fala get her pregnant. Veterinarians said this was a biological impossibility for a dog at 7 months.

9. An abortive but vicious attack on American troops in Japan (probably an indirect attack on General MacArthur) in which he claimed GI's had fathered 14,000 illegitimate Japanese children—5 months after the occupation of Japan began.

SILVER SPOON

Pearson's rise to affluence and unenviable notority reads like a story from the Devil's handbook. He had a silver spoon thrust into his mouth back in 1932 when he was an obscure reporter assigned to the Baltimore Sun's Washington Bureau. Even then he was in the habit of including his personal grudges in the copy he sent his employer.

Pearson and a colleague had gotten out a well-written tome on the Washington scene entitled "Washington Merry-Go-Round," to which they didn't have the courage to sign their names. Among others it lied about was the then Secretary of War, Pat Hurley.

About this time Pearson sent a dispatch to the Sun chiding the British Ambassador for "being peeved because he didn't get an invitation to a dinner given by the State Department correspondents." Actually the Ambassador did't give a damn, but he did give a damn about being falsely placed in a ridiculous light—and he didn't hesitate to let the editor of the Baltimore Sun know about it.

PICAYUNE GIBBLE-GABBLE

Big Bill Moore, managing editor of the Sun, did some gumshoeing before summoning Pearson to his office. He discovered that Pearson himself had sent out invitations. That was enough and Pearson was summarily canned.

Pearson then gave out a story to the press that he had been fired for writing "Washington Merry-Go-Round"—which was good business in anybody's language. The resultant publicity not only sold thousands of books, but the sale of these books made it possible for Pearson to sell many sucker publishers a daily column, which has since turned out to be 75 percent administration propaganda and 25 percent picayune gibble-gabble.

Throughout the Roosevelt stranglehold on America, Pearson was the main White House stooge and sewer-level rumor-monger.

Whenever there was a trial balloon to be run up, or a litle propaganda to be put out, or an alibi for a Presidential blunder to be framed, or someone else's boom to be pricked, or a little bile to be gotten off the Roosevelt or Wallace chest about a solid somebody in Washington, mustachioed Drew would come arunning.

He would jump through the hoop when ordered by ringmaster Steve Early, and 5 days later this concatenated hokum would appear in the Pearson column disguised as news or "inside stuff."

MANY LIBELS

Pearson has been the party of the first part in many a well-founded libel suit but so far has escaped unscathed. His guardian angel was the same in all cases. Since the newspaper which published the libel in each instance was a party to it, it was necessary to sue the paper also. And it was necessary to sue it in its own jurisdiction.

What political clique is going to refuse to do the local newspaper a favor when its existence is at stake, such as manipulating the jury wheel so that favorable jurors came out?

What local politician wearing the robes of a judge is going to refuse a favor to the local newspaper which can make or break him at the next election? Lucky Drew.

And then he participated in the theft from the mails of confidential letter written by a Republican manufacturer in Connecticut to a correspondent in South America. The law allows the Post Office to "hemlock" private mail going out of the country but doesn't permit it to give this information out to political opponents.

This is exactly what was done and Censorship Director Byron Price accused the State Department of having unlawfully given this particular tidbit of gossip to Mr. Pearson who, in turn, peddled it to his clients.

SARDONIC SEAL

This smirking and sardonic seal is known as the Lilliputian Lion of Washington society, but those who have been victimized by his violation of confidences call him a social titmouse. Pearson is said to attend every social function he is invited to and to sit like a Cheshire cat while he waits for the flowing water to do its dirty work.

His ears do not perk up until the relaxed revelers are in their cups and their tongues become as loose as a screw dealer's handling public money. They think they are among friends and their guards go down.

Pearson listens avidly to their confidential chit-chat and often surreptiously makes notes on his starched stiff white cuffs. Many whose confidences were thus violated were so "spifficated" when they talked that they never found out how it happened.

An apt illustration of the way he murders the truth and twists facts around to propagandize the "Screw Deal" was his quotation of a Government official whom he claimed had thought of a unique definition of the various isms now plaguing the world.

TWISTING THE TRUTH

Although Pearson credited this official with being the author of them they were simply little wisecracks he had read and which have been going around Washington for months. Here is how the subservient seal quoted the definitions:

Capitalism: If you have two cows, you sell one and buy a bull.

Socialism: If you have two cows, you give one to your neighbor.

Communism: If you have two cows, the government takes them and gives you the milk—sometimes.

Fascism: If you have two cows, the government takes them and gives you part of the milk.

Nazism: If you have two cows, the government shoots you and takes the cows.

But Pearson purposely left out the definition of New Dealism, which was the bedrock point of the whole thing. Without that the story lacked a pivot. Shorn of its real meat, which made it an untruth or half-truth in the known Pearson tradition, the tale became a downright hunk of administration propaganda, based on the old Army game of drawing a red herring across the trail. Here is the rest of the story:

New Dealism: The Government kills one cow, milks the other and throws the milk away.

OTHER OPINIONS

Just to show the Squirrel Cage isn't the only one in the national political pool who low rates this journalistic Jezebel, a few quotes from others are in order:

President Truman: Pearson is one columnist in Washington who wouldn't have room on his breast if he got a ribbon for every time he's been called a liar. He is the author of a vicious statement.

Ex-Secretary of State Hull: The truth is not in him, he is a pathological liar.

Senator MCKELLAR of Tennessee: Pearson is an infamous liar, a revolving liar, a pusillanimous liar, a lying ass, a natural-born liar, a liar by profession, a liar for living, a liar in the daytime, a liar in the nighttime; a dishonest, ignorant, corrupt, and groveling crook and skunk.

Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey: Pearson is a blackguard who, by insinuations and outright lies, tried to destroy public confidence in the Navy's air arm. The scoundrel didn't have the guts to take a plane ride with a man he said got his wings by fraud.

Congressman JONES of Ohio: Pearson makes his living by blackening characters. He is a smear columnist, a professional character assassin and the author of false and vile insinuations.

Walter Reuther, president UAW Union: Pearson is not only a chronic liar but a fool.

Senator CAIN, of Washington: Pearson is a liar and a disgrace to the newspaper profession.

Senator TYDINGS of Maryland: Pearson is a scoundrel. In the last war the only powder he ever smelled was in the presence of ladies on the windward side of the parade ground. I would call him a perpetual, chronic, revolving liar. He has been engaged in the gentle art of blackmail, has been guilty of trying to buy public influence, has been affiliated with the great gambling rackets of America, kept a deposit box containing

thousands of dollars until the recent Treasury drive against income-tax evaders.

General MacArthur: There is no truth in Pearson's statement that I fired General Eisenhower as my chief of staff in the Philippines before the war. The facts are quite the contrary because, as my chief of staff, General Eisenhower performed splendidly, as he always does.

The Washington Post (New Deal organ): Drew Pearson wrote a column about John Foster Dulles which the Post, in the best judgment of its editors, deemed a personal attack, unfair on the face of it. The Post did not print this column. For the same reason the Post has omitted parts of all of Pearson's columns in the past.

DRAFT DODGER

Pearson seems not to be ashamed of anything—except his draft dodgery in the other war. From 1928 to 1942 he put nothing about any war service in his autobiography furnished the publishers of "Who's Who in America." But in 1942 he added these imaginary words—"Served in the United States Army, 1918."

An examination of the record shows that in 1918 Pearson was of military age (20 years old), healthy and with no dependents. He made no move to enlist, so just before his draft board reached his number he joined the drill team of Swarthmore College, then known as the SATC, a refuge for draft dodgers who wanted to take this easy way out.

All the boys in the Washington press galleries, except the leftist stooges and Communist sympathizers and New Deal dog robbers have an abiding contempt for this fellow who has brought prostitution of their great profession to its zenith. They say:

"When bigger lies are told Pearson will tell them."

EXHIBIT B

EXCERPTS FROM A CHAPTER OF THE WASHINGTON SQUIRREL CAGE, 1948 EDITION

(By Morris A. Bealle)

Oil once ruined a sure-shot Democratic Presidential candidate (1924)—and wrecked the Democratic Party. Oil had a not inconsiderable part in embroiling us in Europe's periodical family fight in 1917. Oil had an even bigger part in forcing and lying us into World War II.

If we get into a world war III in the near future we can thank the exploiters of that priceless, indispensable, useful, and dangerous mineral known as black gold, but commonly called oil. For oil is thicker than blood in American political and financial circles.

If Russia discovers the secret of the atomic bomb in the next few years our mammoth oil lobby fears the Red Army will first seize its fabulous concession in Saudi-Arabia paid for in part by the taxpayers of the United States. It was at the instance of the oil lobby that President Truman, in his St. Patrick's Day war scare, laid such an egg.

It was at the instance of the oil lobby that Congress was high pressured some months ago into voting $400,000,000 for military aid to Greece and Turkey. Both nations, in the event of war, would be key territories and operating bases for the recapture from the Russians (at the cost of a million Americans) of Standard Oil's Saudi-Arabian petroleum fields.

HIGH-CLASS BURGLARY

How the Standard Oil mob secured and developed this concession in Arabia is a study in high-class burglary. First, their good old White House stooge (F. Roosevelt) negotiated a pipe-line concession to tidewater from the bearded King Ibn Saud of Saudi-Arabia, he of the many goats and wives. The King needed the small sum of $90,000,000, and Franklin D. was all for secretly giving it to him.

He even certified to Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, that this pipe line (which couldn't possibly have been completed during the war, and hasn't been completed yet) was necessary to the war effort. But the conscientious Jesse, who could see through F. D. R. like a pane of glass, said there was no warrant of law for giving this money to the King for the private enrichment of Standard Oil.

So F. Roosevelt simply loaned the money to England under the Uncle Sammy Claus (lend-lease) bill, and England transferred the 90,000 grand to King Saud. All was ready to build the pipe line for the House of Rockefeller (which had financed Franklin D.'s original foray into politics).

Shortly afterward Mr. Roosevelt ordered the war effort robbed of some millions of tons of precious steel to build the pipe line. Standard then started construction of some $300,000,000 worth of refineries and other installations.

ARAMCO A FRONT

We say Standard as a figure of speech. In order to make it look unlike a special privilege for one company, the Rockefeller mob took in the Texas Co. Standard Oil of California, Socony-Vacuum and the Texas Co. then formed the Arabian-American Oil Co. (called Aramco for short) to take over and accept these bountiful gifts from the American taxpayers.

The Standard mob then set out to short change their partners in this grab (the Texas Co.). In the original grab the California Standard and Texas companies split 50–50. Then the war drums began to beat. Wallowing Walter Winchell broadcast the "startling news" on St. Patrick's night 1946 that the Russian armies were on the move—world war III had begun.

The Texas Co. was induced to sell 40 percent of its 50 percent to Socony-Vacuum and New Jersey Standard for $102,000,000, California Standard doing likewise. This left Texas with a 30-percent slice for this multibillion dollar gravy and a $25,000,000 profit on its original investment.

And the next day our White House issued its new famous Truman doctrine, by which we were to militarize and arm Greece and Turkey and go into the Near East to save this oil. Officials of the Texas Co. were exceedingly wroth, feeling they had been tricked into selling 40 percent of their holdings for many millions of dollars less than its market value.

TEXACO SORE

W. H. H. Rogers, board chairman, vehemently told the Senate War Investigating Committee that his company never would have sold out for such a small sum if it had known the Truman doctrine was to be announced. Apparently, the only ones who enjoyed advance knowledge of this doctrine were the Standard Oil people.

Control of the Saudi-Arabian fields was now definitely in the hands of the Standard Oil crowd. This particular field had estimated reserves of 30,000,000,000 barrels. Two other concessions in the Near East, owned by British, Dutch, and French (with Russia on the outside looking longingly in) had reserves estimated at 70,000,000,000 barrels.

The total was a staggering 100,000,000,000 barrels. England started to double-cross its coconspirators of World War II, the Standard Oil mob, after American lives and money had saved the British lion's hide from Hitler. A dummy owner was set up, who is now suing in the British courts, claiming the Saudi-Arabian concession is a violation of what is called the red-line agreement.

According to this suit, Aramco has no valid title to the Saudi-Arabian oil, which is now selling to the United States Navy at the hold-up price of $1.48 a barrel, a profit of about $1 a barrel. According to oil experts in Washington, these four countries have formed a cartel to hold up prices to the level of Gulf of Mexico quotation. The minimum profit in this near eastern oil therefore seems to be $100,000,000,000.

ONE MILLION CASUALTIES

That is why the oil mob, and their stooges in Washington, are willing to sacrifice 1,000,000 American boys and run our national debt to over a trillion dollars, to drive Russia out of these oil fields. It is easy to understand that, if Russia decides to go in, she can take the whole field in 24 hours. England and France will sit back and politicate. America will be expected to spill the blood needed to dislodge the Soviets.

The American people never would have had definite knowledge of these explosive deals had it not been for Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, chairman of the Senate's War Investigating Committee which did such good work (under Chairman Truman) during the late war.

Senator BREWSTER is jumping the gun this time. He wants to expose the thing that may get us into another frightful conflict before we get into it, hoping that facts given the American people may prevent it.

Senator BREWSTER, be it known, has made a reputation for himself as a Senate expert on oil, Palestine, and aviation. These three groups maintain the three biggest lobbies in Washington and constitute the three heaviest propaganda groups in the country.

Mainly because of his ruthless exposing of the Standard Oil mob, he has been the victim of the most ruthless and unfair smear campaign since the late, great, Huey Long stepped hard on Standard Oil toes by making them pay their taxes in Louisiana.

HOWARD HUGHES A PAWN

Howard Hughes (whose family fortune came from oil) was one of the pawns used in the smear-Brewster sortie. Remember, the burst of mock indignation in which he cloaked his evasive answers to Senator FERGUSON, subcommittee chairman some time ago? Remember how many news writers tried to make Senator BREWSTER look like a persecutor and Hughes like a persecuted little lamb?

And, remember how they brought General Benny Meyers into the picture to help along the smear? And, remember how some astute committee investigator drew out of him the admission that Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau had tipped him off as to how the price of Government bonds were being manipulated?

Whew. More than one high government bigwig, past and present, was sweating it out when Bald Benny was induced to air his alleged amours with his attractive secretary. Senator BREWSTER let this stink brew while he ordered his investigators to dig deeper into the matter, of which insiders speculated in Government bonds in amounts of $500,000 or more. If this deal in high finance isn't uncovered fully it will be because Senator BREWSTER is no longer chairman of the committee

This feature will be given an airing by his committee in the not too distant future, so the oil mob's smear brigade is sitting up nights figuring how to boil Senator BREWSTER in smear oil.

SCARED OF BREWSTER

The Standard Oil mob recognizes in Senator BREWSTER a foeman worthy of their steel, and one who cannot be bribed with their cash. They still recall that he was the only one of many who tried, that was able to stop Sam Insull, the power-trust racketeer, and start his pendulum on the backswing, which eventually landed Insull in jail.

BREWSTER had to make four attempts before one finally stuck, because the Insullites reportedly paid out $300,000 in a Maine slush

fund. Standard is jittery over the prospect of finally succumbing to Brewsterites.

In the recent report to the Senate, the Maine man tore the hide off the oil racketeers and their activities during and following the recent war. He showed that, when King Saud was given that ninety million, Washington was told that it meant our Navy could get Arabian oil whenever it needed it at 40 cents a barrel—but that when the pinch came the Navy was held up for $1.05 a barrel and from now on must pay $1.48.

WAR AGENCIES PACKED

Perhaps the packing of the war agencies in Washington with oil men and postwar jobs given Army and Navy officers by the oil mob might throw some light on this. Here is something Senator BREWSTER told the American people, through the Senate:

Admiral Andrew F. Carter, head of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, is now with Arabian-American Oil combine.

His brother, Admiral William J. Carter, was in charge of naval purchases and ordered the Arabian oil for which the Navy paid $38,000,000 too much.

James Duce, head of the Foreign Division of the Petroleum Administration for War, is now vice president of the Arabian-American Oil.

C. F. Snodgrass served under Duce in the Government, is now with International Corp., employed to build the Arabian pipe line.

Commander Ralph Fowler, of the Navy's fuel division, participated in the negotiations by which the Navy purchased high-priced Arabian oil, is now employed by the Arabian-American Oil Co.

Lt. Col. E. P. Kavanaugh, on the Army-Navy Oil Board, got special priorities for Arabian-American Oil to build its refinery. He now represents the oil mob in Washington.

Franz von Schilling was Middle Eastern oil attaché for the State Department in Cairo, while on leave from the oil mob. He is now back with them.

J. Howard Marshall, general counsel for the Petroleum Administration of War, is attorney for Standard Oil of California.

1 PERCENT TAXES ON $117,000,000

Senator BREWSTER further showed that the Arabian-American Oil Co. paid only 1 percent taxes on a profit of $117,000,000—and even bragged about it. Their method was simply to form two corporations—a Canadian one and a Bahaman outfit. Under Bahaman law, a Bahaman corporation isn't taxed on its profits.

Senator BREWSTER's committee claimed this hocus-pocus could be handled in either or all of three ways. The monopoly grabbed by these Standard companies is a violation of the Webb-Pomerene amendment (foreign phase) of the Sherman antitrust law. And that the whole operation of these various Standard companies are a violation of the Landis decree of 1909 dissolving the Rockefeller Oil Trust.

In addition, the claim is made that this oil hocus-pocus is a violation of the income-tax amendment passed by Congress to prevent Marshall Field evading taxes by squandering it on such playthings as PM and the Chicago Sun. Senator BREWSTER's committee has put it up to Attorney General Clark, asking prosecution so that it can be determined by the courts if further legislation is necessary to collect these American taxes and/or stop the hold-up of our Navy of $1.48 per barrel for oil that costs 10 cents to get out of the ground.

PICTURE OF GREED

This is a picture of private greed in the oil racket that will be brought home forcibly to the American people—particularly those who will lose sons in saving this Rockefeller Arabian oil—after the war comes. It is Senator BREWSTER's purpose to prevent this war if he and his courageous committee can.

We have had bales of propaganda out of the mouths of President Truman, Secretary Forrestal, ex-Secretary Patterson and others who know better, that this Near East oil is vital to our defense. Of course, they leave out the qualification that our defense really means Standard's oil. Let's face the facts in this slimy, oily mess.

If we are to depend on Arabian oil, we must be prepared to defend the sea and air routes over which it must travel to the United States. The air routes across Africa, the sea lanes through the Mediterranean, will become national life-lines.

We have a two-ocean navy; we shall need a three-ocean one. The Mediterranean, as well as the Atlantic and the Pacific, will become our concern. Any increase of British or French or Italian or Turkish or Russian naval or air power in the Mediterranean and Near Eastern areas will call for a comparable increase in our own.

Arabian oil is supposed to be very cheap, and no doubt will continue to be so as long as Arab governments are willing to sell their resources cheaply, and Arab workmen will provide their labor at low wages. But what will the real cost of this oil be when we finish paying for the armament required to defend it? And American lives?

There is no gainsaying that Old Red Joe in Moscow covets this Arabian oil. He would like to have it for his military machine when it discovers how to make an atomic bomb. The "have not" nations of the world also covet it. The one group that does not covet it is the American people.

They do not covet it because, at least calculation by the American Petroleum Institute, there are 20,873,560,000 barrels of proven oil reserves in the ground here, and countless billions of barrels yet to be discovered. Each year more reserves are discovered or developed. Total consumption in the war year of 1944 was only 1,677,904,000 barrels.

Even if these proven reserves were exaggerated the American people still wouldn't want to go to war to save the Near Eastern contraband. The discovery of atomic energy opens up vast possibilities for power generation without petroleum.

OIL NOT WORTH WAR

Under no circumstances do those who would have to fight agree with President Truman's advisers that this Near East oil is worth going to war to save for the Standard-Texas group. On the other hand, its acquisition will hurt the American oil industry.

So, if Standard and Texas can flood America with this cheap Arabian oil, many independent producers can be expected to go out of business—forced to the wall. The Oil Trust will have a monopoly.

They hope to "handle" the Department of Justice, make a mockery of the antitrust laws, and with the aid of the Truman administration control world markets and boost the price of gasoline to motorists to whatever the traffic will bear.

WAR DRUMS ARE BEATING

Everything apparently has been done that can be thought of to create an incident that will start the tomtoms beating for a third grandiose war. Warships recently were sent to the Mediterranean to parade our naval might under Stalin's prominent nose.

It was akin to Russia's securing an oil concession in Mexico and sending a huge display of naval might to the Caribbean Sea in the vicinity of the Panama Canal. The Mexican oil fields are about the same distance from New Orleans as the Arabian oil fields are from the Soviet borders.

Suppose Russia had made enormous gifts and loans to Mexico and Venezuela, sent swarms of trained, equipped technicians, and financed the Mexican and Venezuelan Armies, built new ports and cities, constructed airfields—and then sent a might naval armada to parade in the Gulf of Mexico.

What would happen? Why, we would go to war overnight. So would Russia if she possessed the secret of the atom bomb.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I regret the Senator from Maine has seen fit to bring up again on the floor of the Senate the question of the Howard Hughes investigation. While I realize the personal interest the Senator has in the matter, and that perhaps it is perfectly natural he should seek to avail himself of his privilege as a United States Senator to take the floor in order to discuss and rehash matters which have been thoroughly canvassed in committee and discussed by the press throughout the country and in the various reports which have been filed. Especially do I want to reply to that part of the statement of the Senator from Maine wherein he accuses Mr. Howard Hughes of testifying falsely before our committee concerning his income, which I understood to be the import of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. No, I simply read from the report what he said and what the committee said. I have the copy here if the Senator desires it.

Mr. HATCH. Anyway, my definite impression was that the Senator from Maine wanted to create the impression either by his remarks or from the report he read that Mr. Hughes testified falsely before our committee concerning his income, and the income of his company.

Mr. BREWSTER. I read every word of the testimony incorporated by the committee in the record, and every word of the committee's report, in which I thought they made it clear. I thought they were very charitable toward Mr. Hughes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Mr. Hughes unfortunately does not have the privilege of the floor of the Senate for reply. I am not Mr. Hughes' defender, and I am not thoroughly familiar with all the proceedings of the subcommittee. I was a member of the subcommittee. I was present the first day or two, but I was compelled to leave Washington and go to the West for several days, in fact, for practically all the time the committee hearings were in progress. From the evidence I heard at the beginning of the hearings and later in the fall, when Mr. Hughes was before the committee, I received a definite impression that Mr. Hughes did not testify falsely in regard to his income.

I recall quite well, it was plainly evident that when Mr. Hughes referred to his income and to not having made any money, he was referring to his war company. There was no question about that, particularly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I merely want to say that I must catch a plane at 4 o'clock, so I am obliged to leave. But I shall be here on Monday, and if there is anything the Senator says which would seem to require comment or answer, I shall be happy to supply it. I am very sorry I

must leave, but I do not want the Senator on that account to restrict in any way what he may say about me. I say to him, Go right ahead. I fully trust the Senator's fairness.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no intention of making a personal attack on the Senator from Maine. I sincerely hope he will not return Monday to again go into this question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have never spoken on it before, and I certainly hope never to speak on it again.

Mr. HATCH. I thought the matter had been closed, but, like Banquo's ghost, it constantly rises.

I think, however, that in justice to Mr. Hughes—since he does not have the privilege of the floor, and like every citizen who appears before a congressional committee was placed at a great disadvantage—it should be said here and now by some of us who are members of that committee that there was nothing whatever in the evidence to show Mr. Hughes had testified falsely.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator was speaking about the disadvantage that a citizen has when appearing before committees of Congress. Does the Senator recall that Mr. Hughes in this case insisted before the committee that he have the privilege of cross-examination, and that it was denied him?

Mr. HATCH. I certainly recall that that occurred. Again, it was one of those things that demonstrate how innocent citizens may be injured by the improper use of the investigative powers of a congressional committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senator from Illinois sometime ago submitted a resolution for a congressional reform in connection with investigative committees. I shall not have time to press the resolution at this session. For the last 2 months the Senator from Illinois has been corresponding with people all over this country with respect to the resolution. I want to state that of all the letters I have received, from every character and class of people, there is not a single individual who does not believe something should be done to bring about a reform with respect to congressional investigating committees, as a result of the failure upon the part of certain Senators and certain Members of Congress to use the necessary and proper self-discipline and self-restraint in conducting investigations.

As a consequence, that with respect to investigations, the Congress has been dragged down to a level not in keeping with the dignity of the United States Senate; and if something is not done, the investigative powers which are vital in seeking out corruption and evil in the Government will lose all their force and effect so far as the confidence of the American people is concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his remarks. I hope that among those who are urging him to initiate and carry forward to a successful conclusion proper reforms in the procedure of legislative investigating committees, he will include the Senator from New Mexico as one who strongly urges it.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator very much. The primary reason I rose was to say, in view of the fact that the Congress of the United States will adjourn a week from today, according to plan, it will be impossible for full hearings and full investigation and debate to be had upon the resolution, even if we could get it favorably reported. But I serve notice now that when the Congress returns next January, the Senator from Illinois will press the resolution. Some of the ablest men in America have expressed a willingness to come to Washington to testify in behalf of a congressional reform of that kind.

Mr. HATCH. I certainly hope the Senator from Illinois will continue until the necessary reforms have been accomplished. They are necessary. I have seen, as have all other Senators, citizens haled before committee, where they have been not only browbeaten, but insulted, and charged with offenses almost criminal, without an opportunity to answer or defend themselves. It is wrong.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able Senator from New Mexico announce whether it is not a fact that the minority, the Democratic members of the War Investigating Committee which investigated the Hughes case, unanimously made that recommendation in its report to the Senate?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; we did so recommend in our report to the Senate in connection with this particular investigation. We also made a finding in the report that there had been no wrong or corruption found so far as Howard Hughes was concerned. Of all the thousands and thousands of dollars spent in that investigation, the only corruption and the only wrongdoing uncovered related to a man altogether separate, apart, and distinct from Howard Hughes—Gen. Bennett E. Meyers.

Mr. President, today the question of the taxes of Howard Hughes was brought up. That is a question over which the commission never had any jurisdiction or authority. I objected to it at the time the committee considered it. The idea of a committee of the Senate attempting to go into complicated tax returns such as the returns of the Hughes industries, and attempting to make a finding as to whether there was an avoidance of taxes due the Government. As a matter of fact, everyone knew that the whole subject was in controversy and litigation between Mr. Hughes and the Government, and that eventually it would be determined according to the law of the land. There was no concealment of profits, no concealment of money received by Mr. Hughes. The books of the Hughes company revealed everything. The only question was one of law, of legal interpretation of the application of law to those companies. That was something which the committee had no jurisdiction to determine.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course the Senator from New Mexico will agree that that was a smoke screen raised by the majority to escape the real issue.

Mr. HATCH. It was another example of how unfairly and unjustly a Senate committee can treat a reputable citizen. The charge was raised, and the newspapers—I do not blame the newspaper men—printed the statement that Howard Hughes owed eight or nine million dollars in income taxes.

I submit, Mr. President, it is an example of the need and the absolute necessity that congressional committees reform their procedures and that citizens be accorded some rights and privileges. The strong powers of a congressional committee are amply sufficient to unearth and uncover wrongdoing, fraud, and corruption without resorting to tactics which smear unjustly and unfairly reputable citizens.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Possibly the Senator will recall, also, that there appeared in various newspapers what was generally considered as confidential information which had been obtained in some manner, and before the case was heard this confidential information reached the press and was published, which disturbed Mr. Hughes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had not wanted to go into this subject this afternoon. I have been waiting for 3 hours to discuss another subject with respect to our Republican friends, which party, I am happy to say, is now represented, in the seat of the majority leader, by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the Senator from Oregon upon the great rank he has attained in the Republican Party.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the Senator from New Mexico think the Republican Party is taking a bit of a chance in leaving the other side of the aisle alone?

Mr. HATCH. From my standpoint the Republican Party is not taking a chance, but from the standpoint of some who do not always follow the leadership of the Senator from Oregon, I rather think they are taking a chance. I regret very much that the distinguished and able Senator, when I made my remark a moment ago, vacated the seat of the majority leader. I now beg and implore him to resume that seat.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to see the great concern on the other side of the aisle at the growing liberalism of the Republican Party. I think I can serve notice on the Senators on the other side of the aisle that in due course of time the

Republican Party will be the great party of constitutional liberalism in America.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I notice the Senator used the expression "due course of time." I am not an old man, at least I hope I am not old; but I am fearful that so many years will pass in the due course of time that I shall never see the happy day when the Republican Party becomes the party of constitutional liberalism in America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that the Senator from New Mexico will be with us on November 7, 1948, when we achieve that accomplishment. At least, I pray that he will be with us.

Mr. HATCH. I hope I shall be present on November 7, 1948, but certainly, Mr. President, I shall not be on the Republican side of the election.

I shall now proceed to state briefly some of my reasons——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have something here bearing upon the question of constitutional liberalism and with reference to the Republican Party being a party of the people or a party of privilege. I have a copy of the Republican News, which contains what might be called an advertisement in the lower right-hand corner, about three columns wide, the heading of which is:

Don't throw peanuts to the elephant. Take a look at the table below. Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of their tax savings for this year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible.

Savings of a family of four under new tax plan.

Net income $2,500 for a family of four, present tax, $95; new tax, $16.60; savings, $78.40.

Income of $5,000. Present tax, $589; new tax, $431.60; savings, $157.40.

Income of $10,000. Present tax, $1,862; new tax, $1,360.96; savings, $501.04.

Net income, $15,000. Present tax, $3,658.50; new tax, $2,512; savings, $1,126.50.

Net income of $25,000. Present tax, $8,521.50; new tax, $5,475.84; savings, $3,045.66.

The last one, Mr. President:

Net income, $50,000. Present tax, $24,111; new tax, $16,577.92; savings, $7,533.08.

Down below it says:

To the Republican National Committee, 1337 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington 6, D. C.

Enclosed is my contribution.

And, down below, it says:

Make checks payable to Republican National Committee.

Mr. President, it is obvious that the elephant was addressing his plea for sustenance, not to the peanut crowd, not to the masses of the people, but to the people who had the big, luscious hunks of food that would be appropriate for an elephant, something that would sustain his great strength and power. In other words, do not throw peanuts. The little folks did not get anything but peanuts out of the tax bill. The Republican National Committee is not appealing to the little people, with their peanut savings. They want the rich people of the country, who profiteer under the tax bill, to come across with a grateful contribution to the Grand Old Party which made those savings at the expense of the national budget and at the expense of the people.

Mr. HATCH. And so that future tax bills may be enacted, and that the peanuts may fall to the little people of the land and the big sums to the big, the rich, the wealthy who need it the least.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Just a question?

Mr. HATCH. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I knew the Senator would be delighted to yield. My question is, Can the Senator tell me how many of the Senators on the other side of the aisle voted for the 1948 tax bill?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I cannot answer for all the Senators on this side of the aisle, but I can answer for the Senator who is speaking. The Senator from New Mexico voted against the tax-reduction bill last year; he voted against the tax-reduction bill this year, and he voted to sustain the President's veto, and if he were in the Senate next year, as he will not be, he would vote again just as he has voted, because, as the Senator from Oregon so ably argued last year—and I followed his leadership then—a time of excessive expenditures, a time of a national debt such as was never before known in the history of the world, is no time to reduce taxes. I followed the leadership of the Senator from Oregon last year. I am sorry we could not be together this year. The Senator from Oregon departed from the able argument he himself made last year, and fell into the ways of that "constitutional liberal" Republican Party.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from New Mexico that it is going to be a matter of great regret to me that he will not be with us next year, when we continue the fight for what I think is a sound tax bill.

My next question is: Does the Senator from New Mexico recall whether or not he supported the Senator from Oregon this year in the series of amendments which the Senator from Oregon offered seeking to put into the tax laws the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development?

Mr. HATCH. I do not recall how I voted on those amendments. I am rather inclined to think I voted with the Senator from Oregon on at least some of them.

Mr. MORSE. On some of them, but not on the entire program.

Mr. HATCH. I could not follow the leadership that was going off, as the Senator from Oregon was, on the main issue.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from New Mexico—and I think he will agree with me—that we would not have had some of the better provisions of this year's tax bill if the Senator from Oregon had not made the fight he did make for his amendments, some of which were accepted by consent.

Mr. HATCH. I have spoken rather facetiously in my remarks. I do not want it to go into the RECORD that I am unduly censuring the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon understands that.

Mr. HATCH. He has made many valuable contributions to the Senate and to his country since he has been a member of this body.

Mr. MORSE. I can certainly pay as high a compliment, and really a higher compliment, to the Senator from New Mexico regarding his service in the Senate.

I am sure he will permit me, in order to keep the record clear, to let the RECORD show at this point that an overwhelming majority of the Democrats in the Senate voted for the 1948 tax bill.

Mr. HATCH. I am perfectly willing to have the RECORD show that in my opinion too many Democrats voted for tax reduction, and entirely too many Republicans sponsored that measure, and by their action made it possible.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me just a comment, we are certainly of one mind that there are many features of the 1948 tax bill which need to be improved, particularly that feature whereby we will pay only $2,500,000,000 on the national debt, when we should pay at least twice that amount, in order to pay an amount at least equal to the carrying charges on the debt each year.

Mr. HATCH. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator in that statement.

Mr. President, I should really like sooner or later to get to the subject about which I rose to speak. It will be recalled by some that before the adjournment of the Congress last year, not once, but many times, I stood on the floor of the Senate and protested against adjournment. I protested against the Senate leaving the city of Washington for 5 or 6 months at a critical time in the history of the country, at a time when we knew, as I stated on the floor, that foreign affairs were such that Congress should remain in session. While I admitted then that it was necessary for Senators to take a reasonable vacation, and I advocated their taking their vacation during the hot months of July and August, to rest so that they could return in the fall prepared to carry on the business of state and the Nation, I said many times that the business of the Congress of the United States is not for 5 or 6 months out of the year, but it is a 12 months' job, from which Senators should be excused only for such reasonable absences as are necessary, as they are at times for vacation and rest, in order that they may restore their strength and come back and resume their duties.

The same situation confronts us today. We see the Congress of the United States now preparing to adjourn, preparing to quit and go home. Against that I wish to protest, feebly as my voice is as I address these empty seats—for with very few exceptions the Senate is empty today, and I should like to have the RECORD show it. Probably between now and the

adjournment time there will come discussion, even if adjournment is to be on the 19th, in which bitter words will be exchanged, and criticisms will pass, for this is Presidential election year, and I fear that too many minds in the Senate are turned to the elections rather than toward duties and affairs of state.

Mr. President, I regret that this session of the Congress will come to an end, if it does end on June 19, with a conflict between the President and the Congress. That such a conflict was inevitable as a result of the November elections in 1946 was apparent to all of us, and if it was not apparent, all that was necessary was a review of the history of the country during past Congresses under similar circumstances. Before this session of the Congress adjourns I want to address myself fully to that subject, for in the opening days of the Eightieth Congress I prepared and offered a measure to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for the extension of the terms of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 years to 4.

On that subject I have gathered a vast amount of material as to the records of previous Congresses in situations such as that in which we find ourselves today, and that record is not a pleasing one from the standpoint of the country. I hope to address myself at length to that subject later, but not this afternoon.

President Truman may have said, as he has been reported to have said—and in some ways it is understandable—that the present Congress is, to quote the words used in the papers, "the worst in the history of the country." Regardless of what might have prompted the President to make that statement, I think there might better have been stressed, as they will be stressed, the specific failures of the Congress, of which there are so many. But even so, Mr. President, President Truman made no personal attack upon any individual Member of the Congress. He condemned the Congress as a whole, not in vilifying words, but he condemned rather the legislative failures of the Congress and did not apply epithets to individual Members. I hope the President of the United States will never, and I am sure he will not, resort to vilifying language if it is unnecessary. But during the campaign I am sure the President and many others will continue to criticize the Congress on the record it has made, and certainly that record affords ample opportunity for criticism without resort to name-calling.

Entertaining those thoughts, Mr. President, I turn now to a criticism of the President made by a Member of Congress. After all, no matter to what party he belongs, Harry Truman is President of the United States of America, which, in my opinion, is the highest and most honorable office in all the world. The dignity of that office, the high respect and regard in which the office itself should be held by every true American, especially by men in high public life, should prevent the use of unseemly and improper words.

Mr. President, I do not now refer to the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] made on yesterday, when he expressed doubt as to the wisdom of giving advice to the President because the President's criticism of Congress had indicated, as the Senator from New Hampshire suggested, the turning of a deaf ear to any advice Congress might offer. I disagreed with the Senator from New Hampshire on yesterday and so stated on the floor. But the Senator did not indulge in the type of criticism I have in mind. The type to which I refer appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 10 on page 7723. Speaking in the House of Representatives, Mr. CLEVENGER, a Member of that body, used certain language. Mr. President, it may be that the rules of the Senate prevent my criticizing a Member of the other branch of Congress, although I do not think they do. But I am not attempting to criticize the man who used that language, because I want the words themselves to criticize and condemn the one who used them. This is what Mr. CLEVENGER said in the House of Representatives on June 10:

> Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress has not done badly. It has given the country 2 years of balanced budget; it has passed a tax-cut bill over the veto, as it did a labor bill giving the President the only control he has over John L. Lewis.

I presume in that brief statement the distinguished and honorable Representative summed up in one grand total all the achievements and accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress that he could call to mind, and they were, a tax-reduction bill, which has already been discussed on the floor, and the Taft-Hartley law, which many men severely criticized and condemned as hamstringing the cause of labor. The Representative said that the only control ever exercised by the President of the United States over John L. Lewis arose out of that bill.

Mr. President, I refer to the record made by the President of the United States in his various controversies with Mr. Lewis when authority was exercised to protect the dignity of the law of the land, and it was upheld without the aid of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would it be fair for the Senator from Oregon to imply from the Senator's remarks that he is criticizing the Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. HATCH. I have not criticized the Taft-Hartley law. I am criticizing the man who stood in the House of Representatives and summed up the grand total of the Republican effort in the Eightieth Congress as only two measures. But that is not what I rose to read. In the next paragraph——

Mr. MORSE. Permit me to say on that particular point, that if the Senator were criticizing the Taft-Hartley law I would join with him, but my recollection is that the Senator from New Mexico voted for the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico voted for the Taft-Hartley law and voted to override the President's veto. But in doing that, Mr. President, I want to say that I believed the Taft-Hartley law was a good measure and I voted for it in the exercise of my constitutional duties as a legislator. When the President vetoed that measure I took no affront at the President's veto. He was exercising his constitutional right. I never disagreed with him for exercising the powers conferred upon him by the Constitution of the United States, and presently I shall refer to the continuation of such powers.

The next paragraph of the remarks to which I refer is as follows:

> Now "High Tax Harry" like a nasty little gamin has dipped his hands into mud and dirt and plastered it all over our new buggy—and danced out of reach of the whip.

Mr. President, I do not know what the Representative refers to as the new buggy and the whip. Somewhere I have heard references to the Republican Party as belonging to the "horse and buggy" age. I wonder, Mr. President, if the able Representative is confirming that criticism which has been made of the party by reason of the action and attitude of the present Congress on many measures.

But the worst of all is yet to come, Mr. President. I continue to read:

> Might well be there will be some Congress-tanned Missouri jackass hide on the Christmas market—come November.

The President of the United States is referred to by the Representative as a jackass, and he speaks of hanging his hide on the political fence.

Mr. President, if the Republican Party can get any comfort out of this kind of tactics it is welcome to it. I let the words remain, speaking not only their own condemnation, but their condemnation of the man who uttered them.

I am glad that a distiguished Democrat, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, rose and made a very brief comment, and only expressed himself as sorry at such an expression on the floor of the House. The mildness of the retort of the former Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, shows a high character of statesmanship which should be reflected by every Member of the Congress. But, Mr. President, nothing can better point to the caution we should exercise in these closing days of the session than words expressed by the Senate Chaplain on that same day, Thursday, June 10, in his opening prayer. Dr. Peter Marshall said:

> Since we shall be judged for every idle word, let us speak carefully, with a deep respect for the truth that cannot be twisted.

I only regret that the gentleman who referred to the President of the United States as he did had not heard the prayer of the Senate Chaplain that selfsame morning.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the able Senator from New Mexico that not many weeks ago, when a very bitter attack had been made upon the President——

Mr. HATCH. May I interrupt the Senator from California to say that I know the incident to which he refers. I was present in the Chamber. I never

heard a finer, more statesmanlike, more truly American utterance than was made by the Senator from California on that occasion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. What I was about to say was that I did rise, when I felt that a very unfair attack had been made upon the President of the United States and certain other Government officials, because I have grown up to have respect for the office of President of the United States, regardless of who might be occupying it at the particular moment.

I cannot help but believe that the able Senator from New Mexico himself must to some degree agree with me that the statement which has been attributed to the President on his recent political tour in the West, in which he said that the present Congress was the worst Congress in the country's history, was not serving the spirit of cooperation which we need in meeting the great problems facing the Nation at this time.

It so happens that not only did we have before this body this very week the selective-service legislation, which had widespread bipartisan support because many of us who are Members of this body—and I believe also Members of the other body too—recognize that there are obligations to our country that are far superior to any obligation we owe to our particular political party; we have pending at the present time before the Senate Committee on Appropriations the European recovery appropriation bill. I have just come from the Appropriations Committee, where we are to consider that measure in a few minutes.

At a very critical time in the country's history, and at a very critical time in the consideration of the question as to whether we shall be able to supply adequate funds—and speaking for myself alone, let me say that I expect to support in committee the restoration of the Budget estimate for the European Recovery Act, because I think it is essential to our general foreign policy and to the peace and rehabilitation of the world—it seems to me that the President is not rendering that cooperation which many of us believe the Nation needs in the solution of the problems facing us. While he is out on what is sometimes termed a nonpolitical trip, but which I think the facts will disclose is a political trip, of necessity he has left the leadership in fighting for this very important measure in the hands of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and other Senators on both sides of the aisle who recognize their obligations. I say, in no partisan sense whatsoever, that I think the President would be better serving the purposes which we are all striving to achieve if, on his part, and perhaps on the part of some of those in Congress who had taken the other extreme, there could be an end to this sort of fighting. Let us put our shoulders together in meeting the common problems which face our country.

Mr. HATCH. I think perhaps the Senator did not hear my opening remarks. I mentioned the matter to which he refers. As I have said, I have no knowledge as to what prompted the remark of the President; but I do say this: There are ample differences between our two bodies so that we can stress specific issues and differences. There are specific examples of the manner in which this Congress has failed. I think it has failed in many respects, which from time to time I shall point out. I think that is legitimate criticism. A responsibility is assumed by the majority party which it must carry. I have never believed that there was any occasion to engage in name-calling; and I think it does not help in any way whether the President does it or whether it is done by Members of the House or Senate. I am against it, from whatever source it comes.

When I paid the Senator from California a compliment a few moments ago I should also have included our distinguished and able friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the acting majority leader, who participated in the discussion at that time and made some very able remarks of his own.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Since I am passing around bouquets, I recall that on another similar occasion the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] rose and made some very appropriate remarks in similar vein in reply to a certain Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator will recall—and I say this in connection with his remarks about criticism of the President—that on one occasion, in the heat of debate, I made an unkind remark about the President.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; the Senator did, and I took him to task for it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New Mexico and I got into a little argument over it. The Senator will also recall that some time later I did what I thought was appropriate on the floor of the Senate. I extended to the President of the United States my sincere apologies, and after that particular comment I received from him a personal note which I shall always cherish. It shows that he understands that sometimes in the heat of debate, when we are fighting pretty hard for the things in which we believe, we use adjectives for which later we are happy to express our regrets. I appreciate his understanding and courtesy in the matter.

Mr. HATCH. I recall the incident to which the Senator from Oregon refers. I am very happy that he was man enough to make the apology publicly, as he did. The President graciously accepted it. I appreciate the character of men who make mistakes, as all of us sometimes do, but who are willing to admit their mistakes and make public apology, as did the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, that is the reason I am quoting the prayer of our Chaplain:

> Since we shall be judged for every idle word, let us speak carefully, with a deep respect for the truth that cannot be twisted.

Certainly in this discussion today, and throughout the campaign, I shall indulge in no name-calling, no personal abuse which may reflect upon the honor, integrity, character, or reputation of any Member of this body.

But Mr. President, the Republican Party has made a record in the Eightieth Congress. That is the record to which I referred in the colloquy with the Senator from California. As the majority party, it must bear its responsibility for the record which it has made. It is entitled to all the credit it should receive for good things; but by the same token, where it has failed it should receive sharp and severe criticism.

My only regret is that my own lack of ability and fluency of speech prevent me from adequately expressing the high degree of condemnation which I think the record of the Republican Party in this Congress ought to receive. Today I shall confine my criticism largely to what I conceive to be a total lack of responsibility of those who control the Congress, and those who express their avowed intention of adjourning on the 19th day of June and not returning to complete essential legislation to which many members of that party have given strong support, but to which others, I fear, have given only lip service.

I knew, Mr. President, that when the time came for the Congress to finally adjourn, the majority party would be compelled to find some excuse, to search for some alibi for its many failures, for its sins of omission and its sins of commission. But never, Mr. President, did I anticipate that the great, strong, mighty GOP, the majority party, would seek to place responsibility for its failures upon the already overtaxed and overburdened shoulders of the President of the United States. However, such seems to have been decided upon as the course the majority party will pursue. It is the way out of the present difficulties, in which they find themselves in these closing days of the Congress—difficulties which might have been and should have been avoided. There can be no excuse, no alibi for their failure to enact the measures they should have enacted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has had a long experience in the Senate of the United States, and on many occasions I have gone to him for advice as to procedure and as to the programs which were advanced here. Let me ask him this question in all sincerity: Would it make any difference when the Congress adjourns or takes a recess? Would not the criticism of those who argue against adjournment now be in order a little later or at any other time? Would there ever be a time when the calendar would be absolutely clear of proposed legislation?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska did not understand me.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, I have just returned to the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I have said that the business of Congress is a 12 months' business, and I have said that the only time the Congress should recess is during the summer months.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the Senator takes the position that the job which Congress has is a full-time job; does he,

Mr. HATCH. Yes; it is a full-time job, and we do not have any right to leave.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the Senator is in opposition to the Reorganization Act.

Mr. HATCH. No, because the Reorganization Act provides "unless otherwise provided by the Congress." Last year I argued that Congress should otherwise provide; and I am arguing for that now, and if I am here next year I shall argue for it again.

Mr. WHERRY. The Reorganization Act provides that Congress shall adjourn by July 31.

Mr. HATCH. The act provides "unless otherwise provided by the Congress."

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. The Senator's point is that the legislative impact is so great that the Congress has a 12 months' job. Is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. I certainly do, and I have said it time and time again. I think we should adjust ourselves to that program. I think the Congress should convene in January and should lay out its work for 12 months. Then we would not be in the jam we are in today.

I am not charging the Senator from Nebraska with any wrongdoing.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. HATCH. I have worked with him and cooperated with him, and he has done his best to get legislation through. But he is confronted with a situation which neither he nor any other man can correct, if the Congress adjourns on the 19th of June.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the Senator's criticism is not of any party in particular; the Senator does not charge any particular party with failure to carry out the program as expeditiously as possible during the time available; but I understand that the Senator feels that regardless of whether the Republican Party or some other party is in power, the job which Congress has is a 12 months' job, and therefore it is inopportune for us to adjourn, as we are contemplating doing on June 19.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, let me observe, if the truth of the matter is to be known, that I have had just as many requests from the other side of the aisle for an adjournment on June 19 as I have had from this side of the aisle.

Mr. HATCH. I have no doubt of that, Mr. President. Last year, when I stood on the floor of the Senate arguing against adjournment, I think I was just as unpopular on this side of the aisle as I was on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

I am not sure that I would take exception to what the Senator has said to the effect that the Congress has a 12 months' job.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me point out that the Senator must remember that, by the ill-advised action of the people in November 1946, the present majority party has full responsibility for carrying on the legislative program. We on this side of the aisle cannot even make a motion to have a measure taken from the calendar and considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; Senators on that side of the aisle can make such a motion.

Mr. HATCH. But what would happen to it?

Mr. WHERRY. Probably it would be defeated. [Laughter].

Mr. HATCH. Yes; and that is customary and usual, and I approve of it. I think the party which has the responsibility should be forced, if possible, to carry its responsibility.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree.

Mr. HATCH. Frankly, that is what I am trying to do today. I wish to put a little more responsibility on the shoulders of the Republican Party, and I hope they will carry it for the people and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator wishes to place more responsibility on us, he should help elect a Republican President in November, to go along with the Republican Congress. When that is done, we shall carry that responsibility well. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr President, I have just said that I never expected to hear the Grand Old Party attempt to excuse its failures by piling the burden on the shoulders of the President of the United States. The Constitution of the United States makes the legislative branch of the Government one thing and the executive branch of the Government another. But I wish to discuss that matter a little later, when I shall go into some detail regarding it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is entirely different from the point I was making. I simply said that if the Senator from New Mexico wishes us to accept more responsibility, we shall be glad to do so. Just give us a Republican President, and we shall take all the responsibility on our shoulders.

Mr. HATCH. The only responsibility I want the majority party to have is that which exists between now and next January. After January, I am hopeful that the political complexion of the Congress will change, and that the political complexion at the White House will remain the same. Then responsibility will be carried to the betterment and progress and welfare of all the country, even including the Republican Party. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the Senator from New Mexico does not believe in what he has been saying; he does not want us to have more responsibility, but he wants the responsibility to be given back to the Democrats, in November.

Mr. HATCH. Well, that is where it is best carried. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. The people will decide that in November.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is no excuse, to say that the President has failed to cooperate. It is no excuse, to say to the schools of my State, which so badly need Federal aid, and to the schools of so many other States of the Union, that Federal aid has not been granted because the President of the United States has failed to cooperate. The President of the United States has urged that legislation, and I am proud that the Senate has passed it. But there is no reason to let that legislation linger, languish, and die in the House of Representatives, and there is no excuse for telling the people that the President refuses to cooperate. The President cannot be charged——

Mr. President, when the Senators cease the conversation they have been engaged in, I shall be glad to continue.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] wished to know what would come up next. I told them we would have to wait until the Senator from New Mexico concluded his speech, before we could tell what would come up next.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there are only three or four Senators on the floor; and when they are engaged in conversation, there is no one for me to talk to. [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I merely inquired of the acting majority leader whether it was planned to have other matters taken up on the floor of the Senate, after the speech of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is concluded. The Senator from Nebraska informed me that it was not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to inform the other Senators who are present that when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has concluded his remarks, if there is no other business then to be transacted by the Senate, it is contemplated that the Senate will take a recess until Monday, at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as I have been saying, the President of the United States cannot be charged with failure to cooperate. He cannot be charged with failure to cooperate in the enactment of a proper housing bill, for President Truman has long urged Congress to enact adequate legislation to assist in correcting the deplorable housing situation which prevails all over the United States. Republicans may go before the country and may say that President Truman has failed to cooperate, but they will have difficulty in explaining to the homeless why they, the Republican Party, in control of the Congress, did not pass the housing bill which bears the name of the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, and for which he so valiantly worked, but which today also lingers and languishes in the House of Representatives, and probably will die on the 19th day of June, along with other essential legislation.

The Republican Party may take the stump in this campaign and charge the President with failure to cooperate; but again, they will have difficulty in explaining to the voters of America why the inflationary spiral continues to go upward and upward and why the cost of living already is so high that it is causing countless numbers of American citizens to be deprived of the necessities of life, for the citizens of the United States will know that President Truman has urged Congress, for months and months, to take appropriate action to stop the constant rise in the cost of living which

is working such hardship upon practically every household in this fair land of ours.

Mr. President, it will be difficult for the Republican majority to explain to the people of America who are faced with the constant rise in the cost of living why taxes have been reduced, with the result that those who are most able to pay have been relieved of some of the burden of taxation, whereas the little man, the "peanut man"—and also the man in the middle brackets—is met with living costs which his inadequate means and salary cannot meet.

Mr. President, I have high regard for the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I told him today that probably this afternoon I would refer to him, and I expressed the hope he would be on the floor of the Senate. Privately and publicly I have said I admire the honesty, courage, and intellectual integrity of the Senator from Ohio. I hold that opinion of him and do not hesitate to make it a part of the RECORD. Should he receive the Republican nomination for President, I would in the campaign not hesitate to say, as I have said here, that I consider him a man of courage, honor, and ability.

Entertaining this high opinion of the Senator from Ohio, I could not help but be shocked to read in the newspapers that in a radio address last night he called for the immediate adjournment of Congress, urging party members to return home in order to appeal to the people for a vote of confidence. Mr. President, regardless of the faults of the Republican Party—and goodness knows they are so numerous it would be most difficult to state them all—never did I believe that that party would, on the first mild attack by the President, quit, lay down its legislative duties, surrender, and, if I might use an inelegant expression, "tuck its tail between its legs" and run home to the voters, pitifully crying that that great party was unable to complete its work because the President had seen fit to spank it just a little.

Can this be the party of Abraham Lincoln, the man who withstood the greatest storm of criticism ever to break on the head of any President, but who notwithstanding the criticism, carried on, faithfully discharging the duties placed upon him by the Constitution, until the day he fell, the victim of an assassin's bullet? No, Mr. President, a party which quits and surrenders on the first word of criticism is not the party of Abraham Lincoln; it is not the party of bravery and necessary courage to have control of the Government at a time when bravery and courage are required in the performance of almost every official act.

Mr. President, I said I would refer to the division of powers between the executive and legislative branches in connection with the respective duties of each. One of the happiest memories of my life and of my service in the Senate came one day several years ago, at a time when I was sponsoring in the Senate a measure to which President Franklin D. Roosevelt was opposed. The morning of the day the measure was to be heard in the Senate I received a telephone call to come to the White House. I went, knowing that President Roosevelt would bring to bear upon me all the charm, the arguments and the persuasion for which he was noted, in order to get me to change my course in the Senate. That is what happened. I went into the President's office. He had the particular bill before him. He discussed it intelligently, for he understood it well. He pointed out what he thought was wrong about the bill. I did not argue with the President. I do not suppose one argues too much with the President of the United States. But I tried to point out why I thought it was a good bill. I hope I am never arbitrary in my decisions and am always willing to listen to reason. But on that occasion I was so firmly convinced my course was right that I finally said to President Roosevelt, "As a member of the legislative branch of the Government, I have a constitutional duty to perform, a duty to work for such legislation as I believe is best for the welfare of the country. I believe this is such a bill. Therefore, notwithstanding what you say, I shall be compelled to continue my present course."

It has been said that one could not disagree with President Roosevelt and retain his friendship. He looked stern at that particular time. The happy smile was gone from his face as I said I was coming back to the Senate to vote for the bill. But I did not stop with that. I went on to say, "Mr. President, you also have a constitutional duty to perform. If the bill is passed by Congress, and if it is as bad as you say it is and as you think it is, it would be your duty under the Constitution to veto it. For a moment the President was silent. Then, I shall never forget, he leaned back in his chair, placed his hands behind his head, and with one of the heartiest laughs I ever heard him give, he said, using my first name, "Carl, you are right. You perform your legislative duty as you see it, and then, if the bill comes to me, I shall perform my constitutional duty as I see it."

Mr. President, to the major party that is talking about quitting and going home because the President will not cooperate, I say, the constitutional duty of the majority is to legislate in accordance with what it deems best for the welfare of the country. That is as far as its constitutional duty extends. If, after it has passed all the measures vitally necessary to the welfare of the country, the President in the exercise of his constitutional duty errs by vetoing the measures, there is then a real issue on which to go before the country, an issue of who was right and who was wrong. But the Congress has no right to quit, lay down, and surrender, to run up the white flag, to throw in the sponge, merely because the President may veto some measure.

I again urge the Congress to remain in session until its work is completed. I urge it to do its full duty under the Constitution and not to be concerned so much about the President. Let Congress perform its duty, let the President perform his, and our country will be safe.

Everyone knows that Congress is anxious to adjourn in time for the political conventions, but one distinguished and able Republican Member of this body recently gave a reason for adjournment which I think ought to have a prominent place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So much do I believe it, that I wish to repeat today what the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] said on June 3. I quote his language as it appears in the RECORD:

> Mr. President, I wish I could agree with the able Senator from Wyoming, but in my humble opinion—

Remember, Mr. President, this is a Republican Senator speaking—

> the best interests of the Nation would be served and will be served by our adjourning on June 19. I think we will save the taxpayers a great deal of money by doing so.

He is speaking of the economy-minded Congress, remember, Mr. President.

> I think the country will be much better off by our adjourning, than by remaining here and continuing to spend literally hundreds of millions of dollars, and passing a great deal of legislation which possibly is not needed and which should remain on the docket until next year. I am thoroughly convinced that the best interests of the Nation lie in Congress adjourning June 19.

Again, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that those are the words of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], a member of the majority party, which is devoted to economy.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of the passage of the Vandenberg resolution yesterday afternoon, and the difference of opinion as to the general effect of the resolution, and particularly in view of the interpretation I placed upon the resolution and laid before the Senate as my opinion, I ask leave to incorporate in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, certain headlines and quoted parts of certain newspaper articles interpreting the effect of that resolution.

The first is from the Chicago Daily Tribune of today, the headline of which is "Senate O. K.'s new alliance."

I ask that the Tribune article upon the resolution shall appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST MINUTE OPPOSITION FIGHT FAILS—IGNORE WARNING OF WAR THREAT

(Bulletin)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The Senate tonight voted, 64 to 4, in favor of an unprecedented resolution urging President Truman to seek an alliance of the United States with foreign nations banded together in self-defense agreements. The protests of a small minority that the measure constituted a step toward war that could not be retracted were ignored. Those voting against the resolution were Senators KEM (Republican, Missouri); LANGER (Republican, North Dakota); PEPPER (Democrat, Florida); and TAYLOR (Democrat, Idaho). Senator VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan), insisted that the resolution, which he sponsored, did not pave the way for military alliances, but his internationalist followers abandoned any pretense in debate that it was an effort toward peace.

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—Senator VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan) was accused on the Senate floor today of seeking to commit the Senate to advance approval of military pacts with European nations which will inevitably lead to a third world war.

Senator MALONE (Republican, Nevada), made the charge in opposing the Vandenberg resolution which urges the President to seek alliances with foreign countries which band together in defense agreements.

The Michigan Senator, leader of congressional internationalists, uttered an indignant denial of the implications attached to his resolution by MALONE.

MALONE ALMOST ALONE

But the Senate was strangely apathetic as debate proceeded on the precedent-breaking proposal. MALONE was almost alone in his fight against the resolution.

Senators appeared lulled by VANDENBERG's repeated assurances that new obligations were not involved and the Senate would have a later opportunity to consider anything the President accomplished under the proposals of the measure.

When Senators FLANDERS (Republican, Vermont) and FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas) suggested minor changes in the language of the resolution, VANDENBERG protested that not a word should be altered. He and his Foreign Relations Committee, he said, had carefully worked out the phraseology and any changes would mongrelize it. The Senators subsided.

WARNS OF DANGERS

MALONE said that, for the first time in history, "we are being asked to go to war to defend foreign nations against invasion or any other act that they may term aggression."

"This resolution advises the President to seek a military pact with Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg, which joined in the Brussels pact," he declared. "Once ratified, we shall have to go to war if any one of the five is attacked.

"Once we make this solemn declaration, we will be committed to approval of the treaties which the President may negotiate under its terms. We will be accused of betrayal if we do not approve such treaties just as those seeking to reduce the European spending proposal to sane terms now are being accused of betrayal.

"The founding fathers long ago warned us of entangling alliances. Now we are being slid into one. We have just passed a draft act and this is the logical follow-up."

QUESTIONS AUTHORITY

"Have the Senate and the President the right to thrust the Nation into a foreign war without a congressional declaration of war? If the President should order the Army, Navy, and Air Force into action under such an agreement, we would be in war before we could pass on it.

"The only purpose of the alliances suggested in this resolution is to fight Russia. One of the reasons given by Hitler for his embarkation on war was that he was encircled by his enemies. This is the first step in the encirclement of Russia which may give Stalin the same excuse.

"It is a public confession of abandonment of the United Nations as a peace organization. It is a war move certain to provoke Russian retaliation. It seems certain to start a third world war and is a betrayal of promises to attempt to use peaceful means to avert such a war.

"Yet it is being done casually and almost with gayety."

VANDENBERG REPLIES

VANDENBERG asserted the resolution "automatically declines military alliances."

"It encourages individual and collective self-defense against armed aggression within the United Nations Charter," he asserted. "It declares our willingness to consider by due constitutional process our own cooperation with such regional arrangements. It is another forward move in the indispensable pattern of collective security for us and for others.

"I agree that it is an important and significant step but it is not the recital of the acceptance of new obligations."

As VANDENBERG argued for the resolution which has been labeled the military arm of the European spending experiment, State Secretary Marshall and Economic Cooperation Administrator Hoffman fought before the Senate Appropriations Committee against House reductions of one billion four hundred millions in the program.

SEES END BY 1952

Marshall asserted the spending plan, if not reduced at the start, could reduce itself to zero by 1952 if all goes well. Attempts to pin him down on definite House cuts to which he objected were futile.

Quizzed by Chairman BRIDGES (Republican, New Hampshire), Marshall admitted the recipient European nations first confidentially informed the United States they would need $30,000,000,000 over a 4-year period but finally reduced their demands to seventeen billions. This was the absolute minimum, Marshall insisted.

"This program is material but, even more important, it is spiritual," said Marshall. "If we leave these European states feeling they cannot depend on the integrity of our leaders, we leave them in a very perilous state of mind. The reaction in Europe (to the House cuts) has been most disconcerting and has been exploited to the limit."

HOFFMAN PROTESTS

Hoffman, protesting the House reductions, asserted they could not be applied to food, fuel, and raw materials to be shipped abroad but would have to be applied against shipments of machinery and equipment which he termed genuine recovery items.

"If Congress gives you the full amount," asked Senator FERGUSON (Republican, of Michigan), "will you spend only what you think essential?"

"Absolutely," promised Hoffman. "I can't be too emphatic that there will be no spending for the sake of spending. We are not out to spend but to invest in Europe."

BRIDGES noted that European crops were "the best in many years" but that proposed spending for food had been increased, rather than deceased, in the ECA requests. Hoffman said it was wiser to let the Europeans diet improve than to send less food from America.

Mr. PEPPER. I also call attention to the headline and the article in today's Washington Times-Herald. The headline reads, "Senate O. K.'s curb on big power UN veto." The first paragraph of the article appearing under that headline reads:

The Senate last night adopted, 64 to 4, the Vandenberg resolution expressing approval of mutual defense pacts within the United Nations framework and aimed at restricting the power veto.

I ask that the headline and the complete article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE O. K.'S CURB ON BIG POWER UN VETO—VANDENBERG'S PLAN SUPPORTS DEFENSE PACTS—DOOMS EUROPE'S HOPE FOR UNITED STATES ARMS NOW

(By Ruth Montgomery)

The Senate last night adopted, 64 to 4, the Vandenberg resolution expressing approval of mutual defense pacts within the United Nations framework and aimed at restricting the power veto.

The negative votes were cast by Senators PEPPER (Democrat), of Florida, WATKINS (Republican), of Utah, LANGER (Republican), of North Dakota, and TAYLOR (Democrat), of Idaho.

Final passage came after Senators beat down, 61 to 6, an amendment by PEPPER which would have eliminated the sections giving senatorial blessing to regional-defense arrangements.

DOOMS HOPE FOR ARMS

By its action the Senate slammed the door on western European hopes of obtaining United States arms during this session of Congress. But it leaves it ajar for eventual United States support of collective defense pacts against aggression.

Senate President VANDENBERG, at the time of its introduction, declared that any move to send arms to western Europe would be shelved for this session if the Senate approved the resolution.

The vote came after desultory all-day debate during which VANDENBERG declared that it is "necessary to make plain that we are not preoccupied with bombs and bayonets."

HITS AUTOMATIC ALLIANCES

His resolution, he insisted, was the exact opposite of automatic military alliances, open-end lend-lease formula, and unilateral responsibility for the defense of Europe.

Instead, he said the resolution called for defense arrangements within the UN framework to encourage "defense within the Charter and outside of the veto."

But PEPPER said he could not disassociate the idea of a regional agreement from the triple alliance and triple entente. He charged that the resolution was "the consummation of plans carefully produced to prepare this country for a military alliance with western Europe."

MALONE SEES WAR MOVE

Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, also attacked the resolution on the grounds that it would be the "first step in breaking down the independence of the Senate" in passing on treaties. He called it a definite war move.

Supporting the resolution, Senator GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, said it did not commit the United States to a military alliance. But he added: "If it becomes evident that some military alliance is about to take over western Europe we would not stand idly by."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD an article from the New York Times, the headline of which is "Senate proclaims military aid plan for free nations. Votes by 64 to 4 for principle set forth by VANDENBERG for defensive action."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PROCLAIMS MILITARY AID PLAN FOR FREE NATIONS—VOTES BY 64 TO 4 FOR PRINCIPLE SET FORTH BY VANDENBERG FOR DEFENSIVE ACTION—OUR SECURITY PUT FIRST—RESOLUTION SENT TO PRESIDENT—SIMILAR MOVE CONTAINED IN OMNIBUS HOUSE BILL

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The Senate proclaimed tonight by a vote of 64 to 4 a high and solemn policy committing the United States to the principle of military aid to defensive alliances formed among the world's free nations.

Such help would be given only with the approval in each case of Congress and under severely objective tests, of which the first and greatest would be the military security

of the United States. The others would be the degree of self-help and mutual aid guaranteed by the applicants.

This profound evolution in the foreign position of the United States, for all its qualifications, would extend to the non-Communist world a prospect of military comradeship without precedent in peacetime history.

It was brought about by the passage of a simple resolution by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, which simply advised the President of the Senate's views. It requires no action by the House.

MEASURE IS BEFORE HOUSE

That body now has before it an omnibus bill embodying the Vandenberg plan and a series of other matters, including an authorization for a $65,000,000 noninterest loan for the United Nations' permanent headquarters in New York.

Its sponsor, Representative CHARLES A. EATON (Republican, of New Jersey) had been anxiously watching the Senate in the hope that the vote there would be impressive enough to strengthen his appeals to the House leaders that his measure not be allowed to die in the adjournment crush.

Senator VANDENBERG, who had brought his significant paper forth from the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously, put it through the Senate after 8 hours of debate, and in the process smashed down by 61 to 6 the only strong attack made upon it.

This was an effort by Senator PEPPER (Democrat, of Florida) to strike from the resolution all that pertained to military aid. Mr. PEPPER was supported in this unsuccessful amendment by two Democrats. These were Senators GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, the Wallace party's candidate for Vice President, and KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee.

Standing with Mr. PEPPER were three Republicans—Senators JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri; WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota; and GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada.

PASSAGE NEVER IN DOUBT

On final passage, of which there had been no doubt but for which Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, the Democratic leader, demanded a record vote because of the gravity of the occasion, Mr. PEPPER was supported in his opposition only by Senators LANGER, TAYLOR, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah. Because he was paired with an absentee, Mr. MALONE could not vote this time. Mr. MCKELLAR voted "aye" on the final test.

Thus was accomplished a plan looking toward military aid to western Europe and perhaps elsewhere, to accompany and supplement the Marshall plan. The administration has been in close touch with Mr. VANDENBERG throughout and fully approved the resolution.

One of the briefest documents of state ever to come from the Senate, it was attacked by the minority opposition variously as a "bypassing" of the United Nations and as a provocative act against Russia which meant military alliances and perhaps a great war.

Senator VANDENBERG and his associates retorted that the resolution proceeded in full loyalty to the United Nations and its Charter and that it involved only the ancient and inherent right of self-defense.

Again and again they disclaimed any commitment in the nature of a blank check, declaring that it had been stated in the plainest terms that any military aid could be extended only through constitutional processes. Congress, they pointed out, was specifically left in final charge.

The opponents, and particularly Senator MALONE, argued vehemently that what was afoot was a moral commitment, and that when requests for military aid actually came the Senate would be under overwhelming pressure to approve and implement them.

POINTS IN RESOLUTION

These were the points of the resolution:

1. A reaffirmation of the determination of the United States to go forward with others in the United Nations and under an unaltered Charter.

2. A recommendation that the removal of the veto in the Security Council on all pacific settlements and admission of members be sought by voluntary agreement.

3. The strongest encouragement to the development, under the Charter, of regional and other collective arrangements for self-defense.

4. The aid and association of the United States "by constitutional process" with such blocs as were "based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid" where the security of the United States would be promoted.

5. A reaffirmation of the determination of the United States to resist, alone or in concert with others, any armed attack, anywhere, affecting its national security.

6. A recommendation for maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed force, and to regulate and reduce armaments.

7. Finally, a review of the Charter if necessary and at an appropriate time for means to strengthen it.

NEW HOPE FOR SECURITY

The debate, which proceeded almost listlessly for hours until after Senator PEPPER's principal opposition speech late in the day, was opened by Mr. VANDENBERG at 10:40 a. m. A quorum was rarely present during the day, save when the roll was called to bring one in.

Senator VANDENBERG declared that the resolution offered "new hope for security and peace for us and others, through the United Nations." Among the realities it was intended to face, he said, was "the grim reality that peace may fail through the acts of others."

Thus, he went on, Congress, having passed a draft measure only yesterday, must now take action to demonstrate that the determination of the United States was for peace.

"Another war will never be our fault," he observed.

The resolution, he declared, was "the exact opposite" of the old conception of military alliances by which one nation simply underwrote another regardless of the effort or lack of effort of the second. It was also "the exact opposite of the old open-ended lend-lease formula," he said.

"It never steps outside the United Nations Charter," he went on. "It never steps outside the Constitution of the United States. It never steps outside the final authority of this Congress. But it steps constructively and hopefully toward a better and a safer world."

Senator PEPPER contended that the program had been "carefully developed to prepare Congress and the country for a military alliance between the United States and western Europe."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post with reference to the Vandenberg resolution, the headline of which is "Senate Approves Plan for Army Aid to Europe." The first paragraph of the article is as follows:

An overwhelming Senate vote late yesterday approved the Vandenberg resolution, paving the way for American military help to a western European defense union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE APPROVES PLAN FOR ARMS AID TO EUROPE—RESOLUTION DRAWN BY VANDENBERG URGES PRESIDENT TO SEEK DEFENSE PACTS

(By Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr.)

An overwhelming Senate vote late yesterday approved the Vandenberg resolution, paving the way for American military help to a western European defense union.

The roll-call vote was 64 to 4, an endorsement almost as one-sided as the ratification of the United Nations Charter 3 years ago. The only Senators voting against the resolution were ARTHUR V. WATKINS (Republican, Utah), WILLIAM LANGER (Republican, North Dakota), CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida), and GLEN TAYLOR (Democrat, Idaho).

A few minutes before the final vote, after 8 hours of generally listless debate, the Senate rejected by 61 to 6 an amendment by PEPPER to delete every reference to regional self-defense arrangements abroad.

AN IMPORTANT DECISION

In its size and in its substance, the vote was one of the most important Senate decisions in the field of foreign policy since the end of the war. News of it was promptly cabled to American Embassies abroad, and was expected to give new confidence to the non-Soviet nations of Europe.

The resolution did not commit the United States to join a military alliance or to give any military aid at this time; VANDENBERG made this plain a dozen times during the debate. What it did, under the Senate's constitutional power of advice, was to ask the President to negotiate an agreement and then submit it to the Senate for ratification.

ASKS VOLUNTARY LIMIT ON VETO

The exact language of the resolution asked the Government to seek "association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security."

The resolution also asked for other things—for a voluntary agreement limiting the use of the UN Security Council veto; for renewed efforts to provide the United Nations with armed forces and to limit armaments under safeguards, and, "if necessary," for a conference to review the charter at an appropriate time.

STRENGTHENS GOVERNMENT'S HAND

But the heart of the resolution, and what made it truly historic, was the section that opened the door to making a defense agreement with the European union. This agreement might take the form of a treaty to supply military aid and to guarantee the western European group against aggression.

Secretary Marshall could have negotiated such a treaty anyway, subject to Senate approval, but as Senator TOM CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas) said yesterday, the Senate resolution immensely strengthens the administration's hands in starting such negotiations.

SIMILAR STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE

Its nearest counterparts were the Fulbright and Connally resolutions of 1943, under which President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull began the long negotiations that led to American membership in a United Nations organization.

The present resolution was formulated by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee after long study and debate, leading to a unanimous vote last month. A similar statement, embodied in a bill instead of in a resolution,

has passed the House Foreign Affairs Committee and is awaiting a chance to reach the floor.

VANDENBERG handled his resolution in gingerly fashion yesterday, as if he expected much greater opposition. In his opening speech, and in repeated answers to questions, he tried to assure the Senate that any American alinement with a European defense union would require Senate ratification.

The resolution, he said, "is a plan for our practical American cooperation under specified circumstances, within the framework of the United Nations.

"It encourages individual and collective self-defense within the Charter and outside the veto.

FULBRIGHT AND FLANDERS CRITICAL

"It declares our willingness to consider, by due constitutional process, our own cooperation in one way or another if we feel our own national interests are involved. But it warns that self-help and mutual aid are prerequisites.

"Our cooperation must be a supplement to, not a substitute for, the adequate and continuous defensive activities of others."

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (Democrat, of Arkansas) complained that the resolution gave no encouragement to political union in Europe.

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS (Republican of Vermont) a supporter of the so-called Culbertson plan for revising the charter at once thought the resolution should make a stronger call for charter revision. Senators GEORGE W. MALONE (Democrat, of Nevada), and GLEN TAYLOR (Democrat, Idaho) argued that the resolution was a step on the road to war.

But the debate did not really come to life until Senator PEPPER launched into a long argument against regional pacts as a danger to peace. The League of Nations was destroyed, he said, by having too many collateral pacts like the Locarno Treaty formed outside it. "The same error," he warned, "will undermine the foundations of the UN."

VANDENBERG's most fervent support yesterday came from Democratic Senators WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, and CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico. "We cannot decline to take this step at this time," said GEORGE, emphasizing the safeguards that surrounded it. And HATCH declared that "if this resolution will give these countries of Europe the courage they need to stand together, I'll vote for it."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I also wish to have incorporated in the RECORD the Washington Evening Star report on the Vandenberg resolution, as carried in today's Evening Star, the headline of which is "Senate action paves way for military aid to western Europe."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE ACTION PAVES WAY FOR MILITARY AID TO WESTERN EUROPE—REGIONAL DEFENSE PACTS TO DISCOURAGE AGGRESSION ENDORSED, 64 TO 4

(By J. A. O'Leary)

Military as well as economic aid to western Europe may become a part of this country's effort to insure peace, as the result of action taken by the Senate yesterday.

Without committing itself in advance to any specific arrangement, the Senate endorsed the principle of regional defense pacts among like-minded nations to discourage aggression until the world is ready to give the United Nations Organization the force it needs to prevent wars from starting.

By a vote of 64 to 4, it adopted the Vandenberg resolution recommending six steps to make the UN a more effective peace agency, including a general endorsement of the regional agreements authorized by one section of the Charter.

HOUSE ACTION NOT REQUIRED

Since the resolution requires no action by the House, it does not have the force of law. Its approval was another important milestone in the development of existing bipartisan foreign policy, however, because it holds out to the anti-Communist countries of western Europe the hope of later action by the United States, looking to their mutual defense.

It is not expected that any specific agreements growing out of the resolution will be submitted to Congress before the end of this year.

Only Senator PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, offered any serious resistance to the regional defense pact plan, and when the roll was called on final passage, he picked up the support of Senators LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota; WATKINS, Republican, of Utah; and TAYLOR, Democrat, of Idaho. The latter is running for Vice President on the Wallace third-party ticket.

Earlier, a motion by Senator PEPPER to strike out reference to regional agreements was lost, 61 to 6.

KEM AND MALONE SUPPORT PEPPER

Senators KEM, of Missouri, and MALONE, of Nevada, both Republicans, supported the Pepper amendment, but on final passage they did not vote because they were paired with two absentee supporters of the resolution.

Senator VANDENBERG assured the Senate its action does not mean automatic military alliances, but is a plan for American cooperation with like-minded nations, within the framework of the UN, to keep the peace. The Michigan Republican said it would serve as a warning to any "possible aggressor who might sneer at any arguments save those of force."

Senator PEPPER, however, called it a return to the old balance-of-power method of preventing war, and insisted the UN could never become a central peace enforcement agency if the world is divided into three camps. He had reference to the Rio pact between this country and South America, the proposed western European defense group and the Soviet bloc.

SIMILAR MOVE IN HOUSE

While the Vandenberg resolution goes direct to the President in the form of "advice," the question is due to come up separately in the House. The Foreign Affairs Committee of that body has approved a similar declaration of policy, but has written it into a bill authorizing a $65,000,000 fund to erect the new United Nations building in New York City. If the House passes that bill, the Senate will have to act on the proposal again, and send it to the President, if the building fund is to be provided.

Other steps which the Senate resolution suggests for strengthening UN include efforts to modify the Security Council's veto power, creation of the UN armed force contemplated in the Charter, and efforts to bring about multilateral disarmament agreements.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the next article which I wish to have incorporated in the RECORD appears in today's Philadelphia Inquirer, the first paragraph of which is as follows:

The Senate tonight adopted, by a vote of 64 to 4, the Vandenberg resolution calling for a stronger United Nations and eventual United States support of collective defense pacts against aggression.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PLEDGES DEMOCRACIES AID

(By Nicholas P. Gregory)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The Senate tonight adopted, by a vote of 64 to 4, the Vandenberg resolution calling for a stronger United Nations and eventual United States support of collective defense pacts against aggression.

The decision was taken after 8 hours of debate, during which opponents of the resolution charged that the United States was embarking on a plan to wreck the UN through collective pacts with western Europe.

HOUSE MAY ACT, TOO

Inasmuch as the Senate has sole authority over treaties, it is not necessary for the House to adopt a similar resolution, although one has been introduced. Chairman CHARLES A. EATON, Republican, of New Jersey, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, believes that the House will enact a similar resolution now that the Senate has voted for its own overwhelmingly.

Senate President ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan), author of the resolution, called for adoption to show that the United States is interested in a stronger UN and thereby demonstrate to the world it had only peace in mind in voting yesterday to revive the draft.

"It is necessary to demonstrate we are not preoccupied with bombs and bayonets," the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee declared. "Another war will not be our fault."

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

In approving defense preparations, VANDENBERG said, Congress should also "renew its relentless dedication" to collective security. He asserted that the resolution is "a demonstration that we had peace in mind" in passing the draft.

VANDENBERG bluntly stated that it is necessary for the United States to enter collective pacts with Western European countries to stop aggression, but Senators GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada), CLAUDE E. PEPPER (Democrat, Florida), and GLEN TAYLOR (Idaho), third-party Vice Presidential candidate, attacked the resolution on that score.

PEPPER PLAN LOSES

PEPPER spoke for more than half an hour against the Vandenberg measure, and then offered an amendment to eliminate all reference to United States support for collective security pacts. The amendment was defeated by a roll call vote of 61 to 6.

PEPPER charged the resolution was a "prelude to a subsequent request that we enter into a military union" similar to the economic union in the European recovery program. He decried the "bypassing" of the UN, and declared "there must come an end sometime to the decentralization and wreckage of the UN organization."

The Florida Democrat said it was very clear from the history of this resolution that this is the consummation of plans carefully produced to prepare this country for a military alliance with western Europe.

Malone charged the resolution was a war move and said it would invoke retaliation from Russia. VANDENBERG objected to MALONE'S interpretation, TAYLOR declared that this "country is drifting toward war."

The resolution asks these six steps to make the UN a more effective instrument for peace:

1. Limitation of the Security Council veto to questions of peaceful settlement and the admission of new members.

* * * * *

3. United States participation in such regional arrangements "as are based on con-

tinuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security."

4. Making clear the determination of this country to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense should any armed attack affect its security.

5. Joining in efforts to provide the UN with the armed forces contemplated in the Charter and to obtain agreement among member nations for regulation and reduction of armaments with suitable guaranties.

6. If necessary, after adequate effort toward strengthening the UN, seeking a review of the Charter at an appropriate time.

CHARTER REVISION DROPPED

VANDENBERG offered his resolution after a group of other Senators had called for drastically revising the UN Charter "with or without Russia." VANDENBERG and Secretary of State George C. Marshall advised against action along that line.

Thirty-two Republicans and an equal number of Democrats supported the resolution on final passage. Two Republicans—WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah—opposed it, as did PEPPER and TAYLOR.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD today's PM article on the same subject, the first paragraph of which is as follows:

The Senate passed tonight the VANDENBERG resolution holding out the prospect—if Congress later approves—of American military aid to non-Communist nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE VOTES TO ASK UN TO DROP VETO ON DISPUTES

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The Senate passed tonight the VANDENBERG resolution holding out the prospect—if Congress later approves—of American military aid to non-Communist nations.

The resolution, which requires no action by the House or President Truman, calls on the United Nations to drop the Security Council veto on peaceful settlement of disputes and on admission of new members. The vote was 64 to 4.

It was sponsored by Chairman ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Approval came after more than 7½ hours' debate.

The Michigan Senator told his colleagues that passage of the resolution in the wake of draft law approval shows the Senate is not preoccupied with bombs and bayonets.

UNITED STATES POLICY

The resolution states that this country's policy would be to join with regional groups of other nations for common defense, under the UN Charter, if its security is threatened. Several Senators objected that this means a military alliance with western Europe.

But VANDENBERG said Congress must approve in advance any action of this kind. He said the resolution does not call for revival of the old open-end military lend-lease but proposes aid to other countries as a supplement, not a substitute, for self-defense.

VANDENBERG offered his resolution after a group of other Senators had called for drastically revising the UN Charter—with or without Russia, as a number of them said.

COUNTERADVICE

Both VANDENBERG and Secretary of State Marshall advised against action along that line, saying Russian withdrawal from the UN would widen the breach between east and west and make negotiations even more difficult than at present. The Vandenberg resolution also favors setting up the international peace-keeping force authorized by the UN Charter. In addition, it proposes worldwide regulation and reduction of armaments under adequate and dependable guaranty against aggression.

The House has before it a bill along the lines of the Vandenberg resolution. No date has been set for a vote on it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is one other reference to the subject in today's Washington Daily News, in which a similar sentiment is expressed, as follows:

Each branch ticked off a major piece of legislation yesterday. The Senate approved a resolution calling for a stronger UN and eventual United States support of antiaggression alliances in Europe.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HILL CALLS SESSION TODAY IN SEEKING TO ADJOURN IN WEEK

Senate Republican leaders today indicated a growing willingness to meet next Saturday's adjournment deadline on whatever date the House insists.

Both House and Senate scheduled unusual Saturday sessions in an effort to clean up "must" legislation.

One GOP leader said the adjournment date will depend on whether the Republican Policy Committee decides whether the Senate should try to pass a civil-rights bill or the Mundt-Nixon Communist-control measure. But he intimated strongly that both are headed for a pigeonhole.

The antilynching bill was revised by the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday to meet some objections but not to the extent that it could avoid a filibuster by southern Senators.

The House has not passed an antilynching bill but has approved an anti-poll-tax measure. That might be considered by the Senate if leaders decide to press one of the civil-rights proposals.

If the Senate doesn't adjourn a week from today, both Houses will have to come back to Washington, either between the Republican and Democratic conventions, or later in the summer.

Each branch ticked off a major piece of legislation yesterday. The Senate approved a resolution calling for a stronger UN and eventual United States support of antiaggression alliances in Europe.

ISSUANCE MONTHLY OF PUBLICATION ENTITLED "ECONOMIC INDICATORS"

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate approved several resolutions, among which was a joint resolution providing that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report be authorized to issue a monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators." That joint resolution (S. J. Res. 226) reads as follows:

That the Joint Committee on the Economic Report be authorized to issue a monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators," and that a sufficient quantity be printed to furnish one copy to each Member of Congress; the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate; the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; the libraries of the Senate and House, and the Congressional Library; 300 copies to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; and the required number of copies to the Superintendent of Documents for distribution to depository libraries; and that the Superintendent of Documents be authorized to have copies printed for sale to the public.

Inadvertently, provision for two copies to be supplied to the libraries of the Senate and the House was omitted. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 226 was passed. When that is done I desire to offer an amendment to insert after the semicolon on line 8, page 1, the words "two copies to."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska to reconsider the votes by which Senate Joint Resolution 226 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed? The Chair hears none, and the votes are reconsidered. The joint resolution is before the Senate.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 226) to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, at the end of line 8, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert "two copies to."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that a unanimous-consent request has already been granted that when the Senate shall recess at the conclusion of the session today, it recess until next Monday at 11 a. m. The unfinished business is the consideration of the reciprocal trade-agreements bill. A unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into, to vote on the bill at 5 o'clock, the time before that hour to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the measure. Senators can find in the RECORD the names of the Senators who have charge of the time, and if they wish to speak with reference to the bill they may see the Senators in charge of the time.

PERIOD OF SERVICE UNDER THE DRAFT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks with reference to a speech which was delivered on Thursday, June 10, appearing on page 7662 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, by my very good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. Ordinarily I would not take the time subsequently to reply to a speech after a vote has been taken on the issue to which the speech refers.

However, in order to keep the record perfectly clear as to the differences in point of view between the junior Senator from Washington and the junior Senator from Oregon on my amendment,

which sought to reduce the term of service per draftee from 24 months to 18 months, I feel that it is necessary and proper that I make these remarks on the speech made by the Senator from Washington.

I told the Senator from Washington that I would make these remarks before the afternoon was over, and he said he would endeavor to be present, but in any event he wanted me to feel perfectly free to proceed to make this statement for the RECORD, because he is fully aware of the position which I am taking on his speech.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that it was quite appropriate for the Senator from Washington to make the speech he did make on June 10 while I was not on the floor of the Senate, because after all, we were debating at that time under a unanimous-consent agreement involving a limitation-of-debate agreement, and it was impossible for me to be on the floor of the Senate when time was allotted to the Senator from Washington under that unanimous-consent agreement. I was in attendance at a very important meeting of a subcommittee.

Mr. President, I wish to say good naturedly that I am afraid that the Senator from Washington was seeing a mirage when he thought he saw an inconsistency in the position which I had taken on the amendment which I offered seeking to reduce the term of service per draftee to a period of less than 24 months. To use another figure of speech, I think the Senator from Washington in his speech charging me with being inconsistent, built up a straw man and proceeded to tear it down. I submit that an examination of my language will not show the inconsistency the Senator from Washington thought he saw in my remarks. If by an inconsistency he means that at one time during the course of the debate I proposed that the length of service be reduced from 24 months to 12 months, and then on a subsequent day perfected my amendment so as to increase the length of service from 12 months to 18 months—if by inconsistency he means the mathematical difference in those two figures, then I am perfectly willing to plead guilty to an inconsistency. But I suggest that what the Senator from Washington should have done was to analyze further my comments, to see the reasons I gave for the change in perfecting my amendment by providing for 12 months rather than 18 months of service per individual draftee.

In order to reply to the Senator I wish to read this portion of his speech of June 10. He said:

> The Senator from Oregon has spoken on the subject of the length of the draft on two occasions during this week. If he was right on one occasion, he was completely and alarmingly wrong on the other. In changing positions in two short days' time his testimony is subject to serious doubt and searching inquiry by every Member of the Senate who is deeply concerned about the problem of how best to maintain and preserve America's security.
>
> The Senator from Oregon told us last night, both feelingly and at length, that it was the will of the American people that a draft period of service be limited to 18 months. He attempted to prove this. I quote his argument, but only in part. On page 7817 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9 I find this paragraph, the Senator from Oregon speaking:
>
> "I have some evidence in support of that judgment on my part, and that evidence takes a variety of forms. It is based upon many conversations as I have gone about this land. It is based upon audience reactions in open-forum discussions on military manpower legislation; it is based on a great mass of correspondence and telegrams I have received on the subject.
>
> "I have deliberately, in my many public discussions in this country, raised the question of military manpower legislation. I have sought to provoke discussion among my audiences in order to learn the attitude of the members of the audiences on the question of military manpower. I have talked to a very good cross section of the American people in those audiences—labor audiences, businessmen's audiences, general audiences. All I can say to my colleagues in the Senate on that object is that on the basis of those many observations I am satisfied that my proposal for 18 months represents the will of public opinion as of tonight."

Then the Senator from Washington proceeded in his argument:

> There is much more the Senator from Oregon said last night in support of his contention that an 18 months' training period was sufficient. We must not forget that that was last night. But, Mr. President, what did the Senator from Oregon have to say on the same subject on Monday of this week? I quote from page 7451 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, the following statement by the Senator from Oregon:
>
> "I want the RECORD to emphasize tonight that I believe 12 months' training will provide the basic training necessary for a future Army in case of an international incident which might cause us to mobilize all of our manpower at a very rapid rate."
>
> And again:
>
> "But I am satisfied from the hearings and from the record made before the Armed Services Committee that 12 months' service under the draft law will give these men the basic training they need for future service in the Army. If following the 12 months' period they go into the various branches of the Reserve I think the final bill, with my amendment in it, will then give us the national security we need and will accomplish in the main all we seek to accomplish by the pending measure on the 24 months' basis."

Mr. President, I submit that there is no inconsistency between the sections of my two speeches on this subject from which the Senator from Washington was kind enough to quote. The Senator from Washington, in his comments on my speeches, I state most respectfully, did not give due weight to the language of the quotation from my June 7 speech which he used in his argument, because when I was suggesting a 12-month period of service per draftee, I said, in the very remarks quoted by the Senator from Washington:

> I am satisfied from the hearings and from the record made before the Armed Services Committee that 12 months' service under the draft law will give these men the basic training they need for future service in the Army.

When I offered the first amendment I was seeking to put into effect the arguments which men high in the military branch of our Government themselves put into the record before the Armed Services Committee, to the effect that they could do a good job of giving to men in 12 months what is referred to in the Army as the basic training. In fact, when in the Armed Services Committee we were hearing witnesses from the military branch of the Army, we had much testimony from them to the effect that under the universal military-training program they could do a pretty good job of giving the men the basic training necessary for Army service if followed by assignment in the Reserve Army in 6 months. That is why the universal military-training program called for a 6 months' period of training with future training in the Reserve. It was a program of 6 months' training strongly recommended by the Army itself.

I wish respectfully to suggest to the Senator from Washington that he needs to keep in mind that in discussing these two amendments of mine I was talking about two quite different programs, first, a program which would have built up the Reserve we need, and which at the same time would give the men the basic training they need for future service in the Army in case some international incident leading us to war should occur.

Of course, what I had in mind when I introduced my amendment calling for 12 months' service was that part of that 12 months' period of service would be used by the Army in training the draftees not only in this country, but at so-called foreign outposts. We have been doing just that for a long time past with the young volunteers in the Army who have volunteered for the Army since VJ-day. We have sent to Germany hundreds of young men 17 and 18 years of age who have not had more than 4 months of so-called basic training here in our own country. I found in my inspections of our Army in Europe that we had many men over there who had not had even 4 months' basic training here at home before we sent them to Europe. I came back and on the floor of the Senate on one occasion I protested sending 17- and 18-year-old men over to Europe who had not had more than 4 months of basic military training. I want to keep the record straight on that.

It was my view when I offered the 12 months' basic training amendment that perhaps we would continue the practice of sending some men to our foreign outposts during the latter half of the first year or during the last 4 months of their service and complete the basic training there.

After submitting that amendment, Mr. President, I talked to some men high in our Army, both civilian and military officers themselves. They said—and I want to be completely frank about the testimony they gave to me personally and I want the RECORD to show it—they said, "We want you to understand, Senator, that we prefer 24 months of service for each draftee, but if there is going to be any reduction from 24 months, we suggest 18 months." They told me they preferred 18 months to 12 months. They said, "We can complete the job of basic training in 12 months, and we would like to do that for the most part within our country, and then we could use some of

the draftees for 6 months after basic training in our foreign occupation operations." They pointed out that the change in my amendment from 12 months' service to 18 months' service would enable them to send men abroad for 6 months' foreign service after 12 months' basic training here at home.

It should be kept in mind that in the original proposal of the Army for a universal military training program based upon 6 months of service the Army would have been dependent upon voluntary enlistments for services abroad because it was not contemplated to use any of the universal military training trainees for foreign service. One reason for proposing the draft was that it was believed that the Army would not get a sufficient number of voluntary enlistments along with the universal military training program in order to meet our immediate needs of men for foreign service duty. Under the universal military training program it was contemplated that our reserves would be built up by requiring the trainees after 6 months' service to go into the Reserve components of the Army for further service.

However, either one of my proposals for a 12 months' period or an 18 months' period would be very effective in meeting both our immediate military manpower needs and our future reserve needs. When I was advised by friends in the Military Establishment that if they had to accept less than the 24 months' period of draftee service they thought they could do a much better job under an 18 months' period than under the 12 months' period I came on to the floor of the Senate and suggested a perfecting change in my amendment from 12 months to 18 months. I thought I had made that clear at the time I made the change.

I also want to be frank and say that I made the change further for another reason, a reason which I am sure the Senator from Washington and every other Member of the Senate will understand, and a reason also I think the Senator from Washington on more than one occasion has put into practice, namely, that in discussing the amendment with colleagues on the floor of the Senate, a great many of them said, "WAYNE, we will be more inclined to go along with you and vote for your amendment if you will modify it to an 18 months' proposal rather than a 12 months' proposal. We think the Army can do a much better job in 18 months and we think that we should let the Army have about 6 months additional service from the draftees after 12 months of basic training."

After discussing the matter with some of the Senators on the Senate floor, and after discussing the matter with men high in our Military Establishment, who urged the desirability of 6 months' foreign assignment after 12 months of basic training given here at home, I perfected my amendment to provide for the 18 months' period.

Therefore, in light of this explanation of the history of my two amendments, I want to say that after reading all the remarks of the Senator from Washington contained in his speech of June 10, I fail to find that awful inconsistency which caused him in the first instance to charge me with being inconsistent. If Senators will keep in mind that the objectives that we must face, as far as raising military manpower is concerned, are, first, the objective of obtaining the immediate manpower we need to fill out the ranks of our Army, and second, to give us the military manpower we need in order to send into the Reserves at the end of their service in the draft a sufficient number of men to build up a very strong Reserve army for the next few years, I think they will find no real inconsistency in my remarks.

Before I close I want to say that I have been very much interested in reactions which I have received to the bill we passed the other day calling for 24 months' service. I find in talking to a great many people who are very familiar with military training, that there is a general consensus of opinion that 18 months of service would give us an Army well trained to meet any immediate exigency that might arise. Now a word or two about the argument of the Senator from Washington in support of the 24-month period.

The Senator from Washington in his argument proceeded to discuss the desirability of having men in the service for longer than 18 months, because in his judgment it would better train them for combat service. Of course I am willing to agree that 24 months' training should make a better combat soldier than training for a lesser period of time. Keeping them in the Army for 3 years or 4 years or 5 years would do that also.

The point I want to stress, Mr. President, again is that we are dealing here with a peacetime Army. We are not at war. I have every reason to believe that we are going to keep out of war. I think passing a draft law requiring 18 months' service would have served notice just as effectively on Soviet Russia that we intend to build an Army sufficiently trained in what we call our basic training to enforce the peace as we did by passing the bill with the 24-month period. I think the bill with my amendment calling for 18 months' service would have given us all the benefit that the draft bill could possibly give us as a check upon any aggressive attitude on the part of Russia. The bill with my amendment in it would have made clear to Russia that we intend to build up our Reserve Army so we can enforce the peace if she decides to break it.

After all, taking men out of civilian life for 2 years, Mr. President, is a tremendous charge upon their lives. It is no small matter in peacetime to take 2 years of civilian living away from young men who are trying to prepare for their educations, economic pursuits, and home making.

I am convinced that we could have done the job with 12 months of basic training with no extra service after that except in the Reserves, but after I talked to the military subsequent to my submission of the first amendment and they argued that the basic training alone would not be sufficient to meet the essential needs of the Army right now, I changed my amendment from 12 to 18 months. I knew that they were making strong representations to other Senators against my amendment, and had it not been for that I would have stuck to the 12-month period irrespective of whether that would have resulted in my getting more or fewer votes on the floor of the Senate for my amendment. Nevertheless I agreed, Mr. President, that it was fair and reasonable to ask for the additional 6 months' service, because of the need to increase the number of men to be assigned to foreign duty. However, I think the job could be done with 12 months of service. I am convinced that it is unreasonable and unfair to require 24 months' service. I proposed the 18 months' period as a reasonable compromise. If that makes me inconsistent, then it is a common crime among all Senators, because each one of us frequently work out compromises between conflicting proposals. We would not pass much legislation in the Senate if we did not do that.

The Senator from Washington in his statement made comments about the cost of the 18 months' service which I proposed. I answered that the other day in my speech of June 9. Suffice it to say now, Mr. President, that I do not think we can justify keeping men in the Army for the 6 months over and above my 18-month suggestion on any ground of cost if, in fact, the 18 months' period would have given us an Army of men sufficiently trained in basic training, and given us an Army which would permit us to assign men to 6 months of foreign duty to the extent necessary.

I think the young men of the country are entitled to have their Government spend the additional millions that it would cost in order to save them the extra 6 months' service which is now going to be exacted from them as the result of defeating my amendment calling for 18 months of service rather than 24 months of draft service.

As I recall, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] put into the RECORD the estimate that my amendment would cost an additional $300,000,000 a year. I do not know whether that is the exact figure or not, but if it is an accurate figure, then I say that is indeed a small additional cost in comparison to charge of time which Congress is exacting from the men under the 24-month requirement. I think it is an unreasonable charge upon their time.

The last point I want to make, Mr. President, is that I am willing to let time judge whether the junior Senator from Washington or the junior Senator from Oregon is right on this issue. But come 2 years from now when he and I sit on the floor of the Senate side by side, as we do, continuing the fine friendship that exists between us, I think I can hear the Senator from Washington 2 years hence say to me: "WAYNE, I am inclined to think that there would not be as much public opposition to a continuance of this draft if we had followed your advice 2 years ago and made the period of draft service 18 months' service instead of 24."

I am perfectly willing to let time settle the dispute that exists between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oregon.

STOCK-PILING OF MINERALS AND SHORTAGE OF CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC METALS AND MINERALS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion over the radio, in the press, and in leading magazines over the slowness with which we are building our national stock pile of minerals; the shortage of critical and strategic metals and minerals; and the distressed condition of a large segment of our domestic mining industry. In these discussions it has been emphasized that the Stock-Piling Act of 1946 in itself is not sufficient to insure our national defense, and that we must have special legislation to encourage our prospectors and potential investors in the hazardous business of mining if we are to maintain our national security.

TO DEVELOP LARGE MINES—MUST FIRST HAVE SMALL MINES

Mr. President, to develop large mines we must first have small mines. To have small mines we must first have the prospects or the outcrops of minerals. To find such prospects or outcrops of minerals we must first have prospectors and incentive capital investors. For men to spend their time and capital in the speculative business of mining, they must be assured of a reasonable chance of a profit at the end of the rainbow when they find such minerals.

THE STOCK-PILING ACT

It should be remembered that on July 23, 1946, when President Truman signed the Stock-Piling Act, he did so reluctantly, for he specifically objected to applying the principles of the Buy American Act of 1933 to proposed purchases of raw materials. He said then:

> The overriding importance of empowering the Government to acquire stock piles overcomes my reluctance to sign the bill.

Further, he said:

> There can be serious conflict between the provisions of the bill and the foreign economic policy which the Government is actively pursuing.

The President evidently had no objection to the application of the Buy American Act principle to the purchase of manufactured articles originating in the United States. But he has shown repeatedly that he objects to applying the same rules which apply to other items to the purchase of raw materials from domestic producers. These producers have the same high-cost conditions which prevail throughout American industry, as compared with low-cost wages and slave-labor conditions which prevail in many countries from which the raw materials are imported.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

The White House press release at the time the President signed the Stock-Piling Act further stated that the legislation clearly indicates that the stock-piling program should not be used as a means of generally subsidizing those domestic producers who otherwise could not compete successfully with other domestic or foreign producers. Further, the President said:

> To insure that the necessary stock piles are accumulated as rapidly as deemed advisable and with a minimum of cost to the public, this act—the Stock-Piling Act—should not be used as a device to give domestic interests an advantage over foreign producers of strategic materials greater than that provided by the tariff laws.

TARIFFS CONSISTENTLY LOWERED

At this point I invite attention to the fact that the tariffs have been consistently lowered over the period of operation of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, the word "reciprocal" being a catchword invented to sell the idea to the public, since the word "reciprocal" does not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

LOW-WAGE EUROPEAN AND ASIATIC LABOR DIRECT COMPETITION

The low-wage European and Asiatic countries are therefore placed in direct competition with American high-wage-living-standard workers. In the production of tungsten, for example, the 8- or 9-dollar-per-day American miner is competing directly with a 40-cent-per-day Chinese workman.

Members of the Senate will recall that only last year we suspended temporarily the import tax on copper and, just recently, Congress passed legislation permitting lead to be imported free of duty. It is apparent that these measures were passed to help foreign producers, but nothing has been done to help the domestic producers.

My purpose here is to show that the President's position when he signed the Stock-Piling Act, and the present position of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. William E. Warne, as indicated by his letter dated June 4, 1948, sent to both the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, are quite inconsistent. In the letter, Mr. Warne states:

> The existing Stock-Piling Act contains the necessary authority for the stimulation of production if the necessary money is appropriated and made available for that purpose.

Let us see how it has stimulated production under the guidance of the Truman administration.

ADMINISTRATION AGAINST DOMESTIC MINERALS IN STOCK PILE

The same hostility of the administration to the purchasing of domestically mined metals or minerals for stock-piling purposes was shown when the Chairman of the Munitions Board requested an interpretation of the "Buy American" clause of the Stock-Piling Act from John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President. Prior to this action, domestic producers had construed the "Buy American" clause to mean that a domestic producer was to be given preferential treatment over the low-cost foreign producers in the sale of his metal to the United States Government, making up approximately the differential of cost between this Nation and where the competition is located, due to the difference in the wage standard of living.

This is not the way the Stock-Piling Act is being administered, for the Steelman reply to the Munitions Board inquiry placed an entirely different interpretation upon the provisions of the act from that clearly set forth in the legislation by the Congress of the United States. I quote from the Steelman directive:

> The Buy American Act required that the Government purchase domestically produced commodities but excludes from this rule cases where domestic purchases are determined "to be inconsistent with the public interest or the cost to be unreasonable."
>
> For the purpose of establishing a criterion in deciding the reasonableness of cost of domestic products, the Director of Procurement of the Treasury Department, in 1934, directed that a differential of 25 percent will apply in favor of domestic articles, materials, or supplies on purchases where the foreign bid exceeds $100. This practice is embodied in Circular No. 37, as revised in 1939, which is still in effect for purchases governed generally by the Buy American Act.

Mr. President, it is clear that the Government bureaus not only expect the high-wage-living-standard domestic producer to meet the low-wage standard foreign competition, but they expect a reduction on the larger purchases:

> The Bureau of Federal Supply points out that the functioning of this differential seems to have been recently somewhat misunderstood and, in this connection, has submitted the following explanation: The purpose of the Congress in passing the Buy American Act was to have the Government buy domestically produced materials when their purchase is in accord with the public interest and their cost is not unreasonable. But, clearly, it was not the intention of Congress to give an unnecessary bonus to American producers.

MINERALS SHOULD BE SOLD AT OR BELOW THE MARKET PRICES

Thus, if an item produced in this country normally sells in the domestic market in competition with foreign material at a quoted market price, there is no basis in the act, or in Circular No. 37, for the expectation that the Bureau of Federal Supply will purchase the item at a price in excess of the quoted market price. Purchases in such cases should be at not over the market price and, in view of the magnitude of purchases by the Government, some concession from the market price might even be expected.

> In cases of this kind, the proper application of the differential would be to determine whether or not to accept a foreign bid in which the foreign bidder has offered to sell at less than the quoted market price.
>
> If domestic production of an item is normally small and little or none of it is sold in competition with foreign production, there may not be any recognized domestic market price for the material as distinguished from a world market price. In such cases, a domestic bid which is greater than the foreign bid should be accepted only if: (1) It does not exceed the maximum allowable differential; (2) it is justified by prudent Government buying policy; and (3) it is reasonable in the light of relevant price factors.

REJECTION OF DOMESTIC BIDS FOR MINERALS

It is clearly unreasonable under the Buy American Act, and not contemplated by Circular No. 37, that a domestic producer should expect an award if he bids above the world market price, merely because he feels that the Government will be compelled to buy from him at a premium.

> With respect to the other exception mentioned, namely, domestic purchases "inconsistent with the public interest," it is not now practicable to formulate an over-all policy because of the multiplicity of considerations that must be taken into account. Accordingly, at least for the present, a case-by-case analysis must be followed in applying this exception. For example, there may be a few cases where domestic sources should be conserved or supplemented and, for that

reason, a particular product should be obtained from foreign sources.

It is plain that application of the statutory exception with respect to the public interest may, in some cases, result in the rejection of a domestic bid whether or not the cost would be unreasonable within the meaning of the act. The views herein expressed have been discussed with representatives of the Army-Navy Munitions Board and the Bureau of Federal Supply. There is common agreement on such views, and they have my approval.

VIEWS OF PRESIDENT CLEAR

Mr. President, the views of the President of the United States with reference to using domestic-produced materials for stock-piling purposes are thus clearly stated, first, in his public release when he signed the Stock-Piling Act, and, second, in the directive signed by John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President. In view of these facts, how can the Department of the Interior take the position that domestic producers will receive any benefits under Public Law 520? If, as the Department contends, Public Law 520 (60 Stat. 596, 50 U. S. C., sec. 98 et seq.) contains the necessary authority for the stimulation of production if the necessary money is appropriated and made available for that purpose—again quoting from the letter received from Mr. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior—then why has not the executive department of the Government carried out the mandate of Congress and built a stock pile of strategic and critical materials? The act has been in operation since 1946, and today we know the stock pile is dangerously low. The facts are that instead of building up a stock pile of certain metals, the Government has sold copper and lead to industry. This may be commendable, but what about our domestic mining industry and our national safety?

NO DOMESTIC PRODUCER ENCOURAGED

It is clear from the actions of the administration that practically no domestic producer can expect to receive much encouragement in the production of strategic and critical minerals within the United States for stock-piling purposes under present legislation. To my knowledge, only one contract has been made with a domestic producer for the production of lead for stock-piling purposes, and that contract, which was for a period of years, was at a price below the present quoted price in New York. Other producers who attempted to make contracts with our Government to supply strategic or critical materials have had very sad experiences; and few, if any, are convinced that any real satisfaction will be achieved in negotiating contracts with the Bureau of Federal Supply, the Munitions Board or, in fact, any agency of the Government, under present laws.

ADMINISTRATION POLICIES CURTAIL PRODUCTION

A considered appraisal of the condition of the domestic-mining industry shows clearly that, almost without exception, the policies of the present administration have been designed to curtail, rather than help, the development of the domestic mining industry, which has been working to increase production under the highest cost conditions which ever have prevailed in the industry. Numerous restrictive measures enacted under the guidance of this administration have placed innumerable burdens upon the industry, until we find that throughout the developing segment of the industry, and particularly among the small mines of the Nation, distress prevails. On May 28, on the occasion of the introduction of my mineral-development and national-security bill, Senate bill 2756, I presented to the Senate exact figures showing the large numbers of individual mine shut-downs which have taken place under present administration policies. True, the large low-cost mines of the Nation have been able to step up production since the return of veterans to these fortunate mining operations.

There are several such fortunate mines in the State of Nevada, and I commend both management and labor for the increased production so badly needed from these mines. But the existence of satisfactory conditions in these large low-cost-mining operations does not mean that equally large properties and literally thousands of smaller mines throughout the Nation are not being closed or are not suffering serious repercussions from the unfortunate veto of the Allen bill passed during the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

TO PREVENT SMALL MINES FROM CLOSING

Members of Congress from mining districts will agree that hundreds, yes, thousands, of letters have been received urging Congress to enact legislation similar to that passed for the agricultural industry, the shipping industry, and numerous other industries, to prevent the complete destruction of the small mines of America and aid in the development of and prospecting for additional properties.

In the tri-State district of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri, pillars ordinarily used to support the roofs of mining operations are being pulled out and shipped elsewhere in an effort to keep other mines from closing. Neglect and destruction of our mineral resources—a disgrace to our generation—are taking place.

LARGE VERSUS SMALL MINES

Factories are being closed in all sections of the Nation for lack of copper, lead, and other strategic and critical materials. In spite of the fine record made by the large low-cost producers, such as Kennecott Copper Corp., St. Joe Lead, and others, our Government—yes, our Government—which is charged with the responsibility of stock-piling metals for the defense of our people, is unable to buy lead or copper in any substantial quantities for stock-piling purposes. In fact, the Stock-Piling Act was designed to prevent our Government from buying large stocks of these metals when they were required to keep our fabricating industries going. Our first line of defense is, naturally, a healthy manufacturing and processing operation, as well as a strong, active mining industry.

STOCK-PILING ACT NOT ADMINISTERED PROPERLY

Mr. President, my point in calling your attention to the policies of the administration and the Munitions Board with reference to the domestic mining industry is twofold: First, to show beyond any question of doubt that the Stock-Piling Act is not now, nor will it be under the present administration, administered so as to enlarge the domestic production of strategic and critical materials; and, second, to show that legislation in addition to the Stock-Piling Act is necessary for the national defense of our country. Even the administration agrees with the latter statement.

In view of our experiences during the last war, we cannot afford to leave the national defense and security of our country dependent upon the whims and fancies of foreign producers. The sinking of 52 out of 60 boats carrying minerals to the United States during the war, and the fact that Russia is reported to have a larger and more efficient submarine fleet than the Germans had during the last war, are additional reasons why it is highly important to our national well-being and safety that legislation designed to enlarge domestic production and exploration for minerals should be enacted by this Congress.

WAR PRODUCTION

A great deal could be said in commendation of the mining industry for the fine job done during the war in producing the metals and minerals needed for victory; but, Mr. President, the Congress seems to have forgotten that the mining industry in a great many instances depleted reserves in an all-out effort to produce the metals for victory. In fact, exploration was put aside until a more opportune time when manpower and equipment would be available for exploration and development work. Under present cost conditions, many producers find that they cannot carry on exploration and development work without having our Government assume part of the responsibility for our national security supply.

PURCHASE CONTRACTS—SMALL MINES

Not only have the Munitions Board and the armed services taken a strong position against stock-piling domestically produced minerals, but from testimony before the various congressional committees it is clear that neither the Navy nor the Army wants any part in a program designed to encourage domestic production or to study the economics of the mining industry. The Navy's comments were summed up by W. J. Kenney, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, before the House Armed Services Committee, when he stated that—

> Negotiation of contracts by the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, through the Secretary of the Treasury, to purchase high-cost materials and thus permit continued operations of small domestic mines, is in effect the extension of a subsidy to such operations, a function not theretofore imposed upon the War and Navy Departments, and one which, in the present instance, can only be carried through by diversion of the funds appropriated for basic stock piling or through the appropriation of additional funds for that specific purpose.

ARMED SERVICES' ATTITUDE

The Navy Department believes that responsibility for prospecting, exploring, and developing new mineral resources is more properly covered within the responsibilities of section 7 (a) of Public

Law 520, and that it should not be imposed upon the War and Navy Departments without separate legislation and separate appropriations, if that is in fact the will of Congress.

The War Department's view, expressed before the same committee, can be summed up in the testimony of the Secretary of the Army as follows:

> It is my feeling that the question of subsidizing marginal industries and/or exploring or developing domestic products beyond the limited encouragement expressed in Public Law 520 should be kept entirely separate from the work of accumulating and maintaining a national defense stock pile of critical and strategic materials in accordance with the current provisions of Public Law 520.

The net result of this testimony by the armed services indicates that there is no opposition to the enactment by Congress of legislation which would encourage production of metals and minerals within the United States. But, it is quite apparent from the testimony that the armed services want no part of the administration of such a program and would much prefer to have it under the direction of an agency of our Government more familiar with the mining industry, its requirements, and needs.

NEW LEGISLATION—SENATE BILL 2756—THE MALONE BILL

It is for that purpose, Mr. President, that I have introduced legislation which would place within an incentive division of the United States Bureau of Mines the responsibility for administering a program designed to rebuild the mineral reserves of the United States and to encourage further mining development of the small-mine segment of the industry by the payment of incentives similar to those being paid to numerous other industries in a constructive program badly needed for the safety and security of this Nation.

This legislation is based largely upon the studies conducted under the operation of what was known as the premium-price plan during the war. The plan was criticized severely in its initial stages for it provided for controls, ceilings, and contained other undesirable features. However, after the discontinuation of controls and the installation of a system of exploration incentives, numerous new mines were developed, as well as many ore bodies which otherwise would not have been discovered.

The opposition to a renewal of this legislation by one or two of the major producers whose monopolistic tendencies are leading to the imposition of controls which are not desired either by the industry or the majority of the Members of Congress is not surprising. It is said that these companies reap greater benefits through open-market manipulation than they could possibly realize in the event that the mines of America, that is, the rank-and-file mines of America, are restored to a healthy condition.

"TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE"

Mr. President, I am familiar with the mining districts of the United States; I am a practicing engineer; I have visited many of these mining properties and I know the conditions which exist therein. I want to point out with all the emphasis at my command that it is high time that the Congress of the United States gave some special attention to the needs and requirements of additional development of the smaller mines as an invaluable support of the mining industry of America. My plea is not based entirely upon the welfare of the mining industry. It is based largely on the fact that I know that during the last war we heard much about "too little and too late." We saw fine Americans killed for lack of proper equipment in the early stages of the great world catastrophe.

Mr. President, troops were trained with wooden guns and the shortages of metals held up the offensive until the mining industry came to the rescue with increased production and know-how. Where would we have been had we depended entirely upon foreign production? Have we learned our lesson, or are we to make the same mistakes that were made by the same people who oppose this legislation designed to encourage and strengthen the mining industry today and which will make it possible for us to build up our stock piles of metals and minerals at the earliest possible date?

GOVERNMENT BUREAUS—"HAVE-NOT" NATION

Mr. President, for some peculiar reason the bureaus and departments of this Government have consistently insisted that we are a "have-not" Nation, and that we must depend almost wholly upon foreign sources for our so-called strategic and critical minerals.

I submit, Mr. President, that we are not a "have-not" Nation, if the unit price can be offered the domestic producer that will pay the differential of cost of production between the low-cost European and Asiatic labor and the American standard-of-living wages.

STOCK PILE AND GOING-CONCERN MINING INDUSTRY NECESSARY

Mr. President, in my opinion, no piece of legislation is more deserving of favorable consideration by the Congress of the United States than the legislation I have introduced on this subject. The present small stock pile is alarming. The condition of the mining industry is distressing. We would, in my opinion, be unable to meet any real emergency without both a stock pile and a healthy, active, going-concern mining industry.

PERIOD OF SERVICE UNDER THE DRAFT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I rise to respond in a most friendly yet positive way to my very good friend from Oregon, by reason of certain very interesting observations he made a few minutes ago on what he considered to be the consistency of the two positions which, prior to this afternoon, he had maintained throughout the present week on the need as he viewed it of having a draft period of 18 months rather than 24. It is not an easy matter to argue with the Senator from Oregon. I really mean it when I say he knows more about more things than almost any other Senator in this body. That he is well informed and exceedingly intelligent is an obvious understatement.

I conceive, however, that in the question presently before us, the Senator cannot avoid the entanglements of the particular contradiction into which he has placed himself. Within the next few minutes, and based upon the RECORD, I hope to reestablish that contradiction, which I tried as best I could to do in the earlier debate this week.

Before reading from what I think are two entirely dissimilar positions I should like to make clear only what is known to everybody, that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington come from neighboring States. We come from a land which is known commonly as the Pacific Northwest, an area of this country which is comparatively new, but very articulate, a country whose rich past is as nothing compared to what we jointly conceive will be its future. It is good under any and all circumstances either to work or to joust with the Senator from a neighboring State.

The Senator from Oregon has said there is no contradiction between his support on Monday of the amendment he mentioned, to provide for a 12-month draft period, and his proposal on Wednesday to provide for an 18-month period. For whatever it may be worth, my conviction is that there is between the two proposals as much difference as between day and night. Why do we even argue about it now, after the draft bill has been passed, which included a 24-month period as opposed to the 18-month period proposed by the Senator from Oregon?

I think we are entitled to and must argue the matter as between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington this afternoon, because, as the Senator from Oregon has so often said during the past week, the matter will be before the Congress again within the short period of 2 years. For that reason, we shall have occasion to refer to the record developed during the past week.

On Monday of this week, when the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered and spoke to his amendment providing for a 12 months' period, he had this to say. I quote from page 7276 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7:

> I am satisfied that if the amendment is thoroughly studied and all its implications are considered, it, too, when we come to vote on it, will be adopted.

Is that, Mr. President, a careless statement? Is that an observation by one who has not given much considered thought to the virtue of the amendment which he offered? I think not. I think the Senator from Oregon had thought for a very long time about the virtues and the reasons of justification for his suggestion that we have a draft period of 12 months.

On Monday of this week the Senator from Oregon offered two other amendments, one of which is the one which we are discussing. With reference to both of those amendments, he said:

> I hope that on both amendments, Mr. President, I may have the courtesy of the yeas and nays when a vote is taken on them, because I think the amendments will receive great attention on the part of the people as a whole.

No man alive, Mr. President, could offer an amendment with such accompanying words unless, on the day he offered it, he was prepared to support it out of the fullness of his logic, his experience, and his knowledge.

On the next page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. President, I find these two paragraphs. To me they are important principally because we are coming back to them again in the future. I quote the Senator from Oregon as follows:

From a military standpoint—

The Senator is now getting into the realm of the military. The Senator is getting into the realm of saying in a considered fashion what is good for the country.

From a military standpoint I am satisfied that my amendment will provide a stronger army—

His amendment for what? A considered offer of a 12-month period of service—

that my amendment will provide a stronger army, not because of a war within—

When?

within the next 5 years. If we should proceed now on the basis of drafting a smaller number of men for 2 years it will spread out among a larger group of our citizens the patriotic obligation to serve our country in a peacetime draft. I expect—

The Senator from Oregon goes on to say in very strong language—

I expect strong opposition to this amendment, but I am satisfied that if my colleagues will study its implications—

Its biggest implication obviously being 12 months as opposed to the committee recommendation of 24 months—

if my colleagues will study its implications they will see the democratic fairness of it.

If there was democratic fairness in a period of 12 months on Monday, it should still, I think, have been equally democratic, on the basis of fairness, on Wednesday, 2 days later. The Senator from Oregon goes on to say:

In fact, I think that so far as our Reserve and its building up are concerned, the drafting of more men on a 1-year basis will in a very short period of time give us a stronger reserve army than we shall have if we draft a smaller number of men for a 2-year period.

Mr. President, just as one of 96 Senators, if I had not had any experience with the armed services of this country, if I had not spent any time on military subjects generally, if I had been but another interested Senator with reference to a subject about which I was not very familiar, had I read those remarks on Monday, I think I should have given much consideration to voting for that amendment, when it was to have come up in a day or 2 days' time, because of the very way and the very sense of conviction in which the amendment was offered. I could gather no other conclusion than that whoever was the author of these remarks had spent much time in thought and study and that he knew, if he knew nothing else, that it would be improper for any reason to have this country, embarking on its first peacetime draft, support and approve within our society a draft period longer than 12 months.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon sees no inconsistency between what I have just quoted and what I should now like to quote very briefly from the RECORD of Wednesday. Maybe I am wrong when I think the remarks constitute, on the part of a very intelligent and very well-informed man on a great many subjects, a great contradiction. I want to pin that contradiction down. If I serve the purpose I have in mind, I should like so thoroughly to prove that contradiction that we shall not again, at least for some time, have reason to argue the merits as they exist between a period of 12 months on the one hand and a period of 18 months on the other hand.

I wish to read from page 7580 of the RECORD. Sometimes the RECORD makes all of us shudder because of what we read in it, but it is a very valuable instrument, because it lets the American people know what is said by whom, in order that every Senator can stand upon his own responsibility.

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1948, I quote the following:

Mr. President, as we sit here tonight, called upon to vote my amendment up or down—

The amendment being, 2 days later, an amendment to provide a 6 months longer period—

to vote my amendment up or down, one of the facts, or shall I say one of the factors, which we should consider and weigh before we vote, is the question, What is the will of the American people in regard to the length of service for which a boy should be drafted and placed in the Army?

I have not forgotten, Mr. President, what I just read and stated out of the RECORD of 2 days before, June 7. If there was to be expressed a will and a wish of the people on Wednesday, I should have thought it would likewise have been expressed in very clear language on Monday.

The Senator from Oregon in explaining the wish and the will of the American people had this to say:

Reasonable men can differ as to the interpretation of the will of the American people on that question. My vote, so far as the weight of that factor is concerned, is going to be resolved in favor of the judgment on my part that the American people generally will that the service should not be in excess of 18 months.

Mr. President, if there is not a fundamental contradiction between that position of Monday and what I have just read—talking now as Americans—I do not happen to know what a contradiction is.

I wish to quote a little further from the same page, a couple of paragraphs later.

I find that overwhelmingly—

What sort of a word is "overwhelmingly"?

It is about as expressive a word as we can possibly have.

I find, Mr. President, that overwhelmingly those sources of public opinion lead me to the conclusion that the American people generally will 18 months as a maximum of service under the draft law, in preference to 24 months.

When a man uses the word "overwhelmingly" he must have good and sufficient reason so to do, and the Senator from Oregon had that. He had sufficient reason to justify the use of that word on Wednesday, but not on Monday, when we were discussing with seriousness the same fundamental problem, which was to embark the United States of America on a new and admittedly perilous and uncertain course.

The Senator from Oregon read the other night briefly from an excerpt from the Gallup poll. He said:

I have the most recent evidence in the form of the latest announced Gallup poll which was printed in this morning's newspaper.

That was Wednesday morning.

I read from the Washington Post one paragraph setting forth the results of the Gallup poll on the draft.

This is what the paragraph said, and I think the RECORD should repeat it:

While 70 percent of voters think Congress ought to pass a draft law, when it comes down to a choice between universal military training and the draft, twice as many would choose UMT as the way to build up our armed forces. If a draft has to come into being, the public believes 18 months, rather than the 2 years.

That was the end of the Gallup poll on this particular problem. The Senator from Oregon went on to say:

That Gallup poll came as no surprise to me, because for the last several months—

"Because for the last several months"—

as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have deliberately—

What is the definition of the word "deliberately"? It means "I have tried, and I have considered what I was going to do before I did it"—

for the last several months I have deliberately, in my many public discussions in this country—

The discussions were not isolated to the Pentagon, they were not isolated to Washington, D. C., the State of Oregon, or the State of Washington, they were discussions held throughout the country.

I have deliberately in my many public discussions in this country raised the question of military manpower legislation. I have sought to provoke discussion among my audiences in order to learn the attitude of the members of the audiences on the question of military manpower. I have talked to a very good cross section of the American people in those audiences—labor audiences, businessmen's audiences, general audiences. All I can say to my colleagues in the Senate on that subject is that on the basis of those many observations I am satisfied that my proposal for 18 months represents the will of public opinion as of tonight.

All I can conclude from that, Mr. President—and I think I have a right to arrive at such a conclusion—is that the conclusion was reached in a 48-hour period.

No man is supposed to know everything about everything. I have already said that I think the Senator from Oregon knows a very great deal about a great many things, certainly more than I do. I happen merely to think him very wrong in his approach to a problem which I

seek to protect with every instinct and resource at my disposal.

Mr. President, I do not wish longer to labor the time or the patience of the Senate. This argument has pretty well been restricted to two men, the Senator from Oregon on the one hand and the Senator from Washington on the other. I have not made what I conceive to have been charges on the basis of prejudice. I certainly have endeavored to restrict my observations as much as possible to the written record, and I have done it completely and willingly, because the Senator from Oregon and I agree that the record is a responsible document. He maintains that before very long, in 2 years' time, in his opinion, the Senate and the Congress will reconsider the action it began to take this week when the Senate passed a draft law to include a 2-year period.

I suppose one could say more; either the Senator from Oregon in support of his feeling that he was not inconsistent, or the Senator from Washington in speaking even more strongly on what he conceives to be a monumental example of a contradiction which ought not to be repeated, if my assumption is correct, because this is a dangerous field for people to play around with.

Whatever we do in the draft we do for one reason, and one alone, that is, to prepare ourselves and to provide for America an Army which can do just one thing and *do it well*, which is its only function, namely, to fight.

At the conclusion of or near the close of his remarks this afternoon, the Senator from Oregon said he saw no inconsistency in his position, because among other things, after he offered his original amendment on Monday he conferred with certain distinguished military men.

I do not think one can support that position, Mr. President, on a subject such as the one we are considering. We cannot come to considered conclusions, opinions, and justifications overnight, and I could not gather, anyway, that that was necessary from reading what had been said previously on 2 days of this week. Reading what I have read from the RECORD on Monday, I must conclude that a man knew exactly that 12 months was the proper period and that anything shorter or longer was not going to serve the national welfare.

On Wednesday I read it even better, because it was a fuller presentation for justification for an 18 months' period. But I would like to say again upon this point, because of the importance of the problem, that we have three records on this subject now, that of Monday, of Wednesday, and of Saturday. We have a few comments of rebuttal and opposition on Thursday and Saturday by the Senator from Washington. And as the Senator from Oregon so often wants the people to decide public issues of all kinds on the basis of what he refers to as facts, I should like to have the record on this subject, in its entirety, printed, and if you please, at public expense, and sent to the average American man or woman who can read and understand the English language, and then in friendly fashion with the Senator from Oregon, I as an American would be, as he would be, entirely satisfied by the verdict to be handed down in the future or in 2 years' time, when, as he thinks, this problem will come back to us.

I have been awfully serious in what I have said, and I have not been very happy about it, because what I have said reflects not on the integrity, not on the ability, but on the judgment in this instance of a friend I hold in affectionate regard. It is not an easy thing to do, but I would gladly on this or any thousand occasions, take on the Senator from Oregon or any other group of people anywhere, when in my opinion they are extremely careless with what to me and to most other people is the most precious thing in the world—the defense and the maintenance and the preservation of our country.

I close where I started, that I do think my colleague from Oregon was entirely too hasty in saying one thing on Monday, and quite a different thing on Wednesday. I leave the record as it is to be judged by those who are concerned with the same subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my beloved friend from the State of Washington [Mr. CAIN] opened his rebuttal by saying "I hope to reestablish the contradiction." By the way of a very brief surrebuttal I wish to join with him in his last pronouncement and say that I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself as to whether he reestablished any contradiction in the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon.

It seems to me that my good friend from Washington has sought during the course of this argument between us, to take the position of a literalist, but even as a literalist I suggest that the literal language from the speeches of the junior Senator from Oregon, which the Senator from Washington has quoted, does not sustain his charge that I have been inconsistent. The literal language which he has quoted in each instance from the speeches of the junior Senator from Oregon, is language to the effect that the period should not be in excess of 18 months. He quotes me accurately when he points out that I said that the American people do not want a draft for a period longer than 18 months as a maximum. Thus he quotes from my speech:

The will of the American people is for 18 months as the maximum.

That was then my position and it is now my position. He seems to think that one day I said the American people want a draft which contains a 12-month period and then 2 days later I said the American people want a draft with a period of 18 months of service. That is not what I said and the remarks from my speeches which he quotes show that I did not say it. The only proper meaning he can give to my speeches on this point is that I tried to make clear that the majority of American people want the top limit, the maximum period of service for draftees not to be in excess of 18 months. I think they would prefer 12 months.

In regard to the Gallup poll, which I cited in my speech and to which the Senator from Washington refers, it is my understanding that the choice submitted for questioning was a choice as to 24 months or 18 months. The newspaper article which I inserted in the RECORD is not clear on the point.

Now, I want to assure my good friend from Washington that I am satisfied that if the people of the country should decide this matter by referendum, and had before them one very important fact—namely, that the basic military training can be given draftees in 12 months—they would decide that the period of service per draftee should be a 12-month period.

When I discussed this matter with my colleagues and with high officials in the military, I found that there was a desire to exact from these men more than 12 months of basic training, and a desire not to give any part of the basic training on foreign soil, but only to take them to foreign soil after they had had their 12-month basic training, I decided to offer the 18-month compromise as a second choice. I repeat, as a second choice.

Let us not forget that under the universal military training program which had previously been recommended by the military, only 6 months of training prior to going into the Reserves would have been the program. As I understand it, if we had adopted the universal military training program it would have been necessary to have taken the voluntary enlistments under a universal military training program into the foreign outposts prior to the expiration of their basic training.

I want to say to my friend from Washington that I am perfectly satisfied that on the basis of a referendum the American people would say exactly what I said in my speech on last Wednesday that 18 months ought to be the maximum. I think they would say that 12 months is even preferable to 18 months.

The Senator from Washington refers to the open-forum discussions I have had on this subject now for many months. I want him to understand, and I think he will find in the RECORD, that I sought to make it clear that I think the American people would have preferred a 6 months' UMT period to any draft period for either 12 months or 18 months or 24 months. In fact, as I said the other night in the closing speech I made on this subject, I think the American Legion program of 1946 would have been preferred by the American people to the final program which we adopted.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. But conditions have changed since 1946. I appreciated the fact that we did not have much chance of getting through in this session of Congress the American Legion program of 1946. Our hindsight frequently being better than our foresight—I wish that in 1946 we had adopted the program of the American Legion as of that time, because that would have given us a 2-year period to serve notice on Russia that we intended to enforce the peace. I think such a program adopted in 1946 would have had a tremendous effect on international negotiations with Russia from 1946 to the present date.

Now let me make this comment, Mr. President, as to my 12 months' program. Do not forget that my original amendment for a 12 months' draft would have

given us 54,000 Reserves 1 year sooner than we will have them under the program we adopted the other night when we adopted the 24 months' program. I say that because at the end of the 12 months 54,000 men would have gone into the Reserve, and we would have taken on a new body of men for further basic training and subsequent admission into the Reserves.

I now yield to my good friend the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to raise this question to the Senator from Oregon. The Senator says that the 12 months' draft would have resulted in 54,000 additional men to go into the Reserves. On the surface, sir, that sounds like a very good thing. Now what happens in the fall-off in the number of men to go into the Reserves as the result of the Senator's second suggestion of a program for 18 months instead of 12?

Mr. MORSE. As I said in my speech the other day, even on a 12 months' basis we would have built up our Reserves over a period of 3 years, and if we have not lessened this international emergency in 3 years, then it is my prediction, I may say to my friend the Senator from Washington, that we will not be talking about continuing a draft on any such basis as we are conducting it now. We will be talking about mobilizing the entire country—its economy, its manpower, and much of its womanpower, in what I think will be a fight to the death to preserve freedom in the world.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to say that I conclusively agree with what will happen by way of a total mobilization if conditions have materially gotten worse in the next 3 years. But if they do, and we have to mobilize in a total sense, then I think we ought to consider today, as we did the other night, when we voted accordingly, an instrument which will begin to get men into fighting units prepared to fight. That is the big justification for the 24-month period. The draft in itself is no good unless a man is given an opportunity to learn how to use his weapons in concert with his fellows.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close my colloquy with the Senator from Washington with this final statement: Either my 12-month amendment or my 18-month amendment would have resulted, during the period of the next 3 years—which I think is the period which will determine in a very real sense the destiny of America—in the basic training of more men than will the 24-month period which we adopted. Either one of my amendments would have resulted in giving to this country a larger number of reserves than the 24-month training will give us. To me that is conclusive in this argument, and it shows to my satisfaction the desirability of either one of my amendments over the 24-month period. At the same time—and I think that will be the result—in case of a lessening of the emergency, it would have saved at least an unnecessary expenditure of time in the Army for many thousands of men to the extent of at least 6 months per draftee. I do not think we should have called those men into the Army for the full 24-month period until we first tried a draft with an 18-month service period in it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, just a word or two to conclude my side of the discussion. I have enjoyed it thoroughly. It has been a real American controversy. In the course of the debate during the week, as I recall, the Senator from Oregon said, "I want the Senate to pass this 18-month draft measure, because 2 years from now the Senate and the people will feel better for having passed it." Some of us took a contrary view. Those of us who did feel very grateful that our side prevailed. Now we stand in the position where we shall let history, at the end of 2 years, decided whether those who favored 24 months were nearer right than the Senator from Oregon and his colleagues who favored the 18-month period. There were some very honest, exceedingly well-intentioned advocates on his side.

I should like to have an opportunity during the recess to tell the people that I am delighted that the will of those who supported a 24-months draft period prevailed to the end that this country during the next 2 years will be undeniably better qualified to take care of itself because of that action than it would have been had the 18-months draft view prevailed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to represent the other point of view in that national debate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FELLOWS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CHADWICK, Mr. CELLER, Mr. CHELF, and Mr. GOSSETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 20, 25, 26, 27, 29, 33, 37, and 50, to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 34 and 39 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. MORSE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 14, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 12 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William C. Burdett, Jr., of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William M. Lindsay, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas. Mr. Lindsay is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.

Frank C. Blackford, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York. Mr. Blackford is now serving under an appointment which expires June 29, 1948.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant, to rank from December 1, 1943:

Arthur E. Muffler

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from January 1, 1947:

George W. Miller	Eugene E. McCrory
Ralph W. Niesz	David R. Rondestvedt
Mark F. Mitchell	James C. Heffernan
Frederick N. Lattin	Jesse G. Magee
William O. Schach	Kevin L. Moser
Robert B. Long	Jack D. Lyon
Robert G. Schwing	Douglas H. Clifton
Hubert W. Cocklin	Allen C. Pearce
James J. Hill	David G. Walker
Robert D. Winship	William D. Ebright
Alvin N. Ward	David C. Porter
Risto A. Mattila	Abe H. Siemens
William D. Ball, Jr.	James H. B. Morton
James A. Dillian	Robert R. Hagan, Jr.
William C. Brown	Paul A. Hansen
Robert I. Price	David D. Fritts
George T. Richardson	Laurence M. Newkirk
Frank C. Anderson	Spencer M. Higley
Robert J. Healy	Herbert J. Lynch
Frances A. Tubeck	William G. Donaldson
Robert L. Kallin	Leslie M. Greig
John P. Obarski	Christopher S. Changaris
Gerald G. Brown	
Winford W. Barrow	Mario J. Cataffo
*Clifford F. Peistrup	Meindert P. Boon
Robert E. Williams	Casimir S. Rojeski
William R. Banks	James R. Iversen
Stanley B. Russell	Philip M. Hildebrandt
Joseph B. O'Hara	Norman L. Scherer
Marc Welliver II	Charles W. Berkman
Willis N. Seehorn	Paul W. Welker
Leslie J. Williamson	John J. Barry
Martin W. Flesh	

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from January 15, 1947:

George A. Choquette	Adam Stanzak
Leroy B. Smith	Paul A. Berg
George A. Gyland	Olaf T. Sturdy
John Kruszewski	Thomas B. Prather
Floyd L. Hartson	James G. Cowart
Jacob C. Sorensen	Carl D. Eubanks
Earl G. Hamilton	Ronald S. Krueger
Lloyd S. Sadler	Mart L. Jackson
Loran V. Perry	Sterling M. Anderson
Franklin H. Schonewolf	Harry S. Raleigh
	Leo J. A. King
Clemons C. Pearson	William S. Bishop
Elmer Winbeck	Henry J. Pfeiffer
Charles W. Smith	Thomas C. Pennock
Nathan Vanger	Hugh E. McCullough
Alton F. Pinkham	Alvin J. Boxwell
Ernest W. Payne	Willard E. Carlson
Axel R. Mattson	Hugh J. LeBlanc
Marvin H. Twiford	David T. Haislip
Charles B. Martinson, Jr.	Stanley L. Waitzfelder
	Harold D. Muth
Leland O. Wilkie	James C. Boteler
Orville C. Hinnen	Richard L. Huxtable
Byron M. Wineke	John Vukic

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be a lieutenant commander, United States Coast Guard, to rank from December 1, 1942:

Ferdinand Lederle

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 12, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou blessed and ever-living Lord, as we wait in Thy presence, grant that this day we may live not for our own aims and advancement but on the higher level of our natures, giving Thee free dominion over selfishness, pride, and every evil passion. Touched by Thy sacrificial spirit, we pray for the fellowship of a single purpose and for a will to share our common tasks.

Thou who dost bring from the mute, unpromising earth harvests rich and abundant, O bring out of our hearts the fruits of peace, love, and brotherhood. Do Thou take all confined breasts, grasp all selfish minds, and use them as Thy earthly vessels to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 1, 1948:

H. R. 183. An act to transfer lot 1 in block 115, city of Fairbanks, Alaska, to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska;

H. R. 2218. An act for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards;

H. R. 2760. An act for the relief of Thomas Camarda;

H. R. 3344. An act to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt;

H. R. 4443. An act for the relief of Jacob Cohen;

H. R. 4593. An act for the relief of Abraham Spevak;

H. R. 4672. An act for the relief of John Cameron Henry;

H. R. 5901. An act to provide for the distribution among the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for use in the fiscal years of 1949 to 1955, inclusive, on a basis which is as nearly equal as practicable and to make available other funds for the investigation and construction of projects in any of the States of the Colorado River Basin in addition to appropriations for said purposes from the Colorado River development fund;

H. R. 6302. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 381. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949.

On June 2, 1948:

H. R. 4426. An act to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes.

On June 3, 1948:

H. R. 350. An act for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.;

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Michel Ferapontow;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Dora Greenbaum (Brenner);

H. R. 1608. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338);

H. R. 1916. An act for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura;

H. R. 2384. An act for the relief of Colbert H. Cannon;

H. R. 3358. An act for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang and Dr. Esther Chang Liang;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret K. Cahn;

H. R. 3578. An act to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other;

H. R. 3633. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 3635. An act to ratify sections 1 and 2 of Joint Resolution 7 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its regular session of 1947;

H. R. 3640. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte D. Wang, Harvey S. P. Wang, and Arthur Y. P. Wang;

H. R. 3644. An act for the relief of James M. Dingwall, Jr.; Aileen Reynolds; Bert Woolslayer; and Mrs. Maisie Purser Davis;

H. R. 3730. An act to amend section 20 (12) of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recourse, by an initial or delivering carrier, against the carrier on whose line loss of, or damage or injury to, property is sustained, on account of expense incurred in defending actions at law;

H. R. 3954. An act to approve Act No. 74 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to revenue bonds of the Territory of Hawaii," and Act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to Territorial and county public improvements and the financing thereof by the issuance of revenue bonds";

H. R. 4091. An act to ratify Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1947;

H. R. 4201. An act to authorize payments to the public-school district or districts serving the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the education of dependents of persons engaged on that project;

H. R. 4377. An act for the relief of the Consolidated Steel Corp., of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 4379. An act for the relief of the Harbor Boat Building Co., the Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, and B & R Machine Works, of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 4393. An act to provide for the distribution, promotion, separation, and retirement of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4484. An act for the relief of Theodore Loetsch;

H. R. 4512. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Northeastern State College at Tahlequah, Okla.;

H. R. 4513. An act to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4551. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4804. An act to allow service credit for certain enlisted men of the Coast Guard who acted as policemen and guards at the Ivigtut Cryolite Mine, Greenland, during 1940 and 1941;

H. R. 4817. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.);

H. R. 5122. An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512);

H. R. 5173. An act to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, designating certain public lands as available home lands;

H. R. 5175. An act to confirm and ratify Act 205 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the issuance of public-improvement bonds;

H. R. 5244, An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5607. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5836. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.;

H. R. 5839. An act to authorize the conveyance to States, or political subdivisions, of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend the act of May 16, 1946 (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead;

H. R. 5922. An act relating to th issuance of reentry permits to certain aliens;

H. R. 6209. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended;

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1949; and

H. J. Res. 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes.

On June 4, 1948:

H. R. 3731. An act authorizing modification in the repayment contracts with the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 1 and the lower Yellowstone irrigation district No. 2;

H. R. 3785. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4823. An act to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5874. An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp series in honor of volunteer firemen;

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Fort Kearney in the State of Nebraska; and

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City.

On June 8, 1948:

H. R. 3638. An act to amend section 10 of the act establishing a National Archives of the United States Government;

H. R. 5965. An act to amend paragraph 813 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 6242. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap; and

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., Atlantic City, N. J., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

On June 9, 1948:

H. R. 3805. An act for the relief of Thomas A. W. Elder; and

H. R. 6071. An act to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5888) entitled "An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. CHAVEZ to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5416) entitled "An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. O'MAHONEY to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CORDON, Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. HAYDEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles and letters.

WALTER BURA

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the resignation of Walter Bura on June 30 from his post as Director of the Prosthetic Appliances Service in the Veterans' Administration, veterans everywhere lose a trusted friend and the Veterans' Administration a most able and conscientious administrative officer.

When the war ended, the Veterans' Administration was confronted with the tremendous problem of adapting for normal civilian life almost 17,000 veterans who lost arms and legs in World War II. At the time the Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped, which I headed, made an investigation into the problems of the amputee and found a shocking situation. The Veterans' Administration was hopelessly unprepared for the magnitude and delicacy of the task which faced it. Little improvement in artificial limbs had been made in the last 50 years, the limb industry itself was small and in need of policing, and the Government had so far failed to recognize its responsibility for these amputee veterans.

The Veterans' Administration attacked the problem under General Bradley, and General Hawley, then head of the Department of Medicine and Surgery. A program of research and development of artificial appliances was established, a Division of Prosthetic Devices organized, and I can remember General Hawley's reporting to our committee that he felt he had finally found just the right man to fill the post of director. He was Walter Bura, an engineer, and a leg amputee himself, who had done excellent work on prosthetic devices with the Surgeon General of the Army during the war. His appointment followed in December 1945.

Only a young man but with full appreciation of the job to be done, Walter Bura had to solve the threefold problem of developing improvements in artificial limbs, obtaining the cooperation of the limb industry in furnishing the best and right limb at a nominal cost, and instructing the veteran in the use of his limb. By July of 1946, just 7 months later, a comprehensive program went into effect and it has been operating satisfactorily since. Continuing research and development is carried on for the improvement of appliances. A permanent reference exhibit of all known prosthetic devices has been established at the Veterans' Administration central office, including not only artificial legs and arms, but hearing aids, aids for the blind, and other handicapped. Anyone, veteran or nonveteran, has access to the exhibit and can see for himself the appliances available to him through the Government or private industry. Showing readily what has been done and where improvement is needed, the exhibit serves, too, in the elimination of duplication in research work.

To assure the veteran's receiving the best in artificial limbs, it was necessary to set up standards for the limb industry, and a method of licensing of approved limb manufacturers was put into effect, with a sliding scale of discounts to the Government guaranteeing a good appliance at the most reasonable cost. The veteran has the privilege of a free choice of appliances from one of three manufacturers in his immediate area, but before it is delivered to him the Veterans' Administration sees that it meets the standards in every way. When the veteran requires repairs to his limb, his prosthetic service card identifies him to any limb manufacturer as being entitled to repairs up to a limit of $35 without the delay of prior authorization from the Veterans' Administration. In each regional office the prosthetic representative is prepared to guide him in the use and care of his limb, and he is entitled to a spare limb and a replacement when it is needed.

The exacting problem of the care of the amputee veteran has been capably handled under the sympathetic leadership of Walter Bura. His primary concern was the convenience of these veterans, and in his program he emphasized simplified procedure and availability of complete information and advice. That program has functioned smoothly, with a minimum of delay for the veteran. And not only was the amputee benefited by the prosthetic program but the needs of the blind, the deaf, and the paraplegic were as carefully scrutinized and provided for and constant efforts made toward their restoration.

Walter Bura can be justly proud of the coordinated program that evolved out of his resourcefulness and determination. I know how seriously he approached it, the hard work that went into it, and his unfailing devotion to the veteran, for, as a member of the Prosthetic Advisory Committee, I served closely with him throughout its conception and development. He has done a splendid job,

given tirelessly of his knowledge and experience in the prosthetics field, and he deserves the wholehearted appreciation and gratitude of all of us. It is understandable that he should wish to return to private life, now that his program is safely in operation, but his going is a keen loss for the veteran and the public. It is incumbent on the Veterans' Administration to carry forward his sound program, and it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that it is done properly. I, for one, shall be watching very closely to be certain that Walter Bura's program is in no way jeopardized.

COL. DAVID (MICKEY) MARCUS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and extreme regret that I record the death of Col. David Marcus. He died as supreme commander of the defense army of the state of Israel on the eve of the truce.

He died as a true lover of freedom fighting at the head of his forces.

He was "Mickey" to those of us who knew and loved him. Appointed to West Point out of my own district, he graduated with honors and served our country with honor and distinction.

He retired from active service in World War II as a colonel. Before going overseas he had drawn up the military defense plan for New York City. He served as Chief of Planning of the Civil Affairs Division of our War Department. He was legal aid to the American delegations at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

In civilian life he was a brilliant lawyer. His intrepid spirit was evidenced as much by his leadership in the Republican Party in an overwhelmingly Democratic district, as by his devotion to his community by participating in every worth-while endeavor.

As we place an imaginary wreath upon his bier, let us vow to bring to an early end the possibility of Britain ever again sending armaments to aggressors for use against the defenders of democracy.

We salute you, David Marcus, with the prayer that you shall not have died in vain.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be permitted to sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one an article entitled "Good Business Transaction" and in the other a telegram on public housing received from Wilford I. King, chairman, Committee for Constitutional Government.

Mr. GOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Penrose on America in the Middle East.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

PAY INCREASE FOR POSTAL AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, before this session adjourns we should take action to increase the pay of postal employees and other Federal employees. Their pay has always been barely enough to provide a living. The increase in the cost of living has made their pay inadequate. They are faithful and loyal employees, totally dependent upon the Congress to do justice by them. Unlike other employees, they do not have, nor claim, the right to strike to secure a living wage. The bill providing pay increases has been reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It is now resting, without action, in the Committee on Rules. When preparing the list of must legislation, this bill should be included by the leadership.

Justice requires that all of these employees receive a minimum of $800 increase. The pending bill provides a lesser amount. It should be brought to the floor so that the membership may determine what pay increase should be approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may be granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of a death in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

REFUND OR CREDIT TO BREWERS OF TAXES PAID ON BEER LOST IN BOTTLING OPERATIONS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6808) to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the effect of this bill?

Mr. FORAND. This bill provides for the refund of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations. Under the present system, the beer coming out of the vats in the breweries is metered and the tax is paid at that point. During the bottling process bottles are broken, beer is spilled, and so forth, and the tax has been paid but the beer is not there for sale.

Mr. RICH. How much beer are we going to have to refund the tax on? Let us get this, so we will know how much this will amount to.

Mr. FORAND. Does the gentleman want to collect taxes on a product that is not available for sale?

Mr. RICH. No; but I have seen so much about liquor evaporating and things of that kind. Taxes are evaporating, too, and I want the country to get all the taxes it can to pay for these expenditures you are making. Now you want to cut out some taxes.

Mr. FORAND. Is the gentleman in favor of taxing a product that is lost and was never available for sale?

Mr. RICH. I should like to hear this matter discussed and argued here. I think we ought to have an argument on it to find out just how far we are going. It does not sound good to me. Just temporarily, Mr. Speaker, I will object to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So will I, Mr. Speaker.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

Andrews, N. Y.	Dolliver	Johnson, Tex.
Barden	Dorn	Jones, N. C.
Bell	Eaton	Kee
Bender	Elliott	Keefe
Boykin	Fisher	Kefauver
Bramblett	Gallagher	Kennedy
Brophy	Gillie	Keogh
Buckley	Grant, Ind.	Kersten, Wis.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	King
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall,	Klein
Canfield	Leonard W.	Lane
Carroll	Halleck	Lewis, Ohio
Case, N. J.	Harness, Ind.	Ludlow
Celler	Harris	Lusk
Clark	Hart	McConnell
Clippinger	Hartley	McDonough
Coffin	Harvey	McDowell
Cole, N. Y.	Heffernan	McGarvey
Corbett	Hendricks	McMillan, S. C.
Cotton	Herter	Macy
Coudert	Hinshaw	Maloney
Courtney	Isacson	Meade, Ky.
Cunningham	Javits	Meade, Md.
Davis, Wis.	Jennings	Miller, Nebr.
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Ind.	Mitchell
Dingell	Johnson, Okla.	Morgan

Muhlenberg	Robertson	Stigler
Mundt	Rooney	Stockman
Murray, Tenn.	St. George	Taber
Murray, Wis.	Scoblick	Taylor
Nixon	Scott, Hardie	Thomas, N. J.
Norton	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Tibbott
O'Konski	Sheppard	Towe
O'Toole	Simpson, Pa.	Twyman
Peden	Smith, Maine	Vail
Pfeifer	Smith, Ohio	Wadsworth
Ploeser	Smith, Va.	Whitaker
Powell	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Redden	Stanley	Wood
Reed, Ill.	Stevenson	
Richards		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 313 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REFUND OR CREDIT TO BREWERS OF TAXES PAID ON BEER LOST IN BOTTLING OPERATIONS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the objections having been withdrawn, I renew my request and ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6808) to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 3154 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code are hereby redesignated (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E), and section 3154 (a) of such code is further amended by striking out "(a) allowance:" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Allowance:

"(1) Unsalable products."

SEC. 2. Section 3154 (a) of such code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Loss: The Commissioner shall make refund, or in lieu thereof, if he so elects, allow credit to a brewer in the amount of tax paid by such brewer on any beer, lager beer, ale, porter, or other similar fermented malt liquor manufactured by such brewer which was lost in his bottling house through breakage or leakage or in the process of filling, capping, pasteurizing, or labeling, upon the filing of a claim therefor by the brewer and proof by him to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such beer, lager beer, ale, porter, or other similar fermented malt liquor was fully tax-paid and that no refund or credit was made or allowed therefor under paragraph (1) to this subsection. Refund or credit under this paragraph for such loss during any calendar month shall not exceed an amount equal to 2½ per centum of the tax paid by him on all beer, lager beer, ale, porter, or other similar fermented malt liquor removed by him during such calendar month from his brewery to his bottling house."

SEC. 3. Section 3154 (b) of such code is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Time for filing claim: No claim under the provisions of subsection (a) shall be allowed unless filed within 90 days after the close of the month within which such destruction or return to the brewery for use as brewing material, or loss, occurred."

SEC. 4. The amendment made by section 2 shall be applicable only with respect to beer, lager beer, ale, porter, or other similar fermented malt liquor which is lost after the first day of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and newspaper articles.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item.

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the San Diego Union.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend in the RECORD an address delivered by Ronald E. Fisher.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON H. R. 5888

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] be excused as a conferee on the bill H. R. 5588.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ROHRBOUGH] and the Clerk will notify the Senate accordingly.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following newspaper clipping:

TRUMAN CALLS STALIN POLITBURO PRISONER

EUGENE, OREG., June 11.—President Truman declared tonight "I like old Joe," referring to Premier Stalin of Russia, and added that some day "that great country and this great country" would get together on their mutual interests.

The President recalled the Potsdam Conference of 1945.

"I got very well acquainted with Stalin there," Mr. Truman said. "I like old Joe. He's a decent fellow but he's a prisoner of the Politburo."

"He would make certain agreements and he would keep those agreements, but they won't let him keep them," he added.

Mr. Truman told an audience of several thousand persons to listen in on the radio tomorrow night and they would hear more of this country's foreign policy and its relations with Russia.

STABILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRICES

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6248, with Mr. ANDERSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the first section of the bill had been considered as read and is open to amendment.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 1, strike out "harvested" and insert "marketed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 2, strike out "December 31, 1949" and insert "June 30, 1950."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 7, strike out "(except cooperators outside the commercial corn producing area, in the case of corn) at."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, in the committee amendment just adopted there is a clerical error in that the word "at", which is the last word in line 8 on page 2, is shown as stricken out. It should not be stricken out. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be corrected by deleting from it the word "at."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendments:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)."

Page 2, line 14, after the word "noncooperators", strike out "(except noncooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn)."

Page 2, line 21, strike out the word "section" in insert "subsection."

Page 2, line 24, strike out "December 31, 1949" and insert "June 30, 1950."

Page 3, line 5, strike out the word "any."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 6, after the comma insert "except milk and its products, which shall be supported at 90 per centum of the parity or comparable price."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: On page 3, line 6, strike out the following, "except milk and its products, which" and insert in lieu thereof the words "except that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and egg."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, subsection 1 (b) deals with the so-called Steagall commodities. A general provision of that section is that the Steagall commodities

shall be supported at not less than 60 percent of parity or comparable price or not more than the level at which such commodity was supported in 1948. In the bill you have before you, you will find the committee amendment makes milk and its products an exception to that provision and provides that they shall be supported at 90 percent of parity. The amendment which I offered to the committee amendment provides that hogs, chickens, and eggs, as well as milk and its products, shall be supported at 90 percent of parity, and that potatoes harvested in 1948 shall be supported at 90 percent of parity, notwithstanding the fact that they may not be marketed until after January 1, 1949.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Steagall amendment does not expire until December 31, 1948, and that is operative on all Steagall commodities up to that time, is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That takes in potatoes produced in 1948. If this amendment that you have proposed to the committee amendment permitting the marketing of potatoes under the Steagall amendment after the first of the year is not adopted, will that not mean that virtually all of the potatoes produced in 1948 will be dumped on the market, and that they will be owned by the Government?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that is correct. To avoid that is one of the purposes of the amendment. The intention is to prevent the disruption of orderly marketing which would occur if the price support of 90 percent of parity went off on December 31, 1948, and thereafter a price support of not less than 60 percent of parity should go on. It is inconceivable to me that the Secretary of Agriculture would permit that to happen, because he has the option of continuing the 90 percent of parity rate, but in order to afford definite assurance to the producers of potatoes, the Committee on Agriculture adopted this amendment. If it is adopted by the Committee of the Whole, it will assure the potato producers of a 90-percent support price for all potatoes produced in 1948.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And it will also continue the orderly marketing of potatoes harvested in 1948, so that there will not be a glutted market before the first of the year.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. Undoubtedly if it was expected that the price support of 90 percent of parity would go off, every producer would attempt to rush his potatoes to market during the late months of 1948. I can think of nothing that would be more distressing from the standpoint of loss and wastage of potatoes than to have something like that occur.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In determining your parity price, what period do you use for the base year?

Mr. HOPE. The base period for most commodities is the 1909–1914 period.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the additional cost to the taxpayers of raising the parity price from 60 to 90 percent?

Mr. HOPE. I think that will save money for the taxpayers, because if the 90-percent rate is not carried over during the remainder of the marketing year, there will be a rush of potatoes to the market during the months of November and December, in order to get the 90-percent support price. The Government will be swamped with potatoes which it will have to buy under the support-price program, and there will be such spoilage that it will undoubtedly cost the taxpayers a great deal of money. On the other hand, if the potatoes can be marketed in an orderly manner throughout the marketing year, as they will be if this amendment is adopted, the loss will certainly be much less, and there should be no loss from disorderly marketing.

Mr. KEATING. On that theory, is it not a fact that we would have to carry on this 90 percent of parity support program indefinitely? Would not the same argument apply later?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. No, I do not think that is a logical conclusion at all. I think that whenever the price support may be lowered or terminated, it would be more orderly if it were terminated at the end of the marketing year rather than at the end of the calendar year. That is what we are doing in the case of potatoes. If the gentleman will observe the bill, he will see that is what we are doing with all commodities, in that we extend the price-support program until June 30, 1950. That is for the purpose of enabling the marketing of all 1949 crops to take place in an orderly way. We do not extend for the purpose of supporting the prices of crops produced in 1950, but for the purpose of enabling orderly marketing of crops produced in 1949. That is the only purpose.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. What, if any, consideration was given to the matter of soya beans?

Mr. HOPE. Well, the committee considered all of the commodities that are included under the Steagall amendment, but it was not felt that it was necessary to give any special treatment to soya beans since they are above parity price at the present time, and the world shortage of fats and oils indicates that they will continue above parity, during the period covered by this bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the chairman if this is not the real meaning of his amendment, that regardless of what the Secretary of Agriculture thinks, he has to give 90 percent of parity to the raisers of potatoes, regardless of the fact that in his judgment he may think that 60 percent would be fair. The potato raisers would get 90 percent, regardless?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has again expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I would say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois that the purpose of the amendment is to make it mandatory that the price of potatoes grown in 1948 be 90 percent of parity irrespective of the time they may be marketed in order to provide for the orderly marketing of that potato crop. As I said a while ago, I have no doubt in my own mind but what the Secretary of Agriculture would do this very thing if we left it to him. However, I think the potato growers are entitled to have that assurance in the legislation.

As I said to the gentleman from New York a moment ago, in my opinion it will cost the Federal Government much less money if we adopt the amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Why not include in the amendment a little discretion on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture so he can permit them 60 percent or 90 percent or any figure in between?

Mr. HOPE. Of course that would be taking away from the producers the assurance that we want to give them on this matter. The purpose is to give the producers the assurance that they do not have to rush their potatoes to market before December 31 in order to get the benefit of the 90-percent support price; and that is what they would do if we did not give them this assurance. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. Last year the Department of Agriculture spent $33,800,000 to buy potatoes and it cost $1.54 a bushel. They sold those potatoes at an average of 70 cents per bushel. They recovered $21,200,000. We know that in the process they destroyed millions of bushels of potatoes. Certainly the consumer did not profit or get potatoes cheaper. Is this amendment going to relieve the taxpayers and benefit the consumers? What are we going to get out of this amendment?

Mr. HOPE. As I said a while ago the amendment will benefit the taxpayers because the more orderly marketing that we have of this potato crop the less loss there will be to the Federal Government under this support program.

May I say that the committee recognizes the potato situation as being a serious one and one which has caused a

great deal of grief and trouble. That is one of the reasons why the committee provided that in the case of Steagall commodities with the exceptions contained in the committee amendment the support price should be not less than 60 percent of parity rather than 90 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment and also the bill. I for one am concerned and apprehensive over the cost of living and that problem confronts every citizen of this land. I am also concerned about what next year is going to bring when some of the foods that we raise in profusion go out of this country and we are not going to be able to supply them to the rank and file of Americans. I listened with a great deal of interest to some of the proposals that have been made here in the past few days. It is easy enough to get the ear of the House when you are proposing the expenditure of billions of dollars to countries across the sea.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has made an understatement that ought to be corrected. What the gentleman means is that it is easy enough to get the ear of Congress when you recommend the spending of billions abroad. Mere millions do not interest them.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman misunderstood me. I did say "billions."

Mr. RANKIN. I thought the gentleman said "millions."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Just a matter of a little misunderstanding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Just why is the gentleman concerned for the housewives when he wants a support price of potatoes at about three times the cost of production?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am concerned for the housewives, of course, for potatoes under this support price program as well as for people's ability in the future to get the food they need in competition with all the foreign demands that will be made upon the agricultural production of this country under the programs we have adopted.

We have many potato growers in upState New York. They represent an important industry in several localities of my district, I am naturally interested in their welfare.

I want to see our farmers put in a position where they can raise everything they possibly can to feed the people of this country. I know the gentleman agrees with me that our first consideration is to see that the population of the United States is fed.

It was stated here on the floor the other day that if the American people are going to be fed, if we are going to meet the program of ERP and the other alphabetical programs we are pledged to, we will have to encourage the farmers to raise all of the produce and all of the food they can. This bill will implement and make that possible; this legislation is going to save the farmer from going under, and will enable him to produce just as he did in World War II. It was stated on the floor of the House the other day that this price support plan worked out all right when we fought World War II. We fed not only the people of this country and maintained a high standard of living, but we fed the armies of the world as well, and we took care of the downtrodden and those who had been the victims of the aggressors. It was pointed out also that this bill will keep this program in effect and will continue to feed the people who need feeding.

May I say in connection with the matter that I hope the production of the farmers of this country will reach the people of Europe for whom the food is intended, that it will not be diverted into black markets, that it will not be taken over by aggressors and dictators who want to store up warehouses so that they may have a future success in a military way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would rather have the Secretary of Agriculture be the black marketeer and have him store the warehouses full?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I was not referring to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman referred to warehouses full of potatoes and food.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. When I mentioned the word "warehouses" I was talking about some of these dictators over in Europe who are doing everything they can to grab a lot of the food that is going over there so they can feed an army to be brought into action against the remaining people of the world who want freedom. I say we can prevent that by seeing that this price support program is adopted and that all these articles are brought in under the program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I should have to rise in opposition to a committee amendment. I am also sorry that the Committee on Agriculture has become the tool and spokesman and the mouthpiece of a gang of "do-gooders" and New Dealers down in the Department of Agriculture, who lay awake at night trying to find ways of doing things to help the people of this country.

The situation has become absolutely ridiculous. It has been suggested that eggs be put in this program. May I say to the House that yesterday morning in committee it developed that not one producer of eggs in America had asked to have this support. I want to say to the gentleman who just spoke that I, too, am concerned about the cost of living, but I attend committee meetings and I take an interest in them.

Mr. Chairman, this whole parity program is wrong. Parity was not in the beginning set up to guarantee a profit to the farmer. It was set up as a sort of stop-loss order. Think of the ridiculousness of the whole situation. The support price on potatoes for the 1948 production shall be $3.25 in some sections of the country. Why should a farmer plant anything but potatoes for the Government to buy and dump?

Mr. Chairman, I hope and pray that the Republicans of this country will have sense enough to nominate someone for President who has not thrown the Treasury at the people and who is not throwing the Treasury at the people now but will give consideration to the taxpayer, not the small groups who come from here and there wanting a hand-out from the Treasury.

Parity was not intended to be an incentive to produce. A price of $3.25 for potatoes will cause a production that the Treasury cannot stand. This will go on all over the land. If they would put the support price, not at a parity price that would guarantee anything, but a support price on potatoes in this country at a cent a pound, no farmer would lose his shirt. No farmer would plant potatoes for that dollar. He would plant them for the market. He wants a high price, yes, but he wants that high price to be established in the market place and not by the arbitrary actions of the Secretary of Agriculture who, at the same time, when he uses Federal funds, practically bribes and buys them by putting them under quota and marketing restrictions. All over the country we held hearings. All over the farmers want high prices, but everywhere they want the authority held down that we place in the Secretary of Agriculture. This bill should be thrown back into the hopper and revised and made a good bill. The farmers are not dumb. If the potatoes are too cheap, they will farm a few acres less, and you will have nothing left to justify this action. If you believe in freedom, if you believe in American traditions as one who wants to give the farmers a chance to make a living, then you cannot go along on this kind of stuff. I am the only farmer on the Committee on Agriculture. I am one of the few farmers in this House, and I know what the farmers want. I have been interested in this agricultural problem since I was a boy, and I want to tell you that the farmers do not want to be the goat or the pawn of the politicians or the victims of the Department of Agriculture. The farmers do not ask for anything except what is right, and you have no right to offer them anything that they do not want. We are creating a situation where a farmer can come in and make a claim. Right now in the Department of Agriculture they are complaining that the farmers are not cooperating in accepting hand-outs. They say it is because of low income. The banks are overflowing with farmers' money. It is simply because farmers are disgusted with this ridiculous program. Some day you will try to balance the budget and farmers are afraid it will be charged against them. We are not asking these things for the farmers. These things are being jammed down our throats and I am against it from top to bottom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, while I of course find myself in full accord with the beautiful tributes paid to the American farmer by the gentleman from New York, and trust that all of the good things that he envisions may come about, I cannot share in the fears of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because I do believe the country is doing a better job than he sometimes suggests.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will remember that when we were down in his home community in Texas I spoke just as I speak here; that your farmers nearly raised the roof, and that the only things you had to complain about down there were that the leaders of the Department of Agriculture were crooked. Your farmers were satisfied with everything else.

Mr. POAGE. I understand the roof is still on the buildings where we had the meeting, but I cannot recall and charge that anyone was crooked, we only complained of our crooked rivers. While the gentleman undoubtedly made the same statements that he now makes, I do not think that either my farmers or the committee members are entirely in accord with the expression of fear voiced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania; in fact, I must confess that I do not share the gentleman's fears.

I only arose, Mr. Chairman, because Members have asked me to try to help them more fully understand this potato amendment, which is the matter now before us. I think that the chairman of our committee has explained the matter wonderfully well, but I realize that it was utterly impossible for all of us to understand or for all of us to follow the discussion because of the numerous interruptions that occurred.

May I merely say this about the potato amendment, and that is all that is before us right now. We are not going to save the whole world or all of the farmers by this amendment, but it is important because it may save the United States Government a great deal of money. We have a potato program. Many of you people think that there is something wrong with that program which supports the price of potatoes at 90 percent of parity. Now, it actually happens that potatoes are one of those crops where we have learned how to produce a much larger yield than we knew how to produce during the base period 1909 to 1914. Actually they are today producing 800 bushels of potatoes per acre. With that kind of production, it is perfectly possible to produce potatoes profitably at a lower cost than was originally anticipated, and that is probably the basic reason why we have found that our potato price-support program has brought us into trouble. It has encouraged a lot of people to go into the potato business and produce more potatoes than the country needed. But it was the intent of Congress that potatoes should be supported at 90 percent of parity.

The subcommittee of which I am a member, and of which the gentleman from Minnesota is chairman, held extensive hearings on this potato program last spring. We recognized that it was not working without some loss, but in spite of all that it was impossible for the subcommittee to recommend a formula which it seemed would cure the matter. In spite of all the criticism, neither the subcommittee nor any member thereof has brought in any new legislation on the subject. Clearly those who criticized so violently could offer no improvement in the law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Since we held our hearings a year ago, though, the Department has tried to follow out some of the suggestions we made with reference to the marketing program.

Mr. POAGE. I think those suggestions have been helpful. I think the hearings of the committee were most helpful. The point I am making is that it was impossible for any of these who were so critical to suggest a better method to support the price of potatoes at 90 percent of parity and still not have some trouble from time to time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I cannot yield now because I want to complete my statement. I am sure the reason the Members have never understood this thing is that nobody has been able to complete a discussion.

May I say that the present law requires a support on Irish potatoes at 90 percent of parity, and that is going to be the law until the 1st day of January. The people who planted potatoes this year did so in contemplation that the Congress of the United States would carry out the promise and the program that had been established. It does not make any difference whether you think it is a good or a bad program, it is your program. You gave it to the farmers. They had a right to rely on it. They did rely on it, and they planted potatoes. All in the world this amendment would say is that we are going to assure those people who planted those potatoes in the year 1948 that they will have 90 percent of parity whenever those potatoes are sold. You might say, "Well, we ought to make them sell their potatoes as fast as possible." but if we made the farmers sell them, if we forced them on the market in December, when we know the farmers could get 90 percent of parity, you would only break the market at the expense of the Government. Surely if the farmers knew that on the 1st day of January they could not get 90 percent, then of course they would sell all their potatoes in December.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. You cannot keep potato growers from getting 90 percent of parity for all the potatoes that are grown this year even if you wanted to do so. All you can do by not adopting this amendment is force all potatoes on the market in the month of December and make the United States Government buy them all, rather than let them move in the normal channels of trade. We do not think that makes good sense. We think it makes good sense to say to those growers, "You keep your potatoes and market them in the regular manner, and if you do not market them until March or April you will still get your 90 percent, so do not dump them all on the market at one time." By doing that, it will be possible to have all of those potatoes move in the normal channels of trade. If they are allowed to move that way we can anticipate that the United States will not be required to buy any of the late crop of potatoes. The Government has not been having to buy the late potato crop because it is in storage, and it keeps. That is the reason we have not been buying the Maine crop and have been having to buy some of the early crop each year. If we have to buy both crops, then you are going to have a real loss to the Government.

If you adopt this amendment we think we will have an orderly marketing of those potatoes with a minimum of cost to the United States Government. It does not carry this change into the program as to future years. It provides that in 1949, when the farmer plants potatoes, he will know he may not get 90 percent of parity. He will be on notice, then, that we have provided for dropping the parity support price on the crop that is grown in 1949. We try to be fair to the potato grower and we try to do the sensible thing for the United States Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does this apply also to sweetpotatoes?

Mr. POAGE. No; it applies to the Irish potatoes only.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you do not do anything for sweetpotatoes at all?

Mr. POAGE. No, we do not change sweet potatoes at all.

Mr. RANKIN. Sweetpotatoes are more valuable than Irish potatoes.

Mr. POAGE. But they are not under the program. Irish potatoes are under it. We are simply talking about the existing program and not a new program.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it the gentleman's contention that the reasons for passage of the amendment regarding potatoes apply also to chickens unhatched, eggs unlaid and pigs yet unborn?

Mr. POAGE. No.

Mr. KEATING. They are all in this amendment.

Mr. POAGE. No, if you will read the amendment, it reads, "white Irish potatoes grown through the year of 1948."

Mr. KEATING. I understood that the amendment also includes poultry, eggs, and hogs.

Mr. POAGE. No; the amendment reads, "Irish potatoes grown in the year 1948, hogs, milk and its products, chickens and eggs." Now the hogs, milk and its products, chicken and eggs may be raised or produced any time. But white Irish potatoes can be grown only in the calendar year 1948 if they are to be supported at 90 percent.

Mr. KEATING. But they are all part of this amendment, and if we vote for the amendment, we are voting to increase the support prices on eggs, hogs, and poultry, are we not or at least to issue a mandate to the Secretary of Agriculture to support all of them at 90 percent of parity?

Mr. POAGE. The support prices are already in existence. You are not voting to increase them, but just voting to maintain them. All of the commodities named are now supported in one way or another. The bill assures continued support of all the commodities the gentleman has named for another crop year or until July 1, 1950, at 90 percent of parity except potatoes. The bill allows the support price on potatoes to drop to 60 percent of parity. The only question here is whether we should let that drop occur on January 1, 1949, in other words whether the support price on potatoes should be changed on a crop-year basis or calendar-year basis.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised and disappointed that any member of our committee would rise on the floor of the House and oppose this amendment when he had all the opportunity in the world to stand up before the committee and tell us why he did not like this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read the first five lines of the statement in the report. The report says:

> The accompanying bill would provide for a continuation on a modified basis of price support for producers of agricultural commodities until June 30, 1950. The levels at, and methods by, which support may be provided have been modified to provide for improved administration and greater flexibility in the conduct of price-support operations so as to give to producers proper protection and to provide an adequate supply of agricultural commodities at fair prices to consumers.

What could be better than a statement like that? Let me talk just a moment about potatoes. There is no one but who would admit that we have had difficulties with potatoes. Why should not you have difficulty with potatoes? The potato crop is a peculiar crop. I am talking about late potatoes, and if you check, you will find that most of our troubles have been with early potatoes. After all, there is one power that controls production in the world. It is not this Congress, by any manner of means, nor is it the price support program. The laws that govern the universe control production. The farmer is the greatest gambler in the world. He knows when he prepares the ground, and he knows when he prepares that seed bed that he may not even receive his seed in return. Potatoes are a very peculiar crop. We have had from 5 to 7 years of wonderful production where a farmer planted a few potatoes in a hill and had a great crop of potatoes. But we may be headed for difficulties. Even now if you will look you will see a cloud no bigger than a man's hand facing this great Nation of ours. I can talk to any Congressman who lives in a territory in a farm producing area, and you will find letters from farmers and friends in communities who are beginning to realize that the time of pleasant seasons are beginning to pass, and already there are dry spots appearing in many farm territories throughout this Nation. So we could very well get to the point while we are trying to support many foreign countries, give them the food that is necessary to help them maintain and establish a representative form of government—we could very well get to the point, where we would be short of the necessities of life ourselves in this country. Let us not be foolish. Let us talk about potatoes. One of the gentlemen from our committee did have the facts. I will give you the average.

In 1945 we had a potato acreage of 2,862,000. In 1946 we had 2,580,000. In 1947 we had only 2,190,000. We only had actually in 1947 a little over 84 percent of the number of acres you had the year before.

When I was in Germany last year the worst thing I encountered, a thing that caused our committee real worry, was the failure of the potato crop in Germany. There is no argument about the support of potatoes. Any mistake, any error, any difficulty that the Department of Agriculture has had because of the potato program is a matter of administration and because of the plan. I do not even find fault with them. Potatoes are a difficult crop to handle as we are just beginning to learn. I say frankly today, we had better look out, because the great cities of this country must be fed. They will be fed. They cannot be fed by any such remarks as you have just heard from the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There came to your own desks this morning from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics this bulletin. What did it say?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. The average price, the support price of potatoes for 1948, up to now, is $1.86 a bushel. Then, in that same report, the farmer is not in anywhere near as good shape as some people would have you believe.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The support price is only 90 percent of the $1.86.

Mr. HILL. The truth is that potatoes have been bringing 10 cents a bushel more than the support price. The Federal Government, in the over-all picture, is not out a single cent. You have to understand this. Let me tell you something else that you will find in this bulletin. The farmers are in no such a financial position as some would have you believe. On page 15 you will find that in 1947 the income of all industrial workers had risen from the 1910–14 period as an average 438 percent. Keep that figure in mind. I will put the entire line in the RECORD. It shows exactly what the farmer's increase in price has been. The increase in poultry and eggs has been 221 percent. I will have the figures all extended in the RECORD.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. First, I would like to say that I agree entirely with what the gentleman from Colorado has had to say upon this subject. He is doing a wonderful job for the farmers, as he has always done in this House. But perhaps the gentleman does not know that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics came before our Subcommittee on Appropriations last January and brought out the fact that the laboring man today is paying a smaller percentage out of his dollar for food than he was in 1939.

Mr. HILL. Of course, there can be no doubt about that statement. Even if that were not true, the picture is not too good for a continuation of the wonderful production we have had. I come from a farming section, where we produce more beets than any congressional district in the United States. During the war they asked us to do this job. They asked the farmers of this country to do the job. There was no question but that they got out and did the work. They increased production in this country on an average of 30-percent increase, and they did it when they had 20 percent less help on the farms than they had before in the history of America.

It is time that this House recognized this fact. All we are trying to do is to continue the program that you have had. I hope you will stand by the committee which thinks this is a good bill, and this is a good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that we who are members of the Republican Party in this House ran on a program of economy 2 years ago. If that be true, and I think it is—and that was the plea we made to the people—we are making a very poor attempt to fulfill our obligations in this subsidy program.

What are the facts? The facts are simply these, the potato program in the past two fiscal years has cost the taxpayers over $100,000,000. A short time ago I had occasion to make a little survey of the situation out in Chicago regarding potatoes, and let me tell you what I found. We had a surplus of potatoes in the Chicago market, but notwithstanding that fact, they moved over 1,000 carloads of potatoes from the State of

Maine to Chicago and the Midwest when we were crying for freight cars, box cars, and refrigerator cars on all railroads. It cost the Government and the taxpayers, over $4 per bag to put those potatoes in Chicago. What did they do?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Not just now.

They put them in storage at 25 cents a bag for the first month, and 15 cents a bag for each additional month. Then all of a sudden they started to sell some of these potatoes under the pretense that they were beginning to spoil. They sold sacks of good Maine No. 1 potatoes without a single bad potato in the bag at what price? At 1 cent a bag. One man in my district bought over 7,000 bags of these potatoes at 1 cent a bag, of 100 pounds. Some of them he fed to hogs, some of the others went into the commercial market. And when he got through with these potatoes and had the bags left over he sold the bags alone for 15 cents each. He only paid 1 cent a bag, mind you, for the whole sack, potatoes and everything. That is not all. After a while they moved some of these potatoes out of storage, reloaded them into cars and shipped them back East to New York and exported them to France. What foolishness and cost to the taxpayer through the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation. And that is not even taking into consideration all the paper work here in Washington. They had to sign contracts on these potatoes to sell them at 1 cent a bag, these voluminous contracts that they make out in the bureaus down here; and think of the overhead and the administrative costs all along the line handling the contracts for potatoes at 1 cent a bag.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you in all seriousness this whole price-support program should be overhauled.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Not at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the same kind of story told by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] year after year: "The farmers are depending on this money, we cannot go back on our word." That has been going on for years and years, ever since this program went into effect. We had better start to economize somehow, somewhere.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the committee.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman says we ought to overhaul this program. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that is just what we are doing in this bill. We are seeking 60 percent, not 90, but we cannot change the 90-percent parity on potatoes for this year because the farmers have already planted their crops in accordance with commitments under the program. Next year we are reducing that to 60 percent of parity and in addition we are giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to require compliance with production and marketing quotas in order to cut the support price. We are overhauling the whole thing, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is exactly what I am complaining about. Every year the same song: "The farmers have already planted their crops in accordance with commitments under the program. We cannot go back on our word." Have we not, as Members of Congress, the courage to stop making commitments? If we stop making commitments of this kind the farmers would not be expecting this dole and we would save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] who spoke about what a grand job nature has done in increasing the production of potatoes. We had a surplus of approximately 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes last year. What was the cause of that? Because hundreds and hundreds of farmers who had never planted potatoes before started out planting potatoes because they were guaranteed the support program. I figured the yield on some of the farms with the support program on potatoes. They were receiving around $840 an acre off potato farms in the State of Maine.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder where the gentleman got the report and the story he is telling us about shipping the potatoes to Chicago, then shipping them to France?

Mr. BUSBEY. I got it right from the Director of the Commodity Credit Corporation in Chicago. I went down to his office and he showed me the facts and figures.

Mr. POAGE. Would the gentleman be willing to put a letter or something of that kind in the RECORD on that because it is so contrary to what we have been able to find out. I do not question the gentleman's statement, except I would like to have something to show it, because it is contrary to the statements made to us in committee, it is contrary to other statements we have had. Of course, it is in line with what newspapers have published. We have tried to check those newspaper accounts and time and time again we have found them to be incorrect. I hope the gentleman will put the documents in the RECORD so that we might check and confront somebody with the facts.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will try to get them. I may say that these are not rumors, these are not newspaper articles or anything of that kind. The statement was made directly to me when I made the investigation personally in the Commodity Credit Corporation office in Chicago. I am sure the committee could verify my statement by writing to the Chicago office of the CCC.

Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances I will be forced to vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the whole support program. I do know something about potatoes. You may have heard of the Idaho potato.

Mr. Chairman, may I say, first, that the whole support program as far as potatoes are concerned has been a real detriment to the industry because the 90 percent of parity was too high. Without helping the price to growers in established potato areas it encouraged production in new areas. When this matter came up in commitee I was one of those who insisted that it be cut to 60 percent of parity. That is provided in the bill before us. But, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has pointed out, the present 90 percent parity law applies until December 31, 1948, and there is not anything we can do about it. I may explain that there is a large quantity of potatoes grown in our Southern States and in California. Most of these potatoes come on the market very early. All of them are protected by the 90 percent parity program. All the late potatoes, however, are marketed very much later, and I refer to the production of potatoes in Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, the upper tier of Middle Western States, and Idaho. In the orderly course of marketing they sell these potatoes to the public in the early months of the following year, January, February, March, and April.

We have taken care of the support program for next year but with this 90 percent of parity, and with the northern potato producer knowing he must take a speculative chance on potatoes he might market in 1949, what is going to happen is that we are likely to have a terrible glut on the market in December this year. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] and I do not want that kind of business. More of it will wreck the potato market. The Government is going to pay millions of dollars out in support prices if we do not pass this amendment. It permits the 90 percent of parity to apply to potatoes grown during the 1948 season.

It is my prediction that we can save the Government a lot of money. Certainly, it is going to help the lot of the northern potato grower because he does not want to sell to the Government. It is going to help the public not to have a perishable commodity put on the market all in 1 month's time.

So far as potatoes are concerned, I hope you will support the amendment.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, much can be said in support of the entire bill which the House is now considering. Much has been said in condemnation of the administration of the triple-A marketing agreements and the act that expires this December. But certainly to those of us who live in the Southland the entire program has

been a Godsend, and it has been of great benefit to those who live in the North and West, particularly in regard to the amendment the chairman has offered with respect to potatoes. I urge the Members from the South to support this amendment. It is just and fair, it is proper, and should be included in the bill. At the present time the Southern States are enjoying the 90 percent of parity guaranteed under existing law, notwithstanding the faults that may have occurred in the act as it exists today, particularly in the administration, and I regret to hear of the terrible mismanagement about which the gentleman from Illinois has spoken. However, we should adopt this amendment to give to those States in the North, those States that have fall crops of potatoes, the security that we have enjoyed in the early States that are now marketing the crops and will continue to market them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I call attention to another most important thing in this bill, and that is, every farmer that is supposed to come under the protection of price support or parity must do this, according to the bill. We think this is a one-sided program. It is not. The bill provides on page 3, line 14:

> In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate what the gentleman has said and I thank him for his observation of this point. May I add further that in the South today, in the States of North Carolina and Virginia, we have entered into a marketing-agreement program with respect to potatoes, and we are not permitting other than No. 1 grade potatoes to be shipped from these States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think it is fair to the man who has a dozen mouths to feed to deprive him of a cheap potato if he can buy it, or a No. 2 grade, which is just as good except for the size? Is it fair? Is it right?

Mr. BONNER. I have had the pleasure of listening to the gentleman in several farm meetings. I know he is sincere and honest. The gentleman has a right to his opinion about this and I have a right to my opinion. I think the result of the entire agricultural program, compared with the destitute condition the farmer found himself in in 1932, absolutely proves that the gentleman simply does not know what he is talking about. I hope, Mr. Chairman, in justice and fairness, this amendment that the chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture has offered will be adopted and that the bill will be passed in its entirety as it is without any crippling amendments. I hope my friends on the left will bear that in mind. Later an amendment will be offered which I consider a very crippling amendment to the agricultural program of the country. We are most fortunate to have as chairman of the Agriculture Committee, such an outstanding, fine gentleman as Mr. HOPE, one who knows the farmers' problems and is willing and anxious to help in the carrying out of the fair and workable farm program that has been in effect for years and found sound. A program that has lifted the farmer, the farm wife and their family from drudgery and poverty to security and a comfortable way of life.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the title of this bill ought to be, "A bill to guarantee that the high cost of living will not go down for 2 years, and for no other purpose."

Let us examine how this guaranty will operate. At any real threat that the present fabulous price of wheat, for examble, might come down, which threat would reduce the price the city dweller pays for his daily bread, the Government will step in. The Government will support the price of wheat, which means buying wheat on the open market to prevent the price of wheat and bread from falling. Ironically enough, the money the Government uses to buy this wheat and thus keep bread prices from falling is the very money urban dwellers have paid to their Government in taxes. It is for all the world like forcing a prisoner to use his own money to buy the rope which will hang him.

But this is not all. The bill assures that these commodities the Government buys to protect the high cost of living will not again reach the market and reduce consumers' prices. Witness the hundreds of millions of dollars presently held in Government wool while clothing sells at all-time high prices. Witness what happened a year or so ago when the Government poured kerosene on thousands of bushels of potatoes, at the same moment it continued to buy potatoes to support prices. The consumer cannot win.

Then there are some more tricks to prevent prices from coming down. The Government under this bill can, and I quote, "impose production goals and marketing regulations upon commodities which are in overproduction or threatened overproduction." Shades of the New Deal—and this is a Republican Congress.

There remained one loophole which might have let consumer prices drop to a level at which consumers could buy without going into bankruptcy. That loophole was imports. Fabulous domestic prices attract low-priced goods from abroad. But that was not overlooked. The bill gives the President the power to shut those goods out with import fees or import quotas. The guaranty that living costs will not fall is still safeguarded.

I now address myself to Members who represent city districts. When your constituents complain this fall against high living costs, will you squirm a bit in trying to explain a vote in favor of this bill? Think carefully, gentlemen—think carefully.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my very good friend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] that he will also be surprised at my attitude on this legislation. I want to also take this opportunity to compliment my very good and able friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, CHESTER GROSS, for the stand that he has taken on this matter. I am glad to see that at least one member of the Committee on Agriculture had the courage of his convictions to stand up and state his position in a very definite manner in opposition to the proposed amendment. If anybody has a right to express himself on the farm question, it is the gentleman from Pennsylvania, CHESTER GROSS, because I feel he is a real dirt farmer. He is an experienced farmer who has more to lose than any other Member of the House for the position he has taken in opposition to these subsidy payments. Now permit me to state:

We built America on free enterprise. We built America on a system of supply and demand. We did not build America on subsidy payments. We did not build it on parity payments or Commodity Credit Corporations. But several years ago, during the depression, the New Dealers found that here was a wonderful idea of subsidizing the farmer, creating parity prices and subsidy payments and away we went. So even though we are out of depressions and reached new heights of prosperity the program has gone on and on and on. The surprising thing to me is that the Republicans are now picking up where the New Dealers left off. We say we are opposed to subsidies; we are opposed to restrictions and regulations and strangulations on the farmer and business but still we go along and are now going to adopt a program that has been carried on by the New Deal over the past several years. A couple of years ago a certain organization took me apart because I was opposed to subsidies. I said, "Yes, I am opposed to subsidies, and I will always be opposed to subsidies. I do not think it is the American system and pattern that built a great nation. I said, "I will tell you why I am opposed to subsidies. We spent four or five billion dollars up to that time on subsidies on corn and wheat and cotton and soybeans and peanuts and butter and everything else." I said, "We are $260,000,000,000 in the hole. We did not pay the subsidy bill as we went along. We put it on an already overburdened debt to be paid later" just the same as we are doing here today. I said, "Who is going to pay the bill?" The boys who were over there doing the fighting for you are coming back home and going out to find a job and earn the money to pay the taxes to pay for the subsidies which you spent, you who had security back home and had good jobs. You should have paid the bill as you went along.

Now, are we paying this as we go along? No. We are adding it on to an already overburdened debt. What for? Political expediency or what? I do not know. But I am telling you right now that sooner or later you will have to discontinue subsidies, and you may as well start reconciling yourself to that fact, because it is not the way of doing things, and you had better stop it. The sooner you stop it the better off the country will be, because, in the final analysis, the American taxpayer has got to pay the bill, whether he pays it in prices or pays it in taxes. He pays it anyway. Supply and demand should create the price and create the markets, and it is about time we got rid of subsidies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman realize that none of these proposals originated in the committee or came from the country? The idea came from down there in the Department of Agriculture. They have grown so heavy that their travel agents' expenses amount to more than the operation of the House and the Senate put together. As far as this being a New Deal program is concerned the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] was right yesterday when he told us that we were carrying on the New Deal program. Those people are laughing at the Republicans for going ahead with this program that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], a member of the committee, criticized Members for opposing. Let me remind you that I was quoting the parity price in hundred pounds, while he was giving it by the bushel. So there was not very much difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] for his contribution and then I will be glad to yield.

I want to call attention to the fact that our good friend and former majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was of a different opinion than that held by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] vigorously opposed this legislation, while the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] endorsed it wholeheartedly. So there is a difference of opinion on their side of the aisle as well.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I just wondered if the gentleman were going to abolish subsidies, if he would start with abolishing what is known as "Pittsburgh plus."

Mr. GAVIN. Well, I am not in a position to discuss "Pittsburgh plus." Let us confine our discussion to the program of subsidies on wheat and corn and cotton and soybeans and peanuts and flax and butter and everything else. The American taxpayer is entitled to some relief. I was hoping that my side of the House, when we came into control, would not be carrying on a program that has been carried on and adopted by the other side for the last 15 years. Now, this country is $260,000,000,000 in debt. Let me call your attention to this fact: A million dollars is one thousand thousand dollars. A billion dollars is one thousand million dollars. We owe two hundred and sixty thousand million dollars. So you are going to sit here today and add to this already overburdened debt and, to appease everybody on both sides of the aisle, because this is an election year, you do not have the courage of your convictions to stand up and be counted against these subsidy programs that have gotten us into the condition that we are in today. We are fast heading toward bankruptcy.

As far as I am concerned, I say it is about time to call a halt on this unnecessary spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, to my friend from Massachusetts? Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask if under this bill the small farmer has to plant what he is told to plant by somebody in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, of course not, no. The farmers meet, they have a free election in their various communities and sections. That is my understanding of our basic farm legislation. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman knows of course that this is not a party matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Not now, not now. It was in years gone by when we Democrats put it through.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] found fault with the fact that the Republicans are sponsoring this legislation. I just want to call to the attention of the members of this Committee that the backbone of the Republican Party is in the agricultural States of the Midwest.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is a very good Republican observation. I hope the backbone of the Republican Party, the farmers, will remember that it was the Democratic Party that gave them the farm legislation years ago when they were prostrated and then when they turned in vain in 1929, 1930, and 1931 to their Republican Representatives in Congress, turned to them in vain. It was only after we Democrats came in under the leadership of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt that a real farm program was put into operation. It is most pleasing to know that the Republican Party has finally been converted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. The New Deal certainly has been beneficial to the farmers, and despite all of the characterizations of past years the great majority of the Republican Members of Congress are now coming in falling over one another to try and show their farmer constituents that they favor this legislation which is strictly New Deal legislation proposed by Franklin D. Roosevelt and put on the statute books by a Democratic-controlled Congress against the severe opposition of the Republican Party in the Congresses of the past.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the smartest Republican politician in Congress, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCCORMACK. And, by the way, the manager of one of the Republican candidates for President who said that Congress ought to adjourn because of President Truman's statement, and forgot 145,000,000 other Americans.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to ask this simple question.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Is it simple?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; very simple; I think the gentleman can understand it.

The bill to which the gentleman referred and to which he pointed with such great pride as having been passed in the early days of the New Deal is the bill the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional; is it not?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes; but we passed other legislation, and the legislation that is upon the statute books was passed by Democratic Congresses. The pending bill is nothing but an extension, in the main, of existing law on support prices and that was placed on the statute books by a Democratic-controlled Congress. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman makes my case out then.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman remembers very well that after the New Deal legislation, to which he originally referred, was declared unconstitutional, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and some of the Republican members of the Committee on Agriculture worked out a bill that was constitutional.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is trying to hang his hat on the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who is one of the real outstanding Members of Congress and who as a Republican was constantly repudiated by his own party in bygone years when he was trying to cooperate with the Democratic majority in getting through a real, sound, stable agricultural program. It is very pleasing now to note our Republican friends are converted to good Democratic policies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will dispense with the political discussions until after the national conventions have met. This is a question that affects the whole economy of America. Republicans and Democrats should be equally interested in seeing this price-support program put over.

Mr. Chairman, I know something about how the farm program was worked out and I thank God it was not worked out under the leadership of the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania who have just spoken. It was worked out by Democrats and Republicans alike of the House Committee on Agriculture. That is where most of the farm legislation originated. I am happy to say that the members of that committee, both Democrats and Republicans, when they enter the committee room leave their politics on the outside. They have been working over the years in the interest of the farmer, without regard to politics, and as a result I believe the farmers of America today have the best program of any country in the world. Now, let us forget politics. We have a most important piece of legislation, so far as the farmers of America are concerned, up for consideration today. Let us consider it on its merits. Do not let us measure it by the Democratic yardstick or the Republican yardstick,but let us measure it by a higher yardstick, namely, what is good for the American people, with special reference to the American farmer. I know that the consumers of America, when they understand this program, are going to be just as strongly in favor of it as the farmers themselves.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. May I say for the benefit of the House that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], who is the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, could not have been more nonpartisan than he was during my service on that committee, and today, with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] as chairman, we do not recognize politics on our committee. There is never a single word, as the gentleman speaking well knows, of a political nature discussed in our committee. May I add, we will sorely miss the gentleman from Virginia when he retires from our committee and the House next January.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] which will permit the growers of potatoes to harvest their 1948 crop any time prior to June 30, 1949, and still be assured of the guaranty of 90 percent of parity. I agree with the gentleman from Kansas that this is the best way out of a bad situation. Unless we extend this guaranty the 1948 crop of potatoes will be thrown on the market in November and December of this year. Under existing law the Government would have to buy those potatoes at 90 percent of parity. We know from experience that they could not be disposed of economically and the result would be that millions of bushels of perfectly good potatoes would be thrown away.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to extending this so-called price-support program for another 2 years. I think the bill could quite properly be called a bill to support the high cost of living.

When I first came to the House in 1939 some of my friends from the agricultural districts attempted to explain the so-called parity formula to me. I do not expect to live long enough to understand all of the detals of the parity formula. I was convinced, however, that if farm prices ever reached the parity level, the American farmer would be in a seventh heaven.

Some representatives of rural districts preferred the so-called cost-of-production program rather than the parity program. To guarantee the American farmer the cost of production appealed to me as extending reasonable support.

During general debate yesterday several Members stated that we had guaranteed industry a profit during the war. I know of no legislation that guaranteed industry a profit. It is true that many corporations made large profits but many suffered losses even during the war years. Colt's Patent Firearms Corp. is certainly a well-known munitions manufacturer. It may surprise many of my colleagues to learn that Colt's actually operated at a loss during some of the war years.

Is there a single Member of this House who honestly believes that there will be any need of support prices for agricultural products during the next 2 years? Certainly the amount of currency in circulation and the demand for foodstuffs both at home and abroad should be sufficient guaranty to the American farmer of a fair price in a free market and without the necessity of Federal control and regulation. Let us look for a moment at the way the potato program worked out this past year under this legislation. It cost the American taxpayer more than a hundred million dollars, and at the same time the American consumer of potatoes paid just about the highest price in all our history. Hundreds of thousands of bushels of perfectly good potatoes were burned or otherwise deliberately destroyed. It is only natural that every farmer who has some cultivatable acreage will go out and plant potatoes if he knows that he is guaranteed a very substantial profit.

I understand in the bill now before us it is proposed that we prevent farmers from growing all the potatoes they want to grow by adopting some system of acreage allotment. I for one have not reached the point where I am willing to admit that we can no longer operate a free economy here in the United States. I still look forward to the day when an American citizen can buy a farm, operate it as he sees fit, grow whatever crops he wishes to grow, and that the country will be prosperous enough to assure him a fair return on his investment and for his labor. To me that is the American way.

Unfortunately, partisanship has been injected into this discussion. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] expresses pride that the price-support program is a New Deal program sponsored by the late President Roosevelt. He expresses the hope that the American farmer will remember that in November. I would point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that the American farmer has passed on his administration's agricultural program in several elections since 1932.

The votes cast in the Farm Belt and in the rural areas of industrial States indicate quite clearly that the American farmer will accept the dollars Congress votes to give him, but when election day comes around he expresses his disapproval of the whole program by voting against those who propose and make effective such a system.

I am reminded that in the campaign of 1944 one irate farmer in my district endorsed a check for something over $300 that he had just received from Washington, to the Treasurer of the Republican campaign committee and sent a note along with his check saying he wanted this Government check used in the most effective way that it could be used to defeat the program under which the check had been sent to him.

There may come a day in the United States when we should consider and may need a price-support program. When that day comes we can deal with the situation, but there is nothing before us today that indicates any need for this program for the next 2 years at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, coming from the greatest steel center in the world, the city of Pittsburgh, and not knowing anything about the farm-price program, I was very much interested to hear my good friend and colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] refer to the Pittsburgh-plus program. He, of course, is way out in South Dakota and I do not think he understands the Pittsburgh-plus program. The Government has nothing whatever to do with it. That is simply a business arrangement made between the producers of steel and coal and one or two other products. Why Pittsburgh-plus should be brought into the argument by the South Dakota farmers I cannot understand, because the Government certainly has nothing to do with initiating or continuing a Pittsburgh-plus basing point.

Then I was also interested to hear my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] say that this program is not the American way of free enterprise. I wonder what all the farmers throughout the country who have been so much in favor of this program will think about

the remarks of my friend when he makes that statement.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the gentleman misunderstood me. What I meant to say was that it is against the principles on which this country has operated. It is an entirely different procedure. It was instituted by the New Deal, and I regret that our Republican colleagues are now following on with it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. From what I can understand, this amendment is a good amendment, because it will stabilize the potato market. We in the cities like to have the potato market stabilized, of course. That is the reason I am going to vote for the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield, gladly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was wondering if the gentleman would not admit that the Interstate Commerce Commission has something to do with railroad rates, which are related to Pittsburgh-plus, and if the tariff laws do not have something to do with the protection for Pennsylvania steel?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Pittsburgh-plus basing-point system is a matter of private enterprise and private business. The Government certainly did not set it up, so I fail to see any relationship between the two.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] would be here at this moment. I wanted to ask him some questions. But perhaps the gentleman from Colorado will be able to speak for him in answering.

The thing that disturbs me most about this amendment has not been mentioned in the debate thus far. I can see no objection to that part of the amendment which provides that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, will be marketed in an orderly way throughout the first half of next year, if they are not disposed of before the end of this year. But in order to get that which I favor I have to take the latter part which puts hogs, chickens, and eggs under a support-price guaranty of 90 percent of parity for next year and until June 30, 1950. In the case of potatoes we are merely providing for the orderly marketing of potatoes already in the ground. It will not in the least increase production of them, but for eggs, hogs, and chickens, the amendment will guarantee clear up until the middle of 1950 a 90-percent support price, no matter how great surplus production that may stimulate for next year. No evidence, facts, or figures or even estimates have been presented on these commodities. I do not like to vote for any mandatory 90-percent support without some justification from the committee. I would rather leave them under the flexible 60 to 90 percent of parity guaranty.

It seems to me the committee ought to agree to divide the amendment and let us vote on the potato proposition separately from the others. Let each stand on its merits. We do not want to create the sort of expensive surpluses and wastage of these other commodities that developed with potatoes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota than whom there is no greater expert in these fields.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman does not need to have any fear about the price of hogs going down to the support price level.

Mr. JUDD. Then why put hogs in? As a matter of fact I am not so concerned about the hogs, or even the chickens. It is eggs I am worried about. I think we may get into trouble with egg surplus as we have a couple of times before.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The poultry population is 10 percent less now than it was last year, which means fewer eggs. The pork population is down. The cattle population is down. Meat prices and pork prices are going up, and the people of the country will be eating more eggs because of the higher price for meat.

Mr. JUDD. If that is true, if you are so confident that there will be increased demand for eggs with resultant higher prices, then the price support will never be necessary, so why do you want to write it in? Why do we not allow the Secretary of Agriculture discretion in setting support prices for these commodities between 60 and 90 percent of parity, depending upon whether a shortage in production of eggs, chickens, or hogs actually develops or threatens?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me point out to the gentleman that the poultry industry of the United States is a very sensitive industry.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It takes time to raise a chicken that will lay eggs. You cannot turn on a faucet overnight and accomplish that. Therefore, in order to insure a sufficient quantity of eggs that might be consumed next winter, you have to make plans for that now, so that these pullets can be raised and be in production next year.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman accept a division of the amendment so that it can be voted on in two parts?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think it would be advisable.

Mr. JUDD. I regret that I am forced reluctantly to vote against the potato part which I strongly favor, because of some of the other parts for which the committee has not presented convincing evidence.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then the gentleman is penalizing his consumers.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that in some portions of the debate this afternoon we have heard speeches and observations with a sectional tinge. I do not suppose there is a potato that will be sold in the market in my district. I do know, Mr. Chairman, that this particular amendment with reference to potatoes, whether it passes or not, would make no difference in the world to the potato growers of the South. Therefore, my approach to this matter is entirely impersonal. I believe that in America we should be one for all and all for anyone who needs us. It is a matter of high importance to the Government, then, in the saving of money to the growers of the North in Maine and in the Western States such as Idaho and many other States, that we might name, that this amendment be adopted. If the farmers of those regions are compelled to sell their potatoes in order to get the benefit of the parity provision in November and December, they must sell them at 60 cents if that is the market price, and then they must look to the Government for the difference between that and the parity payment. But if you will let them follow an orderly market which is not glutted because of a crop that has to be sold within a certain period of 30 to 60 days, and if you give them the same assurance for the 1948 crop for sales later, then they will have an opportunity to work their own way out and guarantee to the Government less possibility of loss through such payments. Wherever we live, North, South, East, or West, let us try to legislate for the benefit of the country, so that we will be one for all and all for one. I think my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, is under a misapprehension about the egg proposition because that is necessary in view of the fact that the poultry population is going down, and if they have any assurance of some kind, it is going to go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this farm bill should pass. I will support it wholeheartedly, because it is similar to the bill which I recently introduced, although I firmly believe mine to be a superior bill. However, this legislation will help the American farmer insofar as the basic commodities are concerned, and for that reason should be made law.

It is gratifying indeed that we are giving some consideration to the American farmer here today. I must confess that I am rather surprised that the farmers of the United States have been able to get some consideration. We have all been so busy giving away the good food which he produces, I was beginning to suspect that we had forgotten the man who grows it.

And while the Congress is in this most charitable mood, I beg it to give its careful attention to another bill, of which I am the author, and which is aimed at the solution of a pressing domestic problem. I refer now to my bill to establish a Department of Transportation.

Such legislation is needed in order to solve a problem which long has plagued our farmers and consumers—the problem of transportation and distribution. This problem will continue to plague us until legislation such as I now propose is made into law.

Several Members from city districts have taken the floor today and talked against this farm legislation. They, with expressions of pure holiness, claim we

are subsidizing the American farmer—a peculiarly difficult remark for me to understand, since it comes from those who have recently passed legislation which would subsidize millions of farmers in some 16 foreign countries. But in the passion of their righteousness, these Members from the city districts have neglected to tell you how industry and big business are subsidized. They neglect to tell you that in the ECA relief program big business is given a golden opportunity to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into already overflowing Wall Street coffers.

The critics to whom I have listened patiently—even wearily—today, are the same ones who criticized our committee when it cut the ECA appropriations somewhat so that American farmers could have a little more machinery; so that American consumers would not have to tighten their belts to a point of pain because of the scarcities ECA may cause.

These critics from the city neglected to tell you, among a great many other things, about the price of eggs. When American farmers were getting 28 cents a dozen for eggs, the consumers in the East were paying from 85 to 90 cents a dozen for the very same eggs.

Contributing to this big difference in prices is the cost of transportation and distribution, a problem which my bill seeks to remedy.

But let's go back to the ECA for just a moment, so that I might point out further inconsistencies in the arguments of the city critics. Our committee, in the course of carefully examining the ECA, studied the availability of every item in the United States which the ECA plans to include in its program. We studied availabilities and production potentials in the participating countries. We are familiar with every item that will go into this gargantuan gift. And we do not object to the food, medicines, clothing, and necessities needed to help our less fortunate friends across the oceans. But I believe our American people expect us to study each item carefully and give some serious consideration to the needs and wants of our own people. There is a half-billion dollar cost for transportation alone in this program. There are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of machinery, steel, copper, wool, cotton, tobacco, and many other items which affect our availability and economy.

In the first year of the program alone, there will be taken from this country five to six billion dollars worth of items in general need here. Admittedly, much of it we can spare and will gladly share with the needy foreigners. But the argument that we are subsidizing the American farmer in this bill is definitely not supported by facts. Rather, it is the foreign farmer that the ECA bill will subsidize to the tune of billions of American taxpayers' dollars. And not merely for 1 year, but at least for 4½ years and perhaps more.

The total can easily exceed $25,000,000,000. The program hopes to increase the productive capacities of foreign farms; it hopes to bring under cultivation greater areas of foreign lands, so that the countries of Europe can attain a level where they can feed themselves.

This is indeed a laudable purpose. But I must object strenuously when the city Members suggest, as they did today, that this American farm bill will be doing something for American farmers to which they are not entitled.

The American farmer has performed miracles of production whenever he has been called upon to do so, either in time of war or in time of peace. And he is being asked to perform another miracle now.

But I ask you, is it unreasonable to request that we start protecting the American farmer against the day when he will again be faced with foreign competition in his own American market.

I do not think it ridiculous of me to demand that in our hysterical rush to rebuild the world we do a little rehabilitation right here in America and on American farms.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend passage of this American farm bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I think the controversy on this one commodity, potatoes, is indicative of a significant fact. It is indicative of the success of the agriculture price-support program. I think it is rather remarkable that a program of such vast scope and complexity as a price-support program of so many and varied commodities would be before the House for debate, with no more complaint or criticism of its operation than we have had here today.

With respect to the price support on the nonbasic agricultural commodities, I would like to recall to you that it was enacted for two reasons; first, to encourage production during the war; and, second, to give to the farmers a justifiable assurance of a reasonable income from the commodities which they did produce in response to the request of their country to do so. This guaranty extended for 2 years after the end of the war. The program has been a success, but unless extended it dies next December. Hence this bill which I hope the House will adopt.

I appreciate the kind reference of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] on yesterday to the part I had in bringing about the enactment of the program at that time, when I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which committee was led by one of our beloved and departed colleagues. I would like to just take a moment to pay tribute to the memory and service of the late Henry Steagall.

Those of us who labored with him know that he was a gentleman of sterling heart, of abiding faith that programs like this could be made to work, of abiding faith in the ability of democracy to meet the tests, to solve the problems. Henry Steagall made great contributions to his country. He was a great citizen. May God give to us and our posterity more men of his worth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I come from a State that raises potatoes and a few other things. We produce up there nearly one-seventh of all the white potatoes produced in this country.

I am not a great subsidy advocate. Any man who is opposed to all subsidies can support this amendment so far as potatoes are concerned. The proposition is in here to meet a definite situation. We face a condition, not a theory. Unless something like this is done the farmers will suffer and the public will suffer because the Steagall amendment is going to expire on December 31, 1948, and after that there is to be a reduction to a minimum of 60 and a maximum of 90 percent in the parity support price formula. Between those two figures it is to be left to the Secretary of Agriculture. You can see what is going to happen next December unless the price of this year's crop is protected. The market will be destroyed. So I am going to support this amendment to save the farmers and the public from the evil results which will otherwise inevitably follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am against this proposition because I believe it is another manifestation of the old effort to have the Government take care of you and me, which idea is repugnant to the people whom I represent here. We are able to take care of ourselves.

The gentleman from Maine who just spoke is afraid the market may be glutted. I think that Yankee institutions and initiative can take care of their own markets. We are being asked here to take care of a certain group of farmers. Let me ask who takes care of the fisherman who goes out on his boat and takes his life in his hands every time he does so? How many of you know the number of boats which come back with one or two members of the crew missing? Who is going to help support their families? They can take care of themselves if given the opportunity to compete. The only important thing we need is competition. They talk about potatoes. They say they cannot ship them to Europe because of the lack of refrigeration. Let me remind you that we took care of the potato situation and the food situation and every other situation before the New Dealers decided to try to regulate our lives. I do not say that this is a New Deal regulation. I will not admit it, but I will say, once and for all, that the sooner we return to the proposition under which we were born—to take care of ourselves—the sooner we will be 100 percent better off. When the day comes that we must ask somebody from California, Arizona, New Mexico, or Florida to take care of the State of Massachusetts, I do not want to be here. Let us each take care of our own problems in this country; let us get back to the system we had that worked so well for 300 years. Let us try to run

our own affairs and not try to tell somebody else what is best for them to do.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 101, noes 13.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the committee amendment, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD as a substitute for the committee amendment in the bill as amended: Page 3, line 6, strike out the following: "except milk and its products," and insert in lieu thereof: "except that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and its products, hogs and chickens."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 14, after the word "hereof", insert the following: "In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

ESSENTIAL IN FARM PROGRAM

The backbone of a sound agricultural program must have two features. One is to put a floor under commodity prices for times of slump. The other is to maintain soil as a national resource.

This bill proposes to take care of the first item by continuing the so-called support program which would otherwise expire at the end of this calendar year. As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has explained, the Committee on Agriculture is working on a longe-range farm program but proposes to continue this support program in the meantime. Certainly that should be done and this bill should pass by an overwhelming vote.

Maintenance of soil fertility is a function of the soil conservation program. That, too, is essential; and when time comes for the House to express itself on continuing an adequate program in that regard, I am sure it will do so.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress is meeting its responsibility in giving attention to matters such as these before we adjourn, and I express my appreciation for the action of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Rules in bringing this bill before us today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 21, strike out "1948" and insert "December 31, 1948."

Page 3, line 23, strike out "1949" and insert "June 30, 1950."

Page 4, line 9, strike out the words "and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand" and insert the following: "In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 2, line 1, after the word "peanuts", add the words "all fruits."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at the termination of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, the gavel fell when I was on my feet before, and I was unable to get the point over that I was making. Therefore I am going to indulge the Committee further by speaking about a great industry which does not have any boundaries except the very limits of the United States. I speak of the fruit industry. Not only can pears, apples, grapes, and all those other edible fruits which are raised in up-State New York be included, but also citrus fruits of Texas, oranges of California and Florida, and any number of other fruits that are grown throughout the entire Nation. Fruits should certainly be included in the program, but due to the fact that I did not mention anything of that sort to the chairman, because it was motivated by rather an eleventh-hour thought, and in view of a point made to me by one of the other Members of the House who is not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I will not present the amendment for a vote.

I do feel, however, that it is a subject which ought to command the attention of the House, that fruits of all kinds ought to be included in such a program. I am happy to say that 3 or 4 years ago, when the subject of crop insurance was up on the floor of the House, I presented an amendment which was passed by the House to include all fruits in the crop-insurance program. Perhaps you do not think there is much connection between crop insurance and this support-price program, but there could be some relationship, and I think the subject ought to be aired here today. It ought to be emphasized that there is a possibility of some of the canneries of the Northeast being unable to meet their 1948 pack unless the fruit and vegetable growers are guaranteed a support price. I am told that they are not going to be able to have enough of a crop so that they can possibly operate in the 1948 pack.

I want to call attention to another matter which I think is deserving of notice at this time. Two distinguished members of the Committee on Agriculture are leaving the House. They have served here many years. They have contributed a great deal to the thoughts and the efforts of the Committee on Agriculture and of the entire House of Representatives. They are deserving of the most honorable mention. I speak of our former distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], and our beloved Member on the Republican side, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ANTON JOHNSON. The gentlemen I have named are leaving the House at the end of this session. They will be sorely missed, certainly by the Committee on Agriculture, as well as by the entire membership. I believe that such sterling Americans as those gentlemen deserve all the tributes it is possible for this House to give.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was interested in the remarks made by the gentleman about fruits. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and is always alert to take advantage of every situation. Did I understand him to say that he intended to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I asked unanimous consent at the beginning of my remarks to withdraw the amendment at the termination of my speech.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So the gentleman does not care to press his amendment for a vote?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not care to, for the reason I gave. I have not consulted with the chairman or the other members of the committee. I did not wish to impose upon them at this time because, as I explained before, this was motivated as a result of an eleventh-hour discussion I had with one of the other members of the committee, but I believe it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman, of course, has always been aware of that situation, so it did not lead to any particular observation for another member to call attention to it now. It is nothing new.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's efforts, but I was not armed, let me say, with some of facts which he presented me until a few minutes ago and I hesitate to press the amendment further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the bill which is now before us to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities. Nothing would benefit our country more than such a stabilization of prices at this time, for if the farmers of our Nation are given the security that such a measure provides not only they but all of us will be benefited. This bill, as you know, simply extends the provisions of various price-support programs, some of which have been in effect since 1938. It would

enable the Secretary of Agriculture to impose production goals and marketing regulations upon commodities which are in overproduction or threatened overproduction.

The price-support program is the only program that enables the Government to see that the farmers of America are given a square deal. It is an attempt to give the farmer's dollar the same purchasing power enjoyed by the consumers and the industrialists and the laboring people of America. It is an effort to help the farmer through organization, just as the laboring man and the industrialists are helped through their organized efforts.

Unless this bill is passed, price supports will terminate on December 31, 1949, and I feel that such a course would be disastrous to the farmers of the entire country. The plan has been tested by time and experience, and has proved eminently satisfactory and highly beneficial to our farmers. The continuance of this program is our best defense against the bankruptcy and ruin which brought such woeful despair to our country before this price-support system was enacted into law. If it should not pass, I hate to think of the consequences, for the stability of our country, particularly of the South, would be severely jeopardized.

The bill extends the provisions of various price-support programs, some of which have been in effect since 1938.

Deals with the basic commodities, such as wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, cotton, and peanuts—section 1. Prices on these commodities shall be supported at 90 percent of parity until June 30, 1950.

The 90-percent provision applies to all farmers who cooperate in the program, provided marketing quotas have not been disapproved by producers.

The method of price support not only includes loans but also purchases and other market operations on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation, thus giving an opportunity to put into effect a broader program than would otherwise be possible.

A provision in the bill would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to impose production goals and marketing regulations upon commodities which are in overproduction or threatened overproduction.

The Secretary of Agriculture as a prerequisite to support shall require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations. This affords some control over actual or anticipated overproduction.

Section 2 provides that from any funds available to department or any agency under its direction for price support or surplus disposal the Secretary is authorized to use such amounts as necessary to carry out section 1.

Section 3 restates section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It broadens the present section 22, which authorizes the President upon a certain showing being made to put into effect an import fee or an import quota upon those commodities the importation of which renders ineffective or materially interferes with a price-support program. At the present time there are in effect import quotas upon certain types and kinds of cotton and upon wheat and wheat flour. No quotas on other commodities at this time. There is no logic and no reason in supporting the price of an agricultural commodity in this country if the program can be rendered ineffective by imports.

No connection between price-support program and the price-control program. The price-support program was in effect before anyone ever heard of the price-control program.

This is an attempt to give the farmer's dollar the same purchasing power enjoyed by the consumers and the industrialists and the laboring people of America.

This is an effort to help the farmer through organization, just as the laboring man and the industrialists are organized.

This is the only program that enables the Government to see that the farmers of America are given a square deal.

Price supports will terminate December 31, 1949, unless this bill is passed.

This plan has been tested by time and experience and has proved eminently satisfactory and highly beneficial to the farmers of this country.

The continuance of the price-support plan is our best defense against the bankruptcy and ruin which brought want and woe, desperation and despair to the farmers of this country before this price-support system was enacted into law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 2, line 1, strike out "rice, and peanuts" and insert in lieu thereof "and rice."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I may be the only one on one side to belabor this amendment, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I assume the gentleman would have no objection if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] might have an equal length of time when it comes to presenting the opposition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, before I address myself specifically to the amendment, let me just say one word about this bill generally. I doubt whether any piece of legislation has disturbed me quite as much as what is before us today. Pending in the Rules Committee are two bills to provide pay increases for the postal workers and for the generality of Government workers. I do not know what the aggregate amount is, but I fancy it is probably $500,000,000 and maybe more. It is labeled a cost-of-living-increase raise. The same bills are pending over on the other side of the Capitol. Raise the cost of living and then, of course, of necessity you must come along and raise the capacity of people to enjoy a decent living standard.

The thing that disturbs me most about this bill is the mandatory provisions. If you read the bill, you will find that the Secretary of Agriculture must take all the instrumentalities at his command, cash and credit resources and authority, for the purpose of supporting prices. It is not flexible; it is not permissive. Line 4 on page 1 states that the Secretary is "authorized and directed." He has $5,250,000,000 of cash and credit authority to do what? To follow out what we propose to tell him to do, and what we are going to say to him is this: "Mr. Secretary, we do not care what the conditions are, we do not care what you may think and what your findings may be, we do not care what kind of adjustments you would like to make on the basis of your findings over the country, the Congress is going to say to you that you must, whether you like it or not, support 90 percent of the parity price on cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, peanuts, milk, milk products, potatoes, sweetpotatoes, hogs, chickens, and eggs." That is what you are going to say to the Secretary of Agriculture today. I regret there is not time enough at this late hour to devote myself to the philosophy of this bill. To my friends on this side of the aisle, I am going to say that this is going to be the biggest argument you will have. I have argued and debated upon the platform in nearly every State in the Union. I am willing to meet any argument that comes along, but when a man stands up in an audience at Yakima or Portland or Massachusetts or in Illinois or Greensboro, North Carolina, or Texarkana and waves a newspaper advertisement and says to me, "Mr. Congressman, what are you going to do about $1 steak?" I have run out of arguments, and you are likewise going to run out of arguments. You see, by making this rigid, by removing all the flexibility on hogs, chickens, sweetpotatoes, potatoes, rice, corn, wheat, cotton, and all the rest of the commodities.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman speaks as if this bill were adding inflexibility to the law. As a matter of fact, this bill add flexibility. While there are some commodities on which the inflexible rate is maintained, on many commodities the bill does authorize a flexible rate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But we had added commodities to which the flexible rate does not pertain.

Mr. HOPE. No; we are not adding commodities to which the flexible rate does not pertain. Heretofore the rate on all the Steagall commodities has been not less than parity. In this bill we say the rate on most of them shall not be less than 60 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand. The last amendment by the committee specifically added new commodities.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. This bill and the price program has nothing in the world to do with $1 steak. If cattle were selling today for 90 percent of parity, steak would not be anywhere in the neighborhood of $1.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would say to my friend that I was using that as symbolic

of the cost of living. If you do not have the cost of living involved in this bill, I would like to know what it relates to.

Mr. Chairman, in the first part of this bill you mandate the Secretary of Agriculture to support at 90 percent of parity the price on peanuts. The amendment that I have offered undertakes to exclude peanuts. The welkin rang not so long ago in the great struggle here, the struggle of the century, the American housewife versus the American dairy cow. The American housewife won by more than a 2-to-1 vote. The argument I make to you today is for the American youngster who eats candy bars with peanuts in them against the oil expressers and against the policy which keeps the price so high that the number of peanuts in a peanut bar is gradually getting less and less. That is the argument today. When I was in high school way back in 1909 and 1910, one of my greatest delights was to walk home after school or a school party munching a bag of peanuts. Principally they were munched in ball parks. It can hardly be said that it was an outstanding commercial crop, because the value of the crop then was about $14,000,000 and the value of the crop in 1947 or 1946 was in round figures perhaps $240,000,000.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman will want to revise that figure. The maximum value would be about $150,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One hundred and fifty million dollars. That is right. I meant about $140,000,000 when I used the figure above.

Now, over the years peanuts came along, and finally became a basic crop. For practical purposes they are considered as a basic crop in this bill today and the Secretary of Agriculture is mandated with respect thereto. I do not quarrel so much about the fact that the grower in Georgia and Florida and California and Texas and Alabama and Virginia and the Carolinas and elsewhere is entitled to a fair shake, but I say to you that what we are going to do today is to further price peanuts out of the market.

When the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee on this long-range program, in April of 1947, this is what he said:

> We should make sure, however, that we do not establish a rigid system of price relationship. We will do well to heed the warning of the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning. It spoke of the danger of pricing our commodities out of the markets. It states the needed long-run adjustments in agriculture will not necessarily be accomplished by present price-support programs, together with a system of production quotas.

So by keeping this price up where it is at the present time, you are pricing peanuts out of the market and you are denying a very essential food to the youngsters of America; and if it continues, obviously it will hurt the industry and the trade of those who built up the peanut industry from a half million acres back in 1909 and 1910 to where it is today, hovering around 3,500,000 or 4,000,000 acres.

Another significant thing has happened. During the wartime a provision crept into one of the acts in 1945 to the effect that the Commodity Credit Corporation, with its authority to take over and purchase peanuts, make loans, and do all necessary things, could not sell a single peanut below parity price, unless they were sold for oil, seed, or export. Now, that is the law today. What you propose to do in the bill that is before us is to continue the discrimination that was written in wartime, and certainly should come out of our agriculture policy. It was Public Law No. 30, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved April 12, 1945. That suspended section 1 of the act of 1938, so that peanuts for oil, or other commodities, including peanuts, that might be used for export or seed or feed would not come within that restriction. So, in proportion as they gear the price of oil, that is where peanuts go down, but not for the candy makers, not for the peanut-butter makers, not for the salters trade, not for edible users.

Now, on yesterday I belabored this oil matter. It costs 29 cents a pound to produce peanut oil. It costs 19 cents a pound to produce soybean oil. It costs 17 cents a pound to produce cottonseed oil. It costs 14 cents a pound to produce coconut oil. You notice the difference. If you are going to peg that oil at 17 cents, somebody has to pay the difference between what the Commodity Credit Corporation pays for the peanuts which it buys and the peanuts it sells to the oil expresser. That will be either the Federal treasury or it will have to be taken out of the candy trade, the salters trade, or the peanut-butter trade. The Department informed me only yesterday that losses on peanuts for the present year will run between three and four million.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman would not want to leave the impression that the price of peanut oil was 17 cents, when it sold yesterday for 35 cents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. PACE. That is the impression the gentleman left.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am speaking of the base price of oil, with which peanut oil has to compete. Everybody knows it has to compete with cottonseed oil. When they sell peanuts at $100 a ton less, or whatever the Commodity Credit Corporation wants to take, it is fair to impose that kind of a burden, that kind of an offset upon the users who built up the peanut industry in the country? As a result of that discrimination, as a result of that disparity, this market for peanuts is rapidly receding.

I have here some figures. The figures are dated May 20, 1948, and they show that in 1944 we used 313,000,000 pounds of peanuts for peanut butter; in 1945, 394,000,000 pounds; in 1947, it dropped back to 272,000,000 pounds, or a recession of 125,000,000 pounds for peanut butter. Why is it? Certain good mulsified grades of peanut butter will cost 35, 38, or 40 cents a pound. But you can buy apple butter for 12 cents a pound. You can buy good jelly for 16 or 17 cents a pound. Obviously, at that rate, the peanut butter cannot compete with those cheaper spreads that are in the market today and little by little the growers' market disappears and the country is denied the food value of this crop. As a result the market for peanuts, the market which was built up by the people who plunged in and made this a very popular spread, is receding year by year.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman made a statement yesterday afternoon that the candy bar had decreased in size and increased in cost because of this situation with respect to peanuts. Let me say to the gentleman that Great Britain, after all the lend-lease, all the UNRRA, all the British loan, and all the Marshall-plan help we have given her, is the chief malefactor in this situation because she has a monopoly on cocoa and has raised the price of cocoa to 26 cents a pound. That is the reason for the high price of candy bars.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is one reason for the high price of candy bars and candy; I admit that. Glucose, milk, and the cost of eggs have gone up, too. Since 1926 the cost of peanuts to the trade has gone up 221 percent. It is a notorious fact that the cost of cocoa has gone up and insofar as it may relate to chocolate bars that would be true; but may I point out to the gentleman that is a matter over which we do not have control in this Congress and it is a matter that is not pending in the present bill and I do not know any way of getting at it since it lies in the power of a foreign government to remedy this condition. But shall we argue that because the price of one commodity that is controlled on the outside in some island where the cocoa bean is produced should prevent us from taking remedial action over something we can control?

Frankly, the amount of peanuts used in the peanut bars and peanut candy has progressively gone down; and I may say that even our distinguished friend from Georgia will admit the fact. Somebody said, "Well, you find only three peanuts in a Hershey bar or three or two peanuts in some other bar." Obviously with prices so high that is all you are going to find, and that is the reason I make the statement that peanuts are pricing themselves out of the market and a tremendous advantage is being given now to those candy-bar makers who have always popularized and emphasized the so-called soft-center bars.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman give us the price per ton of peanuts, say in 1936 and 1937, and the price of peanut butter in those years compared to prices for the same commodities today?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether I have those prices before me or not but I may say to the gentleman there is a tremendous disparity even between 1940 and 1947. In 1939 the peanut-butter makers paid 5½ cents a

pound for peanuts. In 1947 they paid 15¾ cents.

One of the matters that was emphasized here is simply this: Why should we consider peanuts as a basic commodity and let the Secretary through this act mandate the trade of the industry and the country to keep them at 90 percent of parity? If it is a question of the size of the crop, then why not mandate soybeans, a crop that returns upward of $500,000,000? Why not mandate barley? The barley crop is around $225,000,000. Why not include oats?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me finish this; then I will yield.

So you see we go on the theory that this is a basic commodity, so we are going to mandate the Secretary of Agriculture to keep it at 90 percent. In proportion as we do so, of course, this market is going to recede progressively as it has done in the last few years and this is going to be denied to the youngsters of America. Can it not be on a basis comparable to other edible commodities? Why not peas, beans, turkeys, and all other Steagall commodities on which we can go down to 60 percent? That is the answer.

Before I close I want to bear witness to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. This is not new. He and I have considered this matter for years. He has been a perfect gentleman about it. He is a great legislator and he is a fine Christian gentleman. We have tried to find some basis that might be agreeable. He may say that the candy people were satisfied with what they got in the last discussions we had in his office. They are not satisfied. They have no choice except to be satisfied with what appears in the law today. It is like a man who is about to be hung and the governor has refused to commute his sentence. He might as well be content. The candy makers have to be content because the law is what it is.

In proportion as we give flexibility to the program under the Secretary of Agriculture to go down to 60 percent on peanuts, whether it be permissively or by mandate, we, of course, are going to bring peanuts back to the market. So that is the whole story. I hope this Congress will not make the mistake of mandating the Secretary of Agriculture from now until June of 1950 to insist upon a parity price of 90 percent on peanuts and lose this market progressively. You do not want to lose it any more than the candy makers want to relinquish it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman is disturbed about losing the market on peanuts and suggested we were producing and selling less peanut butter now than 2 or 3 years ago. The price has gone up. Does the gentleman have the price of peanut butter for 1940 and the consumption per capita for 1940 or any of the prewar years?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the price of peanut butter here for 1940. I do not find the note on it at the moment.

Mr. POAGE. Any of those prewar years. I think the gentleman will undoubtedly find that during the time we had millions of men under arms the United States Government bought and shipped to those men millions of tons of peanut butter, which accounts for that extra consumption per capita during that period of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman makes an argument for the amendment that is now pending on the floor. That was an emergency, it was done in wartime; now, are you going to go along with the committee and perpetuate that kind of discrimination in peacetime? That is the question that is before us right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather important issue for hundreds of thousands of people. I may say at the outset that the position of the gentleman from Illinois has somewhat changed overnight. He addressed us yesterday afternoon appealing to take peanuts out for the benefit of the candy manufacturers. This afternoon he tells us we should take them out for the benefit of the children. Certainly he and I will not have a dispute concerning the welfare of the children.

It has been suggested here that something special is being done for peanuts. That is not true. I would like to call your attention to the fact that there is no such thing in the law as a basic commodity. Peanuts is one of the six controlled crops. Cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts are subject to marketing quotas. All of those are in the same family and they have always kept together. As soon as peanuts were put under control they immediately joined the controlled family and have been carried along with wheat, corn, tobacco, cotton, and rice.

Peanuts is getting to be a significant crop. May I say that, unfortunately, peanuts is one of the commodities that it has not been able to mechanize and we anticipate it will be some 10 to 15 years before we can. It is still mostly hand labor. When peanuts are matured they have to be plowed up, picked up by hand, shaken, taken to a stack pole like a haystack pole, put on a stack and kept there for several weeks. Then you employ a picker to come and pay him as much as $28 a ton to pick them for you.

Unfortunately we have not been able to increase the yield of peanuts. In 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913 we were producing on the average about 800 pounds of peanuts to the acre. Last year the production was 667 pounds of peanuts to the acre. We have not had the advantage of the area served by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois of hybrid corn greatly increasing yields. We have not had the advantage of the mechanism which is enjoyed in the far west in the wheat areas. We have not had an opportunity in the way they have had to reduce our cost of production per unit. Of course, neither I nor the gentleman from Illinois suggest that we reduce the parity on corn or wheat, although from the production-cost angle there are many reasons why it would be more susceptible to other commodities rather than peanuts.

The appeals have been coming in, and everybody has received telegrams from various candy manufacturing companies. I would like to read one of those I received which is signed by the Curtis Candy Co. Listen to this. Maybe you have forgotten it. It says: "To save the confectionery industry." May I repeat that? "To save the confectionery industry vote 'yes' on peanut amendment." This is that amendment. They allege that they are just about to go out of business; they are just about to be ruined on account of a few little lowly peanuts. Let us look at the record.

I have before me the report of the Department of Commerce, March 8, 1948. Hear me now. Listen to it. March dollar sales of confectionery manufacturers were 13 percent above March 1947, and 4 percent higher than in February, and in the first quarter of this year were 12 percent above the first quarter of 1947. Now listen to this. Sales in March as reported by 124 manufacturers were up 8 percent over March 1947, and dollar volume was up 21 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume, though I have not seen those figures, that those are gross sales?

Mr. PACE. That is the confectionery industry which must be saved by reducing the price of the peanut 2, 3, and 4 cents. My friend does not merely mean to knock down the peanut farmer. By this amendment he means to stomp him to death, and I tell him now if he thinks he is saving the candy people by offering us a price under the cost of production, he is fooling himself. He will not get any peanuts at all. Who is going to ask the farmer to take his soil and deplete it and go out there and work in the sun and produce peanuts for nothing for this group? Listen to me now. These are the figures the staff of this committee secured on profits in the confectionery industry. I am not going to call any names, but if anybody wants to check they can come up here and check it. Now, these figures that I have are for 1945 and 1946. The staff advises us that the Security and Exchange Commission says that they are even greater in 1947. Listen to me. First company:

In 1943, their profit was $173,000; 1944, $182,000; 1945, $170,000; 1946, $205,000.

Another company: In 1944 their profits were $5,400,000. In 1945 their profits were $4,800,000. In 1946 their profits were $8,496,000. Talk about saving the confectionery industry for the benefit of the children, it looks to me as if they are asking that poor guy down yonder working in the hot sun 8 to 9 months a year to increase their profits further.

Another company: 1944, $391,000; 1945, $314,000; 1946, $444,000 of profit. That is more money than all the peanut farmers of my home county made out of peanuts last year, and that is one company, if you please. Talk about saving the confectionery industry, I think the time has come when these people who talk so much about the spread between the farm and the consumer had better look into the confectionery industry.

Another company: In 1944 it made $74,000; 1945, $67,000; 1946, $175,000.

I am going to read one more, but there are several others. In 1945 this company made $914,000, and in 1946 it made $2,420,000, yet they are asking you today to take peanuts out from under the protection of this section of the bill. You voted a few minutes ago to put chickens in at 90 percent support and you voted to put hogs in at 90 percent, and I supported it. You have wool in here at 90 percent. The gentleman from Illinois did not mention that. I supported that. You have eggs, and you have his wheat, and his soybeans enjoying the 90-percent support price at this hour, but he comes here and is going to solve the entire farm problem by hopping on the peanuts, and yesterday he said do it in the name of the candy industry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Of course.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be an answer, I think, to the gross profits picture that is being presented here at the present time, but to keep the record straight, the gentleman from Illinois opposed the amendment offered by the committee to extend this 90-percent provision to even other commodities, to make it even more rigid.

Mr. PACE. Let us take a look at this thing. We have gone downtown and we have bought some candy bars. We knew they would be talked about. I want to show them to you for a minute. We have here Old Nick, we have here Powerhouse, we have here Baby Ruth, and we have here O Henry. We bought two bars of each. Very carefully we separated the candy and sugar and everything else from them, and we saved out the peanuts in each bar. I took them myself down to Dr. Calver's office and had his technicians weigh them. Here they are. Now, let us get this straight. These gentlemen are buying shelled goods, No. 1 peanuts, on the market quoted this week at about 17 cents a pound. That is 16 ounces for 17 cents. To make it easy, let us say it is 1 cent an ounce, although you remember there is a slight difference to add.

Mr. GAVIN. How much a ton?

Mr. PACE. The gentleman will have to multiply that himself.

Mr. GAVIN. It is $340 a ton. Let us talk in terms of tons, and then we will get it straight.

Mr. PACE. Here are the peanuts from the Powerhouse. Look at them. He did not pay 17 cents for these because they are not No. 1. There are the peanuts from the Powerhouse.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. How many are there?

Mr. PACE. We weighed them, and they weighed 4 grams, which they tell me downstairs is approximately one-seventh of an ounce. If an ounce costs 1 cent, there is one-seventh of a cent's worth of peanuts in that candy bar. Why, you could cut the price in two and it would not make very much difference. It would not make any difference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that bears out the statement I made to the House that fewer and fewer peanuts are going into peanut bars.

Mr. PACE. No; it does not do any such thing. I will tell you what it does. The gentleman from Illinois told you that they are paying more for their cocoa. The sheet that they gave me shows cocoa has gone up 668 percent. They are paying more for their butter. They are paying more for the milk, and they are paying more for the sugar. They are paying more for their peanuts. What are they doing here this afternoon? They are asking you to let the farmer take the whole load. They do not dare come here to do something to try to reduce the price of the butter they buy. On the contrary, the gentleman from Illinois sat in his seat this afternoon and did not raise his voice when you voted here to put the 90-percent mandatory price on butter and milk that these candy people who are sitting in the gallery have to buy, just like they have to buy the peanuts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was a division vote on that amendment, and the gentleman from Illinois was one who stood on this side of the House in objection to that. But if the gentleman will yield further, I know that he wants to keep the record straight because these statements are being made in good faith. May I point out that glucose and milk and that sort of thing have gone up not to exceed 80 percent, while peanuts have gone up 221 percent.

Mr. PACE. But that depends on when you start. I admit that back in 1932 when wheat was selling for 25 cents a bushel, peanuts were selling at 2 cents a pound. There is no question about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman deny that these prices apply to the period from 1941 until the present?

Mr. PACE. I cannot check him on 1941.

Here is your O Henry bar. Here is your Baby Ruth bar, and this is your Old Nick candy bar. It happens that every one of them have exactly the same weight in peanuts. They have 10 grams. They told me downstairs that that is slightly less than one-third of an ounce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the only difference between these candy bars is that one of the companies uses No. 1 peanuts, and the other two companies use broken ones, and peanuts that they buy for about 14, 15, or 16 cents a pound.

Now, if you please, we have been told here that we must take the peanut farmer, the farmer who grows the crop that depletes his soil the most, the farmer who is in the worst economic condition, we are told that we must cut his price 30 percent or 40 percent in order to augment the profits of the candy manufacturers. It brought to my mind a passage from the Good Book, which teaches us many lessons:

> For unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

My friends, let me say to you, I do not know of any reason you voted to put eggs on the mandatory 90 percent list, and after you voted to put chickens on that list, and after you put cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco, and after you rightfully voted to put hogs on the mandatory 90 percent list, why you should now exclude peanuts.

Is there any good reason in your mind to go down and take out this one commodity? There is a group here which came to Washington about 3 weeks ago, who have walked up and down the halls of our office buildings, and stood outside of these doors and have button-holed you Members and demanded that you save the confectionery industry by reducing the price of peanuts. My distinguished friend from Illinois says that we are pricing ourselves out of the market. Who do you think is most interested in the peanut market? He or I? Really and truly, who do you think? I must have somebody to buy our peanuts. I am interested in selling peanuts to these candy makers. The gentleman from Illinois will confirm this. They came to my office a month or 6 weeks ago with the gentleman from Illinois and they made me this proposition: They said, "Go ahead and pay the farmer 90 percent of parity for peanuts. That is all right. We do not object to it. He is entitled to it. But you get out a bill whereby the Commodity Credit Corporation can pay the farmer 90 percent and sell them back to us at 72 percent."

We made a little calculation and we figured it would have cost the United States Government $50,000,000, and the gentleman from Illinois and I both agreed that no such thing could be done and no such thing should be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes; of course I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know about that specific conversation, although I

have had many conversations in the office of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. But if the candy people did make that kind of a proposition, what do you have to say about the oil people who, in a single year, got 162,000 tons of peanuts and, under existing law, as you would perpetuate it in this, can get it for any price that the Commodity Credit Corporation is willing to sell it to them for, while the candy people can get it only at 100 percent of parity.

Mr. PACE. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would get that oil business straight. He has not. It is not intentional. If the Government buys any peanuts and has to sell them; if the Government buys any wheat and has to sell it; if the Government buys any corn and has to sell it; or, if you please, if the Government buys any of the gentleman's soybeans and has to sell them, then under the law, act of April 12, 1945, the Government cannot sell any of these for less than the parity or comparable price except for new or byproduct uses, for export, for seed or feed, or peanuts for oil. Millions of bushels of wheat have been sold for feed, corn has been sold for byproducts, and peanuts have been sold for oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if others will be permitted to discuss this amendment, and, if so, to what extent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to answer that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am afraid I will have to object, Mr. Chairman, because others want to discuss this. The gentleman from Georgia has had 20 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois had 15 minutes. What is the time limit, may I ask the Chairman?

Mr. HOPE. There is no time limit agreed upon, as far as this amendment is concerned. I think the subject has been pretty well discussed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee specifically if those of us who want to discuss this provision of the bill will at least be allowed to have our full 5 minutes, inasmuch as the gentleman has had an extra 5 minutes, and that we will not have to be cut off and have to take a minute and a quarter.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree upon time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the time of the gentleman from Georgia will not be cut off, because I regard him as one of the best-informed men on this subject in either branch of Congress. We are interested in getting the whole story to the membership.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois has made the statement which he just made. Where has the interest of the taxpayer and the bond buyers in this matter been discussed? I have heard all I care to hear about the oil and candy people, but who is putting up the subsidy on this matter? Let us have a little discussion of that. There are some taxpayers who are interested.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CHURCH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is always sincere, and I am anxious that he show that sincerity here. The gentleman has quoted thousands in profits. Then he mentioned some larger figures. He has not in any way quoted percentages. I do not believe the gentleman wishes to leave the impression here that these thousands—there are hundreds of thousands and millions of profits have not in part at least gone to people in his section of the country.

Mr. PACE. No, in no sense of the word.

Mr. CHURCH. Let me ask the gentleman, if there are these thousands of profits, and he does not mention percentages, why down in his country does he not have companies that make these profits that he is trying to give us the impression other men have made?

Mr. PACE. We do have.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from Georgia be recognized for five additional minutes?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let us see if we cannot have some understanding as to how much more time is going to be required. I count 17 Members standing.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to serve notice that in case this motion is agreed to I shall have to object to the additional 5 minutes for the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that he be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object to make a parliamentary inquiry, will this 5 minutes be deducted from the 50 minutes already fixed, or in addition there?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be in addition to the 50-minute limitation.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. PACE. Let us look at the oil picture a minute. Today the price of oil, not just peanut oil, if you please, but the price of practically all oils are up around 30 and 35 cents. At that price the Government can sell all its peanuts if it had any, all of its soy beans, and make a considerable profit.

I think it should be mentioned here, because the gentleman from Michigan asked about the taxpayers, that last year the Commodity Credit Corporation made three-quarters of a million dollars on the peanut program. That is to say, it took peanuts it brought in and sold them for crushing and made a profit. It now has on hand 1,000 tons of peanuts. It could sell those peanuts today at a profit, but the planting season is still on and it is holding back this thousand tons of peanuts in order to provide any producers who are without seed the seed they need. They will be offered for sale within another 2 or 3 weeks.

The law to which the gentleman refers provides that any commodity the Commodity Credit Corporation procures must bring parity unless it is sold for the purposes I mentioned. Some of you remember—the gentleman from Illinois remembers—here some years ago we sold about 200,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed at a loss while the mills were paying the support price. We sold corn for byproduct purposes much cheaper than the support price. We sold other commodities at a loss. Why does the gentleman point his entire criticism at peanuts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Department informed me yesterday afternoon that it anticipated the loss for 1948 would be between three and four million dollars on peanuts. In connection with feed wheat that was a critical emergency that lasted only for a little while. But here you propose to make this part of a permanent program and might extend it after 1950. I submit that is unfair.

Mr. PACE. Let us get that straight. I am not asking you to make this a permanent program and the committee is not. We are extending this 90 percent for 18 months until my committee gets back here in January and works out a future farm program. It is then contemplated that not only peatnuts but cotton, corn, wheat, and practically everything else will be put into a flexible price support program. That is what is in the Aiken bill in the Senate now, involving supports from 60 to 90 percent for all commodities. If you want to put peanuts in that group treat them all alike. The only thing I complain to you about this

afternoon is that my distinguished friend from Illinios picks one of the most lowly commodities, the peanut, and says, "I am going to solve the farm problem by taking peanuts out of the support position it has been in," while at the same time the overwhelming majority of the House—the gentleman said he objected—voted to put in hogs at 90 percent, chickens at 90 percent, eggs at 90 percent, butter at 90 percent, and milk at 90 percent this afternoon. I think you acted wisely when you did that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I certainly would not take unfair advantage by this question, and the gentleman does not have to answer it if he does not want to.

Mr. PACE. You ask any question you want.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the committee deliberated on this matter it did strike peanuts out of the bill while it was still in the committee.

Mr. PACE. I will tell the gentleman about that. The committee did. Some wanted to get dairy products in. An amendment was offered to strike peanuts, which was adopted; then they turned around and offered another amendment immediately to add peanuts and dairy products, and that amendment was adopted. The gentleman has been given some very bad advice in that connection. That happened to be the modus operandi of getting dairy products in, but it did not work on me because I thought dairy products should be in there all the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the advice was bad, it came from a member of the committee.

Mr. PACE. There is no question about who did it, and I am sure he will be glad to tell you he did it. Peanuts were stricken, and peanuts and dairy products were immediately added.

I hope this amendment will be defeated by an overwhelming majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is, of course, easy to endeavor to not necessarily draw a herring across the trail, because I know that my friend from Georgia would not do it, but to indicate what gross profits of a company are without indicating what its capital investment is and the size of the company, one might very well say, "Look at the profits of the United States Steel Corporation." It has no bearing on it, but the fact is and the gentleman will agree that the number of peanuts in peanut candy is getting smaller year by year, and that the amount of peanuts used by candy manufacturers has dropped from substantially 67 percent to 32 percent, and those are the best figures I can get. So, if those figures are correct—and they were submitted to both Houses of Congress; certainly they were submitted in a long memorandum to me—there can be no question but what they are pricing themselves out of the market. The gentleman obviously should be concerned. We are all concerned, because after all this is a national pattern and a national problem. Now then, the gentleman belabored in part the oil picture, but the fact remains that the oil people can buy peanuts at whatever they can buy them for from the Commodity Credit Corporation, under the insertion provided in the law of 1945, and the oil can be used for food purposes. But you penalize the entire segment of the peanut industry, and if anybody can justify that on the ground of fairness, I would like to hear the argument.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this question goes into the real fundamental problem of subsidies. Sooner or later we will have to look this question of subsidies in the face and meet it squarely. Now, we come here talking about the free-enterprise system and those who talk most for the free-enterprise system are those who are getting on the floor of this House year after year asking for subsidies for this, for that, and subsidies for everything. Mr. Chairman, we have to come to the point, in the interest of the taxpayers of this country, to cut out some of these subsidies and save some of this money. If you want to go back to the free-enterprise system, one of the best ways to start is to eliminate the New Deal program of subsidies.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] why is it not possible to have all commodities in this bill on a flexible basis instead of 90 percent of parity? I hope the chairman of the committee will answer that when he gets his time.

I shall vote against the bill because it is not economically sound and we had better start to think about the American taxpayers. Nevertheless the amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is a good amendment and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment. First of all, I want to join the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] in deploring the attempt of the confectionery lobby to have this Congress discriminate against one agricultural group, the peanut growers. Secondly, I want to state that during the war farmers in my district responded to our Government's call for the production of peanuts and other needed commodities. Now, why should peanut growers be discriminated against? To the candy manufacturers we can only say that they will get no peanuts at all unless the farmer who grows them can get some reasonable return for the long hours of labor he devotes to their production. This is fair legislation and the amendment to strike peanuts from the bill should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] what is the present duty on shelled peanuts coming into the United States.

Mr. PACE. I understand it is 3 cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When was it reduced to 3 cents?

Mr. PACE. I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman certainly ought to know, and I say this in all kindness, because he is the peanut expert of this Congress. Does the gentleman not know when it was reduced to 3 cents?

Mr. PACE. I do not have the date in mind; no.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The approximate date.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the tariff duty is 2 cents on shelled and 6 cents on unshelled peanuts.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, there is a lot to this question, if we had time to debate it, but the way we have been treated here today is illustrative of what happens in this House when you let some one or two persons use most all the time. Here is a duty of 6 cents per 100 pounds, and yet since 1934 the taxpayers of this country have put into the tax box, in order to cover the losses on this deal that is going on, $26,256,000, with an estimated $3,000,000 to be imposed on the taxpayer on the crop that is now going into the ground. That is a phase that the public is interested in. You have your tariff protection plus all the other.

Let us go a step further. If the acreage this year is very substantially increased, and I understand it is to be substantially increased, what is to be the cost of this proposition provided your oil markets break in the meantime? Just recently we had the fight here between oleo and butter. Two firms in the United States cornered the oil market, pushed the price up about 14 cents a pound, and the consumers of this country, who consume oil used in oleo, such as peanut oil, cottonseed oil, and so on down the line, pay the price. That is what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was referring to a while ago when he mentioned the relative increase in prices.

We do not have time to develop these issues. You will have to vote on this amendment uninformed, take your chances on whatever develops, and let the taxpayer take the rap.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment sounds like "peanut politics."

The lowly goober, which has contributed so much to the health and happiness of the world and at the present time means prosperity in certain of the agricultural sections of America, will be in foul shape, indeed, if the pending amendment is adopted.

Everybody everywhere wants peanuts. The vital life-giving qualities of the peanut are known throughout the world, but just look what is about to happen to this friend of mankind, the peanut.

The Republican Campaign Committee does not even want peanuts fed to the Republican elephant. In the June 1948 issue of the Republican News, a publi-

cation sponsored by the Republican National Committee, amazing statements are made and, in desperation, the Republican National Committee stoops to a new low. Here are a few quotations and excerpts from this Republican publication:

Don't delay, contribute today.

Don't throw peanuts to the elephant.

Don't count on winning by throwing peanuts to the elephant. The Republican Congress did more than provide a few peanuts for the harassed taxpayer.

We are not going to win this election by sitting around denouncing Democrats or Henry Wallace. We are going to win only by hard work and by liberal contributions. The stakes are too high to take any chance on not winning. If we do not win this year, we may not have another chance.

The Republican Campaign Committee "emphasizes the need for funds now to underwrite contracts in advance for campaign essentials; billboards, radio time and advertising. The funds are pledged solely for election of candidates."

Under the title "Don't Throw Peanuts to the Elephant," we find this language:

Take a look at the table below:

Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of their tax savings for this year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible.

Savings of family of four under new tax plan

Net income	Present tax	New tax	Savings
$2,500	$95.00	$16.60	$78.40
$5,000	589.00	431.60	157.40
$10,000	1,862.00	1,360.96	501.04
$15,000	3,658.50	2,512.00	1,126.50
$25,000	8,521.50	5,475.84	3,045.66
$50,000	24,111.00	16,577.92	7,533.08

On last Thursday the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] referred to a situation in Tennessee which had come to his attention. Information had reached the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] to the effect that politics in Tennessee might be putting the squeeze on Government employees to force them to contribute a part of their salaries to political bosses. I know nothing about the situation in Tennessee other than what the gentleman from Wisconson [Mr. KEEFE] had to say about it, but here, in words and figures we can all understand, are statements contained in a publication issued by the Republican campaign committee and sent through the United States mail.

This is a brazen, mean, low, and vicious attempt to blackjack and highjack the taxpayers of America. Yes; it is a frank and open confession on the part of the Republican campaign committee that the Republican Party is not so vitally interested in the welfare of the taxpayer as it is in the success of the Republican campaign in the elections of 1948.

Those who sponsored the Republican tax measure were openly accused of doing so for political purposes and to the end that Republican candidates might call for substantial campaign contributions from those who had received the benefits of tax reduction. The Republican campaign committee now confesses its guilt.

The implications in this method of raising campaign funds are broad in scope and involve moral turpitude in a great degree.

Why not call directly on the corporations which have been relieved of tax burdens? Why not blackjack and highjack them directly as you are attempting to do the individual taxpayer? The reason the Republican campaign committee has not advertised for contributions from corporations is due to the fact that such an act is in direct violation of Federal laws. The campaign committee is apparently conscious of this fact. I call your attention to the statement printed in the smallest type possible at the end of this advertisement in words as follows:

A political committee cannot accept contributions from corporations.

If this is the method to be employed by the Republican campaign committee, why not call for contributions from taxpayers whom you might relieve in the future, or whom you might punish by the imposition of taxes in the event they fail to contribute?

Yes; this campaign is regarded by the Republican campaign committee as a race for heavy stakes, and the statements I have read clearly indicate that the party is not pitching its campaign on high principles or on worth while issues. No doubt this desperate appeal for contributions will be effective when received by tens of thousands of would-be office holders who hope that they will be taken on the Government pay roll if the Republicans win this fall. Certainly this is a solicitation for campaign contributions sent through the United States mail to Government employees in Washington and in all of the cities and counties of this country. This, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] should be called to the attention of the Department of Justice and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, parity to me does not simply mean parity for my hog or corn raisers in Minnesota. It means parity for each and every agricultural group in America, including the people who happen to produce peanuts down in Georgia. If I wanted to be vindictive at this time, I could get even for what you gentlemen of the South did to my butter industry by your oleo legislation and get up here and fight for this particular amendment. But I am not built that way. I think what is fair is fair, and I think if the people in Minnesota are entitled to a guaranty of 90 percent of parity on products we have in Minnesota, then you people down in Georgia are entitled to the same kind of treatment for your cotton and peanuts and so forth. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment ought to be beaten. I think it is more or less class legislation. We do not want to go on record here as a Congress to protect special interests at the expense of the farmers of the Nation.

May I compliment the great Committee on Agriculture for its fine work in this bill. Last January it was my privilege to introduce legislation of this nature and was very much pleased at its acceptance by the Banking and Currency Committee. It matters little as to how this legislation is passed—the main thing is, that it does become law. I again pay my respects to Mr. HOPE and his committee for their so well taking care of the interests of our farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, when I heard that this amendment was going to be offered to try to strike peanuts out of the bill, I immediately began to look around to see who was responsible for the high price of peanut products, and whether the farmer or some other processor was getting this money. Peanut legislation is a very interesting subject. I could discuss this subject at some length, because of my intimate knowledge of it. Not so many years ago, my district and four counties in Virginia grew all the peanuts that were grown in this country. The value of this crop at that time was about eight or nine million dollars. In the last 14 years, the value has increased greatly. Mr. Chairman, peanuts can now be grown in nearly every State in the Union. The crop of peanuts recently in this country brought nearly $228,000,000. A few years ago it was only nine million.

I recently went around to find out what the candy makers were paying for peanuts, and what they were charging for products made out of peanuts to determine who was getting the large profits out of the peanut business. My visit was to the greatest peanut processor and candy manufacturer in the world who operates in nearly every city in the United States. I purchased a half pound of raw peanuts just as they were received from the farmer and they cost me 40 cents a pound. The farmer received only ten and a fraction of a cent per pound for this type of peanuts. Then I purchased a half pound of peanut bars, four-fifths of which bars were composed of peanuts, and I was charged 60 cents a pound for the peanut bars. These samples which I now have on the table before me are the ones I purchased. So, it is quite evident that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for the peanuts, but the manufacturer and processor whom the author of this amendment insists that he is trying to help is the one who is getting the exorbitant profits involved in this industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, despite the impassioned and able pleas of the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from North Carolina and the other peanut growers, buttressed by the arguments of our western agricultural Members who never looked a peanut in the face but who have a deep and continuing interest in keeping up the price of other products and who, I apprehend, will have the support of our southern brethren in that endeavor, I remain unconvinced. We in the consuming areas

are simply caught in the middle between the upper millstone of western wool and wheat and the nether millstone of southern peanuts, tobacco, and cotton.

I commend the gentleman from Illinois for his peanut amendment, and expect to support it. I can find no justification in economics or in conscience for us to take legislative action which will raise the cost of peanuts at the ball park and candy bars at the corner store and at the same time impose a mandatory price support creating a potential liability for the taxpayers of several million dollars a year.

The consumers of this country, including the farmers in my neck of the woods, who are pretty substantial citizens, are getting tired of this back-scratching at their expense. We should concern ourselves with action to lower, not to raise prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the effort which has just been made to cut the price of peanuts is one of the most selfish I have ever seen. It is merely a repetition of the spirit of: "To hell with you; I've got mine."

We hear a great outcry about maintaining the price of the 5-cent candy bar. I wonder if the proponents of the amendment would care to propose to bring this about not only by penalizing the farmer but also by reducing the price of the labor which goes into the production: the milk, the chocolate, the sugar and all of the other different ingredients.

Such a proposal is just as reasonable as to ask that the farmer bear the entire burden of price reduction. If the amendment should carry, you are opening the way to similar treatment of tobacco, of rice, and ultimately of the whole structure by which the American farmer can be assured of a reasonable price for his produce and you are leading the way to a condition with which those of us who remember the early thirties are all too familiar.

The basis of the parity price on peanuts is no different from that used on other commodities, and there is no reason for you to take this position in connection with peanuts except that they are a relatively small crop and the proponents of the amendment think they can get away with it.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize the fact that this is only temporary legislation. The so-called Steagall amendment will expire on December 31, 1948, and in view of the adjournment of Congress next week, it is therefore absolutely necessary that price supports be continued at this time.

I am quite sure you all know that the Committee on Agriculture since October of last year has been working on a long-range farm program. Extensive hearings have been held in Washington and 11 regional hearings have been held throughout the United States. I am one of those who has been insisting that we adopt a long-range farm program at this session of Congress. However, it now appears that time is running out and the least we can do for the farmers of America is to extend the provisions of the Steagall amendment to June 30, 1950, in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 6248. This bill has been carefully considered by the Committee on Agriculture and has the unanimous approval of the committee. The committee amendments to the bill also have the united support of the committee, and in my judgment, we are offering the best possible legislation which can be enacted at this session of Congress under all of the circumstances involved. No Member of Congress except those who represent the agricultural districts of the country can tell you of the psychological effect this legislation will have upon the farmers of America. It is true that agriculture is prosperous at the present time but that has not always been the case. Much too long in years gone by our farmers have fed the people of this Nation and large portions of the world at a loss to themselves. In fact, during all the years of the depression while farmers were compelled to liquidate their resources and their lands sold from under them at public auction, they continued to produce the food. No segment of our economy did more to help win the recent war than the farmers of America. With the shortage of manpower and farm machinery and with the cost of materials and supplies skyrocketing, they went forward from sunrise to sunset planting and gathering the harvests so that our boys on the fighting fronts and the people at home might have the food they had to have.

We are still living in uncertain times. There is unrest throughout the world and no one can predict from day to day whether or not this great Nation can continue to furnish the food and fiber not only for our people at home but for the starving millions abroad. The farmer is entirely dependent upon the elements and the blessings of Divine Providence for the production of his food crops. Contrary to the belief of many people, food in the broad sense does not grow on trees.

It is absolutely necessary to the welfare of this country that we have a prosperous agriculture. Everyone knows that agriculture is the Nation's basic industry. The production of food is in a little different category. Mankind can get along without many material things but it is absolutely essential that he have food and drink, clothing, and shelter. The whole problem of producing food then is one in which the Federal Government has an interest and in which it must take a part. There must be some guarantee that this necessity of life be produced in abundance. Although prices of food products are high at the present time, we must not forget that by the same token the type of legislation we are now considering is most surely a guarantee that the consumers of the country will get the food they need. It is much better to make hay while the sun shines and to give the farmers the assurance that they will not have to produce and sell their products at a loss. If the farmer of America is given that assurance, I am confident he will continue to produce the food and fiber not only for the millions of our own population but also for a large portion of the world.

H. R. 6248 has my unqualified support. I sincerely trust the bill will be passed in the form recommended by the Committee on Agriculture. I think I can assure you that the Committee on Agriculture will give full consideration to all matters dealing with this entire price-support problem when it reports a long-range farm bill early next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill, H. R. 6248, is to continue stabilizing the prices of agricultural commodities and to carry out the price-support program in practically the same form as at the present time.

The Banking and Currency Committee reported out a bill a few weeks ago to provide a permanent Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation and to carry out the support program in the exact form that it is today.

While I think it is advisable to continue the support program in its present form for the next 2 years, I shall support the pending bill because it is late in the session and it is very essential that we extend this support program before the end of the session.

Congress has enacted many basic agricultural laws which constitute the framework of a national farm program. Among these laws are the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which provides for mandatory commodity loans on basic commodities; the Bankhead Commodity Loan Act enacted in 1941 and the Steagall Price Support Act of 1941 which were later amended so as to provide commodity loans on basic agricultural commodities at 90 and 92½ percent of parity prices and providing price supports on nonbasic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity for all of these commodities on which the Secretary requested increased production during the war period. Comparable price supports for other nonbasic commodities also were to be provided as far as practicable. Other requirements and restrictions with respect to loans, purchases, and sales of commodities in connection with price-support operations are also contained in various other statutes enacted by Congress from time to time.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is the conerstone on which the national farm program rests. It is the agency through which price support and stabilization policies are effectuated. The provisions for mandatory commodity loans for basic agricultural commodities and the provisions for the support of farm prices of nonbasic commodities by loans, purchases, and other operations under the Steagall Act and other acts all depend upon the existence and use of the Commodity Credit Corporation with adequate powers and lending authority. The provisions of existing law for the maintenance of an ever-normal granary through storage of farm surpluses in times of oversupply for use in times of scarcity, are made possible through the

use of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This is vitally important to the consumers of the Nation as well as to farmers.

The consuming public has a vital stake in maintaining the price-support functions and ever-normal granary features of the national farm program. The farm price-support program encouraged farmers to produce at record high levels all during the war and since the war.

Without this protection, it is unlikely that we could have achieved these record levels of food production so essential to the winning of the war and the saving of the peace. Even today, food produced by American farmers under the price-support program is playing a crucial role in helping save the peace won at such a fearful cost of human sacrifice and helping Italy, France, and other war-devastated countries to ward off the menacing threat of communism. Shipload after shipload of food for hungry people constitute far more potent evidence of our good will in aiding Europe to get back on her feet than the empty, deceitful promises so glibly given by the emissaries of communism. It should never be forgotten, however, that America has been able to do this because farmers were able to produce at record levels. This they have continued to do despite shortages of machinery, shortages of fertilizer, shortages of farm labor. They did this only by toiling early and late and by risking their capital as well as their labor to produce abnormally large supplies that in normal times would probably wreck farm prices. They did this with confidence because of the protection given them through the price-support program of the Bankhead Commodity Loan Act and the Steagall Price Support Act which assured them that the Government would support farm prices at not less than 90 percent of parity not only during the war years but for 2 years after the end of the war emergency.

It was not enough to give assurance of price support protection during the war years. It was equally important to assure farmers against a collapse in farm prices when the war closed. Farmers have not forgotten what happened after World War I. During the war in response to the appeals of our Government that "Food will win the war," farmers greatly expanded their production. Then when the war ended and wartime requirements declined and export outlets dried up, surpluses accumulated, and the bottom dropped out of farm prices, hundreds of thousands of farmers lost their life savings and their farms and went through bankruptcy. For 20 years thereafter, farm prices were at a disparity with industrial prices and wages, and it is only in recent years that farmers have recovered from the terrible disaster that fell upon them after World War I.

It was providential that Congress enacted in early 1941 these basic laws for the support of farm prices during and after the war. That was just a few months before Pearl Harbor. When that terrible blow struck, the farmers were ready to do their part and they did a mighty job which played an important part in the ultimate victory.

It was an intense fight, however, to get this legislation enacted. The Government then was supporting prices at much lower levels and there was much complaint among farmers over Government price-support policies. Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, then president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and several other leaders of that organization, appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee and urged the enactment of legislation which later became the Steagall Act.

This legislation served as the pattern and framework for the Government's entire price-support program during the war years and since.

In an over-all picture, the price program has not cost the Government anything, as on many commodities it made money, especially on cotton. A price-support program is one upon which the farmers everywhere are united. They realize the vital necessity for continuing the price-support program in order to encourage sufficient production to feed and clothe the people. The consumers in the cities want to be assured that there will be plenty of food and fiber, and unless farmers are encouraged to produce same everyone realizes small production would mean high prices for the consumer. Therefore, I am sure when the Members from the city districts realize this they will not hesitate to join us in voting for this measure.

The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Dodd, pointed out before the Banking and Currency Committee some time ago the way in which the support program had stabilized the price of corn. In 1932 the market price of No. 3 yellow corn at Chicago averaged 44 percent of parity, but in 1933, the first year the loan program was in effect, the market price of No. 3 yellow corn at Chicago averaged 68 percent of parity. During the 10-year period from 1923 to 1932 the market price of corn averaged 74 percent of parity. But during the years that loans have been offered—1933 through 1947—the market price has averaged 107 percent of parity.

The Corporation built up some heavy stocks of grain during the years it was supporting prices. On October 1, 1941, for example, the carry-over of corn was 645,000,000 bushels. But how glad we were, later, to have that corn and other grain. That grain enabled us to produce the meat and milk and eggs we needed to fight a war.

Cotton offers a splendid example of the manner in which the price support program both stabilizes prices and facilitates orderly distribution. The Corporation acquired a lot of cotton under its price support operations in the 1930's. In 1938, the carry-over was more than 13,000,000 bales, most of which ultimately got into the Corporation's inventory. This big supply, equivalent to an average year production, eventually was moved into consumption. The Corporation thus supported prices of cotton and still was able to provide cotton to trade channels when needed.

Mr. Chairman, American agriculture is relatively prosperous now. In March 1948, farm prices of wheat average $2.21 per bushel; corn, $2.11 per bushel; hogs, $21.80 per hundredweight; and beef cattle, $20.70 per hundredweight. But agriculture has not always been prosperous. In March 1933—a few months before the Commodity Credit Corporation became an agency of the Government—prices of wheat averaged 35 cents per bushel; corn, 21 cents per bushel; hogs, $3.21 per hundredweight; and beef cattle, $3.57 per hundredweight. Do any of us know what prices will average in March 1949, or 1950, or 1951?

These are troubled times. The House right now is concerned with matters of grave international significance—endeavoring to get ready for what may come. Is it not just as important, in the agricultural field, to get ready for what may come—surpluses, low prices, droughts, floods?

I am convinced that our farmers, our consumers, our Nation if you please, can face the future more confidently if farmers are assured a fair price for their products.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill in its present form. I am supporting the Dirksen amendment. I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. The gentleman quoted the Bible, and he also talked about profits. He talked about a few thousand dollars as profits, but did not mention the capital invested nor the profits percentagewise. He has been asked by me and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] what were the percentages of profit. The gentleman should not convey the idea that there were great profits in the candy-making industry. What I am interested in is that those companies make enough profit on the capital they have invested in the industry to be able to put more peanuts into their candy for the kiddies of this country.

The gentleman has not answered the question of profits.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for an answer to our question.

Mr. PACE. I regret I do not have the figures by percentages. The purpose for which I quoted figures was to meet the charge that you are trying to save the peanut industry, that it was going down. I was trying to show that it was going up.

Mr. CHURCH. I was interested in bringing out the percentage of profits because I know that some of the companies in my State are having a struggle to keep going and make profits upon their investment. The gentleman is not informed with reference to the real profits of these companies and furnishes no figures on that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The question has been raised as to why there were five basic commodities when we started in 1933. We included cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco because they were in surplus. Those were our exportable commodities. For the most part they were the ones that were in difficulty.

Peanuts came along a good many years later. The fact that they happen to be a storable commodity is not taken into consideration by the gentleman. What about Michigan beets or dried beans or what about soy beans from the gentleman's own region? What about a good many other things that could be included. Just where do we stop on this thing? We are going to have to stop somewhere. There is no common sense, in my judgment, in perpetuating this condition. I think it ought to stop now because if it is included here obviously it is going to be used as leverage for including it in the long-range program sometime after 1950.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I hope the membership will support the Dirksen amendment. Now, if the gentleman from Georgia has an answer to the question I will yield to him. Does he have an answer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the price producers receive for peanuts is practically identical with the support price. That ha been demonstrated throughout the entire period that support prices have been in operation.

If we pass this amendment the prices received by farmers for their peanuts will be cut by one-third. The net effect would be to reduce the income of peanut producers by one-third. This would mean that prices for farmers'-stock peanuts would be below the cost of production. Now, I am sure the Members of the House would not want their action here to have the effect of fixing the price of any farm commodity at a figure below production cost. This would simply mean that peanut farmers would have to shift to some other crop.

I have listened to the discussion with a great deal of interest. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has made an impassioned plea, and I know of his sincerity and his interest in the candy manufacturers. Producers themselves have an interest in the welfare of the confectionery industry. The problem of peanut prices is one of mutual interest, because in the long run the confectioners must depend upon peanut producers for their supplies of this important candy ingredient, and peanut producers must depend upon the confectioners for a market for much of their production. Looking at the matter from a long-time viewpoint, it is, therefore, in the interest of peanut producers that the prices of their commodity are at a level which will permit of maximum utilization by their customers. Likewise, the public interest and the confectioners' interest will be served best if farmers' prices are fair and at a level which will assure adequate production.

I have heard arguments today concerning the need for flexibility in the range at which prices are supported, and I recognize merit in much that has been said on this point. However, it would be utterly foolish for us to attempt to deal with this proposition on the House floor. This is a subject which requires committee study and deliberation.

The bill we are considering is merely a short-time measure and is not intended as permanent legislation. The committee has indicated its intention of submitting to the Congress a long-range program next year. The Members of the House have no basis for knowing whether the 60-percent level proposed by the amendment is a proper point at which this proposed flexibility should begin. To pass this amendment would be unwise and might do irreparable harm, both to peanut producers and to the manufacturers of products containing peanuts.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. COX. The Committee on Agriculture is made up of friends of all of the farm commodities. That committee has unanimously agreed upon the pending bill. The program agreed upon, it would seem to me, ought not to be torn apart by the adoption of the pending amendment.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Let us vote down this amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, some of those who have spoken out here today apparently are under the impression that a farmer who makes a modest profit is automatically guilty of a serious crime.

Many of our larger newspapers and quite a few columnists seem to think that Congress should pass laws designed to prohibit the American farmer from earning a living and furthermore Congress should go all out to punish those farmers who do.

In today's debate and in the magazines and the big newspapers, on an almost around-the-clock schedule, the farmer is described as a fat profiteer, burdening the taxpayers by subsidies, and generally that he is to blame for the high cost of living.

Of course, there is no truth in this absurd propaganda.

There are many facts that should be taken into consideration by those who are even the slightest bit inclined to begrudge the farmer his present prosperity. Farm income has reached an all-time high, it is true, but the farmer, like everyone else, is putting out more money for what he has to buy.

It is a known fact that while farm-produce prices have increased 11 percent during the last 12 months, the prices for what the farmer buys have soared 16 percent.

Contrary to the popular idea, the farmer buys a great percentage of his food, and when he shops he has to pay for the cost of production and the cost of selling—processing, wholesaling, distribution, and speculation. He has to buy clothing, trucks, tractors, farm machinery of all kinds, the family auto, gasoline and tires, and many other things. He has to maintain his house, farm buildings, machinery, and fences, and is obliged to pay for his labor, the wage scale of which has mounted with each passing month. In spite of all this, the farmer is better off now than he has been in years, but only some of the big operators are growing rich at the expense of the present-day inflationary situation.

First, let us analyze the charge that the farmer is the chief beneficiary of Government subsidies.

The appropriations for rural electrification are not subsidies because they do not burden the taxpayer for the benefit of a few. As a matter of fact, the rural-electrification program does not cost the taxpayer a single thin dime because farmers' cooperatives repay every dollar that the Government provides. In this connection, it is most significant to me that the Congress has been generous in its gifts to foreign nations for rural electrification, while at the same time has denied adequate funds for the exact same purpose that would be beneficial to the American farmer.

The totals which may properly be classified as subsidies to the farmer are $30,000,000 for the so-called encouragement of domestic-consumption program, and $90,000,000 for the price-support program handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This adds up to $120,000,000 for farm subsidies.

Ironically, the newspapers and magazines who protest so loudly about the farmer help themselves to the Federal till by getting a subsidy of nearly $150,000,000 a year. The cost to the American taxpayer for carrying newspapers and magazines through the United States mails is $180,500,000 a year, but the Government charges only $33,000,000 for postage.

This subsidy to the big newspapers and magazines is larger than all the subsidies granted to the farmer combined. The law could easily be changed to reduce these subsidies without injury to the small newspaper.

Some of our magazines and big newspapers who paint a word picture of the farmer, portraying him as a millstone around the neck of the taxpayer, behold the mote in their brother's eye but considereth not the beam in their own.

The wool program furnishes an excellent example of some of the broadsides of unfair propaganda fired at point-blank range at the farmer. The American wool farmer would have long since been out of business were it not for the price support program, because he cannot compete with the foreign wool that is dumped on our domestic market.

Not long ago this the Eightieth Congress provided a subsidy to copper. The excuse was that we must insure profits to the copper trust for fear that our foreign supply would be cut off in case of war.

But ironically, when a proposal was made to continue $22,000,000 to support American wool growers, the possibility of a war cutting off our foreign supply was completely forgotten. Instead, the great hue and cry went up that the American farmer was looting the Treasury; $75,000,000 for Copper Trusts is necessary to protect the supply in case of war. The $22,000,000 to the farmers is immediately labeled as a subsidy grab. The only difference seems to be whose ox is being gored.

There is never the slightest mention of the real fat cats who benefit from Federal subsidies, such as the estimated $300,000,000 paid yearly by consumers to the Sugar Trust for the price support of sugar, or the $91,000,000 a year in maritime subsidies, or the $52,000,000 a year in subsidies to those who send advertising matter through the mails, and the billions in high tariffs. Alongside of these, the farmer is a piker in comparison.

Now to look at charge No. 2 that the farmer is a profiteer.

The average income for our farmers last year was $725. For workers in manufacturing industries the average income was $2,255. Profits of manufacturers are higher now than ever before. In the last 10 years the nonfarm income has come up more than the farm income. In addition, many conveniences, such as electricity in some rural areas, are lagging far behind those in cities and towns.

It seems to me that some people want prosperity for everybody else but the farmer. They do not object to industrial profits and wage boosts which are now at an all-time high, but the profit to the farmer, they say, and with emphasis, is inflationary and evil.

Now look at it through the farmers' eyes.

For four good cows a farmer got a doctor to deliver his wife's baby. This, of course, did not include hospital fees. For 12 fat hens another farmer got a tooth pulled, and still another farmer reported that for one 14-month old steer—23 months from breeding date—at 25 cents a pound, he got 10 pieces of 1 by 12 inch board, 12 feet long, and second quality at that.

Those who are trying to keep the farmer from getting his fair share in our national income are definitely not working for the peace and prosperity of America.

Agriculture is our basic industry. Neither industrial profit nor wages will stay high long if the farmer must operate at a loss.

Let us not begrudge the farmer his prosperity which was a long time coming.

After all, the record shows that agriculture gets only 10 percent of the national income, although 20 percent of the Nation's population lives on the farm.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is true that a commodity can be priced off the market, and peanuts are priced off the market right now. As evidence of that fact I have an editorial here telling about a case in Boston where apples were priced off the market. There was a firm up in Boston that made a business of selling apples prepared for pies at 14 cents a pound. Pies were selling at 20 cents per cut. The public was crying out against it. Finally, they reduced the apples prepared for pies to 10 cents a pound and sold the cuts at 15 cents. One restaurant sold a thousand pies a day more within 2 weeks' time.

This just goes to show that things can be priced off the market, and this support-price program is doing it in some instances. I am thinking of peanuts, apples, and potatoes. Tobacco and cotton will follow.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a letter from Lummis & Co., of Philadelphia, a quotation from which will show you how silly the Commodity Credit Corporation's handling this peanut business is. The letter states:

> We hold several million dollars worth of peanuts which we have purchased to take care of our customers. The Commodity Credit stands ready to buy these back if we see fit to sell them.
>
> If this parity is to be revised, we would like to know it, as it would be important that we should sell back a good part of our holdings to Commodity Credit within the next few weeks, for if peanuts are to be supported at lower prices and this new basis would be announced July 15, 1948, we would suffer a heavy financial loss.

So you see the taxpayer is to be the goat.

When the Government sets itself up in business where it comes in and buys a commodity, then sells it and guarantees that if the purchasers have to take any chance or risk the Government will make it up, that is a deplorable state of affairs. We should take into consideration the taxpayer, the man who pays the subsidies. As it stands today, the taxpayer is paying one subsidy to keep peanut prices up and encourage farmers to grow more, while paying another subsidy to keep the industry going. It is destroying prices all around.

Let me tell you something to show that these peanut growers are not faring too badly. We made a trip down in the peanut country and drove around 400 miles. It was Saturday. They told us they would not work on Saturday, yet they complain of a shortage of help, equipment, bad weather, and so forth. They refuse to follow good soil practice in order to maintain their soil fertility by maintaining the humus in their soil. They tell us that if the Government wants to keep us going, they have to supply the goods. It just does not add up. They are so prosperous they just do not care a whit—depending entirely on the Government.

Mr. Chairman, to save the peanut industry, to save the peanut farmers, the Dirksen amendment should be agreed to. The same argument could be applied to the tobacco farmers. You fellows are all just digging a ditch for yourselves. The taxpayers, the Treasury, the consumer, and the country as a whole must be taken into consideration. Prices for commodities must be made in the market place if we want to maintain free enterprise, and not here in Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I include an article entitled "Peanut Trouble," appearing in the Washington News. I had this verified by the Department of Agriculture.

PEANUT TROUBLE

One thing leads to another, and now the peanut-products industry is in trouble and wanting the Federal taxpayers to come to its rescue.

Peanuts are among the farm products which the Government supports at 90 percent of parity. The Government buys enough peanuts from growers to keep the law of supply and demand from forcing prices below that level. It paid $172 a ton last year, is paying about $200 now, and the support price is expected to raise to $216 by July.

That arrangement is fine for the peanut growers, who are expanding production. But makers of peanut products complain that high prices are ruining them. Housewives are buying jams and jellies—their prices not being Government supported—instead of peanut butter.

What to do? The peanut-products industry could be helped, and the taxpayers would save some money, if the Government support price were lowered. But industry spokesmen, certain that nothing of that sort will be done in an election year, aren't proposing such action. Instead, they plan to ask for a Government subsidy to consumers of their products.

The Government would pay part of everybody's bill for peanut butter, salted peanuts, peanut candy, etc.

So the taxpayers, now paying one subsidy to keep peanut prices up and encourage farmers to grow more peanuts, would pay another subsidy to save the industry that uses peanuts from being destroyed by high prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, whereby peanuts are stricken from the bill under consideration as one of the basic commodities. I desire to further state that I wholeheartedly support the bill under consideration and wish at this time to express my appreciation to the Committee on Agriculture for the painstaking work and thorough investigation they have made in an effort to be of real help to the agricultural interests of this country.

There seems to be a misunderstanding by some of the Members of this body as to the actual purposes and effect of the bill. I wish that more of the Members could have heard the very fine explanation of this bill by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] who gave a most comprehensive statement regarding it. This is nothing more or less than a price-support program. Its whole purpose is to put farmers on a level with other segments of our society. The object is to give the farmers the same purchasing power as the dollars of others, such as the laborer and industrialist. It is extremely important to the economy of our country that farm income be maintained in line with the income of the various other groups.

The parity concept and price-support program has been tried, tested, and found to work well. This bill seeks to taper off wartime price support and fill

the gap until a comprehensive long-range program can be worked out. It merely extends an existing program until June 30, 1950. We cannot permit farm prices to sink to a disastrously low level. It is imperative and necessary for the well-being of this country that we prevent a farm depression. Our economy cannot move forward unless agriculture is assured of its fair share of the national income.

Beginning with the 1937 crop of peanuts there has been either a loan or purchase program on each crop. These programs were designed for, and have been successful in removing surpluses, providing markets, promoting orderly marketing, stabilizing prices to producers and handlers, and increasing consumption. Peanuts acquired under these programs were held until the supply and demand factors could be more nearly determined, thus assuring constant supplies of peanuts at reasonable prices and resulting in the use of greatly increased quantities for edible purposes.

It is estimated that for each dollar spent on these programs the income of farmers was increased approximately $5. In 1937 there were 616,378 tons of peanuts produced in the United States.

During the emergency, the farmers all over the country were urged, and as a matter of fact it was almost demanded by the administration, to increase in every way possible the production of agricultural products, including peanuts. A magnificent job was done, never equalled before in our history, by the farmers of our land. In the face of acute labor shortage, a dire lack of machinery, unavailability of the proper fertilizer, impossibility of securing new equipment and working under severe strain, the farmers rallied to the call of their country, raising and producing more foodstuff than ever before in our history. As stated above, this was done under the most trying handicap and in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles. As a result of this activity, all of which was at the urgent request of our Government, the peanut farmers greatly increased and enlarged the acreage production and poundage of peanuts. The peanut acreage in the United States has been doubled since 1940 as a result of the above set-out expansion of production in connection with the war effort, resulting in approximately 300,000 tons in excess of present or foreseeable edible requirements. This 300,000 tons of excess peanuts, which represents about one-third of the present production, must necessarily be used for crushing into oil. The value of peanuts for this purpose, normally, is not such as to afford the farmer a return sufficient to pay the cost of production. During the emergency the greater part of the increased production was required for edible purposes. The balance was crushed for critically needed oil at a loss. There were no surpluses.

It is anticipated that many farmers will reduce their acreage because of labor shortages or to conserve the fertility of soils overworked during the war, while others, who have increased their production facilities at the Government's wartime request, will find it difficult to make any immediate adjustment. It is therefore imperative to support the price of peanuts of the present crop at a level, which, while lower than wartime levels, will provide farmers who produce peanuts with an assured return. The present bill is of a temporary nature, and no change should be made therein to reduce the support, as a long-range farm program bill has been promised by the Agriculture Committee for consideration at the next session of Congress. This bill, I understand, will provide for the continuation, on a modified basis, of price support until June 30, 1950. These programs have proven to be invaluable in obtaining production of agricultural commodities.

The recent world-wide emergency and the embarking of this country on a program to help rehabilitate the western countries of Europe have completely changed the agricultural outlook. It now develops that it is vitally necessary that our farmers continue an all-out production of agricultural products in an effort to help win the peace. It is impossible to obtain satisfactory results, so far as the peanut industry is concerned, unless this present program is kept alive. The program will automatically die December 31, 1948, unless this bill passes with peanuts included therein. Due to the above emergency and program, agricultural production has been kept far above prewar levels and as a consequence farmers have not had an opportunity, as was contemplated, to adjust their acreage because of the urgent need for their products. It is impossible to tell at this time just what will be the need or call upon the American farm interests to carry out the European recovery program. In view of all this, it would be most unwise not to carry through the proposed support price as provided in this bill, without any amendment, which would be a carry-over until Congress shall have ample opportunity to pass on a long-range measure. I, therefore, urge that the support price for peanuts, by all means, be kept in the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation testified before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture that last year it made a profit of $30,000,000 in relation to all of their operations having to do with price support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it has been a very, very interesting debate that has taken place here today and I am particularly gratified to see how well the Members of the House are representing all of the American people. I have not heard one word in defense of the consumer, the taxpayer, the American housewife or the service man who are going to pay the cost of this bill.

We hear on every hand about the high cost of living and every one here is seemingly trying to develop a legislative program to keep up the high cost of living rather than to conceive and devise legislation that will bring down the high cost of living. In my estimation this whole program ought to be wiped out.

It is about time that we get back to the fundamental way of doing business in America where supply and demand creates the prices. It is about time that we try to think about how we can bring down the high cost of living rather than passing legislation that will keep up the high cost of living. It is about time that we think of the boys who made sacrifices and are now back home trying to raise a family and make a living, the American housewives, the taxpayers and all the rest of them—all who are paying the bills, All of you know that subsidy payments, parity payments, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and all the rest of this bureaucratic legislation will bring about an increase in the cost of living rather than bring down the cost of living. I wonder if we should not conscientiously think this thing through; the type of legislation we are enacting here today. Think of the people who pay the bills. Just think what you can do here with your vote today to bring down the cost of living. Have the courage of your sincere and honest convictions and vote as you would vote, not from the standpoint of political expediency and what it is going to mean to you in the coming election. I feel with certainty that if each and every one of you will weigh carefully this legislation that you will vote it out of existence, and if you do it will be a contribution to our American way of life and help reduce the high cost of living.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the ground has been pretty well covered. I think perhaps at this time, however, since the question has been raised as to the possible loss that might be sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation if we go ahead with this legislation, that this would be a proper place to insert in the RECORD information as to the profits and losses which have resulted from the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation up to date. I am going to ask unanimous consent later to extend my remarks and include a statement on that subject. I simply want to say at this time that the Commodity Credit Corporation up through April 30, 1948, showed a net gain from its price-support operations throughout the years of $52,400,000. As far as this particular amendment is concerned, in my opinion, it would be a gross discrimination against this commodity if the amendment were adopted and peanuts placed on a different basis than the other five commodities which heretofore have been considered and treated in the same way as peanuts. As has been said, the Committee on Agriculture is getting ready to bring out a long-range program next year. At that time certainly consideration will be given to the category in which all of the important agricultural commodities should be placed. Consideration will be

given then to whether or not we should have a flexible price-support program on the various commodities. But, that is not under consideration at this time. This is not the time or the place to consider changing the status of these commodities which have been grouped together during all of these years. This great amount of agitation on the subject might sound like there was a great demand for legislation, but as a matter of fact it comes only from a certain group of candy manufacturers who, as the gentleman from Georgia has shown, are making ample profits. There is no point to be made today out of the issue of saving the candy manufacturers. They are taking pretty good care of themselves now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 43, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in accord with the objectives of this bill. I am now, and have been since the inception of this program, one of its most loyal supporters. In my opinion it is one of the most constructive and most helpful things that has been done for agriculture in these United States. I have no time for the line of argument advanced here on this floor that the farmer has been preferred over the industrial worker and other classes of our people as the result of this program. On the contrary, the whole purpose of the support price set-up has been to place the farmer on something near an equal footing with the man who works in the factory and the mill, to give him something approaching an equal return for his labor to that received by the worker and the producer of other commodities.

However, I want to call the attention of this House to one agricultural product that is not, but should be, included in this program. I refer to the agricultural product of tung oil. For the information of the Members of the House I should like to point out that tung is produced in this country in the limited area along the Gulf coastal plains of this great country. It originally is a Chinese product. The word tung comes from the heart-shaped foliage of the tung tree. Tung, in Chinese, means heart. It is a semitropical tree and will grow only along the coastal plains of those States bordering on the Gulf, to-wit: Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. From the nut produced by the tree comes the tung oil. Tung oil is used in the production of paints and varnishes and is the best water-proofing or water-resistant oil known. It is used extensively in water-proofing our electrical equipment. It is also the best drying oil known. It is an absolute essentiality to and is used extensively by the Navy.

Prior to World War I there was no tung produced in the United States. Because of the difficulty of obtaining this strategic material during that war the industry was encouraged by the Government in this country, and notwithstanding the fact that the industry has grown in that section since its beginning at that time, the armed services found it very difficult to meet their demands during World War II, due to the fact that our imports from China were almost totally cut off because of the Japanese conflict. In fact, in spite of the growth of this industry, we are now importing approximately 80 percent of our tung oil from China. It does not require any exceptional wisdom to see what would happen if we should get into a war with Russia in the next few years. It is a matter of common knowledge that Russia has its eyes on China and if a real shooting war should start it is obvious that our supply of this strategic material would again be cut off.

For the past 5 or 6 years I have endeavored in every way I could think of, and have exercised myself considerably, in trying to emphasize to our various governmental bureaucracies the necessity for governmental encouragement of this infant industry upon two grounds: first, that it is a strategic material needed for the national defense, and, second, that it offers a new cash crop for the people of this section, as well as an opportunity for diversification in agriculture in this section, which has been so strongly advocated by the Department of Agriculture.

One of the chief problems of this pioneering industry is the fact that the Chinese product comes into this country on the free list. Chinese oil is produced with Chinese labor, the cheapest labor in the world, and although the methods of production are very crude and uneconomical, resulting in an inferior product to the American oil, it is difficult for this infant industry to compete with the Chinese oil. There should be a duty imposed on the Chinese product, at least until this industry could develop to the point that it could compete with the Chinese oil. The yield per acre as the result of experimentation is constantly increasing and we have reason to believe that in a few years more the industry could and would be able to compete with the Chinese oil without the necessity of a tariff or other governmental assistance. To that end several months ago I introduced a bill, H. R. 5350, which provides for the removal of tung oil from paragraph 1732 of the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 and its inclusion under paragraph 54, imposing a duty of 5 cents per pound on the imported product.

Unfortunately for this industry and the national defense, the powers that be have taken the position that such a law would run counter to the Government's foreign trade policy generally. They take the position that it is necessary in the effort to help China obtain American dollars that this product be permitted to enter duty-free; therefore, there appears to be no immediate relief from this angle.

But, realizing the necessity for some governmental assistance and encouragement for this infant industry, some of us interested in this matter more than a year ago prevailed upon the then Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, and the Commodity Credit Board, under the broad powers given it by Congress, to grant the industry a support price of 25 cents per pound for the 1947–48 crop. About 60 days ago we appealed to Secretary Anderson and the Commodity Credit Board to renew the support price upon the same basis for the 1948–49 crop. Again Secretary Anderson was most cooperative and sympathetic and the new program was well under way when, unfortunately, the able Secretary resigned in the midst of the negotiations and the working up of the new program.

Shortly after the resignation of the Secretary, and pending the appointment of his successor, the Board met and refused to grant a new support program for next year's crop. I understand that this refusal was based upon the grounds that it had become necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy up at the support price of 25 cents per pound, approximately 75 tank cars of this oil. And in this connection it might be well pointed out that this action of the Corporation in acquiring this oil was necessitated by the fact that just prior to the time for renewal of the support price program exceptionally large quantities of tung oil were imported from China, thus running the price down from around 30 to 24 cents. There are ample grounds for the opinion, prevalent in many quarters, that this was done deliberately to prevent the granting of a new support price upon the domestic product. It is significant that the price of tung oil during these deliberations has never gone below 24 cents. Of course, the brokers who import Chinese oil are naturally more interested in commissions than in the building up of the domestic supply.

Anticipating that we might encounter some difficulty in the renewal of the support price for next year's program, on February 12, 1948, I introduced H. R. 5348, which would make tung nuts one of the basic commodities along with cotton, peanuts, et cetera, and by legislative edict make it mandatory upon the Department to support tung nuts at not less than 90 percent of parity, as is provided for the other basic commodities, using the base period from January 1936 to December 1940, which would result in a support price of approximately 28 cents per pound for tung oil.

Unfortunately again, we failed, due largely to the governmental attitude plus the fact that this product is produced in such limited areas. This commodity was refused this support notwithstanding the fact that linseed, which historically brought a lower price than tung, and which oil is inferior to tung oil, in every way, as a drying oil and otherwise, has been consistently supported at a higher level than tung.

Under all of the facts of the case the bill under consideration should provide for a support price for this most valuable industry, but I realize the futility of offering this as an amendment on the floor of this House today. I know too well that this bill is a "closed shop" so far as adding any new product is concerned. I am told that if an amendment is permitted to add tung to the bill, there will

be many other commodities sought to be brought into the scope of the bill. Therefore the committee is opposed to any amendment. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I considered offering my bill as an amendment to this bill, but in view of the attitude of the committee and the apparent haste of the House I deem it wise not to jeopardize the chances of securing this support at the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation which already has the authority to grant such support.

My purpose, therefore, in bringing this to the attention of the House is to acquaint the membership with this industry and its tremendous importance, both economically and as a matter of national defense, and to keep the record straight. I might add that we are still carrying on negotiations with the Commodity Credit Corporation and we are very much in hopes that they will yet grant this most deserving infant and strategic industry the support price to which it is so justly entitled. But I here and now make the statement that if we do not succeed in that, next year we are going to be camping on the doorstep of the Committee on Agriculture of the House to see that the support price is made mandatory by legislation.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAND: On page 2, line 1, strike out the word "and" before "peanuts" and after "peanuts", insert "and vegetables and fruits."

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I have some little reluctance in offering this amendment because I am inclined at least partly to agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that this may not be the time or the place to offer it. The fruits and vegetables to which my amendment refers are perishable, and do not lend themselves easily to the type of parity program which is envisioned in this bill. On the other hand, it occurs to me to be essential to this program that either we are going to have a program for agricultural support, or we are going to have a program merely for the support of certain selected commodities.

I think we should agree that if this program were confined to wheat, corn, and cotton, it might be said that they are basic commodities, but since we have added rice and since we have added tobacco, crops that are regionally important but perhaps not basic to our national economy, and since we have just retained peanuts, it seems to me that if we are going to have a fair and equitable program, we have to consider not merely those regions but all regions of our country which are concerned with agriculture.

In New Jersey we are glad to go along, I hope and think, with this program for the benefit of our friends in the West and South, but New Jersey has no concern as a State with wheat or cotton. On the other hand, we have a very great concern with tomatoes, beans, asparagus, and the great garden crops, of which we are one of the country's largest producers. So it seems to me if we are going to be at all fair about this thing, if we are going to have a program really for agricultural support generally and not for the support of just a few selected commodities, it is fair to consider that this amendment be now included.

I was greatly heartened by the discussion I had on the floor yesterday afternoon with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who has assured me that in the consideration of the long-range agricultural program now under way, these crops to which I refer will be considered on a fair and equitable and proper basis.

This bill has already been markedly improved. Potatoes, milk, and hogs have been added. And chickens and eggs are now included. Since my area is one of the greatest producers of poultry products in the United States, I was particularly glad to support the committee in these respects. But these other items must have consideration at once. I think the chairman agrees with me in the principle of this amendment, although he perhaps disagrees that this is the time and place to offer it. Nevertheless, I do feel constrained to offer it. I hope it may now receive the attention of those Members who are as concerned as I am that these commodities have been left out of this general program. In the closing pages of yesterday's RECORD I inserted certain communications from the New Jersey and Pennsylvania Tomato Growers Association, as well as other communications which I think might be of interest to the membership I hope this amendment may be adopted now. In the event it is not, I feel sure it will be taken into consideration in the long-range program, and that we will give fair and equitable treatment to these groups that have been left out of the program so far.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather sympathetic with the purposes and intents of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. I know that he represents a large section of fruit and, particularly, vegetable growers. He spoke about the tomato growers. But it is entirely impracticable to take into consideration in this proposed legislation any perishables, such as tomatoes, and so forth.

All that I can say on the subject can be said in 2 minutes. It is not practicable to include perishables. I happen to know something about tomatoes, because as a farmer many years ago I used to grow about 20 acres of tomatoes for a canning factory. I know the practice is that the tomatoes are always contracted for in advance at a certain price. They will take all that you grow at that price, and that price is fixed. The farmers are protected, because they know what they are going to get.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I appreciate that what the gentleman says is largely true, that it might not be easy to fit this group in, but that, I do not think, is the same as saying that your committee on the House of Representatives cannot work out a program which would be fair to these groups.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I do not see how we could accept this amendment and still have a workable piece of legislation, for the simple reason that last fall I was up to one of the largest canning factories in the New England States, where I found that they were flooded with tomatoes and did not know what to do with them. They had more tomato juice and more canned tomatoes. It was stacked to the roof inside and stacked outside as well. They are not going to contract for any more than they can use this year. A man can grow something else beside tomatoes.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HAND. That is one instance that sometimes causes difficulty. This year tomatoes have gone down $4 a ton, although the cost of producing them has risen 15 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Well, they can turn to some other crops. On most all other perishable crops, a man never knows in advance what he is going to get. His price is regulated by the going market price.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. I agree with what my distinguished colleague from Illinois says. Does not the gentleman also think that since this is a bill which extends certain existing price supports for a temporary period, we should not at this time add any other commodities to it, and that we ought to leave that to a long-range program?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I am in entire accord with that because this is merely a temporary carry-over because the committee is planning a long-range program, and the committee has already started hearings all over the country on such a program, and I know it will be considered at that time.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. Does not the gentleman think it might be practicable to give some consideration to citrus fruit in the hearings which your committee will hold in the reasonably near future on this long-range support program?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I might say to the gentleman that the committee has to some great extent heard the citrus fruit people. They have a problem. For instance, Florida has a market for about 100,000,000 boxes of citrus fruits, yet they have been producing this year at the rate of 110,000,000 instead of 100,000,000 for which they have a market.

Mr. BRADLEY. We in California have a great problem and would appreciate anything the committee can do to assist us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I am sure it will go into that thoroughly and try to work out something.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to again point out that the measure before us is only of a temporary

character. Whether you pass it or not, supports will be continued through December of this year.

For the past 12 months or more the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate have been making a study of the various farm programs, looking to the writing of a long-range bill. It is now too late to write such a bill during this session of the Congress, and necessarily it must go over until next year. Therefore, the purpose of the pending bill is to more or less retain the status quo until the long-range bill is enacted. The bill before us merely extends the support program through 1949.

The statement was made on the floor yesterday that our farmers were rolling in money, that they have become rich. This is positively not true. Our farmers are living a little better today than they were a few years ago. But so are the rest of us. Many of you seem to have forgotten the days when our farmers were selling their corn, wheat, cotton, hogs, cattle, and so on, at much less than the cost of production.

Now what is the present situation? The Government has again called on our farmers to produce large crops to help feed the world. The large production goals could create price-breaking surpluses. Chances are that will not happen. But it can happen. Therefore, the Government should at the same time assure our farmers against such a serious hazard. And that can only be done through price supports.

The support-price program is nothing but a means of supplying a reasonable floor price. Labor has its minimum wage. Business has its tariffs. They are nothing more nor less than a floor under wages and profits. Why should there not be a floor price under farm commodities? Furthermore, labor is organized and through such organization it has the means of fixing wages. Farmers cannot so organize. They cannot fix prices. The price-support program is the only process by which farmers may be saved from disastrous price breaks.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation is only temporary. New legislation will be written next year. Certainly the present farm program should not be disturbed until the new long-range bill is put into effect.

I urge you to support this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation designed to continue and to improve our price support program on agricultural products. If this kind of legislation was ever needed, it is needed today. Even in these days of so-called prosperity the farmer gets less return for his work, hour for hour, than any citizen of our country. Never before in the history of our country was there such necessity for increasing farm production as there is today. With half of the world dislocated and destroyed by war the American farmer is being called upon to feed the world.

We have passed legislation for the recovery of Europe. We do not like to see people in distress or suffering for want of food anywhere. We want to see the democratic nations of the earth strong and able to stand on their feet. We want them to be able to furnish an outlet for our farm products to the end that the farmers of our country will enjoy a good market for the things they grow. This cannot be done unless we can guarantee to our farmer citizens that they will receive a reasonable price for their goods. I am telling you people who come from the cities that this legislation is just as important to you as it is to our farmers. You have no choice but to depend on the farmer for your food and clothing. Most of the basic necessities of life come from the farm. You are not going to keep young men and women on the farms producing the things you need unless they can have some reasonable assurance that they are going to enjoy a good standard of living on the farm.

I want to tell you a little bit about what farmers have always had to face, and you will see why I feel so strongly about this legislation. I grew up on a farm in Pittsburg County, Okla. I am proud of it. I remember as a boy we used to pick a bale of cotton and haul it 8 miles to the gin. We did not have trucks on farms in those days. We would hitch up a team of horses or mules and take out for town at about 3 o'clock in the morning. We would have our cotton ginned. The buyers would sample it. They never asked us how much we would take for it; they told us how much they would give us for it. Then we would go down to the store and buy a few things that we needed on the farm. This time they told us how much we would have to pay for it. In other words, a farmer never had anything to say about how much he would take for what he had to sell, nor did he have anything to say about what he would pay for the things he had to buy. He was at the mercy of a buyer's market on the one hand and of a seller's market on the other. In other words, they caught him coming and they caught him going. This has always been true. Yet there are people who do not believe in price support for farm goods.

Manufacturers have had protection in the form of tariffs from time immemorial, but price supports for farm goods is a new thing. Yet this program will end this year unless we pass this bill today. I hope it has the overwhelming support of this Congress.

During my brief service in this House I have supported every piece of farm legislation that has ever come to this floor. I am for our soil-conservation program. Our freedom is our greatest governmental inheritance; our soil is our greatest material inheritance. Yet we are advised that 50,000 acres of soil are lost to our children through floods, erosion, and depletion every year. That is a vast supply of wealth that must be conserved. It presents one of the greatest problems now facing the American people. Our soil not only belongs to this generation. We must conserve it for generations yet to come.

I believe in rural electrification. I have had the honor during my term in Congress of supporting the largest appropriations for this program in the history of our country. Nothing that our Government has ever done for the farmer or to the farmer has done so much to lift from the backs of our farm people and particularly our farm women the drudgery and the toil that they have always known. I am happy that within the past 12 months electricity has been extended to many hundred farm homes in my district. I am happy that new lines are being built and new connections are being made every day. I hope I live to see the day when electricity is within reach of every farm home in Oklahoma.

I am for the school-lunch program. I hope this program is continued through the years. It is an American program. It is a program for our country, a program for the finest things we have in this life, the American boy and the American girl. It has been a great success, and I do hope it remains a permanent part of our agricultural appropriation bills.

Again I want to urge the adoption of this measure for the support of farm prices. It is necessary legislation. It is necessary in order to keep up farm production. It is necessary in order to give the farmer an income which will enable him to maintain the standard of living that all of us know he deserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that there are those among us who on the least provocation or, I might better say, at every opportunity, bring partisan politics into all legislation debated before the Congress immediately preceding every national election. The debate thus far has in a degree followed that pattern. All of which adds up to the fact that it is very difficult to give unbiased, unprejudiced consideration to important matters at this time.

Certainly there should be no politics in farm legislation. It is my understanding that this has always been the rule in the Committee on Agriculture, but when legislation reaches the floor of the House unfortunately the rule seems to be different.

Now I am not going to again repeat the usual statement that I have the greatest agricultural district in the country, made up of family-sized farms; that the percentage of absentee ownership is very small, and that my farmers are real farmers. Neither am I going to elaborate on the fact that many of the farmers of my country are active members of the National Grange and the National Farm Bureau Federation; both of which favor this bill; that many are graduates of our agricultural college, and that modern approved methods of farming are commonplace in our district.

I believe thoroughly in free enterprise. I therefore naturally do not favor Government subsidies except where they are necessary in the public interest. There are cases where Federal aid is not only desirable and advisable but where it is essential in the public weal.

Now this bill does continue for a limited period support prices for certain agricultural products. I am convinced that there must eventually be an over-all farm stabilization program, based upon peacetime consumption and not upon wartime economy. This bill recognizes

this fact and I think that the carefully prepared statement of the Committee on Agriculture explaining what the present proposal is and why it is submitted to us at this time, is clear and concise. That statement is as follows:

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS AND THE WAR

The price-support programs for agricultural commodities which would be modified and continued by this bill came into being principally because of the urgent demands for increased food and fiber production to meet war and essential civilian needs. Some of the price-support programs were built upon and around prior legislation, such as the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. Other programs were inaugurated under powers already vested in the executive branch of the Government without further legislative action. Still other programs came about as the result of amendments to legislation dealing with price control and economic stabilization activities during the war. These programs have been invaluable in obtaining necessary production of agricultural commodities. Most of the various price-support programs were scheduled to terminate 2 years after the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President, by proclamation, or the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declared that hostilities in the present war had terminated. This 2-year period of mandatory price support at certain levels was provided originally to give producers an opportunity to make readjustments in production. The President, by proclamation, on December 31, 1946, declared that hostilities in the present war had ceased, thereby automatically terminating, in the absence of further legislation, certain price-support programs on December 31, 1948.

The Committee on Agriculture shortly after the Eightieth Congress convened commenced working to develop a new and long-range agricultural program to supplant the wartime program. Extensive hearings were held in Washington throughout the first session of the Eightieth Congress. During the summer recess the committee held hearings throughout the length and breadth of the Nation to obtain first-hand the views of the farmers to assist in developing a long-range agricultural policy.

In the period since the issuance of the President's proclamation events of great significance to our economy have taken place throughout the world. These developments included one of the worst weather periods in the history of western Europe, which resulted in a further drastic reduction in an already greatly reduced agricultural production. In June came the speech of the Secretary of State outlining the so-called Marshall plan. Shortly thereafter there developed the crises in France, Italy, and Austria which brought about the enactment of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 authorizing emergency aid for such countries. The aid provided under that act required the exportation of large quantities of agricultural commodities. Concurrently with these events, the 16 nations embraced within the so-called Marshall proposal were busily engaged, in conjunction with representatives of this country, in developing a plan of aid designed to assist in the economic recovery of western Europe and in the stabilization of free governments which were being subjected to increased pressures from the east. This culminated in the European recovery program and the enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. The effect of these developments has been to change drastically the agricultural outlook from what it was at the time the President declared an end to hostilities and at the time the committee commenced work on its long-range agricultural program in this Congress.

All of the developments referred to above have resulted in heavy demands upon American agriculture equivalent to those experienced during the war. During and since the war it has been necessary to continue agricultural production far above prewar levels, and farmers have not had an opportunity as was contemplated to adjust their production to anything like anticipated normal peacetime demands because urgent needs for food and fiber throughout the world have been too great. The full impact of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947, approved December 17, 1947, and of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, approved April 3, 1948, on American agriculture is not yet known, and no one can, with certainty, predict what it will be. We may, however, be assured that the repercussions will be great. In view of these rapidly changing circumstances and conditions, the committee has experienced extreme difficulty in attempting to formulate a long-rate agricultural price-support policy which will be effective under conditions which may be expected to exist under normal peacetime situations and at the same time meet conditions as they exist at present. The reason for this difficulty is readily apparent. Programs designed to meet average peacetime situations simply are not adequate to cope with the extraordinary domestic and international conditions confronting the world today. At present there appears to be little prospect of any substantial lessening in the demands for products of American farms from that experienced during the past year. It is imperative, therefore, that we keep in readiness the tools by which we may obtain food production at maximum levels, consistent with sound land-conservation practices, if we are to have available at fair prices the kinds and amounts of food needed to meet our domestic requirements and at the same time carry out the obligations we have assumed in foreign fields. It is also necessary that the tools be flexible enough to bring about adjustments to meet changing conditions. The accompanying bill provides that flexibility.

There is at present considerable uncertainty in the minds of farmers, and among Government officials administering various agricultural and foreign-aid programs, concerning the agricultural situation which will prevail after the end of this year. Since some of these support programs are scheduled to terminate at the stroke of midnight on December 31, 1948, while others continue on throughout the marketing year for certain 1948 crops, our production and marketing pattern could be severely distorted unless these uncertainties are removed at an early date. The committee is, therefore, recommending the immediate enactment of the accompanying bill, which provides for a continuation of price-support programs on a somewhat modified basis. The authority provided under this bill, it is believed, will permit maximum production of essential commodities to be obtained and at the same time permit such adjustments in the production and marketings of certain less essential commodities as may be necessary to bring about a reasonable balance in the supply of foods and other agricultural commodities with changing levels of demand.

In recommending enactment of this bill it should clearly be recognized that the committee is continuing its work in formulating a long-range agricultural price-support policy. For this and for the other reasons referred to herein the committee believes it would be unwise at this time to extend the price-support programs provided for in the accompanying bill beyond June 30, 1950. Prior to that time the committee expects to have some recommendations with respect to a long-range agricultural price-support policy available for the consideration of the Congress. The enactment of this program now, however, will give farmers assurance of continued price support so that they can, with confidence, make plans for the future and provide the quantities of food and other farm products so vitally needed in the world today.

In the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress our farmers are not all agreed as to Federal aid, the AAA program, and other legislation affecting agriculture. These farmers are honest and sincere, but do not entertain the same views respecting these problems. Therefore, it is impossible for a Member of Congress to vote with all of them. In these circumstances, I concede it to be my duty to weigh the arguments on either side and then support that policy which I believe to be most likely to provide adequate food and fiber for our people at the lowest price possible, allowing cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the farmers, just the same as makes the operation of industrial business possible.

There is no new principle embodied in this bill. Existing legislation has its faults, and changes should be made. However, no law is better than its administration, and the present Department of Agriculture has, in my opinion, failed miserably in carrying out the intention and purpose of Congress in its administration of some of the provisions of the law. Many of my farmers protest against what they call bureaucratic control and domination on the part of Washington agencies. As stated in the committee report, to which I have just alluded, committee hearings have been held, studies made, and investigations are now in progress as to that administration. In the next Congress there will be a general revision of all farm legislation. Yes; there will be more than a revision. There will be a general overhauling to the end that our people are assured of adequate food and that the young men and the young women will be encouraged to continue in the agricultural industry rather than to abandon the farm projects, as has been the custom within the last few years. The hours of work in the urban centers are so much shorter and the financial reward is so much greater that these young people just will not stay on the farm under such conditions.

Mr. Chairman, it has been made clear in this debate that this overhauling of present farm legislation is necessary, and I think the Congress is unanimous in the promise that it will be done.

We are all mindful of the fact that in election year promises are the common thing. I do not want to be a party to any promise that will not be kept insofar as it is legislatively possible to do so. So, it would seem the best plan to be pursued at the moment is to pass this continuing law, and that each of us in our respective districts give special attention to just how the law affects our particular constituents and be prepared to contribute our part in the formation of a sound, long-range agricultural program for the future. No one can find fault with such an endeavor. A vast majority of our membership contemplates this course of procedure. I feel sure that in the light of the experience of the past, and the information gained in the investigation and study to be made during

the summer, a wholesome and necessary law protecting not only the producer of food, but also the consumer, can and will be written.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEARHART: On page 3, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and add the following: "And that citrus and dried fruits and raisins shall be supported at such percentage of parity as shall be determined by the Secretary."

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, citrus, dried fruits, and raisins are now in distress. In days gone by, the producers of those articles have enjoyed, without support, a great prosperity, and during those days they yielded to the National Treasury great sums in national revenue, a large part of which has been used in rescuing other distressed crops, such as those that have been mentioned here today.

Times have changed, and we find that citrus, raisins, and dried fruits are in distress, and they are calling on the country, which they have ever sustained, for relief by inclusion in this program. Those crops meet every test and every requirement for inclusion. They are export crops. By that I mean 20 to 50 percent of the production of these farm commodities must be exported from this country each year. The reason those crops are in distress grows out of the fact that the export markets of the world are now in confusion and dislocation, this as a consequence of the war. So it would be an act of graciousness on the part of the Government to extend this great privilege, this great sustaining privilege, if you please, to those industries which have so nobly supported this program in the days gone by, when they were enjoying a prosperity which unhappy conditions now deny them.

There is another reason why these commodities should be accorded this support. They are not annuals in any sense of the word. It takes from 5 to 7 years to develop a grapevine; from 5 to 7 years to grow a fruit tree. It takes from 7 to 14 years to bring a citrus tree to that point where it will produce in high quantity. Therefore, to tell them that they must abandon their orchards and their vineyards is unthinkable. They must be tided over, and this is one way we can do it, and, by doing it, we can, at the same time, save other industries from a consequential distress which will overtake them if this support formula is not written upon the statute books.

My amendment refers in part to dried fruits and berries—peaches, apricots, pears, apples, raisins, and other commodities which in their fresh state are raised in every corner of this country. Because of climatic conditions they are not, however, dried in every section of the country, though the production of them in every section of the country is very, very great. Without support, it will mean that much of the tree fruit will not go on the drying trays but will be marketed for table use or processed. If this is to be the consequence of the failure of the Congress to act, the market for fresh and canned fruits will be glutted, this to the disaster of the entire tree-fruit industry, dried, fresh, and preserved. So in order to provide a reasonable protection for the deciduous-fruit industry against the vicissitudes of the market in all sections of the United States it is absolutely necessary that we include in this support program the dried fruits I have mentioned.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know that about $49,000,000 worth of dried fruits from Italy and other foreign countries are in the ERP program, the cost of which is about $600 a ton as compared with a cost of about $220 a ton for California fruit?

Mr. GEARHART. That was one of the very difficult things to understand.

We wonder why our Government persists in buying foreign-grown fruit at greater cost to the taxpayers when the fruit of our own orchards rots in the drying sheds or warehouses for want of buyers. Certainly, such a saving as the one the gentleman from Nebraska refers to cannot be lightly disregarded.

So it would appear to be but even-handed justice, the adoption of this amendment now. It is in confidence that I commend it to your careful consideration. It is upon its intrinsic merit that I submit it to the membership of this great Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Thank you.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is a good amendment, and I hope it may have the support of the Members of the House.

The point to which I particularly call attention is the fact that it differs from any amendments introduced, or discussed in regard to the support price program, in that this amendment does not say that citrus or dried fruits or raisins are to have a specific percentage of support but that the percentage of support is left to the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

A support program can be justified on certain grounds: One, that the commodities involved are those which have a material effect upon the economy of the country such as wheat, peanuts, corn, hogs, and so forth; or, that they are commodities which are involved at the moment in serious distress, or that they are commodities where there have been long-time preparation or large investments. In other words, as the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] pointed out, the investment in tree fruits and vines may run to 7 years or more, in time and money involved. This seems to me to be an admirable amendment. I am glad the gentleman from California has introduced it. I shall vote for it myself and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that it may have the support of the House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I notice the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchase 265,000,000 pounds of fresh and dried fruits, and I assume that is——

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is under the authority of section (c). The gentleman from California places it under section (b), where I think it belongs, and gives it this additional advantage, that it leaves the Secretary to determine the percentage of support.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TAFT, A FRIEND OF LABOR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, activities of a few—a very few—who were taking advantage of the Wagner Act to infiltrate into and use union organizations for their own purposes, brought about the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law. Unfortunately, Senator TAFT and Representative HARTLEY and the members of the committees which drafted the act, have been characterized as antilabor.

Everyone with a grain of sense knows that neither TAFT nor HARTLEY, nor the committees over which they preside, had the power to enact this law.

The Congress of the United States—by far more than a two-thirds majority in each House—passed the bill over President Truman's veto.

It is not only untrue, but it is absurd, to charge any small group with the responsibility or claim the credit for this law or, on the other hand, to contend that it is unfair to labor and that those Senators and Congressmen who voted for it in such overwhelming numbers are antilabor. Senators and Congressmen hold their jobs because a majority of the people in the States, in the case of Senators, in the congressional districts in the case of Congressmen, vote for them.

A Senator or a Congressman who does not reflect the thinking and the will of the people of his State or district does not long remain in Congress.

The people are the employers—the Senator or the Congressman is the employee—in my own case, the hired man.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding due to unfair propaganda. Because Senator TAFT is a candidate for the Republican nomination for President, he has been the object of a most misleading attack.

Permit me to read from an article by that unreconstructed Democrat, Morris A. Bealle, setting forth his views on TAFT and the law which bears his name:

I quote:

"BUCKEYE" BOB

ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, reminds us of nothing so much as Franklin D. Roosevelt and "Hitax" Harry Truman—he is so different.

BOB TAFT is the one professional politician in today's Presidential sweepstakes—Republican or Democratic—who appears to possess the ability and courage to pick up the pieces of our shattered government and put them together again.

Senator TAFT has been smeared by the labor press and its leaders, and by the goons

and racketeers of the labor movement, in the hope that the delegates at Philadelphia will be scared into ditching him. If the Republicans have any sense, they will nominate him and then proceed to clarify the issues so they will be understood by the American people.

The newspapers have poll parroted the vilification of the labor goons since Congress passed the Taft-Hartley labor bill to such an amazing extent that millions of Americans believe the Ohio statesman is some sort of a horned labor baiter. Actually he is anything but.

LABOR'S BILL OF RIGHTS

The record shows, and the truth proves, that the Taft-Hartley Act not only will be the best thing for labor in the long run but it is the best piece of legislation for the American people that has been passed since F. Roosevelt began to make fun of the Constitution and show his contempt for it by his official acts.

If the labor goons would tell their meal tickets (dues payers) the whole truth, they would point out that it was Senator TAFT who saved the striking railroad workers from being made into conscripts overnight. President Truman had sent to Congress his bill to draft these railroad men into the Army while antistrike hysteria was at its height.

The House of Representatives had passed the bill with a whoop. It was Senator TAFT who stood up in the Senate and, using his influence and power as the majority leader, killed the proposal dead as a door nail. Every labor vote against candidate TAFT would, therefore, be an act of gross ingratitude, the kind a snake shows when it bites the hand that feeds it.

If the Republican bigwigs will hire themselves a real publicity department, and "debunk" the smear-Taft propaganda of the labor goons, they will have a winner for years to come. If they let the Whitneys, and Tobins, and Bridges, and Wallaces stampede them into nominating a second rater they may find themselves on the outside looking in for 16 more years.

Where the Wagner bill emancipated labor from the law of supply and demand when wielded by hard-boiled employers, it also gave labor under the control of its own racketeers and the political party in power. The Taft-Hartley bill emancipated labor from this ugly feature of the Wagner Act.

A proper presentation of this bill to the American people by the Republican bigwigs and money bags would be a far smarter move then to turn thumbs down on its author just because he has been vilified from A to Izzard by the labor goons and their journalistic dupes.

HYSTERICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

When the bill was passed, hysterical full-page advertisements were found in many newspapers calling it a slave-labor bill, a ripper law to gut unions, a wreck labor bill, crucifixion, treason, and every other uncomplimentary epithet the labor mimeograph department and the Communist press agents could think of.

These advertisements were paid for by the workingmen themselves. They were inserted at the instance of the labor leaders, goons, and racketeers who have muscled into a lush racket and live on fat $25,000 salaries and unlimited swindle sheets. All of this is at the expense of the organized workingmen.

These advertisements fanned into a flame the passions of 100,000 CIO members who paraded up Fifth Avenue in New York on June 10, 1947, in protest against the bill. It is doubtful if 10 of these 100,000 marchers ever read the bill or had the slightest knowledge of its provisions. In fact it is doubtful if the majority of them could read at all.

When one carefully studies the Taft-Hartley Act, the reason for the vituperation of labor's pay-roll bums is apparent. It not only weakens their control over the individual honest workingman but it threatens the existence of their respective rackets. Is it any wonder they hurl epithets and spend millions of dollars of their victims' dues to misrepresent the act to the public?

WORKMEN'S RIGHTS

The Taft-Hartley Act gave workingmen the right to earn a living at their chosen calling without interference by government or goon squad. This feature will hasten the economic recovery of the United States—if and when the political parasites are run out of Washington and the war is declared over—by at least 2 years.

The act's section 8 prevents a union from depriving a workman of his job for any reason other than nonpayment of union dues or initiation fees. It still leaves the union free to take away a member's card for any reason that it sees fit, but it does prevent the union from forcing an employer to discharge a good workman because he has incurred the displeasure of the union bosses.

This act is enough to make labor racketeers see red. We don't blame them, but we do blame those who would vote against Senator TAFT, should he be the nominee, on this false and phony premise.

The Taft Act retains the Wagner Act provision that employers may not discriminate against employees for union activities. But it also grants employees the right to refrain from union activities if they desire, and prevents the unfair-labor practices of union bosses and racketeers discriminating against them for not so doing.

DOESN'T FORBID STRIKES

Contrary to the published propaganda of the labor goons, section 13 does not forbid strikes. It not only expressly reaffirms this right, but it gives the worker the right to make important decisions for himself and frees him from the Hitler-Mussolini technique of his leaders who in so many cases insist on making decisions for him.

It requires that issues must be sold the voting members on their merits, and not by threats of lost jobs or cracked skulls. That, too, is a bitter pill for the union racketeers to swallow. Some unions charge initiation fees running into hundreds of dollars. When the war approached, the carpenters' union was given employment-agency rights in the various camps that were going up in a hurry. The result was an orgy of racketeering and a slow-down of camp construction.

Any old hack barber or street sweeper who would pay $50 to the union, was put on the Government pay roll as a carpenter. One local union in a large metropolitan city (the Nation's Capital) cleaned up over $400,000 by this racket. A first-class carpenter would be denied a job—and the war effort would be denied his services—if he thought this was a shake-down and refused to submit.

CAN FINE UNIONS

The Taft Act makes this impossible—in the event there is an honest National Labor Relations Board—by giving the Board power to fine any union caught charging excessive or discriminatory initiation fees or dues.

Under the Wagner Act a workman was often deprived of his right to present grievances to his employer and to seek redress. Under the phony "Magna Carta" he was required to let the union's grievance committee present it for him.

Often he was not present or allowed to be present, so he had no knowledge of how his case was presented. Often the grievance committee had no knowledge of the facts in his case.

And too often, the worker was either not a member of the union or he didn't stand in with the dominant clique. In that case he never got a hearing. Under the Taft Act the worker can present his own grievance to his employer. Is it no wonder those who sought to control him are howling and yelping for the act's repeal?

DIFFICULT FOR RACKETEERS

The Taft Act makes it difficult for labor racketeers, for their own selfish purposes, to pull or foment secondary or jurisdictional strikes. It thus protects workers in entirely different fields of production from being victims of the greed and lust for power of the leaders of another union.

The Wagner Act has been interpreted as requiring workers to belong either to the old-line American Federation of Labor or the Communist-dominated CIO. The Taft Act gives workers the right to organize independent unions where the old-line outfits and the commies are not properly representing their membership.

It is any wonder the commies and standpatters and goons of the labor movement are lying about Senator TAFT and Congressman HARTLEY?

The Communists will all vote against Senator TAFT because his act requires this breed of two-legged polecat in the labor brass-hat clique to stand up and be looked at as well as counted. Since Mr. Wallace and his third party will get all of the Communist vote, there is nothing about this for the Republican leaders to worry about if they nominate Senator TAFT.

MUST ACCOUNT FOR MONEYS

For the first time in history unions are required to supply the Government and their own members with information about the local's finances and what the members' money is spent for. This brought a yell to high heaven from those professional labor leaders and goons who were mishandling their members' dues and who were stealing from the union till.

No wonder they are sore at Senator TAFT. No wonder they insert full-page advertisements in newspapers (at the members' expense) lying about the Taft Act and its principal author.

Another emancipation given the workmen under the Taft-Hartley Act is emancipation from forced political contributions. No longer can the Communist leaders of a CIO union force its members to contribute to the campaign of a candidate friendly to communism who will help destroy the American form of government and the free-enterprise system which provides good jobs at high wages.

The shameful way in which the CIO slugged money from its members to bring about the election of that friend of communism (Franklin Roosevelt) in 1944 would not have been permissible had the Taft Act been on statute books then. Even the creation of a dummy organization known as the PAC (to avoid the penalties of the Hatch Act) would have been of no avail.

PROTECTS AGAINST THEFT

And the act finally protects workers against the squandering of or theft from funds contributed for health and welfare.

We submit that the case of the people for the Taft-Hartley Act, and against the labor racketeers, goons, and false leaders whose little playhouse it breaks down, is complete. Now to Senator TAFT himself.

Unlike Harry "Accident" Truman, he can see many miles ahead of his nose.

He has demonstrated the ability to analyze a public issue, to see its virtues and vices.

And he has demonstrated the political courage to tell the facts to the American people instead of pussy-footing and trying to ride both sides of the fence, as most professional politicians feel they must do.

He is being crucified for his honesty and courage. We cannot reiterate too many times Henry Mencken's description of a professional politician, because Washington is

so cluttered up with them and others are seeking to further clutter it up.

MENCKEN SAID IT

Mr. Mencken said, with hard-hitting bluntness and unassailable logic:

"A professional politician is a professionally dishonest man. In order to get anywhere near high office he has to make so many compromises and submit to so many humiliations that he is undistinguishable from a streetwalker."

Senator TAFT, if America is fortunate enough to elect him President, appears capable of proving the exception to this hard and fast rule. At least his record so far in the Senate gives such evidence.

He was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, 58 years ago, the son of a brilliant father. We disagree with his press agents that because he was brought up in the White House this makes him better Presidential timber. They are doing him a disservice by bringing up such a specious plea.

The elder Taft's public service started as Solicitor of the Justice Department and ended as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. In between he was President of the United States. The son has made no effort to bask in his father's glory.

He is seeking the Presidency on his own merits and his merits appear at this time to overshadow those of every other candidate on the horizon with the possible exception of General MacArthur.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has made a forceful and very eloquent plea for his amendment and I am sympathetic with the situation in which the fruit producers of California, both citrus and deciduous, find themselves. I believe, however, that it would be a mistake in this temporary extension of existing price-support legislation to enlarge the scope of the program. As I said a while ago in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, when the committee comes to considering a long-range program it will give consideration to the tree fruits. But this is not the time or the place to enlarge existing law to include those commodities.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman does agree that one of the elements involved here is the length of time and the investment before these commodities are produced?

Mr. HOPE. I think that is an additional argument for the inclusion of these products in a price-support program. I may say to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], that under the existing program and under section 1 (d) and this legislation there is authority to carry out a price-support program of this kind. But what the gentleman does is to make it mandatory and I do not believe we should say to the Secretary of Agriculture that he must support the price of these tree fruits.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated with the understanding, of course, that the committee will consider the matter when it takes up the long-range program.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. In view of the fact that we treat this in a slightly different way, in that we do not fix a 60 or 90 percent of parity but leave it to the Secretary himself to determine what is a fair support price, does that not make it a little more acceptable to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HOPE. It does make it more acceptable, but it still is a mandatory provision and says to the Secretary, "You must support the price of these commodities." I do not think that is a wise provision. As I said, there is already in the law now and in this bill the authority to support these commodities if the Secretary deems it advisable. That is as far as we should go at this time. We are merely extending existing law by this bill, and I do not think we ought to add to it at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GEARHART and Mr. PHILLIPS of California) there were—ayes 53, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER: Page 2, line 23, before the period insert the following: "except that for the purpose of computing the parity price of Maryland tobacco, the base period shall be the period August 1936 to July 1941 in lieu of the period August 1919 to July 1929."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SASSCER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

This bill is directed toward loans, and this amendment establishes the loan base for this particular commodity. Therefore I think it is rather closely interlocked, making it germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this bill, and the section to which the amendment is offered, merely extends the price-support program. It does not in any way deal with the parity formula or with the base period upon which parity may be computed. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland deals with one subject only, and that is, it sets up a new base period upon which to compute parity for Maryland tobacco. It clearly does not have any place in this bill which does not in any way deal with the subject of parity or the parity formula.

Mr. SASSCER. As I understand, the bill relates to parity, and in order to get loans you have to have a base to get the parity. This relates to the base, and my contention is that the two are interlocked; that you cannot have parity without a base.

Mr. HOPE. This bill deals only with an extension of existing law. It does not in any way touch the parity formula, and I cannot conceive that any amendment which attempts to change a preexisting formula would be germane to the object or purpose or language of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment which has, as its principal purpose, a change in computing the parity price for Maryland tobacco. The Chair feels, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the committee, very properly suggests, that this is beyond the scope of the bill presently under consideration and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate pro and con on this farm legislation and find that I cannot escape the conclusion that it will not only maintain but increase the cost of living for the consumer without at the same time effecting any justifiable additional relief for the farmer.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] pointed out, the agricultural price-support program was originally intended to save the farmer from excessive loss. To that extent legislation is appropriate because farming is essential if the people as a whole are to be sufficiently and adequately nourished.

The program was, however, not intended to assure a great profit to the farmer. The result of such legislation is to control the farmer's crops and to glut the market because farmers will grow that crop as to which such excessive security has been conferred. Potatoes are one striking illustration of that.

I regret that the pendulum has swung too far. I cannot support this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. From any funds available to the Department of Agriculture or any agency operating under its direction for price-support operations or for the disposal of agricultural commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to use such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he

shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that section 3 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. HOPE (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will receive an overwhelming vote, and certainly the vote of every Democrat. It continues for 18 months the support-price program which was enacted by a Democratic Congress and which has been of such great benefit to the farmers in every part of the Nation. These supports cover cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, peanuts, hogs, chickens, eggs, wool, milk, butter, and soybeans.

The Committees on Agriculture of the House and Senate have devoted many months to investigations and hearings looking to the preparation of a long-range farm program for the future. But due to the early adjournment of this session it is now apparent that a long-range program cannot be enacted before adjournment. Therefore the purpose of the pending bill is to continue present supports until a long-range program can be enacted.

Earlier this week we passed a bill to extend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, now scheduled to expire December 31, and within the next 2 or 3 days we will have before us a bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

These three measures are the heart of the farm program. One to stop the erosion and depletion of our soil and rebuild its fertility. Another to give the farmers protection against breaks in prices by supporting such prices at 90 percent of parity, and the third to continue that agency which makes the loans and purchases necessary to maintain those supports.

I think we now have a great farm program and about all we need for a future long-range farm program is to make permanent the one we now have with such improvements and refinements as our past experiences show to be needed. It contributes in good measure toward the end we have sought so long, that is, an assurance to those who till the soil and ride the range that they shall have their fair share of the national income and that same high standard of living as is now enjoyed by other groups.

I do hope when our present farm programs are perfected and combined into one great long-range program for the future that proper adjustments will be made in the parity prices of cattle, dairy products, and wool. Their parity figures are out of line on the low side, they need some upward adjustments, and being three of our most important and basic commodities I shall insist upon a proper adjustment of their parity prices.

Of course the pending amendment to strike peanuts as a commodity to be supported at 90 percent of parity must be defeated. Possibly to some of your peanuts may seem to be of little importance, but in my country, and in many parts of the South, the production of peanuts has become an important crop and contributes a great deal to the income of the farmers. There can be no justification for treating it any differently from other basic crops.

The production of peanuts is an expensive undertaking, they are our most soil-depleting crop, our fields are still low, means of mechanical cultivation and harvesting are not yet generally available, and I do not know of any commodity more greatly in need or more entitled to have 90 percent of parity support prices. Let us kill this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 638, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does any member of the minority seek recognition to offer a motion to recommit?

If not, the Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 6248, to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 33, noes 163.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 238. An act for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction;

H. R. 239. An act to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey;

H. R. 945. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis;

H. R. 2776. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 2867. An act to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rice Talbot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb;

H. R. 3007. An act for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of the estate of John Deiman;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4244. An act to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities;

H. R. 4298. An act for the relief of Henry Hill;

H. R. 4455. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4566. An act for the relief of William Nally;

H. R. 4659. An act to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States;

H. R. 4964. An act to preserve seniority rights of 10-point-preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier;

H. R. 5036. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948;

H. R. 5272. An act relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks;

H. R. 5330. An act for the relief of W. W. DeLoach;

H. R. 5655. An act confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing 139.62 acres;

H. R. 5820. An act to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes;

H. R. 5889. An act to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 5936. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5957. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6188. An act to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6239. An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 6246. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6289. An act to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital;

H. R. 6339. An act to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title;

H. R. 6766. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) entitled "An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. KILGORE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

BEVERAGE INDUSTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 6451) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

FRED E. GROSS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 709)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval H. R. 2131, Eightieth Congress, "An act for the relief of Fred E. Gross." The purpose of this bill is to remove certain statutory bars as they apply to Mr. Fred E. Gross, a Government employee, so as to permit him to file suit in the Court of Claims for the purpose of recovering from the United States for its use of the invention shown and described in his United States Letters Patent 2,389,-358.

The invention disclosed in Mr. Gross' patent relates to a packing box for bomb fuzes which he developed while employed as a civilian ordnance inspector at the Arkansas ordnance plant. The development was made at least partially on Government time with Government materials and with the assistance of other Government personnel. Under settled rules of law of the United States the Government, as the employer, became vested with the right of free use of the invention made by Mr. Gross under these circumstances. Further, with respect to Government-employee inventions, the Congress by the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (35 U. S. C. 68), has seen fit expressly to exclude Government employees from bringing claim against the Government in the Court of Claims on inventions made by them while in the Government service. The pertinent part of this statute with respect to Government employees reads as follows:

> The benefits of the provisions of this section shall not inure to any patentee who, when he makes such claim, is in the employment or service of the Government of the United States, or the assignee of any such patentee. This section shall not apply to any device discovered or invented by such employee during the time of his employment or service.

The Government appreciates the value of the contribution made to the war effort by Mr. Gross' packing-box invention. However, he is only one of a large number of persons engaged in the service of the Government who have developed valuable inventions or made contributions of note within the scope of their employment. To attempt to reward each of them despite the rights of the United States in the inventions concerned in each case would defeat the purposes of the acts of March 3, 1883, as amended (35 U. S. C. 45), and of June 25, 1910, as amended, supra, and would

be impractical. Further, the present bill by permitting Mr. Gross to maintain his suit despite the otherwise complete right of the Government to the free use of the invention is unfair to others who have made as great or greater contributions to the war effort under similar circumstances and who are denied this right by statute.

I am, therefore, obliged to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the bill and message referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 9, and 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 10, 11, 12, and 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$166,989,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That from this appropriation not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 932), and the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$339,491,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$61,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 7.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HOMER FERGUSON,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 relates to the establishment of national cemeteries on military, naval, or Territorial lands to be transferred or otherwise made available for this purpose at Punch Bowl Crater, T. H., and Bayamon Naval Gunnery Range, P. R., and provides language granting authority for the establishment of such cemeteries at the locations named as proposed by the Senate. The House bill carried funds for the establishment of these cemeteries.

Amendment No. 2 strikes out the words "remain available until expended" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 provides that not to exceed $16,000 may be used to pay expenses of Corps of Engineers representatives to attend three international engineering conferences as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates $166,989,100 for river and harbor projects instead of $151,831,300 as proposed by the House and $195,084,400 as proposed by the Senate.

In connection with this item, it is understood and agreed that the amounts allocated to planning on the following project shall be:

Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ga. and Ala	$290,000
Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla	500,000
Buford Dam, Ga	400,000
Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill	200,000

Included in the amount herein approved is an amount of $50,000 for oil-pollution control, Norfolk Harbor, Va.

Amendment No. 5 relates to funds carried in the bill available for transfer to the Department of the Interior for the protection of anadromous fishes, accepts the Senate language with an amendment that "not to exceed" $1,000,000 shall be available for such transfer as proposed by the House instead of $1,490,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates $339,491,100 for flood-control projects instead of $321,282,000 as proposed by the House and $371,656,800 as proposed by the Senate.

In connection with this item, the following amounts are allocated for planning: Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif., $50,000; Farmington Reservoir, Calif., $45,000; Lucky Peak Reservoir, Idaho, $90,000; Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr., $250,000; Eufaula Reservoir, Okla., $400,000; Bear Creek Reservoir, Pa., $200,000; West Fork Reservoir, W. Va., $60,000.

No funds from this item are to be used for planning purposes on the following projects: Toronto Reservoir, Kans.; Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans.; Boswell Reservoir, Okla.; Hugo Reservoir, Okla.; Pudding River, Oreg.; or Gathright and Falling Springs Reservoir, Va.

No part of the $268,000 earmarked for Jonesville, La., in the report under this item shall be used unless and until local interest make available for use on the project at least $100,000.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $61,000,000 for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House and $67,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; $6,000,000 of the amount to be allocated to the Yazoo River Basin.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $1,750,000 for flood control, Sacramento River, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed $10,000, when authorized by the Governor of the Panama Canal, for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with activities pertaining to the Panama Canal, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 appropriates $13,149,000 as proposed by the Senate for maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, instead of $12,499,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12 adjusts the total appropriation for the Panama Canal at $20,126,313 as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,476,313 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13 eliminates language relating to employment on the Canal Zone proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, relating to employment of expert services, permits the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, as well as the Governor of the Panama Canal to authorize the employment of such expert employees as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

Following is a statement of the amendment reported in disagreement and of the motion that has been authorized by the managers on the part of the House to be made in regard to it:

Amendment No. 7 relates to the authority contained in Public Law 526, Seventy-ninth Congress, and proposes to extend such authority to certain projects named in the amendment. A motion to concur in the Senate amendment will be offered.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the only way to render this report amendable would be to vote down the conference report. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states the situation correctly.

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan about some division of time. I would like to have some time against this report.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am not going to yield any time against the report.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-five members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish first to express my appreciation to the members of my subcommittee who have worked diligently and hard on this bill. We began hearings on the 10th of January, and had some 1,400 pages of hearings on the bill. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the ranking minority member; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], and every member on my side of the committee have cooperated on this bill, worked on it very diligently, and I think we have a very good bill.

The following summary table sets forth the results of our labors very clearly:

Regular and supplemental budget estimates for 1949	$737,804,300
House bill	606,558,766
Senate bill	708,586,666
Conference bill	641,575,666
Conference bill under budget	96,228,634
Conference bill over House bill	35,016,900
Conference bill under Senate bill	67,011,000

The conference bill brought in here is approximately $96,228,000-plus below the budget.

Of the $101,000,000-plus added by the Senate the House conferees conceded $35,000,000, roughly speaking, to the Senate and the Senate conceded $67,000,000 to the House.

FLOOD CONTROL—PLANNING FUNDS

The House allowed $3,000,000 for planning. The Senate allowed $3,329,000 for planning. The Senate report shows a total of $2,969,000 allowed for planning but this does not include $360,000 shown in the construction column but actually for planning. The conference allowed $3,318,000 for planning but this figure does not include the following amounts allowed for planning in the construction column:

Barre Falls, Mass	$20,000
Milton Freewater, Oreg	10,000
Belton Reservoir, Tex	70,000
Gorza-Little Elm, Tex	115,000
Total	215,000

Of the $3,318,000 allowed for planning, the following sums were earmarked for use or not to be used as follows:

TO BE USED

Whittier Narrows, Calif	$50,000
Farmington Reservoir, Calif	45,000
Lucky Peak, Idaho	90,000
Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr	250,000
Eufaula Reservoir, Okla	400,000
Bear Creek Reservoir, Pa	200,000
West Fork Reservoir, W. Va	60,000
Total	1,095,000

NOT TO BE USED

Toronto Reservoir, Kans	—$30,000
Tuttle Creek, Kans	—35,000
Boswell Reservoir, Okla	—30,000
Hugo Reservoir, Okla	—30,000
Puddin River, Oreg	—29,000
Gathright and Falling Spring, Va	—35,000
Salem Church Reservoir	—175,000
Total	—364,000

RIVERS AND HARBORS—PLANNING FUNDS

The House allowed $1,000,000 to be distributed by the Corps of Engineers among projects listed in justifications. The Senate increased the planning figure by $1,308,000 which included $176,000 for St. Anthony Falls, Minn., and $25,000 for Intracoastal Waterway Apalachee Bay, Fla.—New Orleans district—or a total of $201,000 which amount was included in the construction column. This explains why the Senate report figure for total planning is shown as $2,107,000.

In conference it was agreed that a total of $1,924,000 would be available for planning but this figure does not include $176,000 for planning carried in the construction column for St. Anthony Falls, Minn. In the conference report the following amounts are earmarked:

Alabama-Coosa River	$290,000
Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla	500,000
Buford Dam, Ga	400,000
Calumet-Sag, Ill	200,000
Columbia River at Foster Creek	42,000
	1,432,000

The difference between the $1,924,000 allowed for planning and the $1,390,000 earmarked or $534,000 is to be allocated by the Corps of Engineers among projects shown in their justifications.

NOT TO BE USED

Intracoastal Waterway, cross Florida section	—$25,000

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan if he is willing to give me some time.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. RANKIN. Ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I will give the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the gentleman promised me some time also.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BROOKS. Five or ten minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I will give the gentleman 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is an outrage. It is the result of a railroad lobby that has fought for years against the most important waterway development ever proposed to the Congress of the United States, and that is the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway that would provide a slackwater route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, to Pittsburgh, Pa., on the Ohio River, and to Minneapolis and St. Paul on the Mississippi. It affects everybody in the United States, and especially the ones in the Middle West and in the far West, as well as everyone in the South and everyone along the Great Lakes.

This project has already been authorized by act of Congress. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] can try his hardest, but he does not stand any more chance to kill this project in the long run, to use a Biblical expression, than he would to "bind the sweet influence of the Pleiades" or to "loose the bands of Orion." By his stubbornness, however, he has prevented us from voting on it at this session of Congress.

In doing so he has rendered a great disservice to the people of this country.

He has voted billions and billions of dollars to send to Europe under the pretense of protecting America from communism. This project is as necessary to our national defense as any other project ever proposed. It will give us a slackwater route from the Gulf into the Oak Ridge project, where our atomic bombs are manufactured, and will shorten the water distance between Oak Ridge and the Gulf of Mexico by approximately 800 miles—to be exact, 786 miles.

It will give us an additional outlet from Oak Ridge to the Gulf that we are going to need, and need badly, in case of another war.

This small amount of $1,500,000 was put in the bill by the Senate to begin work on this great project. The engineers are ready and anxious to get to work on it. They have their plans already drawn; they have their machinery ready. Yet the gentleman from Michigan knocks it out of the bill and then votes to send billions and billions of dollars to build waterways in Europe and in Asia. Right today American lend-lease money taken out of the pockets of the American taxpayers is being used to rebuild the Dnieperstroy Dam in Russia.

The money that you voted last week will be used to develop water-power projects. It will be used to develop water-transportation projects in Europe and Asia, and probably flood-control projects on the Ganges or a "TVA" on the Danube.

Yet, when we have a project that affects the American people all the way from Montana and North Dakota, from Pennsylvania and Ohio, Illinois and Wisconsin, to the Gulf of Mexico, that affects an area, if you please, known as the Mississippi Valley, and that is so vital to our national defense, the gentleman from Michigan arbitrarily refuses to approve the Senate amendment providing the small amount of $1,500,000 to begin the construction of this the greatest inland waterway project that has ever been proposed in the history of this country.

It was not possible until a few years ago. For 150 years our Army engineers had told us that they were unable to find a way to connect those two streams, the Tennessee and the Tombigbee. It could not be done until the building of the Pickwick Dam. When that dam was built, it raised the water level about 55 feet at

the mouth of Yellow Creek, and made it possible to cut through that sand ridge and give to the American people a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

Yet the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] seems determined that so long as he is able to dominate the conference committee not a dollar will ever be appropriated for this great project.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should vote down this conference report and let us concur in the Senate amendment, so as to provide funds to begin this construction. We are going to need it. Everybody with any intelligence knows that the next war America has will be an atomic war. This project which would be the greatest asset that Oak Ridge could have would not only cut the water distance to the Gulf by 786 miles but at the same time it would give a slack-water route for the upstream traffic. This may mean the difference between victory and destruction in the next war. The very life of the Nation may depend on it. It will be too late if we follow the pre-Pearl Harbor policies of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and wait till our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the atomic bomb.

The gentleman from Michigan should not forget that in case of an atomic war that probably one of the first cities that would be blown to bits and whose people would be burned to a crisp would be Detroit, Mich.

If anyone doubts what I have to say, go and consult the Army engineers, who have surveyed this project time and time again and pronounce it one of the greatest of its kind ever proposed. They will tell you that it is the only one that can be found on the face of the earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, with so little expense, and with such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances. It would be of untold benefit to the States of Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and the Dakotas, as well as to Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, and the other Southern States.

From a defense standpoint it would be of untold value to the people of every State in the Union.

From a transportation standpoint, it would benefit the people in every State that borders on the Great Lakes or the Gulf of Mexico, or that is drained by the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Illinois, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, or any of their tributaries.

It would save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic and at the same time provide a slack-water route not only from the Gulf of Mexico to our defense plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., but from the Gulf of Mexico to all points on the upper Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Great Lakes, and would be worth untold millions to the people along the Missouri and its tributaries.

Here is a table showing the savings in transportation costs which this project would provide for upstream traffic:

From—	To—	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex.	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400	$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	2.74	9,590	1.00	5,000	1.14	3,990	15,960
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	2.39	8,365	0.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	2.96	10,360	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	3.04	10,040	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,010	34,440
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,940
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,360	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.23	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction.	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

Mr. Speaker, I hope the conference report will be voted down and we are given a chance to concur in the Senate amendment to add the small amount which that body has provided for beginning the construction of this the greatest project of its kind that has ever been proposed.

It has already been approved by Congress, which authorized its construction 2 years ago. That authorization is written into the laws of the land and will remain there until this great project is constructed.

It has been recommended by the Army engineers time and again. They are ready, willing, and anxious to begin work on it. They have all their plans drawn and are ready to start the work now.

It is our duty to provide the funds. Let us meet that responsibility by concurring in the Senate amendment.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report because I think it is an unwarranted cut in the amount of funds which the Senate bill provided. In making that statement I want to say that I have no grievance against any member of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I have worried them over the past few weeks about this bill from time to time. They have been uniformly courteous to me, Mr. Speaker, on many occasions, and I want to publicly thank them for their patience and their tolerance.

Mr. Speaker, I put in years working on the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, and my work has been largely with this same subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. It handles appropriations, and our committee handles the legislation. I know the gentlemen, and I think they are faithful and loyal and sincere in their work. I think the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], is a hard-working, conscientious public official. But, Mr. Speaker, I differ with them in their view on this particular subject on this occasion. The Senate added $102,000,000 to this particular bill. I think much of the Senate addition was justified. I think it was worthy of consideration, and I think the cut was too heavy. When we came out of conference this subcommittee reported back to the House with an agreement which reduced the Senate amount by 64 percent; in other words, flood control and rivers and harbors took the burden of all of the cuts when it came to the conference report.

In receding, we receded from many very valuable projects. Yet, Mr. Speaker, just the other day in the other body, the gentleman from Michigan, Senator VANDENBERG, made the statement that we had passed an authorization bill in this Congress authorizing the appropriation of some billions of dollars to Europe, and that authorization was a commitment to the people of the world, and we would back it up with appropriations. I do not take issue with the gentleman from Michigan, Senator VANDENBERG, but I think that the bills which we passed authorizing these projects is in effect a commitment to the people of the United States that we will back them up with funds. When the other body comes in and provides $102,000,000 additional to the appropriation—and many of them are very worthy projects—I think they are entitled to the full consideration of this subcommittee. I think the willingness of the subcommittee to go along with reductions—in fact, the acceptance of the reductions and not standing by the Senate amendment—was wrong; it was not a proper support of the flood control and rivers and harbors program

of the Nation. In making that statement, Mr. Speaker, I think that my own State of Louisiana, which does accept the burden of the waters from the great Mississippi Valley which course through the lands in our State, has taken a very heavy and unwarranted reduction. Our State of Louisiana loses by this compromised conference report over $10,000,000, and I think that we should have stood by more firmly and fought for the $102,000,000 additional.

This Congress has appropriated something like $40,000,000,000. Many, many of these billions of dollars are going to other lands across the seas. I was over there during the war and I saw how these canals and waterways were used in Europe to win victory for the United States of America and our allies. I was near Antwerp, and I crossed the Albert Canal behind our lines, and I saw how our armed services were using the great canals and waterways of Europe to win the war that has just been concluded. I realize the importance of water transportation. When they come to me with a water transportation project that is worthy and has the approval of the Army engineers and the endorsement of the Congress, both the House and the Senate, I think it is worthy of every consideration. I think our country and our land will be far better off and our national security improved when we build these waterways.

Mr. Speaker, while I prefer to be general in my remarks in reference to this conference report, I realize that something may be said by others in regard to Louisiana projects. I am especially interested in two of them. One is a flood-control project and the other is a navigation project. One is in north Louisiana and the other is in south Louisiana.

The first one of these two projects is known as the Atchafalaya floodway project. This is a very large project to be used in emergencies for the carrying off of the flood waters of the Mississippi, thereby bypassing the city of New Orleans on its way to the Gulf. This project is extremely important to the people of our greatest city and they are all looking to Congress to provide flood protection for the Crescent City of Louisiana.

Under the Senate version of this bill, some $7,000,000 would have been available, so I am told, for this project. It would have been used in the raising of rights-of-way and closing levee gaps so that, in the event it is used in the future, those who live outside of the floodway will not be inundated and flooded, and the floodway may be used without extreme hardship. The amount of money for the lower Mississippi has been reduced. It has been reduced from $67,500,000 to $61,000,000, and $6,000,000 of this remaining amount has been designated solely for the Yazoo River Basin. This leaves only $55,000,000 for general lower Mississippi flood control; and I know this and other worthy projects along the lower Mississippi will suffer. The hearings indicate that a large part of this reduction of $6,500,000 will come from the great Atchafalaya floodway project, and I am seriously concerned that all of this reduction may be taken from it. The people of Louisiana know what the construction of this project means to the city of New Orleans and to others living below the juncture of the Mississippi and the Atchafalaya Rivers. They want to see it completed and they want New Orleans to be given the guaranties of protection to which this city is entitled. I, therefore, feel that the reduction of the general fund for the lower Mississippi by this amount will be very injurious to our people.

The Overton Red River lateral canal is the other project to which I have reference. It is a project which the Army engineers state is economically justified by a heavy margin. It will open up a great empire to river transportation. The Red River is a stream some 1,300 miles long, and this project proposes to make the valley navigable from the mouth of the river to the city of Shreveport. Already $15,000 has been spent on the project in planning, and only $50,000 more is needed to complete the planning. The Senate bill provided $2,200,000 for the beginning of construction in the lower part of the project. This amount was completely taken out by the conferees, and we must wait until a future date to begin what I conceive to be a most worthy project.

Mr. Speaker, I realize all projects cannot be built at one time. I cannot quarrel with the committee in arranging for orderly construction of them. But, Mr Speaker, this project has the approval of your Congress, and the Army engineers testified it is highly important to begin it at once. The canal will lead into the heart of the most prolific oil and gas fields in the world. It will furnish water transportation to the rest of our great inland waterway system. It will furnish a means of cheap transportation for fuel oil which will be so badly needed this coming winter in New England and all along the Atlantic seaboard. Our failure to build the project will be regretted by those who will need fuel desperately in the cold months which lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I will be pardoned by my reference to two local projects. I am more interested in the general work of flood control and rivers and harbors. Far out in the West tonight tens of thousands of people are suffering. They are suffering because of one of the worst floods in history. Too late, our Army and our civil agencies rush relief while our people hope and pray that loved ones will not perish in the maw of destructive waters. The flood occurs and these people suffer and die because of our failure in flood control. It is false economy to economize when the sun is shining and reap destruction to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars when the rains begin to pour. Peoples throughout America have reason to complain when this Congress fails in its simple duty to provide flood control.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this subcommittee for 12 years, and this is about the twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth time I have helped to hold hearings on civil-functions appropriations, but this is the first time I have ever been criticized for not sustaining the Senate position on a bill. The remarks of my good friend from Louisiana would be very fine were he making them in the Senate, but permit me to remind him that the duty of the House conferees is to sustain the House position. I think he ought to congratulate the House conferees on the success they have had in sustaining the House position, instead of criticizing them for not yielding to the Senate.

I do not want to answer my good friend from Mississippi. He is rather aggravated because he is not having his own way. I should like to have him mention one member of a railroad lobby who has even talked to a member of my committee. I never heard of a railroad lobbyist on this. The House voted down this project at least three times. This is the seventh or eighth time I have heard him make the same speech on the floor of the House, and I am getting just a little tired listening to it, and I thought the House was, judging by the action it took after he made the previous speeches.

If the Senate position had been sustained, it would have required approximately $812,000,000 in fiscal year 1950 to continue the projects put in by the Senate and those already in, at a rate of construction which sound engineering says we must follow if we are to get the most flood control for the flood-control dollar. It would take $850,000,000 in fiscal year 1951, eight-hundred-million-odd dollars in 1952, and about $600,000,000 in 1953 to continue these projects without adding one new project.

The two projects about which the gentleman talks were projects that were added by the Senate—the Overton Canal and the Tombigbee—and would cost $189,000,000. It would require approximately $40,000,000 a year to carry on these projects at the rate of construction required by sound engineering to get the most flood control for the flood-control dollar.

Three years ago I placed in the hearings a statement of all the flood-control and rivers-and-harbors projects authorized. At the then cost level, it would cost over $7,000,000,000 to build them. At the present cost level it would cost at least $10,000,000,000 to build the flood-control and rivers-and-harbors projects and Interior projects already authorized. If we are going to build them just because they are authorized, we are going to have the budget loaded down to the *n*th degree.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman stated a moment ago that this has been voted down time and time again.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I said it was voted down two or three times. On the vote last year the gentleman did not even get enough Members to support his request for a roll call to get a roll call.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman never voted for a thing of this kind in his life.

He has opposed all our waterway development ever since he has been in the House.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I do not yield any further.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time only so that I might clear up some things that I think ought to be cleared up in the conference report. There are some questions that I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee. Under planning money there are two types; is that not so? There is planning which takes place before the blueprints come into the picture, and then there is the blueprint money.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. Then you have the preconstruction money and then, following that, the construction money; is that not correct?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. Under the category of planning money, the House allowed $1,000,000 for rivers and harbors; is that not correct?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I think that is correct.

Mr. HORAN. That would include $42,000 for Foster Creek Dam in my district?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. That is supposed to be in the conference report; is it not?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It will be in the report, and the gentleman will see it in my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HORAN. Then your bill went over to the other body. The other body granted an increase in this planning money of $1,308,000; is that right?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I think the increase is $583,000, making a total approved by the Senate of $625,000.

Mr. HORAN. That included $583,000 for blueprint money, so-called, on the Foster Creek Dam; is that not correct?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I believe that is correct. That is not construction money.

Mr. HORAN. No.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is just planning money.

Mr. HORAN. The total, then, of the amount allowed by this body and the other body for planning money was $2,107,000?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes; that is right.

Mr. HORAN. I have no prejudice against any project in this bill at all, but I want to clear another point up because I think it is necessary to do so. The Buford Dam was knocked out by your committee before you brought your bill to the floor; was it not?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. HORAN. On the Senate side, $1,000,000 was allowed for construction, not planning?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Construction, of which a part would be used for planning. The gentleman is referring to the Buford Dam in Georgia?

Mr. HORAN. Yes. I have no prejudice against the dam, but $1,000,000 was allowed on the Senate side for construction money; is that not correct?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is substantially right.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not true that construction money is not allowed until the blueprints are ready?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. They can allow the construction money and the blueprint money simultaneously.

Mr. HORAN. Is that what the Senate did?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I think that is right; yes.

Mr. HORAN. That is the point that I want to clear up because by a peculiar coincidence the final result of the Senate and House conferees on this bill showed a total reduction to the extent of exactly the amount of money that I requested for the Foster Creek Dam, namely, $583,000. I wanted to clear that up. Simultaneously, you allowed an increase of $400,000 for planning money for Buford Dam, even though such an item had been completely denied by both the House and the Senate—yet the conferees put that amount in.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I can inform the gentleman that it is a pure coincidence, and there is no relation between the two items at all. That is the first time I have had my attention called to it or ever thought of it in that way, and I can assure the gentleman that it is a pure coincidence.

Mr. HORAN. I want to clear that up because that would cause trouble in my district. I am pleased to see Foster Creek recognized. However, the Nation needs that dam.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. There is no relation at all between the two items.

FOSTER CREEK DAM

Mr. HORAN. We of the Pacific Northwest have a regional problem which can be met in the best interests of our people and the Nation as a whole only by an orderly and progressive approach on the part of all of us—our local residents, private and public industrial agencies, and the Federal Government, including Congress and its committees. We of the Northwest have studied the problem for years. We have had our differences of opinion and we have composed them. We are now united in our own estimate of our needs and the policies according to which they should be met.

Most of the things I have to say require considerable factual substantiation. I have been given to understand that most of the statistical information to which I shall refer has already been made part of the record.

PRESENT SITUATION

Very briefly, our present situation, as it concerns this committee, is that the Northwest is suffering from acute growing pains at a time when it is being asked to contribute more than ever before to the national domestic product, to our continuing national defense needs, and to our efforts at relief for distressed countries of the world. If we of the Northwest are to meet the obligations we willingly have accepted, we must have help—not relief, for we are willing and we insist on repaying to the Federal Government—with interest—every cent of the investment we now request for development of our prime natural resources. It is a known fact that increased Federal tax revenues from Northwest States in the past 10 years have exceeded by about 10 percent the amount of Federal investment in these wealth-producing, reimbursable projects.

Our local and private interests have expended every effort in past years to meet our needs and they are still doing so. We have no oil or natural gas resources in our area. We have only a small amount of inferior-grade coal. Our only natural source of energy is the water flowing down the world's most efficient source of inexhaustible energy, the Columbia River system. In the last year, we had to triple our imports of fuel oil for the generation of electrical energy.

Private utility companies have already developed practically every power site on the main Columbia and its tributaries which can be financed by private funds. The most efficient power sites, and the most economical ones, are the larger projects which can be financed only by the Federal Government. That is why the major utility distributing companies of the Northwest united last year and again on January 6 of this year in signing the so-called Tacoma agreement, requesting immediate and continuing Federal investment in these major hydroelectric projects on a reimbursable, interest-bearing basis.

POWER REQUIREMENTS

The Congress has available to it, I understand, complete information regarding historic power load growth in the Northwest, the current critical shortage of generating capacity which is national rather than regional, and the load increase forecasts which have been stipulated by all competent public and private authorities who have studied them. I think there can be no longer a question that greatly increased power capacities are needed—and needed soon. The only questions are how much more do we need and how shall we get it.

I do want to stress, however, that comparative studies of the load forecasts stipulated by the Tacoma agreement signatories with the historic load growth of the area indicate the forecasts, as of this date, appear to be conservative, rather than exaggerated. It is noteworthy that Northwest electric power loads have increased at a rate of doubling approximately every 6 or 8 years since the turn of the century; that the depression drop lasted only about 2 years, 1933–34, and was only about 15 percent for that period of time, after which it again moved steadily upward; and that the expected load drop in the immediate postwar period of 1945–46 failed to materialize. Bearing these things in mind, the forecast of a load doubling within the next 9 years—by 1956—seems to me to be definitely conservative.

It should also be pointed out that present forecasts are predicated upon peak-load capacities during most of these next several years, whereas sound industrial practice would provide for a 15 per-

cent reserve capacity. If we did experience a brief recession, as so many fear, and we had the same load drop as we felt in the depression of the thirties—15 percent—that would be barely enough to assure the customary reserve rather than causing any condition of serious surplus. Right now, we in the Northwest fear many, many eventualities before we worry about having a power surplus on our hands.

POWER USE IN THE NORTHWEST

Much has been said about the uses to which this federally developed electric power is put. There have been complaints that perhaps too much of it has been devoted to the light metals industry, to the neglect of other components of our economy. While the amount of energy used in the aluminum and other electrometallurgical plants has been tremendous, it is worth while to note that the proportion of Northwest power going into this one industry has decreased in the last 2 years, while more and more power is going to farm and residential users, small business, and light industry. It is this diversification of use which is to me most important and should be encouraged.

The following table will serve as an indication:

Electric energy sales by customer, Bonneville Power Administration

Class of customer	Fiscal years (in megawatt-hours)—			
	1944	1945	1946	1947
Industry:				
Aluminum	5,453,893	4,667,381	2,538,590	4,254,316
Other industries	934,588	878,896	693,795	551,311
Military establishments	87,889	85,828	59,970	26,557
Publicly owned utilities	727,642	823,817	635,284	1,026,188
Privately owned utilities	1,467,304	2,057,203	1,903,508	2,378,307
Total	8,671,316	8,513,125	5,831,147	8,235,679

It should be pointed out here that the decrease noted in 1946 and 1947 was largely due to the lost generating capacity caused by removal of the two Shasta Dam generators from Grand Coulee Dam. If power had been available, the 1947 figures would have been much higher. At present, the major demand for new power is in the category of "other industries," largely small businesses.

The amounts of power going to publicly and privately owned utilities, shown above, indicate the increasing proportion of this power being directed into rural, residential, and small-business channels, a healthy condition for all concerned.

The amount of power going to military establishments, now largely confined to the atomic-energy plant at Hanford, Wash., is expected to increase because of the enlargement of that unit and its increased activity. In the event of a decision to establish a supersonic air research site in the Northwest, which is the logical place for it in view of the requirements set forth in the report of the President's Commission on Air Policy—January 1948—at least another 500,000 kilowatts of capacity would be needed in addition to the load forecasts already referred to.

For all these reasons, I think the Congress may well accept the load forecasts outlined in the Tacoma agreement as, if anything, conservative estimates of the actual demands in the Pacific Northwest. They take into account such important items as increased rural loads due to expansion of both REA and private utility service in farm areas, particularly in the region of the Columbia Basin and other reclamation projects, the tremendous growth in both rural and urban populations in the Northwest—38 percent in Oregon, 35 percent in Washington since 1940—and the number of satellite industries growing up around the maritime and light-metals industries, all of which add stability to the entire regional economy.

HOW TO MEET THE NEED

Now we come to the question of meeting the requirements set up by these load-forecast studies. Proposals to this end have been set forth in many ways. I am going to approach it from the aspect of what can be done in each of the next 9 years, based on the budget requests and the House-approved amounts contained in the bill before this committee. I will take the load-increase requirement for each year and then analyze the possibility of meeting those increases.

1947

The year 1947 was begun with a deficiency of generating capacity under power demands of 94,000 kilowatts. One new generator was added at Grand Coulee, bringing in 120,000 kilowatts. On sound utility practice, this new generator should have been held in reserve; however, it was put immediately on the line and has been operating, like all others, on overload ever since. Deficiency at end of the year was 214,000 kilowatts. In this year, some 15,000,000 barrels of oil were consumed to run steam plants in attempting to offset this deficiency.

1948

New power requests for the year call for an increase of 397,000 kilowatts. Eighth and ninth generators being installed at Grand Coulee bring in 240,000 kilowatts. Power deficiency at end of 1948 will be 371,000 kilowatts.

1949

New power requests already expected to be a minimum of 345,000 kilowatts. Tenth, eleventh, and twelfth units should be installed at Grand Coulee, adding 360,000 kilowatts. Deficiency at end of year still 356,000 kilowatts.

1950

Load increase in 1950 forecasted to be 336,000 kilowatts. No new Federal generating capacity could be installed this year. Ariel Dam—Pacific Power & Light Co.—will add 45,000 kilowatts and Gorge Dam—Seattle City Light—will bring in its first 60,000 kilowatts, increasing net capacity by 105,000 kilowatts. Regional power deficiency still 587,000 kilowatts.

1951

Load increases this year forecasted 312,000 kilowatts. No new generation can be added from any source. Deficiency climbs to 899,000 kilowatts. This will be the worst year for power inefficiency.

1952

Another 242,000 kilowatts added to demand for new power. Ross Dam—Seattle City Light—adds 180,000 kilowatts; Hungry Horse Dam in Montana—United States Bureau of Reclamation—will bring in one 62,000-kilowatt generator if congressional appropriations allow construction on schedule. Without this Hungry Horse unit the deficiency at the end of 1952 will be 961,000. Even if this unit begins to serve a region hungry for horsepower, the deficiency will still be 899,000—no improvement over the previous year's situation.

1953

Another 323,000 kilowatts will be demanded and, for the first time, an appreciable dent can be made in the situation. If the full budget requests for McNary Dam are granted in this 1949 and succeeding fiscal years, the first three units could supply 207,000 kilowatts to the lines, abetted by another 128,000 from Hungry Horse. Even at this rate, the minimum deficiency would be 887,000 kilowatts at the end of the year 1953.

1954

This is the year in which, with the aid of Congress and all other factors being favorable, we could finally make some headway against this tremendous backlog of demand. The load increase is expected to be 258,000 kilowatts. Offsetting this, four units at McNary would bring in 276,000 kilowatts; Hungry Horse, now completed with storage facilities firming up power at downstream installations, would add 110,000 kilowatts, bringing the deficiency down to 759,000 kilowatts.

Now, if construction of Foster Creek Dam could begin by 1950 (for which advance planning and preconstruction funds would be required this year, three units of this project could begin producing by 1954, generating 192,000 kilowatts. This would reduce the unsatisfied demand to 567,000 kilowatts.

1955

The increased load this year would be 305,000 kilowatts. McNary, if kept on schedule, would bring in three more units totaling 207,000; Foster Creek could add three more totalling 192,000 kilowatts. The deficiency would again be reduced but still amounts to 473,000 kilowatts.

1956

Another 300,000 kilowatts added to the load requests. McNary Dam, now completed, would add 138,000 kilowatts; Foster Creek's seventh and eighth units would bring 128,000 more; Ross Dam—Seattle City Light—will be completed

with another 180,000 kilowatts. This tremendous increase of generating capacity still would only bring the deficiency down to 327,000 kilowatts—still more than it is today.

COMMENTS ON THE SCHEDULE

Since no dams other than those mentioned above are included in any way in current budget estimates, I have assumed that no others, whether presently authorized or not, will be brought into operation before 1956. The capacities listed above are based on the assumption that construction of dams involved moves ahead at the fastest economical rate, in accordance with schedules agreed upon by the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee and appropriations made by Congress accordingly.

It will be noted in this analysis that in no year up to 1956, even if all dams are built as fast as economic construction schedules permit, will the deficiency of capacity below load growth ever be less than 327,000 kilowatts. If we were to allow for a mild recession or almost any other eventuality, the worst possible result would be to wipe out the deficiency and give us a saturated load, or a moderate reserve. It would take a major depression to provide anything like a nonsalable surplus. I shall leave it to the committee to determine whether such a depression is in the offing. Personally I see no reason to expect it.

PRIORITY OF PROJECTS

I have asumed that certain priority projects would be agreed upon by Congress, the Federal agencies, and the people of the Northwest. Generally, this priority has been established in what is known as schedule Q, as adopted by the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee and periodically revised according to changing conditions and congressional policies.

The order of construction at the present time lists authorized projects as follows:

Bonneville, engineers; completed, all generators in.

Grand Coulee, United States Bureau of Reclamation; completed, 8 of 12 commercial generators in.

Hungry Horse, United States Bureau of Reclamation; under construction—first power 1952.

McNary, engineers; under construction—first power 1953..

Foster Creek, engineers; authorized, advance planning nearly completed; originally scheduled to begin construction 1948; now scheduled to start 1950 if advance appropriations permit.

From what has been said above, it is obvious that mere completion of projects on which construction has already started before the 1949 fiscal year cannot possibly meet the demands of the area. For that reason, we are asking at this time that the committee look to the over-all needs and make appropriations in the light of these needs.

We contend that the Bureau of the Budget has made purely arbitrary decisions in this matter. We have studied the requirements of the area and ask that the Congress base its decisions upon the following priority of objects.

First. Completion of the Columbia Basin reclamation project is the most important of all. The primary aim is to get water on the land out there and provide a place for veterans and others to live and invest their lives and futures and begin producing the things the world needs for recovery.

Second. Construction of McNary Dam should be continued in accordance with the schedule set by the Army engineers, to provide navigation, flood control, irrigation water, and hydroelectric power, together with the necessary facilities for conserving the salmon runs which must negotiate that dam. McNary Dam, however, will provide only about 42 percent of the necessary additional power capacity required by 1956.

Third. Hungry Horse Dam should be completed by the Bureau of Reclamation to provide storage water for downstream dams and irrigation projects, its own irrigation features, and power capacity.

Fourth. Construction should begin by 1950 on Foster Creek Dam to provide the cheapest large block of electric power, thereby bringing in revenues necessary to help pay the cost of more expensive projects and make the greatest possible contribution to meeting the urgent power requirements of the area. In addition, there are 65,000 acres of semiarid but fertile land immediately adjacent to the Foster Creek Dam site which could profitably be irrigated by pumping and gravity flow at a later date. The Bureau of Reclamation is now studying this feature and the Army engineers have signified their willingness to have these reclamation features developed at a time when national needs and budgetary considerations allow.

WHY FOSTER CREEK?

I do want to tell the committee some things about Foster Creek which may not have come to its attention. There are definite reasons why it is and should be the next in order of priority and why the planning and preconstruction money here requested should be included in the 1949 appropriations.

As to features, Foster Creek is basically a power producer. As the most efficient hydroelectric power site on the North American Continent, it will produce more firm power on a cheaper unit cost than any other development in the world. It is scheduled to cost about $172,000,000—1947 estimate—will develop 1,024,000 kilowatts, of which 683,000 would be firm power, at a cost of approximately $170 per kilowatt-hour—1947 estimate. As I mentioned above, it is the potential benefactor of some 65,000 thirsty acres of high class farm land and, because of its proximity to existing transmission lines of the Bonneville-Grand Coulee grid, can be connected to these facilities at a minimum of added expense.

An important consideration regarding Foster Creek is that it destroys no existing property or resources of any particular value. Because it is above the fish line—the uppermost reach of the Columbia now serving as salmon-spawning grounds—it will not harm the valuable fishing industry. Indeed, the fishing industry has endorsed it for that reason. It floods no farm land, destroys no wildlife habitats, covers no mineral deposits. I know of no segment of our northwestern or national economic or political life which has voiced any objection to its immediate construction.

As the Members of the House know, Foster Creek was authorized for construction under the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 24, 1946. Under previous appropriations, advance planning has been carried forward and the Chief of Army Engineers reported in his annual report to the President for 1946 that the sum of $10,000,000 could be profitably spent in fiscal 1948 on this project.

THE FREEZE CONTINUES

The Presidential "freeze order" on new project construction in 1946 resulted in elimination of all but advance planning funds for Foster Creek in the 1948 budget. I am told on responsible authority that the Army engineers submitted requests to the Budget Bureau for fiscal 1949 as follows:

Advance planning funds	$583,000
General (contingent fund)	42,000
Preconstruction operations	3,300,000

The Budget Bureau, I am told, acting on order of the President to eliminate all items for beginning new projects, ignored the obvious requirements of the people of the Northwest and eliminated the preconstruction item. Because of this action, according to the inference of its report, the subcommittee of the lower House considering this bill, eliminated also the advance planning funds and stated that—

> Conditions with regard to (this project) may be more stable by the time (it) can be reached for construction and plans at a later time should be more up to date and correct than if made now and work not started until several years later.

It is the contention of the people whom I have the honor to represent in Congress that the President and the Budget Bureau have been guilty of lack of foresight in disallowing the preconstruction item in the 1949 Budget. In the light of all the information which has been brought before this committee this week, I hope that your members will agree with us. We contend that the House Subcommittee on Civil Functions Appropriations was misled by the Budget Bureau's action into an inaccurate understanding of the true situation in the Northwest.

The facts are that the Foster Creek Dam is badly needed right now; that plans for its construction have been virtually completed—the current item is for the final phase of advance planning; that the Army engineers have signified their belief that construction should be started by 1950 at the latest; that the planning should be finished and preconstruction work accomplished during 1949 if that goal is to be met.

For these reasons, we of the State of Washington requested that this Congress reinstate in the present bill the item of $583,000 for final phase of advance planning and an additional item of $3,300,000 for preconstruction work.

This latter item would consist of $1,200,000 for building access roads,

$800,000 for an access bridge, and $1,300,000 for initial construction of field offices, temporary housing, and other activities necessary to bring the project up to the actual construction stage. I understand the Army Engineers' representatives fully justified these items to the committees of the Senate and the House.

Mr. Speaker, it takes from 4 to 6 years to build a major dam the size of Foster Creek and McNary. In these times of troubled international relations, of intense effort to supply our domestic needs and those of our allies abroad, we cannot afford to wait 6 years from the time we decide a million kilowatts of electrical energy is needed until we can make it available. We must be prepared to forecast our needs as accurately as possible and provide for them. We should provide for a reserve. But we could not under any circumstances have a reserve in the Northwest before 1956. Even so, it would be far less dangerous to our national interest to have a small surplus than to have a continuing deficiency of energy such as we now suffer.

We in the Northwest had to use nearly 11,000,000 barrels of fuel oil for the generation of electric power in 1946—this in the land of the world's greatest hydroelectric potential. We used over 6,000,000 barrels more oil in 1946 than we did in 1945. We would gladly release those 6,000,000 barrels per year to the other sections of the country which cannot develop hydro power but we cannot do it until we get these dams built and the generators installed in them. In 1947, the rough estimate is that the Northwest used some 15,000,000 barrels of oil—this during the winter in which parts of the East and Central States shivered for lack of fuel oil to heat their homes. We will gladly give up that oil so that homes may be heated in Illinois, in Michigan, in New Hampshire, and in Maryland. We are deeply concerned over the terrific increase in the use of oil for electrical generation. According to a new Federal Power Commission report, consumption of oil for power generation doubled nationally between 1945 and 1946 and in the Northwest it nearly tripled. As we all know, our national oil reserves are in a critically depleted state.

The only answer we can see to the problem that situation has imposed on the oil-short East and Midwest is to give those of us who can develop other sources of electric power the means and the opportunity with which to do it.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], our distinguished majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce as best I can the program for next week.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF RULES ON MONDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we will have a number of suspensions on Monday, but I cannot at this moment say what they will be. We expect to have a full program for the balance of the week. As to just what bills will be considered and which ones cannot be considered, I cannot say. All through the session I have tried to, more or less definitely, indicate what could be expected. But in view of the fact it is hoped that we can conclude the work of this session of the Congress next week, I am not going to undertake to outline the measures that may be called, except to say that on Monday, as has been announced in the press, the Committee on Rules is to meet to consider further the rule on the so-called selective service bill. If the rule is granted and filed on Monday, it is expected that consideration of that bill will begin on Tuesday.

As the Members know, various matters were scheduled for consideration this week which we have not been able to reach. Of course, those matters may be considered next week, as well as such other rules and measures as it may be deemed to be necessary to consider.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Can the gentleman give the House any idea as to whether or not any other measure after these conference reports is going to be taken up today?

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, there is another conference report. I do not know how much more time will be consumed on the conference report. The hour is getting rather late. We have had a rather busy week and we will have a full week next week to dispose of matters. I think probably I could announce that we would not undertake to dispose of any other matters this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might state, there are several small matters which could be taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not have that in mind. Several Members have spoken to me about some rather minor matters, where there were Senate amendments, perhaps, to a House bill. I take it the gentleman refers to the extension of the Social Security.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it is obvious from the lateness of the hour that we could not dispose of it today, so we will not start consideration of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if there will be another deficiency appropriation bill at this session.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand there will be a deficiency bill next week.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman did not intend to exclude consideration of the rather minor matter about which I spoke to him previously?

Mr. HALLECK. Oh, no.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman contemplate that the Consent Calendar will be called again before we adjourn?

Mr. HALLECK. The Private Calendar will be called on next Tuesday. I do not want to make any definite commitment about calling the Consent Calendar again. I understand there are a number of bills that have been recently reported which are now on the Consent Calendar. I would be on the side of indicating that probably the Consent Calendar will be called again, but I have not as yet had an opportunity to examine it to see just what bills are on the Calendar or to determine how they should be handled.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the Rules Committee will consider the housing bill on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know about that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It was understood that the tax revision bill would be taken up this afternoon. Will that be taken up this afternoon?

Mr. HALLECK. No, it will not.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1949

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to take only a few minutes, but I feel that for the purposes of the RECORD, in view of some of the debate, a few facts should be stated that the Members may know them. The House suffers sometimes by our eagerness to get through with certain business so rapidly that essential facts are not given to the Members and are not given to the RECORD.

Something has been said by the gentleman from Mississippi about our appropriations on river items. I want to call attention to the fact that the appropriations carried by this conference report will show that this session of Congress will have appropriated more money for river and harbor projects than any other Congress in the history of the United States. The figures are these: $166,989,100 for construction; $1,390,000 for planning; making a total of $168,379,000. That compares with $116,000,000 last year; $110,000,000 in 1947; and $159,000,000 in 1937, the high before the war.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I prefer not to at this time.

The conference report is $67,000,000 below the funds proposed by the other body. It is an increase over the House bill by about $35,000,000.

Those increases were largely granted where there were flood control projects of considerable urgency.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is disappointed because we did not include a new waterway project. And so is the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] because we did not include the Tombigbee Canal, also a new waterway on which construction has not started. Of course it was not possible to include everything and your conferees gave preference to urgent flood-control projects over waterways where no benefit could come for years.

And, really, Louisiana did not fare so badly as I am sure my friend will agree when he looks over the table which appears on pages 7897 to 7899 of the RECORD of June 11, inserted by our able chairman, the gentleman from Michigan. Here are the river and harbor items:

Rivers and harbors

Louisiana:	
Calcasieu River and Pass	$500,000
Waterway from Empire, La., to the Gulf of Mexico	250,000
Intracoastal Waterway, Apalachee Bay, Fla., to the Mexican border section. (New Orleans district)	2,000,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La	1,159,600

Two of the four projects were increases over the House figures. On the waterway from Empire to the Gulf of Mexico, the Senate proposed $436,000 and the conferees agreed to $250,000 where there had been nothing in the House bill.

On the Intracoastal Waterway where the House figures were $1,800,700 the conferees agreed to an increase to make that $2,000,000.

That is the story on the Louisiana rivers and harbors projects. Here is the story on flood-control projects for Louisiana, over and above those projects on the Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, Ohio and other streams whose waters, if not stopped upstream, pour down on Louisiana:

Flood control

Louisiana:	
Aloha-Rigolette area	$500,000
Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou	34,700
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir. (See Arkansas.)	
Bayou Teche and Vermilion River	600,000
Mermentau River	1,000,000
Pineville	60,800
Shreveport	1,000,000
Jonesville	268,000
Lake Pontchartrain	900,000

In these flood-control projects the Senate proposed an increase of $400,000 at Bayou Teche on the Vermilion River over the $200,000 of the House and the conferees agreed to the full increase.

On the Red River levee below Denison Dam, with special benefits to Louisiana as well as Arkansas and Texas, we allowed $1,000,000. Also $500,000 for the Bayou Bodcau Reservoir which benefits Louisiana as well as Arkansas.

It is true that as to Shreveport where the Senate proposed an increase of $475,000, we stayed with the House figure of $1,000,000. Shreveport is the home, I understand, of the gentleman from Louisiana, and that he may be disappointed there is understandable. But, still we did provide the million dollars that was proposed by the House.

And there were two places in Louisiana where we agreed to two brand-new flood-control projects which were not in the President's budget.

They were Jonesville and Lake Pontchartrain.

Jonesville is a little flood-control project that was authorized back in 1936, for only $368,000 and it has never had a dime but the floods repeatedly menace the life of the town. We were told that this little town of Jonesville had not been able to bring any great pressure because its population was small, but that they had a very urgent situation. Their Congressman brought us some telegrams, however, showing how they were going to try to raise $100,000 to apply on the cost of the project. We thought that spirit and their need should be recognized. So the conferees agreed to include $268,000, that with the $100,000 to make the $368,000 needed.

Lake Ponchartrain: The House did not have any money in for this but the Senate put in $900,000 for Lake Pontchartrain because of a very damaging situation that developed there. We were shown pictures of the houses under water. As I recall a veterans' housing project was involved. At any rate, hundreds were homeless and the threat would continue indefinitely. It was a very serious situation and we allowed the full amount of $900,000 to start the authorized project.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. As Representative of the district I should like to express my very great appreciation to the gentleman from South Dakota and other members of the conference committee for the consideration they gave to that project and to other Louisiana projects.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and will say that the committee was impressed by the factual presentation he made in his talks with us about this matter.

So, there were four Louisiana flood-control projects where the Senate proposed an increase, and on three of the four the conferees either went to the Senate figure or made some increase. Thus, Louisiana has not been treated so badly. And that does not say anything about the other Louisiana projects that were provided for by the House where no change was made by the Senate but are listed in the table.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want to say to the gentleman from South Dakota that two of the projects mentioned are in my district. I want the gentleman and other members of the conference committee to know that I am very well pleased with the consideration they gave those projects. I am very well satisfied.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and will say that the memoranda he supplied were also helpful to the committee.

And I am sure that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] will agree that the over-all treatment for his State was not too bad although we may not have been able to start the so-called Overton Canal in which he is properly interested and which is to be named for a distinguished Senator whose name the gentleman also bears.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in passing, I think something should be said to show the tremendous increase in appropriations for flood-control work. They have increased from a 1938 figure of $30,000,000 until this year we have appropriated $339,000,000 for what we call flood control general, while for flood control on the Mississippi River which in 1937 received $16,000,000, this year we appropriated $61,000,000.

There has been a little loose talk on the part of a traveler in the Northwest to the effect that if he had had his way they would not have the floods in the Northwest that they are having today, and intimating that this terrible Congress has been the worst in history in indifference to flood damages.

I hope he, or anyone misled by his careless remarks, will look over the tables, which I have previously mentioned, on pages 7897, 7898, and 7899 of the RECORD of June 11.

The record is that this Congress has appropriated both last year and this year, more money than has ever been appropriated for flood control in the history of the Congress heretofore and that money is going into all parts of the country—to the South, the East, the North, and the West.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to point out to the Members of the House that in the consideration of these items in the committee, we have considered each and every item separately and distinctly and by itself upon its merits. When we went into conference the same method was used. We started in on the first item of rivers and harbors and then went into flood control, and every single solitary item was figured by itself and it had to stand on its own feet and had to demonstrate its own worth. That is the way the decisions were made and we did not know until the entire conference was over what the total cut would be.

I would like to assure, especially my kind, keen and congenial friend from Washington that the figure of $853,000 or whatever the amount was he mentioned is purely a coincidence and had nothing to do with Foster Creek. Incidentally I may say in passing that had it not been for the freeze order on flood-control funds issued by the President not

too many months ago, and which should not be forgotten, Foster Creek might be farther along than it is now. As I see it, this is one of the few times when the House conferees almost won in a conference.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I note in the report printed in the RECORD of today an item of $1,000,000 for the Red Rock Reservoir in Iowa. As I understand it, that is for flood control in the Des Moines River Valley.

I want to commend the members of this committee on both sides for the careful, sympathetic consideration they have given to a bad situation wherein $11,500,000 were lost through physical damages last year, in addition to the loss of a number of lives. I think $1,000,000 will be ample for initial construction work on that project, which has the approval of the Army engineers. Col. W. M. Lee, division engineer, who died very recently, felt that a million dollars would take care of additional construction work this year and probably will be all that could be used.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the members of the committee for their consideration of this matter.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON].

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at the action of the committee in this particular conference report.

UPPER HARBOR, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MINNEAPOLIS

Mr. Speaker, after many years of continuous effort this bill finally contains the appropriation to begin the upper harbor above St. Anthony Falls. This improvement has been sought for many years by the people of Minnesota and it will be of inestimable benefit to upper Midwest States.

At this time I wish to thank the former Congressmen who have made such a large contribution to the eventual success of this project. Former Congressmen Richard P. Gale, John G. Alexander, Ernest Lundeen, Henry Tiegan, and William Gallagher, of the Third Minnesota District, all supported this project and made valuable contributions, without which this success today would be impossible. Dr. JUDD and previous Congressmen from the Fifth Minnesota District have also given valuable assistance to this project and, of course, the fine efforts of Senator BALL in this session have been of the utmost value.

Also many civic groups have given energetic and valuable support. On the civilian side Mr. A. D. Strong, of Minneapolis, has been the spearhead behind this project in recent years. He has been tireless in his support.

So the successful culmination of this project is not due to any one individual; but, of course, in this session the action of the Senate was all important.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the conference report will be adopted, and I urge the House to do so, so the people of Minnesota and the upper Midwest States can look forward to some definite date in the future when this improvement will be completed. On their behalf, I express their appreciation to the House conferees.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express appreciation to the chairman and his committee for accepting in conference the addition of $1,000,000 provided in the other body for beginning construction of the Mississippi River locks at St. Anthony Falls, in Minneapolis. This is a long-delayed construction of a most worthy project authorized almost a decade ago, which will at last give us a usable harbor and docks and thus make available to a city of more than half a million people, and to the upper Midwest the benefits of the great Mississippi River system of navigation in which several hundred millions of public funds have been invested.

Despite our great need for the terminal and storage facilities which this project when completed will provide and the threatened or actual shortage of coal and oil we have had each winter due to the present very restricted facilities for river transportation and to inadequate coal and tank railroad cars, I made no effort to press for appropriations to start this project during the war years and for 2 years thereafter. I discouraged local civic groups and city officials from pushing. The shortages of labor and building materials and their high cost, the more acute needs for housing for veterans and others, and the necessity for balancing our national budget made me hold off, even though Minneapolis had already raised by bond issues $2,000,000 for its share of the cost of the project.

I would still hold off another year if the backers of other rivers and harbors projects were willing to do likewise. But when last year the Congress decided, against my vote, to appropriate money for dozens of projects more costly and far less necessary and economically sound than this, and it was clear the Congress would do the same sort of thing this year too, then I felt under proper obligation to my city to do my best to get the project started. So, along with my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] and others, I began last summer to work as hard as possible for inclusion of the so-called upper river harbor in this appropriation bill. It is gratifying to have it adopted. I believe few if any of the several hundred projects in the bill will prove more justified and useful.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 10, line 16, after the word "dam" insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the authority contained in section 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 approved July 24, 1946 (Public, 526), is hereby extended to include the projects known as Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak., Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif., Isabella Reservoir, Calif., and Folsom Reservoir, Calif."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, and 46.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, and 49, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$238,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$420,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert

"Capital outlay, Gallinger Municipal Hospital: For an additional amount for the construction of an incinerator, $15,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 20, 25, 26, 27, 29, 33, 34, 37, 39, and 50.

WALT HORAN,
KARL STEFAN,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
JOHN FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1 and 2: Make language corrections.

No. 3: Appropriaties $224,100 for the Executive office as proposed by the Senate, instead of $232,600, as proposed by the House.

No. 4: Appropriates $238,600 for the Office of the corporation counsel instead of $245,600 as proposed by the House, and $236,600, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 5: Appropriates $594,000 for the Assessor's office as proposed by the House, instead of $589,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 6: Appropriates $316,000 for the Collector's office as proposed by the House, instead of $311,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 7: Appropriates $418,400 for the Auditor's office as proposed by the House, instead of $408,900 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 8: Appropriates $78,300 for the Department of Insurance as proposed by the Senate, instead of $62,800, as proposed by the House.

No. 9: Appropriates $145,200 for the Department of Weights, Measures, and Markets as proposed by the Senate, instead of $148,200, as proposed by the House.

No. 10: Appropriates $582,000 for General administration, Public Schools as proposed by the Senate, instead of $586,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 11: Appropriates $13,764,500 for General supervision and instruction, Public Schools as proposed by the Senate, instead of $13,864,500, as proposed by the House. It is agreed by the conferees that the school officials may determine the positions to which this reduction shall be applied.

No. 12: Appropriates $2,632,000 for operation of buildings and grounds and maintenance of equipment, Public Schools, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,662,000, as propcsed by the House.

No. 13: Appropriates $420,000 for furnishing and equipping school buildings, Public Schools, instead of $477,600 as proposed by the House, and $400,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

No. 15: Appropriates $1,201,000 for expenses necessary for the operation of the Public Library as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,221,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 16: Appropriates $1,072,000 for operating expenses, Recreation Department as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,077,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 17: Appropriates $281,000 for capital outlay, Recreation Department as proposed by the Senate, instead of $296,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 18: Appropriates $6,232,000 for expenses necessary for the Metropolitan Police as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,357,000, as proposed by the House. It is agreed by the conferees that the Police Department may determine the positions to which this reduction shall be applied.

No. 19: Appropriates $3,653,000 for expenses necessary for the Fire Department as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,703,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

No. 21: Appropriates $257,600, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $255,200, as proposed by the House, for expenses, Juvenile Court.

No. 22: Authorizes an allowance of four cents per mile but not more than $480 per annum for each automobile for dairy-farm inspectors, Health Department, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 23: Authorizes six full-time chief medical officers, Gallinger Municipal Hospital, as proposed by the Senate, instead of five, as proposed by the House.

No. 24: Appropriates $15,000 for an additional amount for construction of an incinerator, Gallinger Municipal Hospital, and strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $30,000 for plans for a new psychiatric building, and the proposal of the House to provide $300,000 for a new pediatrics building, together with contract authorization for such building in a sum not to exceed $1,610,000.

No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

No. 26: Reported in disagreement.

No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

No. 28: Appropriates $2,606,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,631,000, as proposed by the House, for operating expenses, Department of Corrections.

No. 29: Reported in disagreement.

No. 30: Appropriates $3,485,200, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,535,200, as proposed by the House, for agency services, Public Welfare.

Nos. 31 and 32, in connection with operating expenses, protective institutions, Public Welfare: Inserts the words "Temporary Home for Former Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines," as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $2,244,400 for expenses of such institutions, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,219,700, as proposed by the House. The conferees are vitally interested in the problem as to continuation of the National Training School for Girls, and request the District officials to make a study of the matter and report its findings and recommendations to the Congress prior to any final determination.

No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

No. 34: Reported in disagreement.

No. 35: Apprporiates $106,900 for expenses, central garage, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $112,900, as proposed by the House.

No. 36: Appropriates $3,265,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,285,000, as proposed by the House, for operating expenses, Division of Sanitation, Public Works.

No. 37: Reported in disagreement.

No. 38: Appropriates $1,152,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,172,000, as proposed by the House, for operating expenses, Sewer Division, Public Works.

No. 39: Reported in disagreement.

No. 40: Corrects a typographical error.

No. 41: Strikes out the sum "$2,661,000," as proposed by the Senate.

No. 42: Strikes out the provision of the House to appropriate $20,000 for reclamation of Anacostia River Flats, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 43: Appropriates $85,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $95,200, as proposed by the House, for expenses for the National Guard.

No. 44: Appropriates $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,522,000, as proposed by the House, for expenses for the National Capital Parks.

No. 45: Appropriates $492,600, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $502,600, as proposed by the House, for expenses, National Zoological Park.

No. 46: Restores the proposal of the House relating to the auditing of vouchers covering expenditure of appropriations in the Act.

Nos. 47, 48, and 49, relating to the use of funds in the Act to pay the salary of any employee who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended: The House has receded from its disagreement to these amendments of the Senate.

No. 50: Reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 14, relating to a survey of the public-school system. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 20, relating to Capital outlay, Fire Department. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 25, relating to funds for a pediatrics and crippled children's building. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 26, relating to funds for a laboratory building, Health Department. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 27, relating to the in-patient and out-patient rate, Freedmen's Hospital. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 29, relating to the continuation of funds heretofore available, in connection with operating expenses, Department of Corrections. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 33, relating to the construction of residences, District Training School. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 34, relating to the item for support of Saint Elizabeths Hospital. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 37, relating to appropriations for construction of refuse transfer station, and garage and shops building, Division of Sanitation, Public Works. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 39, relating to the appropriation for construction, Sewer Division, Public Works. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 50, relating to the purchase of typewriters by the District of Columbia government. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

WALT HORAN,
KARL STEFAN,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
JOHN FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 14, 20, 25, 26, 27, 29, 33, 37, and 50 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 15, line 17, insert the following:

"SURVEY OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"For a complete survey of the public-school system of the District of Columbia with respect to the adequacy of the present

plant and personnel, as well as educational methods and practices, to serve the District, said survey to be conducted under the supervision of a person qualified by training and experience in the field of public-school education to be appointed by the chairmen of the subcommittees on District of Columbia appropriations of the respective appropriation committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives at a salary of $1,000 per month and $300 per month for expenses, $100,000: *Provided*, That the person so appointed to supervise the said survey is authorized to employ necessary assistants at rates of pay to be approved by the chairmen of the said subcommittees, and the said director may request and be entitled to obtain such clerical assistance as he may deem necessary from agencies of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the said director shall make a full report to the aforesaid chairmen prior to March 1, 1949, setting forth the results of the survey and his recommendations."

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 21, line 12, insert the following:

"Capital outlay, Fire Department: For an additional amount for the acquisition of sites for fire-engine houses in the vicinity of Forty-ninth and East Capitol Streets SE. and in the vicinity of Twenty-fourth and Irving Streets SE., and for the purchase of fire-alarm systems, $15,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 27, line 24, insert the following:

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $620,000 contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, for the construction of a new pediatrics building is made available for a combination pediatrics and crippled children's building, including $60,000 for additional construction services, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of such combination pediatrics and crippled children's building at a total cost of not to exceed $2,050,000."

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 28, line 8, insert the following:

"Not to exceed $5,340 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $190,000 contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, for the construction of a laboratory building is made available as an additional amount for the preparation of plans and specifications for a laboratory building, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of such laboratory building at a total cost of not to exceed $478,000."

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 29, line 12, after the figure "$400,000", insert a colon and the following: ": *Provided*, That the in-patient rate shall not exceed $9 per diem and the out-patient rate shall not exceed $2 per visit."

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 30, line 18, after the word "parolees", insert a colon and the following: ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $23,000 of the amount appropriated for 'Operating expenses, adult correctional services', District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947, and the unexpended balance of the amount of $116,600 appropriated for 'Capital outlay, structural improvements at the jail', District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947, are continued available until June 30, 1949."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 35, line 7, strike out all after the figure "$36,600" on line 7 down to and including the figure "$406,600" in line 12 and insert the following: "beginning the construction of a residence for employees and a residence for the medical staff at the District Training School, $180,000, including $10,950 for construction services; and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for the construction of such residences at a total cost of not to exceed $365,000; and a preliminary study for the construction of a children's center, $5,000; in all, $221,600."

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 48, line 19, strike out all of line 19 and the remainder of the page and lines 1 and 2 on page 49, and insert the following:

"Capital outlay, Division of Sanitation: Not exceeding $875,000 of funds previously appropriated for construction of proposed incinerator No. 3 is made available for continuing construction of refuse transfer station and a garage and shops building, of which amount $36,586 may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation account 'Office of Municipal Architect, construction services', for the preparation of plans and specifications, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the construction of a garage and shops building at a total cost of not to exceed $1,375,000."

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 62, line 3, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1949, the District of Columbia is authorized to purchase typewriters for educational instruction purposes at not to exceed the lowest price paid for typewriters for such purposes by schools in the States of Maryland or Virginia."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: On page 35, beginning in line 20, strike out the remainder of the page and all of lines 1 and 2 on page 36 and insert the following:

"St. Elizabeths Hospital: For support of indigent insane of the District of Columbia in St. Elizabeths Hospital, as provided by law, $6,682,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the funds of the District of Columbia shall not be available for the care of any person admitted hereafter to St. Elizabeths Hospital who has not lived in the District of Columbia for more than 1 year immediately prior to application for voluntary admission or the filing of the petition provided for in the act approved June 8, 1938, as amended."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HORAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 34 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment and before the period, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to limit or otherwise modify any authority of St. Elizabeths Hospital or its Superintendent pursuant to law to admit, receive, detain, or care for any individual."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: On page 56, line 12, after "$25,000;", insert "in all, $2,411,000."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HORAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 39 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$2,561,000."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

IMPORTED FERMENTED LIQUORS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6162) to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 3150 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (imposing a tax on fermented liquors) is amended to read as follows: "There shall be levied and collected on all beer, lager beer, ale, porter, and other similar fermented liquor, containing one-half of 1 percent, or more, of alcohol brewed or manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or sale, within the United States, or imported into the United States, by whatever name such liquors may be called, a tax of $7 for every barrel containing not more than 31 gallons, and at a like rate for any other quantity or for the fractional parts of a barrel authorized and defined by law."

SEC. 2. That section 3150 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is further amended by inserting between the first and second sentences thereof the following sentence: "Imported fermented malt liquors shall also be subject to the war excise tax prescribed in section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code."

SEC. 3. The amendment made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins at least 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING CERTAIN BENEFITS PAYABLE UNDER THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. LANDIS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION

Mr. WEICHEL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1853)

to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation.

LIGHTER-THAN-AIR AERONAUTICS

Mr. WEICHEL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

OCEAN STATIONS

Mr. WEICHEL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

AUTHORIZING ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FELLOWS, GRAHAM, BOGGS of Delaware, CHADWICK, CELLER, CHELF, and GOSSETT.

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA AND HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unable yesterday to join members of the California delegation with other members of this body in an "Adios," as we say in California, to the two retiring members of our State delegation in Congress, Mr. LEA and Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. LEA is the dean of the delegation, having served in this body for 32 years. He will retire to his beautiful home city of Santa Rosa in the delightful Sonoma Valley.

Mr. ELLIOTT has served 12 years in this House and will retire to his home in Kern County in the southerly section of the great Central Valley.

I wish Mr. LEA and Mr. ELLIOTT many years of health and happiness in their retirement.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which he wrote for the Democratic Digest.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Marquis Childs.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials on the Communist control legislation now pending in the other body.

COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL SECURITY PLAN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Union League Club of Chicago, together with certain suggested plans for a comprehensive national security training to be brought to the attention of the House for study.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House a comprehensive plan for national security training suggested by the Union League Club of Chicago.

UNION LEAGUE CLUB OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., June 2, 1948.

The Honorable RALPH E. CHURCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHURCH: In behalf of the Union League Club of Chicago I am transmitting for your consideration a suggested plan for comprehensive national security training.

This suggested plan has been formulated by the club's committee on national defense of which Col. Walter R. Jeffrey is chairman; has been adopted by the Public Affairs Committee and approved in principle by the club's board of directors as an authorized expression of the Union League Club of Chicago.

This suggested plan for comprehensive national security supplements the comprehensive program for national defense proposed by the club on June 18, 1947, and represents a contribution by this membership to the all-important purpose "to defend and protect the integrity and perpetuity of this Nation," which is a charter object of this club.

Respectfully submitted.

THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB OF CHICAGO,
By GEORGE H. REDDING,
Chairman, Public Affairs Committee.

THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB OF CHICAGO SUGGESTED PLAN FOR COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY TRAINING

In view of the implications of modern warfare and the urgent need for a comprehensive and coordinated civilian and military preparedness program the following recommendations are offered as a general plan to effect the following purposes:

1. Expand the scope of training beyond the merely military needs as encompassed in UMT bill now before Congress.

2. Establish a National Department of Civilian Defense to prepare and coordinate a universal national program which shall be administered on a State and local basis.

3. By these means, provide universal training in the obligations of citizenship to all males between certain age groups and to females within specified age groups on a voluntary basis.

4. Decentralize all actual training programs from a national to a State level.

Such a program should include the following:

1. Utilization wherever posible of existing organizations such as National Guard, State militia, Reserve Officers Training Corps, citizens' military training camps, high schools and colleges.

2. Selective-service program to provide for the registration of all male citizens within specified age groups, an exhaustive analysis of their qualifications, and a program for assignment to types of training, civilian or military, fitted to their qualifications and designed to develop their capacities.

3. Within this framework, actual service and periods of training could be lengthened or shortened in accordance with national needs.

4. Coordinate all training programs with the normal functions of the communities, schools, business, and industry.

The entire program would be financed on a national level but administered as indicated on a State and local level. Such a plan would cause a minimum of dislocations in our society and economy. It is merely a basic framework on which to build but has as its ultimate purpose a universal training for over-all preparedness to be accomplished without the establishment of permanent inflexible national organizations.

The committee in the accompanying memorandum and charts has by way of illustration worked out practical details with graphs of a completed program built on the above framework.

Approved by action of the board of directors, May 18, 1948.

THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB OF CHICAGO SUGGESTED PLAN FOR COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY TRAINING

MEMORANDUM OF CIVILIAN TRAINING IN CITIZENSHIP, CIVILIAN AND MILITARY DEFENSE

This memorandum and attached charts have been prepared to convey and illustrate certain concepts of civilian training in citizenship, civilian, and military defense. These concepts warrant consideration, analysis and development as the basis for a practical, economical, and sound coordinated program of national security training for effective citizenship in peace and preparedness against war as well as civilian defense in a war emergency.

These ideas are provoked by a recognition of the need of defense training for the civilian population which has resulted from our Nation's international commitments and the implications of modern warfare as applied to civilian areas; also, to overcome some of the strongly expressed opposition to the enactment of the universal military training bill (H. R. 4278), and to encourage planning for civilian defense as expressed in the Bull report and to suggest possible improvements in a method of selective service.

The basic concepts rely principally on the United States Constitution and the National Defense Act of 1920, as amended. It will require supplemental legislation covering civilian defense, national security training plan, selective service, a board of coordination, a board of review, and a secretary of civilian defense. The necessary appropriation bills would also be required.

The general plan proposes to utilize existing agencies as far as possible and to provide incentives and checks and balances.

THREE PLANS PROPOSED

The plan should be differentiated for three distinct situations with provisions for integration by well-planned transitions into each; namely, (1) plan P, training for citizenship in peace and preparedness against war; (2) plan ANE, anticipation of national emergency; and, (3) plan W, the national emergency for war.

PLAN P—TRAINING FOR CITIZENSHIP

The plan envisages balancing the military defense with civilian defense with coordination at the Presidential level for the two in conjunction with Federal and State governments and the national economy. The plan further contemplates decentralization to State control of all civilian defense activities and of the citizen's military training camps on a similar basis to the National Guard in peacetime and during periods of

anticipation of a national emergency. During these periods the Federal activities of the civilian defense would be mainly policies and planning with liaison, counsel, and inspection for the corresponding State organizations except under negotiated conditions Federal military defense, however, would continue to have absolute responsibility for the armed forces and, through proposed headquarters and within limits now prescribed by law, responsibility for the Organized Reserve and the ROTC.

This plan contemplates that in event of a national emergency involving war that the Department of Civilian Defense would exercise supervision and control of the general policies and plans with a minimum of interference with the decentralized State organizations and activities. The military defense, however, would be able to call the Organized Reserve and the National Guard to duty.

The over-all plan during peacetime provides for a voluntary plan with a choice of method and time for all male citizens within age brackets for military training, if qualified, and for training in citizenship, physical training, health and morals, civilian defense, administrative, industrial, and scientific skills for those not qualified for military training, together with various combinations of the two types of training for those qualified for military training but not for field combat. Incentives will be provided to induce military enlistment in the regular armed forces and in the Organized Reserve and National Guard.

In peacetime the only compulsion would be that male citizens who have not taken training required of them by the age 21 must do so within a period of time after reaching age 21 although voluntary participation should be provided beginning with age for ROTC, high school, or age 17 for CMTC.

Plans should be made flexible so that the Congress may determine for any peacetime period the extent of any such training so far as necessary appropriations may be concerned but all registrants under this plan would be available over periods of time and must maintain a minimum eligibility. Credits would be established and interchangeable between the various components either military or civilian defense.

PLAN ANE—ANTICIPATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Under plan ANE, for anticipation of national emergency, a compulsory age could be set at 19 and a period for maintaining eligibility could be extended. Under plan W, for national emergency involving war, the compulsory age should be set at 17 and the period of military eligibility and availability would be further extended. Reversibility should be provided when the need has passed. It is also contemplated under this plan to permit female citizens to participate on a voluntary basis.

Registrants under this plan would receive medical examinations with Selective Service with the armed forces medical departments accepting or rejecting and in event of disagreement between medicos of the Selective Service and the regular armed forces, the case should be referred to medical division of the board of review on the presidential level.

Registrants would be classified after personnel-management tests of the State selective service board. The classifications should indicate all skills and aptitudes, should be evaluations, avoiding arbitrary entries into categories giving consideration to the individual ambitions and capacities. All standards should be equivalent to specifications, and regimentation should be minimized. Freedom of choice and action should be encouraged. Opportunities and incentives should be provided as a guide to choice. All should be expected and taught to serve where and when needed in any emergency; otherwise, assignments should be, so far as may be practicable, with respect to the dignity and ability of the individual registrant. All earned credits, military and civilian, should be recorded by selective service.

Provisions should be made particularly for the periodic revision of status of each registrant. Selective service would provide record service and would become the manpower agency as to resources and skills, degree of availability, and utilization, coordinated with the Bureau of Census and the Civil Service.

The registrant then has the distinct personal advantage in that he register with his own State selective service under a director of civilian defense and receives a copy of his medical examination and a copy of his personnel-management tests and classification together with information as to opportunities and incentives available to him for personal improvement as well as to his part of the plan for the national defense, civilian or military. No one under this plan would be rejected except those absolutely incompetent or those incarcerated and not available. Those who are physically, mentally, and morally qualified for military field combat know by the provisions of the Constitution that they are liable for service in the militia, and, therefore, they may expect to take military training in one form or another, and all others would be expected to take an equivalent amount of other training.

The regular armed forces would determine their requirements of manpower as to skills, etc., as well as the civilian defense, the Federal and State Governments, and the national economy through the Departments of Commerce and Labor. The selective service on a national basis having compiled all of the State records would furnish the resources and skills available, and the proposed board of coordination on the Presidential level would determine the allocation as to the various components of the Nation. It is believed that this will relieve the armed forces of the public-relations problem of bringing citizens to draft with a concept that it is purely military and that the armed forces will screen those that they wish and literally discard those they do not care for with the label unfit.

The Security Training Commission both National and State will work out programs of instructions as indicated on the charts utilizing, so far as may be possible, the existing systems of public instructions and provide credits toward graduation as well as credits toward completing the particular type of training that should be helpful to the national defense, both civilian and military. It is believed this should provide a greater opportunity for improvement for the individual registrant as well as providing the skills required for the national defense.

The civilian defense would provide the items indicated on the charts and should instruct the individual, if he survives after a warhead has landed in his vicinity, how to further survive for himself, his family, and his neighbors and how to cooperate in the civilian defense of his community.

In peacetime this plan would require no loss of time from either school or business and in a period of anticipation of national emergency only a minimum of lost time would conceivably be required. In case of national emergency involving war, all registrants would be available and ready to be drafted under the most intelligible and economic plan for immediate and equitable action.

The purpose of this plan is to provide manpower skills of responsible free citizens available for the national economy and its civil and military defense so trained and evaluated as to constitute instant readiness to serve in the most economical, efficient, and intelligible manner. By implication there are some elements of the plan affecting industrial mobilization.

The details have been given consideration and are in process of being drafted but are purposely left out of these memoranda.

Decentralization for parts of the program are in consideration of the constitutional provision for States rights plus the realization that probably in any future war against this Nation whole communities conceivably might be wiped out and hence the individual and decentralized activities must be ready to carry on.

Regimentation is to be avoided except in a national emergency. Militarism is to be avoided and yet adequate military preparedness with cooperation and respect for the military are essential. Freedom of the individual is to be coordinated with registrant's responsibility. Command shall be exercised through leadership. Discipline, loyalty, cooperation, and obedience shall be taught and expected, but the dignity of the individual shall be paramount.

Instruction shall not be prescribed, leaving this to the various authorities under this plan, but shall be prescribed to eliminate any instruction in violent or subversive overthrow of the United States or its component political subdivisions and it shall not be of a nature to intimidate or prejudice registrants. The plan will place much of the responsibility for instruction on the existing school systems and thus should be economical.

Many persons probably will be reluctant to accept training under this plan just as many persons are reluctant to pay taxes in any form or to comply with certain existing laws and ordinances. However, in the interest of the common good and in respect of law and order as long as the law is reasonable and equitable and most citizens comply relative to their ability, there is no great resistance to acceptance of restrictions to liberty or license so long as there is basic freedom.

This country had an experience with the Volstead Act, and the prohibition amendment to the Constitution was not generally accepted and was finally repealed. Therefore it is deduced that if the citizens of this Nation do not want conscription in peacetime or so-called universal military training or compulsory military training in the sense employed in other countries, being afraid of potential dictatorships or militarism, they will not give willing support. We cannot afford, in this country, to impose legislation on an unwilling citizenry, no matter how well intended, if the enforcement means utilization of the powers of a dictatorship through regimentation, militarism and ruthless and utter disregard of the freedom of the individual.

Consequently, it is necessary to devise a law that is for the common good and defense, that is equitable, that not only appeals to patriotic duty but also provides personal satisfactions and benefits, and under peace conditions is practically voluntary as to time and channel, is economical and practical, provides the utmost in opportunity and utilization, guarantees freedom and dignity of the individual and removes the threat of regimentation and militarism in order to gain willing cooperation and acceptance by by the majority.

Such a law can have teeth to enforce compliance from the small minority who lack understanding of its civic responsibilities or who deliberately connive to disregard them.

With the right kind of such a law, judiciously and intelligently enforced for the benefit of the people in this representative form of government, there should be developed motivating, spiritual, ethical, moral, psychological, and other intangible forces, as a result of freedom of choice and opportunity, that should outweigh otherwise greater manpower or matériel of enemy forces which are regimented or controlled under ruthless dictatorships and therefore do not have equivalent motivation.

Deferments, in the sense of special privilege, should not be tolerated in this plan since all should be given assignments corresponding to individual abilities, perhaps not always according to the individual's expressed preference, but usually in some capacity of equivalent degree of importance and required ability in relation to the Nation's requirements. However, individuals should be called to serve, after reasonable warning, in the order of the degree of availability and qualifications correlated with the needs of the Nation.

There should be no duplication in this decentralized plan, but coordination with national central general direction plus checks and balances for insuring a constantly improving training program with the end results of better citizenship, wider application to more citizens, and higher degree of preparedness, individually and collectively, for peace and war.

The plan must be flexible and practical under control of Congress, as the people's representative, for such action as may be consistent with current conditions from time to time in the preservation of freedom of the people and prosecution of the defense of their Nation and its Constitution.

This plan offers no new basic concepts of service by the individual for the defense of his Nation, since the Constitution and the National Defense Act of 1920, as amended, cover these. However, there are new concepts of organization, coordination, and approach to the solution of the problem of how best to provide for the training of citizens under the constitutional provisions. Additional legislation and appropriations are necessary to provide the authorities with means of accomplishment and clarification of manner.

Col. WALTER R. JEFFREY,
Corps of Engineers, Reserves, Chairman, National Defense Committee, Union League Club of Chicago, Ill.

MARCH 18, 1948.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946;

H. R. 3260. An act for the relief of Clarence S. Osika;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder; and

H. R. 6252. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1747. An act to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946;

H. R. 3260. An act for the relief of Clarence S. Osika;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder; and

H. R. 6252. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 14, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1644. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the preliminary draft of parts IV and V of the report of the Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade-agreements program, also chapter 6 of part III, which was not completed at the time the first five chapters of that part were forwarded, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Report No. 2230 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 6451. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic beverage industry in the District of Columbia. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 2323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6874. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 2324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6878. A bill to authorize granting increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5644. A bill to assist the States in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5715. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5807. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 6900. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6901. A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to Trenton Dam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6902. A bill relating to overpayments of the surtax on undistributed profits imposed by the Revenue Act of 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. Con. Res. 215. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward extending the existing railroad system between the Territory of Alaska and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward extending the existing railroad system between the Territory of Alaska and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 667. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4159; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 668. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5464; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 669. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 451; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 670. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4962; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 6903. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be filed under the Federal Torts Claim Act on the claim of the estate of Mrs. Juana Mercado Valle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6904. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be filed under the Federal Torts Claim Act on the claim of Ignacio Colón Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6905. A bill for the relief of Juan Morata Canton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6906. A bill for the relief of Victor Cuquerella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6907. A bill for the relief of Rafael Troyano de los Rios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6908. A bill for the relief of Felix Aranguren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6909. A bill for the relief of Agustin Cortes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 6910. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winfred DeCoteau a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 6911. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Guanapoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 6912. A bill for the relief of Otis Pippin and Imogene Pippin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6913. A bill for the relief of Norman Otis Pippin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were land on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2090. By Mr. BARRETT: Petition of George Guina and 17 other Shoshone, Wyo., Indians, protesting the sale of their horses by the Indian office without their consent; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2091. By Mr. HART: Petition of North Hudson Lodge, No. 1267, B'nai B'rith, urging the immediate de jure recognition by the United States of the state of Israel, immediate suspension of the arms embargo, that the Government of the United States give sympathetic consideration to the granting of a loan or other financial assistance to the state of Israel, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2092. By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of Harlan G. Wynn, Seattle, Wash., and all employees of the Seattle Post Office, urging enactment of legislation providing for an $800 permanent salary increase retroactive to January 1, 1948, for all employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2093. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Joseph Zubarini and others, of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of the Towe bill (H. R. 4728) and all other measures to advance UMT and the draft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2094. Also, petition of Nik Dabssandin and others, of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of the Towe bill (H. R. 4728) and all other measures to advance UMT and the draft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2095. Also, petition of W. D. Hulme. Sarasota, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 1, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who hast made us and designed us for companionship with Thee, who hast called us to walk with Thee and be not afraid, forgive us, we pray Thee, if fear, unworthy thought, or hidden sin has prompted us to hide from Thee.

Save us, we pray, from all sins of intellect, not only from the error and ignorance which belong to our frailty, but from the pride that would make us think ourselves sufficient for our tasks.

Forgive us for thinking of prayer as a waste of time, and help us to see that without it our labors are a waste of effort.

O God, help us, guide us, and use us for Thy glory and our good. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 12, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 19) relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6758) making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ELSTON, Mr. CLASON, and Mr. SIKES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DONDERO, Mr. ANGELL, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. LARCADE, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING TODAY'S SESSION AND PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that there will be a night session tonight.

If it meets with the approval of the Senate, it is proposed, at the conclusion of the unfinished business after 5 o'clock, to call up for consideration the so-called long-range-farm-program bill, which will be in charge of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. After that bill is made the unfinished business, it is then intended that a unanimous-consent request will be made to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and to consider appropriation bills. The bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior is now ready for consideration. The Government corporations appropriation bill is also on the calendar and ready to be acted upon. I believe by the time those two appropriation bills are out of the way the bill

making appropriations for the Navy will be ready. Consideration of those three bills will require some time. For that reason a night session will be held, in the hope that we may dispose of the three appropriation bills and then resume consideration of the long-range-farm-program bill during the session tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, the time from 11 o'clock until 5 o'clock is under the equal control of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The Chair cannot recognize any Senator except by leave of one of the Senators in charge of the time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, for providential reasons it will be necessary for me to leave the Chamber as early as I can, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] control the time in my place. I shall probably desire to speak for a few minutes on the subject under consideration, and thereafter the Senator from Kentucky will control the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. I inquire of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Georgia if time may be granted for a quorum call, to be charged equally to the proponents and opponents of the pending bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that is agreeable to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it agreeable to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. It is quite agreeable to me.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll, the time of the quorum call to be charged equally to the two sides of the debate.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Capper	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tobey
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Feazel	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senate will proceed to the consideration of House bill 6556, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, in January and February of 1947 the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the junior Senator from Colorado, in response to many complaints which both had received, made an effort to secure improvement in the reciprocal trade procedures. On February 7, 1947, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan and the junior Senator from Colorado made a public statement on the subject, which I desire to read:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANDENBERG, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, AND BY SENATOR MILLIKIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Because of our mutual interest in the foreign and domestic aspects of the forthcoming trade agreements negotiations we have held a number of conversations on the subject.

We were referring to the forthcoming Geneva negotiations.

These and the discussions, later referred to, with Under Secretary of State Acheson and Under Secretary of State Clayton have been entirely on our own responsibility and solely for preliminary exploration on the subject. It is understood that the proposals are tentative and subject to revision in the light of develcpments.

Although we are conscious of differences of opinion between us as to some of the philosophy and procedures of the reciprocal-trade system, we are in accord on the following:

"1. Since under existing law the Reciprocal Trade Act, as last extended by the Congress, does not expire until June 12, 1948, important basic changes in the system, if these should be needed, can be made more appropriately by the next session of this Congress. Moreover, pursuant to the authority vested in it by the Reciprocal Trade Act which, as above pointed out, does not expire until June 1948, the State Department has invited 18 nations to bargain with us this coming April for trade agreements; that elaborate plans for the negotiations have been made by the nations involved; that our own domestic hearings have been under way; that from the standpoint of our foreign relations it is undesirable that these plans be abandoned or needlessly postponed.

"2. There is considerable sentiment for procedural improvements leading to more certain assurance that our domestic economy will not be imperiled by tariff reductions and concessions. The desire for procedural improvements arises from fears such as the following:

"'(a) That our proper domestic concern in tariffs adequate to safeguard our domestic economy may be subordinated to extraneous and overvalued diplomatic objectives;

"'(b) That our domestic interests which require protection against injurious imports or the threat thereof are not given proper hearings on proposed tariff cuts;

"'(c) That the exact reductions and concessions contemplated are kept secret and it is impossible to make specific defensive arguments against unspecified perils;

"'(d) That the whole matter is surrounded with unnecessary secrecy;

"'(e) That responsibility for advice to the President against injurious tariff reductions and concessions is unduly diluted and obscured among too many executive agencies and is not sufficiently focused on those best able to give it;

"'(f) That we do not get sufficient return benefit from the generalized benefits resulting to other nations from the operations of the unconditional most-favored-nation clauses in our trade agreements.'"

3. That under the Tariff Act of 1930 and the amending Reciprocal Trade Act there is ample authority for establishment of procedures by the President without further legislation that will safeguard the domestic economy without hampering the negotiation of agreements to encourage the essential expansion of our foreign trade.

4. That to the extent such executive safeguards are provided, claims for legislative action are obviated.

5. We believe that the following measures which may be put into effect by the President out of his existing powers would afford improved safeguards and would, without damage to legitimate reciprocal trade negotiations, allay many of the fears that have been mentioned;

(a) The United States Tariff Commission to review all contemplated tariff reductions and concessions in all future trade agreements and to make direct recommendation to the President as to the point beyond which reductions and concessions cannot be made without injury to the domestic economy;

(b) Inclusion of "escape clause" in every trade agreement hereafter entered into or renewed whereby the United States, on the initiative of the President, can withdraw or modify any tariff reduction or concession if in practice it develops that such reduction or concession has imperiled any affected domestic interest;

(c) The Tariff Commission to keep closely and currently informed on the operation of all of our trade agreements and on its own motion or on the request of the President or of the Congress, or of any aggrieved party, to hold public hearings to determine whether, in its opinion, any particular escape clause should be invoked, and to recommend direct to the President withdrawal or modification of any rate or concession which imperils any affected domestic interest.

(d) Recommendations of Tariff Commission to President for withdrawal or modification of rates or concessions under operation of escape clause, together with any dissenting opinions of members and nonconfidential supporting data to be open to public inspection;

(e) Efficient procedures and policies to assure that nations which do not make available to us their own tariff reductions and concessions to other nations shall not receive generalized benefits from us resulting from the inclusion in our own trade agreements of the unconditional most-favored-nation clause except at our option exercised in the public interest.

6. We have discussed these matters with Under Secretary of State Acheson and Under Secretary of State Clayton and are encour-

aged to hope that improvements by Executive order along the lines suggested will be seriously considered by the President and the State Department.

FEBRUARY 7, 1947.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator give me the date of that statement?

Mr. MILLIKIN. February 7, 1947.

At that time that effort was generally approved as something which was constructive. Unless Senators were dissembling, there was substantial approval from both sides of the aisle. Where criticism was voiced, it was on the ground that we did not go far enough.

The bill now before the Senate incorporates but a part—and in milder form—of the unaccepted suggestions made 16 months ago. But it will not be long before we shall be told that these measures for improvement of the system, so harmless and so innocently conceived 16 months ago and then generally regarded as constructive, are in fact villainous devices to destroy reciprocal trade, to return to congressional log-rolling, and to high protectionism that would isolate us economically and break the heart of the world. Thus we shall see in graphic form the feverish exaggerations which can capture the minds of able men in a Presidential election year.

Unless care is taken to avoid it, the arguments on the subject are based on its extremes. The crypto-high protectionist sees the tariff-lowering tendency of the system, and, therefore, everything about it is anathema to him. The crypto-free trader, likewise, looking at the tariff-lowering tendency of the system, assaults with violence any attempt to reconcile the tendency with avoidance of injury to our domestic producers in our domestic market.

There is a middle ground which will permit the expansion of our foreign trade and the increase of imports without injuring the fair chance of our domestic producers at our domestic market. Here, I suggest, is a feasible and constructive goal for friends of the system.

Those who have a genuine interest in reciprocal trade, those who believe that the public welfare is to be found between the positions of the extremists, will, I respectfully suggest, best advance their cause by repelling argument and attitudes which would make a mystique of the subject, requiring unquestioning genuflection and devotional exercises.

The reciprocal-trade system cannot remain static in a rapidly changing world. No good purpose is served by running up our blood pressures at the mere suggestion that improvement is possible or desirable. If the system does not accommodate itself to fair criticisms, it will fall before their cumulative strength.

The President did not accept the suggestion of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan and the junior Senator from Colorado as to the role in reciprocal trade of the Tariff Commission.

The President ordered inclusion of escape clauses, but in practice hedged the escape procedures with so many conditions that they are ineffectual. This will be demonstrated.

On June 15, 1934, President Roosevelt wrote Representative BUCK as follows, and this may be found in the record of the hearings at pages 377–378:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCK: I am somewhat surprised and a little amused at the fears you say have been aroused in California because of the enactment and possible administration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Certainly it is not the purpose of the administration to sacrifice the farmers and fruit growers of California in the pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of foreign markets, as published reports would make believe. I trust that no Californian will have any concern or fear that anything damaging to the fruit growers of that State or of any other State will result from this legislation.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

In President Truman's message to Congress of March 1, 1948, on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements extension, he said:

In addition, the interests of domestic producers are carefully protected in the negotiation of each trade agreement. I assured the Congress when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was last extended in 1945 that domestic producers would be safeguarded in the process of expanding trade. That commitment has been kept. It will continue to be kept. The practice will be continued of holding extensive public hearings to obtain the view of all interested persons before negotiations are even begun. The practice will be continued whereby each agreement before its conclusion will be carefully studied with the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, the National Military Establishment, and the Tariff Commission.

Finally, each agreement will continue to include a clause which will permit withdrawal or modification of concessions if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concessions, imports increase to such an extent as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers.

In connection with the hearings on the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements in 1945, Mr. Clayton testified; reading from page 7 of that report, and from page 378 of the report on the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee:

A rumor has freely circulated that certain American industries have been singled out as inefficient industries and that if the additional authority provided for in the bill is granted the State Department will use such authority to trade off these inefficient industries for other industries which can compete in the world market. Nothing could be further from the truth than this. The State Department has never construed the Trade Agreements Act as a license to remake the industrial or agricultural pattern of America. The record of 11 years of administration of the act should prove that. If, however, there is any doubt in anyone's mind regarding the use of the act to seriously injure American industry, this doubt should be completely dispelled by the letter of May 25 from President Truman to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. The short letter reads as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Supplementing our conversation yesterday, I wish to repeat that I regard the pending measure for the renewal and strengthening of the Trade Agreements Act as of the first order of importance for the success of my administration. I assume there is no doubt that the act will be renewed. The real question is whether the renewal is to be in such form as to make the act effective. For that purpose, the enlargement of authority provided by section 2 of the pending bill is essential. I have had drawn to my attention statements to the effect that this increased authority might be used in such a way as to endanger or trade out segments of the American industry, American agriculture, or American labor. No such action was taken under President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, and no such action will take place under my Presidency."

"Sincerely yours,

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

Mr. President, you have noted that the noninjury assurances were unequivocal and therefore would warrant their inclusion in the bill as a mandatory standard. These assurances were relied upon by Members of Congress in granting past extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Skepticism as to whether they would be kept has prompted resistance to the system and has substantially narrowed the field of its support.

Is it going back to high protectionism, is it gutting reciprocal trade, to provide a reminder to the President—that is all we are doing here—of an explicit assurance which he has given presumably for the constructive furtherance of the system?

This is all that is intended by the bill before us with its proposed amendments.

The report of the committee tells in summary fashion what we are doing. Let me read from it. I shall begin on page 2.

It is not lengthy.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill extends to June 30, 1949, without diminution, the existing authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to enter into foreign trade agreements. For future trade negotiations it establishes a procedure whereby the Tariff Commission will make findings of the maximum or minimum limits of duties or other import restrictions necessary if serious injury or threat of injury to domestic producers is to be avoided. The bill provides that if, in the resulting agreement, the President makes terms in disregard of these findings, he shall state his reasons for ignoring them.

No more than that, I interpolate to say.

This is the only change of notable importance in the existing law proposed by the bill, and this change is procedural in character.

In reporting out this bill your committee reserves questions such as those posed by allegations that the authority conferred under section 350 of the Tariff Act has been exceeded either by incorporation of general regulatory provisions in the multilateral trade agreement recently concluded at Geneva, or otherwise. Many of these regulatory provisions duplicate provisions in the Habana charter for an International Trade Organization and therefore consideration will be given these matters when the Habana charter is presented to the Congress. If the United States accepts membership in the International Trade Organization broad statutory changes would be needed to carry out effectively engagements that would follow from this country's acceptance of membership in that organization. This approaching decision respecting membership in the International Trade Organization is a strong reason for not extending the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 beyond June 30, 1949.

From progressively widening sources your committee hears complaints that domestic producers who require protection against injurious competition from imports do not receive adequate consideration in trade agreement negotiations. There is much feeling

that fully justifiable needs for tariffs adequate to safeguard the well-being of our domestic economy are being subordinated to extraneous, and perhaps overvalued, diplomatic objectives. There is considerable evidence that advice to the President against injurious tariff reductions and concessions is diluted and obscured in a maze of executive committees not primarily concerned with safeguarding our domestic producers against injury.

The secrecy surrounding the conduct of our trade-agreements program gives occasion for some of the doubts expressed regarding its operations. Your committee, in the hearings on the pending bill, was refused the minutes of the interdepartmental committee largely responsible for the policies of the trade-agreements program. Furthermore, representatives of the State Department refused to give unequivocal assurances that our domestic producers are being protected. In fact, the special adviser to the Secretary of State sponsoring before the Congress an unconditional extension of the Trade Agreements Act for a period of 3 years has declared that calculated risks affecting domestic producers are taken, and that if injury occurs recourse must be had to the escape-clause procedure. This procedure—

I interpolate to say, as will be demonstrated—

is subject to many weaknesses. It requires lengthy investigations and the injury may be consummated and beyond repair by the time the procedure is made effective. The Geneva multilateral trade agreement provides that if any nation takes an escape, all of the other contracting parties (22 of them) may take compensating escapes on articles of their own choosing. This would make entirely unpredictable the magnitude of adverse repercussions of an escape, and thus would discourage its use.

The bill provides a procedure designed to lessen these doubts in the future by requiring that the President shall give focused attention to the injury test. This procedure for focused attention by the President to the injury test merely gives statutory expression to repeated Presidential assurances that in the conduct of the trade agreements program domestic producers would be protected from injury.

Then come letters which I have read.

The procedure provided by the bill is designed to help the President to fulfill such assurances.

For the performance of the fact-finding function involved in the bill your committee believes the Tariff Commission has proved its ability. The Commission is bipartisan. It has an adequate staff of technicians well trained to perform the Commission's function under the bill. Fact finding as to the matters on which the bill directs the Commission to report to the President is the Commission's traditional role. Prior to the recent trade-agreement negotiations at Geneva, the Commission made comprehensive investigations of more than 3,300 articles considered as "concession items." On the basis of the Commission's experience, and with the store of information available to it, there appears no substantial doubt of the Commission's capacity to perform the duties reposed in it by the bill with respect to any future trade-agreement negotiations. In this connection it should be noted that the hearing made it clear that at this time there are no negotiations under way for additional trade agreements, and that those which might be entered into in the indefinite future would comprise a relatively inconsequential part of the world's trade. Therefore the bill will not impose upon the Tariff Commission burdens which could not be handled expeditiously with its present personnel.

Under the bill when negotiations are in prospect the President will furnish the Tariff Commission with a list of all articles imported into the United States which may be considered in the negotiations. Thereafter the Tariff Commission will undertake an investigation, including hearings, and will report to the President its findings, with respect to each article, as to the limit to which a modification or binding of duties and other import restrictions may be carried without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of a like or similar article. If increases in duties or additional restrictions are necessary to avoid serious injury, or the threat thereof, to domestic producers the Commission will report the minimum increase required. Obviously, the peril points cannot be calculated with slide rule precision, but the Commission's practical wisdom in these matters will enable it to reach findings as to peril points which the President may accept with confidence as being the soundest of any available to him. The report of the Commission will be made directly to the President.

Mark this, please:

The President is not compelled to stay within the limits set by the Tariff Commission in its report to him. If, however, he enters into an agreement which disregards such limits, the bill directs that, within 30 days after the agreement is entered into, he shall transmit a message to Congress accurately identifying the articles in question and stating the reasons for his action or nonaction with respect to each such article. Promptly thereafter the Tariff Commission will deposit with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and with the Committee on Finance of the Senate a copy of its report to the President with respect to the agreement. Under existing law the Tariff Commission has the responsibility of reporting to these committees, upon their request, all information at its command.

The Tariff Commission is restricted under the bill to a fact-finding function, and is prohibited from participating in any policy decisions of the executive branch, or in the negotiation of trade agreements. This is as it should be, for the Commission is a legislative agency and should not be a participant in the making of executive decisions. Accordingly, its officers and employees under the bill will no longer be eligible for membership on the interdepartmental committee which recommends to the President the policies to be followed in these negotiations. This does not, however, imply any interference with the function of that interdepartmental committee, or any other the President may establish. On the contrary, the bill directs the President to seek advice from the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources of information and advice as he deems appropriate. With respect to export considerations, for example, the President will be able to obtain advice from the Department of Commerce as heretofore.

What are the objections to the bill with its proposed amendments? They come to these:

First. A year's extension is not enough;

Second. The bill mandates a single standard—noninjury for domestic producers—for making an agreement;

Third. Costs of production would be the sole inquiry of the Tariff Commission and this is impractical under the present state of the world's economy;

Fourth. It will put too much of a burden on the Tariff Commission, and that the Commission is not competent to give advice on peril points;

Fifth. The Tariff Commission will be subjected to pressure;

Sixth. It is not necessary, because domestic producers are protected by the escape clause;

Seventh. It would destroy the functions of the Interdepartmental Committee which now advises the President as to what should be done;

Eighth. It would reimpose the Smoot-Hawley tariff law, which would restore high protectionism; and

Ninth. It would restore tariff making by logrolling.

As to the claim that 1 year's extension is not enough, I respectfully suggest that it is easily demonstrable that a longer extension would be senseless. In the first place, it will be quite evident before the day is over, and it has already been made quite evident by public discussion of the matter and by testimony at the hearings, that in this election year it is impossible to give the subject the type of review which might justify a longer extension. But the decisive reason is in the relation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to the Geneva multilateral trade agreement and the proposed charter of the International Trade Organization drafted earlier this year at Habana. Anticipating that the extension of the act and the action on the proposed charter for the International Trade Organization would be before the Congress during this session, the Senate Committee on Finance, a year ago, conducted extensive preliminary hearings on the subject. These hearings were held because the interlocking relationship between the act, the Geneva agreement, which was in the offing, and the proposed charter for the International Trade Organization, was thoroughly understood by the Senate.

The provisions of the Geneva multilateral trade agreement make entirely clear the inextricable relationships between the three matters which have been mentioned, from which it follows that whether we do or do not approve the proposed charter for the International Trade Organization, revisions will have to be made in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in order to conform it and to make it supplemental to the proposed charter, if it should be adopted, or to conform it to or to delimit nonconformance with the Geneva agreement, if the proposed charter is not adopted.

This should not and will not be allowed to stand on mere assertion. Let me emphasize at this point that the proposed charter for the International Trade Organization has not been submitted to Congress and will not be submitted until next year.

I ask the close attention of the Senators, because I propose now to demonstrate the inextricable relationship between the Trade Agreements Act, the Geneva multilateral trade agreement, and the proposed International Trade Organization's charter, and that this condemns an extension of more than 1 year.

I read from article 29, appearing on page 62 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the so-called multilateral Geneva trade agreement. The

article is entitled "Relation of This Agreement to the Charter for an International Trade Organization":

1. The contracting parties, recognizing that the objectives set forth in the preamble of this agreement can best be attained through the adoption, by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, of a charter leading to the creation of an International Trade Organization, undertake, pending their acceptance of such a charter in accordance with their constitutional procedures, to observe to the fullest extent of their executive authority the general principles of the draft charter submitted to the Conference by the Preparatory Committee.

2. (a) On the day on which the charter of the International Trade Organization enters into force, article I and part II of this agreement shall be suspended and superseded by the corresponding provisions of the charter: *Provided*, That within 60 days of the closing of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment any contracting party may lodge with the other contracting parties any objection to any provision or provisions of this agreement being so suspended and superseded; in such case the contracting parties shall, within 60 days after the final date for the lodging of objections, confer to consider the objection in order to agree whether the provisions of the charter to which objection has been lodged, or the corresponding provisions of this agreement in its existing form or any amended form, shall apply.

(b) The contracting parties will also agree—

I interpolate to say that the contracting parties are all parties who signed the Geneva agreements—

The contracting parties will also agree concerning the transfer to the International Trade Organization of their functions under article XXV.

3. If any contracting party has not accepted the charter when it has entered into force, the contracting parties shall confer to agree whether, and if so, in what way, this agreement, insofar as it affects relations between the contracting party which has not accepted the charter and other contracting parties, shall be supplemented or amended.

Remember, I am double-riveting the point that the proposed Charter, the Geneva Agreement, and the Trade Agreements Act, which we propose to amend, are so inextricably tied up together that they must have unified consideration, one over-all review, and we cannot have it until next year, because we do not have the proposed Charter before us, and will not have it until next year.

Mind this paragraph, please;

4. During the month of January 1949, should the Charter not have entered into force, or at such earlier time as may be agreed if it is known that the Charter will not enter into force, or at such later time as may be agreed if the Charter ceases to be in force, the contracting parties shall meet to agree whether this agreement shall be amended, supplemented, or maintained.

I skip the final paragraph of that article. I shall now read from article 25, which commences on page 58 of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, the multilateral Geneva trade agreement. This is called Joint Action by Contracting Parties, and reads:

1. Representatives of the contracting parties shall meet from time to time for the purpose of giving effect to those provisions of this agreement which involve joint action, and, generally, with a view to facilitating the operation and furthering the objectives of this agreement. Wherever reference is made in this agreement to the contracting parties acting jointly they are designated as the contracting parties.

2. The Secretary General of the United Nations is requested to convene the first meeting of the contracting parties which shall take place not later than March 1, 1948.

3. Each contracting party shall be entitled to have one vote at all meetings of the contracting parties.

4. Except as otherwise provided for in this agreement, decisions of the contracting parties shall be taken by a majority of the votes cast.

5. In exceptional circumstances not elsewhere provided for in this agreement, the contracting parties may waive an obligation imposed upon a contracting policy by this agreement: *Provided*, That any such decision shall be approved by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast and that such majority shall comprise more than half of the contracting parties. The contracting parties may also by such a vote—

(a) define certain categories of exceptional circumstances to which other voting requirements shall apply for the waiver of obligations—

"For the waiver of obligations"—

and (b) prescribes such criteria as may be necessary for the application of this paragraph.

Without arguing it—this is not the time to argue it; the time to argue these matters will be when we have the proposed Charter before us—it must be perfectly evident from the article which I have read that a self-respecting claim can be made that we have now subjected the making of our trade agreements to delegations of power in the second degree. The Congress has delegated its power to the President, the President has delegated his power to the contracting parties, and the contracting parties, by a majority vote or by a two-thirds vote, may make decisions of utmost significance, so far as our trade relations are concerned.

I repeat, this is no time to settle the validity of that. I am making no contention as to whether it is valid or is not valid. The time to consider it in connection with this agreement and the time to consider it in connection with the proposed Charter and the time to consider it in connection with the Trade Agreements Act is when all three are before us, and they cannot be before us until next year.

Let me now read from article 23, found on page 54 of the Geneva agreement:

1. If any contracting party should consider that any benefit accruing to it directly or indirectly under this agreement is being nullified or impaired or that the attainment of any objective of the agreement is being impeded as the result of (a) the failure of another contracting party to carry out its obligations under this agreement, or (b) the application by another contracting party of any measure, whether or not it conflicts with the provisions of this agreement, or (c) the existence of any other situation, the contracting party may, with a view to the satisfactory adjustment of the matter, make written representations or proposals to the other contracting party or parties which it considers to be concerned. Any contracting party thus approached shall give sympathetic consideration to the representations or proposals made to it.

2. If no satisfactory adjustment is effected between the contracting parties concerned within a reasonable time, or if the difficulty is of the type described in paragraph 1 (c) of this article, the matter may be referred to the contracting parties. The contracting parties shall promptly investigate—

Let me interpolate, we are talking about the fate of our own exports and our own imports, we are talking about the exports and imports of all the countries who joined the Geneva agreement.

The contracting parties shall promptly investigate any matter so referred to them and shall make appropriate recommendations to the contracting parties which they consider to be concerned—

"Which they considered to be concerned"—

or give a ruling on the matter, as appropriate. The contracting parties may consult with contracting parties, with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and with any appropriate intergovernmental organization in cases where they consider such consultation necessary. If the contracting parties consider that the circumstances are serious enough to justify such action, they may authorize a contracting party or parties—

I interpolate again, this may include the United States of America, as well as any other party.

They may authorize a contracting party or parties to suspend the application to any other contracting party or parties of such obligations or concessions under this agreement as they determine to be appropriate in the circumstances. If the application to any contracting party of any obligation or concession is in fact suspended, that contracting party shall then be free, not later than 60 days after such action is taken, to advise the Secretary General of the United Nations in writing of its intention to withdraw from this agreement and such withdrawal shall take effect upon the expiration of 60 days from the day on which written notice of such withdrawal is received by him.

Again, I am not arguing whether this is a valid inclusion in the Geneva trade agreement, but certainly it is manifest from what has been read that what is being done, for better or worse, depending upon the way one looks at it, is a revolutionary departure from our past trade practices, and the only time, I repeat, when the merits of it can be considered will be when this complementary document is before us, the document from which this provision is taken, to wit, the proposed charter for international trade.

Let me read another article. I am reading article 16, page 41. I will say for the benefit of Senators who have come into the Chamber since the debate opened that we are making a summary examination of the Geneva multilateral trade agreement, to demonstrate that that agreement, and the proposed charter for the International Trade Organization, and the Trade Agreements Act, are inextricably bound together, and cannot be considered at this time, and cannot be considered until next year because the proposed charter is not before us and will not be before us until next year.

Now here is a very significant article. It is article XV, entitled "Exchange Arrangements":

1. The contracting parties shall seek cooperation with the International Monetary Fund to the end that the contracting parties and the fund may pursue a coordinated policy with regard to exchange questions within the jurisdiction of the fund and questions of quantitative restrictions and other trade measures within the jurisdiction of the contracting parties.

2. In all cases in which the contracting parties are called upon to consider or deal with problems concerning monetary reserves, balances of payments, or foreign exchange arrangements, they shall consult fully with the International Monetary Fund.

Note this, please.

In such consultation, the contracting parties—

I interpolate again to remind the Senate that these provisions apply to the United States of America as well as all other countries which have joined the agreement.

In such consultation, the contracting parties shall accept all findings of statistical and other facts presented by the fund relating to foreign exchange, monetary reserves and balances of payments, and shall accept the determination of the fund as to whether action by a contracting party in exchange matters is in accordance with—

Not with this agreement, from which I am reading, not with the Trade Agreements Act, but is in accordance with—

the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund, or with the terms of a special exchange agreement between that contracting party and the contracting parties. The contracting parties, in reaching their final decision in cases involving the criteria set forth in paragraph 2 (a) of article XII, shall accept the determination of the fund as to what constitutes a serious decline in the contracting party's monetary reserves, a very low level of its monetary reserves, or a reasonable rate of increase in its monetary reserves, and as to the financial aspects of other matters covered in consultation in such cases.

Let me repeat—and I do not argue whether this is something which we should or should not approve—that here we have a delegation in the third degree of the tariff-making powers which are exclusively lodged in the Congress of the United States under the Constitution. We delegate the powers to the President—in the first degree. He delegates to those who have signed these agreements—in the second degree. They delegate to the monetary fund—in the third degree. Perhaps we will approve it. This provision is taken in the exact words from the proposed charter, which is not before us. Perhaps we will approve that charter. Perhaps we will approve this provision. Perhaps we will want to limit it. But, I repeat, we cannot give intelligent attention to the matter until all three are before us next year.

I think I have gone into the reading of the Geneva Agreement sufficiently.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Gladly.

Mr. IVES. It has been stated, I believe, that none of the agreements now in force will be affected by legislation which would be applicable for only 1 year. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. IVES. Are there any agreements now in force or any which are likely to be the subject of negotiation which will require action prior to July 1, 1949?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Secretary of State said unequivocally that at the present time the Department does not have any agreement in mind. He mentioned, in a sort of passing manner, Greece. Later he mentioned three or four other countries, Ireland, possibly Austria, possibly Italy, and another small country. But none of those would be interfered with in any way whatsoever by the bill if the Department should undertake to open negotiations.

Mr. IVES. Then anyone or all of those particular countries might come to us for agreements during the ensuing year?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly; and without the slightest impairment of the privilege.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to repeat that the bill does not adversely affect in any way any of our existing trade agreements, including the Geneva multilateral agreement. The report of the committee makes it very clear that we reserve until next year consideration of the various general regulatory provisions in the Geneva agreement.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not know whether the Senator from Colorado has touched on this point, because I came into the Chamber only recently, but I was wondering if he realized that in the Campaign Book of the Democratic Party—Candidates and Issues, 1932, Democratic statesmen and orators were advised to tell the people of the Nation as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY

The Democratic theory of tariff taxation is based upon the necessity of providing revenues to the government—hence the phrase "a tariff for revenue only"—and providing fair competition between imported and domestic products, without injury to legitimate domestic industries, and safeguarding of interests of labor.

The present Democratic attitude on the tariff is expressed as follows in the national platform adopted at Chicago—

In 1932.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Which was said to be the best platform that was ever adopted.

Mr. HAWKES. I might state, Mr. President, that after I saw it I made the statement to 500 people in New Jersey that it was the best platform I had ever seen, and that I hoped it would be adhered to.

This is what they said in the Democratic platform adopted in 1932 at Chicago:

We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue, with a fact-finding tariff commission free from executive interference, reciprocal tariff agreements with other nations, and an international economic conference designed to restore international trade and facilitate exchange.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, with whom I am in perfect agreement regarding his amendment on reciprocal trade agreements as being the best thing and the wisest thing we can do at the present time—I call his attention again to the fact that the Democratic platform of 1932 said:

We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue, with a fact-finding tariff commission free from executive interference.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if that is not exactly what we are advocating in this amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is exactly what we are advocating in this amendment.

Mr. HAWKES. Except it does not go quite so far.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And it will be very useful in this debate later on when the attacks are made upon the Tariff Commission and its ability to handle the job which we are giving to it. I hope that at that time the Senator from New Jersey will bring forward that Democratic platform provision.

Mr. HAWKES. I hope the Senator from Colorado does not feel that I have brought it forward at the wrong time now. I did so because I feel it should be in the mind of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I think it is effective now, and will be even more effective in rebuttal.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to raise with the Senator a question which perhaps he will include in his remarks. But I should like to obtain an answer if he does not intend to make a statement regarding it. Section 3, on page 7, provides the procedure which is to be followed before the President may act. In other words, he has to furnish to the Tariff Commission the list of articles and so forth with respect to which it is contemplated that such agreement is to be made. Then finally, on page 8, in line 3, it is provided:

No such foreign trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President.

It seems to me that this is something which might provide, unwittingly, to be sure, a veto over action by the President. Does the Senator intend to discuss that question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. IVES. If the Senator intends to cover it, he does not need to answer my question; but I think it is a very important point. I do not believe that there should be anything in the proposed legislation which would thus provide a veto over action by the President.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is nothing in the bill, nothing in the proposed amendments, which would give any veto over any action the President might take with respect to reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Perhaps the Tariff Commission might decide that it did not care to report back. On that basis the President would be prevented from taking action, would he not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We thought somewhat of placing a time limitation in the bill.

Mr. IVES. Why is not that feasible?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We did not place such a limit in the bill because the proposals as they come to the Commission require varying amounts of time for making the investigations and reports. I believe that the Tariff Commission understands that we want prompt action, and want the Commission to get its reports to the President as rapidly as possible. I do not for a moment believe that the Tariff Commission would develop lead in its shoes on that subject.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me add this further remark: The President, under his own Executive order, which now gives the Tariff Commission the exclusive role of making reports and giving advice as to the escape clause, does not place any time limitation on the Tariff Commission.

Mr. IVES. So far as that is concerned, as I understand, the President would not be in any way prevented from going ahead under the provisions as they now exist. As the act now stands, under any Executive order he may make he is independent. But under this proposed provision he would be utterly dependent upon action by the Tariff Commission. It seems to me that a reasonable limit as to time might well be provided, with the understanding that if the Tariff Commission were not able to obtain the information and present it within such period of time, perhaps an additional period, up to a certain point, might be allowed, after which it seems to me the President should be allowed to proceed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We considered that question, and concluded that a fixed time limit might not be desirable because different proposals take varying lengths of time. We felt that the Tariff Commission, on its own steam, would move with expedition. We felt that if it did not, it would be violating the provision of the act which says that upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President.

Mr. IVES. It also says, does it not, that no such foreign-trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. That seems to me to require more clarification and more protection from the standpoint of the country than is provided in the terms contained in the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it be agreeable to the Senator if the language were, "upon receipt of such list the Commission shall with utmost expedition make an investigation and report to the President its findings"?

Mr. IVES. I cannot see that that would remedy the difficulty. Why could not a provision be placed in the bill requiring that within 3 months, for example, the Tariff Commission must report back; and if it finds it impossible to report back in that period of time, perhaps several extensions of 30 days each might be granted, depending upon the way in which the act might be intended to work?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me suggest to the Senator that he put his mind on the question and draw up phraseology which we may consider.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while the Senator from New York is present?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Not only must the Tariff Commission make a report, but it must make it necessarily by majority vote. In other words, six members of a bipartisan commission must report to the President before he is authorized to proceed at all to negotiate any trade agreement with another nation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me that the Commission's duties in this respect are the same as its duties in all other respects, so far as its members are concerned. I assume that the Commission acts by majority vote. There is no requirement that it act by unanimous vote. So I believe we can consider that it would follow the usual procedures.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say first that I am one of those who have been concerned with the point just raised by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. At this time I wish to inquire of the Senator from Colorado whether he will at a later time in his discourse take up another point with which some of us are concerned. It has to do with the certain references in three places in the bill.

First, I refer to line 23 on page 7. The language is:

> Without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles.

This language would give protection to inefficient marginal producers. It seems to me and to some others that that is an objectionable criterion. If the industry as a whole is threatened, that is one thing. If the marginal producers in the industry are threatened, that is quite another thing. This particular point gives me serious concern, and I know that it has caused other Senators concern. I am wondering if the Senator is prepared, at a later point in his discussion, or now, to address himself to that question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall address myself to that point. Let me say now that the language in the President's Executive order is precisely the same so far as using the escape clause is concerned, and that the Executive order and the procedures adopted by the Tariff Commission make it very clear that great leeway is available for the exercise of good sense. I do not believe for one moment that the extreme high-cost fringe of domestic producers would be the test of injury to all domestic producers. From an examination of the regulations which are already in effect, it is clear that the Tariff Commission does not operate under any such criterion.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am not speaking for anyone else, but only for myself. I care not what weight of authority is behind those words—whether the President, the Supreme Court, the Pope, or any higher authority, if there be such—the words are not good.

Mr. MILLIKIN. When it comes to framing such a provision, we find the same difficulty, regardless of what words we select. Being unable to look into the future under all the circumstances which will be presented to the Tariff Commission, it is very difficult to attempt to delineate a precise formula and specify where the cut-off point shall be with respect to the other fringes of high-cost producers. In the end it comes down to the judgment and good sense of the Tariff Commission. If we do not like the provision in operation we can change it.

I should like to add also that we had in mind the language which the executive department now uses in the application of the injury text in connection with the use of escapes.

Mr. FLANDERS. It seems to me that the use of such words as "threatening serious injury to industries engaged in the domestic production of like or similar articles" would tend to close the door on objectionable possibilities.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to make the further suggestion that in using the word "industries," we would be likely to confine ourselves to what we call manufacturing industries. The word "producers" takes in manufacturing industries and also takes in agricultural producers. I think it has been deliberately chosen by the President for that purpose. It is deliberately chosen by us for that purpose.

Mr. President, from what has been read, it is crystal clear that the Geneva agreement has been explicitly tied to the proposed charter; that a part of the proposed charter has been incorporated bodily into the Geneva agreement; that it is manifest that revolutionary departures from past world-trade practices have been incorporated in the Geneva agreement and are in the proposed charter; that nothing of the kind is spelled out in the act which we propose to extend on our part here today; and that good faith contention is available that the act which we propose to amend does not carry implications broad enough on which to base that which has been done at Geneva; that if the Congress shall accept these departures, authority will have to be spelled out in the act; and that there will have to be accompanying revisions of some of our significant domestic legislation. Therefore, it is again suggested that there is no point in an extension that would carry past the time in which revision of some kind will have to be made.

Also, it is again emphasized that our inability to make whatever revisions may be necessary derives solely from the fact

that the proposed Charter of the International Trade Organization has not been submitted and will not be submitted until next year. Moreover, the fact that those who oppose the bill with its proposed amendments do not believe that the heavens will fall on a 1-year extension will be evidenced before the day is over by the offer of an amendment for an extension of precisely that length of time.

As to the claim that the bill mandates a single standard—noninjury to domestic producers—for making an agreement, this is easily refuted by the bill and the proposed amendments. The bill does not say so. On the contrary, section 3 (c) of the bill maintains the direction to the President contained in section 4 of the act that before concluding trade agreement—

the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does not the Senator agree with me that, in addition to the groups mentioned there, one of the most important considerations will be the development of the Economic Cooperation Administration—in other words, the administration of the Marshall plan—and what we do with the cooperating nations abroad? Therefore, would not it be advisable to add to the group of whom the President should seek information and advice the Administrator and the staff of the Economic Cooperation Administration?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that is not advisable because it is not necessary. Advice is already required of the State Department. The State Department is the channel through which we operate, so far as those matters are concerned. In other words, I think the direction is complete, so far as it is now covered by the words of the bill. We name the specific departments, including the State Department, and then we say "and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate."

So obviously the President would be at liberty to talk to anyone and to hear anyone on any phase of the subject, and to make up his mind on the basis of everything that is presented to him.

Mr. SMITH. I merely feel that it is important to dramatize that connection with the Economic Cooperation Administration; and also in connection with the point the Senator is making—that only a 1-year extension can be made now because of the International Trade Organization development—I wish to point out that I agree that all of them are wrapped up together.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator for the suggestion, because it is well understood that the Economic Cooperation Administration program will come under complete review next year.

Mr. SMITH. That was my point in asking the question. I understand from the bill, as the Senator has said, that provision is made in the bill that the President shall seek information and advice from the State Department and the Department of Commerce, and of course both of them are concerned with the Economic Cooperation Administration development. I wish to point out that the Economic Cooperation Administration is intimately connected with this whole development, as I shall discuss later in my remarks.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to say to the Senator that I do not desire to argue anything here today that would derogate in any way the President's authority to consult any source of advice that he may regard as advisable.

Mr. President, I was addressing myself to the objection that the bill mandates a specific, single standard, to wit, noninjury to domestic producers. However, on the contrary, the bill specifically recognizes that the President may not adhere to the noninjury test, when it requires under section 5 (a) that if the President does not do so he shall state his reasons to the Congress.

As to the claim that costs of production would be the sole inquiry of the Tariff Commission, and that this is impractical under the present state of the world's economy, I point out that the bill does not fix upon the Tariff Commission any particular method for determining the peril points.

The bill provides in section 3 (a):

Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350—

Section 350, I may interpolate, is the main provision of the existing Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—

without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required.

There is not a word there, not a word anywhere in the act, limiting the President to the consideration of any standard.

Moreover, the Tariff Commission has already set up its procedures for determining peril points. The Commission under Presidential order is the sole agency to advise the President as to whether escapes should be taken.

Under date of February 24, 1948, Mr. Oscar B. Ryder, Chairman of the Tariff Commission, sent to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee a report on "Procedure and criteria with respect to the administration of the escape clause in trade agreements." This report is set out in full in the report of the hearings. It commences on page 125 and runs through page 132. The criteria regarding injury to domestic producers is dealt with at length commencing on page 129 and running through page 131.

In brief, cost of production is only one of an indefinite number of factors which may be considered.

Listed among the factors are "Trend of ratio of imports to domestic production, costs of production, price trends and conditions of supply and demand."

On page 130, it clearly appears that the Commission recognizes the difficulties involved and will have to limit itself, so far as the cost of production is concerned, to information which is readily available.

The conclusion of the report tells the whole story. It completely refutes any objection which may be made that we are trying to limit the President's consideration to one item, to one test. It appears on page 131 of the record, as follows:

An attempt has been made in this report to state in general terms the nature of the criteria which the Tariff Commission believes will enable it to form a judgment as to whether or not the escape clause should be invoked and, if invoked, the character of the relief, if relief is found warranted, which should be afforded. Such a statement cannot be all-inclusive. American industry and agriculture are too large and too varied to permit at this time more than an indication of the various types of situations which might warrant action under the clause.

Remember please, we are talking about the escape clause, and the escape clause is invoked for injury to domestic producers, or the threat thereof.

The Commission will be receptive to any evidence offered by producers, importers, or others regarding the relationship between imports and domestic production that may have a bearing on the effect of increased competition resulting from a concession made in a trade agreement. It does not intend by this report to suggest the exclusion of any information which interested parties may consider relevant.

I add at this point that nothing in this bill prevents anyone from consulting the Tariff Commission or prevents the Tariff Commission from giving information to any executive department.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield gladly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator refer to the substitute bill offered by the Senator or to the original House bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I refer only to the bill as it is now before the Senate, which consists of a substitute amendment to the House bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assumed that, but the Senator said "this bill."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very glad to have the Senator's correction. We have not accepted the House version. We have excluded from the House version the provision which would have brought a trade agreement back to Congress for review and for possible veto had peril points been exceeded.

As to the argument that the bill would overburden the Tariff Commission and that the Commission is not competent to give advice on peril points: Mr. Ryder, Chairman of the Tariff Commission, and Mr. Gregg, a member of the Commission, effectively disposed of this argu-

ment. From the record of the hearings at page 116, I quote:

The CHAIRMAN. The whole number of items involved in the multilateral agreements.
Mr. RYDER. For all countries?
The CHAIRMAN. For all countries.
Mr. RYDER. I have never counted them.
The CHAIRMAN. What was the figure?
Mr. MARTIN.—

Mr. Martin is connected with the Tariff Commission.

Mr. MARTIN. I think I have seen 45,000.
Mr. RYDER. That seems large to me.
The CHAIRMAN. In view of the generalization of benefits, it is in the whole subject. We have to study the ramifications of the general subject; do we not?
Mr. RYDER. Yes; of course. It depends on how you count the items.
The CHAIRMAN. So you submitted, so far as items directly affecting the United States were concerned, subject to negotiation between the United States and other countries, some 3,000 or more.
Mr. RYDER. Some 1,400 or more the way we counted them. We probably covered a number of classified items, if you want to count those as items.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you hear the testimony yesterday——
Mr. RYDER. No.
The CHAIRMAN. That there are no important trade agreements in the offing?
Mr. RYDER. No; I didn't hear the testimony yesterday.
The CHAIRMAN. That was testified. I think there was some mention of a possible agreement with Greece. I have heard outside of the testimony that there might be something with Portugal.
If preparing digests which I assume are to be used as the basis for conclusions as to whether domestic industry would be injured, if preparing that digest on the scale which you have just mentioned, did not frustrate your Commission, would asking you over the next year or so to prepare digests and possibly reach opinions on the items that would be included in an agreement with, we will say, Greece or Portugal, send you up into a tailspin over there?
Mr. RYDER. If you had only agreements with countries like Portugal and Greece, a few countries like those, in negotiations which involved only a few items, the preparation of the digest would be very simple.
The CHAIRMAN. You gentlemen could do that coming up out of a sound sleep with one-half of one lobe of your brain.
Mr. RYDER. That is a little exaggeration, but it wouldn't be much of a job for small countries of that kind.

Mr. John P. Gregg, a member of the Commission, under date of May 28, 1948, wrote the following letter to the chairman of the Finance Committee. It appears on pages 134–135 of the record. It is very significant. I quote:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington 25, D. C., May 28, 1948.
Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate:

DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: I am taking the liberty of writing you about H. R. 6556, the Gearhart bill, which I understand is now before the Finance Committee of the Senate. The comments and suggestions which follow express only my personal views and do not necessarily reflect any opinions which may be held by the other members of the Tariff Commission. I am led to do this both in order that any suggestions this letter may contain may receive such consideration as you may desire to give them, and to correct any impression which may have arisen that the views expressed by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission in his personal letter to Mr. DOUGHTON of May 17, 1948, represent the views of the entire Commission.

My principal difficulty with Chairman Ryder's letter to Mr. DOUGHTON arises from the discussion in paragraph 7 as to whether H. R. 6556 will enable the Commission to render a better public service than it now performs. I do not agree that to charge the whole Tariff Commission with responsibility for giving advice to the President as to the extent to which a rate may be raised or lowered without serious injury to a domestic industry, if carried out, would be inconsistent with the Commission's present functions and obligations or damaging to its position as a bipartisan, fact-finding agency of the Government.

The Trade Agreements Act itself requires the President to seek the information and advice of the Tariff Commission prior to the negotiation of any agreement. As you know, the Commission and its staff already make available to the President and the negotiating authorities detailed information with respect to each of the products upon which changes in rates in the negotiation of a trade agreement are considered. Certainly this part of the law can reasonably be interpreted also to require that the Tariff Commission advise the President how much of a change in a rate of duty can safely be made without serious injury to American industry. The expressed views of the President and the State Department throughout the past 14 years have been to the effect that it is not proposed to make changes in rates which would seriously damage domestic producers, and that principle is clearly implied in Executive Order 9832 which resulted from the discussions last year between the President, Senator VANDENBERG, and yourself.

Obviously it would be practically unwise to proceed with negotiations without having the best judgment available on this critical subject. As a matter of fact, however, the procedure and machinery established under which advice is made available to the President and the negotiating authorities do not provide that the Tariff Commission as such shall give advice of this character to the negotiating authorities. Recommendations on this matter are made by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements on which, to be sure, a member of the Tariff Commission sits. Such advice, however, as he may give as a member of the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee is his own individual opinion and is not the result of Commission action; so far as I know, it never has been during the 14 years that the Trade Agreements Act has been in operation. The bill now before your committee corrects this situation and it is my opinion that this should be done. I feel strongly that the President and the negotiating authorities should have the advice of the whole Commission and not that alone of one or more individual members.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.
Mr. IVES. Apropos the question I raised a short time ago regarding what seemed to me to be the veto power of the Commission over action by the President, I am wondering if the able Senator from Colorado would be willing to accept an amendment at the end of line 2, on page 8 of the bill, between lines 2 and 3, consisting of this sentence:

Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission.

Also, in the following line, line 4, strike out the semicolon and insert the word "or", so that the language then will read, beginning on line 3:

No such foreign-trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President or until the expiration of the 120-day period.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be very glad to submit the amendment to our legislative counsel. I may say that generally speaking I have no objection to a limitation of that kind. It may be that 120 days will not be sufficient, because the Commission has to send notices, and persons notified have to get ready to appear before it for hearings, and there has to be time for hearings, in addition to the Commission's other background work. Generally speaking, I would accept an amendment along that line. I shall submit it to our legislative counsel. Let me suggest that we have a discussion later in the day, and I have no doubt we can agree on what should be put in.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me continue to read the letter from Mr. Gregg——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.
Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will it interrupt the Senator if I should ask a question?
Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be very glad to yield.
Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to call attention to the language of section 3 of the bill which defines the duties of the Tariff Commission. I read:

Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles.

In the committee's report, on page 4, a quotation from the testimony of Mr. Clayton is found, and at the end of the first paragraph there is this sentence:

If, however, there is any doubt in any one's mind regarding the use of the act to seriously injure American industry, this doubt should be completely dispelled—

And so forth.

I call the attention of the Senator from Colorado to the fact that there is a broad difference between the language of section 3 and the language used by Mr. Clayton. Section 3 directs the Commission to file its report with respect to injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, whereas Mr. Clayton disavows any purpose in the act seriously to injure American industry. The latter language, of course, is much more inclusive than is the language of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I respectfully suggest that it is much narrower than the language of the bill. For example, the word industry is often construed to exclude agriculture. Producers include both industry and agriculture. The word producers has been deliberately used for that purpose and is the word

which is used in the executive regulations in connection with the escape-clause procedure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not referring to the exclusion of agriculture. I was referring to the fact that when one speaks of American industry, such as the steel industry, the leather industry, or the manufacturing industry, one is speaking of the particular industry in its all-inclusive scope.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Whereas, if one refers to domestic producers, he refers to them as individuals. Is it the intention of the committee, in recommending section 3, that the Tariff Commission shall report to the President that trade agreement X, for example, if carried into effect as proposed, would result in serious injury to producers 1, 2, and 3, as individuals, instead of to the whole industry which is affected?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The intention is to relate to the class of producers producing a certain type of article, rather than to individual producers within that class.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that it is not the intention of the committee that this section should be interpreted to mean that the Tariff Commission would be obliged to report that some high-cost individual producer would be seriously affected, but it would be required to report only with respect to the entire industry. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Commission, of course, would hear or have the privilege of hearing such a high-cost member of a given class of producers, but it would not be required to base its recommendation on the facts found in that particular part of that productive business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then it is not the intention of the committee, in submitting this language, to block an agreement merely because one or two individuals in a particular industry who may chance to be inefficient or who may be high-cost producers, would be injured?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has not that intention. What the Commission finds from one or two producers may furnish evidence for that particular producing class; but, specifically, this language does not give relief to individual producers and does not require blocking an agreement because a particular producer is suffering injury.

Mr. SMITH and Mr LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield first to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. In connection with the point raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], it seems to me, that instead of saying "domestic producers" the language be "domestic production of like or similar articles." That would take care of the point the Senator from Vermont raised.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I respectfully suggest that if there is serious injury to domestic production of "like or similar articles," the same question would arise which was raised by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator, then, is distinguishing between an industry as a whole and the individual producer. I am troubled with the same question the Senator from Vermont raised, that a weak marginal producer may be protected by the language of the bill, and it seems to me we do not want to do that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What we intend to do is to allow the Commission, as it does now under existing laws, to determine whether a particular class of producers as a whole is being injured or threatened with injury. I think the bill is adequate for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH. I am not clear why the word "production" would not cover that, instead of the word "producers."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me think that over further.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that under the language the Commission would have no right to take into consideration injury or threat of injury to a producer?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think I made it very clear that in obtaining the evidence the Commission must necessarily listen to all individuals, but in making its recommendation it must translate its recommendation to the whole class. Thus an injury to a single businessman might or might not constitute a ground for affording relief for the entire class.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me respectfully suggest to the distinguished chairman of the committee that the complainant is going to be someone who is injured, and is very likely to be a high-cost producer.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is rather lengthy, but I should be delighted now to go into the way the Tariff Commission handles the matter now.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not talking about the way it does it now, I am talking about the language in the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It follows this precise language.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator can show me that it follows the precise language, I should like to see it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall do that.

Mr. LUCAS. That is one of the questions raised in the committee, as the Senator well knows, by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be very glad to do it before I have finished my discussion.

Mr. LUCAS. I undertake to say, if I may, that under the language of the bill the Tariff Commission will not necessarily be compelled to do what the Senator from Colorado suggests.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the purpose of the bill is as has been explained. The language of the bill follows the language of the Presidential escape-clause order, and the procedures of the Tariff Commission make it very clear that they do not invoke the escape clause because a single person may be injured. The point is whether the whole class of producers, the particular class of producers, is being injured or is threatened with injury.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator at all, and I contend seriously that under the language of the bill an inefficient producer of this country can be protected by the Tariff Commission if it so desires.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is quite evident that the desire and intention of the Senator from Colorado are the same, and the purposes of the legislation are the same, as are those of the Senators who have been questioning the wording of the bill. In other words, there is no conflict of purpose whatever in what we are seeking to do. It seems advisable, if it is possible, to express more clearly the intent of the legislation, in spite of the fact that that intent may be carried out properly by an existing tariff board and existing administrative agencies, because it is always possible to have a change of personnel which goes back to the act and finds a lot of loose rope of which it has not yet made use.

I am afraid that I must ask—and I ask regretfully and apologetically—that the chairman will in a very few words explain his doubts about the language suggested by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The head of the Senator from Colorado was turned the other way when he responded to the Senator from New Jersey and I did not catch his response. It was as to changing the word "producers" to "production."

Mr. MILLIKIN. My main objection is that it contemplates the whole field of production, and we are not operating here in a basis of our entire economy.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Colorado is interested, is he not, in what happens to the chain of production of any given product, those producing the raw materials, those processing them, and perhaps those distributing them? Why is not the Senator interested in the entire chain? If one link is affected, then the whole chain is affected.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am interested that there shall be no injury to our entire economy.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But the bill is focused on producer classes of our economy.

Mr. FLANDERS. But the language is "domestic producers of like or similar articles."

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. If we say "domestic production," how does it do anything more than generalize the effect, rather than give the opportunity for misinterpretation of the intention of Congress to accede to the pleas of marginal and high-cost producers?

Mr. MILLIKIN. By way of a short cut, I may say that I shall be very glad to consider the suggestion, and refer it to the legislative counsel. Let us discuss it later.

Mr. FLANDERS. Another suggestion which I think should be thrown into the boiling legislative counsel pot is threat of serious injury to representative domestic producers, those who represent the general conditions of an industry rather than marginal ones.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be glad to take that under consideration.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator for his constructive purposes.

As to the objection that the Tariff Commission will be subjected to pressure, I wish to finish my statement, and I prefer not to yield until I finish.

The bill does not authorize pressure. It authorizes public hearings. Section 3 (b) provides:

> In the course of any investigation pursuant to this section the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

The bipartisan nature of the Commission should provide a greater degree of insulation against pressure than does the Interdepartmental Committee, which may be entirely partisan. There would be no more pressure against the Tariff Commission than there would be against the panels which now hear the facts, and which, if the President desires, can continue to hear the facts.

In fact, Mr. Clayton destroyed this argument when he admitted that the Interdepartmental Committee was subject to pressure.

During the hearings, the following colloquy occurred—page 475:

> In the State Department we have been pulled and hauled by people from all sides. We have the people that make the movements and the labor unions that perform the work on one side demanding that we stop this great flow of movements from Switzerland. On the other side, we have the people who put the movements into the cases and sell the completed watch pulling and hauling, saying do not do it because you will ruin our business.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Clayton, we honor ourselves when we call you Senator.
>
> Mr. CLAYTON. Did this sound like Congress?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. May I make this little observation. You have made a "pulling and hauling" argument against the Tariff Commission, and now you admit that you are subject to all of these pullings and haulings.
>
> Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; we are. We are.

Mr. President, because of the need for conserving the time of the proponents I shall now suspend for the time being and shall develop other points during the subsequent debate.

Mr. GEORGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall not speak at length because I must leave soon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield for the purpose, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask that the time consumed in the calling of the roll be charged to the time which shall hereafter be allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Revercomb
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Capper	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tobey
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Feazel	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not intend to speak at great length. I understand from the chairman of the committee that he wishes either to offer an amendment, or to have certain amendments considered. I shall bear that in mind in what I have to say.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Before we reach the point of considering any substitute——

Mr. GEORGE. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I do not intend to offer a substitute.

Mr. President, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been before the Senate from time to time since 1934, when it was first enacted; and from the beginning I have had something to do with each successive renewal or extension of the act. I feel very much like a lawyer who is called upon to try a case after it has been reversed three or four or five times by the upper Court. However, I wish to make some observations regarding this particular proposal, and I hope they will be pertinent.

In the first place, I disclaim now, as I have disclaimed since 1934, that it was the view of those who proposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that this country should go to a completely free-trade basis. That has never been my view. It has always been my view that protection was necessary with respect to certain industries, and with respect to certain branches of agriculture.

I very well remember that in the long tariff fight of 1929 and 1930, when the Smoot-Hawley bill was enacted, the distinguished Senator Borah, of Idaho, voted against it. The distinguished Senator Norris, of Nebraska, voted against it, although they both believed in protection. I remember hearing the distinguished former Senator from Iowa, Mr. Cummins, rise in his place in the Senate and make the statement that although he was a life-long protectionist, he never had been able to vote, on final vote, for a single Republican tariff bill when it reached a vote in the Senate.

That was the situation which we faced after the 1930 tariff act. Something had to be done if we finally were to be able to extricate ourselves from the depression into which we had plunged with our tariffs. We did not want to bring a tariff bill back to the Congress for action, because we knew what that would mean. It is impossible to escape log-rolling. It is impossible to escape all the things that go with congressional consideration of a tariff bill, in a country so vast and varied, with industry so widespread. So, in 1934, we undertook to improve our trade relations with foreign countries through the Reciprocal Tariff Act.

It is well to note the real standard of that act, and compare it with the narrow obligation placed upon the Tariff Commission in the bill now presented. The language of the act is as follows:

> For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States—

I omit certain language in parentheses which is now wholly immaterial—

> by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

To negotiate new tariff rates between our country and foreign countries.

Let us take a look at the language of the bill:

> Upon receipt of such list the Commission—

Meaning the United States Tariff Commission—

> shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles.

The distinguished chairman of the committee says that does not deprive the President of his power to take the opinion of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the State Department, or any other agency of Government. So it does not, and I cheerfully concede it. But when the Tariff Commission alone is given the power to fix the upper and

the nether millstones between which the President must operate, it is much like going over the head of the umpire and asking all nine of the players on the team what they think of a given play. What they think amounts to nothing; what the umpire says is the law, and prevails.

What the Tariff Commission would do in this case would be to fix the maximum and the minimum without regard to any other consideration than the plain and explicit language of this bill, if it should pass "without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles."

It is true that under the bill the President can call on the Secretary of State; he can call on anyone on the street; he can call on all the economists in the United States; but the Tariff Commission, and the Tariff Commission alone, will say to him how high the rate shall be and how low it shall be. Within the limitations fixed, he must act, or else disregard altogether the findings of the Tariff Commission, and send his report to the Congress, and no President would ever dare take that course of action. No President would expose himself to the criticism and the virulent attack that would necessarily follow if he disregarded the solemn judgment of an agency of the Congress, to which the Congress would say, under the provisions of this bill, "You fix the maximum and the minimum limitations within which the President must act."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have such a short time available to me that, if the Senator will excuse me, I prefer not to yield now. Perhaps I can return to the point the Senator has in mind.

Mr. President, I am confident that no President would ever disregard the Tariff Commission's findings.

Then what have we when we come to the Tariff Commission provision? I do not impugn their motives, but, under the law, the Tariff Commission is composed of three Democrats and three Republicans. It is a bipartisan Commission, made up in the way I have already stated. Before the President could move to reduce any tariff duty, however high, or to obtain any other trade benefit from any other nation, under the bill, he would have to submit to the Tariff Commission the entire list of all the articles which he intended to cover. He could not move otherwise. The Tariff Commission would have to hold hearings and hear arguments. Believe me, Mr. President, those arguments would be almost interminable. I sat here in Washington through the whole of 1929 listening to the arguments, not on all the items in the Tariff Act, but on the items in two or three schedules. Only 30 days of vacation did I have during that whole year, and yet the act was not passed until the following year.

So the arguments will be long; the briefs will be long; the deliberations of the Tariff Commission will be long. Until the Tariff Commission has made its report, the President's hands will be tied.

Suppose the Tariff Commission divides 3 to 3—and it already is divided; there is no use in quibbling about that. We shall find them divided the second day after this bill is enacted. Suppose the Commission divides 3 to 3. In that case the Commission never makes a report, for in order to make a report to the President the Commission must have four of its six members in favor of the report, and until the Tariff Commission makes its report, under the language of the committee bill, the President's hands remain tied. Do you think, Mr. President, that there will be any readjustment of tariffs under those circumstances?

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was not passed as a tariff act. It is an amendment to the existing Tariff Act. It was passed because the rates had been placed so high that twenty-odd nations had retaliated against us. World trade was virtually stagnant. Perhaps the tariff was not solely or wholly to blame, but it was a powerful factor in bringing about that situation.

So we were trying by means of the Trade Agreements Act to devise a program by which the excessively high rates in our own tariffs and in the tariffs of other countries, including all kinds of trade restrictions, could be leveled down to the point where trade and commerce would again develop.

When we look at the language of the pending bill, and recognize that only the Tariff Commission is to determine whether any producer is to be injured or threatened with injury in fixing the maximum and minimum rates to which I have referred, we are bound to realize that the Tariff Commission will be going back to the organic act under which it was created. In the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act there is not a line or a word that looks to the functioning of the Tariff Commission as a Commission. The Tariff Commission of course is to be consulted by the President. The Tariff Commission, through its Chairman, is to sit on the Interdepartmental Board that finally makes its recommendations to the President. The Tariff Commission has a right to have its say-so—but along with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, and such other heads of departments as are concerned about it. The standard and the basis for Tariff Commission action as such cannot be found in the Gearhart bill; it is not there. It cannot be found in the committee bill; it is not there, except in the language I have read, namely, that in the fixing of maximum and minimum rates, they shall take care not to injure any domestic producer or threaten him with serious injury. I understand that some amendment is to be offered to that language. In my view of it, the language is material but not at all controlling.

The inquiry the Tariff Commission would make would be respecting injury to a domestic industry or branch of agriculture, the proposed language being: "Without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles." That ought to be placed in the act. But with that included, what is the standard that must control the Tariff Commission as a Commission? The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. One is driven inexorably to that act. What does it say? It says the Commission must, in making its recommendations to the President, base its findings upon the costs of production. It not only says that, but—

> If the Commission finds upon any such investigation that such conditions cannot be equalized by proceeding as hereinbefore provided, it shall so state in its report to the President and shall specify therein such ad valorem rates of duty based upon the American selling price as defined in section 402 (g) of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

To make doubly clear what the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act means in setting up the organic law under which the Tariff Commission acts, I call specific attention to section 336:

> In order to put into force and effect the policy of Congress by this act intended, the Commission (1) upon request of the President, * * * shall proceed to make investigation and a report.

This language also occurs in the section:

> The Commission shall report to the President the results of the investigation and its findings with respect to such differences in costs of production. If the Commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the differences in the costs of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the Commission shall specify * * *.

Additional duties may then be imposed.

Mr. President, if I were presenting this case to any court of law in the world I should rest confidently upon this assertion: There is no standard for the performance of the duty required of the Tariff Commission as a Commission, save in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. Of course that was not the beginning of the Tariff Commission. It had its origin prior to that. But the present organic law of the Tariff Commission is to be found in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, and in that act alone. When the Commission is called upon to find whether the producer is going to be hurt seriously, or threatened with serious injury, by the importation of some foreign commercial article, the Commission will go back to this narrow basis, the single consideration of the cost of production.

It is true the President may then call in the nine men who are playing baseball with him, and he may ask them about it, but they cannot upset that ruling; they have nothing to say on that point. It is true he may decline to act upon the Commission's recommendation, and it is true that he may overrule it, but I have already said that no President would overrule it and subject himself to the bitter, harsh criticism to which he would be subjected in a country, Mr. President, where we sometimes have both politics and differing political views.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. On the cost of production, does the Senator agree with me that the Tariff Commission, if they have to follow that rule—and I agree that

they do—would have a tremendous task on their hands, with some trade agreements containing hundreds of articles upon which the peril points should be determined?

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly. But the Tariff Commission, after the passage of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, and until 1934, made very few recommendations to the President either for increases or decreases in important duties or rates. After deliberating for a long, long time, they finally came up with a recommendation that the tariff duties on Mexican live quails should be reduced. Nothing will be done, if reliance is placed upon the Tariff Commission for the performance of the whole job. The Commission has its functions, it ought to be brought into the picture, but it ought not to be given the whole say-so in the matter.

I now invite attention, particularly of the distinguished chairman of the committee, to another matter. At Geneva on October 30, 1947, there was signed an agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade. I am not referring to the charter. Twenty-three nations, including the United States, were parties to the agreement. But not all the nations of the earth were parties, indeed six of the countries included in the western European agreement, who are recipients of our aid and assistance under ERP, if I might call it such, have no agreement with us. We are trying and are hopeful the six countries at least will come into the multilateral trade agreement negotiated at Geneva.

The distinguished chairman developed, and I suppose it is correct, that the multilateral agreement deals with some 42,000 separate articles or items. It was asserted by someone that the United States was interested in about 3,000 articles or items covered by the general agreement. Dr. Ryder, of the Tariff Commission, said his recollection or his opinion was that we had dealt with some 1,800 articles or items, but he then said those could be further broken down, he assumed, into a larger number.

Let us suppose, Mr. President, that we are successful in having Portugal or Austria or Ireland or Italy or Greece or Denmark, the six western European nations who are receiving benefits under the legislation we originally passed come into this general agreement. Let us suppose that one of those nations enters into this general agreement. What is the result? We have adopted and have followed scrupulously the policy of the most-favored-nation clause in treaties. Since we launched upon the reciprocal trade agreements program, we have striven constantly to deal with all nations upon that basis. Indeed, the very concepts of a reciprocal-trade arrangement or trade-agreement program required us to say that we would extend like treatment to all nations. The moment that Greece comes in, or, let us say that Italy adheres to this general agreement negotiated at Geneva on October 30, 1947, every single binding made by the United States, every binding on the free list, and every binding of duties at the present or existing rates, would be open to inquiry by the Federal Tariff Commission. There are literally many thousands of them, because it must be remembered that the vast majority of articles and products imported into the United States are on the free list. It must also be remembered that in literally thousands of instances in this multilateral agreement we have bound ourselves not to increase duties. Yet, all of them would be open if even little Greece came in and wanted to subscribe to this multilateral trade agreement.

The multilateral trade agreement may contain some defects. I should be greatly surprised if it did not contain some defects. But the multilateral trade agreement is the result of reciprocal tariff negotiations. It represents at least the high tide of accomplishment in that field up to that hour. I am not overstating the matter. The Tariff Commission simply would not be able to advise the President with respect to every article upon the free list or every duty continued at the existing tariff levels within the short period of time indicated in this bill and in the House bill as the desirable extension period.

Mr. President, there is, in my opinion—and I must always speak frankly—a very substantial reason why the Trade Agreements Act should not be continued for more than 1 year, and that is that during the early months of 1949 we shall be called upon to consider the International Trade Organization charter, which is a very important matter. It seems to me that the two, while not necessarily dependent upon each other, are so merged and integrated as to make consideration of the charter negotiated finally at Habana in March of this year, and the further extension of our Trade Agreements Act, a concurrent action.

I turn with all seriousness to one phase of the question, because I do not have the time to discuss as I otherwise should like to do. I turn to an act which Congress passed this year and which the President approved on April 3, 1948. We called it the ERP Act, though that is not its official title. I now read from section 102 (b) of that act:

(b) It is the purpose of this title to effectuate the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this title, by—

These are the means which we propose to adopt:

(1) Promoting industrial and agricultural production in the participating countries;

(2) Furthering the restoration or maintenance of the soundness of European currencies, budgets, and finances; and

(3) Facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade.

Looking into the body of the act, at page 17, section 115 (3), we find this is what these countries must do:

Cooperating with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among the participating countries and with other countries and cooperating to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries.

What sort of people are the people of these United States when we say we want Europe to get back on her feet, that we want to strengthen the economy of the western European nations, and when we call upon them in the explicit language of the ERP Act to lower the trade barriers between themselves and with foreign countries, and then say, "To the winds with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act," the primary purpose of which was to talk with foreign countries and see how much they would reduce tariff barriers in consideration of a reduction upon our part of rates and restrictions which those nations had found burdensome?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator has read is not a mere matter of wishful thinking. It is a requirement upon which depends the continuity of our aid to those nations. Is not that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I have been interested in the Senator's remarks, as I always am when he speaks. He referred to the ERP, commonly known as the Marshall plan, and pointed out the lack of consistency with the wording of the law if we shall pass certain phases of the pending legislation in connection with the reciprocal trade agreements extension. To get down to brass tacks, may I ask the Senator if he would agree with me that if this afternoon we pass a bill which contravenes the principles of the Marshall plan we might be construed as being similar to the Roman god Janus, facing both ways, or, to use the common language of the street, blowing hot and cold at the same time. Would that be a fair inference, in the Senator's judgment?

Mr. GEORGE. I think it would be a very fair inference. I prefer to apply the historic inquiry of Mr. Churchill when he said, with reference to the sneak attack upon us at Pearl Harbor, "What kind of people do those Japs think we are?"

Mr. TOBEY. If I may go a little further, it should be the conception of all of us here, as the instrumentalities of the people, that our prime objective, in the last analysis, is to pass legislation pro bono publico for 130,000,000 or 140,000,000 people, millions of little people, who have no lobbyists here, and who sometimes wonder whether we give a damn about them except to get their votes on election day. Such people are often terribly disillusioned by what happens. I ask, then, of the distinguished Senator, would we not be taking a step backward, a retrograde movement, if we did not maintain the law as it is for another year?

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. TOBEY. I rest my own personal feelings on that statement.

Mr. GEORGE. There are good reasons why it should not be extended over 1 year.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator realizes with me also that the Scripture is correct that where the treasure is there shall the heart be also; and he recalls doubtless an instance 2 years ago when I made an attack here on the floor on five lobbyists with round bottoms and round heads who were trying to defeat the reciprocal tariff agreements on both sides. He remembers also doubtless the time when the Smoot-Hawley bill was before the Senate that certain business interests of the State of Connecticut arranged to have one of their employees employed by the Finance Committee of the Senate, on a Government salary, to help rig up the schedules of the tariff making to please the industries of Connecticut. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not able to forget it.

Mr. TOBEY. If we are interested, and sincerely under conviction that our prime job is to serve the people, and not things, and that corporations, fine as they may be yet are subordinate to human beings, then the one purpose we should carry out this afternoon is to maintain this act as it is for 1 year more, and then meet the situation as it arises at that later time.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is absolutely correct. I agree with him entirely.

Mr. President, it is somewhat beside the question, but I cannot help recalling that in 1929 and 1930 when I was much younger and somewhat more innocent than I am today, I offered in the Senate a simple amendment to provide a consumers' counsel, a people's counsel, to sit before the Tariff Commission when the special interests went before that Commission and asked for an increase in rates. The Senate adopted the amendment, but all the protectionists in America held up their hands in holy horror, and through the press, particularly that segment of the press which believed only in protection, and without regard to how the general industry and the general economy were being affected, had so much to say about it that the conferees on the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act struck out that amendment the first thing. The only idea was to provide that somebody should sit before the Tariff Commission whose sole duty would not be to see that somebody got a higher tariff rate, but that the public interest should be protected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will also recall that he and I were both members of the Senate Committee on Finance in 1929 and 1930, and that on the floor of the Senate item after item, and almost item by item, and schedule by schedule, the Senate reduced the rates reported by the Finance Committee, but when the bill got into conference the rates were restored, by agreement of the Senate conferees.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think they omitted a single item. If they did it was an oversight.

Mr. President, I come now to what I consider the fundamental concept involved in this legislation, and to a matter which I think transcends every other thing that may be said on this occasion.

In the highly complex civilization in which we live, and in our highly industrialized Nation, the deep, underlying domestic policies which are adopted necessarily control our foreign policies. I do not think anyone can take exception to the statement that at the last, the foreign policy of every great trading and commmercial nation is controlled by the deep, underlying domestic policies which it follows.

We have fought against improper restraints of trade, we passed laws against contracts in restraint of trade, we passed antitrust laws, because we had learned, as every other greatly industrialized nation learned, that economic and political concentration within the Nation made it necessary for the Nation to adopt a domestic policy, consistent with the general welfare of all the people. In large measure the effort to prevent even combinations of labor to the injury of the public was but an expression of the same philosophy.

America's foreign policy will not be written and cannot stand upon the basis of the Atlantic Charter alone. America's foreign policy will not be written in the eloquent language of the United Nations Charter, negotiated and concluded at San Francisco. It will not be written in the magnificent efforts we in the Congress are making to relieve our people at home and people of the world around. It will be written, it will finally be controlled, by the deeply imbedded, underlying directing forces of our domestic policies.

So when we concede all that can be conceded to the bill as it passed the House, and to the committee bill, in this instance, it is a throw-back to domestic policies, which in but a short time will undermine our foreign policies.

Mr. President, let me show to the Senate what I mean. In the hearings on the bill, Mr. Holman, Secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, appeared as a witness. He was a singularly frank and well-informed witness, and I have no criticism to make of him. I propounded to him a question:

Senator GEORGE. Without arguing the question, Mr. Holman, as to whether you are right or wrong in advocating repeal, you are to be complimented on your frankness.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thank the Senator.

Senator GEORGE. In saying that you do favor straight repeal of the act you are to be complimented. You therefore favor the House bill because it moves in that direction?

Mr. HOLMAN. That is correct, sir.

That is the language of a frank advocate of the bill. He said he favored the House bill because it moved in the direction of straight repeal.

Mr. Holman was not an exception. The philosophy of all the other testimony comes down to the same thing; and in the face of what, Mr. President? Certainly Mr. Arthur Besse, who is known to at least all the wool growers and wool manufacturers of the country and perhaps of the world, an intelligent and an honorable man, said this of the effect of the Reciprocal Tariff Act and the agreements negotiated thereunder, in response to my inquiry:

Senator GEORGE. Your industry has suffered no ill effects?

Mr. BESSE. We have never claimed that.

That is the testimony of every witness, or it is the philosophy of every witness who appeared before the committee. There are anticipated injuries, it is true, but no actual injuries.

Mr. President, I must beg the pardon of the Senate for this most desultory presentation of some views here today, but I cannot dismiss from my mind the fact that a great and honorable statesman, Cordell Hull, even from his sick room must be overwhelmed by the weight of sorrow that comes to him when his contemporaries would preserve the shadow, let us say, and the form, but take away the substance of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in which he so profoundly believed. Mr. Hull, however, must, like many great leaders throughout history who have wrought mightily for their fellow men at home and the world around, calmly await, as indeed he may await, the verdict of history upon what he sought to accomplish in setting up an arrangment which would pare down and level off unreasonable trade restrictions and unreasonable duties imposed both by our country and by other countries upon world trade.

Mr. President, when we have moved away from the position of a debtor nation to the position of a creditor nation, the foremost creditor nation of all times, when we have productive capacity in these United States today equal to the combined power of all nations and all men everywhere to produce the goods and the articles and the services mankind needs, surely we do not need to go back to unreasonable trade restrictions, but we need rather to catch the vision of the honorable Cordell Hull of a movement toward somewhat more liberal trade relations and practices that would make our trade and commerce profitable not only to us, but profitable also to men everywhere.

I thank the Senators for having listened to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6716) to

authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners in fee simple of the land leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.; and

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 13, 15, 35, 41, and 42 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 238. An act for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction;

H. R. 239. An act to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey;

H. R. 945. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and cost of jurors;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis;

H. R. 2766. An act to amend section 2 of an act, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725);

H. R. 2867. An act to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rice Talbot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb;

H. R. 3007. An act for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of the estate of John Deiman;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4244. An act to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities;

H. R. 4298. An act for the relief of Henry Hill;

H. R. 4455. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4566. An act for the relief of William Nally;

H. R. 4659. An act to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States;

H. R. 4964. An act to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier;

H. R. 5036. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948;

H. R. 5272. An act relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks;

H. R. 5330. An act for the relief of W. W. DeLoach;

H. R. 5655. An act confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of Saint Martin, said claim being listed as No. B-690 in the report of the Commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing 139.62 acres;

H. R. 5820. An act to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes;

H. R. 5889. An act to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 5936. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5957. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6188. An act to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6239. An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 6246. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6289. An act to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital;

H. R. 6339. An act to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title;

H. R. 6766. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask how the division of time now stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has left under his control 60 minutes. The Senator from Georgia has left under his control 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that the Senator from Georgia is obliged to leave, I have been designated by him to be in charge of the time under his control. I now yield to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] 35 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday I indicated that my statement on this subject would require 40 minutes, and I was assured then that I would be given 40 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I yield 40 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], said that if the opponents of the measure did not have sufficient time at their disposal to yield me 40 minutes he would yield me some of the time at his disposal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia 40 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, it is no new experience for me to discuss upon the floor of the Congress the question of continuing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House I participated in the hearings and in the debate which led to extension of the act of 1937, in 1940, in 1943, and in 1945.

In the speeches I made on those occasions I dealt at length with the benefits to the United States of a program of freer world trade. I shall not attempt to cover the entire ground today because I intend to be brief and concentrate my attention on the particular bill now pending. But, if there are Senators who are interested in the background of thinking on which I base my current remarks, I can refer them especially to my statements which will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of February 4, 1937, beginning at page 853; February 19, 1940, beginning

at page 1654; February 19, 1943, on page A715 of the Appendix; May 10, 1943, beginning at page 3059; and May 22, 1945, beginning at page 4885.

I want to recall now that in the 1937 speech to which I have just referred I said there must be in the world a practical application of the doctrine of live and let live. I said that World War I had been a trade war and that although we entered it with high ideals, we allowed the seeds of future conflicts to be sowed in the Treaty of Versailles, which forcibly took colonies and sources of raw materials from one nation and gave them to another. I pointed out that our export trade was being held back by the fact that the nations of Europe were arming again and were forcing their people to economize on the necessities of life to buy more cannon and warships. I said too that even if our efforts—this was in 1937 remember—to prove to the world that it was more profitable to trade than fight, should cause our imports to temporarily exceed our exports, we would be the gainer in the long run if we could help avert another world conflict.

It is a matter of record now, of course, that we did not prevent another war. We started too late and were too restricted in our efforts to overcome the handicaps of exchange controls, quotas, clearing and paying agreements and the other devices which other nations had adopted partially at least because they resented our Smoot-Hawley tariff rates adopted in 1930.

And, I say today as I did 11 years ago, that even if our policy of trade agreements had the damaging effect on our domestic economy which opponents have claimed but have never been able to prove, we could well afford to appropriate the money to pay the injured parties as an alternative to saying to the world that we have abandoned the theory that it is better to trade than to fight.

I can repeat today also with full belief and added emphasis these statements I made in 1943: That the negotiation of mutually beneficial reciprocal-trade agreements is the soundest and most practical way of preserving international trade on a democratic basis without regimentation at home and without ill will abroad; and that if after the war, which was then in progress, we were unable to break down international barriers and enable private citizens of one country to trade with private citizens of another, the trade of the world would be handled by governments and regimentation of our economy must result.

Again in 1945 I recall that I told the House that the action the Congress took on the proposal to renew and strengthen the Trade Agreements Act would be interpreted by the world as an indication of the degree of international economic leadership that can be expected from this Nation. I spoke of the reciprocal-trade agreement program as the keystone of this country's foreign-trade policy and recalled that it had then been successful for 11 years and that other countries had known that this country was ready to work with them for trade expansion. "Failure to renew the program on an active basis," I said, "would be taken to mean that we were determined to repeat our mistakes of the 1920's."

I digress here to mention the concluding remarks on that subject by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who said that it was not what we said in the United Nations Charter, it was not what we said in the Marshall plan, but it is what we are doing today and will do in the years to come in implementing those promises that will fix and determine our foreign policy.

Once more we are faced with the question of what we shall do about this program which for 14 years has proved its usefulness.

One indication of the success of the reciprocal trade program is the fact that its opponents no longer assault it by frontal attack. We have before us a bill to extend the act. But it is significant to note that the bill came to us at the eleventh hour, on the eve of automatic expiration of the power to negotiate trade agreements.

The debates to which I previously referred took place in February or at latest in May of the years in which the act previously came up for renewal, but this time a bill is brought out in the House at the very end of May and is passed without any public hearings having been held on the bill, and after only brief and restricted hearings in executive session even on the general policy of trade agreement extension.

As the result of the hearings held by the Senate committee in the limited time at its disposal amendments have been made which, in my opinion, very materially improve the bill, but I still cannot help but regard with grave suspicion legislation which has been sponsored by those who in the past have consistently been enemies of the program which it purports to continue.

I think those of us who believe in and have advocated the expansion of mutually beneficial world trade must examine the pending bill with a critical eye and try if we can to eliminate those features which would pave the way for eventual abandonment of the program and a return to such a schedule of rates as we had in the Smoot-Hawley bill.

Let us consider, then, just what this bill would do to the program.

The major defects, as I see it, center around the way in which it proposes to alter the functions of the Tariff Commission in connection with the making of agreements.

First. If even a pretense is made of carrying on the reciprocal trade program it will entail added expense for enlarging the staff of the Tariff Commission. The Commission has said it is not adequately staffed to carry on functions already assigned to it, and it is absurd to assume that it could begin to do the job of making detailed studies of possible effects of tariff changes required by this bill without additional personnel.

It may be said that the additional appropriation of from $500,000 to $1,000,000 that would be needed to give the Commission the staff it says it would require is not large, considering the importance of the program. But the significant thing is that the bill contains no provision for any such expansion. Could this be an oversight, or is there a willingness on the part of the sponsors of the measure to give the Tariff Commission an impossible task in trying to carry out the provisions of the bill in a reasonable manner?

Second. It will lead to endless delays in arriving at any agreement. Under the existing law a trade agreement can be made on the basis of a reasonable supposition that it will be beneficial, and if it should prove damaging, relief can be given through an escape clause. Under the pending bill, the Tariff Commission would be required to satisfy itself in advance that no serious injury to an industry would be threatened. Naturally the Commission would not be willing to make such a theoretical decision without protecting itself by elaborate studies, including comparisons of costs of production in this and other countries.

In the past the Commission has taken from 2 to 4 years to find the cost of production of an article in the United States alone, without even considering foreign costs, and often cost factors have materially changed in less than 2 years, to say nothing of 4.

It seems evident that sponsors of the bill expect factual studies to be made by the Commission to determine production costs. But if this were done for each and every item considered for inclusion in a trade agreement there would be interminable delay involving thousands of man-hours in fruitless searching for the unattainable.

Consider, for example, the agreement which was negotiated with the United Kingdom in 1939. They gave us concessions on approximately 1,400 items and we gave the United Kingdom concessions on between 500 and 600 items. If our Tariff Commission had to ascertain here and in Great Britain the relative cost of production of these 500 or 600 items of competitive imports, it would take many years to do the job; and, of course, the results would be outdated long before that time had passed.

Consider then the impossible task of making the same studies of all the competitive-items among the 45,000 covered by the agreements with 22 nations negotiated last year at Geneva.

Moreover, the outstanding tariff experts of the country are almost unanimous in their criticism of the cost formula as the sole criteria for tariff rate making.

That was one of the major points made by the preceding speaker, the distinguished Senator from Georgia—that the bill limits the consideration to comparative costs and to the cost formula alone.

Some of the difficulties involved are alluded to in a letter written by the present Chairman of the Tariff Commission to Representative DOUGHTON on May 17, 1948, in which he said:

> Cost studies are, as a practical matter, of somewhat limited usefulness in tariff making, not only because of the time required to make such studies but also because of the character of the decisions which have to be made in resolving the complex questions which arise regarding the comparability of the domestic and imported products, the allocation of general and overhead costs to particular joint products or byproducts, the method of averaging costs

of different producers, the appropriate markets to which to compute costs of transportation and other matters.

Yet, if the sponsors of the pending bill do not refer to this kind of study, they must be content with the kind of fact-finding carried on by the Commission in connection with the reciprocal trade agreements program during the past 14 years. If that is true the net effect of this portion of the bill would be to shift the policy-making responsibility from the administration to the Commission, a thoroughly unsound procedure.

Third. Because of the inherent difficulties of the tasks which the bill would assign to the Tariff Commission, the result is almost sure to be nullification of the program, unless the time limit is extended by more than a year. The 1-year extension will not allow time to get anything done, and the prospects for success in arriving at agreements will be so discouraging that little progress will be made toward any future negotiations. Other nations will be reluctant to deal with us while our attitude remains so uncertain.

Fourth. The Tariff Commission, as a bipartisan body of men serving limited terms, will be hopelessly handicapped by the pressures to which the Commission and its staff will be subjected. To expect a bipartisan agency with equal representation on both sides to arrive at policy decisions is to manifest a lack of understanding of the nature of the questions under discussion. With a membership of six—three Republicans and three Democrats—it is little short of naive to expect that on the controversial questions of real importance, anything other than an evenly split report can be expected. Such split reports can be extremely valuable in guiding the Congress and the President in arriving at policy judgments by pointing up the issues. The bipartisan mechanism has been highly useful in assuring that the fact-finding work of the Commission's staff is kept objective and free of partisan or doctrinal bias. But an evenly divided Commission can hardly be expected to arrive at the policy judgments itself. To expect that it could is to confuse the science of fact finding with the art of politics. The net effect of this change, therefore, would be to block effective action.

If this bill really is intended to provide a workable mechanism, and is not merely a device for forestalling action, it would be well to reorganize the Tariff Commission so as to provide for an odd, rather than an even, number of Commissioners. Evenly split bodies are intended to insure impartiality in fact finding, but they are not efficient in reaching decisions on controversial subjects. On the other hand, with three or five Commissioners, there would be greater assurance that some sort of recommendation would be made.

To expect the Tariff Commissioners to display imagination in the setting of liberal levels would be to ignore the realities of the situation. Tariff Commissioners are appointed by the President, with the approval of the Senate, for 6-year terms, at a salary of $10,000 a year. To expect bold policy leadership under such an arrangement is excessively optimistic, to say the least.

If the Tariff Commissioners are interested in holding on to their jobs, they will play safe. If bold leadership is wanted via this route, the Tariff Commissioners would have to have higher rank than they now have. They would have to have something approaching life tenure and salaries commensurate with their responsibilities. They would, in other words, have to be more like the Supreme Court in stature and security. There have been a number of competent men among past and present Tariff Commissioners; but, with few exceptions, they have shone as technicians, rather than as policy makers. Men who are fearless when it comes to sticking to the facts are naturally inclined to be unduly conservative and cautious when it comes to action.

The Tariff Commission has been able to survive and to grow in usefulness in the years since its establishment in 1916, largely because it has been kept out of the political limelight. Tariff making is highly charged with politics. All sorts of pressure groups are ever ready to go the full way in getting what they are after for their own interests. They stop at nothing. To plunge the Tariff Commission into the arena of actual rate determination would, therefore, bring to bear on the Tariff Commission and its staff unbelievably strong group pressures. Lobbyists would swarm its halls and endeavor to influence the findings of the staff. Indeed, the net effect of this bill might well be not to "take the tariff out of politics" but to "put the Tariff Commission into politics."

The Tariff Commission has been and is a valuable institution. Why should the Congress, after all these years, deliberately plunge it into politics Why should we lose its impartial fact-finding services and gain nothing in its stead?

The views of the present Chairman of the Tariff Commission along these lines were expressed in the letter addressed to the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative DOUGHTON, to which I previously referred:

> The Commission was established in 1916 in order that the Congress and the Executive might have a reliable source of objective information on tariff matters, information which could be accepted as authentic by all sides in any tariff controversy. Thus, from the very beginning its primary function has been to find the facts, leaving policy decisions to the Congress and the President. I doubt the advisability of transforming the Commission into a policy-making agency and thus subjecting it, more than in the past, to political vicissitudes.
>
> My fear is that the attempt to determine the degree to which duties may be reduced without injury to domestic producers or impairment of the national defense would require the making of such difficult and fundamental judgments that the Commission would, in effect, be making major policy decisions. The element of judgment, of course, enters into the various phases of the Commission's present work. This is especially true of the duties which have been assigned to it under the escape clause in trade agreements. In cases under that clause, however, its findings as to whether serious injury to domestic producers has occurred or is threatened will be based upon actual observation of imports and domestic production after the trade agreement concession in question has come into force. In contrast, the findings required under H. R. 6556 would have to be based to a large extent, especially under present abnormal conditions, on assumptions and estimates as to future probabilities.

Mr. President, efficient administration also will be damaged by the provision in this bill requiring the President to submit to Congress detailed accounts of his disagreements with a Commission which he appoints.

Even though provision for congressional veto power has been omitted from this bill, this will tend to bring agreements even more into the field of party politics and to increase the vulnerability of the Commissioners.

Fifth. The talents of the Tariff Commission members will be wasted by keeping them from participating in the making of agreements. Under this bill they will be limited to rate-fixing functions, and will no longer have a share in the bargaining revolving around these rates.

Sixth. At the same time, other agencies of the Government will be deprived of a vote in the determination of rates in fields where their knowledge is greater than that of the Tariff Commission; and this, too, represents a net loss. Consider, for example, the value of having the Department of Agriculture help to decide on agricultural rates, and of having the National Defense Department participate in decisions involving security matters.

Some of the most successful negotiating that has been done here and abroad in behalf of the United States in the past 14 years has been by members of the Tariff Commission and its staff. To deny these services to the administration in such an important task does not make sense, nor does it make sense to substitute the Tariff Commission, or any other single agency, for the interdepartmental machinery, when it comes to recommending changes in tariff rates.

There is no simple formula for determining scientifically and nonpolitically what any tariff rate should be. The setting of tariff rates is political business because it has to do with economic imponderables that happen to have strong political flavor.

One of the virtues of the reciprocal trade agreements machinery, as it has evolved during these past 14 years, is that it has been interdepartmental. All points of view—those of agriculture, industry, labor, consumers, and the Military Establishment—have had a chance not only to be heard but also to vote on decisions. The result is balanced judgment, as close to nonpolitical as can reasonably be expected. The Gearhart bill would do away with all of this, and would substitute the Tariff Commission as the sole agency to make the factual studies, to hold the public hearings, and to make recommendations to the President.

The effect would be to set the Tariff Commission apart from the other Government agencies, and to destroy the interagency teamwork that has been so large a factor in the success of the trade-agreements program to date. Maybe

that is one of the reasons why the proponents of the bill are so anxious to see it passed.

Another major defect is that the bill does not specify any time limit within which the Tariff Commission is to make its report to the President.

I already have called attention to the fact that the Commission is evenly divided between the two parties, and that, therefore, deadlocks on controversial items are to be expected. What is to happen when such a deadlock occurs and continues indefinitely? Under the bill as it now stands, there is no way in which the President can act until he has received a positive recommendation from the Commission, so presumably no cut could hereafter be made on any controversial item.

If the bill is to become law, we should at least insert a provision to the effect that the Commission would have to make its report to the President within a specified period of time—say 6 months, or the 4 months as proposed by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] this morning.

But let us now look at the bill in its broader aspects and see what effect it will have aside from the direct damage it will do to the operation of the reciprocal-trade program.

First, it will seriously damage if it does not lead to the end of a program which has been an important instrument of foreign policy.

We will be in a poor position to bargain with representatives of other nations which know that the Congress has refused to extend the act for more than a year and that at the end of the year it may be abandoned.

In this connection we should not overlook the statement of Secretary of State Marshall when he told the Ways and Means Committee:

> Any serious weakening of the Trade Agreements Act at this critical period in world affairs would almost certainly be regarded by other countries not only as a surrender of our leadership in the international economic field, but as a repudiation of much that has been accomplished under our leadership in that field.

As General Marshall has indicated, taking a step toward abandoning our reciprocal-trade program—and that is what passage of the bill in its present form represents—would sabotage our program of international cooperation, turn the European recovery program into little more than a relief program by discouraging the trade on which permanent recovery must depend, and would practically junk the International Trade Organization, which we have sponsored.

We must not forget that removing the barriers to international trade is a basic objective and a contractual obligation in the European recovery program. Without the authority to negotiate trade agreements, and to participate in orderly adjustment of commercial conflicts, the United States would be in the position of demanding of participants in the ERP obligations which we ourselves are unable to fulfill.

In these days of world crisis and cold war the United States needs vision. By its courageous action in enacting the ERP legislation the Congress showed that it can accept world economic leadership, even when it costs billions of dollars and might entail difficulties in the domestic economy.

We are now called upon to match that vision with a still longer-run vision.

The very philosophy of the European recovery program is that European countries should recover their economic strength and once again get their industries and agriculture back into production.

The European countries do not want to continue to live on international hand-outs. They want to become self-supporting as rapidly as is humanly possible. But, in order to do so, they need American goods and equipment; and the only way they can pay for such materials is to have markets for their goods—markets, that is, which will yield them dollars.

There is only one place in the world where United States dollars can be made available and that is the United States. But, unless we continue giving the dollars away we shall have to give them in exchange for something—for goods. Some of these goods are bound to be competitive with the products of American industry and agriculture—unless we are going to consume, in far larger quantities, bananas, coffee, and other products not now dutiable, than we have ever consumed before. I fear if we are to rely upon such imports to provide the dollars necessary to enable the multilateral trading system to return we shall have to require a daily consumption of bananas to a degree that will have alarming gastronomical implications.

The United States has just taken the leadership in proposing a world charter for international trade which, notwithstanding its shortcomings, does point toward the return of a world multilateral trading system. Even my Republican colleagues are in general agreement that should be a principal objective of our foreign commercial policy.

Next year the ITO charter is to come up for congressional ratification. Essential to it is the commitment that each signatory nation shall endeavor to reduce its trade barriers through negotiation. If we now abandon the Trade Agreements Program Act, after having taken the lead in drawing up the Charter, where does that leave us in the eyes of the world, particularly that part of the world that does not understand our congressional system with its checks and balances?

It is probably true that for the next few years not much use will be made of the power to reduce duties any further. But, that is no reason for playing into the hands of those who are anxious to discredit this country. The direction in which the United States has been moving is clear. Let us not change that direction so materially that it will arouse suspicion on the part of other countries to whom it is so important that we show that the American brand of democracy can work. Let the opposition not, in its enthusiasm to undo what has been accomplished since 1933, undo the larger accomplishments we have already achieved, and hope still to achieve in the months that lie ahead, in the game of international politics. Nothing would please the Moscow propaganda machine more, right now, than to be able to point to a reversal on the part of the United States of its economic foreign policy and to tell the peoples of western Europe and Latin America, "We told you so."

But it is not only because of the international implications that abandoning our liberal foreign trade program would do damage the bill would give the Tariff Commission a veto power in the interests of particular domestic producers over United States trade concessions, regardless of the national welfare.

Under our present system, a diversified group of advisers to the President balances the claims of all groups and recommends what it regards as in the national interest. It considers the farmer as well as the manufacturer; it considers national security as well as private profits. It considers the consumer as well as the producer.

In contrast, under this bill, the Tariff Commission must make decisions based simply on the question of whether a reduction might cause, or even threaten to cause, serious injury to some particular producer or class of producers, and that criterion alone overrules all others.

If the stagnation and eventual abandonment of the program and return to high tariff rates for which this bill would pave the way is allowed to occur, it means that for the benefit of a few producers who may happen to be in an unfavorable position the United States, with half the world's productive capacity and an efficiency that gives us a unit cost lower than any other nation on most items, will force restriction of output on our most efficient producers who need export markets. That means denial to our people of the higher standard of living they might enjoy by fair exchange for the products of other nations, and a reduction in domestic employment.

This is not the attitude that should be taken. The Reciprocal Trade Act should be extended for a length of time that will not suggest to the world that we are on the verge of abandoning it. And the law should not be undercut with unworkable provisions.

It is time for us in the American Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—to rise above political partisanship.

The bipartisan foreign policy of which we have a right to be proud is a fine thing, but it will prove to be hollow mockery if it is not implemented by a genuine bipartisan economic foreign policy geared to the long-run self-interest of the entire Nation. Cooperation in the formation of a host of international organizations—laudable though their objectives may sound in the abstract—will prove to be but an empty gesture if the United States, the only solvent democratic nation in the world today, shrinks back into the shell of economic self-containment.

Many of our wartime allies are on the verge of economic disaster. Without help from us they are in grave danger of toppling over the brink of totalitarianism—either of the right or of the left. With help from us there is at least a

fighting chance they will stiffen their resistance to totalitarian pressures. Hungry men, in the despair of economic depression, are more likely to succumb to the charms of dictators than are freemen who can, without denying bread to their children, maintain the dignity of liberty and the preservation of democratic processes.

It is fantastic to conceive of the United States supporting the democratic world on a WPA basis. To pursue that route would be to sap the vitality of our own economy. The only sane way out is to help these people to help themselves—to assist them along the long, slow road of economic reconstruction. In the short run that means loans and technical assistance, which we have agreed to provide through the European recovery program. But in the long run it means a willingness on our part, as the world's only important creditor nation, to accept their goods in payment of our loans.

That is why the reciprocal trade agreements program is so important. For it is a demonstrated and practical means of stimulating international trade. If we actually are willing to lower our tariff barriers sufficiently to permit our debtors to repay us, is it unreasonable to expect that they, in turn, will be willing to abandon the numerous discriminatory devices—state trading, quotas, bilateral preferences, and so on—to which they have resorted to balance their own international accounts in the face of their inability to generate exports.

If, however, the United States persists in paying lip service to the ideal of multilateral trade, while practicing restrictionism against the leading exports of the debtor countries, there is but slight chance that those countries will be able to keep from moving toward dictatorship.

Former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, to whom the reciprocity program owes so much, stated the case well when he said in his statement recommending extension of the act this year:

> Today our Nation and all nations need more than ever before to cooperate wholeheartedly in establishing, in as large an area of the world as possible, the conditions of political liberty, economic progress, and enduring peace. The attainment of these conditions of civilized life especially requires that the peoples of the world have an opportunity to trade with one another to their mutual benefit and with a minimum of stultifying restrictions. The trade-agreements program provides the most effective framework for the realization of that opportunity. The continued existence of the program is indispensable if our Nation and all nations are to look confidently to a brighter future.

Winston Churchill and Cordell Hull are the two greatest living statesmen of the world. We applaud the remarkable foresight of Mr. Churchill, as recounted in his current memoirs, in evaluating steps that would lead either to or from war. We applaud the remarkable skill with which Cordell Hull handled our foreign affairs for 12 critical years, and deplore the instances in which his advice was ignored.

Mr. Churchill is taxing his failing strength in an effort to establish a union of democracies in Europe in which extreme nationalism and disastrous trade restrictions will give place to a spirit of cooperation and freer trade both in Europe and throughout the world. From a sickbed in a local hospital, Cordell Hull sends us the plea I have just read for international cooperation and freer world trade as a basis for an enduring peace. Yet, many Members of this distinguished body are planning, when the vote comes on an amendment to continue unchanged for another 3 years the Hull good-neighbor and mutually beneficial trade program, to vote that down and then vote for the pending bill which will nullify the efforts of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Hull to prevent a third world war.

I earnestly express the hope that this legislative body, which has the power to influence the trend of world affairs, will be persuaded to show the world that we are not about to renege upon our program of international cooperation as expressed in the Atlantic Charter, the Charter of United Nations, and legislation recently passed to implement the Marshall plan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am sure I do not need to make it plain that when I endorse the pending measure, I do not believe I am, in the first place, violating our bipartisan foreign policy; in the second place, that I am undercutting our foreign-aid program; or, in the third place, that I am veering back toward an economic isolationism in which I do not believe. I am bound to say, with great candor, that I think arguments trying to impute these results to the pending proposal are what I believe lawyers call irrelevant, incompetent, and immaterial.

Mr. President, when this bill came from the House, I issued the following statement, which I wish to read into the RECORD:

> The reciprocal trade agreement principle should be preserved unweakened. It is indispensable in today's world. This rules out any congressional veto on tariff rates. I shall not support this feature of the House bill.
>
> But it does not rule out legitimate procedural precautions to prevent excessive tariff reductions which threaten domestic industry and labor. I favor the practical use of the United States Tariff Commission to set the safety limits within which the President may freely negotiate. This is in the House bill. But if the President finds it is in the national interest to negotiate beyond these limits, it is sufficient restraint to require him to publish the Tariff Commission recommendations with his disclosure of their breach. This was recommended 1 year ago by Senator MILLIKIN and me in connection with the Executive order issued at that time.
>
> The length of extension of the act is of no great consequence. There are no more agreements to be presently negotiated. International trade practices are in constant flux and our attitudes must be responsively resilient. Since the character of the act will always depend upon administrative judgments, the real decisions will be made after the next elections. I prefer an extension of 3, or at least 2 years for the sake of underscoring what is now an indispensable principle in healthy trade for us and our customers. But the time of the extension is largely academic under existing circumstances.

Mr. President, the pending proposal substantially meets the specifications set down in this statement. I shall support the proposal without any fear that it injures the reciprocal trade agreements principle in the slightest degree. On the contrary, I think the proposal strengthens the principle by eliminating some of the complaints against it.

There is nothing incompatible between fidelity to the reciprocity principle and fidelity to legitimate, minimum tariff protections for American industry, agriculture, and labor where reasonably required. There is nothing inconsistent in supporting procedures which protect both of these objectives. On the contrary, the reciprocal trade agreements principle is actually strengthened if domestic opposition to it is sharply reduced by procedural improvements which meet criticisms and remove fears without impairing essential Executive authority to make tariff bargains pursuant to the congressional act which we here extend.

In my opinion this is precisely what the pending proposal does, and, with great respect, I think the State Department's stubborn view to the contrary is unfortunate for the sake of the cause.

The only innovation in the pending proposal is to require the United States Tariff Commission to advise the President of peril points below which a tariff negotiation cannot go in respect to the commodities involved, without threatening serious domestic damage; and then, if the President still thinks it is in the public welfare to go still lower, to require him to report the facts to Congress.

The President is not bound by the peril points set by the Tariff Commission. He is just as free as he is today to negotiate the full 50 percent tariff reduction authorized by law if it be his judgment that other considerations in the public interest are persuasive. His sole restraint, if any, lies in the requirement to report to the Congress from which he gets these delegated bargaining powers. I submit that this becomes a restraint only in the event of a reckless or capricious use of his bargaining power which would make such a report embarrassing. The American domestic economy has a right to some element of at least indirect protection under such circumstances. If it is to have any at all, it could not have less than is here proposed.

If this formula gave the Tariff Commission the final authority—making it superior in power to the President—I would not support it. I would agree that it would impair the act. I would agree that it would be a bad thing thus to rest international trade reciprocity exclusively on Tariff Commission mathematics or attitudes. But it does nothing of the sort. The President would remain a free agent, as in the act that has just expired.

If this formula gave Congress the last word in respect to rates, I would not support it. Tariff rate-making in Congress is an atrocity. It lacks any element of economic science or validity. I suspect the 10 Members of the Senate, including myself, who struggle through the 11 months that it took to write the last congressional Tariff Act, would join

me in resigning before they would be willing to tackle another general congressional Tariff revision. But the pending formula does not bring reciprocal rates back to Congress for action. It merely brings them back, under occasional extraordinary circumstances for information.

I would not want to think the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has to be afraid of congressional knowledge as to what goes on within its jurisdiction, although I must confess, Mr. President, that I have been shocked, in the courts of today's debate, to hear the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance assert that his committee was denied access to the hearings of the Interdepartmental Committee, upon whose recommendations the recent Geneva tariff agreements were written. If we have reached a point where Congress not only cannot ask for information, but is denied existing official information upon which final action is taken, the time certainly has come to look around for some new light-letting device. We cannot proceed indefinitely with our economy at the mercy of an iron curtain.

There is nothing novel or sinister in using the Tariff Commission for the precise purpose for which it was created. Turn to page 726 in your current Congressional Directory and you will find, in the official definition of its duties, that the first job for which it was created was "to fill the long-felt need for an independent organization to supply factual information"—to whom?—"to the President and the Congress." That is the function which this pending proposal seeks to have it exercise. I am sure no President will find himself handicapped by such advice.

I happen to be one of those, Mr. President, who believes the reciprocal trade agreements practice is very necessary in this postwar world. There are many among us, however, who feel otherwise. I know that my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, among others, has serious misgivings on this score in many aspects. When they are willing to seek a meeting of minds on such a basis as is here proposed, which leaves the reciprocity principle intact, I think they themselves deserve reciprocal cooperation from the friends of the act. I think they deserve this consideration because except as we can find a meeting of minds there will be no legislation upon this subject at the present session; and I do not prefer to contemplate that alternative.

If it be argued that this consultation of the Tariff Commission will complicate and delay the bargaining process, I reply that I think the Commission can function just as expeditiously as can the interdepartmental committees, which are presumed to be part of the existing process under the old law. Furthermore, there are few—if any—new agreements to be negotiated in the immediate future; and this is the best possible time to experiment with a device which has no other purpose than to underscore the fact that, though our interest in foreign trade is great, there comes a competitive point where we dare not ignore the domestic preservation of our wage scales, our industrial and agricultural production, and our markets here at home.

The only thing in the text of the proposal as reported which has given me any concern is the fact that the Tariff Commission, by a failure to act expeditiously, might operate, in the net effect, as a sort of veto upon the free use of Presidential authority.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We have agreed to accept an amendment which will put a time limit on the proceedings of the Tariff Commission respecting any trade agreement whatever.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for that statement. I was about to observe that when the able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] made his proposal along this line an hour or two ago, I thought he was closing one of the two possibly legitimate avenues of argument against the pending proposal.

The other thing which has given me some concern was the question raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] respecting the possibility of a narrow application of the needs clause to marginal producers. Here, again, I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Finance is prepared to accept an amendment which removes the possibility of this difficulty, and asserts the application of the needs clause to the major factors in a given industry or agricultural situation, and does not put the negotiations at the mercy exclusively of the marginal producer.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Language has been agreed upon between the legislative counsel, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is also interested in the matter, which covers the point to their satisfaction, and to the satisfaction of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I am glad the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York raised these two points, and I think that with satisfactory and adequate answers to these two suggestions, the pending proposal is "bombproof" in its right to the affirmative vote of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Because of his preeminence in the field of foreign relations, and because of the great ability of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, his opinion carries, with me, a great deal of weight. I have been among those, of whom I know there are many, who have thought that a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form is most advisable. However, the course of the debate today, the presentation by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, and now the presentation by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, have convinced me that such an extension probably would be unwise.

Therefore, I desire to ask the Senator from Michigan a very simple question. Does he think definitely that a 1-year extension, in the form of the bill now before the Senate, amended, as I hope it will be—including my own amendments—before it reaches a final vote in the Senate, is the proper course to take, and is better than a 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its existing form?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do; and I shall proceed to give the Senator my reasons why I think it is advisable to proceed with a 1-year extension at the present time.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first place, the very fact that we are about to experiment in good faith with a new device to protect the procedural integrity of the reciprocal trade process suggests to me that it is highly desirable that that experiment should occur in a short period of tenure for the act, so that if we unwittingly do any harm—and I am perfectly sure we will not—we shall not have to wait very long to overtake it. But fundamentally I think the able Senator from Colorado earlier today presented an utterly invincible reason why it is almost impossible for the Congress intelligently to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act beyond 1 year at the present time, and I shall undertake to underscore the logic of my able friend from Colorado on that point.

Mr. President, I doubt whether Members of the Senate fully appreciate the amazing extent of the so-called prospective ITO—the International Trade Organization—which, after many, many months of preliminary effort, finally crystalized in the Charter for the ITO, which was adopted at Habana on March 24, 1948.

The ITO Charter is almost as important in its scope and economic application as the Charter of the United Nations is in the field of collective security. It is fully as comprehensive as the United Nations Charter in many of its aspects. It has been built largely as the result of the same type of evolution which the United Nations Charter had. It was born originally back in 1945 when the State Department published its preliminary memoranda on the subject. It was developed subsequently as the result of a resolution of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It finally came to fruition in the conference at Habana which met from November 21, 1947, until March 24, 1948.

I undertake to assert, Mr. President, that the ITO Charter encompasses all the fundamentals in respect to international trade which are involved in our reciprocal trade agreements, and infinitely more.

I call to the attention of Senators, because I think they should be intimately familiar with the fact, that when we talk about the ITO we are not talking about any casual experiment in international economy. We are talking about a fundamental reorganization of the economy

of the earth. I want to be sure Senators understand that fact, so I call their attention to a publication of the Department of State entitled "The United States Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program and the Proposed Trade Organization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind the Senator from Michigan that his time has almost expired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield further time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall conclude very briefly. I want Senators to understand that this document issued by the State Department outlines the ITO prospectus as involving the following undertakings:

1. Maintain productive employment and buying power within their own borders as a means of stimulating trade and to do so without injury to each other's economies.
2. Encourage private and public international investment by subscribing to a code of principles and to recognize the need for economic development in less-developed areas of the world.
3. Negotiate for the reduction of all types of trade barriers.
4. Eliminate discrimination in international trade except under certain limited circumstances.
5. Conduct international trade between private enterprise and public enterprise according to principles of nondiscrimination and fair dealing.
6. Curb and regulate within their own jurisdiction monopoly operations which limit production, set prices, allocate markets, or otherwise restrain and minimize the production, distribution, and consumption of goods.
7. Accept a code of principles to govern the formation and operation of intergovernmental commodity agreements.

In a word, Mr. President, the ITO Charter is all-encompassing and utterly fundamental in respect to the entire structure of international trade. It cannot reach the Congress for its consideration until next spring. I respectfully submit that the question of integrating our reciprocal trade agreement practices into the prospective structure of the ITO, if it should be the judgment of Congress ultimately to join the ITO, reduces to an axiom the proposition that action here on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at the present time should be limited to 1 year.

I say this in conclusion, Mr. President: The way permanently to stabilize the reciprocal trade agreements principle in our export-import economy is not to deny all honest efforts to meet legitimate misgivings regarding its possible hazards; but, rather, to seek in good faith an improved formula which can permanently unite the country behind it.

The last word on the subject was not written when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was framed. It is not untouchable in its prudence and its wisdom. The President himself acknowledged this fact when he issued an Executive order 1 year ago making escape-clause changes in the formula. The President has no monopoly upon these efforts to improve the formula. Congress is constitutionally responsible for tariffs, and it can and should join in all these sympathetic efforts to make the reciprocal formula so right that it will become the accepted, standard practice in our economy and immune to attempts at future nullification.

I happen to be one of those who has come to believe that the reciprocal formula is indispensable to our economy in this postwar world. I shall never support any effort to tear it down. But neither shall I ever take the untenable position that it cannot be improved. In the name of its improvement—and without the slightest danger of undermining its validity—I think the proposed experiment is well worth while from the standpoint of its friends.

Every essential reciprocal power is preserved. The only change may well prove, by experience, to have successfully removed a large area of opposition while creating a better formula better to serve the total necessities involved. If this is the pending situation, and I believe it is, the pending extension proposal should pass.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the distinguished President pro tempore in his attempted justification of the committee amendments, and especially to the first part of his speech, wherein he discussed many points that those opposing the amendment have made, which he said the lawyers would call irrelevant.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] today made one of the outstanding speeches of his career on reciprocal trade agreements. He has lived with tariff and trade questions throughout his career in the Senate. He raised all those so-called irrelevant points to which the Senator from Michigan referred, and when it comes to accepting the definition of what is "relevant" and what is not upon reciprocal trade agreements I would rather stay with the Senator from Georgia on that question.

With respect to the question of the President being able to disregard the advice of the Tariff Commission, certainly he has that power, as the distinguished Senator has said, but, as was ably pointed out by the Senator from Georgia, what President of the United States would dare, in a democracy such as ours, to override the Tariff Commission created by the Congress, after it had studied for weeks and for months and possibly for years and submitted its findings with respect to the crucial minimum-maximum peril points involved in trade agreements. I undertake to say that if the distinguished Senator from Michigan should ever to be sitting in the White House he would hesitate and pause before he would override what the Tariff Commission advised him to do under a straight and strict mandate laid down by the Congress of the United States.

Something has been said about a meeting of the minds. Everyone would like to see a meeting of the minds upon this proposition, Mr. President, but for the last 13 years the same group of individuals who are now trying to kill the reciprocal trade program has been fighting reciprocity from the standpoint of international trade and amity through trade agreements.

Every member of the Finance Committee with the exception of the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has voted consistently against extension of these trade agreements when they came up from time to time. Their basic philosophy is entirely different from the philosophy of those who believe in the reciprocal trade agreements. The concept of high tariff is involved in this amendment, notwithstanding the opinion of the Senator from Michigan to the contrary. Let anyone who thinks it is not read the records and the speeches of those who in the past have consistently condemned and attempted to crucify the reciprocal trade agreements, both in the House and in the Senate.

What did Representative GEARHART say about this amendment? He said:

> It is swell. I got 95 percent of what I offered and it was passed in the House of Representatives. The only thing that was eliminated was the veto power of the Congress of the United States over the President's decision on trade treaties.

Mr. President, a meeting of the minds on these trade pacts would be helpful and constructive at this juncture in national and international affairs. We have it on one phase of the foreign policy of this country; but I must most emphatically disagree with the Senator from Michigan when he says that this has nothing particularly to do with our bipartisan foreign policy. I undertake to say that this is the other half of the Marshall plan. The same principle was written into the Marshall plan, as the able Senator from Georgia pointed out when he read the words that the Congress wrote into that legislation, telling the countries of Europe what they had to do in the way of cooperation, in the way of eliminating trade barriers, in the way of trading with one another, in the way of lowering their tariffs—the very thing that has been accomplished under the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. President, this program is most vital to the bipartisan foreign policy of this country. The bill before us is indefensible and wholly unjustifiable. That is especially true in view of the fact that every witness who appeared before the Finance Committee told us that his industry was receiving no injury or threatened injury, and that it had received no injury for 13 years under the reciprocal trade agreements program. I cross-examined practically every witness. The record will show that not a single witness testified to injury. Representatives of the wool industry and the high-tariff advocates who fought this program from the beginning came before us and testified. All testified against the State Department. All were feuding with Will Clayton. But when they were asked, "How has the wool industry been injured?" or "How has the china industry been injured?" they had to admit that no injury has been done under the reciprocal trade agreements program. Dr. Martin, of the china group, who made a devastating speech against Will Clayton, and nothing else, had to admit that in 1947 his industry made more

money under the reciprocal trade agreements program than at any other period in its history.

Mr. President, what is all the shooting about? Where is the injury? Where is the threatened injury? Let the Senator from Michigan point it out. Let the Senator from Colorado point out who is threatened, and where the injury is.

Ah, Mr. President, the shooting is over the basic philosophy involved in the Hull trade programs. The same interests to whom I have referred are getting their nose under the tent through this amendment, and their purpose is the ultimate destruction of the trade program. We shall not have any trade program if this amendment goes through. That is exactly what some interests want. We might as well not have any program as to take this amendment as it is.

Who supports the renewal of this program without any crippling amendments? Let me read them: United Textile Workers of America; United States Associates of the International Chamber of Commerce; Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace; American Chamber of Commerce in France—that was the American Chamber of Commerce meeting in France in April 1948—National Peace Conference; Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade; National Women's Trade Union League; National Foreign Trade Council; American Farm Bureau Federation; National Farmers' Union; Importers' Association of Chicago; Customs Brokers and Forwarders' Association; Small Business Advisory Committee, and many, many other groups in this country are supporters of the reciprocal trade program.

The only individuals who testified before our committee who were against it were: Dr. Robert F. Martin, executive secretary of the Vitrified China Association, and Arthur Besse, of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, who advocated the passage of House bill 6566, and was frank enough to say that he wanted all this legislation repealed, and wanted to return to the good old days; Charles Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, who testified definitely—and the Senator from Michigan should have read his testimony—that this bill points in the direction of the good old logrolling days of the Smoot-Hawley tariff, and he was glad that it did; Mr. H. Wickliffe Rose, representing the American Tariff League of New York, a group of extreme protectionists who all these years have had headquarters managed, operated, and financed by the special interests of this country who have continuously and constantly challenged and threatened the reciprocal trade program, and who are now doing so, also testified against the program. There were a few others, but not one reported an injury to the industry.

The Trade Agreements Act sponsored and developed by Cordell Hull has proved to be a sane and progressive course in sound international economics.

Irrespective of any opinion to the contrary, the pending measure involves the very philosophy of the Hull trade program—a philosophy upon which honest men have differed over the years. I hope that the American people will not be deceived in believing that this amendment is a mere change in procedure. Let no United States Senator believe that a vote for this amendment is a vote to renew or extend the Hull reciprocal trade program. There is as much difference as the difference between day and night. This bill in the nature of a substitute from the House bill strikes at the very heart of the present trade program. The amendment has its genesis in a high protective tariff for the producers of this Nation—an outmoded doctrine which brought this country to the abyss of economic destruction under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1929. This is suicidal legislation for two-way trade in the international field, which is so necessary in the Nation's over-all foreign policy.

The Hull program is the other half of the Marshall plan; and any deviation from a program that has been a success over a period of 13 years strikes a hard blow at international amity, peace, and good will.

It should be remembered that we are the greatest of all creditor nations; and if we expect our loans to be paid they must be paid in terms of goods. It must be obvious to any prudent mind that we cannot hope to export the great surplus of basic commodities produced in this country without also importing. If we sell abroad we must buy abroad.

When the Gearhart bill was passed in the House of Representatives, Secretary of State Marshall said that the crippling amendments preserved the form but destroyed the substance of the act. He further stated that it would be just as well to have no program at all as to attempt to operate under the provisions of the Gearhart bill.

As I stated a moment ago, Representative GEARHART definitely said that he got 95 percent of his bill when he got the amendment now before us reported out by the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Mr. President, it is difficult for me to understand why the Republicans in this Congress did not seek an out-right repeal of this act. I repeat—every member of the Finance Committee except the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has in the past voted against the extension of the reciprocal trade program as is. Even though I am convinced that their theories of tariff and trade are outmoded and outworn, I respect their judgment and know they are honest in their convictions; but why it is that these same gentlemen use a flank attack instead of an all-out frontal attack is beyond me. Because, Mr. President, a majority of the American people cannot be fooled in an election year with a side-door move of this character.

Mr. President, the majority may have the votes today, perhaps, to put through this concept of high protection. This doctrine may prevail for a moment, all to the detriment of the United States and the world at large. The clock of progress may be stopped for a while but not for long. America, the great creditor Nation which she is, is the admitted leader in the non-Communist world; and there can be no retreat on the economic, military, or political front.

Mr. President, the majority may retard this progress of international trade and tariff, but it cannot be crippled without returning to the smugness of economic isolation which in due course will destroy the Nation, in a world in which our influence has become decisive. Mr. President, let no one seriously contend that this bill will not be a step in that direction, if today we pass this bill amending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. That is what the witness Charles Holman said, and many other high protectionists agree with him—yes, back to smugness and complacency, back to economic isolation which has caused us a great deal of trouble in the last few decades.

THREATENED INJURY

Mr. President, this bill lodges with the Tariff Commission the power to make an exhaustive investigation and to report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to the peril points upon all of the articles listed in the agreement. Nothing can be done in the way of carrying out a trade agreement by the President until the Tariff Commission makes its findings with respect to the injury to any domestic producer.

Mr. President, this is a doctrine that proceeds purely upon the basis of protection, irrespective of how inefficient a producer may be. Uneconomic considerations upon the part of producers are ignored if the Tariff Commission follows the plain meaning of the act. But who has been injured, Mr. President, under the present reciprocal trade agreements program? As I have said before, no one. The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New York, and which perhaps will be agreed to, is not the answer at all. It may be the answer to the Senator from New York; he may be satisfied that the answer will be supplied by his amendment if it is adopted; but apparently those who take that position do not understand what is in one of these trade agreements. The able Senator from Georgia said that in making an exhaustive research, to determine the peril point, it is necessary to follow the theory of cost of production under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act; and when that is done with the hundreds of different articles that are in one of these trade agreements, it is impossible to end the work within 3 or 4 months and do an efficient and capable job. Mr. President, it might take a year or a year and a half, in the case of some of these trade agreements before the cost of production could be determined and before determination could be made of the facts on which to base an opinion to be presented to the President of the United States. Under this amendment the Tariff Commission cannot take a calculated risk; they must have the facts. It cannot take a chance of sending to the President of the United States a recommendation that is not based on the facts.

Mr. President, the evidence before the committee is undisputed and unchallenged that not a single industry in

America has been injured or even threatened with an injury under the present program; and the escape clause which is now written into every international agreement amply protects American industry by giving the one who is injured an opportunity to come before the proper committee and present facts upon which the injury is based. If the facts justify, specific relief is mandatory where an industry is threatened with economic injury.

On cross-examination of one witness after another they had to admit that their particular industry had not been harmed or injured in any way under the reciprocal trade program, but the same philosophy that dominated the Finance Committee dominated these witnesses who, from the very beginning, have been the personification of high protection.

THE 1-YEAR EXTENSION

Mr. President, a 1-year extension of this program in an election year cannot be lightly dismissed. Indignation as to this proposed limitation has been expressed by representative Americans from coast to coast. I had hopes that the majority would not inject politics into this part of our foreign policy. I had hoped we might stand by the reciprocal trade program as we did with respect to the Marshall plan—in short, that our approach might be devoid of partisanship, and in the interest of the peace and security of our Nation. Mr. President, those Americans and the rest of the people of the world, believing in these trade treaties, know that this kind of an amendment represents a complete change of policy on our part. Our behavior under the circumstances should in no way give the nations of the world an opportunity to condemn our action in making another fundamental and basic change in foreign policy at a crucial moment in the rehabilitation of the world.

Twelve months from now, under a 1-year extension, this issue will again be before the Senate. During those 12 months, our economic policy at home and abroad would remain absolutely stagnant under this bill. Six countries in western Europe do not have reciprocal trade agreements with us; and we can safely gamble that no negotiations will be had with any one of those nations under this amendment providing for an extension for a period of 1 year.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I say that irreparable damage will be done to the economy of this Nation and the world if this bill becomes the law. There will be undesirable repercussions throughout America and throughout the world. A change in policy will definitely undermine world confidence in the sincerity of our leadership. Last, but not least, a failure to renew these reciprocal trade agreements without any restrictive amendments and for a period of at least 3 years will be construed by those who know as a negation of what we wrote into the European recovery program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have been an uncompromising supporter of every measure that has looked in the direction of international cooperation, led by the United States, to preserve the peace.

Three years ago, when the reciprocal trade agreements program came up for extension, I considered its relationship to our over-all role in international affairs, and I supported that program in the spirit in which it was presented. To my mind, it is intimately related to the United Nations Charter and its whole development, and right now it is intimately related to the Marshall plan—the Economic Cooperation Administration—and, as has been pointed out earlier today, it is also intimately related to the International Trade Organization.

I yield to no one in my allegiance to that approach to our international problems. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I think my colleagues will bear witness that I have always supported measures looking for full cooperation with the other nations of the world. Therefore, I have always been sympathetic toward, and a supporter of, the reciprocal trade agreements program, as distinguished from the old method of unilateral-tariff-schedule writing.

Mr. President, I supported the reciprocal trade agreements program as a step in the direction of economic cooperation in the world, just as the other measures I have mentioned were steps in the direction of political cooperation in the world. I consider the reciprocal trade agreements program no longer a question as between high tariff and free trade or unilateral-tariff-schedule writing. It is simply a question of how we are going to work out our relations with the other nations of the world, and how we are to determine our future trade relations.

So I look forward with interest to the presentation here next year of the so-called International Trade Organization proposal. I feel now, although I have not studied the outline carefully, that I shall be in sympathy with the spirit of that proposal. But because that movement is coming to our attention for action next year and because we shall review, year by year, the whole so-called Economic Cooperation Administration—the Marshall plan—I think we will be sound in our judgment if today we take the position that whatever we do in connection with the reciprocal trade program should be done under a 1-year extension of the present act.

The question we have to face is whether in the light of world developments which are entirely new and different from any prior to World War II, or, for that matter, prior to World War I, we shall approve an expansion of our international trade. I take the position that the Economic Cooperation Administration movement, the building up of the nations of western Europe under the so-called Marshall plan, is all in the direction of a reorientation and expansion of our prewar international trade policy. Therefore, we have before us the question of how best we can implement and strengthen and carry out the existing reciprocal trade agreements program. I think it is a well-established program and one which we must continue to support rigorously. I would be definitely opposed to a return to the old unilateral logrolling tariff system. I have so stated time and time again; and I feel that that question need not be raised here, for it has been definitely settled. Today, we follow the reciprocal trade agreements approach, and we must continue to do so.

So we have the question of how best to deal with this matter. That brings me to refer to the feeling I have had, despite the fact that I have fully supported the trade agreements program, that the way in which our industries have been taken care of in connection with the writing of the treaties was not adequate from a procedural standpoint and did not quite fit in with our American tradition of giving parties in interest full and adequate hearings.

I do not think we should be in the position—and that is why I am defending the so-called Millikin amendment—of saying we will leave it solely to the discretion of the President, whether a Democratic President or a Republican President, of determining the basis on which trade agreements shall be negotiated. There ought to be some place, somewhere, where unbiased objective statistical material should be available and properly used in arriving at the conclusions. Therefore, even as long ago as 3 years, when I supported the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, I made this statement in a speech I delivered in the Senate on June 13, 1945, when I was referring to the industries in my own State:

> Mr. President, I want to say to those industries in New Jersey, and to industries in other parts of the country, that, in my judgment, their interests can be better looked after by us, their Representatives here in Congress, under the reciprocal trade agreements procedure than they could be under the old unilateral-tariff-schedule method. We will continue, of course, to have the battle between high- and low-tariff advocates, but I believe that can be carried on more effectively with the assistance of an expert Tariff Commission working with our State Department and the other departments now included in the trade-agreement negotiations, than it could under the old "you tickle me—I'll tickle you" formula.

I quote that from my statement at that time when I was defending the extension of these agreements, because even then I felt that the Tariff Commission should be used to get at the facts. I feel it is consistent now as we have had experience with the matter for the Congress to say today we will continue the trade agreements program for a year only, because other international problems are coming up within that year. I think of the ECA, I think of the ITO situation. We will continue for a year, but we will place more emphasis on the use of objective material such as the Tariff Commission is supposed to furnish us.

In the light of the able discussions by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], wherein they tried to point out that any President would hesitate to take action counter to the findings of the Tariff Commission, I shall have to ask

them the question, "If you take that position, why do we not abolish the Tariff Commission? Why do we keep the Tariff Commission? Why is there a Tariff Commission, unless it can be expected to furnish effective, objective information on which those who have to decide the policy can act?" The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], clearly leaves the ultimate decision to the President, Although it probably requires him to take the objective studies of the Tariff Commission into consideration.

We have made it very clear, there is no appeal to the Congress. If the Tariff Commission makes certain findings and the President finds differently, there is no appeal to the Congress as provided in the House measure. I would have been definitely opposed to that, because I think it must be a matter of executive discretion in determining what trade agreements should contain. The executive must consider the entire world situation. But I maintain that it is proper and right that we should lay emphasis on the fact that the Tariff Commission, which is organized to get the data objectively and in a bipartisan way, since it is half Republican and half Democratic, should furnish its material before the decisions are made.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Does he have enough time to yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH. I am limited in my time, but I shall be glad to answer a question from the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. I first want to say I think the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is definitely on the right track. I would subscribe to what he says heartily. But as I understand him, under the law as it now exists, the only representation which the Tariff Commission has in the group that offers advice with reference to reciprocal trade agreements is only one Member out of six. Is not that correct?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct, as I understand; it is the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, and, as was stated earlier this morning, I think by the Senator from Colorado, in quoting from Mr. Gregg, who is a member of the Commission, Mr. Gregg himself felt it would be better practice from the standpoint of properly safeguarding our industries if the view of the entire Commission were obtained than if only one member of the Commission had a voice in the considering of trade agreement programs.

Mr. BALDWIN. That Member might be a Republican or he might be a Democrat at a given time.

Mr. SMITH. He might be.

Mr. BALDWIN. But the Tariff Commission as such, as an arm of the Government, is really a fact-finding as distinguished from a policy-making body, is it not?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct. It is provided in this very amendment that they shall have nothing to do with the negotiation of these agreements. They will simply furnish the facts to the President before he makes his determination, and now we are adding an amendment I am glad to say that puts a time limit on the Commission, so negotiations could not be halted or ended because of long delay.

Mr. BALDWIN. So the effect of the amendment is to remove the Tariff Commission's part in this procedure from the operations and thinking of one man, and to repose it in the operations and thinking of six, composed of three Republicans and three Democrats, thus affording a more factual basis on which to proceed.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is a fair implication, and so, Mr. President, it seems to me we are entirely consistent, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan pointed out, in having greater emphasis placed on the Tariff Commission in dealing with this matter.

The question is whether we are to continue our procedure as at present. My first judgment was that we should continue as we are for another year without making any change. At this point in my remarks, I should like to insert a copy of a release I gave to the press in the week of June 7, prior to the time that I knew of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. In that press release I took the position that it was my judgment that probably it would be wisest to continue our present practice for one year. I did say, however, in the press release:

> I approve the principle incorporated in H. R. 6556, which emphasizes the importance of the participation of the United States Tariff Commission in making tariff changes in order to give adequate warnings of threatened dangers to our American industries.

I then said:

> This is a legitimate procedural precaution. But I would oppose making the findings of the Tariff Commission the sole guidepost to determine proper tariff changes.

I think the point has been adequately brought out in the session today, but I ask consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks my complete release.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> With the present development of the international situation, the reciprocal trade-agreements program has obviously become an inseparable part of the European recovery program—the Marshall plan. In these postwar years, with the chaos and confusion prevalent in all parts of the world, it is now the established policy of the United States to aid in assisting the other nations of the world, and especially the cooperating nations of western Europe, to unite and restore their economies to a self-sustaining basis.
>
> In order to attain this objective, a vitally important factor is the trade between these nations and the other nations of the world and with the United States. The restoration of a friendly, cooperative international trade is the most promising road to an enduring peace.
>
> It is, therefore, my considered judgment that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended, and preferably in its present form and for whatever period may be deemed advisable to prevent confusion and misunderstanding. I approve the principle incorporated in H. R. 6556, which emphasizes the importance of the participation of the United States Tariff Commission in making tariff changes in order to give adequate warnings of threatened dangers to our American industries. This is a legitimate procedural precaution. But I would oppose making the findings of the Tariff Commission the sole guidepost to determine proper tariff changes.
>
> General world conditions must also be considered as our experience grows with the evolution of the ECA. Because of the importance of the relation of the ECA to our trade treaties, I would recommend that the Administrator of the ECA and his expert economic staff, as well as the Tariff Commission, be included with the group advising the President on tariff changes in the negotiation of trade treaties.
>
> Further, I would urge that each year when we review the workings of the ECA and make an appropriation therefor, we should also review the operation of the trade-agreements program, to the end that our over-all foreign trade policies may be coordinated. Because of this international approach to the problem, I am opposed to any veto by Congress of tariff changes, as proposed in the House bill. This would only add confusion and delay. I can see no dangers to our industries in extending the act without change at this time. Apparently there are no more trade agreements, presently to be negotiated, and those already negotiated are covered by the so-called "escape clause" in the event that injury is threatened.
>
> Our world is not sufficiently stabilized as yet to give us adequate guideposts for a permanent international trade policy. But I think we are generally agreed that the indispensable trade-agreements principles should be preserved unweakened.

Mr. SMITH. So I feel Mr. President, in summing up the few remarks I have made, that I am entirely consistent in supporting wholeheartedly the international approach to this matter in looking upon the reciprocal-trade program as an integral part of the United Nations organization, as an intimate part of the economic-recovery program of Europe, and as an intimate part of the whole international approach, the positive, aggressive, and determined approach to make our international relationships stronger and better and more effective. I see nothing inconsistent in bringing the tariff commission into the picture as proposed by the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do I correctly understand the Senator that he in the main, favors continuing the present law for a year?

Mr. SMITH. No—the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, the amendment?

Mr. SMITH. I would continue it for a year, with the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] that is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said though, in his release, as I recall, that he was in favor of continuing the act for another year.

Mr. SMITH. I said at the time, before I considered the whole matter, that while I favored bringing the Tariff Commission in, it seemed to me we would be moving wisely to extend the act for 1 year without any change. It is probably that the question may be immediately academic, because I cannot anticipate many agreements being written during the coming year. But my feeling is that we are justified in laying emphasis upon the use of an objective bipartisan commission such as the Tariff Commission to get the facts.

If it is not functioning properly, let us abolish the Commission. But I believe our friends on the left side of the aisle would be more insistent on the Tariff Commission if next year we should have a Republican President and should undertake to write tariff changes to which they would not agree to. They would want to see made available some place where after unbiased discussion, the objective facts could be determined, so as to assure that agreements entered into would be fair, more effective, and more satisfactory to our people as a whole.

The only complaint I have heard of the reciprocal trade agreements program has been that there has not been an adequate or full and fair hearing of industry in presenting its views and how it may be affected by these agreements. I think that involves our American sense of justice. We should use our nonpartisan and bipartisan Tariff Commission in order to bring about the desired result.

So, Mr. President, with the understanding that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] will accept the amendment I am offering, with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I am prepared to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6556) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado wish to use some time now?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I can use 5 minutes at this time. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my able colleague from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] in arriving at a program which should receive a unanimous vote. We must recognize that there are fundamental differences of opinion on international trade policy on the floor of the Senate. We have heard the testimony which has been given before the Senate Finance Committee. We heard in that testimony that the advocates of reciprocal trade agreements did not recognize any standard of protection of the American worker whatever, whether or not the "horse trading" in American jobs by the State Department might injure American industry. That is the testimony offered by Mr. Clayton, the official representative of the State Department, and will be found in the testimony. Some of us do not agree with that premise, but this is not the time to discuss it. We, who oppose the free trade trend of the Administration, agree that no fixed tariff operates perfectly.

Mr. President, many advocates of the "horse trading" methods of the State Department under the 1934 Free Trade Agreements Act—that no damage can be shown to the American industry through such agreements—I respectfully refer them to my address before this body in support of my mining bill introduced on May 26, showing the preponderance of mines which have been closed—also I could cite the glass industry and the watch industry—however, this is not the time to review this picture provided a 1-year extension is accepted, so that the entire policy can be reviewed next year.

A fixed tariff is a fixed tariff, whether the Tariff Commission fixes it, whether it is fixed by the Congress of the United States, or whether the State Department agrees to it through an agreement with one or more foreign nations under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The word "reciprocal" does not appear in the Trade Agreements Act except in reference to Mexico, a matter entirely extraneous to the purpose of the act itself. Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act the only way a change can be made in a tariff fixed through mutual agreement is when the foreign government which is a party to such agreement agrees to the change. In other words, under the Trade Agreements Act it is entirely out of the hands of our own Government. However, this is not the time, in my opinion, to discuss that question. There are many methods of defeating any fixed tariff at this time, including quotas, currency valuation, depreciating the value of currency, the sterling bloc, preferential rates, and many other ways in which such a fixed tariff can be made entirely ineffective without any cooperation or consent on our part whatsoever. We are unable to check it or to prevent it. Therefore, in my opinion, some method must be worked out to meet the problem through a flexible import fee. I have introduced such a bill—April 28—that will provide for the automatic adjustment of the import fee or tariff to correctly represent, at all times, the differential of the cost of production between this country and where any competition is located on each specific product—and when any nation has reached approximately our own wage-living standard—then free and unrestricted trade is the immediate and automatic result.

If, as the State Department suggested, we have no standard of tariff or import fees which will protect workers in any industry in this country, it is inescapable that free trade is the inevitable result.

The escape clause as worded is no answer. Simply because other countries are allowed, under the agreement as pointed out by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], that all other countries could take a compensatory escape under the multilateral agreement if the United States were to invoke the escape clause.

Since the compensatory escape by other nations—the exact nature of which the United States could not foresee—makes the adverse repercussions of the escape clause totally disproportionate. In other words, since we have already agreed that if we invoke the escape clause that the 22 other nation participants may each separately avail itself of a compensatory escape clause on items of their own choosing. It is clear that the State Department has agreed to something which they would not dare to invoke.

They have simply made a bad deal and we are stuck with it.

So, Mr. President, we would not dare, under these agreements, to invoke the escape clause, even though it did injure an American industry.

The reason I agree with the distinguished Senator from Colorado—and again I say he deserves the congratulations of this body because he has worked out a formula which will bring the whole question into focus next year, or a year from this time, when the other two important questions come before the Senate for consideration. Mr. President, the advocates of the Marshall plan did not say that International Trade Organization and the so-called reciprocal trade arrangement were necessary for the Marshall-Bevin plan's success, they have since said that reciprocal trade agreements are necessary to the success of the Marshall plan.

So I say, just as my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said, with whom I agree, that so long as we are considering another appropriation for ERP a year from now, and so long as the International Trade Organization will come before this body officially next year, a 1-year extension of the act is highly proper, so that all three of these subjects mentioned by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] should be considered together.

Mr. President, I have consistently pointed out in addresses throughout the Nation since the inception of the Marshall-Bevin plan—ERP—last year that the Marshall-Bevin plan to make up the trade balance deficits of the nations of the world in cash—the State Department made agreements under the 1934 act, later called reciprocal to sell the idea to the public, and the International Trade Organization with 57 nations and 57 votes planned to meet each year and divide the remaining production and markets of the world is a plan to divide and redistribute the wealth of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from a speech heretofore delivered by me.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I want to again call attention to the long-range plan to redistribute the wealth of this Nation.

The three steps projected by the economic one-worlders for that purpose are:

First. The established policy of exporting American money to make up the annual trade balance deficits—from all sources—of the European, Asiatic, and South American countries. Our chief export is money. The occasion may be the UNRRA, $3,000,000,000; the Greek-Turkey, $400,000,000; the English gift-loan of $3,750,000,000; or the Marshall-Bevin plan of exporting $17,000,000,000 to Europe, but the master-minded policy is the same, the economic equalization and the redistribution of the wealth of the 57 nations of the world, starting with the United States of America. This is a definite part of the international policy as supported in Senate debate, the English and Marshall-Bevin-plan gift loans are simply successive moves in establishing the first step of the policy.

Second. The selective free-trade method of dividing the production of this country with the nations of the world through the Trade Agreements Act, known by the catch word "reciprocal trade," is the second step in the economic one-world plan. Through the Trade Agreements Act industries selected by the State Department are frankly traded to one or more nations for a fancied advantage in furnishing them a market for their goods to secure money—dollar exchange—presumably to buy our processed and manufactured products.

Third. The International Trade Organization—ITO—through which 57 nations, each with one vote, will meet each year and frankly allocate the production and markets of the world between such nations, presumably finally on a population and cost of production, without regard to the differential of production cost due to the difference in the standards-of-living basis, thereby completing the job of international redistribution of the wealth of this Nation.

This Organization is to be the final leveler of the wage-living standards of the world.

International conferences and world wars are incidents, and even time is unimportant in the plan of the internationally minded "one economic world" group.

The "one economic world" group prematurely launched the "one political world" idea in the 1940 Presidential campaign. The emphasis has now shifted back to economics through the three definite policies; and when the "one economic world" goal is reached, the "one political world" is expected to follow in the natural course of events.

What is the answer?

A. A definite international policy; naming the areas and nations we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety and rebuilding our military organization, spearheaded by an Air Corps that can keep any nation on the ground until such time as the United Nations can take over, or the major problems of the world have been settled.

B. A flexible import fee under the Reciprocal Trade Act representing the differential of the cost of production between this Nation and where our chief competition is located on each specified product—in place of the selective free-trade program under the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Mr. MALONE. Therefore, Mr. President, I want to say that I shall vote for the 1-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act in accordance with the report of the chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I speak as one who has believed always in the principle of a protective tariff. I have here a short history giving an outline of that theory. Under the Presidential powers granted by Republican tariff acts of former years, culminating in the act of 1930, under section 336 the responsibility of the President and of the Congress are entirely curtailed, so that the Presidential power to change tariffs was limited by the action of the Tariff Commission in response to the considerable campaign that tariff making should become a scientific matter. I ask that this statement may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, in order to bear out the point I am endeavoring to make.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTHORITY OF PRESIDENT TO CHANGE DUTIES CONTRARY TO TARIFF COMMISSION'S REPORT

Section 315 of the Tariff Act of 1922 authorized the President to proclaim increases or decreases up to 50 percent of statutory rates of duty when he found such changes to be necessary to equalize differences in foreign and domestic costs of production. An investigation by the Tariff Commission was required to be made before action by the President, but the law did not specify that the President was limited in his proclamations to such recommendations as the Commission might send to him. In *Foster* v. *United States* (20 CCPA 15), the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals declared (page 25):

"In determining this matter, it will be borne in mind that we are here concerned with the legality of the President's act in raising the rates on cast polished plate glass, unsilvered, from the statutory figure to that fixed by his proclamation. The question is not whether the United States Tariff Commission committed error, or whether the testimony heard by, or the findings of, the commission were sufficient to legally justify the President's finding and proclaimed rates. The President is not bound by such testimony or findings. He may arrive at his conclusions from information derived from other sources, which information may be privately conveyed and confidentially received. The various elements which he must take into consideration, as fixed by said section 315 (c), give him wide latitude. Therefore, it is fallacious to argue that possible error committed by the Tariff Commission, or failure of proof before that body, may invalidate the President's finding and proclamation. Such hearing before the United States Tariff Commission is provided by law to assist the President, not to control him."

Although in the cases of some reports to the President under section 315 of the act of 1922 the Tariff Commission was evenly divided so that there was no majority finding or recommendation, the President as a matter of fact based his actions on the report and in no case did he proclaim a rate other than that suggested by at least half of the Commissioners.

In reenacting the flexible tariff (section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930), the Congress changed the wording so as to preclude the President from proclaiming a rate other than that specified by the Tariff Commission. Subdivision (c) of section 336 reads as follows:

"Proclamation by the President: The President shall by proclamation approve the rates of duty and changes in classification and in basis of value specified in any report of the Commission under this section, if in his judgment such rates of duty and changes are shown by such investigation of the Commission to be necessary to equalize such differences in costs of production."

Accordingly, the President has the authority to reject the findings of the Tariff Commission under the flexible tariff; he may refuse to act, but if he does take action under section 336 the action must be that specified by the Commission.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senate bill puts into the law no limitations on procedures to which the Administration has not already committed itself to apply. I have a brief analysis on that subject which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BILL PUTS INTO LAW NO LIMITATIONS AND PROCEDURES WHICH THE ADMINISTRATION HAS NOT ALREADY COMMITTED ITSELF TO APPLY

Enactment of the Senate bill provides for application of no limitations on concessions made in trade agreements that may be put into effect without Congressional review. The limitations, however, are clearly in accord with those which officers of the State Department who have been in charge of the program have repeatedly committed themselves to apply. The procedure provided for under this Senate bill is in accord with the spirit of the President's directions and statements of officials of the State Department. The President, under Executive Order 9832, promulgated before the negotiations at Geneva of last year were undertaken, specifically directed that

"With respect to each dutiable import item which is considered by the Interdepartmental Committee for inclusion in a trade agreement, the Tariff Commission shall make an analysis of the facts relative to the production, trade, and consumption of the article involved, to the probable effect of granting a concession thereon, and to the competitive factors involved. Such analysis shall be submitted in digest form to the Interdepartmental Committee. The digests, excepting confidential material, shall be published by the Tariff Commission."

The President further directed that

"After analysis and consideration of the studies of the Tariff Commission * * * of the views of interested persons presented to the Committee for Reciprocity Information * * * and of any other information available to the Interdepartmental Committee, the Interdepartmental Committee shall make such recommendations to the President relative to the conclusion of trade agreements, and to the provisions to be included therein, as are considered appropriate to carry out the purposes set forth in said act of June 12, 1934, as amended. If any such recommendation to the President with respect to the inclusion of a concession in any trade agreement is not unanimous, the President shall be provided with a full report by the dissenting member or members of the Interdepartmental Committee giving the reasons for their dissent and specifying the point beyond which they consider any reduction or concession involved cannot be made without injury to the domestic economy."

It is clear from the foregoing provisions of the Executive order and commitments made to the Congress when renewal of the Trade Agreements Act was under consideration that those who have been in charge of the execution of the trade agreements program committed themselves to apply the same standards and practically the same procedures as enactment of the Senate bill will require by law. In order fully to explain the similarity of the procedure prescribed by the Senate bill and the spirit of the administration's expression of its intentions, attention should be called to the fact that the Tariff Commission is the agency in the Government whose specific responsibility is to study the effects of tariffs on domestic industries. Moreover, under the Executive order referred to above it seems to be clear that the analyses and views of the Tariff Commission are to be primarily depended

upon in the determination of the appropriate limits of concessions in our tariff. This is recognized in the part of the Executive order dealing with procedures to be followed before entering into trade agreements but more definitely stated in the part of the Executive order dealing with the escape clause.

Though it has been contended that enactment of the Senate bill will hamstring or cripple the operation of the trade agreements program, that contention can only be maintained if it be admitted that the procedures and limitations they have committed themselves to apply would have a similar effect. This is a necessary conclusion unless those in charge of the operation of the program do not intend scrupulously to abide by the commitments made to Congress.

It is true that the enactment of the Senate bill will more definitely and formally place responsibilities on the Tariff Commission than does the Executive order of the President referred to above.

In considering the procedure that will be required by this bill, it is to be observed that the Tariff Commission is a bipartisan agency of which no more than half the membership may be of a single political party. Its members, who are appointed by the President, are chosen with a view to their competence and objectivity in supervising the kind of work which this bill will, and Executive Order 9832 now does, require of the agency. All the other agencies which participates in the trade agreements program are under political officers who are members of the President's Cabinet. It is entirely appropriate formally to place upon the bipartisan Tariff Commission responsibility for making decisions regarding injury to American industry and by this means keep these decisions free from political considerations. But the Senate bill still leaves the President free to act.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a provision in connection with the right to increase rates above the rates of 1934 was incorporated in the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934, being the reciprocal trade agreements as then approved by former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. I cite that in the interest of our future consideration. I ask that this statement be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVISION PERMITTING THE PRESIDENT TO INCREASE DUTIES BY 50 PERCENT OF THE RATES IN EFFECT IN 1934 WAS IN RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT OF 1934 AS APPROVED BY CORDELL HULL

There has been considerable criticism leveled at a provision that the President in carrying out foreign-trade agreements may proclaim increases in duty 50 percent above the rates existing on June 12, 1934. This has been described as a return to isolationism and a provision pointing the way to increases in duty 50 percent above the level existing in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930.

The gentlemen who have made these cries of despair have overlooked an important relevant fact, namely, that the provision of the Gearhart bill about which they cry with anguish is identical with the provision of the original Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934. It seems that the necessary conclusion to be drawn from their present criticisms of the Gearhart bill is that Cordell Hull, in sponsoring the act of 1934, must also have been guilty of isolationsim and a desire to increase tariff rates by 50 percent.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have here a compilation of rates under the various tariff acts of the last 50 years, and also of the variations in rates under the operation of trade agreements, showing a reduction from approximately 60 percent under the last Smoot-Hawley bill to the current rate of 15 percent. I ask that this statement of rates be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am advised that during the first full year after the Smoot-Hawley Act went into operation, the ad valorem rates were established at 53.2 percent. In 1932, this jumped to 59.1 percent and follows the following pattern up to 1939:

	Percent
1933	53.6
1934	46.7
1935	42.9
1936	39.3
1937	37.8
1938	39.3
1939	37.3

For such value as the war figures and the immediate postwar figures may have, I am given the following data:

	Percent
1940	35.6
1941	36.8
1942	32.1
1943	32.8
1944	29.7
1945	28.0
1946	25.5
1947	19.4
1948	15.0

It is pointed out that the rate in 1939 just before the war was almost exactly the same as that of the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922.

The 15-percent figure which Mr. Gearhart uses to show the 1948 status of this ad valorem rate is probably correct. I am told it will run somewhere between 12 and 15 percent.

All these rates are based upon the dutiable list and do not take into consideration the items on the free list.

Average rates under various tariff bills of past 50 years:

	Percent
Dingley Act, 1897	46.1
Paine-Aldrich, 1909	40.7
Underwood, 1913	27.0
Fordney-McCumber, 1922	37.0
Smoot-Hawley, 1930	53.2
As modified under reciprocal agreements, 1931	59.1
As modified under reciprocal agreements, 1948	15.0

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think this brings home very clearly that at the present time we are living in a fool's paradise. It is quite true that no material injury has been done to most of the industries which might be affected as the result of the depression and the conditions incident to the war and its aftermath. I point out, however, that the Government has suffered. In one specific instance it has come to my attention, in connection with potatoes. We voted approximately $75,000,000 to take domestic potatoes off the market. Meanwhile, we imported 5,000,000 bushels from Canada under reciprocal trade provisions, which cost us $5,000,000. It did not injure the potato producers, but it did injure the Government.

The cotton situation is not affected, because it operates under an absolute embargo. Therefore the cotton industry is not concerned with protection. However, when our rates are at 15 percent, on the average, as compared with 27 percent under the Underwood tariff provision after the First World War, I think we must all realize a Sword of Damocles is suspended over the people of this country and their industries in the event that anything like normal conditions should come to prevail throughout the world, involving an average rate of 6 percent.

I am asking only that the President shall carry out precisely the regulations he has laid down in his own instructions to the Commission and in his statement to the country. I read a quotation from the President's statement:

The interest of domestic producers was carefully protected in the negotiation of each trade agreement. I assured the Congress when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was last extended in 1945 that domestic producers would be safeguarded in the process of expanding trade. That commitment has been kept and it will continue to be kept.

If that statement is correct, then the proposed amendments constitute limitations in no way, and I trust that the Senate, in the interest of expanding the program, will see fit to enact the proposal of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], as otherwise there is certainly to be no extension of the law.

The State Department has long taken the position, when renewal of the Trade Agreements Act has been before the Congress, that nothing would be done under the act which would injure domestic producers. The President in his message to Congress of March 1, 1948, requesting renewal of the act, said:

The interest of domestic producers are carefully protected in the negotiation of each trade agreement. I assured the Congress when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was last extended in 1945, that domestic producers would be safeguarded in the process of expanding trade. That commitment has been kept. It will continue to be kept.

In furtherance of this policy the President in February 1947 issued Executive Order 9832.

First. Action under the escape clause: Under the Executive order the Tariff Commission determines "whether, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted on any article by the United States in a trade agreement" an article "is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles."

It should be noted that under the Executive order action by the Tariff Commission where injury has occurred or is threatened is taken after the agreement is in effect; under the Senate bill investigation of possible injury is made before the agreement is negotiated. Certainly no one who is really in favor of protecting domestic producers could object to the forehanded procedure provided in the Senate bill. It is certainly preferable to prevent injury by careful investigation before the agreement is negotiated than to attempt action after the agreement has been put into effect.

At best, action under the Executive order will be slow because, as provided in article XIX of the Geneva agreement,

it is necessary to consult with all interested parties to that agreement before a recommendation of the Tariff Commission under the Executive order can be acted upon except "in critical circumstances, where delay would cause serious damage which it would be difficult to repair." What would be considered critical circumstances is not known, but action under the Executive order would be largely vitiated where consultation with interested parties was required.

It should be noted further, that under the Executive order injury or threatened injury must be the result of absolute increase in imports. This is a highly restrictive provision, particularly in a period of declining business activity. For example, the demand for a product may decline substantially but imports remain stable, with the result that the entire loss of business would fall on domestic producers. Thus, domestic production may be declining drastically while the percentage of the market supplied by imports is increasing, yet no action would be possible under the Executive order because imports were not increasing. Why was this limitation inserted in the Executive order if the procedure under that order were intended to provide domestic producers with adequate protection? As a matter of fact, the Executive order is much more restrictive in this respect than the corresponding provision of the Habana Charter (article 40). Under the Charter injury or threatened injury can occur if the article is imported in relatively increased quantities, that is to say, it is not necessary to have an absolute increase in imports.

Second. Participation of the Tariff Commission: Under the Executive order a Commissioner of the Tariff Commission sits with persons designated by the Secretaries of State, Treasury, National Military Establishment, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor on the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements which gives information and advice to the President respecting the concessions he will make in any proposed trade agreement. If any member of the Committee, including the Tariff Commissioner, disagrees with the action of the Committee on any proposal concession, he can file a dissent with the President specifying the point beyond which he considers any reduction or concession involved cannot be made without serious injury to the domestic economy. Not only does the Tariff Commission participate with the Trade Agreements Committee in the making of decisions on concessions, but for all practical purposes he participates through the Committee in the actual negotiation of the agreement.

Under this procedure a Tariff Commissioner, unless he dissents on most of the concessions, will find himself in the embarrassing position of having to take action as a member of the Tariff Commission under the Executive order, in cases where injury has been proved, which is contrary to the position he took as a member of the Trade Agreements Committee. For example, he might have voted for a proposed concession, implying that in his view the concession would not result in serious injury to domestic producers, only to find that later on his colleagues on the Commission found that the concession had caused serious injury. At best this procedure may be questioned.

The State Department has repeatedly assured the Congress, when renewal of the Trade Agreements Act has been under consideration, that domestic producers would not be seriously injured by any action taken under that act. Either the Department meant what it said or it has misled the Congress. If the Department meant what it said it could not have any serious objection to the Senate bill, as this bill would do no more than assure to domestic producers somewhat more protection against serious injury than is provided by the Executive order.

Mr. President, I ask that there be included at the conclusion of my remarks an excerpt from the statement of Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, of California.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Representative GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the subject of foreign trade is such a broad and complicated one that I have reached the conclusion that I had better confine myself to discussion of the bill or my remarks might be interminable.

The bill as introduced and passed in the House of Representatives provides for a 1-year extension rather than the 3 which was requested by the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Congressman, you are aware of the fact, are you not, that the State Department was in serious doubt for many months this year whether they would ask for an extension at all?

Representative GEARHART. I think that idea would support the conclusion that a 1-year extension was sufficient for all purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is more than they anticipated asking for.

Representative GEARHART. Then we can feel that we are very generous and expansive in our office to the country.

The reason why we felt that 1 year would be sufficient in order to make a complete check on this subject was that our investigation into the operation of the trade agreements for its first 14 years discloses that 93 percent of the dutiable items have been cut already, and that 91 percent of the items on the free list have been bound on the free list. So it appears quite beyond contravention that the tariff-slashing job is about completed. In fact, the State Department representatives have stated here that there are only a few odds and ends to be cleared up. When we further contemplate the result of 14 years administration of the Trade Agreements Act it is revealed that they have reduced the tariff to an ad valorem level of 15 percent on the dutiable items and to 6 percent when the dutiable and free items are considered together, which means that we in the United States have practically no tariff at all. This country now is closer to free trade than it ever has been in its history.

I had the staff expert on tariffs prepare some figures for me from which we could make some comparisons as to our tariff in relation to the outside world or, at least to that part of the world with which we carry on most of our foreign trade, the United Kingdom and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

It was revealed to my very great surprise that the United Kingdom, consisting of England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, is collecting $3,164,000,000 in customs, whereas the United States with a population four times as great is only collecting $494,000,000 in customs. Translating that into per capita averages we note that the British are collecting from customs $64.16 per capita and the United States is collecting from customs only $3.41 per capita.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very interesting statement.

Representative GEARHART. It is a very interesting revelation and only recently disclosed. For the purpose of the record, I would point out that England is the highest and the United States is the lowest among these nations: New Zealand, Australia, Canada, South Africa, United Kingdom, and the United States.

As a matter of fact, we never did have a high tariff.

Even when the Smoot-Hawley Act was placed upon the statute books, the United States was thirteenth on the list of important nations, insofar as the ad valorem measurement could be applied to the then-existing tariffs. Taking the United States as 100 par you find Spain had a tariff of 456; Germany, 279; Brazil, 239.4; Greece, 166; Hungary, 180; Italy, 150.5; Mexico 149; Egypt, 130; Switzerland, 128; United Kingdom, 118.3; Argentina, 110; United States 100; Japan, 98; Belgium, 96.8; France, 85; Canada, 76.3; Netherlands, 37.4; and Sweden, 32.8; which involves about all the important trading nations of the world insofar as the United States was concerned at the time.

It has just been a question of giving the dog a bad name. The United States has never been an offending nation in the maintenance of high tariffs. Certainly at the present time with the tariff cut to 15 percent ad valorem on dutiable items and 6 percent on dutiable and free, you can see we have practically no tariff at all.

So in urging a 1-year extension it should be acceptable by the country. Nothing can be done to do more damage to our tariff structure than has already been done, even if they proceed diligently to make as many agreements as they care to make during the 1 year that remains.

The CHAIRMAN. One more jump on the scale of the last jump and we would not have any tariff at all.

Representative GEARHART. That is right. We are so near to that situation that it is appalling to contemplate the result of 14 years of tariff slashing by the trade-agreement method.

There is one other interesting comment I want to make on that phase of our discussions before I pass to a consideration of the bill. That is, when we emerged from World War I the Tariff Act of 1913, the so-called Underwood Tariff Act, was in effect. Under that act, 66.3 percent of the items were on the free list and the dutiable rate was 27 percent. As soon as the war was over and the outside world got back into production stride, the United States, because of those low tariffs, much higher than the tariff levels of today, became the dumping ground of the world.

A crisis developed of such proportions that the then President of the United States called the Congress into special session for the purpose of passing an emergency tariff law, which it promptly did, along with other antidumping legislation which retrieved the situation until the matter could be considered more maturely by the Congress. Because of that historical happening, the consequence of this Underwood tariff and its ad valorem rate of 27 percent, drastic legislative action became imperative. And now that we have an ad valorem level of but 15 percent, I wonder what the future will unfold for us, when the outside world does in fact get back into a normal production stride. This, as it is anticipated, will be within the next year or so. If the United States again becomes the dumping ground of the world, this commit-

tee may be called upon to take drastic and immediate and emergency action to save this country from disaster.

Senator GEORGE. What do you mean, Mr. Gearhart, by 15 percent ad valorem?

Representative GEARHART. The figures represent the general average across the board of the tariff rates now existing. I have similar figures as to all of the other tariff bills passed since 1897.

Senator GEORGE. Is it your statement that that is the general average of all dutiable items?

Representative GEARHART. Yes, ad valorem.

Senator GEORGE. Translated specifically into ad valorem, altogether.

Representative GEARHART. Yes. To complete the comparison I might point out the Dingley Act of 189" established an ad valorem percentage on the dutiable list of 46.1 percent, the Paine-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909 established an ad valorem rate of 40.7 percent. The 1913 Underwood Tariff Act established 27 percent. The 1922 Tariff Act established 38.4 percent, and in 1930 the Smoot-Hawley Act established 40 percent, one and a fraction percent higher than the preceding McCumber tariff.

So we contemplated a new situation now which is quite novel and unique in American history. I would not dare to predict what the future is to unfold as a consequence of the slashes that have occurred.

Another reason for fixing 1 year as the period instead of 2 or 3 years is that this Congress already has provided that the European relief program shall be checked up as of that date and also the International Trade Charter will be presented to the Congress for its consideration next year and we believe that in theory at least these three programs have some relation to each other and therefore should come on for consideration simultaneously.

Then there is the very important fact which all Americans should consider, and that is that this is an election year and a newly elected administration will take over next year. Should that administration be Democratic, undoubtedly the House and Senate will be of the same party. It would follow as a matter of course that that party would write its own trade policy, and conversely should the new administration be Republican, the Congress being of the same persuasion will undoubtedly proceed to write its own foreign-trade policy.

So it is just idle to endeavor to impose on such a new Congress coming into power, as it will next year, a system which that administration may or may not like. The incoming administration, aided by a supporting Congress, will simply write its own policies. So let us be realists and acknowledge the fact that that is going to occur in any event, and therefore let us write laws that are consistent with that immutable conclusion.

To make it more than 2 years would be to bypass the Eighty-first Congress, that is, at least the House of Representatives part of it. A proper respect for a group of gentlemen who will be elected to that body next year would dictate a decent restraint in the exercise of the legislative prerogative at this time.

In fact, every law is written in that way. Every law is subject to repeal. Every law is subject to change. We do create moral situations sometimes by the enactment of legislation which makes it very difficult for the legislative branch to rise to its constitutional prerogatives. Therefore, I would say let us not——

Senator LUCAS. As a former Member of the House, I never knew any Member of the House not to be able to rise to its constitutional prerogatives.

Representative GEARHART. That is a compliment you pay to the House, and coming from a former Member of the House, I value it.

The CHAIRMAN. He has to overcome his will power in some cases, Senator.

Representative GEARHART. The changes we ask in the bill which the House has sent to the Senate are, I think, simple, sound, and supported by administrative precedent. The transfer of the responsibilities from the Committee on Reciprocity Information in respect to holding public hearings to the Tariff Commission will promote confidence in the trade-agreements procedure generally throughout the country, confidence in the program and its administration. If there is any agency of the trade-agreements set-up which has fallen in public confidence and in public estimation, it is the Committee for Reciprocity Information. It is known to be a fact, in fact it is notorious, that the men who sit upon the bench and hear the complaints or the criticisms or the suggestions of people who travel from the far corners of this country to testify before that agency, have nothing to do with the working of any decisions upon the testimony they pretend to listen to. It is widely known that the men who sit there have nothing to do with the negotiations that are later or simultaneously being carried on.

I happen to know two former members of that committee who are now in retirement and because thereof are under no restraint in respect to that which they might say concerning their functions, the functions they performed when they were members of that committee, and both of them assure me they never received an order from anyone other than to present themselves and to sit on the bench. Thereafter they never made any findings on anything they heard or formulated any conclusions, neither were they ever thereafter asked to make any recommendations.

That is a cruel travesty. That is a cruelty inflicted upon the American people who came to Washington to present their cases to a body of gentlemen whom they were led to believe would have something to do with solving the problems with which they were vexed. But this Punch and Judy show has gone on with its farce now for 14 years.

So I say the first thing that the transfer would do would be to promote public confidence in the administration of the program, and that is a very, very important thing.

In making the transfer from a trade-agreements committee to the Tariff Commission, the House of Representatives in presenting this bill to the Senate was following a precedent established by the President himself in his Executive order of February of 1947, when he transferred the function of receiving complaints after injury had been inflicted from the Committee on Trade Agreements to the Tariff Commission.

We of the House thought that if the President believed, as we believe, that the Tariff Commission was competent to correct a mistake after a mistake was made, certainly it was competent to prevent a mistake from being made before it was made. That is all we hoped to accomplish by this suggested change.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, anyone who appeared before the Senate today to say that American industry cannot exist right now without foreign markets would be, of course, subject to easy refutation, for we all know that the American economy of the moment is finding ready markets here at home for just about everything we produce and that some foreign shipments we are making in a world clamoring for our goods are made at some expense to the convenience of the domestic consumer.

Hence, I have no intention here today of maintaining that unless this Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is extended this week that wholesale lay-offs of workers will take place in Pennsylvania or that Pennsylvania industry will begin to suffer deep cuts into its operating revenues and profits.

On the other hand, those who would cripple or kill the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act on the grounds that it is not now necessary for the continuation in the immediate future of present levels of production and prosperity in Pennsylvania or other States, fail utterly to comprehend the basic theory and practice of this act and also fail to recognize the close correlation between our long-range needs in this Nation and the immediate economic picture.

To a Senate which has approved such far-reaching measures as the UN Charter, Bretton Woods, the Marshall plan, and other broad-gaged proposals for the spreading and protection of world peace, for the expansion and improvement of peaceful means for international cooperation, I do not believe it is necessary for me to go into the imperative need for effective tariff cooperation among the various nations if international economic conditions are to improve. Although the House may not be at all sure sometimes in which way it is heading when it passes the Marshall plan one month to provide for progressive reductions of tariffs among recipient nations abroad and then turns around and seeks to open ways for the raising of American tariffs a month or so later. I do not think the Senate today is in doubt as to the vital importance to our hopes of achieving a decent world and of making possible the growth and spread of freedom through economic means. The Senate, I am sure, is convinced of the foreign-policy values of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by now. The action of the Senate's Finance Committee in dropping out some of the most objectionable features of the House bill—those features granting to Congress virtual veto power over all agreements—indicates general approval in that committee and in the Senate itself—for the committee is representative by and large of majority party policy in the Senate—of the fundamental theory of reciprocal trade, at least from the international point of view.

My concern with the committee bill, in addition to its significant limitation on the time of extension of the act to a mere 1 year instead of the customary 3 years, rests largely in the fact that the committee bill fails to recognize the close connections between actions taken now in boom times here in the United States with long-range economic programs.

Mr. President, the Senate is familiar with the fact that last summer three subcommittees of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report operating in different parts of the country completed what was perhaps the most far-reaching congressional experiment

in history, and certainly in modern times, in going to the grass roots—to the people—to find out what the prevailing sentiment was in this country in regard to charting our economic future.

We were assigned the task of determining the economic pulse beat of America. The purpose of this study was to provide the Congress with the basic facts of economic life in America so that the Congress could determine what legislative steps should be taken to preserve our prosperity and to prevent the development of conditions such as occurred prior to the tragic 1929 crash in our economy.

Of course, all of the subcommittees and all of the individual members of the subcommittees came back to Washington with their original views pretty much strengthened by what they had heard, each of us, naturally, paying the greatest attention to that testimony which bolstered our own views.

Nevertheless, I think all of the members of the touring subcommittees of the Joint Economic Committee last summer were tremendously impressed by the evidence we received of the close connection between the various industries of the country and the immediacy of the reaction on scores of other industries to the action of any one industry. I doubt if any of us were as familiar before that series of hearings with the true extent of the interdependence of all of the economic interests in the United States.

We learned, also, that the rank and file of the American people had become economically conscious, to an amazing degree, and amazingly aware of what was happening in Washington and in the world, which directly affected the individual citizen.

It was my impression from these hearings that there was a great deal of unwarranted pessimism among highly placed and influential leaders of industry over the fundamental soundness of our present economy. There were guarded references, but references unmistakably clear, nonetheless, to the impermanence of a 60,000,000-job economy and of a 200 billion or better national income. A great many industries were voicing reluctance to expand facilities for fear that our economic bubble would burst. Others looked abroad with a certain degree of nervous apprehension, fearing that a recovered Europe might cut seriously into our markets, both abroad and at home.

I will say that this was not the general feeling.

What disturbed me and other members of the subcommittees, however, was the fact that many prominent Americans voiced doubts as to the competitive ability of the American free-enterprise system.

Most of us do not share those doubts. America competed brilliantly throughout the world—throughout those portions of the world where competition was possible—before the war. When we have helped European industry to recover from the war's devastations, American industry, I am sure, will continue to be able to hold its markets and find new ones—that is, if competition is again possible.

This reciprocal trade agreement program is one of the keystones of our world-wide attempt to keep the channels of international trade open. Unless we continue to show the same wholehearted support for open international trade as we have done since the start of this magnificent program 14 years ago, then we will signal to all of the struggling nations of Europe, nations struggling to revive their economies and to win back foreign markets, that they had better not count too heavily on American cooperation. Once they begin to suspect that we might run out on them and on this dream of expanded international trade in both directions, then out of desperation, they are going to begin all over again to invoke the same closed-door, high-tariff economic nationalism which we set the example for just 20 years or so ago with the infamous Smoot-Hawley tariff.

A 1-year extension of reciprocal trade adopted now would, I am sorely afraid, be such a signal. It so happens that the greatest support in the House for the alleged reciprocal trade bill which the House enacted came from those who were most violent in their criticism of and opposition to the reciprocal trade agreements program in previous years. Just about all of the enemies in the House of the reciprocal trade program voted for the House committee bill. If the Senate allows itself to agree to a substantially similar measure, even though one or two objectionable features have been removed from it, the fact remains that the Congress, by its refusal to extend the act the customary 3 years, will be serving notice to the world that, should the Republican Party win in November, we can look for the reciprocal trade agreements program, as we have known it, to be murdered. Whether that is a justified conclusion or not is not too important. The fact remains that that is the conclusion which will be reached. Furthermore, if these time-consuming Tariff Commission reviews are to be written into the act, and if the Tariff Commission, as it would be under that proposal, were given as a practical matter virtually blanket power to set the limits of all tariff reductions on the basis exclusively of protectionism, we would find few nations willing to begin negotiations for tariff reductions and for two-way trade improvements for at least the rest of this year until they see which way the election is going to go and then for perhaps a year or two after that, until they see how drastically the next Congress, if it were to be a Republican Congress again, would go in emasculating or murdering the program.

Of course, our economy today, as of right now, could probably withstand the shock of a collapse in international faith in American economic policy. But over the long range a shock like that would be most severe, particularly in a State like my own, which is a State of tremendous export potential and a State whose industries depend on a gigantic volume of imports.

I have here a statement which I shall not take the trouble to read because of the severe limitation on debate, which sets down the importance of foreign trade and the reciprocal trade program to the various industries of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, although we can sell all of our products today in the American market, we all know that for a continuation of our present level of prosperity we are going to need foreign trade. That is elemental. We are going to have to drag down our prices in this country so that our consumers can continue to buy the things they help to make. Those readjustments, long overdue, are beginning to occur now to a modest extent. What I greatly fear is that we might wait until our domestic market collapses from lack of purchasing power before prices come down sufficiently, and by then it is too late. Industry is beginning to realize this, recognizing that once steel and coal and textiles and a few other great industries slow down for lack of orders, because of lack of purchasing power, and begin laying off their workers "temporarily" until things pick up, that these lay-offs, like a pebble thrown into a pond, send ripples out over the whole economic picture and start a psychology of fear which leads to extreme caution in all businesses and results in panic.

We do not need foreign trade now from the strict economic standpoint, perhaps, but we are going to need it if we are to preserve this high-level economy. Unless we indicate the willingness to play ball now with the other countries which need us desperately, then we are going to find that the good will has been thrown away and that when we do need customers abroad, we are going to find all sorts of barriers thrown in our way.

As I said, I have no intention of speaking here now, in view of the shortness of the time, on other than the economic angles because I know that the Senate is fully conversant with the importance of this program to our foreign policy and to our hopes for a decent world in which freedom—and that includes economic freedom and free enterprise—can exist. At the same time, I want to include with my remarks a few expressions from Pennsylvanians who are tremendously disturbed by trends in this country toward economic nationalism. I might say in passing that the Chambers of Commerce of Philadelphia and of Pittsburgh, and of other parts of the State, are wholeheartedly in accord with a continuation of the present act without change. I have here a letter from H. J. Heinz II, chairman of the United States Associates of the International Chamber of Commerce, Inc., endorsing the present act and urging its continuation. Mr. Heinz made a fine statement before the House Ways and Means Committee, which I think should also go in the RECORD. I have here other communications from leagues of women voters in Pennsylvania, from the United Nations Council in Philadelphia, from the chairman of Philadelphia World Trade Week, sponsored by the Philadelphia Chamber

of Commerce, from YWCA's, and so on, a few of the many, many I have received.

The Church Peace Union endorses the act and its extension as is for convincing reasons, which I include in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I believe with these Americans, and with most Americans, that for the best interests of the United States and of the world, and of world peace and prosperity, the Reciprocal Trade Act should be extended without change for 3 years.

I ask that some of these telegrams, letters, statements, and newspaper articles on this subject be printed following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

EXHIBIT A

PENNSYLVANIA'S STAKE IN RECIPROCAL TRADE

(Statement by United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania)

Pennsylvania is a great producing State with tremendous manufacturing and other industrial enterprises and with a huge volume of agricultural production, much of which goes into foreign trade. With a population in the neighborhood of 10,000,000 persons—second highest among the States—Pennsylvania demands great quantities of industrial supplies and consumers' goods, much of which come from abroad. For these reasons the Keystone State has a major and direct interest in foreign trade, and in the reciprocal trade agreements program.

INDUSTRIAL EXPORTS

Whether a particular article produced in Pennsylvania is actually sold abroad is less important than the fact that articles of that kind, wherever produced in the United States are exported. Foreign markets increase the total demand for these products and thereby help to sustain Pennsylvania's industry.

Among the major Pennsylvania enterprises producing goods which are customarily exported from the United States are the following, in the order of their importance in 1939: the iron and steel industry, the anthracite and bituminous coal industry, machinery manufacture (including electrical), petroleum refining, hosiery and other wearing-apparel industries, food and food-products industry, paper and paper-products industry, the production of certain nonferrous metal and metal products, and of important chemicals.

In 1939 these major Pennsylvania industries produced goods to an aggregate value of over $3,500,000,000; employed over 700,000 workers; and paid wages and salaries totaling over one billion dollars. Goods of these types, produced in Pennsylvania or elsewhere, were exported from the United States in 1939 to a value of nearly $1,750,000,000.

I have by no means called the full roll of Pennsylvania industries that benefit from United States exports. I could add leather, tanning and finishing, publishing and printing, manufacture of lumber and lumber products, rubber manufacture, manufacture of professional and scientific equipment and supplies, manufacture of tin cans, and so on. This group added millions of dollars worth of production and of wages and salaries paid. Millions of dollars worth of their products are exported from the United States.

In reciprocal trade agreements the United States has obtained the reduction of foreign restrictions against American exports of goods in all the classes which I have mentioned, as well as in many others. These concessions from other countries may take the form of reduction or elimination of tariffs or tariff preferences, guaranties against increases in tariffs, relaxation of import quotas, or other measures.

Thirteen countries have improved their customs treatment of iron and steel and their products, imported from the United States. Especially substantial concessions were obtained from such major markets as Canada, Cuba, the Netherlands, Brazil, Finland, Guatemala, and Colombia. Pennsylvania producers of iron and steel benefited, furthermore, by foreign concessions on highly advanced manufactures such as automobiles, machinery, and office equipment manufactured in other States for which Pennsylvania producers supplied the iron and steel.

On coal, Canada gave a guaranty against any increase in tariff. Not only have American exports of coal and coke exceeded imports in the past but the increased demand for coal for manufacturing and for transportation of all types of export goods has sustained the demand for Pennsylvania coal.

Twenty-four foreign countries have made concessions on their imports of machinery of practically all types other than electrical and on electrical machinery 22 countries have given us concessions. Five countries have given substantial concessions on their imports of refined petroleum products.

Twenty-three countries have made concessions of benefit to American producers of transportation equipment and 16 on rubber tires and tubes.

For every group of products which has been mentioned there has been an improvement in foreign market opportunities, so far as the regulations of the foreign governments are concerned, and these improvements have been obtained through the reciprocal trade agreements.

Thirteen countries have reduced their duties or otherwise improved their customs treatment of imports of silk, rayon, and other hosiery from the United States. In Pennsylvania 44,000 persons were employed in the hosiery industry in 1939. Five countries have made concessions on cotton shirts, of which the United States exported $1,375,000 worth in 1938. In the same year the United States exported nearly $1,500,000 worth of cotton dresses. Fourteen countries, including Canada, have made trade-agreement concessions on American paper and paper products. In Pennsylvania in 1938 trade-agreement benefits affected the 23,000 persons who produced $138,000,000 worth of paper products.

More than $126,000,000 worth of nonferrous metals and their products were produced in Pennsylvania in 1939. Wages and salaries in the industry total almost $34,000,000. Eight countries have made trade-agreement concessions on such products, of which United States exports in 1938 were valued at $94,000,000. Seventeen countries have improved their import treatment of United States paints, varnishes, and pigments. Twelve have made concessions on medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations and 14 on soaps and toilet preparations. Nearly $8,000,000 worth of such products were exported through the Philadelphia customs district in 1938.

FARM EXPORTS

Pennsylvania growers of corn, hogs, wheat, apples, peaches, and other things benefit because United States exports of such products support the market for them. In 1939 Pennsylvania had one and one-third million acres in corn and nearly 900,000 acres of wheat. Apples were grown on over 100,000 Pennsylvania farms and peaches on more than 40,000. More than half a million hogs were on 83,000 Pennsylvania farms in 1940.

While a number of trade agreements contain concessions on corn and corn products exported from the United States, most of the United States corn which is exported is in the form of meat and meat products on which 18 foreign countries have granted concessions which directly or indirectly benefit more than 131,000 Pennsylvania corn growers. These concessions were of direct benefit to Pennsylvania hog producers.

Seven foreign countries, including our major customers in Europe and Latin America, have given trade-agreement concessions on United States exports of wheat and 12 on wheat flour. These concessions supported the market for the 18,000,000 bushels of wheat grown on 80,000 Pennsylvania farms in 1939.

United States apple growers in Pennsylvania as well as other States have benefited from the concessions obtained in trade agreements with 21 countries. Eight countries have given the United States concessions on its exports of canned peaches, nine on dried peaches. Canada reduced its duty and made other concessions on fresh peaches from the United States. Cuba, Mexico, and several of the British colonies also reduced their duties on fresh peaches, while Brazil bound its duty at the existing level. The Pennsylvania peach crop of 1938 was valued at more than $1,750,000.

Other Pennsylvania farming enterprises which benefit from trade-agreement concessions include the growing of barley, oats, and potatoes. Four countries have made concessions on barley, 4 on potatoes, 3 on oats, 4 on oat flour, and 16 on rolled oats and oatmeal.

EXPORTS IMPROVE DOMESTIC MARKETS

The Pennsylvania or other producer of an export commodity is by no means the only person who benefits by the expansion of profitable foreign markets. Such producers, when they are able to sell their goods abroad to advantage, become paying customers in the domestic market for things which are not produced for shipment abroad. Examples are the workers in factories producing export machinery who, because they have jobs, are able to buy dairy products, fresh vegetables, clothing, shoes, and other things which are not exported in substantial proportions.

The domestic market, for practically every American producer, is the most important market. This is true whether he depends on foreign markets for a part of his sales or not. The more customers there are in the domestic market, and the greater the effective demand in that market, the better off all American producers are.

PENNSYLVANIA ALSO NEEDS IMPORTS

Many industries, in Pennsylvania as in other States, are dependent, in whole or in part, on imports in order to keep operating. Imports provide supplies of things which Pennsylvania industries and consumers need but which (if obtainable at all) can be obtained in this State or in this country only at higher costs, if at all. Among the industries which must have imported raw materials are, the steel industry, the silk and woolen-textile industries, the nonferrous metal and metal-products industry, the leather and leather-products industry, cane-sugar refining, confectionery industry, and the rubber industry.

In 1939 Pennsylvania industries which depend in whole or in part on imported raw materials produced more than $2,000,000,000 worth of goods, employed more than one-third of a million persons, and paid out more than $500,000,000 in wages and salaries.

It is well known, of course, that Pennsylvania and other consumers rely on imported supplies of coffee, tea, spices, cocoa, tapioca, and other products. The United States does not produce enough sugar, wool, hides, and certain other things for its own requirements.

IMPORTS NO MENACE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCERS

American producers of some commodities more or less competitive with imported products sometimes express fears that their industries will be injured by huge imports of low-cost foreign goods. Experience under the reciprocal trade agreements program has not borne out those fears. The tariff reductions made by the United States in trade

agreements are made only after the most thorough investigation to make sure that serious harm will not result for domestic industry.

In addition, most of the trade agreements now in effect, and all of those which may be concluded in the future, will contain an escape clause under which the United States can take immediate action to withdraw or modify a trade-agreement concession if it is found that, as a result of the concession, imports have so increased as to cause or even threaten serious injury to a domestic industry.

Among the commodities produced in Pennsylvania whose American producers have given voice to fears of foreign competition as a result of trade agreements are glass, silk and woolen textiles, rayon, pottery, and shoes.

In the case of glass, however, the United States is on a strongly export basis and domestic production has increased from a value of $450,000,000 in 1937 to $900,000,000 in 1946. Imports in 1937, the peak prewar year, were valued at $10,000,000; in 1946 the figure was slightly over $4,000,000. Exports of all glass and glass products were valued at nine and three-quarter million dollars in 1937 and at fifty-four and two-thirds million dollars in 1946. Before the war the United States produced more plate glass than all the European countries combined and production has risen from 141,471,000 square feet in 1939 to 252,000,000 square feet in 1947. Since the 1920's imports have supplied less than 1 percent of domestic consumption. In addition to these exports it is estimated that more than $3,000,000 worth of plate glass is exported annually in automobiles.

Domestic production of window glass has increased from 550,867,000 pounds in 1939 to 1,160,000,000 pounds in 1947; in the same period exports have increased from 730,000 pounds to 44,712,000 pounds; imports have dropped from 26,584,000 pounds to 281,000 pounds.

While the United States reduced its tariffs on window glass by some 30 percent in the recent agreement at Geneva, American glass producers will benefit by concessions granted to the United States by our two principal foreign customers, Canada and Cuba, in the same agreement.

The American woolen and worsted textile industry produces mostly medium and low-priced fabrics which meet more than 95 percent of the domestic demand for these fabrics. Imported fabrics are of fancy goods imported to meet a specialized and very limited demand at high prices on the basis of quality and style preference. Imports supplied smaller and smaller proportions of domestic consumption during the period 1929–39, and domestic production supplied 98 percent of consumption during the latter year. United States tariff duties on certain woolen fabrics have been reduced by proportionately greater amounts on the higher-priced goods, and the United States has reserved the right to increase the duty on imports of woolens and worsteds in excess of 5 percent of average annual production in the United States. Under these circumstances the great bulk of the industry in the United States retains fully adequate protection from foreign competition.

Before the war, silk was being largely replaced in American consumption by rayon, nylon, and other synthetic textiles. From 1929 to 1944 United States rayon yarn production increased about 5 times, and rayon staple fiber about 30 times. Postwar production is expected to show further great increases. Exports of rayon fabrics from the United States in 1939 were about 10 times greater in value than imports.

Imports of pottery, including the few types on which United States duties have been reduced, have steadily declined since 1937 and, in 1939, equaled less than 7 percent of domestic production. At the same time, domestic production has increased rapidly.

Similar conditions apply to other commodities on which United States tariffs have been reduced in trade agreements, and clearly demonstrate that domestic industries have nothing to fear from the trade-agreements program.

EXHIBIT B

STATEMENT ADVOCATING RENEWAL OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT BY H. J. HEINZ II, PRESIDENT, H. J. HEINZ CO., AND CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES ASSOCIATES OF THE INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TARIFF AND RECIPROCAL TRADE OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 5, 1948, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, despite the fact that we are met today in closed hearings, your recommendations in regard to the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will make front page news wherever people read. Interest in your work is at least as great in Moscow, London, Paris, and Chungking as it is in Washington.

I head a company which operates plants on three continents and does business in almost every country in the world. In the past 3 years, that business has taken me to Canada, England, the European continent, South Africa, and Australia. I think I have had perhaps a better than average opportunity to form an opinion of our commercial relations with the rest of the world.

To my mind, the economic and political stability of the world will rest to a large extent for some years on a delicately balanced tripod. At present the legs of that tripod are the International Bank and Monetary Fund, the European relief program, and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. If we eliminate or shorten any of these legs, world political and economic stability may topple.

As a member of the Republican Party I am proud of the record of statesmanship in international affairs which this Congress has made. I hope that record finally will contain at least one more chapter of accomplishment before adjournment—the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I believe that the reciprocal trade program should be extended for at least 3 years for these reasons:

1. The ultimate success of the European recovery program depends on renewal.
2. Our prestige throughout the world depends on renewal.
3. Our effort to contain communism will be aided by renewal.
4. Continuing domestic prosperity requires renewal.

1. THE ULTIMATE SUCCESS OF THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM DEPENDS ON RENEWAL

Only recently Congress thoroughly debated the merits of ERP. After exhaustive study you agreed that the economic rehabilitation of Europe is necessary for world peace and world trade. Passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 is ample evidence of Congress' and this country's conviction that revived trade is essential to the welfare and best interests of the United States.

Congress insisted on certain quid pro quos. Europe must help herself. To receive aid during the full life of ERP, it was understood that the recipient countries would step up their production goals to an extent that rivaled our own efforts under the stimulus of war. You required as one of the conditions that the recipient nations "cooperate with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among participating countries and with other countries as well." You also demanded that these countries "cooperate to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries." We must remember the United States is a participating country.

If we attempt to emasculate or fail to renew the Trade Agreements Act, can we demand a wholehearted effort by other countries? To do either would be to retard seriously the development of trade and would indicate at the very least a real reluctance on the part of the United States to do the same things which we tell others that they must do. If we expect them to rebuild their economies, we must provide opportunity for them to sell goods and services abroad.

2. OUR PRESTIGE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD DEPENDS ON RENEWAL

In the Orient, men and nations are concerned about "face." Our faces are going to be very red, our world prestige is going to fade, if we in this period of world economic crisis appear to sanction any retreat to economic isolationism. Even the slightest retreat will be interpreted in some quarters as a major rout.

If we could choose to let our prestige wane and at the same time choose to abdicate our position of world leadership, we might permit the reciprocal trade program to lapse. However, we have no such choice. We cannot abdicate.

In 1945, our Government issued the Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment. Out of this grew the London, Geneva, and Habana Conferences. Wherever I have gone abroad businessmen have greeted these moves of ours plus our support of reciprocal trade agreements as evidence that the United States is going to assume its full responsibility of world economic leadership.

In the years between the two world wars, commodity agreements, cartels, bilateral agreements, and blocked currencies helped to divide the world into groups of economically warring nations. However, during the past few years progress has been made by many nations toward reducing and eliminating such artificial obstacles to world trade. But most nations are still a bit uneasy. Any material change in the Reciprocal Trade Act as it now stands would be viewed correctly by the whole world as evidence of inconsistency and vacillation on our part at a time when the constancy of American purpose is the hope of the entire world—at least that part of the world which is allowed to hope.

3. OUR EFFORT TO CONTAIN COMMUNISM WILL BE AIDED BY RENEWAL

If I were to list the major objectives of world communism, I would put high on that list the forced withdrawal of the United States from world trade. Recent economic history indicates that when foreign trade is at high levels the trading nations enjoy greater economic stability.

World markets need American goods and this demand helps to maintain our production and will increase their productivity unless—

(a) Our prices rise to a point where purchases cannot be made; or

(b) We do not permit our customers to create dollar exchange with which to purchase our goods.

Communism does not flourish nor does it have much of a popular appeal when economic conditions are prosperous and stable. Even if we wanted to—and we don't—the United States could never attempt to be the lone rich nation in an international slum.

4. CONTINUING DOMESTIC PROSPERITY REQUIRES RENEWAL

We must recognize that we have not had a truly sound world trade since before World War I. In the twenties our foreign trade was financed by loans which were never repaid. In the thirties our trade was financed by the import of gold which we promptly buried. This reduced the gold reserve of our customers and contributed materially to their economic instability. In the forties our foreign trade has been primarily financed by

Government subsidies much of which will never be repaid.

Obviously none of these three methods of financing has provided a healthy, dynamic world trade. Extension of reciprocal trade agreements will assist in correcting trade imbalance.

Our present prosperity is synthetic unless our present export business is replaced by exports which are paid for in dollars which other nations get by selling to us. We have half the world's productive capacity and we are going to need foreign markets if we are to keep that productive capacity at work.

Full employment is now rated at about 60,000,000 jobs and 600,000 new people are coming into the labor market each year. If they are going to have jobs, we must export. Our foreign trade accounts for somewhere between 5 and 10 million jobs and that can be the difference between good and bad times. If we need to export to prosper, so do other nations; and renewal of the Trade Agreements Act is an assurance that the United States will not exclude their goods.

Currently the importation of goods which reciprocal trade encourages is anti-inflationary, because it increases the total supply of available commodities. It increases business in the distributive trades; it lowers the cost of many manufactured items by providing scarce but essential components. In the food industry many products would not even be processed where it not for imported materials. Many people forget that before the war the United States was the largest net importer of food in the world.

The principal question is not what we but what we will import. We cannot limit to the demand for American-made goods—but what we will import. We cannot limit our imports to those commodities which cannot be produced in this country but must import larger volumes of goods which will compete with American-made products. This need not be disastrous as some might allege.

Skilled American workmen, competent management, adequate financing, and modern American equipment will permit our producers to compete with foreign imports. There is ample evidence that the American per unit cost compares favorably with unit cost of foreign producers despite the disparity between wage rates.

In recommending renewal of RTA for 3 years, I do not wish to indicate in any way that Congress should lose any of its rightful control over this country's destiny. It should have the power to review the law at the end of 3 years. The determination of our trade policy remains with Congress. The existing machinery for hearing, reviewing, recommending, and bargaining, plus the escape clause is in my opinion adequate to execute such policy.

Any shorter period than 3 years would indicate an uncertainty in the United States policy which would discourage other nations in planning their trade policies. Negotiation of trade agreements is a lengthy process. As a practical measure, it would be extremely difficult to either negotiate new agreements or renegotiate old agreements if the present reciprocal trade program is extended for a period shorter than 3 years.

THE AMERICAN PULLEY CO.,
Philadelphia, May 14, 1948.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: Six years in a foreign country representing an American manufacturing company, plus a good deal of subsequent experience, study, and observation of international trade in its practical aspects, have led me to the firm conviction that the leading manufacturing and trading countries of the world must ever think in terms of reducing the barriers to international trade, whatever their form, as fast as circumstances reasonably permit. The foreign policy of the United States features this general premise.

I am convinced that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is a major element in this policy and that it has fulfilled a useful and important purpose in promoting the relaxation of trade barriers and the over-all flow of goods between countries.

Whether we like it or not, we must continue to take the lead in finding ways to increase international trade, including an increased volume of imports. Renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements is therefore clearly indicated by the circumstances, and I hope that you will see fit to vote for doing so.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. ROBINS,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
WHARTON SCHOOL OF FINANCE AND COMMERCE,
Philadelphia, May 27, 1948.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: I urge you to exert every effort to see that the Senate passes a bill extending the Trade Agreements Act for a 3-year term without crippling amendments, in place of the ridiculous act of sabotage and shortsightedness and partisan folly which has recently passed the House.

As a teacher of international politics and American foreign policy, I can think of no action which would do greater harm to our long-term objectives and to the cause of international economic sanity than the failure of the Congress to extend that program which has rightly been called "the cornerstone of our foreign economic policy."

I know that you are even more aware of the significance of this matter than I am. All I can hope, therefore, is that my letter, along with others to the same effect, may give you encouragement and support at this time, when so many of your fellow Members of the Congress seem incapable of putting national interests ahead of fancied political expediency.

Yours very sincerely,

NORMAN D. PALMER,
Associate Professor of Political Science.

WAYNE, PA., *June 1, 1948.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that the question of extending the present reciprocal trade agreements is now under consideration by the Senate of the United States, I would appreciate your doing everything in your power to have these extended for the full 3-year term after their present expiration date. At the same time I believe that you will find it beneficial to this country as a whole and especially to your own State of Pennsylvania to have the present tariff duties reduced to the maximum extent permitted under the law.

In the first place, I believe that you should extend the present reciprocal trade agreements for a 3-year period not so much because of the benefits arising from the provisions of the law itself but more because of the moral effect which such an extension would have on the many foreign countries to whom we, after many years of advocating high tariffs, have begun to advocate freer trade with less tariff barriers. Especially is this so in the case of the European nations where lower tariffs were advocated in connection with the Marshall plan in order to increase the interchange of goods between the various European countries thus lessening their dependency on goods obtained from or paid for by this country. If, after having recently advocated freer trade among nations, we should now prolong the present reciprocal trade agreements by only 1 year with the implication that they would probably be canceled at the end of that time, we would no doubt cause other countries to adopt other restrictive measures to restrain their foreign trade with the result that each country would try to become as self-sufficient as possible with possible disastrous results. At the same time we would lose what moral standing we had gained since very few countries would trust us after we had advocated one course for them and almost immediately followed the opposite course ourselves.

With regard to the lowering of tariffs to the maximum extent permitted by law, this should be done to protect both our manufacturers and the people who work for them. As you know, at the present time a large percentage of our exports are being paid for by money which has either been loaned or given to foreign governments. In the case of the money which has been loaned, it can only be repaid by selling us goods or services. Since our ability to use the services provided by foreign countries is rather limited, this means that most of our loans would have to be repaid by the sale of goods to us by the foreign countries. If, by the use of high tariffs or any other means, we prevent the foreign countries from selling us their products, they will not be able to repay the loans which we have made them and the result will be that our Government will have to cancel these loans. This cancellation would mean that the loans would have to be paid by the taxpayers in this country, since our Government is the people themselves, and any loss which the Government would have to absorb by reason of the nonpayment of these foreign loans would be passed on to the taxpayers.

In the case of gifts to foreign nations, the cost of these has already been absorbed by the taxpayer since the money for these gifts comes from our National Treasury, whose principal source of revenue is the taxpayer.

Since, therefore, the taxpayer will always have to pay for any foreign aid unless the cost of that aid is repaid to us by the foreign nations which receive it, every effort should be made to make it possible for the various foreign nations to reduce the amount of aid required by permitting them to sell us goods. The easiest way in which foreign nations can be induced to sell us more goods is by a reduction of tariffs to the point where the goods produced by these countries will be able to be sold widely in this country. Although you may say, and rightly so, that such reductions in tariffs may take some of the market from our domestic producers, I wish to point out that these domestic producers or their employees must pay out in money the equivalent of the goods which would be imported into this country if tariffs were lowered so that they do not benefit from higher tariffs but only appear to do so since they can see for themselves the fact that a plant must reduce operations due to lower tariffs but do not readily see that they must pay higher taxes because we are making gifts to Europe since the cost of these gifts comes from their taxes and is not collected as a separate item.

Coming, as you do, from an industrial State, you can readily see that it is to the advantage of the factories in this State to work as near full capacity as possible which means that they will usually have to export in order to do this. Since, as explained above, unless our taxpayers pay the cost of such exports either as gifts or because of the foreign nation defaulting on their loans from us, it will be necessary for us to import merchandise approximately equal in value to the value of the merchandise sold to the foreign country. Another point which I wish to call to your attention is the fact that a great many of the products

which are imported into this country and which frequently pay the highest tariffs are hand-made products which do not directly compete with the products made here.

From a study of the present tariff schedules, you will find that a great many of the products on which duties of 50 percent or more are charged are products which are normally hand-made and which therefore are not in direct competition with American products. On the other hand, most of the products which would directly compete with products made in this country carry low rates of duties, this being especially true in the case of items which are mass-produced here. Since there would be an advantage to our manufacturers of mass-produced materials to have customers who can pay them without having the money come eventually from the American taxpayer, I would suggest that you try to establish a ceiling of 50 percent on the duty which may be assessed against any foreign product imported into this country. Since this lowering of duties will not affect the great majority of products made in this country and will affect very few of the products made in this State but will provide foreign countries with a means of obtaining dollars with which to pay for the products made in your State and by the voters to whom you will turn for reelection, I believe that you can appreciate the advantages to be gained by this proposed reduction of tariffs.

In the foregoing I have tried to show the advantages to the taxpayers of this State and country of extending the present reciprocal trade agreements and also the advantage of lowering the present tariffs and, in the hope that you will use your influence to have these things done, I am,

Very truly yours,

FRED W. WEISENBACH.

UNITED NATIONS COUNCIL
OF PHILADELPHIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 30, 1948.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: The Legislative Committee and the Committee on Reciprocal Trade Agreements of the United Nations Council have endorsed the enclosed statement of policy. Also the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce has advocated prompt passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (H. J. Res. 335) now held in the House awaiting hearing.

In view of the great need for world trade revival and its special significance to an industrial region like Philadelphia, we look to you for leadership in this issue.

Can we count on your vote to support this bill and to withstand any efforts to cripple it with restrictive amendments?

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. GRENVILLE D. MONTGOMERY,
Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the United Nations Council of Philadelphia.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
YARDLEY-MORRISVILLE BRANCH,
Yardley, Pa., May 5, 1948.

The Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: This League has sent the following telegram to HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and to BERTRAND W. GEARHART, chairman of the Tariff Subcommittee, House of Representatives:

"The Yardley Morrisville League of Women Voters, no sewing circle, having studied international trade for 6 months, greatly deplores no opportunity for public hearings in Ways and Means Committee, and emphasizes its conviction that an unamended reciprocal trade agreement will be a potent factor in bringing peace and prosperity to the United States and the world."

We earnestly hope that you will do your utmost to see that this important matter is given open hearings, since we feel that the extension of the reciprocal trade agreement in its present form is vital to world recovery.

Very truly yours,

CLARA BROMBERG, *Secretary.*

PHILADELPHIA JOINT BOARD,
AMALGAMATED CLOTHING
WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 19, 1948.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the 20,000 members of the Philadelphia Joint Board, A. C. W. A., we urge that you act favorably on the bills extending the present reciprocal trade agreements program (H. J. Res. 335).

Never before in the history of our country has this program been as vital as it is today. Our Government has undertaken the building of a democratic Europe by the passage of the ERP, but in the long run an active, well-balanced world trade is the only way to prosperity and lasting peace. Congress, therefore, must and should lower tariffs to allow international trade to increase.

If world trade is to be extended, the United States must take the lead.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES WEINSTEIN,
Manager.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
HAVERFORD TOWNSHIP,
Haverford, Pa., May 21, 1948.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MYERS: The United States renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act before June 12 is in my opinion of utmost importance for world economic recovery. We must show our readiness to cooperate and share in world trade now and for the next 3 years. I hope you will do everything you can to see that this is renewed in its original form. I appreciate the work that you have already done for this.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. E. CADBURY, Jr.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 25, 1948.

The Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: The League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania, knowing well your stand on tariff barriers, is confident that you will exert your influence when the proper time comes to insure the extension of the trade agreements for a 3-year period, with no change in procedures as provided for in House Joint Resolution 335.

We are strongly opposed to the Gearhart bill, H. R. 6556, just reported out of committee providing for a 1-year extension and in other ways opening the door to the old log-rolling practices. We are certain you disapprove of this and we very much value your position in the matter.

Please do not feel you should answer this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ROBERT P. WETHERALD,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
PHILADELPHIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 26, 1948.

The Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: The League of Women Voters of Philadelphia has directed me once again to write you urging your vote in favor of renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a full 3-year period, without any modification. This act is basic to the success of the European recovery program; its continuation is fundamental to providing an outlet for the products of other countries. To achieve recovery other nations must sell, as well as buy; if we will not buy how can we expect them to repay us for what we sell them? May we count on your full support for the reenactment of this measure?

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DONALD F. BISHOP,
President.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 18, 1948.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate:

World trade week meeting last night approved unanimously extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years in present form without crippling amendments. Seven groups participating in meeting represent 12,000 members of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce; Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia, Inc.; Foreign Policy Association; Junior Chamber of Commerce; Pan-American Association; Philadelphia Commercial Museum; and United Nations Council. Resolution expresses expectation that legislators will recognize the changed international status of our country and adopt policies consistent with that position.

ROLAND L. KRAMER,
Chairman, Philadelphia World Trade Week Committee.

LANCASTER, PA., *May 26, 1948.*

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
Senate Office Building:

Public affairs committee, Lancaster YWCA, urges support 3-year renewal Trade Agreements Act.

Mrs. J. NEVIN SCHAEFFER,
Chairman.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *May 25, 1948.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building:

This organization strongly favors 3-year extension Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

JAMES H. GREENE,
Executive Vice President, Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSN.,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 28, 1948.

The Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MYERS: A short time ago we wrote you that the metropolitan public affairs committee of the Philadelphia YWCA had gone on record as favoring an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of 3 years and with no crippling amendments. We are greatly distressed by the action just taken by the House in ratifying an extension for just 1 year and with time-consuming procedures, such as, giving Congress some veto power in tariff making.

The present act provides for the participation of seven governmental agencies in public hearings and the subsequent decisions as background for the negotiation by the State Department (as agent of the President) of reciprocal trade agreements with other countries. Out of their several interests a com-

posite point of view is developed, which reflects the general national interest as effectively as it is humanly possible to do. This approach to negotiations with other countries has proved workable and effective during the past 14 years and it seems to our committee that such procedures should be continued. A 3-year extension of the present Trade Agreements Act without any amendments, remains the one hope for the United States continuing a consistent world-trade policy.

Therefore, when this question comes to the Senate for action we trust that you will do all in your power to see that the Senate passes a satisfactory and workable Trade Agreements Act.

Very sincerely yours,
Mrs. EDWIN E. AUBREY,
Chairman, Metropolitan Public Affairs Committee.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 28, 1948.

The Honorable FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MYERS: The board of directors of the Young Women's Christian Association, in its meeting of May 24, unanimously endorsed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and urges you to take immediate action to see that this act (H. J. Res. 355) is passed without any crippling amendments. The members of the board feel that this is a vital factor in promoting world understanding and international peace.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. W. W. COMFORT,
Corresponding Secretary.

ERIE COUNTY LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Erie, Pa., January 29, 1947.

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: As legislative chairman of the Erie County League of Women Voters, I am writing to urge your support of a program of international economic cooperation.

At this time there seems to be a rising tide of economic nationalism. You may be feeling pressure from businessmen fearful of foreign competition, protesting further tariff reductions. And yet, to prove our good faith in the unselfish promotion of world prosperity the United States must be willing to enter the World Economic Conference, set for April in Geneva, able to negotiate tariff reductions under the Trade Agreements Act with 18 nations. At the same conference it is hoped that agreement will be reached on a proposed charter for an International Trade Organization which will regulate trade to prevent discrimination and increase the flow of trade.

The dangers are evident. If, after leading the world thus far in the negotiations for better trade relations and economic peace, the United States abdicates its leadership, it will be a long time before any nation again takes seriously a United States proposal. Will we have freer nondiscriminatory trade, or will the world divide in economic blocs? The decision literally lies in your hands as a Member of the United States Congress. If we, the most powerful economic force in the world, back down on our stand for cooperation and isolate ourselves behind high tariff walls, the economically less-secure nations of the world will have no alternative but the formation of economic blocs. Our own export industry will suffer immediately. We have industrial capacity in excess of our own needs in some areas, and our farmers are already worried about falling prices and surpluses. If other nations have no dollars to buy our goods there will be unemployment in heavy industries and depression in farm prices.

May we hear how you feel about this problem?

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. JOHN C. ANDERSON,
Legislative Chairman.

[From the World Alliance News Letter of May 1948]

RESOLUTION ON THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Church Peace Union endorses the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act now in effect.

The Church Peace Union recognizes that:

1. Our domestic prosperity is dependent to a great degree on international trade.

2. While the Europrean recovery program is designed to reconstitute European industry, the success of the program is dependent upon access to markets able to absorb exports from western Europe.

3. The chances for peace will be immeasurably enhanced by a freer exchange of commodities among the nations.

4. The abandonment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements system would be evidence of the American faith in the process of peaceful international collaboration.

For these reasons the Church Peace Union earnestly urges the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act beyond the expiration date of June 12, 1948, and the prompt ratification of the International Trade Organization Charter.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 28, 1947]

WORLD TRADE KEY TO CITY'S PROSPERITY—EX-GI EXPORTS PRODUCT FOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE INDUSTRY COUNCIL

The critics who claim Pittsburgh's trade is dying on its feet will have to eat those words some day, if Harry E. Zwinggi has his way.

Mr. Zwinggi, a forward-looking ex-GI, who is secretary of the World Trade Council of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, has plunged into the job of convincing Pittsburgh businessmen and firms that the Steel City has hundreds of markets abroad for local products.

Convinced himself of the innumerable possibilities for establishing markets abroad, Mr. Zwinggi declared, "The World Trade Council receives at least 200 letters a month from points all over the world asking where they can purchase a particular product."

LUMBER FROM BRAZIL

Pointing out that every one of those letters represented a potential buyer of Pittsburgh's industrial goods, Mr. Zwinggi has taken on the task of making certain that a copy of the inquiry reaches every Pittsburgh producer of that product listed in the telephone book.

"For instance," he said, "we recently got a letter from a company in Brazil with mahogany to sell, and we notified every lumber company listed in the phone book of the offer."

Up until this time Mr. Zwinggi, who took over the council's secretarial post in February, has not been able to check on the results of this informal method of notifying Pittsburgh's businessmen, but the letters continue to pour in asking about Pittsburgh-made glass, steel sheets, paints, chemicals, and even hairpins and bathtubs.

"Pittsburgh's products are already known all over the world," Mr. Zwinggi said as he recalled the time he drove an army truck hundreds of miles into the jungle of Brazil.

"And there in a tiny community of 200 grass huts I found cans of Heinz food," he said, with the certain air of a man who needs no further proof of the selling qualities of Pittsburgh's goods.

FIRST EVER HELD HERE

In an effort to show other district merchants how they can join the 290 local firms already in the exporting business, Mr. Zwinggi and the council are planning the first world trade conference ever to be held in Pittsburgh.

Hundreds of district manufacturers are expected to attend the conference scheduled for March 31 in the William Penn Hotel. Plans are being completed now to obtain nationally known figures as the speakers. E. P. Schroeder, of the Westinghouse International Corp., is chairman of the council.

"Details of the program will include discussions on tariffs, customs, insurance, packing and marking, and all types of freight," he related.

Mr. Zwinggi's final proof that foreign trade is set for expansion is the large number of ex-GI's who come to him for information on how to establish import-export business, or where they can obtain employment in foreign trade.

"Sadly enough," he said, "most servicemen don't realize how much capital it takes to get started in foreign trade, but for those and the servicemen interested in studying for overseas jobs, we have information that may help them."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not intend to review the specific details of the bill. I merely want to say that I deeply regret that the majority party has undertaken to scuttle the reciprocal trade program which has been making such excellent progress during the past several years, and has come to be accepted by the American people and by the people of the world. I think the proposed action is entirely inconsistent with the purpose of the Bretton Woods Agreements. In those agreements we undertook to set up machinery which would promote multilateral trade throughout the civilized world. This act will prevent that. I think the proposed action is inconsistent with the basic principles of the European recovery program. We are doing the opposite of that which we ask the European countries to do.

Immediately after the last war, and for many years thereafter, there was great complaint on the part of many of the same persons who are supporting the present bill that foreign countries were unwilling to pay their debts. They seemed to be unable to realize that there is only one way for foreign countries to pay their debts or to carry on trade, and that is that we give them an opportunity to sell something to our country. I take it that the future of international trade and of reasonable economic relationships, and from them a peaceful world, depends a great deal upon the willingness of the United States to purchase in foreign markets.

There was a time, of course, in the history of our country when protective tariffs were justified. There are individual or certain aspects of our economy today in which protection is justified. I think the administration, whether it be

a Republican or a Democratic administration, could be relied upon to protect our industry in those specific instances where such protection is justified, but at this time, especially in view of the situation in the world and in this country, and in view of the action of the House on the ECA program. I think the destruction of the trade program will be a severe blow to our friends throughout the world and that it will discourage them as to the future policy of our country if we are not willing to cooperate in the development of multilateral trade agreements and are unwilling to make use of them in the political relationships which are involved in trying to integrate the western democracies.

I feel that it is a great mistake at this time, especially without thorough and serious consideration, to throw this program overboard. It would seem to me that if the majority party is as confident as they say they are of gaining the control of the executive as well as the legislative branches of the Government, they could well wait until next year to give thorough consideration to the matter. I think it is not only very bad judgment, but bad taste to come at this time in the Congress and ask for a bill which certainly on its face seems to be a repudiation of the reciprocal-trade program which has come to be accepted by the world as a basic principle of our foreign policy. This act will be but one more reason for the people of other nations to feel that they cannot rely upon our pursuing a consistent foreign policy.

I regret that I feel I must vote against the bill in its present form. Unless it is amended in a way to extend the existing law for at least 1 year—and I would hope 3 years—I must vote against the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado desire to use any of the time under his control now? The Senator from Kentucky authorized me to yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I send to the desk three amendments which will be offered at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I send to the desk an amendment, which I shall ask to have considered at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I regard it as distinctly unfortunate that at this particular juncture of world affairs and our relationship to those affairs, we should send a message to the rest of the world that we are beginning to change our policy with regard to international trade agreements. The trade agreements have been in operation now for a great number of years. They have not resulted, as I understand, in any great hardship upon any American industry. That was amply proved in the Committee on Finance when we considered the bill.

When former Secretary of State Hull proposed the reciprocal plan of handling international trade it was a somewhat unique departure from our old custom of horse-trading tariff arrangements. It is amazing that the plan was so successful. It is amazing that it has created so little real opposition here at home, although it has received opposition from the very beginning, and it is quite apparent that those who are active now in wanting to modify it and change it here and there have the same feelings and the same aspirations as those who opposed it from the very beginning.

Mr. President, we have learned in our international affairs in recent years that we cannot wrap our cloak about us and live alone. The doctrine which we are now facing is a suggestion that we return, at least partially, to economic isolation. We cannot survive on economic isolation. We have got to deal with other nations of the earth. They produce goods which we need. We produce goods which they need. In a healthy international relationship economically we find sources of strength for both our economy and for their economy. Just now, when we have passed the measure providing for the European recovery program, to help rebuild Europe, to restore its productive industries, to feed its famished people, is no time to change that policy and revert to our old system which we abandoned years ago.

We have found, Mr. President, that we cannot get along on the road to peace with isolation. We have come to know that we have got to cooperate with the other nations of the world if we are to attain the objectives of peace and make it possible for the peoples of the world to resume proper activities in their chosen professions and vocations and businesses.

So, Mr. President, as we cannot pursue the paths of peace successfully with a policy of isolation, we cannot successfully pursue an economic policy by cutting off to a measurable extent our trade with the rest of the world.

We cannot trade with other countries successfully when we say that we shall trade with them but demand that the trading shall be on our own terms; that we are unilaterally to determine the conditions upon which we will trade with them. What good does it do to say to a foreign nation, "Come over and trade with us, but when you come over and trade with us you must trade entirely upon our conditions and our terms, upon our dictates, upon our policies, upon our unilateral edict as to what kind of trade we will conduct"? That is not trading. That is economic dictatorship. It will not succeed. In the long picture it will not benefit our country as a whole. There may be some industries here and there which would derive an unholy profit from the other policy; but in the large picture and in the fuller view, our economic system and our people cannot prosper unless we trade with the other nations of the world. If we are to trade with them we must make conditions which will permit them to trade with us and receive a cooperative benefit from the transaction. It must not redound wholly to our own selfish privilege or advantage. We cannot successfully trade with foreign nations upon our own terms.

Do we want to send this message to the other nations of the world? Do we want to send such a message to Europe, for whose benefit we are pouring out billions of dollars to rebuild her industries and make it possible for European countries to produce more goods? What are they going to do with their goods unless they can dispose of them? What are they going to do with their goods without markets? That would indeed be a solemn message to send to the 16 cooperating nations of Europe. It is said that we are a great creditor nation; and we are a great creditor nation. How are the debts to be paid unless we permit the importation of goods from abroad?

Secretary Hull initiated this program. He has seen it succeed. It has now attracted world-wide attention, as witnessed by the fact that an International Trade Organization has been formed. Let us not abandon it. Let us not send the message out yonder to Secretary Hull in the naval hospital that his great achievement has been wrecked.

We ought to extend this program for a year as it is. I would prefer an extension of 3 years as it is. Within that time, in another year from now, we could approach the problem again with greater success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-six minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much time has the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the Senator from Colorado has only one further speech, and that that will be his own. Therefore, as the proponent of the legislation, I suppose he is entitled to close. I shall consume my time at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was a Member of the Senate, and of the Committee on Finance, when the Tariff Act of 1930, commonly known as the Smoot-Hawley Act, was passed. The enactment of that legislation was one of the most excruciating and tortuous experiences in the history of the United States Senate. Following the election of Mr. Hoover in November 1928, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives began in December 1928 to hold hearings on a new tariff act. Bear in mind that from 1921 until 1928 there had been enacted two separate tariff acts under the jurisdiction and guidance of the party then in power, which happens now to be in power in the two branches of the Congress.

Those hearings began in December 1928. They continued through the winter of 1928 and 1929. The House passed the bill. About the middle of 1929 it

came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Finance. Hearings were conducted before the Finance Committee, followed by consideration of the bill on the floor of the Senate. Final enactment came on the 30th of June 1930.

So the Congress was occupied almost exclusively, and certainly in a major sense, from December 1928 to June 1930, a period of more than 18 months, in the consideration of the last congressional tariff act. We talk about log-rolling and back-scratching. There was so much log-rolling on the floor of the Senate that we could see the logs rolling down the middle aisle. There was so much back-scratching that it was almost possible to see blood trickling down the backbones of Senators.

I know that Senators who say that they do not want to go back to the old system are sincere about it. I should dislike to think that there was a single Member of this body who wished to go back to the old method of making tariffs. But whatever the desires of Senators may be, however much they may deplore any possibility or tendency toward a return to those days, what is proposed here today is a tendency in that direction. It is a backtracking of our record, toward the old-fashioned way of making tariffs.

When the bill came to the floor of the Senate in the spring of 1930, although the Republicans were in the numerical majority of the Senate, with respect to nearly every single roll call, on nearly every item and nearly every schedule, the rates were reduced, as compared with those imposed by the amendments reported from the Senate Committee on Finance. When the bill reached conference, the conferees being headed by the late lamented distinguished Senator from Utah, Mr. Smoot, joint author of the bill, all the high rates were restored, and the bill came out of conference in the same form in which it had been reported, and it finally became law.

I do not mean to indicate that that measure alone was responsible for the disasters which occurred in this country and the world; but undoubtedly we set an example for all the other nations. By that act we practically announced that we were self-sufficient, that we need not trade with other nations, that we constituted a self-sufficient, water-tight economic trade compartment, thereby setting the example for nearly all the other nations to do the same thing. I believe that that very situation and that very development made a very substantial contribution not only to the panic of 1929 and the early thirties but also by reason of its emphasis upon a narrow, hidebound nationalism all over the world, made a very substantial contribution to the conditions which brought about World War II.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have only a limited time. If the Senator will wait until I conclude what I wish to say, I shall be glad to yield to him if I have any time left.

When the 1930 act was before the Senate the prediction was made here that when it became law, within 60 days from that very hour, prosperity would be on its way in the United States, employment would be revived, the curling smoke of industry again would be seen on the horizon. The distinguished Senator from Indiana, then the majority leader, Mr. James E. Watson, of whom all of us were fond and still are fond in a very affectionate way, made that specific prediction when the conference report was under consideration in the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry that I am so limited in time.

Mr. TOBEY. I only wish to inquire whether his tongue was in his cheek when he said that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not looking at his cheek, but I was thinking of his head. [Laughter.]

In 1929 our foreign trade—in 1929, mind you; just a year prior to the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which the Trade Agreements Act was intended to soften—our trade with other nations amounted to $9,640,000,000, or only a little less than $10,000,000,000, in that 1 year. But after the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act became effective in June of 1930 our international trade fell off until, in 1932, it amounted to only $2,934,000,000. That was for both imports and exports. That meant that in 2 years, operating under the Smoot-Hawley tariff law, which it was said would revive everyone in the United States, we lost two-thirds of our international trade.

Mr. President, we know what conditions were at that time. We know that farm surpluses were piled up until no market for them could be found. We know that the industries of the country were shut down because no markets for their products could be found. In 1930 or 1931—I have forgotten the exact date—the Honorable Robert P. Lamont, then Secretary of Commerce in the administration of Mr. Hoover, in testifying before a committee of which I was a member, stated that a loss of $1,000,000,000 in American foreign trade meant a loss of jobs by 3,000,000 American working people, no matter whether that loss of trade was in imports or exports; he said that much loss in our international trade meant the loss of 3,000,000 jobs in the United States.

So it was in order, Mr. President, not to return to the old log-rolling, back-scratching methods of enacting tariff laws; and when the Roosevelt administration came into power and Secretary Hull became the head of the State Department, recognizing the impossibility of getting a fair, economic tariff law by those methods, he proposed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which was enacted in 1934.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to what happened under that act. Following the enactment of that law in 1934, many trade agreements were entered into under the jurisdiction of the President and the Secretary of State, in accordance with the law. A comparison of the annual average of our international commerce for the 2 years 1938 and 1939—and they were prewar years, let us remember—and our annual average of international commerce for the 2 years 1934 and 1935, 1934 being the year in which the Trade Agreements Act was passed, and 1935 being the following year, shows that for the years 1938 and 1939 United States exports to nations with which we had trade agreements increased 63 percent; in other words, in 1938 and 1939 we shipped to other nations which had trade agreements with us 63 percent more of our goods than we did in the corresponding period 1934–35; but our exports to non-trade-agreement nations increased by only 32 percent during the same period. In other words, during 1938 and 1939 under the trade-agreements program our exports to other countries—thus giving labor to American working men and profits to American capital—increased 63 percent, or nearly two-thirds, whereas our exports to the nations with which we had no trade agreements increased only 32 percent, or approximately only one-third. For the same period, United States imports from trade-agreement countries increased by 27 percent. So it appears that while we were increasing by 63 percent our exports to nations with which we had trade agreements, we were increasing our imports from those countries by only 27 percent, which could not possibly harm American industry; and we were increasing our imports from non-trade-agreement nations by only 12½ percent. I give those figures for those two corresponding periods of 2 years each because they are typical and present a fair cross section of our trade with trade-agreement nations and with nations without trade agreements with us, all of it being in a time of peace, and not in a period of stimulation due to war.

Of course, all of us know the chaos which existed all over the world when World War II ended. We know the devastation which had come about in all the world. We know how the war destroyed cities, industries, and economies, and actually destroyed the morale of the people of the world. It was then that we ourselves took the initiative in bringing about the enactment of legislation and the consummation of international policies which would revive trade and thereby revive employment and thereby revive economic stability and thereby also revive political stability, because, as all of us know, it is impossible to have political stability if there is no economic stability; and that is as much true of the United States as it is of any other country in the world. Whenever we have had economic depression and disaster, whenever we have had low employment and low business, that very economic condition has determined the political complexion of our country, as was evidenced in 1932 when, largely due to the economic collapse of our entire economy and our entire industrial system, the then candidate for President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, received an overwhelming majority, because of the economic conditions which prevailed in the country, and which had prevailed for nearly 4 years.

So we initiated all these movements. It was the United States of America, our Government, representing our people, that initiated the conference at Dumbarton Oaks that ultimately resulted in

the conference at San Francisco which wrote the Charter of the United Nations; and in that Charter of the United Nations we not only dealt with political conditions and political cooperation, but we set up a Social and Economic Council to deal with social and economic problems in all the nations that were members of the United Nations. That was a movement initiated on our part, and it was consummated by the signatures of the representatives of nearly all the nations of the world.

We also initiated the conferences which took place at Bretton Woods, resulting in the establishment of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund for the stabilization of currencies—all of which was an economic movement in the direction of international stabilization, international trade, and international cooperation to bring about the production of goods which might finally reach markets and thereby increase the employment of men to turn out those goods, because men cannot be employed in industries unless the products of those industries find a market.

So the question of employment and economic recovery and the question of profits on invested capital are involved in this international movement which we ourselves initiated in all the various organizations and set-ups of which we have been a part.

Then, of course, we know that it was our Government, representing our people, without regard to politics—and I am happy to say that in all these things there has been political cooperation here in the United States no less than cooperation between the heads of governments—that took the first steps leading to the United Nations. Without regard to politics, we endorsed the United Nations, and we rejoiced at its consummation; and the United Nations Charter was adopted by the Senate with only two dissenting votes, as I recall, and without regard to politics.

Likewise, without regard to politics we entered into and consummated the agreements at Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods. Following that, we also initiated the Economic Conference at London, which proceeded later at Paris, and then at Geneva, and finally in Habana, designed to bring about an international trade organization that would seek in some way to level off the rough barriers, the rough edges which formed obstructions to trade and employment and profits and to economic political stability.

Let us see what we have done about that. We have not yet passed upon the International Trade Organization, because it has not reached us, and will not reach us for some time.

Mr. President, we have, as I said, initiated all these programs for international cooperation economically and in matters of trade. Then a year ago we initiated through our Secretary of State delivering what was then regarded by some as a mere casual commencement address at Harvard University, the program for economic cooperation on our part to help restore the devastated economies and morale of Europe. We know the history of that program. General Marshall said, and wisely said, that we could not be expected to pour money indefinitely into a relief program, that before we would be justified in doing much more, if any more, the nations of Europe must get together and take account of their own condition, take stock of their own possibilities, to see how much they could help themselves, and help one another, and when they had done that, then we would be in a position to know what we would have to do or could do under the circumstances.

All those steps were taken, at our invitation and at our suggestion. The result was the enactment of what is commonly called ERP or the Marshall plan, or the economic cooperation act, by whatever name it may be called; it makes no difference. Having in mind what we had done and what they had done, we set forth certain stipulations in the act of Congress. We required them first to make agreements one with another. We required them to make agreements with the United States before they could receive this assistance. The agreements they make one with another, which we require in the law before we will agree to give them any relief or any assistance, are that they shall cooperate to produce things within their own boundaries and cooperate to find markets for them beyond their own boundaries when they have been produced, that every one of those 16 countries shall level off barriers to trade and that not only shall they do that with respect to themselves, but they shall make agreements and efforts also with other nations likewise to level off and reduce the barriers between the respective countries in the matter of trade, so that they may find a market for what they produce.

How foolish it would be for us to give any one of those countries money or loan them money in order to establish factories unless there were a fair prospect that what the factories produced could find a market in some other country. Would it not be a silly performance on our part to set up a factory in any country merely to see it produce goods without any possibility of a market? Therefore we require them in advance, and it is a part of the law which Senators can read for themselves and with which they are all familiar, that as a condition precedent they are to make agreements among themselves to stimulate production within themselves and to stimulate trade among themselves, which means the leveling off of carriers.

As a part of that, as a result of it, the organization of the customs union by Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg, known as Benelux, has already been agreed to and is in effect. Subsequently an agreement by those countries and Great Britain and France has been entered into. All these things have been at our invitation, by our initiation, by our suggestion, and even later by our very requirement that before we will aid them they will do all they can to produce a revival of trade and a revival of employment and a revival of the economic foundations of liberty and political stability in all the countries which are involved in the Marshall plan program.

Mr. President, in spite of that which has been done at our suggestion and on our initiative, after leading these nations up the hill, after meetings in London and in Paris and in Geneva and in Habana, and through our influence and our persuasion, having led these nations up to the top of the hill in the international trade revival, we here are asked to march down the hill at least two-thirds of the way, leaving them up there where we have led them. I am unwilling to do that, and, because I am unwilling to do it, Mr. President, I shall not be satisfied with a 1-year extension of this act.

I shall offer an amendment to extend the act 3 years without limitation or restriction. If that is defeated, I may offer an amendment providing a 2-year extension. If that is defeated, or even if I do not offer the 2-year amendment, I shall offer a 1-year amendment, so that the Senate may pass upon the question whether it desires a continuation of the program without restriction and without delay and without requiring the President of the United States to wait around for the pleasure or the whim of a bipartisan Tariff Commission before he can even initiate negotiations with any other country in the world. And that is what this proposal is. He cannot even start to negotiate with any other Nation until he has submitted to the Tariff Commission the list of the things that might be the subject of any possible negotiation, and then he must await their action before he can do anything further.

In my judgment, if this amendment, notwithstanding its distinguished sponsorship, shall be adopted by the Congress, there will be no more trade agreements entered into within the next year under it, because it will be physically and I believe intellectually impossible for the Tariff Commission, being a bipartisan board made up of three Democrats and three Republicans, even if it did not divide on party lines, to make all the investigations necessary to advise the President with respect to it so that another agreement might be made before the year expires.

Therefore I think the adoption of this proposal is the death-knell of the trade agreements program and anything that may be done under it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement made before the House Committee on Ways and Means by the Honorable Charles P. Taft, in which he refutes the argument that injury has been done to any industry on account of the trade agreement program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES P. TAFT, FORMERLY DIRECTOR OF WARTIME ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, VICE CHAIRMAN, CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCAL WORLD TRADE, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS SUBCOMMITTEE MAY 6, 1948

This testimony is personal, and not on behalf of the Federal Council of Churches, although it is in no way inconsistent with the position of that organization which I have set forth today.

I was director of Wartime Economic Affairs in the State Department in 1944, and dealt with the problems of wartime procurement for us and for our allies and the requirements of all of us, as well as of the countries from which we purchased. It gave me considerable practical experience in this field. I was in charge of the presentation of the case for the Government in the hearings on the renewal of this act in 1945.

I do not wish to repeat the testimony of witnesses better qualified than I as to the urgent necessity for us in the United States not only to maintain our position of leadership in the economic reconstruction of the world, upon whose prosperity we must be dependent for prosperity at home, but to promote our own welfare by making the United States the greatest truly world market. That will mean both high levels of employment and general maintenance and improvement of our standard of living, and will promote healthy business and living conditions everywhere else.

What I wish to do today, however, is to recall what was predicted by various industry spokesmen 3 years ago and to tell you what has happened to their industries since then. That comparison casts serious doubts upon the fears so eloquently expressed now.

The statement made by Mr. W. L. Clayton on many occasions 3 years ago was that this program had been and would be so administered as to cause no substantial injury to any American industry of any import.

The problem is to determine what is "substantial injury." I submit to you that if from a base period there has been an increase in the production of an American industry, in which of course I include those producing any major agricultural staple, it has not been injured at all. That is true even though it may supply a smaller percentage of American consumption of the product of that industry.

If there has been a reduction in the total production of the industry, then the industry has presumably been injured by something. The producers concerned, however, have clearly not been injured if they have without difficulty or loss switched to some other product which they are now producing profitably.

So, also, if they have maintained their percentage of American consumption, it would seem clear that the reduction is not caused by imports, but by general economic conditions, and the reciprocal trade agreements cannot be blamed. The industry has not been substantially injured by any such agreement.

Let me apply these principles to specific industries from which you have heard at length, either in the 1945 or 1947 hearings or in the Congress during these years.

The producers of pulp have been cited at length. Clearly what has happened to this industry has nothing to do with tariff policy, or at least very little. The exhaustion of our supplies of the raw material led inevitably to the development of supplies in Canada, and the producers themselves found it desirable to move the plants to Canada in many cases. The transportation cost of the raw material as compared with the cost of moving newsprint makes that obvious. Some of that trend is due to the absence in this country of adequate conservation policies. How can any intelligent person blame the reciprocal trade-agreements program?

On cattle, Mr. Mollin, of the National Livestock Association, testified that the act does not provide adequate safeguards against low-cost production abroad, and that no one but Congressmen from the districts where the industry was located could protect them. He felt that the real threat was the possibility that some day South America might clean up the hoof-and-mouth disease.

The hoof-and-mouth disease is worse than ever, and right next door to us at that. Meantime we pay sky-high prices for meat, and Canada will not even let meat out. The percentage of our demand supplied by imports, which before the war was under 2 percent and was never over 5 percent, is now negligible. Is the cattle industry damaged by the tariff policy of the United States? When they are damaged, that is the time to act, and to act on the general basis that I have suggested above. In the meantime, I suggest that consumers have a little consideration, instead of bogeymen. Today we have the lowest number of stock sheep since 1867, and cattle and hog populations are away down. Where is any injury at all?

Three years ago there was no testimony from any aluminum producers so far as I can find. But there is an equally interesting contrast between statements made to Congress and to the stockholders in a series from the pen of Mr. Reynolds, of Reynolds Metals Co.

January 21, 1947: Reynolds says that if the tariff is reduced, cheap Canadian aluminum will enter the United States and destroy the independent aluminum industry.

During the public hearings of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, January 21, 1947, Mr. Walter L. Rice, vice president of the Reynolds Metals Co., stated that: "Reynolds Metals Co. believes, * * * that if you take the tariff protection away, if you let the Aluminum Co. of Canada come across the border and sell its cheap aluminum in this market, that you will destroy competition. You will destroy an industry that has real promise, and you will destroy a tremendous Government investment." He continued that "Reynolds Metals Co. is very definitely interested in export trade as well as domestic trade. If we have a surplus production of aluminum, we are definitely interested in exporting that surplus to South America, to Asia, and to other foreign nations."

March 8, 1947: Reynolds' annual statement to stockholders cites strong demand and concludes further plant expansion needed.

The annual report stated: "Your management faces the future with optimism. The market for aluminum and its products have already been expanded to several times their prewar size. We are confident that the demand will require all of the present capacity plus further expansion." The report continues that net profits in 1946 (when United States imports were 41,000 tons, instead of 16,000 as in 1947) were 21 percent greater than during any previous year.

November-December 1947: Reynolds and and Permanente allege that cheap Canadian aluminum, as a result of tariff reduction, will "stifle" domestic independents.

Reynolds and Permanente petitioned the President, the Secretary of State, and Senators and Representatives to cancel the tariff reductions made under the general agreement (effective January 1, 1948, and to raise the old duty by 50 percent on grounds that "full justice to the independent producers of this country would require a virtual embargo on Canadian aluminum." They said that the tariff reductions would enable the Aluminum Co. of America, through its relations with the Aluminum Co. of Canada, to bring low-cost Canadian aluminum into the United States to undersell the domestic independents and "to stifle the competition of the two new producers (Reynolds and Permanente) and thereby further entrench Alcoa's monopoly."

November 1947: Aluminum workers of Reynolds plants wire Congressmen that tariff reductions will jeopardize their jobs.

An example of these telegrams is Mr. Edward Kaiser's wire to Representative KERSTEN November 20, 1947, that "These tariff cuts will jeopardize jobs of 20,000 employees working in Reynolds Metals Co. because aluminum can be produced cheaper by Aluminum Co. of Canada."

January 1948: Canadian prices of aluminum are raised after the United States tariff reductions go into effect.

The Canadian prices were raised by 1 cent per pound, the full amount of the tariff reduction. Thus, contrary to the expectation implied in the Reynolds letters, Canadian aluminum is not being sold any cheaper in the United States after the tariff reduction than before.

April 1, 1948: Reynolds predicts continued prosperity in aluminum industry.

The annual report of Mr. Reynolds, president of Reynolds Metals Co., to company stockholders predicted that "In my opinion the year 1948 will see the continued prosperity of the aluminum industry * * * expansion in these numerous directions (building, construction, and automotive) coupled with the fact that national air power will be increased beyond the former peacetime expectancy levels, may well provide the necessity of increasing aluminum production beyond its present peak which is seven times greater than prewar." (Net income of the company was $12,815,000 or $11.12 per share in 1947 but data are not comparable with earlier years because of special income relating to financing another company.) (American Metal Market, April 1, 1948.)

April 19, 1948: Mr. Reynolds proposes construction of new aluminum plants.

Mr. Reynolds reported that a shortage of aluminum would make futile proposed expenditures for national rearmament and that domestic plants' capacity should be expanded to 1,000,000 tons per year.

I do not need to quote the many foreboding statements on woolen textiles in 1945 and 1947. I will only record the fact that net profits after taxes of one of my friends, Mr. Sylvan Stroock's company in 1947, were nearly eight times as great in 1947 as in 1939 ($908,000 from $104,000), and the American Woolen Co. was up from $2,300,000 in 1939 to $20,000,000 in 1946, after taxes.

In cotton textiles I have great confidence in the capacity of Solomon Barkin, economist of the Textile Workers Union, CIO, on whose work Mr. Rieve's testimony was based. Dividends for the cotton-textile industry as a whole were reported for 1947 as 56 percent more than for 1946.

Where is the injury substantial or otherwise?

As to watches, Mr. Potter, of Elgin, said, in April 1945, "In short, whenever the industry gets back into civilian production, it will be infinitely worse off than it was when the war started. The reconversion will deepen this disadvantage." As to the predictions of competent observers that there was a reservoir of purchases of watches the same as other industries, Mr. Potter said:

"I think you have got to remember this: That there have been more watches sold in the last 3 years; that the money in the consumer's hands could buy watches—he couldn't buy anything else; that the other things were not available; and while we can see a good backlog of orders for a short time, for us to get back on the retailer's shelf. I

don't see the big watch business that is going to match that $150,000,000 income the way it is going to come along with your washing machines and your radios and whatnots. They are going to buy the things that they haven't had the opportunity to buy."

On August 18, 1946, appeared the following headline in the New York Times: "United States watchmakers seek a peak volume; 1947 sales expected to be 50 percent more than prewar level; Swiss competition strong."

On March 3, 1948, in the New York Times, appeared a story on the watch business and the Elgin Co. American ingenuity, which in the long run is all that can keep us ahead of anybody, has put Elgin with its new watchspring where tariffs can't do much to it. The story read as follows:

"Elgin watch record sales for 1947; net was $1,387,244—equal to $1.75 a share.

"The Elgin National Watch Co. transacted last year the largest volume of sales in its history, with a total of $22,157,658, exceeding the 1946 volume of $17,800,519 by 24.5 percent, according to the annual report of T. Albert Potter, president, mailed to stockholders yesterday. He forecast an increase in production in 1948."

I could go on in many other fields, and the story would be the same. Injury comes only when there is an absolute reduction in business and a reduction in percentage, and also when a producer cannot quickly and profitably shift from a product competitive with imports to one not so competitive. Such a standard has in fact been applied under the fixing of the tariff rates, and can readily be applied in the future under the escape clauses.

So at this stage Congress should certainly renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without change. Nothing could damage our interests more than a crippling of this policy as we put the Marshall plan into effect, which calls for just the principles of trade established under this act. Nothing could advance our interests more than a firm declaration of Congress in favor of these policies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to place in the RECORD at this point a statement made only a few days ago by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, an outstanding candidate for the Republican nomination for President, in which he endorsed the 3-year extension without limitation of the Tariff Agreements Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I favored the reciprocal trade treaties from the very beginning. I favor their extension now for the full 3 years and I believe that with a Republican administration we could avoid the abuses that have caused so much criticism. I am entirely confident that these policies are sound, they are necessary for the development of trade; trade is the route by which peace is brought about and it is of great importance.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to include also as a part of my remarks a similar statement on the part of Governor Stassen in favor of the 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act, without crippling amendments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During this interim period, while the discussions of our future trade policies proceeds within the Republican Party, leading to a decision in the platform of 1948, it is of grave importance that we do not obstruct the existing trade program, while we share the responsibility of our national administration, with Republican majorities in the Senate and the House, and an opposition party President and executive branch.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope, Mr. President, that the 3-year extension may be granted. If we cannot get that, I hope we can get at least one more year without a hobble, without a blind bridle upon the President of the United States to prevent his acting in behalf of this great program in line with all our professions and all the enactments on this subject by the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk, and there will be called up in due order, four amendments, one of which has the purpose of extending the act from June 12, 1948, until June 30, 1949, so that there will be no hiatus due to the delay of Congress in extending the act. I assume that that will meet with the general approval of the Senate.

There is another amendment which is responsive to the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], under an interpretation which he made of the bill and the amendments reported by the committee, that the Tariff Commission in connection with future agreements with countries with which we do not now have agreements might have to consider all the items which had been considered in connection with the Geneva agreements. The amendment will simply limit the Tariff Commission's consideration to those items directly concerned between the United States and nations with which we may in the future make trade agreements. As has been pointed out a number of times today, there are no important treaties remaining to be consummated, and the State Department has no present plan of opening negotiations with any country.

There has been sent to the desk an amendment offered by myself, at the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], which changes the words "domestic producers," which met with some objection, to read "the domestic industry producing like or similar articles." I assume that that amendment will be generally acceptable.

The fourth amendment which has been sent to the desk was inspired by an objection made by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. The purpose of the amendment is to give the Tariff Commission 120 days—from the time it receives the list of articles which it shall investigate and on which it shall report—within which to conclude its report. If it does not conclude its report within that time the President is free to go ahead and do as he pleases, without the report.

In this connection, Mr. President, the argument has been made several times today that the Tariff Commission might have a tie vote. If the Tariff Commission has a tie vote and does not report in time, the President will be able to do as he pleases without the aid of such report. So there is no possible constriction of the President's power under the tie-vote theory.

It has been suggested that we are marching down the hill in this matter. There has not been one argument made today which substantiates that claim. The President retains every power he has at the present time. Not a particle of power would be taken away from him. He can accept or reject the recommendations which are made to him. If he rejects them, he only has the burden of making an explanation. It is to be assumed that since the test is his own, he will not reject the recommendations unless he is able to make an explanation that will meet with general approval.

It has been suggested that many businessmen have been complaining when they have not been hurt. The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has pointed out that we now have our tariff levels to a point where, if we make a further substantial reduction, we reach the level of free trade. Many wise men believe that under the reductions which have already been made, we might find ourselves in a similar situation to that in which we found ourselves after World War I, when the productive facilities of the world were restored and the world came into a surplus position, as it will again, and the markets of this country were demoralized by dumping, and tariff legislation was necessary.

Those persons who are complaining about injury have a most substantial reason for it. Mr. Clayton reaffirmed again and again at the hearings that they are taking calculated risks in making cuts and concessions. He said, in effect, "You have to look to the escape clause for your protection against injury."

Let us see what the escape clause provides. The escape clause sets up four conditions for taking an escape. They are all in the Geneva agreement. First, that there has been an increase in the quantity of imports. Secondly—please mark this one—that this increase has been the result of unforeseen conditions. Obviously, if calculated risks are taken—and Mr. Clayton emphasized again and again that they are being taken—the injury has been foreseen and there is no ground for escape.

It has been said that it is important to bring in the remaining countries. I should like to see them brought in; there is no reason why they cannot be brought in; but the State Department did not think so. It has no definite plans at this time, for bringing them in. It did not even invite those countries to Geneva. They did not invite themselves to Geneva, and their proportion of world trade is entirely unsubstantial.

The testimony showed that the Tariff Commission could take whatever work was required entirely in stride.

It has been said that if we pass this bill with its amendments we are doing nothing if we rely on the Tariff Commission. On the contrary, the Tariff Commission prepared and presented more than 1,400 digests, touching more than 3,000 articles, in which we were directly interested in the Geneva multilateral agreement. Yet it is said that the Commission cannot handle this infinitesimal work which might be connected with agreements which may be made in the future but for which there are no plans.

It has been suggested that the Tariff Commission may come to a tie vote. I

have already replied to that. If the Tariff Commission becomes tied, there is no report, and the President can do as he pleases. Those who are opposing this mild restriction which is being placed on the President certainly can have no substantial objection to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the close limit of time upon me I cannot yield. I am sorry.

It has been said that we go back to the Smoot-Hawley Act and to the cost-of-production theory. The bill and the amendments before the Senate specifically provide that any increase or any decrease within the limits of 50 percent up or down must be taken from the rates in effect on January 1, 1945, just as provided in our last extension.

The cost-of-production suggestion was gone into fully this morning. The existing regulations prescribing criteria under which the Tariff Commission operates when it is attempting to find out whether there has been injury, include the cost of production, competitive factors, percentages of imports, effects on particular areas of the country, and so forth. The Tariff Commission said explicitly that it has no fixed standard, but that it will consider anything that is pertinent to the problem. It must move, because it has to do its job, under the amendment, in 120 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a half minute remaining.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is said that the Tariff Commission fixes the peril points without consideration of such matters as national defense. This bill and the amendments do not preclude the President from giving any weight of his own choosing to the recommendations of the military or of anyone in this country on the question of national defense or on any other question that would be pertinent in considering whether to make a trade agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. All time under the agreement has expired.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky will be received and will lie on the table until the appropriate time to consider it.

The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cain	Ecton
Baldwin	Capehart	Ellender
Ball	Capper	Feazel
Barkley	Chavez	Ferguson
Brewster	Connally	Flanders
Bricker	Cooper	Fulbright
Bridges	Cordon	Green
Brooks	Donnell	Gurney
Buck	Downey	Hatch
Butler	Dworshak	Hawkes
Byrd	Eastland	Hayden
Hickenlooper	McKellar	Smith
Hill	McMahon	Sparkman
Hoey	Magnuson	Stennis
Holland	Malone	Stewart
Ives	Martin	Taft
Jenner	Millikin	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Thye
Kem	Myers	Tobey
Kilgore	O'Conor	Tydings
Knowland	O'Daniel	Umstead
Langer	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Lodge	Pepper	Watkins
Lucas	Reed	Wherry
McCarran	Revercomb	White
McCarthy	Robertson, Va.	Wiley
McClellan	Robertson, Wyo.	Williams
McFarland	Russell	Wilson
McGrath	Saltonstall	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask that the four amendments which I have submitted be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 6, after the word "extended", it is proposed to insert "from June 12, 1948."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. I have sent to the desk an amendment proposing a 3-year extension, from the 12th of June 1948, and to strike out the remainder of the committee amendment. Is it in order to offer the amendment in that form? The committee amendment is one amendment, although it deals with two sections. It strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts one amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The situation seems to be rather complicated and involved. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is in the nature of a complete substitute for the committee amendment. In the opinion of the Chair, the committee amendment should be perfected first, then the Senator's amendment in the nature of a substitute will be in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. If that is the ruling of the Chair, I modify the amendment by eliminating that part which strikes out the remainder of the committee amendment, and limit it to the change in the period for the extension as carried in section 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator is now confining his amendment to a change in the date. The Chair asks the Senator to indicate how he wants his amendment to read.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to question the propriety of the Chair's ruling, but I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Committee on Finance proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill, and brought in a single amendment consisting of two paragraphs. It occurred to me that it would be regarded as a single amendment to the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Therefore that I could offer an amendment changing both the sections of the single committee amendment, so as to change the date or the length of the extension in the first amendment and then eliminate all the remainder of it. Though it would sound like a substitute, it is not altogether and precisely a substitute. It is an amendment to a single committee amendment which is before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the Senator is correct in his characterization, but it is in the nature of a substitute, and it seems to the Chair that the orderly process would be to perfect the committee amendment first.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I am trying to do by eliminating most of it. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What does the Senator from Kentucky wish further to inquire?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Chair insists on this ruling that I can only perfect one section of the single amendment at a time, then I offer the amendment which I sent to the desk minus that part of it which I wrote below the printed part, the effect of which is to extend the Trade Agreements Act, without any change in the procedure, for a period of 3 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is offering the amendment as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. Is that the Senator's purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the Senator can do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the amendment to the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state precisely what the situation is. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. The net effect of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is to extend the date for 3 years. The Chair thinks he has correctly stated the import of the pending amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. My amendment extends the date from that contained in the bill, June 30, 1949, to June 30, 1951.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the Chair's attention to the fact that the amendment we are now considering merely covers the hiatus between June 12 and the time the bill will become law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; Mr. President. The only change proposed by the amendment is to extend for 3 years instead of 1 year the trade agreements carried in section 2 of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment is not the one which extends the agreements for 1 year. The pending amendment is the amendment which covers the interim period to the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Precisely.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the Senator from Kentucky would probably wish to offer his amendment to the 1-year-period provision in the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. But that is not the pending amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought that was the proposal in section 2 of the committee amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The amendment which the Senator from Colorado had

proposed in section 2, is on page 7, line 6, after the word "extended" to insert "from June 12, 1948," the effect of which is to cover the hiatus.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In other words, it is to maintain continuity. It is purely a perfecting amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to interfere with the hiatus.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky temporarily withdraw his amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, I withdraw my amendment temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment, on page 7, line 6, after the word "extended", to insert "from June 12, 1948."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 7, beginning in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "with respect to which it is contemplated that such agreement may provide for," and in lieu thereof insert "to be considered for possible."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is not the amendment I have offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is an amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to perfect the text of the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I beg the Chair's pardon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Kentucky as soon as the Chair thinks his amendment is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no doubt of that. I thought we had come to consideration of the amendment I offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment, on page 7, line 13.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I now call up my third amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 7, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "domestic producers of" and insert in lieu thereof "the domestic industry producing."

On page 8, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "domestic producers of" and insert in lieu thereof "the domestic industry producing."

On page 9, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "domestic producers of" and insert in lieu thereof "the domestic industry producing."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I now call up my fourth amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8 of the committee amendment, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following: "such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission"; and on page 8 of the committee amendment, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "President" and insert "President or until the expiration of the 120-day period."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Kentucky. If the Chair correctly understands his purpose it is on page 7, line 7 of the committee amendment, to strike out "1949" and insert "1951."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May we have the amendment stated, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is on page 7 of the committee amendment, line 7, to strike out "1949" and insert "1951." If the Chairman may interpolate, the issue is whether the Trade Agreements Act shall be extended for 3 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without amendment; which will be taken care of in a subsequent action by the Senator from Kentucky.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAFT (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

On this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—41

Barkley	Holland	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Connally	Kilgore	Robertson, Va.
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Eastland	McCarran	Sparkman
Ellender	McClellan	Stennis
Feazel	McFarland	Stewart
Fulbright	McGrath	Taylor
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Murray	Umstead
Hoey	Myers	

NAYS—48

Aiken	Ecton	Morse
Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	Flanders	Reed
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Bricker	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brooks	Ives	Smith
Buck	Jenner	Thye
Butler	Kem	Vandenberg
Cain	Knowland	Watkins
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Capper	Lodge	White
Cooper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Donnell	Martin	Wilson
Dworshak	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	Moore	Wagner
George	Taft	
Maybank	Thomas, Utah	

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 7, after "June 30," it is proposed to strike out "1949" and insert "1950."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAFT (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

On this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—42

Barkley	Hoey	Myers
Byrd	Holland	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Cooper	Kilgore	Robertson, Va.
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Eastland	McCarran	Sparkman
Ellender	McClellan	Stennis
Feazel	McFarland	Stewart
Fulbright	McGrath	Taylor
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Murray	Umstead

NAYS—47

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Flanders	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Smith
Brooks	Jenner	Thye
Buck	Kem	Vandenberg
Butler	Knowland	Watkins
Cain	Langer	Wherry
Capehart	Lodge	White
Capper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Donnell	Martin	Wilson
Dworshak	Millikin	Young
Ecton	Morse	

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	Moore	Wagner
George	Taft	
Maybank	Thomas, Utah	

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now desire to offer an amendment, the effect of which will be to extend the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year, without change. In order to do so, I move to strike out all the remainder of the committee amendment beginning in line 8, on page 7, with section 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky moves to strike out all the committee amendment after line 7, on page 7, the effect of which, as indicated by the Senator from Kentucky, is to extend the act without amendment for 1 year.

Mr. BARKLEY. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAFT (when his name was called). Mr. President, I make the same announcement as the one I have made on the two previous votes.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

On this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—43

Barkley	Holland	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Cooper	Lucas	Sparkman
Downey	McCarran	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McFarland	Taylor
Feazel	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McKellar	Tobey
Green	McMahon	Tydings
Hatch	Magnuson	Umstead
Hayden	Murray	Wilson
Hill	Myers	
Hoey	O'Conor	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Flanders	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Smith
Brooks	Jenner	Thye
Buck	Kem	Vandenberg
Butler	Knowland	Watkins
Cain	Langer	Wherry
Capehart	Lodge	White
Capper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Donnell	Martin	Young
Dworshak	Millikin	
Ecton	Morse	

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	Moore	Wagner
George	Taft	
Maybank	Thomas, Utah	

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment, the question is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. LUCAS, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TAFT (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS (when his name was called). Present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

On this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 18, voting "present" 1, as follows:

YEAS—70

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Holland	Revercomb
Bricker	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Buck	Kem	Saltonstall
Butler	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	Langer	Sparkman
Cain	Lodge	Stewart
Capehart	McCarthy	Thye
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Cordon	McFarland	Umstead
Donnell	McGrath	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McMahon	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	White
Ellender	Martin	Wiley
Feazel	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
Flanders	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Conor	

NAYS—18

Barkley	Green	McCarran
Chavez	Hatch	McKellar
Connally	Hayden	O'Daniel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Downey	Kilgore	Taylor
Fulbright	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.

VOTING "PRESENT"—1

Tydings

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	Moore	Wagner
George	Taft	
Maybank	Thomas, Utah	

So the bill (H. R. 6556) was passed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, during the course of the debate on the reciprocal trade agreements program bill, due to the limitation of time I was not able to express my views on that matter and the reasons why I voted as I did. I shall not take the time of the Senate now to refer to that matter further, except to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Indispensable," published in the Washington Daily News for May 29, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDISPENSABLE

"The reciprocal trade agreement principle," says Senator VANDENBERG, "is indispensable in today's world." He is absolutely right about that.

He wants this principle preserved unweakened. And so he opposes one provision of the bill just passed by the House Republicans to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a single year. That is the one which would give the Tariff Commission and Congress power to veto agreements negotiated by the President with other countries for the lowering of barriers to international trade.

Mr. VANDENBERG would have preferred an extension of 3 years, or at least 2. But he does not believe the indispensable principle is endangered by the 1-year renewal or by other provisions of the House bill.

We respect the judgment and sincerity of this Republican statesman. If he were speaking for his party, we would have little fear for the safety of reciprocal trade and the European recovery program, of which it is a cornerstone.

But we do not share his confidence that changing one provision of the House bill would mean "unweakened" preservation of the principle he defends.

For we have seen this bill railroaded through the House, after secret hearings and under gag rule, by Republican leaders who have been for that principle. We know that they inserted the provision to which Mr. VANDENBERG objects for the deliberate purpose of weakening. We know that their hope and intention is to kill the Reciprocal Trade Act next year, and to return to the old trade-chocking system of log-rolled high tariffs. And we know they have many counterparts in the Senate.

To change Mr. VANDENBERG advocates would make the bill less immediately dangerous. But enactment of the bill, even with that change would be a first long step back toward economic isolation for America. It would be a signal that leaders of the Republican Party mean to take the other steps—to drop the indispensable principle—and the rest of the world would so understand it.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended, with no weakening amendments, for three full years.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6028) to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6777. An act to extend the coverage of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6874. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947;

H. R. 6878. An act to authorize granting increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

H. J. Res. 412. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities;

H. J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION IN BERMUDA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 201, the Chair appoints the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION (S. DOC. NO. 171)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation, amounting to $190,000 fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 172)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $14,135,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 173)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, amounting to $600,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 174)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to $10,792,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL AND DEFICIENCY ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 178)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriation for the District of Columbia, amounting to $21,957.39, fiscal year 1948 and prior fiscal years (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM (S. DOC. NO. 175)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $31,800,000, to finance the selective service program to

be established by legislation now pending in the Congress (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 176)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $15,000,000, fiscal year 1949, and a proposed contract authorization in the amount of $10,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, SEVERAL EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES (S. DOC. NO. 177)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $2,393,458.55, together with an indefinite amount as may be necessary to pay interest and costs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Laura B. Prisk, of New York, N. Y., relating to Flag Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Walter I. M. Hodge, chairman, Municipal Committee, St. Croix, V. I., praying for the enactment of House bill 5904, to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the forty-second annual convention of the Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor, at Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of the Mundt-Nixon un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2080. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1622); and

H. R. 6090. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title; without amendment (Rept. No. 1618).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3190. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure;" with amendments (Rept. No. 1620); and

H. R. 6412. A bill to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623).

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2764. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1619).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6772. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1621).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2698. A bill to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution; with amendments (Rept. No. 1624).

PROTECTION AGAINST LYNCHING—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill, to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1625) thereon. The report is short, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill and the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2860) to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

The report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, which has had under consideration various bills relating to the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, report favorably a bill to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is self-explanatory in the title statement in that it is designed to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons from lynching.

STATEMENT

Section 1 of the bill is self-explanatory.

Section 2 of the bill, which contains the definitions, might be considered one of the most important parts of the measure.

The bill defines lynching as an exercise or an attempt to exercise by an assembly of two or more persons, without authority of law, by action of physical force against person or property, of any power of correction or punishment over any persons in the custody of any peace officer, or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension or trial or punishment by law of such person, or of imposing a punishment. The essence of the offense is the depriving of the person accused or suspected of crime of a trial in the manner provided by law and, if such person is convicted, of punishment in the manner provided by law.

Section 3 of the bill makes it a crime punishable by imprisonment and/or a fine for Federal or State officers to conspire with members of a lynching mob in the prosecution of a lynching. The constitutionality of the imposition of Federal sanctions against Federal or State officers for their participation in a lynching will not be discussed in this section. In a later paragraph it is pointed out that such sanctions are valid. The question here involves the validity of Federal sanctions imposed against members of the lynch mob when they conspire with the Federal or State officers. It seems to be well-settled law that any Federal sanctions against the individual lynchers (aiders, abettors, etc.) are invalid.

It appears well settled that under the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, Congress does not have the authority to enact sanctions against private individuals or individual actions. (*The Civil Rights cases* (109 U. S. 3); *U. S.* v. *Harris* (106 U. S. 629); *Slaughterhouses cases* (83 U. S. 36); *U. S.* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542); *Strauder* v. *West Virginia* (100 U. S. 303); *Virginia* v. *Rives* (100 U. S. 313); *Hodges* v. *U. S.* (203 U. S. 1); *Corrigan* v. *Buckley* (271 U. S. 327).)

It is the opinion of this committee that those individuals who conspire with Federal or State officers for the purposes of lynching may be held guilty of the crime or conspiracy when, in effect, they could not be held guilty of lynching. It is sufficient if one of the parties to a conspiracy is legally capable of committing the offense, while the other party may not have that capacity (*Chadwick* v. *U. S.* (141 F. 225); *Ohen* v. *U. S.* (157 F. 651, 85 C. C. A. 113, certiorari denied, 207 U. S. 596)). A person may be guilty of conspiring although incapable of committing the objective offense (*Farnsworth* v. *Zerbst* (98 F. 2d 541); *U. S.* v. *Rabinowick* (238 U. S. 78, 86); *U. S.* v. *Halte* (236 U. S. 140, 144); *Jelke* v. *U. S.* (255 F. 265); *Israel* v. *U. S.* (3 F. 2d 743); *U. S.* v. *Lyman* (190 F. 414); *U. S.* v. *Socony Vacuum Oil Company* (310 U. S. 150)).

Section 4 punishes State officers and employees for their failure to prevent a lynching. The fourteenth amendment is directed toward the action of the States, including the action of State officers. Any action by the officers of the State which violates the prohibition upon State action contained in the fourteenth amendment is subject to penalty imposed by the United States (*Ex Parte Virginia* (100 U. S. 339); *Screws v. U. S.* (325 U. S. 91)). The right not to be deprived by a State (or State officers) of a trial by the State, or of the punishment prescribed by law, is inherent in due process of law (*Screws* v. *U. S.*, supra; *Crews* v. *U. S.* (160 F. 2d. 746); *U. S.* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299)).

Section 5 of the bill penalizes Federal officers and employees for their willful failure to prevent a lynching. Congress has, many times, created penalties upon Federal officers for a violation of their duties. The creation of the sanction in itself creates a duty on a Federal officer not to commit acts which would invoke the imposition of the penalty. (See the offenses defined and punished in U. S. Code, title 18, secs. 171 et seq.)

Section 6 defines the duty of the Attorney General of the United States under this act. It imposes a duty upon him to cause an investigation to be made to determine whether there has been a violation of the bill, whenever a lynching occurs, and information on oath is submitted to him that any officer or employee of the United States or of a State, or any governmental subdivision thereof, is guilty of a criminal offense under section 4 or section 5 of the bill. This section merely spells out a duty which normally rests with the Attorney General, the chief law enforcement officer of the United States, to enforce, and prosecute violations of, all criminal laws of the United States. It is not intended to restrict the Attorney General in the enforcement of the act but to make it mandatory upon him to cause the investigation prescribed if the information on oath is submitted to him.

Section 7 provides for civil actions for damages by an individual who is lynched (or his next of kin) against any person violating section 3, section 4, or section 5 of the act with respect to that lynching.

The validity of this section rests upon the same constitutional bases and cases cited under the foregoing sections 3, 4, or 5. Obviously, if Congress has the authority to make certain acts a crime, punishable by fines and/or imprisonment, it also has the

authority to constitute such acts the basis for civil liabilities.

Section 8 permits any judge of the United States district court, wherein any civil action under the proposed bill is commenced, to direct the holding of the trial at any place within the district. The section also permits a criminal trial, under the proposed bill, to be held at any place in the district and provides that where possible no criminal action shall be tried within the territorial limits of any city or county within which a lynching occurs. This provision does not violate the constitutional stipulation of the sixth amendment inasmuch as the trials will have to be conducted within the territorial limits of the State and district where the crime is committed.

Section 9 applies the kidnaping law to lynching. The so-called Lindbergh kidnaping law was a valid exercise of the power of Congress under the commerce clause. (See *Robinson* v. *U. S.* (324 U. S. 282); *Seadlund* v. *U. S.* (97 F. (2d) 742).) As it now reads, it provides a penalty for the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of any person who has been kidnaped and is "held for purposes of ransom or reward or otherwise." It would seem that Congress can spell out that one of the meanings of "otherwise" is "held for purposes of lynching," or that Congress can provide for a penalty for the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of a person who has been kidnaped and is subsequently lynched.

Section 10 makes the bill applicable to officers and employees of the Territories and possessions and of the District of Columbia. The term "officer or employee of the United States" is defined to include an officer or employee of any Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia. This is to remove any doubt, insofar as this bill is concerned, of the status of these officers and employees.

Sections 11 and 12 contain the separability clause and the short title respectively.

Section 11 is the customary separability section.

Section 12 applies a short title for the bill, "The Federal Antilynching Act."

SURVEY OF SPACE LEASED BY GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted a report (No. 1617) entitled "Survey of Space Leased by the Federal Government," which was ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 14, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. CAIN introduced Senate bill 2858, to establish a reclamation project fund; to provide for an orderly rate of construction of self-liquidating reclamation and irrigation projects; to provide for the issuance of revenue bonds to finance the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the self-liquidating portions of certain reclamation and irrigation projects; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2859. A bill for the relief of Isaiah Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original bill (S. 2860) to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2861. A bill to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced Senate bill 2862, to remove the restrictions upon the acquisition, possession, and ownership of gold, and to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

RECLAMATION PROJECT FUND

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the Federal Revenue Bond Act.

Out of it, I hope, eventually will come a speeded-up construction pace and a more effective, business-like, orderly approach by the Government to finance the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the self-liquidating reclamation-irrigation projects in the Nation.

This bill affects 49 projects now under construction in 17 States and needing an estimated $3,461,294,492 to complete.

This proposed legislation should appeal to Eastern States, where, because of the absence of facts many complaints automatically arise when large appropriations are made for the West, despite the fact that these projects, for the most part, are self-liquidating, have proved to be self-liquidating and are furnishing service to the public.

Then, too, it is a chance for the West to obtain the projects quicker, to prove we are not getting more than our share of something for nothing, to further prove the self-liquidating nature of the projects and to graciously let the East have a chance to invest in the growing West.

In my own State of Washington alone new industries started since 1940 because of the availability of hydroelectric power have paid $300,000,000 in Federal taxes, more money than invested in the Columbia Basin to date. We also are up to date in repayments, but we need more funds to speed up construction in order to catch up with the demand for electric power and furnish water to otherwise rich land waiting only for congressional appropriations before starting to produce. There is a list of industries as long as my arm awaiting only the electricity to begin operations in the West.

I do not contend, Mr. President, that this proposed legislation is the answer to the ever-growing problem of how to finance the great and necessary reclamation-irrigation-power projects, or the answer as to how to bring the projects to completion as soon as necessary.

I only hope that it will start more people thinking along this path; that it is a step in the right direction; or that it may lead to a solution.

But I do hope that this bill will initiate a study by the Congress of methods that possibly would be more effective than those presently used in dealing with these projects. I hope that a congressional committee will study this proposal between now and the next session of the Congress in order that definite action can be taken.

I am fully aware that the Congress cannot take up this proposed legislation at this time, but I earnestly solicit the help of each Senator in studying this bill, or in proposing similar plans which may be better, or submitting other ideas between now and next January.

Mr. President, the annual appropriations for reclamation-irrigation projects are growing to such an extent that we have to stagger through astronomical figures in studying the annual Interior appropriations bill. This year's Interior bill is more than $100,000,000 more than for the previous year and a new record. The Republican Congress of last year and this year has recognized the growing need for this money and has made more money available for reclamation than in any year in history.

Each year there is a constant scramble for funds for particular projects; no plans can be made from one year to the next because one Congress cannot commit another, and no one knows how much money a particular project will receive or how much work can be accomplished.

The projects listed in this bill are all, or partly self-liquidating. Projects which bring no return to the Federal Government in the way of power or water revenues are not included, and are not affected in any way by this proposal.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2858) to establish a Reclamation Project Fund; to provide for an orderly rate of construction of self-liquidating reclamation and irrigation projects; to provide for the issuance of revenue bonds to finance the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the self-liquidating portions of certain reclamation and irrigation projects; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in my remarks a further explanation of the nature and character of the bill.

There being no objection, the further explanation of the bill by Mr. CAIN is as follows:

In brief the bill does this:

1. Affects all self-liquidating reclamation-irrigation projects now under construction in the Nation.

2. Authorizes the sale of Federal revenue bonds to the public to finance the completion of the projects.

3. Money received from the sale of such bonds would go into a special Treasury fund.

4. This money, in the special Treasury fund, would be used to complete each project within a specified number of years. Each year's work would be planned in advance to prevent a stop-and-go schedule and, instead, establish an orderly feasible rate of construction based on engineering data rather than on year-by-year prospects of congressional appropriations. The amount of money needed for each project each year would be established in advance and allocated.

5. The Congress would not appropriate any more money for the projects now under construction.

6. Nonliquidating projects would not be affected by this bill; new projects would not be affected.

7. Money received from the sale of hydroelectric power and water from the self-liquidating projects would be placed in the Treasury and this money would be used to pay off the Federal revenue bonds sold to the general public at an interest rate not exceeding 3½ percent per annum.

8. Money previously expended on each of the projects listed in the bill would be, in effect, charged against the Government, or written off the books, as the bill specifies that no money in the fund would be used for the purpose of repayment of money already spent. (I estimate the cost to date of all the projects listed at around $900,000,000, or, roughly, about 22 percent of the total cost.)

9. Farmers who have irrigation contracts would, as now, be exempt from paying interest. Power features of these multiple-use projects pay the interest on the investment.

10. The bonds shall have a lien against the special treasury fund as well as against future power and water revenues of the projects.

11. Construction work on the projects will be done by private contractors who will submit bids.

Additional generating capacity is of essential and paramount importance. This is not limited to the West, as the shortage of power reserve capacity is Nation-wide and has resulted in actual curtailment of power in several regions, especially in portions of the Pacific coast which has experienced such a great increase in population and industrial production.

Since my election to the Senate I have stressed time and again the need for hydroelectric power and have tried to create an awareness of the public utility responsibility for furnishing adequate sources of electric power at low rates.

Not many years after the passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902, it was soon discovered that the electric revenue was an important factor in the irrigation economy and of great assistance to the irrigation districts in meeting their repayments. Electric service also contributed greatly to the convenience of farm living.

There is all too much thinking in terms of ironing out business cycles by delay until there are surpluses of labor and materials.

Mr. President, I submit that these self-liquidating projects in 17 States are not "make work" projects. It may have been the idea and policy conceived with some of these projects, but now it has been proved that all the cost can be returned with interest. The old policies of useful water and power projects constructed at a time of surpluses and low costs no longer apply in this day of an expanding economy.

There is one possible factor which I quite frankly point out in the consideration of consolidating all self-liquidating projects into one revenue bond fund.

We must be sure that stronger projects would not support weaker ones and only requiring that the total of all projects should pay out successfully. Under this proposed legislation only that portion of the self-liquidating features would be subject to revenue bonds; each project must stand on its own feet.

The Federal Government is committed to construct adequate hydroelectric works, and, just as importantly, the Government is responsible for the total construction cost of flood-control projects, and in some cases, also the costs of lands and rights-of-way. Of course, such projects must show a benefit-to-cost ratio. This has enabled the War Department to compete with the Bureau of Reclamation in using the taxpayers' money for the benefit of local areas for the reason that irrigation investment must be returned, while flood-control expenditures require no return to the Treasury.

The question is: How should we differentiate in the treatment between self-supporting projects constructed with funds from the Treasury, which will be repaid with interest, and the other forms of Federal projects, the costs of which are generally recognized as being nonreimbursable.

One answer might be that the Government should abandon the policy of holding up the self-sustaining projects until depression periods. But the national budget is growing and growing; money needed for national defense is increasing and the funds needed for these reclamation-irrigation projects will increase, I estimate, to a total of almost $400,000,000 for fiscal 1950. If Congress made no more appropriations for these projects, we might be able, from a budget point of view, to appropriate more money for the nonreimbursable projects.

The answer I think can be found in bringing into the reclamation picture a new element—the investing public.

Another proposal is the issuance of power revenue bonds for financing Federal hydroelectric projects which have been guaranteed by contracts with publicly owned and privately owned utilities. Here I have mentioned privately owned utilities.

This is no time for argument of private versus public power. The needs are so great and so imperative that all persons and parties should pull together to secure the necessary additions to hydroelectric capacity to protect the economy and security of our country.

I would like, however, to call the Senate's attention to the fact that in my own State of Washington we have no so-called private versus public-power fight. All the private power companies in my State have united with the public utilities in requesting more funds for the Columbia Basin. The truth is that private power companies in my State could not exist without public power.

Mr. President, we in the Pacific Northwest were marketing public power before TVA was born in its nightmare and we discovered years ago that the cheaper you make electricity the richer become the returns. Yet we comprise a region which believes in direct personal democracy, with hatred of regimentation.

We do not want a TVA in the Pacific Northwest. The most recent expression from farmers is contained in the following editorial from the Seattle (Wash.) Times of June 3, 1948:

"Pacific Northwest exponents of American free enterprise should know how firm a stand many of the region's farm organizations have taken against creation of a facsimile of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the valley of the Columbia River.

"A striking instance of this is found in the strong statement in opposition to establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority presented by the Yakima Farm Council at a congressional hearing in Spokane.

" 'Cheap electric power,' the farmers' statement asserted, 'has been used during the past 15 years as attractive bait to lead the Nation into a new socialistic or a nationalistic conception of government. The valley-authority bills, of which only the Tennessee Valley Authority has thus far been enacted, would divide the Nation into seven areas and convert the United States of America into U. S. S. A. * * *

" 'As a matter of fact, TVA, which was initially installed without the consent of the States or their citizens, is now a supergovernment not subject to State or local authorities. For example, the Tennessee Railroad and Utility Commission no longer has any control of electric utility rates. The local taxing bodies have no authority, but must accept what the TVA elects to hand out to them in lieu of taxes.'

"The Yakima farm organization's vigorous statement is timely now. For if cheap electric power has been used as bait to lead the Nation into more valley-authority experiments, the Columbia River floods will provide new ammunition for valley-authority exponents in the Northwest. The flood-control issue will supply them with a new and lively talking point.

"The Vanport disaster, indeed, has demonstrated need for more adequate flood-control measures in the Columbia Basin. But the accomplishment of an effective flood-control program there will not require the supergovernment of any autocratic river valley authority."

One of the things often pointed out in my State concerning the TVA is the authority that TVA has to utilize the revenue from power and other industries, in which it engages, to do such things as it considers necessary. Herein lies one of the great dangers of this corporate State method of development.

If such a method were applied in the Pacific Northwest it would involve a Government corporation with a capital outlay running into the billions—ten billions as estimated by the Pacific Northwest Development Association.

This revenue, turned over to three politically appointed men, could subsidize and largely control institutional and public leadership and most of the people. It could easily end our representative form of government by merely perpetuating its ideology. No private or public group could successfully impose such a powerful monopoly with all its money.

The Pacific Northwest Development Association had this to say in the May 30, 1948, issue of the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review:

"This method for utilizing public funds, if made applicable to a corporate state and not to other agencies of the Federal Government dealing with the conservation and development of natural resources, would create a condition in which the corporate state would soon take over or control this work.

"It would be somewhat comparable to giving the Forest Service authority to completely socialize the lumber industry and use the revenue from the sale of lumber to sell an ideology in addition to carrying on its other duties.

"The so-called efficiency claim by TVA proponents if spread to include the proposed valley authorities in the United States would eventually result in dictatorial inefficiency of the type now practiced in Russia. It could, in effect, end by trading this method of development for freedom.

"That the TVA corporate state method of resource development is socialistic there should be little doubt. Many of the leading socialists in the country claim it is.

"Inasmuch as Government has taken over and operated businesses which were formerly operated by private enterprise and inasmuch as the corporate state has complete power over practically all business by having control of power, it would seem highly socialistic.

"In addition, the corporation directors can, under the act, take over or socialize any business they desire.

"The TVA, now under trial, has benevolent dictators, but this is no indication that this kind will be there perpetually. It is very difficult for private enterprise groups to compete with a Government corporation which had $44,000,000 gross revenue as its disposal last year (from the TVA annual report) in addition to Federal appropriations. Such a gigantic Government corporation with its highly skilled propaganda machine has done a clever job of selling its ideology to the world."

Mr. President, electricity is like the water it comes from—it belongs to the people as a whole but must not be controlled entirely by a private utility or a bureaucratic group.

Westerners, from time to time, have complained of absentee ownership. Well the Government itself is the largest absentee owner in the West today and we certainly are not going to let a bureau such as a TVA run our region by absentee ideology.

I hope that whatever comes out of this proposed legislation that we will be able to afford the maximum generation of power and the maximum use of land in a businesslike manner.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Section 1: The act may be cited as "The Reclamation Project Fund Bond Act."

Section 2: (a) Establishes Treasury "Reclamation Project Fund" to be used for financing cost of self-liquidating reclamation-irrigation projects.

(b) List of projects, location, and estimated cost to complete.

Section 3 (a): Secretary of Treasury at the request of Secretary of Interior to use up to 300,400,000,000 for construction costs. Money to come from sale of bonds in that amount.

(b) Secretary of Treasury to prescribe form of bonds.

(c) Interest rate not to exceed 3½ percent per annum.

Section 4: (a) All revenue from projects to go into the reclamation fund; specific provision made to protect farmers so that they will have no interest to pay on project features (power features to pay interest charges).

(b) Makes previous laws unapplicable to proposed bill.

(c) Secretary of Interior directed to submit construction schedule to cover each year's work for each project for estimated entire building period. Construction schedule to contain cost of each year's work on each project. Bonds can be sold each year for amount of money needed that year for all projects.

Section 5: (a) Bonds be retired as matured; each bond shall have a lien against the Treasury fund as well as against future power and water revenues, of projects listed, for the amount of unpaid principal and interest.

(b) Claim clause.

(c) Federal Government not liable for payment.

(d) Accounts to be prescribed on business basis; certification of Comptroller General required of reimbursable and nonreimbursable features of the projects.

Section 6: (a) After passage of the act no money shall be appropriated for construction of self-liquidating portion of any of the projects.

(b) No money allowed in fund for bureau of reclamation salaries.

(c) Secretary of Treasury authorized to pay principal and interest of bonds.

(d) Provision for money to enable Secretary of Treasury to carry out functions of this act.

(e) No money to be paid out of the fund to reimburse United States for money heretofore expended on projects.

Section 7: (a) Prohibits expansion of present proposed undertakings.

(b) Construction work to be done by private contractors under contracts with Bureau of Reclamation.

Section 8: (a) Unexpended balances transferred to reclamation project fund.

(b) Money in present reclamation fund transferred to the fund established under this act.

Section 9: (a), (b), (c) Amends reclamation project act of 1939 to give Secretary of Treasury new duties in connection with administering fund.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON GOLD

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to remove the restrictions upon the acquisition, possession, and ownership of gold, and I request that an explanation of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanation of the bill by the Senator from Colorado will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2862) to remove the restrictions upon the acquisition, possession, and ownership of gold, and to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanation of the bill presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado is as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this is submitted with respect to the proposed bill to remove the restrictions upon the acquisition, possession, and ownership of gold. Sections 1 and 2 speak for themselves.

The third section of the proposed bill repeals sections 3 and 4 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. Section 3 of such act provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe the conditions under which gold may be acquired and held (a) for industrial, professional, and artistic use, (b) by the Federal Reserve Banks, and (c) for such other purposes as in his judgment are not inconsistent with the purposes of such act. It then provides that gold in any form may be acquired only to the extent permitted by regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Section 4 of such act provides that any gold acquired or held in violation of the regulations issued by the Secretary shall be forfeited to the United States and that any person failing to comply with such regulations shall be subject to a penalty equal to twice the value of the gold in respect of which such failure occurred.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 11 (n) of the Federal Reserve Act by striking out the words "gold coin" and "gold bullion" wherever they appear therein. This subsection authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to require all individuals, partnerships, associations, and corporations to deliver to the Treasurer of the United States any gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates owned by them. It requires the Secretary to pay an equivalent amount of any other form of coin or currency for the gold coin, bullion, or certificates so delivered.

Subsection (a) of section 5 of the proposed bill rescinds sections 3, 4, and 5 of Executive Order Numbered 6260, dated August 28, 1933. This Executive order, which was issued prior to the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, required, in general, the turning in to the Treasury of all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates, prohibiting any person from acquiring gold coin, bullion, or certificates except under a license issued pursuant to the Executive order, and made it unlawful for any person to have in his possession any gold coin, bullion, or certificate except under license issued pursuant to the Executive order. Although the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 was in part a repetition of the requirements of this Executive order, the courts have held that the act did not repeal or supersede the Executive order.

This Executive order was issued under the authority of subsection (b) of section 5 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which authorized such action by the President during the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President. Subsection (b) of sections 3 of the proposed bill provides that this power shall not be exercised by the President except during the time of a war declared after the date of amendment of this bill or during the period of an emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this bill.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. WHITE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. DOWNEY) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit three amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 6777) to extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes, and I request that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The first amendment relates to section 105 of the bill. Its purpose is to increase the Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits on an average of about 40 to 50 percent. At the present time the old-age insurance benefits average only $25 a month. These benefits to our retired workers and to the widows and orphans of workers who die are woefully inadequate to meet present-day living costs. When the provisions relating to insurance benefits were written into the Social Security Act in 1939, they were grossly inadequate. Since that time living costs have gone up almost 70 percent but benefits have remained stationary.

The average orphaned child receives less than $13 a month. The average payment being made to a widow of a deceased worker is approximately $20.50. And our retired workers cannot get along on a $25 a month benefit from old-age and survivors' insurance. These payments are wholly inadequate to provide the basic necessities of life for these people. The increase which my amendment provides would be less than the increased cost of living but it would be a substantial step forward.

At the present time benefits for retired workers under the railroad retirement program average over $70 a month. And Congress quite properly voted to increase this amount by 20 percent. The average old-age assistance recipient is given $38 a month and within the last few days we have voted to increase old-age assistance grants to States by $5 a recipient. This is the second time that we have raised old-age assistance payments since the end of the war. The Congress has also increased benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act. We must also raise old-age and survivors'

insurance benefits for its 2,500,000 beneficiaries to a point where they can support themselves.

My amendment would give the average retired worker about $40 a month on which to live. However, it would not necessitate any increase in old-age and survivors' insurance taxes. The old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund which now stands at $10,000,000,000 would still continue to grow at the rate of from one-half to one billion dollars a year, depending on economic conditions.

My second amendment amends section 109 (a) (2) of the bill so that benefits would not be delayed where the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had not made a ruling on the taxability of wages in a particular case. Under the bill as passsed by the House widows and orphans would be denied their benefits until such a ruling was obtained. My amendment merely provides that where benefits are otherwise payable they are to be paid by the Federal Security Administration until the Commissioner has definitely ruled that they should not be paid. I see no reason to delay payment of benefits to beneficiaries while such rulings are being obtained.

My third amendment strikes out section 201 of the bill which is designed to exclude some 500,000 to 750,000 persons from the old-age survivors insurance unemployment insurance systems. I believe these people should be included under our social-security system. Both Democratic and Republican platforms have pledged extension of social security. Unless section 201 of the bill is stricken those pledges will be repudiated. I for one intend to live up to the promises we have made the people of this country.

There being no objection, the amendments submitted by Mr. MURRAY were received, referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"SECTION 105. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 203 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Whenever the total of benefits under section 202, payable for a month with respect to an individual's wages, is more than $20, and exceeds (1) $85, or (2) an amount equal to 80 percent of his average monthly wage (as defined in section 209 (f)), whichever of such two amounts is least, such total of benefits shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (d), (e), or (h), be reduced to such least amount or to $20, whichever is greater.

"'(b) Whenever the benefit or total of benefits under section 202, payable for a month with respect to an individual's wages, is less than $20, such benefit or total of benefits shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (d), (e), or (h), be increased to $20.'

"(b) Subsection (e) of section 209 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) The term "primary insurance benefit" means an amount equal to the sum of the following:

"'(1) (A) Forty percent of the amount of an individual's average monthly wage if such average monthly wage does not exceed $100, or (B) if such average monthly wage exceeds $100, 40 percent of $100, plus 10 percent of this amount by which such average monthly wage exceeds $100 and does not exceed $250, and

"'(2) an amount equal to 1 percent of this amount computed under paragraph (1) multiplied by the number of years in which $200 or more of wages were paid to such individual. Where the primary insurance benefit thus computed is less than $20, such benefit shall be $20.'

"(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall be effective with respect to monthly benefits payable for any month after the month in which this act is enacted and with respect to lump-sum death payments shall be effective with respect to deaths occurring after the date of the enactment of this act."

At the end of section 109 (a) (2) strike out the period and the quotation marks and insert the following: ": If, within 30 days after a request therefor by the Administrator, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue does not certify, in accordance with the provisions of the preceding sentence, that wages with respect to which such request was made were or were not assessable under section 1400, the Administrator may include such wages in his records; but such inclusion shall not be effective, except pursuant to final judgment of a court in an action under subsection (g) of this section, with respect to payments under this title for any month after the month in which the Commissioner certifies to the Administrator in accordance with the provisions of such sentence, that such wages were not assessable under section 1400."

Strike out section 201 of title II of the bill and renumber the sections of title II accordingly.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—ADDITIONAL CONFEREES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday last I was called back to the State. Before I left I had heard that the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, would probably be acted upon in the House, which would result in a conference. I hastily submitted the names of three conferees, namely, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. Today it appears that I should have submitted five names. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] be added to the group of conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6777. An act to extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 6874. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947;

H. R. 6878. An act to authorize granting increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 412. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities; and

H. J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

JOSIAH W. BAILEY

[Mr. HOEY, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute prepared by him to the life, character, and public service of JOSIAH W. BAILEY, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SWEDISH INVASION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Swedish Invasion," delivered by him before a Swedish centennial mass rally at Detroit, Mich., on June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY — ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Who Can Preserve Representative Democracy?" delivered by him before the Men's Club of Central Presbyterian Church, Montclair, N. J., on November 27, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

PACIFIC COAST CONFERENCE ON UNESCO—LETTER FROM PROF. BEN M. CHERRINGTON

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Prof. Ben M. Cherrington, director of the social science foundation of the University of Denver, in regard to the Pacific Coast Conference on UNESCO at San Francisco on May 13–15, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pick-Sloan Plan Transforms Missouri River Area," published in the New York Times of June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRUMAN GIVES NOTICE HE'S IN FIGHT TO FINISH—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Gives Notice He's in Fight to Finish," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOIL AND LIFE—PRIZE ESSAY BY GENE DICKS

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the prize-winning essay by Gene Dicks, of Middletown High School, Middletown, Va., in the 1948 school-essay program of Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District of Virginia, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALUTE THE FLAG—POEM BY KARL VASS

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Salute the Flag," written by Karl Vass, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BILL

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with the Department of Commerce bill for the fiscal year 1949 which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING BY JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 137, representatives of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings during the summer months beginning July 6, 1948.

The purpose of the hearings is to receive information and suggestions pertaining to all phases of our immigration system, including the administration of our immigration and deportation laws and practices thereunder, and recommendations for changes in the laws.

Any person or organization wishing to testify or offer information to the subcommittee may do so by notifying Mr. Richard Arens, staff director, room F-41, United States Capitol, telephone, National 3120, extension 1618.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORT FROM APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to report during the recess or adjournment following today's session, House bill 6801, the foreign-aid appropriation bill, which will be ready to be reported then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAYMENT OF FEES, EXPENSES, AND COSTS OF JURORS—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF S. 19

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House returning to the Senate in compliance with its request the bill (S. 19) relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors.

A similar House bill having passed the Senate, without objection, the vote whereby Senate bill 19 was passed is reconsidered and it is indefinitely postponed.

ESTATE OF LEE JONES CARDY—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 179)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith without my approval S. 252, an act "For the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy."

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $4,244 to the estate of Lee Jones Cardy in settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States as compensation for the death of the said Lee Jones Cardy as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by an Army vehicle near San Diego, Calif., on November 17, 1944.

It appears that on the date in question an Army truck operated by an enlisted man on official business was driven out of the main gate of Camp Callan, Calif., onto a four-lane roadway with the northbound and south-bound lanes separated by an island; that the Army driver intended to proceed in a northerly direction but instead of using the underpass which leads to the north-bound lane he entered the south-bound lane and headed south looking for an opening in the center island which would permit him to cross over and head north on the north-bound lane; that as the truck proceeded on the west or outside lane the driver saw what he believed to be an opening and thereupon made a sudden left turn; that at about the same time a civilian car, owned and operated by a Mr. Warren H. Thompson and in which Mr. Cardy was a passenger, was just about to pass the Army truck, with the result that the Army truck collided with the Thompson vehicle, knocked it into a tree in the center island where it overturned and Mr. Cardy was killed instantly. There appears to be no question but what the accident was due to the negligent manner in which the Army vehicle was being driven and that Mr. Cardy met his death in the line of duty and not as a result of his own misconduct.

At the time of the accident, Mr. Cardy was in a duty status as chief pharmacist mate in the United States Navy. He was 27 years of age and left surviving a 25-year-old widow, Margaret Marie Cardy, a 2-year-old son, Bruce Lee Cardy, and a dependent mother, Mrs. Pearl M. Cardy.

By reason of the fact that Mr. Cardy met his death in line of duty with the Navy, the following monetary benefits have been awarded under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or the Army, or Navy:

(a) Mrs. Margaret Marie Cardy was awarded the death gratuity benefit by the Navy (6 months' pay) which, in this case, was in the amount of $756.

(b) The Army paid a claim filed with it which represented the expenses incurred in connection with the deceased's burial in the amount of $227.93.

(c) The Veterans' Administration has awarded death compensation to Mrs. Margaret Marie Cardy, effective from November 18, 1944, at the present rate of $78 per month on her account and on account of the one minor child. The total amount of such compensation paid to this Mrs. Cardy through May 31, 1948, is $3,024.17, and she will continue to receive $78 per month under the present law until her death or remarriage, or until the allowance for the minor child is discontinued for the several reasons provided under existing law, in which latter event the pension rate for the widow would be reduced to $60 per month. (At the present rate she would receive $936 a year.)

(d) The Veterans' Administration has awarded to Mr. Cardy's mother, Pearl M. Cardy, death compensation effective from January 31, 1946, at a present monthly rate of $54, and she has received a total amount, through May 31, 1948, of $1,449. The present rate of $54 will be paid to her during the period that she is considered by the Veterans' Administration as the dependent mother of Mr. Cardy.

Reference is made to the fact that the widow, Mrs. Margaret Marie Cardy, has been receiving monthly installments since November 18, 1944, on a $10,000 Government life insurance policy issued to Mr. Cardy, and through June 16, 1948, she had received payments on said insurance policy aggregating $1,556.60. These monthly installments of $36.20 will continue until the amount of the insurance policy has been liquidated.

Approval of this measure, awarding compensation to the survivors of Lee Jones Cardy, in addition to the monetary benefits that have been or will be paid to them as dependents of a member of the armed forces who died in line of duty, would be discriminatory in character in that it would grant to the estate a special benefit denied to the estates of other members of the armed forces where the facts are similar. There are no circumstances present in this case that would warrant singling out the estate of this one member of the armed forces for preferential treatment. There is no question but that had Mr. Cardy been a civilian his estate would have been entitled to relief by special act, but under those circumstances the estate would not have received the several benefits hereinabove enumerated to which the dependents of deceased members of the armed forces are entitled.

While deeply regretting the untimely death of Mr. Cardy, I feel obliged, nevertheless, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, to withhold by approval of the measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1948.*

CONSTRUCTION WORK ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. HOLLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND TO OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

CERTAIN BENEFITS PAYABLE UNDER LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2237, to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read:

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That subsection (b) of section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $35 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $12 per week: *Provided, however,* That, if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $12 per week, he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages.'

"SEC. 2. So much of subdivision (c) of section 8 of such act, as amended, as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Permanent partial disability: In case of disability partial in character but permanent in quality the compensation shall be 66⅔ percent of the average weekly wages, which shall be in addition to compensation for temporary total disability or temporary partial disability paid in accordance with subdivision (b) or subdivision (e) of this section, respectively, and shall be paid to the employee, as follows:'.

"SEC. 3. Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Reasonable funeral expenses not exceeding $400.

"'(b) If there be a surviving wife or dependent husband and no child of the deceased, to such surviving wife or dependent husband 35 per centum of the average wages of the deceased, during widowhood, or dependent widowerhood, with two years' compensation in one sum upon remarriage; and if there be a surviving child or children of the deceased, the additional amount of 15 per centum of such wages for each such child; in case of the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or dependent husband, if there be one surviving child of the deceased employee, such child shall have his compensation increased to 35 per centum of such wages, and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased employee, to such children, in equal parts, 35 per centum of such wages increased by 15 per centum of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided,* That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ per centum of such wages. The deputy commissioner having jurisdiction over the claim may, in his discretion, require the appointment of a guardian for the purpose of receiving the compensation of a minor child. In the absence of such a requirement the appointment of a guardian for such purposes shall not be necessary.

"'(c) If there be one surviving child of the deceased, but no surviving wife or dependent husband, then for the support of such child 35 per centum of the wages of the deceased; and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased, but no widow or dependent husband, then for the support of such children, in equal parts 35 per centum of such wages increased by 15 per centum of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided,* That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ per centum of such wages.

"'(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than $52.50 nor less than $18, but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased.'

"SEC. 4. Subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 10 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) If the injured employee shall have worked in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, whether for the same or another employer, during substantially the whole of the year immediately preceding his injury, his average annual earnings shall consist of three hundred times the average daily wage or salary for a six-day worker and two hundred and sixty times the average daily wage or salary for a five-day worker, which he shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"'(b) If the injured employee shall not have worked in such employment during substantially the whole of such year, his average annual earnings, if a six-day worker, shall consist of three hundred times the average daily wage or salary, and, if a five-day worker, two hundred and sixty times the average daily wage or salary, which an employee of the same class working substantially the whole of such immediately preceding year in the same or in similar employment in the same or a neighboring place shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"'(c) If either of the foregoing methods of arriving at the average annual earnings of the injured employee cannot reasonably and fairly be applied, such average annual earnings shall be such sum as, having regard to the previous earnings of the injured employee in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, and of other employees of the same or most similar class working in the same or most similar employment in the same or neighboring locality, or other employment of such employee, including the reasonable value of the services of the employee if engaged in self-employment, shall reasonably represent the annual earning capacity of the injured employee.'

"SEC. 5. Subdivision (m) of section 14 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(m) The total compensation payable under this Act for injuries shall in no event exceed the sum of $11,000: *Provided,* That this subdivision shall not apply to cases of permanent total disability or death: *And provided further,* That in cases of disability compensable under paragraph (21) of subdivision (c) of section 8 the total compensation for such disability, and for any temporary total disability or temporary partial disability sustained in addition thereto, shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $10,000.'

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable only to injuries or deaths occurring on or after the effective date hereof."

And the House agree to the same.

JOSEPH H. BALL,
IRVING M. IVES,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
MAX SCHWABE,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6430, making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, and 46.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, and 49, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$238,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$120,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Capital outlay, Gallinger Municipal Hospital: For an additional amount for the construction of an incinerator, $15,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 20, 25, 26, 27, 29, 33, 34, 37, 39, and 50.

HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WALT HORAN,
KARL STEFAN,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
JOHN FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6430, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 12, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 20, 25, 26, 27, 29, 33, 37, and 50 to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriation for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment and before the period, insert the following: "*Provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to limit or otherwise modify any authority of St. Elizabeths Hospital or its Superintendent pursuant to law to admit, receive, detain, or care for any individual."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$2,561,000."

Mr. DWORSHAK. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 5883, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 31, and 37.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 34, 36, 39, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,074,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,416,533"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,966,950"; and the Senate agree to same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,204,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,787,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreemeent to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,689,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 13, 15, 33, 35, 41, and 42.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5883, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 14, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 12, 13, 15, 35, 41, and 42 to the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 33 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$300,000,000" inserted by said Senate amendment, insert "$262,500,000."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to said bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 33, and that the Senate insist on its amendment No. 1, and ask for a further conference thereon and that the Chair appoint the same conferees.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the same conferees are appointed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think the Senate clearly understands the action being taken. An amendment was adopted on the floor of the Senate increasing payments for soil conservation under the land use program from $225,000,000 to $300,000,000. The conferees were unable to agree on the disposition to be given that amendment. It was the subject of extended discussion in the conference, the Senate conferees standing fast for the Senate's position of an appropriation of $300,000,000, and the House insisting upon an appropriation of $225,000,000. The House, when the amendment went back to that body for a separate vote, accepted an amendment which compromised the amount as passed by the Senate, by making the total $262,500,000 for soil-conservation payments next year. The difference of $75,000,000 is $37,500,000 below the budget and $37,500,000 above the House funds.

I am satisfied, as the result of the conference, that we cannot secure a larger figure in the conference, and inasmuch as the other body has voted on the proposition on the floor, much as I regret to see the amount lost from conservation payments, it seems to be best to concur in the House amendment.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTERED BY DEPARTMENT OF ARMY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY. I submit a conference report on House bill 5524 making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 9, and 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 10, 11, 12, and 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$166,989,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same wth an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 932), and the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$339,491,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert the following: "$61,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 7.

CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
HOMER FERGUSON,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a full list of the projects included by both House and Senate in the 1949 civil functions appropriation bill, House bill 5524, and the amounts allowed by the conference committee.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Flood control, general—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
Arizona: Holbrook	$30,000	$30,000	$30,000
Arkansas:			
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo.	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
Carden's Bottom drainage district No. 2	700,000	700,000	700,000
Conway County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 8	390,000	390,000	390,000
Conway County levee district No. 6	33,000	33,000	33,000
Crawford County levee district	600,000	600,000	600,000
Little Rock	310,300	310,300	310,300
Little Rock to Pine Bluff	400,000	400,000	400,000
Narrows Reservoir, Little Missouri Basin	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Nimrod Reservoir	75,000	75,000	75,000
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo.	750,000	750,000	750,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La.	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
West of Morrilton	500,000	500,000	500,000
Bayou Bodeau Reservoir, Ark. and La.	500,000	1,040,000	760,000
California:			
Folsom Reservoir	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Isabella Reservoir	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Los Angeles County drainage area:			
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	----------	1,000,000	200,000
Sawtelle-Westwood	400,000	400,000	400,000
Los Angeles River Channel	4,138,000	4,138,000	4,138,000
Merced County stream group	935,000	935,000	935,000
Pajaro River	185,000	185,000	185,000
Prado Dam	263,500	263,500	263,500
Pine Flat Reservoir	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Sacramento River minor tributaries	500,000	500,000	500,000
Ventura River	800,000	800,000	800,000
Cherry Valley Reservoir	600,000	1,000,000	600,000
Farmington Reservoir	----------	545,000	250,000
Colorado:			
Cherry Creek Reservoir	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Colorado Springs	605,600	605,600	605,600
Creede	159,700	159,700	159,700
Georgia:			
Allatoona Reservoir	8,000,000	9,500,000	8,000,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	7,000,000	8,400,000	7,700,000
Macon	200,000	200,000	200,000
Idaho:			
Heise-Roberts area	351,000	351,000	351,000
Lucky Peak Reservoir, Boise River	----------	2,000,000	500,000
Illinois:			
Coal Creek drainage and levee district	700,000	700,000	700,000
Degognia and Fountain Bluff drainage and levee district	240,000	240,000	240,000
East St. Louis and vicinity	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Farm Creek Reservoirs	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	64,000	64,000	64,000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district	730,000	730,000	730,000
Harrisonville and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	323,500	323,500	323,500
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas, and Kerton Valley drainage and levee districts	617,000	617,000	617,000
Mounds and Mounds City	884,000	884,000	884,000

Flood control, general—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee—Con.

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
Illinois—Continued			
Prairie Du Rocher and vicinity	$900,000	$900,000	$900,000
Stringtown-Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district	730,000	730,000	730,000
The Sny Basin	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Wood River drainage and levee district	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Reevesville	----------	651,000	651,000
Indiana:			
Cagles Mill Reservoir	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Cannelton	640,000	640,000	640,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek section	1,000,000	1,624,000	1,000,000
Jeffersonville-Clarksville	235,000	235,000	235,000
Levee unit 8	243,000	243,000	243,000
Muncie	78,000	78,000	78,000
McGinnis levee	420,000	420,000	420,000
New Albany	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
Shufflebarger levee	420,000	420,000	420,000
Iowa:			
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo	750,000	750,000	750,000
Coralville Reservoir	700,000	700,000	700,000
Council Bluffs	886,000	886,000	886,000
Denison	52,000	52,000	52,000
Dry Run	320,000	320,000	320,000
Elkport, Turkey River	30,100	30,100	30,100
Missouri River agricultural levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to mouth, Iowa, Nebr., Kans., Mo.	8,000,000	9,500,000	8,000,000
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak.	700,000	700,000	700,000
Red Rock Reservoir	700,000	1,200,000	1,000,000
Little Sioux River	200,000	200,000	200,000
Kansas:			
Fall River Reservoir	4,000,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
Kanopolis Reservoir	48,000	48,000	48,000
Kansas Citys, Mo., and Kans	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to mouth, Iowa, Nebr., Kans., and Mo. (See Iowa.)			
Wichita and Valley Center	----------	490,000	490,000
Pioneer Reservoir, Kans., Nebr., and Colo. (See Colorado.)			
Kentucky:			
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. (See Tennessee.)			
Covington	900,000	900,000	900,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	200,000	200,000	200,000
Dewey Reservoir	2,071,000	2,071,000	2,071,000
Louisville	3,500,000	4,500,000	4,000,000
Newport	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Taylorsville	80,000	80,000	80,000
Uniontown	350,000	350,000	350,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir	12,400,000	17,600,000	12,400,000
Maysville	400,000	400,000	400,000
Ashland	----------	420,000	420,000
Hawesville	200,000	200,000	200,000
Rossview Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. (See Tennessee.)			
Louisiana:			
Aloha-Rigolette area	500,000	500,000	500,000
Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayous	34,700	34,700	34,700
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir. (See Arkansas.)			
Bayou Teche and Vermilion River	200,000	600,000	600,000
Mermentau River	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Pineville	60,800	60,800	60,800
Red River levee and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)			
Shreveport	1,000,000	1,475,000	1,000,000
Jonesville	----------	368,000	268,000

Flood control, general—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee—Con.

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
Louisiana—Continued			
Lake Pontchartrain	----------	$900,000	$900,000
Maryland:			
Savage River Dam	$400,000	500,000	400,000
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgely, W. Va	500,000	500,000	500,000
Massachusetts:			
Birch Hill Reservoir	100,000	100,000	100,000
Chicopee	110,000	256,000	256,000
Holyoke	755,000	755,000	755,000
Springdale	315,300	315,300	315,300
Barre Falls Reservoir	----------	754,000	----------
Michigan: Mount Clemens	284,000	284,000	284,000
Minnesota:			
Lac Qui Parle Reservoir	113,200	113,200	113,200
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers	500,000	1,200,000	1,000,000
Missouri:			
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)			
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Iowa.)			
Clearwater Reservoir	1,182,100	1,182,100	1,182,100
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff	153,400	153,400	153,400
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.)			
Missouri River agricultural levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. (See Iowa.)			
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)			
Perry County Nos. 1, 2, and 3	300,000	500,000	300,000
Montana:			
Forsyth	74,200	74,200	74,200
Havre	----------	500,000	0
Nebraska:			
Bartley	96,000	96,000	96,000
Harland County Reservoir	7,500,000	8,600,000	8,000,000
Indianola	13,000	13,000	13,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to mouth, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. (See Iowa.)			
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak. (See Iowa.)			
Omaha	2,400,000	2,900,000	2,400,000
New Hampshire:			
Blackwater Reservoir	231,000	231,000	231,000
Franklin Falls Reservoir	150,800	150,800	150,800
West Peterboro Reservoir	300,000	600,000	600,000
New York:			
Almond Reservoir	1,600,000	1,808,200	1,808,200
Davenport Center Reservoir	----------	1,000,000	0
East Sidney Reservoir	2,700,000	3,602,300	3,000,000
Elmira	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Lancaster	40,000	40,000	40,000
Montour Falls	1,130,000	1,130,000	1,130,000
Mount Morris Reservoir	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Olean	733,000	733,000	733,000
Syracuse	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Whitney Point Reservoir	----------	57,700	57,700
Portville	400,000	400,000	400,000
North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
North Dakota:			
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)			
Baldhill Reservoir	784,500	784,500	784,500
Beulah	87,000	87,000	87,000
Garrison Reservoir	25,000,000	28,900,000	26,000,000
Hazen	$35,500	$35,500	$35,500
Mandan	334,000	334,000	334,000
Homme Reservoir	478,300	478,300	478,300

Flood control, general—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee—Con.

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
Ohio:			
Berlin Reservoir	$204,300	$204,300	$204,300
Burr Oak Reservoir	239,400	239,400	239,400
Cincinnati	285,000	285,000	285,000
Delaware Reservoir	1,494,900	1,494,900	1,494,900
Dillon Reservoir	1,000,000	3,000,000	1,500,000
Massillon	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Muskingum River Reservoirs	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Portsmouth-New Boston	2,000,000	2,407,300	2,407,300
West Fork Reservoir	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Big Walnut Creek Reservoir	----------	600,000	600,000
Oklahoma:			
Canton Reservoir	700,000	700,000	700,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	500,000	500,000	500,000
Eufaula Reservoir	----------	1,000,000	----------
Fort Gibson Reservoir	6,500,000	9,000,000	7,000,000
Great Salt Plains Reservoir	125,000	125,000	125,000
Hulah Reservoir	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Kaw	102,000	102,000	102,000
Oklahoma City floodway	----------	800,000	500,000
Polecat Creek	750,000	750,000	750,000
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Wister Reservoir	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
Arkansas River Basin (see also Arkansas)	----------	----------	----------
Oregon:			
Amazon Creek	67,000	67,000	67,000
Arlington	35,000	35,000	35,000
Coquille River	93,000	93,000	93,000
Detroit Reservoir	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Dorena Reservoir	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,000,000
Fern Ridge Reservoir	155,000	155,000	155,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	5,000,000	6,000,000	5,000,000
Mill Four drainage district	22,000	22,000	22,000
Multnomah drainage district No. 1	83,800	83,800	83,800
Nehalem River	15,000	15,000	15,000
Puddin River	29,000	----------	----------
Umpqua River and tributaries	116,000	116,000	116,000
Willamette River (bank protection)	500,000	500,000	500,000
Milton Freewater, Walla Walla River	----------	300,000	300,000
Pennsylvania:			
Conemaugh River Reservoir	7,875,000	7,875,000	7,875,000
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir	1,700,000	2,000,000	1,700,000
Latrobe	146,000	146,000	146,000
Loyalhanna	276,200	276,200	276,200
Johnstown	402,000	402,000	402,000
Punxsutawney	1,100,000	1,428,100	1,428,100
Sunbury	1,390,600	1,390,600	1,390,600
Williamsport	1,900,000	2,244,400	1,900,000
York	203,100	203,100	203,100
Youghiogheny River Reservoir	299,200	299,200	299,200
South Carolina: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)			
South Dakota:			
Fort Randall Reservoir	16,000,000	19,000,000	18,000,000
Hot Springs	175,000	175,000	175,000
Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak. (See Iowa.)			
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	1,200,000	3,000,000	2,000,000
Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr. (See Nebraska.)			
Tennessee:			
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky.	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. (See Kentucky.)			
Memphis	----------	640,000	----------
Texas:			
Benbrook Reservoir	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla. (See Oklahoma.)			
Grapevine Reservoir	3,300,000	$3,300,000	3,300,000
Hords Creek Reservoir	280,000	280,000	280,000
Lavon Reservoir	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000

Flood control, general—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee—Con.

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
Texas—Continued			
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)			
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway	$4,000,000	$4,000,000	$4,000,000
Texarkana Reservoir	3,350,000	3,350,000	3,350,000
Whitney Reservoir	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Brady	300,000	300,000	300,000
Belton Reservoir	----------	1,000,000	500,000
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	----------	1,000,000	500,000
Utah: Redmond	125,000	125,000	125,000
Vermont: Union Village Reservoir	1,200,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Virginia:			
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C. (See North Carolina.)			
Philpott Reservoir	1,700,000	2,200,000	2,000,000
Washington:			
Diking and improvement district No. 4	70,400	70,400	70,400
Mud Mountain Reservoir	543,700	543,700	543,700
Tacoma	650,000	650,000	650,000
Mill Creek	400,000	400,000	400,000
West Virginia:			
Bluestone Reservoir	5,000,000	5,713,800	5,713,800
Parkersburg	2,450,900	2,450,900	2,450,900
Point Pleasant	700,000	1,100,000	800,000
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgely, W. Va. (See Maryland.)			
Snagging and clearing	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Emergency bank protection	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Planning funds	3,000,000	2,969,000	3,318,000
Subtotal	311,237,000	361,391,800	329,226,100
Preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Maintenance of completed work	3,000,000	3,220,000	3,220,000
Salaries, office, Chief of Engineers	570,000	570,000	570,000
Emergency repairs	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Transfer to U. S. Geological Survey	375,000	375,000	375,000
Transfer to U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service	100,000	100,000	100,000
Total, flood control, general	321,282,000	371,656,800	339,491,100
Flood control, general emergency fund	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	60,000,000	67,500,000	61,000,000
Emergency fund, tributaries of Mississippi River	500,000	500,000	500,000
Flood control, Sacramento River, Calif	1,750,000	2,000,000	1,750,000
Total, all flood control	386,532,000	444,656,800	405,741,100

Planning funds of $3,318,000 are agreed to. In the conference report, the following amounts are earmarked for the projects listed:

To be used:	
Whittier Narrows, Calif	$50,000
Farmington Reservoir, Calif	45,000
Lucky Peak, Idaho	90,000
Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr	250,000
Eufaula Reservoir, Okla	400,000
Bear Creek Reservoir, Pa	200,000
West Fort Reservoir, W. Va	60,000
Total	1,095,000
Funds are not to be used on following projects:	
Toronto Reservoir, Kans	−$30,000
Tuttle Creek, Kans	−35,000
Boswell Reservoir, Okla	−30,000
Hugo Reservoir, Okla	−30,000
Puddin River, Oreg	−29,000
Gathright and Falling Spring, Va	−35,000
Salem Church Reservoir, Va	−175,000
Total	−364,000

The balance of planning funds is to be allocated by the Corps of Engineers to projects included in their justifications.

Rivers and harbors—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
Alabama: Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, Ala. and Miss	----------	$1,500,000	----------
Alaska: Wrangell Narrows	$1,038,400	1,038,400	$1,038,400
Arkansas: Overton-Red River waterway, La. and Ark. (See same project under Louisiana.)			
California:			
Cresent City Harbor	----------	540,000	500,000
Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors	253,000	253,000	253,000
Napa River	865,000	865,000	865,000
Sacramento River	----------	2,128,000	250,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay	900,000	1,170,000	900,000
Connecticut:			
Bridgeport Harbor	100,000	100,000	100,000
Clinton Harbor	----------	61,800	61,800
New Haven Harbor	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Norwalk Harbor	----------	75,000	75,000
Stamford Harbor	----------	45,000	45,000
Greenwich Harbor	----------	71,400	71,400
Delaware: Delaware River, N. J., Pa., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea	----------	1,051,000	500,000
Florida:			
Jim Woodruff lock and dam	2,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000
Hollywood Harbor (Port Everglades)	----------	376,000	376,000
St. Johns River, Jacksonville to Lake Harney	255,100	255,100	255,100
St. Johns River, Jacksonville to the ocean	800,000	1,201,600	800,000
St. Josephs Bay	378,400	378,400	378,400
Tampa Harbor	500,000	500,000	500,000
Georgia:			
Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ga. and Ala. (See same project under Alabama.)			
Buford Dam	----------	1,000,000	----------
Savannah Harbor	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,020,000
Illinois:			
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (Exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn.)	850,000	1,850,000	1,000,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers	8,500,000	9,500,000	9,000,000
Ohio River open channel work. (See same project under Ohio.)			
Idaho: Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho. (See same project under Oregon.)			
Indiana: Ohio River open channel work. (See same project under Ohio.)			
Iowa:			
Keokuk lock (No. 19), Mississippi River	----------	1,500,000	----------
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. Exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn.) (See same project under Illinois.)			
Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa	2,500,000	4,000,000	3,000,000
Kansas: Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See same project under Iowa.)			
Kentucky: Ohio River open channel work. (See same project under Ohio.)			
Louisiana:			
Calcasieu River and Pass	800,000	500,000	500,000
Waterway from Empire, La., to the Gulf of Mexico	----------	436,000	250,000

Rivers and harbors—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee—Con.

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
Louisiana—Continued			
Intracoastal Waterway, Apalachee Bay, Fla., to the Mexican border section. (New Orleans district)	$1,800,000	$3,395,700	$2,000,000
Overton-Red River waterway, La. and Ark.	----------	2,200,000	----------
Pearl River, Miss. and La.	1,159,600	1,159,600	1,159,600
Maine: Portland Harbor	1,000,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Maryland:			
Baltimore Harbor and Channels	587,400	871,400	871,400
Black Walnut Harbor	28,000	28,000	28,000
Duck Point Cove	26,000	26,000	26,000
Lower Thoroughfare, at or near Wenona, Deals Island	28,600	28,600	28,600
Pocomoke River	6,000	6,000	6,000
Town Creek	32,500	32,500	32,500
Massachusetts, Fall River Harbor	750,000	750,000	750,000
Michigan:			
Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River	225,000	225,000	225,000
Grand Traverse Bay Harbor	190,500	190,500	190,500
Keweenaw waterway	75,000	75,000	75,000
Manistee Harbor	255,500	255,500	255,500
St. Marys River	3,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
Minnesota:			
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (Exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn.) (See same project under Illinois.)			
St. Paul Harbor	----------	199,600	199,600
St. Anthony Falls	----------	1,100,000	1,000,000
Two Harbors (Agate Bay)	500,000	1,000,000	500,000
Mississippi:			
Pearl River, Miss. and La. (See same project under Louisiana.)			
Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway. (See same project under Alabama.)			
Missouri:			
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. (Exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn.), (See same project under Illinois.)			
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers. (See same project under Illinois.)			
Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See same project under Iowa.)			
Missouri River, mouth to Kansas City	2,000,000	2,500,000	2,000,000
Montana: Missouri River at Fort Peck	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
Nebraska: Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa. (See same project under Iowa.)			
New Jersey:			
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See same project under Delaware.)			
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	----------	750,000	----------
New York and New Jersey Channels. (See same project under New York.)			
New York:			
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor	193,000	193,000	193,000

Rivers and harbors—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee—Con.

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
New York—Continued			
Buffalo Harbor	$500,000	$500,000	$500,000
Hudson River	269,000	269,000	269,000
New York and New Jersey Channels	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
Wilson Harbor	300,000	300,000	300,000
North Carolina: Cape Fear River, at and below Wilmington	1,108,000	1,264,500	1,264,500
Ohio:			
Cleveland Harbor	2,000,000	2,600,000	2,000,000
Ohio River, open channel work	199,500	199,500	199,500
Oregon:			
Columbia River at Bonneville	600,000	500,000	500,000
Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg	775,000	775,000	775,000
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg	----------	326,000	326,000
Longview Harbor	----------	154,000	154,000
Coos Bay	1,000,000	2,000,000	1,500,000
McNary lock and dam, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash	20,000,000	27,000,000	22,000,000
Saquina Bay and Harbor	109,400	109,400	109,400
Pennsylvania:			
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea. (See same project under Delaware.)			
Monongahela River (lock 2)	900,000	1,400,000	1,000,000
Schuylkill River	1,295,000	1,295,000	1,295,000
Rhode Island: Wickford Harbor	----------	95,000	95,000
South Carolina:			
Charleston Harbor	178,000	178,000	178,000
Winyah Bay	856,600	856,600	856,600
Tennessee: Cumberland River. (See same project under Kentucky.)			
Texas:			
Brazos Island Harbor	175,000	325,000	325,000
Houston Ship Channel	500,000	500,000	500,000
Neches-Angelina Rivers	1,818,100	1,818,100	1,818,100
Sabine-Neches waterways	480,000	480,000	480,000
The Intracoastal Waterway, Apalachee Bay, Fla., to the Mexican border section (Galveston district)	2,119,000	2,119,000	2,119,000
Trinity River Channel to Liberty	400,000	750,000	750,000
Virginia:			
Broad Creek	32,700	32,700	32,700
Cranes Creek	----------	7,500	7,500
Hoskins Creek	25,000	25,000	25,000
Norfolk Harbor	----------	108,000	108,000
Virgin Islands: St. Thomas Harbor	----------	750,000	----------
Washington:			
Columbia River at Baker Bay	60,000	60,000	60,000
Columbia River at Bonneville. (See same project under Oregon.)			
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg. (See same project under Oregon.)			
Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg. (See same project under Oregon.)			
McNary lock and dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See same project under Oregon.)			
Olympia Harbor	187,000	187,000	187,000

Rivers and harbors—Projects included by House and Senate in 1949 civil functions appropriations bill, H. R. 5524, and amounts allowed by conference committee—Con.

Project	Amount allowed by House, construction	Amount allowed by Senate, construction	Allowed by conferees, construction
Washington—Con.			
Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho. (See same project under Oregon.)			
Willapa River and Harbor	----------	$74,000	$74,000
West Virginia:			
Monongahela River, lock and dam 2. (See same project under Pennsylvania.)			
Morgantown lock and dam, Monongahela River	----------	4,150,000	3,000,000
Ohio River open channel work. (See same project under Ohio.)			
Wisconsin:			
Mississippi River between Missourf River and Minneapolis, Minn. (exclusive of St. Anthony Falls, Minn.). (See same project under Illinois.)			
Planning funds	$1,000,000	2,107,000	1,924,000
Subtotals, construction and planning	76,304,300	115 617 400	90,412,100
Maintenance	50,000,000	51,500,000	51,000,000
Operating and care	20,000,000	21,000,000	20,000,000
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies	2,000,000	2,950,000	2,050,000
Removing sunken vessels	300,000	300,000	300,000
Survey of northern and northwestern lakes	300,000	300,000	300,000
Prevention of deposits in New York Harbor	350,000	350,000	350,000
California Debris Commission	12,000	12,000	12,000
Salaries, office, Chief of Engineers	540,000	540,000	540,000
Printing for River and Harbor Board	40,000	40,000	40,000
River and Harbor Board expenses	400,000	400,000	400,000
Beach Erosion Board expenses	160,000	160,000	160,000
Work under sec. 3, River and Harbor Act, Mar. 2, 1945	300,000	300,000	300,000
Transfer to U. S. Geological Survey	125,000	125,000	125,000
Transfer to Fish and Wildlife Service	1,000,000	1,490,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, maintenance, etc	75,527,000	79,467,000	76,577,000
Total	151,831,300	195,084,400	166,989,100

Planning funds of $1,924,000 are agreed to. In the conference report the following amounts are earmarked for the projects listed:

Alabama-Coosa Rivers	$290,000
Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla	500,000
Buford Dam, Ga	400,000
Calumet-Sag, Ill	200,000
Total	1,390,000

The balance of planning funds is to be allocated by the Corps of Engineers to projects included in their justifications, except no funds are to be used for planning on the Intracoastal Waterway, cross-Florida section, Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. If there are any questions, I shall be glad to answer them. If there are no questions, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish, in a word, to express my regret that certain items carried in the bill as passed by the Senate were not agreed to by the House conferees or by the House. I realize that the Senate conferees did the best they could to secure the acceptance of the Senate amendments to the bill. Of course, all we can do is to accept or reject the conference report. In view of the fact that the chances probably would not be propitious to secure a better conference report than that which is brought forward at this time, I shall content myself with expressing my regret that the House conferees were not more willing to accept the Senate version of the bill with regard to many things that were entirely worthy of the favorable consideration of both Houses.

Mr. GURNEY. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that there are quite a number of worth-while projects provided for by the Senate not agreed to in conference. I am not too happy to make this report to the Senate.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS subsequently said: Mr. President, there was so much noise and confusion immediately after the final votes on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that it was impossible for me to hear the calling up of the conference report on the Army civil functions appropriations bill, and the conference report was agreed to before several of us knew it had even been called up. It is too bad that in this rush to adjourn we are jamming important legislation through at such a hasty tempo, and I am sure none of us like this.

I recognize the tremendous handicap under which the Senate Appropriations Committee has been operating, and I want to voice my personal appreciation for the simply tremendous amount of work which it performed and which its members are called upon to handle.

I had no intention of seeking to recommit the civil-functions bill back to conference because I know that that would have been impossible to achieve in view of the lateness of the hour in this session. However, I do want to make some brief comments on the conference report, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed at the point in the RECORD where the conference report on the civil-functions bill was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MYERS. On the whole, and speaking in over-all figures, I cannot complain too much about the conference report, for the Senate did succeed in restoring some of the more damaging cuts made by the House. For instance, the Senate conferees did persuade the House conferees to allow the full budget amount for the Punxsutawney dikes, and to raise substantially the amounts which the House had voted for maintenance on rivers and harbors, so that the reduction in work on very essential channel maintenance at Philadelphia and Erie will not suffer nearly as much as it would have under the original House bill. There is no gainsaying, however, that there will be unfortunate curtailments of work at both places because the conference bill does not go far enough. Even the Senate figure on maintenance was about one and one-half million dollars below the budget and this final bill reduces the

budget by two million instead of the three-million cut made by the House.

Funds restored by the Senate for the Williamsport dikes were cut out in conference and that will mean a delay in the completion of this project of about a year and that is most unfortunate—in fact, it is most dangerous because if a flood occurs before completion of the dikes, a flood of the severity of recent floods at Williamsport, we are going to find this alleged saving of about $344,000 at Williamsport in the coming year to have been false economy indeed.

The same holds true for the so-called savings of $300,000 for the East Branch Clarion River Reservoir. Here again the Senate conferees retreated from the Senate amount and agreed to the House amount.

The most puzzling aspect of this conference report, however, is the pittance of $500,000 voted for the Delaware River improvement work at Philadelphia as against the $1,051,000 voted by the Senate originally, which was the budget amount. The House for the second straight year had left this project out entirely for reasons I have never been able to learn. If it were a matter of principle which caused the House to leave out this project originally, then I am surprised now that it would agree to anything. Apparently it was not a matter of principle; apparently it was just a matter of some penny pinching at the expense of the Port of Philadelphia, the economy of Philadelphia, and many of our important businesses in Philadelphia. Restoring our harbor depths will have to be done to accommodate the larger ships and we are going to have to spend the money, and this cut of a half million dollars merely prolongs the agony and inconvenience.

Similarly, we are relocating and rebuilding two locks on the Monongahela River, one at Braddock and one at Morgantown, W. Va., and in both cases the House conferees have persuaded the Senate conferees to give in on the Senate amounts and to agree to cuts and this is most unfortunate and is a blow to river transportation in western Pennsylvania against which I protest.

This is shabby treatment for a State which pays such a substantial portion of Federal revenues. This type of economy is short-sighted. It is cheap.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1346 on the calendar, Senate bill 2318, to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, and that it be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1670, House bill 6705, the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

MAINTENANCE OF STATUS QUO OF EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 711)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read.

(For text of President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 8188.)

During the reading of the veto message the following occurred:

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to Senators that the veto message of the President of House Joint Resolution 296 is now being read, and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] expects immediate consideration of it. After the conclusion of action on the veto message there will be brought before the Senate two appropriation bills and some other business, and as I announced this morning, the expectation is that there will be a night session. The question now before the Senate is the veto message and I trust that Senators will be prepared to debate it if they care to, or vote on it immediately.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What was before the Senate when the veto message was taken up?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 6705, the Interior department appropriation bill, is the business which has been taken up, after the unfinished business had been temporarily laid aside.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the veto message have preference?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is privileged matter.

Mr. LUCAS. At any time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The other business is automatically laid aside?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The clerk will continue the reading.

The clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the veto message.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the reconsideration of House Joint Resolution 296.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall give a very brief review of what is in the joint resolution.

The joint resolution would reaffirm the unbroken intent of Congress that the usual common-law rules, realistically applied, shall continue to be used to determine whether a person is an "employee" for purposes of applying the Social Security Act.

The resolution would maintain the status under the act of those who, prior to the enactment of the joint resolution, have been given coverage by erroneous construction of the term "employee"—as defined in the joint resolution—if social-security taxes have been paid into the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund with respect to the covered services.

The joint resolution would assure continued benefits to those who will have attained age 65, and to the survivors of those who will have died prior to the close of the first calendar quarter which begins after the enactment of the act and who have coverage under the system because of misconstruction of the term "employee"—as defined in the joint resolution—even though social-security taxes have not been paid by them or in their behalf.

The joint resolution would stop extension of coverage of the act to between a half and three-quarters of a million persons who have not been, are not now, and should not be under the act, until coverage is provided by act of the Congress.

The joint resolution would stop the plan of the Treasury Department to give to these 500,000–750,000 persons free, retroactive coverage, and thus would stop a more than $100,000,000 impairment of the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund which has been built up out of taxes collected on the wages of those who are truly employees and who have paid for their coverage under the system.

The pending resolution would not disturb the existing Treasury regulation which construes the term "employee" in the Social Security Act harmoniously with the usual common-law rules.

The pending resolution will maintain the moving principles of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the Silk, Greyvan, and Bartels cases, where, in the opinion of your committee, the Court realistically applied the usual common-law rules. But if it be contended that the Supreme Court has invented new law for determining an "employee" under the social-security system in these cases, then the purpose of this joint resolution is to reestablish the usual common-law rules, realistically applied.

The joint resolution preserves the integrity of the trust fund by limiting payments out of the fund to persons who are employees under the act by the usual common-law rules, realistically applied. It leaves to Congress the opportunity to

provide coverage for independent contractors and the self-employed, who are not employees under the act, or to those who are employees and are now expressly excluded from the coverage of the act.

The joint resolution would restore to the trust fund by appropriation moneys which have been paid out of the fund in the form of social-security benefits to persons not employees under the act and who have not contributed social-security taxes to the fund.

The bill also provides increased old-age-assistance payments and payments for dependent children and the blind.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Colorado kindly tell the Senate what the language in the original Social Security Act which was the subject of the Supreme Court decision deals with? What is the language of coverage which was interpreted by the United States Supreme Court decision?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The question is, What is meant by "employee"?

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is asking what the language is in the act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The single word is employee.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. In the original Social Security Act affecting old-age and survivors' insurance, employees were covered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Employees were covered, except farm employees and domestics, and certain excepted categories.

Mr. PEPPER. Now when the Supreme Court had the matter before it, it was interpreting the meaning of the term "employee," was it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes, and it interpreted it, in the view of the committee, entirely in accord with the existing Treasury regulations, and if it did not do so, then it was making law of its own, a privilege which is exclusively with the Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator from Colorado has stated very clearly what is the issue involved in this matter. The Senator has stated clearly and rightly that the original Social Security Act respecting old-age and survivors' insurance covered "employees." The question arose later as to who was an employee. Naturally the decision went to the judiciary, and finally to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, there is more to it than that. The Senator asked me a very narrow question. The Congress itself has decided who is an employee. The Social Security Agency attempted to secure the type of enlargement which it now contemplates in its proposed regulation, and the Congress refused its request. Shortly after the Social Security Act became effective, the Treasury Department put out regulations interpreting the word "employee." Those regulations were before Congress again and again in connection with revisions of the Social Security Act. Congress accepted them, did not change them and thus they became the Congress' own interpretation of the word "employee." They became the law of Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what the able Senator from Colorado has stated does not change the basic assumption upon which the Senator from Florida began, namely, that the Social Security Act extended the coverage to employees. The Social Security administrators in their interpretation of the term "employee" embraced a certain category of persons. Their coverage was questioned, and the issue went to the Supreme Court of the United States as to what the term "employee" as used in the act meant. That involved an interpretation by the Supreme Court of the United States of legislative language as well as intent.

Now, Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States in the performance of its review function interpreted the word "employee" to be based upon a factual and a realistic predicate. It did not regard itself—nor did it regard the language of the law—to be confined within the narrow limitations of the common-law definition of employer and employee or master and servant.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me finish the sentence. What is involved in the joint resolution is an attempt on the part of the sponsors thereof to induce the Congress of the United States to reverse the Supreme Court of the United States in its interpretation of the term "employee," or to lay down a different standard of coverage, which would exclude the people who the Supreme Court said are in fact employees.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that he is assuming that the Congress is reversing the decisions of the Supreme Court. It is the contention of the sponsors of the joint resolution that nothing of the kind happened, and that the Treasury is perverting the intent of those decisions in order to give itself new fields of legislative power. But, I repeat, if the Supreme Court of the United States is giving a definition of its own which is contrary to the law as established by the words and by the practice and by the regulations which have been accepted by the Congress, then we mean to reverse the Supreme Court, as we have the right to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President, we have a right to pass a law that will invalidate the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and that procedure has been attempted in numerous cases here in the last year or two. There is a considerable tendency to reverse the Supreme Court of the United States in the Congress when the Supreme Court lays down a definition that generally will be in the public interest. In this instance, Mr. President, I think it is in the public interest for half a million or 700,000 men and women who are in fact employees to be given the advantage of coverage under the social-security and old-age and survivors' program. They pay by their own contribution into this fund. They are not beneficiaries of charity.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me to continue a moment. They pay into the fund a sum equal to the amount the employer pays into the fund. That makes the common fund. They contribute to it, and they are denied by this joint resolution, nearly 700,000 of them in this country, the right to contribute to this fund, to be the beneficiaries of it, by a definition which will be, in the language of the President in his veto message, within the whim and the caprice of an employer's legal contract of employment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is making a misstatement, which I am sure is not deliberate.

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly I did not intentionally make a misstatement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is not one person, not one, who is covered in this system, who has carried his weight of the load, who has contributed any taxes for coverage, who has been denied it—not one person.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator——

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator will wait a moment. I intend to demonstrate that point, because it is very important. Moreover, if there is anyone in this system who is not an employee, but who has paid his taxes, he receives benefit credits, and moreover, if there is anyone whose benefits have matured, who has had no place in the system rightfully, even though he has paid no taxes into the system, those benefits continue. That is contained in express language in the joint resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am afraid it is the Senator from Colorado who is laboring under a misrepresentation, or else the Senator from Florida has been misunderstood. I mean the 500,000 or 700,000 who would be covered by the Supreme Court's interpretation of the term "employee" are to be excluded by this joint resolution if it becomes law, and I mean that those people would not be the beneficiaries of charity. They contribute to this plan. I am not talking about someone who contributed in the past and whose rights are in jeopardy. I am talking about the right of this class to come into the system. I am saying that they pay part of their wage. They put up as much as does the employer. This is not just a charity we are speaking about. This is the right to contribute to a system which will give them some protection in case of disability, or give their dependents some benefits in case of their death.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. MILLIKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BARKLEY. The fact that they may not heretofore have paid any contribution into the fund would not preclude them from being eligible to do so hereafter under the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. While it is probably true that technically no one who is on the rolls is taken off by this legislation, it bars the door to their entry in the future.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I mean to say. Between 500,000 and 700,000 are precluded from sharing in the program. They are precluded from contributing. They are precluded from the benefits which the program would afford, contrary to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I challenge that statement frontally. There is not one person who is an employee who will be disestablished from the opportunity of future coverage under the act—not one person.

Mr. PEPPER. I think we can at least come to an understanding about the facts. Let me see if I am correct——

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Supreme Court, in the moving principles leading to its decisions in the Silk and Greyvan cases and the Bartels versus Birmingham case, adopted the usual common-law rule realistically applied, which is the present rule of the Treasury Department.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the Senator trying to do by this resolution?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We are trying to prevent the Treasury from making new rules which would misinterpret the decision of the Supreme Court and would give to itself the law-making power.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Colorado is trying to review in the Congress an administrative interpretation of the Bureau, that is certainly a new and peculiar procedure. If a bureau of the Government attempts to promulgate a regulation which is in violation of the law as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States, is it necessary to come to Congress to curb it? Can it not be curbed in some court? Here is the Senator from Colorado, in the Congress, trying to keep the Social Security Agency from exceeding its lawful power. Are we going to review in the Congress of the United States every administrative transgression? Either the Bureau is acting within the scope of the United States Supreme Court decision, or it is not. If it is not, then we have no right to stop it. If it is, it can be stopped by the courts, and it will be stopped by the courts of this land. It is not the function and prerogative of Congress to review every attempted exercise of administrative authority, or to review a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; and both those attempts are involved in this resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the Senator's declaration that it is not within the province of the Congress to review the assertion of law-making power by a bureau which has powers delegated from the Congress is one of the most fantastic doctrines I have ever heard. I do not believe the Senator means it. The question of coverage depends on the interpretation of the word "employee." It is a word which has been used by Congress. The jurisdiction of the subject is in Congress. Congress has the complete right to interpret the word as it sees fit.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but when the Congress uses a word to cover a class, and when the Supreme Court of the United States defines and interprets that word, and determines and defines and delimits that class, we ought not in the Congress to be asked to take away from the beneficiaries of that definition the coverage which the definition extends. That is what is attempted here. The insurance companies and those who are not friendly to the extension of social security are the ones behind this resolution. They are the ones trying to freeze an administrative interpretation. They are the ones trying to reverse the Supreme Court definition. They are the ones trying to find a new definition which will limit the coverage of a class. The Senator well knows that that is what is involved in this resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Supreme Court was not dealing with the inclusion of the 500,000 to 700,000 people to whom the Senator refers. The Supreme Court was dealing with the Social Security Act as it related to parties in cases before it, and with the regulations of the Treasury Department. I respectfully suggest—there may be argument about it—that the Supreme Court decision does not authorize the proposed regulation. It does not authorize the inclusion of all these people. It simply goes back to the old common law rules, realistically applied, where the facts of each case determine the situation. Some of the 500,000 to 700,000 are employees. Some of them are self-employed. Some are independent contractors. They can find their place in the system if they are employees; and neither this resolution nor the present regulations of the Treasury will prohibit it, nor will the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Let me first answer the Senator from Colorado, and then I shall be glad to yield to the able Senator from New Mexico.

The Supreme Court had before it the interpretation of the word "employee," as used in the Social Security Act affecting old-age and survivors' insurance. The Supreme Court held that the definition of "employee" should be on a realistic basis, and that it was a question of fact when one man worked for another, that was to be determined in the light of all the circumstances and facts surrounding the case. It was not to be predicated upon some phraseology in a lawyer's document, or on the way the contract was worded, phrased, or termed. It was simply a question of fact in each case. But the Supreme Court said, "We are not going to be bound by the technical requirements of the antiquated common-law definition of master and servant, employer, and employee." When the Supreme Court rendered that decision, the Bureau attempted to implement the decision in its regulations by beginning to see that people who were in fact employees were covered by the bill. No one else, mind you, is covered, except one who in fact is an employee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me just a moment, in the debate on the resolution I stated that I had been in contact with the legal authorities in the Treasury. I asked them about a man who was general agent for an insurance company. They said that he was not covered because he was in fact an independent contractor and not an employee. I said, "What about a man who is in the general insurance business, who represents many fire-insurance companies, and sells insurance for those companies to the public. Is he covered?" The Treasury officials said, "No; he is not in fact an employee. He is actually an independent contractor." But in the other cases, where a man was an employee of an insurance office or an insurance company, when, as a salesman, he was an employee in fact, he should be covered, and he would be covered under the definition which was interpreted by the United States Supreme Court.

The Senator from Colorado and the sponsors of this resolution do not want the realistic, factual interpretation of "employee" by the Supreme Court of the United States. They want to take us back to the technical conditions of the common-law definition of employer and employee, under which the master is expected to give detailed instructions to the employee. That is made the criterion of the relationship between the two.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly, Mr. President, there is a very fundamental question involved in this decision.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I have been trying to attract the attention of both Senators. There is one thing about this resolution that has puzzled me since the beginning. For a long period of time, as Senators will recall, we had much criticism of the executive department of the Government and of the bureaus, because they could make arbitrary regulations and decisions, and there was no method whatever to review them by any agency of Government.

So, after a long period of consideration, we passed the administrative law bill. Among other features, it contains a feature for judicial review. If I am correctly informed, if the regulations which now are under discussion violated the laws of Congress, if they violated the Supreme Court's decisions, if they were as bad as the Senator from Colorado thinks they are, they could be reached; and the decision could be made regularly and in accordance with the administrative law bill, which provides for full and complete judicial review.

But instead of that, we are asked to take the extraordinary step of having the Congress determine the validity of the regulation, and interpret the decision of the Supreme Court, and say that the regulation violates the decision of the Supreme Court.

To my mind, it is most extraordinary for the Congress to attempt to do that, when for months and years we went through the procedure of setting up the administrative machinery.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much for his valuable contribution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has said that the Senator from Colorado favors going back to the determination of coverage according to the technical concepts of the old common-law rule. He has said that the Senator from Colorado does not want a realistic application of the rule.

I invite the Senator's attention to the report of the Senate Committee on Finance which makes it completely clear that the Committee on Finance does favor the realistic application of the rule; and from that report the Senator will see that the Treasury Department has promulgated regulations which are in existence at the present time, and which do provide for the realistic application of the common-law rule.

The point is that the Treasury Department is now using a Supreme Court decision to go off into the stratosphere and make a lot of law of its own.

So it certainly is within the jurisdiction of the Congress, and the Congress should take hold of its jurisdiction, and should stop that.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have two answers to make to my able friend. The first is as to what the resolution means. As to that, let us look at the language of the resolution. The Senator says I am accusing him of desiring to go back to the common-law definition. I have before me a copy of House Joint Resolution 296, Calendar No. 1298. Is that the correct one?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall read the title and a part of what follows:

> Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage
>
> *Resolved, etc.*, That (a) section 1426 (d) and section 1607 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code are amended by inserting before the period at the end of each the following: ", but such term does not include (1) any individual who, under the usual common-law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an independent contractor or (2) any individual (except an officer of a corporation) who is not an employee under such common-law rules."

I respectfully submit that the language of the joint resolution will take priority over anything that may have been said in the committee report.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me invite the Senator's attention to the interpretation of similar language which has been made by the existing Treasury regulation which, as I said a while ago, has been before the Congress in connection with several revisions, and has never been changed by the Congress, and which under a very elementary rule, which the Senator is fully acquainted with, has become the law. Let me read it to the distinguished Senator, so that he may see that the present regulation interpreting the statute adopts the common-law rule, realistically applied.

I shall quote the regulation. It is not very long, and it will help clarify our discussion if I read it now:

> REGULATIONS 91, ARTICLE 3: WHO ARE EMPLOYEES
>
> Who are employees: Every individual is an employee if the relationship between him and the person for whom he performs services is the legal relationship of employer and employee.

That would seem to be rather self-evident.

I continue to read:

> Generally such relationship exists when the person for whom services are performed has the right to control and direct the individual who performs the services, not only as to the result to be accomplished by the work but also as to the details and means by which that result is accomplished.

That is the usual, common-law rule.

I read further:

> That is, an employee is subject to the will and control of the employer not only as to what shall be done but how it shall be done. In this connection, it is not necessary that the employer actually direct or control the manner in which the services are performed; it is sufficient if he has the right to do so.

That is the first penetration of what the documents might show, what some phony arrangement might show. In other words, you look through that to find the substance.

Continuing:

> The right to discharge is also an important factor indicating that the person possessing that right is an employer. Other factors characteristic of an employer, but not necessarily present in every case, are the furnishing of tools and the furnishing of a place to work to the individual who performs the services.

I remind the distinguished Senator that that was a factor which was considered in one of the cases before the Supreme Court. There was a slaughterhouse case involving some men who were working along a production line, but they had a sort of contract which the owners of the business claimed made them independent contractors. The Supreme Court looked at all the circumstances, just as this regulation authorizes, and said that under all the circumstances, due to the placement of those men in the continuity of the business, and so forth, and so on, and looking at it realistically, they were truly employees.

Continuing with this regulation:

> In general, if an individual is subject to the control or direction of another merely as to the result to be accomplished by the work and not as to the means and methods for accomplishing the result, he is an independent contractor. An individual performing services as an independent contractor is not as to such services an employee.

The Supreme Court has not said anything different.

Continuing with the regulation:

> Generally, physicians, lawyers, dentists, veterinarians, contractors, subcontractors, public stenographers, auctioneers, and others who follow an independent trade, business, or profession, in which they offer their services to the public, are independent contractors and not employees.
>
> Whether the relationship of employer and employee exists will in doubtful cases be determined upon an examination of the particular facts of the case.
>
> If the relationship of employer and employee exists the designation or description of the relationship by the parties as anything other than that of employer and employee is immaterial.
>
> The measurement, method, or designation of compensation is also immaterial, if the relationship of employer and employee in fact exists.

In other words, look through the form, and go to the substance.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what the regulations now provide.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; and that is what we are sustaining.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator is trying to invalidate the regulations which have been promulgated by the Social Security.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, no; we are retaining the present regulations, and are invalidating the proposed regulations.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, yes; the regulations have been promulgated since the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The regulation I have read is the existing one which has been in effect since immediately after the act was enacted, and which the Congress has reviewed again and again, and which therefore has become the law.

Mr. PEPPER. But the able Senator from Colorado now is ignoring the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and the changes in the regulations that are contemplated as a result of the Supreme Court's decision. The Senator is asking us to reaffirm in a congressional enactment what the law was before the Supreme Court passed upon it. That is what the able Senator is asking us to do. He wants to maintain the status quo, he says; but what is meant by that, according to those who make that statement? Do they mean to maintain the regulations which were in effect before the Supreme Court's decision, without any amendment or change in light of the Supreme Court's decision?

The joint resolution has the title:

> To maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

In other words the able Senators who are authors of the resolution do not want extended coverage, which is about to be put into effect by the Supreme Court's authority. They want to freeze the coverage where it was before the Supreme Court spoke. They want to slam the door against those new people coming in whom

the Supreme Court said had the right to come in. That is what is involved here.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We are not trying to exclude from coverage any man who is an employee.

Mr. PEPPER. According to whose definition, may I ask?

Mr. MILLIKIN. According to the law of Congress as interpreted by the existing regulations, and according to our interpretation of the rule of the Supreme Court. I repeat, I think the issue is a good thing to debate.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, I agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat, if the Supreme Court has set up a law of its own that is different from the existing law which the Congress has continued as interpreted in the existing regulations, then we should stop it.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, I see.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In other words, any man who is an employee, we want him covered, but we do not want anybody covered who is not an employee.

Mr. PEPPER. And the Senator from Colorado is not willing for the Supreme Court of the United States to determine and to interpret what the word "employee" means. He wants to decide it for himself. He does not want the judiciary to pass on legislation in the usual course if it gives benefit to somebody he does not want to see receive it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the contrary, I respectfully submit we are trying to sustain the Supreme Court decision as we interpret it, to prevent an abuse and a misinterpretation of it by the Treasury.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, Congress is a rather busy body. I shudder to think how many cases we shall have here if we are going to become the tribunal of review of every asserted transgression of administrative authority by the administrative hosts of this Government.

Mr. President, I affirm that if a single taxpayer is assessed with a tax as an employee and he is not in fact an employee as determined by the courts of this country he will never have to pay it, nor will an employer have to pay it, because all he has to do is to go into court and ask for a definition of the term "employee" or "employer" and if it is not in the category where it should be, I have sufficient confidence in the judiciary of this country to believe he will not be required to make the payment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think one of the most important features of this proposed regulation which has not been touched upon and perhaps the Senator will come to it, is that the proposed regulation intends to give coverage retroactively to 500,000 or 750,000 people for free, without paying a penny for the retroactive benefit, and these free benefits must come out of the trust fund which has been accumulated by the 30,000,000 workers who have been building it up so that their claims for benefits will be paid when they mature.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am unwilling to believe that the Social Security Board will use the fund to give an unfair advantage to one class at the expense of another.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Social Security Board said it intended to do that very thing, at the hearings.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President; but the Senator from Colorado is not so much concerned about retroactive coverage as he is about future coverage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado is concerned in not impairing the trust fund to the extent of $100,000,000 at the cost of 30,000,000 people.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the third position I have heard the able Senator from Colorado take, and no doubt there will be other positions he will be able to take in the debate, but it is very obvious to anyone who examines the legislative history of this proposal that the real milk in the coconut is, there are certain people in this country who do not want to extend social-security benefits, and under the United States Supreme Court decision there is about to be an extended coverage of those entitled to participate and share in the old-age and survivors' program, and this joint resolution is designed to prevent that extended coverage from taking place.

I read in the title of the joint resolution a confirmation of what I have said:

> To maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

Mr. President, I believe in social security.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not also true that the President of the United States has for a very long period of time advocated, by message and otherwise, that the benefits of the Social Security Act be extended to all who are in fact employees?

Mr. PEPPER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not true that the purpose and intent of the new regulations has been to carry that policy into effect?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. And it will be carried into effect if the President's veto is sustained and the resolution is defeated, will it not?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is exactly correct, and it could not be stated better.

Mr. President, as I said a little bit earlier, I am in favor of the extension of social-security coverage. I believe it to be in the public interest as well as in the interest of those directly affected. After all, if citizens of this country become subject to public support, it means a public burden to which they may not make a contribution; but if they are permitted while they are working and while they are earning money to make a contribution to an insurance fund which the employer matches, then there is a fund being stored up to protect them not only against personal distress but against public responsibility and support, perhaps in their old age or a period of disability in their lives.

So, Mr. Presdent, I think it is a very salutary step forward that the social-security authorities propose to make. I think we should protect them instead of striking down what they are about to do. If they go outside the scope of the Supreme Court's definition, they will be stopped by competent judicial authority. We do not have to perform that function here in the Congress of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, just this last word: Unhappily, there is involved in the joint resolution the question of the $5 addition to the Federal contribution to old-age assistance, which was passed by the Senate and was later concurred in by the House of Representatives. We are in the dilemma either of denying the old people of the country who benefit from old-age assistance this $5 protection and assistance, or we are on the other horn of the dilemma, if we give them that protection, of withdrawing social-security coverage under the old-age and survivors' insurance plan from more than half a million worthy citizens who also are striving for protection in periods of disability and old age, and some security for their dependents in case of their passing.

Mr. President, I think I have supported old-age assistance as strongly as any other Member of this body. I have never missed an opportunity to aid it in every way within my power. I am ashamed almost of the pettiness of the contribution we have made to our senior citizens. I feel that we have been delinquent and we have been in default in the discharge of obligations to the senior citizenry of the country. I welcomed a chance to join in the amendment sponsored by the able and illustrious Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], but I stated at the time that I voted for the amendment that even if it were adopted I was going to vote against the joint resolution on final passage, because it would take away from more than half a million of our fellow citizens protection and coverage the Supreme Court has said they were entitled to enjoy under our social-security system.

If we enact this joint resolution and take that coverage away from those half million people, they will not get it back unless a new law shall be enacted, and that will be very difficult. It would have to be initiated as new legislation. But if the President's veto is sustained and we lose the $5 added to old-age assistance by the amendment adopted by the Senate, we can put that amendment on another bill which will be coming through the Senate before we adjourn.

We can add it to an appropriation bill or we can add it to an authorization bill. There are many vehicles to which we can attach the amendment with a view to its ultimate enactment.

So, Mr. President, I am not voting against old-age assistance; I am simply saying that we do not have to deprive a half million persons entitled to another stage of social-security coverage because of the additional $5 which the old people would receive with this

amendment attached. For my part, Mr. President, I shall vote as I did when the joint resolution was previously before the Senate. I shall vote against the resolution by voting to sustain the President's veto and progress the salutary extension of social-security coverage.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I must differ with my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Florida, regarding our ability to attach this old-age assistance legislation to another bill. I think there is no question that if we vote to sustain the veto we shall lose the increased $5 payments to the aged, the blind, and the $3 for dependent children. We may hold different views regarding the first part of this resolution, but I would say to my friend from Florida that that legislation could be attached to another bill as well as legislation for increases for the aged, blind, and dependent children. If we disagree as to the first part of the resolution, our point of view depends upon what we consider more important. I say it is far more important to increase assistance for the aged, the blind, and dependent children. They need this assistance now.

So I hope, Mr. President, that, regardless of their views in regard to the first section of this legislation, Senators will vote for the resolution. I consider it most important that we give this assistance to the aged, the blind, and dependent children. After Congress adjourns we cannot tell them that we can put an amendment on another bill. Mr. President, if we want to give assistance to those persons, it is my humble opinion that we had better vote for it at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the debate is concluded, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Jenner	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lodge	Taylor
Donnell	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarthy	Thye
Dworshak	McClellan	Tydings
Eastland	McFarland	Umstead
Ecton	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Feazel	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Myers	Young
Hawkes	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to address a question to the Senator from Colorado. I understand the measure which has been vetoed by the President did provide, among other things, that there should be an increase of $5 a month to those pensioned because of age. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall appreciate very much if the distinguished Senator will address his question to the author of the amendment the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then I do address the question to the Senator from Arizona. As I understand, the amendment which was offered and adopted when the joint resolution was before the Senate, and which was accepted by the House of Representatives and went to the President and was vetoed, provided for the payment of an additional $5 a month to those who were recipients of old-age pensions. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is correct. The existing law provides that of the first $15 put up, the Federal Government contributes $10, and the States, $5. This amendment provides that the Federal Government would supply $15 out of the first $20, and then the payments are to be on a 50–50 basis thereafter to a maximum of $50.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, as I understand, at the present time, of the portion paid up to $15, $10 has been paid by the Federal Government and $5 by the States.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the amendment in the measure which was vetoed, the Federal Government would pay $15 of any amount paid and the State $5.

Mr. McFARLAND. Fifteen dollars of the first twenty dollars.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct; I understand that.

Mr. McFARLAND. That applies to the aged and blind; and an increase of $3 is made to dependent children.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then I understand that if the pensions are paid today upon the same basis it would really result in an increase of $15 Federal payment to each old-age pensioner, and perhaps a double amount, or $10 a month, from the States?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. If the States would match that amount, it would mean an increase of $10. In other words, if a State would match the $30 of the Federal Government, the aged and blind would get a maximum of $60 a month.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator. Let me say that this is a subject in which I have been interested for a matter of years. I have felt that old-age pensions should be applicable at the age of 60 years instead of 65, not that anyone would be required to accept old-age benefits at 60, but those who were not possessed of strength sufficient to carry on their work could, if they chose to do so, retire at the age of 60 and receive the benefits to which they were entitled.

When the joint resolution was before the Senate I asked that an amendment to that effect be adopted, but it was not adopted by the Senate. I wish to say that I intend to continue to push that proposal so long as I am a Member of the Senate, until it is adopted, because I feel it is unjust and unfair to keep the age point at 65.

I understand the President has recommended that the age limit be dropped from 65 to 60 with respect to women. The bill which I have introduced at this session would drop the age limit from 65 to 60 for both men and women.

I hope that the Congress, though it perhaps will not act at this session, will in time, and at any early date, proceed to the expansion and the improvement of the social-security law, which would help the aged and the needy, and that Congress will extend the provisions so that the age limit will be fixed at 60 for both men and women.

Furthermore, I hope the law will be changed so that those who become disabled from injury or illness at any age may have some aid for the maintenance of themselves and their families.

Mr. President, it seems to me that with respect to the joint resolution which has been vetoed, there is a good provision—and from my own viewpoint it is the best provision—one I discussed a few moments ago with the Senator from Arizona, by which it will be made possible to increase, with Federal help, the aid to the aged and the blind, and to dependent children as much as $10 a month. That has been vetoed. The joint resolution is not all I want, but it is that much a step in the right direction, and for that reason it is my hope that the joint resolution may become the law of the land, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate. I voted against the joint resolution when it passed a few days ago, though I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona. I voted against the joint resolution in the committee for reasons identical with those set forth by the President in his veto message. I do not care to repeat what I then said in regard to the joint resolution. I content myself with saying that I shall vote to sustain the veto of the President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. A vote to override the veto will be a vote "yea," will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A "yea" vote is a vote to override the veto.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to a portion of the President's veto message which reads as follows:

> I note that section 3 of this resolution was adopted as an amendment on the floor of the Senate and passed by both Houses in a single afternoon. Accordingly, I am placing this matter before the Congress in adequate time so that the public-assistance program will not suffer because of my disapproval of this resolution.

I can say that some of us will certainly see to it that this identical amendment,

the McFarland amendment, providing this $5 old-age-assistance increase, will be offered to other legislation in the Senate, and Senators will have a chance to vote for the old-age assistance even if the President's veto shall be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objection of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea" if present, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who, if present, would vote "yea," are paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who would vote "nay" if present.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—65

Aiken	Ellender	Knowland
Baldwin	Feazel	Lodge
Ball	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bricker	Fulbright	McClellan
Bridges	Gurney	McFarland
Buck	Hawkes	McKellar
Butler	Hayden	Magnuson
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Martin
Connally	Hill	Millikin
Cooper	Hoey	Myers
Cordon	Holland	O'Conor
Donnell	Jenner	O'Daniel
Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Eastland	Kem	Russell
Ecton	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Smith	Thye	White
Sparkman	Tydings	Wiley
Stennis	Umstead	Williams
Stewart	Vandenberg	Wilson
Taft	Watkins	Young
Thomas, Okla.	Wherry	

NAYS—12

Barkley	Langer	Morse
Byrd	Lucas	O'Mahoney
Green	McGrath	Pepper
Hatch	McMahon	Taylor

NOT VOTING—19

Brewster	George	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cain	Malone	Tobey
Capper	Maybank	Wagner
Chavez	Moore	
Flanders	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 65, the nays 12. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Chair announces the time is 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.

LT. GEN. JAMES A. VAN FLEET

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sure that other Senators noted, as I did, a press dispatch this morning in which Tass, the Soviet news agency, released a peculiarly poisonous piece of propaganda, directed against that distinguished American military commander, Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, who is now serving conspicuously as head of our military mission in Greece.

I quote the press dispatch as it was carried as an Associated Press item in the Washington Post of June 14:

MURDER OF GREEK CHILDREN LAID TO UNITED STATES AIDE BY TASS

LONDON, June 13.—The Soviet news agency Tass accused a United States military official today of ordering a reign of terror in Greece which resulted in the killing of a number of children by Greek troops.

Tass, quoting the Communist Free Greece radio, said Greek Government troops killed all but a small number of Stromni's 120 children when they captured the Rumelian Mountain village last month from leftist guerrillas.

The Communist radio claimed, according to Tass, that thoroughly verified data proved that child killings were part of a terror campaign ordered by American Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, head of the United States military mission to Greece, against the peaceful population of guerrilla areas in the Greek civil war.

I am confident that most Americans will appraise this release for what it is—false and pernicious Russian propaganda. But there may be some who, while they know of Gen. Van Fleet as a great military leader, may not know of his outstanding personal qualities. All of us know that he was the commander of one of the spearhead combat units which made the historic D-day landings on the Normandy beaches in June 1944. We know of him as a successful leader of the Ninetieth Division in its difficult operations in France. We know of him as a brilliant corps commander, commanding the Third Army Corps in its operations with Hodges' First Army from the Remagen bridgehead in the envelopment and capture of the Ruhr, and later commanding that same corps with Patton's Third Army in its swift and skillful campaign across Germany and into Czechoslovakia.

But since I have had the pleasant experience of knowing James Van Fleet throughout his life I feel that it may serve a useful purpose for me to speak briefly of his high character and kindly personal qualities. We were schoolboys together, in grammar school and high school. We hunted, fished, and played baseball together. Later, after he had graduated from the United States Military Academy, he served with great ability under an assignment as an ROTC training officer at the University of Florida. Later he served as football coach and athletic director at the University of Florida, endearing himself to thousands of students and their families, and to the people of Florida generally, by his fine personality and his inspiring qualities. Through the years I have maintained close friendship with him and his typically American family.

Mr. President, James Van Fleet is one of the kindest men, one of the gentlest men, one of the cleanest men that I have ever known. His love for children and for young people in general is manifest on every occasion. I know him as a true Christian gentleman. He could not possibly be the author or sponsor of any terror campaign of child killings such as that described in the foul mouthings of Tass. He would never agree to such a campaign. Jim Van Fleet has unlimited courage—courage which has carried him through some of our toughest fighting. He bears on his body the scars of three wounds—all received as an American infantryman. But, Mr. President, his fighting has been done against some of the best trained and best armed soldiers who have ever confronted our American arms. James Van Fleet will always be, by nature, by training, and from choice, the defender and protector of children and women. The charge of the Soviet propagandists is utterly false and despicable.

In closing, however, I cannot help wondering if this release may not be regarded as rather clear evidence that General Van Fleet is making the Communists feel keenly the results of his presence in Greece and his inspiring military leadership there. Mr. President, such a contemptibly false release indicates to me that American aid to Greece has communism definitely on the run.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to repeat even in substance the high encomiums which have been paid to Lt. Gen. James A. Van Fleet by my colleague from Florida. However, I wish the RECORD to show that I thoroughly and heartily associate myself with every tribute paid by my colleague to the character, patriotism, and fine Christian qualities of General Van Fleet.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF READING, PA.

Mr. MARTIN. I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, in Berks County, Pa., which is being celebrated this year.

I do so because within the boundaries of the city of Reading and Berks County are embraced all the outstanding elements and characteristics which we proudly call the American way of life.

The city and county are inhabited by a happy, prosperous, sturdy people, who walk humbly in the fear of the Lord.

They have achieved rich material greatness and the highest level of cultural and spiritual development. Their splendid progress was the result of self-reliance, hard work, initiative, thrift, devotion to religion, and deep respect for the rights and obligations of American citizenship.

It is interesting to note that the Colonial town of Reading was laid out under the direction of the sons of William Penn, illustrious founder of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. They named the new town after the city of Reading in England, the seat of Berkshire, for which Berks County was named.

The early settlers were Quakers, French Huguenots, German Amish, Mennonites, and Dunkards. They brought with them many specialized skills and crafts of the Old World and a tradition of industry and thrift. Many of the Old World customs handed down through the years are observed among the Pennsylvania Germans today very much as they were among the pioneers of 200 years ago.

Great diversification of industry and extensive agricultural development have given Berks County substantial prosperity and a stable economy for many years. Here are located giant metal industries which grew from the first iron forge established in 1716. Here are located the largest American manufacturers of textile machinery and the world's largest producers of full-fashioned hosiery. These giant industries, that contribute so much to American progress and prosperity, have grown great from small beginnings, reaching their present leadership in a little more than half a century.

They are the result of the freedom and opportunities that have long existed in this country and will continue to exist so long as we adhere to the American system of individual enterprise.

They represent the energy, resourcefulness, and inventive genius of two men, Ferdinand Thun and Henry Jannsen, who came to Reading in 1892. With small capital, but with unbounded ambition and willingness to work, they began the manufacture of braiding machinery. Four years later, at Wyomissing, they established the manufacture of machine-made braids.

In the meantime they devoted long hours of work to the development of knitting machinery, and in 1902 they built the first American full-fashioned knitting machine. In the process of perfecting the new machine the product of their experiments was utilized to establish what is now the largest full-fashioned knitting mill in the world.

Of the 55,000 persons gainfully employed in Berks County, more than one-fourth are engaged in the manufacture of clothing, including hosiery, hats, shirts, shoes, and many other types of wearing apparel.

The latest available figures placed the annual value of products manufactured in this area in excess of $334,000,000. Of this impressive total, the production of metal and metal products is approximately $121,500,000, and $107,000,000 in textiles and textile products. Food and kindred products are represented by production valued at $39,500,000.

The early settlers of Berks County found fertile soil, and their descendants regard it as their bounden duty to keep it that way.

Agriculture has prospered in this region through love of the soil and the use of the most modern methods and machinery. The farmers here have built their security without depending upon grants or subsidies. They are the kind of people who consider it a disgrace to look to the Government for help. When trouble makes the going difficult they work harder. When disaster overtakes one of their own people assistance is provided, generously but quietly, through their churches.

The tradition of loyalty and patriotism is strong in Berks County.

The first troops to reinforce General Washington's army in Massachusetts at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War were two companies of infantry from Reading and Berks County.

The area furnished two Revolutionary generals for Washington's army—Peter Muhlenberg, whose statue stands in this Capitol, and Thomas Mifflin, first elected Governor of Pennsylvania under the State Constitution of 1790.

Another member of the Muhlenberg family, Frederick C. A. Muhlenberg, was the first Speaker of the House of Representatives; and today Berks County is is ably represented in the House by the Honorable Frederick A. Muhlenberg, a direct descendant of the Revolutionary general. Like the soil they love, Berks County has preserved through the years the high character and outstanding ability of its people.

Berks County is notable also as the ancestral home of the Lincoln family and as the birthplace of Daniel Boone.

In Pennsylvania we are proud of the city of Reading and Berks County. May the simplicity, tolerance, industry, thrift, and love of God, which are the foundation of their greatness, continue for many centuries to come.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on a former occasion, I gave an analysis of the bill and what it proposes. At this point I should like to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement showing the cash appropriations, and the contract authorizations, as recommended by the Senate committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1949, H. R. 6705

CASH APPROPRIATIONS

Amount of bill passed by House	$375,692,591
Amount added by Senate (net):	
Based on regular estimates considered by the House	35,143,507
Based on supplemental estimates not considered by House	11,343,000
Total added by Senate	46,486,507
Total of bill reported to Senate	422,179,098
Amount of appropriations, 1948	262,801,059
Total amount of estimates, 1949:	
Regular budget estimate	459,970,835
Supplemental budget estimates (S. Docs. 166 and 168)	14,803,000
Total	474,773,835
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the estimates for 1949	52,594,737
Exceeds appropriations for 1948	159,378,039

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Contract authorizations included in bill as passed by House	$29,944,290
Added by Senate from estimates before House	4,901,210
Total in Senate bill based on estimates considered by House	34,845,500
Supplemental contract authorization submitted to Senate, $15,610,000, and added to bill (S. Doc. 166) and additional $2,000,000 added by committee	17,610,000
Total contract authorization in bill as reported to Senate	52,455,500

ANALYSIS OF INCREASE IN CASH APPROPRIATION AND CONTRACT AUTHORITY RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, of the net increase of $46,486,507 in the cash appropriation recommended by the committee, $11,343,000 is part of supplemental estimates totaling $14,803,000 which were not before the House but which were received by the Senate after the bill passed the House. Thus, the actual increase in cash appropriations over amounts considered and allowed by the House is $35,143,507.

The committee is recommending contract authorizations totaling $52,455,500, as compared to contract authorizations of $29,944,290 proposed by the House, or an increase in contract authority of $22,511,210. However, of the increase of $22,511,210 proposed in contract authority, $15,610,000 was submitted to the Senate in a supplemental estimate and was not before the House. Thus, the

actual increase in contract authority proposed by the committee over contract-authority items considered and allowed by the House is $6,901,210. Of the $15,610,000 contract authority included in the supplemental estimate, which the committee has approved, $6,960,000 is for expediting road and bridge construction in Alaska and $5,300,000 is for the purpose of accelerating the program for the rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad from a 5- to a 3-year program.

This bill is by far the largest appropriation bill ever presented to a Congress for the Department of the Interior. As a matter of fact, the 1949 budget estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation alone are greater than the total amount appropriated in the fiscal year 1948 for the whole Department of the Interior. This is all the more astounding in view of the fact that the President very emphatically said that this year's budget was an economy budget and that he had adopted the policy of not allowing the executive departments to ask for more in 1949 than they had received in 1948.

The Senate would like to know, I am sure, of where the principal increases are. These major increases are in five different bureaus of the Department. I will state the amount of increase in the Senate bill over the appropriations for 1948 listed in order of the amount of increase:

Bureau of Reclamation	$111,317,817
Territory of Alaska	12,096,000
Bonneville Power	10,679,600
Indian Bureau	8,234,184
Bureau of Mines	5,309,100

The increases granted to the other bureaus were smaller, but every bureau received an increase, except the Commission on Fine Arts, which did not ask for any, being satisfied with $12,000, the amount of its present appropriation.

I have already mentioned the fact that nearly $12,000,000 of the increase is due to supplementals not considered by the House. The large increase granted to the Bureau of Reclamation is to carry on the construction work of the many different multiple-purpose irrigation, hydroelectric, and flood control projects of the Bureau. The increases of over $12,000,000 in Alaska are almost entirely for highway and railroad construction which has been advanced from a 5-year to a 3-year program because the military forces have vigorously supported the accelerated program. The Senate will remember the furor about the affairs of the Navajo and Hopi last winter. The Congress has been asked to increase the appropriations to the Indian Bureau, largely on account of the increased needs of these two tribes. There are many other increases in other bureaus. I might mention one which all will understand. It is an increase for activities of the several bureaus that deal with the exploration, development and management of our mineral resources.

I believe that the résumé which I have given and the Committee report which is before the Senate provide all the necessary data for consideration of this bill.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 2, before the word "including", to insert "and elsewhere"; in line 3, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$965,842" and insert "$1,250,000"; and in line 8, after the word "That", to strike out "no part" and insert "not to exceed $75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 14, after the word "field", to strike out "$220,225" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 22, after the word "Interior", to strike out "$146,800" and insert "$185,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two" and insert "four", and in line 12, after the word "binding", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 7, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$2,700,000" and insert "$2,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 1, after the word "Department", to insert "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; hire of aircraft;"; and in line 8, after the word "binding", to strike out "$205,730" and insert "$230,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 19, after "June 30", to strike out "1947" and insert "1948", and on page 6, line 2, after the word "service", to insert "or furlough from active duty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration," on page 6, in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "five", and insert "ten"; in line 25, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$20,920,760" and insert "$21,125,700"; on page 7, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,231,800"; in line 8, after the word "for", to strike out "materials and" and insert "materials"; in line 9, before the word "for", to insert "and services"; and in line 10, after the words "excess of", to strike out "$10,269,290" and insert "$12,046,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the Senate has already taken action on the section of the bill dealing with the Bonneville Power Administration, on page 6 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was impossible for me to be on the floor a few minutes ago when that section was covered. I had a few brief remarks I wanted to make at that time, but I propose to save the time of the Senate by asking unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the point where the section dealing with the Bonneville Power Administration was under consideration by the Senate.

There being no objection, Mr. MORSE's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is unfortunate that a bill of the dimensions and importance of the 1949 Interior bill should come to the Senate at such a late date. There is much in this bill that affects the destiny of the West. Such a late reference to the Senate places the Senate Appropriations Committee and the individual Members under a serious handicap. Without intending to be critical, this fact should be recognized.

The House hearings on the Interior 1949 bill commenced February 16, 1948, and the bill did not reach the House floor until Thursday, May 27. This date happened to fall just before the Decoration Day holiday. Therefore, officially, the first day available for Senate hearings was Tuesday, June 2. Senate hearings commenced on that day, and with night sessions it was necessary to complete hearings by Saturday, June 5. This made 1 week available in the Senate, compared to about 15 weeks of consideration in the other body. In such a short time it is manifestly impossible for a noncommittee member to analyze the House bill in close detail.

The Columbia River has just encountered from the standpoint of resulting damage, its worst flood in the history of man. The crest of the 1948 flood was slightly below the maximum flood of record, which occurred in June 1894. In 1894 the flood peak included a crest flow of 1,174,000 cubic feet per second. The data available in the present flood indicate a crest flow of about 1,050,000 cubic feet per second. Therefore on the basis of flows, the 1948 flood was about 10 percent lower than the 1894 volume, but since the valley has been greatly developed since 1894, the resulting damage was naturally very much greater.

Floods elevate the tail water of hydro plants. For this reason the output capacity of the Grand Coulee plant was reduced about 10 percent, or—in volume of power—a reduction of 110,000 kilowatts. At the Lower Head Bonneville plant the normal rated capacity, in round numbers, is 520,000 kilowatts. The high tail water resulting from the flood cut back this capacity to around 170,000 kilowatts. Nevertheless the two plants carried the actual load with a tight squeeze, showing the real benefits of integration. With the railroads being out of commission, factories could not fully function, and the industrial load naturally dropped off, equalizing the plant output reduction. The bulk power contracts of the Bonneville Administration contain provisions that protect the Government in such cases of extreme half-century floods by eliminating such flood conditions from the contract definition of prime power.

On May 18 of this year I addressed this body at length on the critical materials power requirements of the Pacific Northwest. On that occasion I approached power requirements from the standpoint of resources. I then demonstrated that the Nation was short of power capacity needed for critical material processing. If we are to hold our own as a nation we must give greater consideration to critical material production through the utilization of low-cost hydro power. As I have pointed out, these critical materials are essential to an expanded air program.

On January 6, 1948, representatives of all public and private power distributing agencies met in the city of Tacoma, Wash., to determine the electric generation power requirements of the Pacific Northwest for the next 8 years. The conclusions of this meeting were to the effect that by 195_ the area would need 899,000 kilowatts of generation more than what is presently scheduled, and by 1955, 1,847,000 kilowatts. The analyses and the conclusions embodied in the Tacoma agreement indicate that the people of the Pacific Northwest are facing a serious power shortage. As is well known, power is the basis of regional economy and the essential need of regional growth. The Tacoma agreement was based on the then existing authorizations and budget submissions. If the budget submissions had been realized, a shortage would still have existed in generating and line capacity. The bill as coming from the House cuts generation of Hungry Horse by some 18 percent, but creates a further unbalance through the retardation of transmission lines scheduled to be in step with the additional capacity coming in at Grand Coulee.

This situation suggests the great necessity for an early departmental and Budget Bureau review of scheduled generating capacity and accessory transmission capacity necessary to equalize completion schedules. This must be done in order to protect all possible situations against impending shortages.

I understand that such a survey is now being conducted by the National Security Resources Board and I hope that the conclusions of this Board will be given to the public, so that the true situation as to power capability in the Pacific Northwest will be fully known. The Tacoma agreement conclusions were based entirely on local load requirements and do not consider the additional capacity required to process critical materials such as the expansion needs of the country's aluminum, light metal, and ferro-alloy industries.

The House committee did not present a project break-down of items making up the Bonneville cash and contract authorization allowances. The Senate committee had to request such a break-down, which appears on page 1533 of the Senate hearing record. This break-down, furnished by the Bonneville Administration is apparently an endeavor to distribute the House allowances, based on submitted Budget Bureau estimates. This allocation gives due weight to the requirements of rural cooperatives and for that reason should be commended. However, under the House cuts below the Budget recommendations, the difference has to come out of some projects, and in this case the reductions were made largely in the heavy line and substation items, excepting those 220,000 volt facilities directly serving the Hanford plant.

These heavy items are an essential part of the grid system and represent minimum requirements if the indicated power shortages are to be even partially met, and the mulk line schedules are to be made nearly coincident with the generator schedules. If these two sets of schedules do not coincide, we will find that the new Grand Coulee units will be idle during periods of power shortages.

The transmission grid overloading from the winter peak of 1948–49 through the same peak of 1951–52, under the submitted schedules will be serious, and the operation during these periods even under the estimates must fall within the category of emergency operation. This analysis indicates a precarious system condition under such extremely heavy overloads.

GRAND COULEE GENERATION

During the present fiscal year, three new units were brought into production at the Grand Coulee generating plant, representing 360,000 kilowatts of new machine capacity. This makes the existing Grand Coulee generation capacity total 9 units, or in round numbers 1,100,000 kilowatts. During the next fiscal year, three additional units, totaling 360,000 kilowatts, will come into production, and during the peak load period of 1950–51 three more units will be producing. It is obvious, from a comparison of these new generation schedules with the line and substation schedules set out in a series of nine tables, appearing on page 196 of part 3 of the House hearings, that even under the submissions there must be a lack of balance between generation and line capabilities.

In going over the Senate committee report, I am happy to see that in the short time available the Senate committee recognized this situation and introduced such remedial measuers as were possible under the budgetary situation. The committee is to be highly commended for going into this very vital point.

CRITICAL SHORTAGE AREAS

It is also apparent from the record that the most critical shortages exist in the Portland, Willamette Valley and southwest Oregon areas. Next in shortage priority appears to be the Olympic Peninsula area in the State of Washington, followed closely by the East Puget Sound area. Therefore, the acute shortages will occur in all the coastal areas, and the bulk lines into these coastal areas should have top construction priority. Three quarters of the new Coulee generation must therefore be transmitted to the coastal area.

The budget estimates submitted to the House naturally represent price levels existing at the time that the estimates were prepared, which was last August. Under existing law, these estimates have to go to the Budget Bureau by September 15 of each year and some to the Congress by the following January 3. During the interval, prices have been steadily climbing, and the price index on the lowest advances is now some 15 to 18 percent higher than existed at the time the estimates were prepared. On materials going into the bulk power facilities the price increases in the cited interval have risen over 20 percent. This means that the amount of construction possible under even full budget estimates will fall far short of what was proposed last September. This is another reason behind the creation of emergency operating conditions for the next 4 years.

I am pointing out such facts to emphasize that more needs to be accomplished than has been accomplished. There is a large task ahead, and during the coming recess all the executive agencies having jurisdiction should resurvey the load and power capability situation in the Pacific Northwest so that a full report can be made when the next Congress convenes. It is obvious that more information is needed than is presently available.

A close examination of the Senate Interior Subcommittee report and bill section applying to the Bonneville Administration shows an extraordinary effort was made to produce a balanced program within over-all budgetary limitations. For such a result in such a short time the committee is to be highly commended.

The increased contract authorization allowances granted by the Senate committee were largely used to balance the 230,000 volt grid and thus restore the major grid lines to their budgetary positions so that their completion schedules will more closely approach the generator schedules at Grand Coulee. This is the most important item affecting power deliveries into shortage areas.

Correction of the operation and maintenance limitation was sound procedure as this will permit a higher degree of maintenance so that the vital element of service can be bettered. The Administration manufactures electricity but really sells service. Last year the operation allowance was so small that equipment failures resulted from reduced maintenance. This rendered the ability to deliver standard service impossible.

I was happy to see the Senate committee restore the Coos Bay and the Lebanon substations deleted by the House committee. I have received a number of inquiries regarding the status of these stations so I have closely examined the report on these two deletions. I find the House conclusion on these two items was based on a misconception resulting from incomplete testimony. The House testimony shows that these two stations were treated as customer services, whereas the tables following page 196 of part 3 of the House hearings clearly define these stations as switching stations. If the Lebanon substation is omitted from the list of abproved projects, the construction power delivery to the Detroit flood-control dam will be delayed. In view of the critical flood situation now confronting Oregon we cannot afford to tamper with any flood-control project.

Without the Coos Bay switching station the projected transmission set-up for southwest Oregon would not be operative. I am also happy to see the committee has added the McKinley-Gold Beach interconnection project which I suggested in my appearance before the committee and which I detailed out as shown on page 654 of the Senate hearings on H. R. 6705.

CONCLUSION

From what happened to the McNary project resulting in a final $22,000,000 allowance it is evident that Congress needs more factual material on the power shortage status in the Pacific Northwest. This is presently available. Therefore I cannot too strongly urge that those agencies in the executive branch of the Government having jurisdiction get together between now and next January and work up a comprehensive report and submit the same with recommendations to the Congress early in the next session.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the leadership of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] in connection with this bill, particularly those parts which pertain to our northwest projects. I know that he had the advice and counsel throughout the discussions in the committee, of my very able Senator colleague [Mr. CORDON], who is a member of the Appropriations Committee. But I want the Senator from Nebraska to know that I think the bill as it has come out of the Senate committee is very superior to the bill that came out of the House. In the course of the remarks which the Senate has kindly agreed should be inserted in the RECORD at the point where the discussion of the Bonneville Power Administration took place, I have sought to point out for future reference some of the problems that will confront us in the next Congress with respect to the greater development of the power resources and the flood-control projects of the Pacific Northwest, so vital to our entire national economy.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 10, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out *"Provided further,* That not exceeding 6 percent of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis" and insert *"Provided further,* That no part of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis,

except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, installation of machinery or equipment, engineers and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, or in those instances when no bids have been received in response to a public invitation therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 1, after the word "works", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That interest heretofore or hereafter collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power in Grand Coulee Dam shall be covered into the reclamation fund and shall not be allocated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Land Management," on page 8, line 12, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "only", and in line 15, after the word "proceedings", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "ten" and insert "fifteen"; in line 10, after the word "buildings", to strike out "$2,562,656", and insert "$3,000,000"; and on page 10, line 2, after the word "deposit", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of any appropriation to the Bureau of Land Management contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of regional offices.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 6, after the word "only", to strike out "$469,300" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 22, to strike out:

Notwithstanding the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 or any act of Congress, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used, transferred, or allocated for the expenses or salaries of any regional, field, or other office or committee to perform any function or duty of the Bureau of Land Management which, on July 25, 1947, was being performed in the District of Columbia, or for the transfer or removal of any functions or duties of said Bureau, including original tract books now and heretofore located in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 7, to strike out:

Appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management for "Management, protection, and disposal of public lands, Bureau of Land Management," "Range improvements," and "Revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay wagon road grant lands, Oregon," shall be available for the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and appropriations for "Fire fighting" shall be available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management for "Management, protection, and disposal of public lands, Bureau of Land Management," "Revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay wagon road grant lands, Oregon," and "Fire fighting," shall be available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 14, after line 9, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, district offices: For expenses of district offices, including printing and binding, $600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 15, after the word "provisions", to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert "$2,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 20, after the word "Indians", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 5, after the word "service", to strike out "$4,518,962" and insert "$4,118,962"; and in line 8, after the word "buildings", to insert "vessels."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 2, after the word "exploration", to strike out "$907,900" and insert "$1,907,900"; and in line 5, after the word "law", to insert "and in addition the Secretary may enter into contracts in an amount not to exceed $3,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 12, after the word "organizations", to strike out "$3,748,615" and insert "$4,584,115."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 14, after the word "service", to strike out "$4,656,515" and insert "$6,492,015."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 4, after the word "systems", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$810,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 15, after the word "support", to insert "and equipment"; and in line 19, after "Arizona", to strike out "$9,574,709" and insert "$10,376,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 3, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$711,687" and insert "$950,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to strike out:

Revolving fund for loans: The authorization for loans to individual Indians and Indian organizations otherwise ineligible to participate in loans from the fund established in accordance with the act of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C. 470 and 471), and the acts of June 26, 1936 (25 U. S. C. 506), May 1, 1936 (25 U. S. C. 473a), and July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 459), is hereby increased from $962,500 to $1,250,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Revolving fund for loans: To increase the revolving loan fund for making loans to individual Indians, Indian associations, Indian tribes, and Indian chartered corporations in accordance with sections 10 and 11, of the act of June 18, 1934 (25 U. S. C. 470 and 471), and the acts of June 26, 1936 (25 U. S. C. 506), May 1, 1936 (25 U. S. C. 473a), and May 7, 1948 (Public Law 516), $400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 12, after "Arizona: Colorado River", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 13, to insert:

Payment to the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 7, 1947 (Public Law 10), $190,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment on page 22. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether he prefers that I wait until the committee amendments are adopted, or whether I present the amendment now.

Mr. WHERRY. I should appreciate it if the Senator would wait until the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 23, after "Miscellaneous small projects", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 1, after the word "including", to strike out "not exceeding $12,500 for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 3, after the words "In all", to strike out "$3,086,000" and insert "$3,541,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 17, after the word "quarters", to strike out "$222,500" and insert "$622,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 20, to insert:

Celilo Falls, Oreg.: For the construction, repair, or rehabilitation of buildings and utilities at Celilo Falls, Oreg., for the use of the Yakima Indian Tribes, the Umatilla Indian Tribes, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, and other Columbia River Indians affiliated with the aforementioned tribes, $125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 4, after the word "improvements", to insert "$79,000"; and in the same line, after the word "supply", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$35,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 11, after "Public Law 231", to strike out "$85,000" and insert "$213,000"; and in line 14, after "Public Law 223", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$35,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 19, after "Public Law 332", strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 23, after "Public Law 667", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$80,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 6, after the word "facilities", to

strike out "$100,000" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 10, after "Public Law 182", to strike out "$100,000" and insert $300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 12, after the word "improvements", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 17, after the words "In all", to strike out "$2,122,500" and insert "$4,104,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 2, after "(Public Law 521)", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,894,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous Indian tribal funds," on page 28, line 10, after the word "Oregon", to strike out "$213,405" and insert "$203,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "the sums herein indicated shall be available for expenses incident to the following activities: Fees and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys selected by the tribe and employed under contract approved by the Secretary, $4,500; education, $40,000; health, $51,375; law and order, $15,000; extension and land, $52,530; and administrative and other expenses, $50,000" and insert "$4,500 shall be available for fees and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys selected by the tribe and employed under contract approved by the Secretary, and for relief, including cash grants."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 2, after the word "Wisconsin", to strike out "$162,250" and insert "$215,500"; in line 3, after the word "including", to strike out "$33,000" and insert "$40,000"; in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,100" and insert "$2,000"; in line 5, after the word "and" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$5,200" and insert "$7,700"; and in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,250" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 15, after the words "Indian Affairs", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That a recreational director for the Menominee Reservation may be employed with the approval of the Menominee Tribal Council.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 17, to strike out:

Support of Osage Agency and pay of tribal officers, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the support of Indians and administration of Indian resources under the jurisdiction of the Osage Agency, Oklahoma, including printing and binding, and rent of quarters for employees, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, $197,000, of which not to exceed the sums herein indicated shall be available for expenses incident to the following activities: Legal, $10,170; land and realty, $25,304; oil and gas, $36,095; welfare, $20,093; construction and maintenance, $7,271; tribal council, business committees, or other tribal organizations, including travel and other expenses of members thereof when engaged on business of the tribe, not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, and 5 cents per mile for use of personally owned automobiles, when duly authorized in advance by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, $16,350; and administrative and other expenses, including pay of a curator for the Osage Museum, which employee shall be an Osage Indian, appointed with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council, and not to exceed $2,000 for the education of unallotted Osage Indian children in the St. Louis Mission Boarding School, Oklahoma, $81,717.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

For the support of the Osage Agency, and for necessary expenses in connection with oil and gas production on the Osage Reservation, Okla., including pay of the superintendent of the agency, a curator for the Osage Museum, at a salary of $1,954, which employee shall be an Osage Indian, appointed with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council, and of necessary employees, and pay of tribal officers; not to exceed $2,000 for the education of unallotted Osage Indian children in the St. Louis Mission Boarding School, Oklahoma; payment of damages to individual allottees; repairs to buildings, rent of quarters for employees, and printing and binding, $197,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma: *Provided*, That of the said sum herein appropriated, $16,350 is hereby made available for travel and other expenses of members of the Osage Tribal Council, business committees, or other tribal organizations, when engaged on business of the tribe, including supplies and equipment, not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, and not to exceed 5 cents per mile for use of personally owned automobiles, when duly authorized or approved in advance by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 2, after the word "Affairs", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$73,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 22, after the word "Interior", to strike out "$62,080" and insert "$82,880."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 19, after the word "thereof", to strike out $277,500" and insert "$422,500"; in line 20, after the word "Wisconsin", to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$200,000"; in line 23, after the word "Idaho", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$25,000"; in the same line, after the word "Dakota", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$60,000"; and in line 24, after the word "Montana", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred" and insert "two hundred and fifty"; and in line 8, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which two hundred shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 15, after "'Alaska native service'", to insert "'Salaries and expenses, Reservation Administration'"; and, after line 17, to strike out "Appropriations for 'Salaries and expenses, reservation administration' shall be available for the maintenance and operation of aircraft."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 39, line 8, after the word "binding", to insert "purchase of not to exceed 300, of which 200 shall be for replacement only in fiscal year 1949, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition (not to exceed three in fiscal year 1949 from the Departments of the Air Force, Army, and Navy, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, or any disposal agency of the Government without reimbursement or transfer of funds), hire", and in line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to insert "at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General offices," on page 41, line 1, after the word "functions", to strike out "$3,161,472" and insert $4,000,000"; and in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out $"6,000,000" and insert "$8,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 15, after the word "work", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of personnel whose activities include efforts to obtain power contract with customers who already have an existing adequate source of power supply.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 20, after the word "That", to insert "after January 31, 1949."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on this last amendment I desire to say a few words. It is an amendment which was added by the committee to a floor amendment which was inserted in the House of Representatives. It reads as follows:

Provided further, That after January 31, 1949, no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 5 years' engineering and administrative experience, (1) the Commissioner of Reclamation, (2) the Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation, and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation.

As the bill came from the House the provision called for 10 years instead of 5 years' engineering and administrative experience, and would have applied immediately after the beginning of the fiscal year. The Senate committee changed the date of the application of the amendment to January 31, 1949.

I desire merely to point out that this language, though it is couched in terms designed to fix the qualifications of persons who fill these three categories of positions by requiring that they shall be engineers, was in fact designed to remove two officials who have been appointed according to law, namely, Mr. Michael Straus, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and Mr. Richard Boke, who

was the Regional Director for district No. 2 in California. I have no doubt that the Congress of the United States is perfectly within its rights in fixing the qualifications of any executive officer, whose duties are not fixed by the Constitution, even by a legislative rider upon an appropriation bill. But in this case there was debate in the House of Representatives and a statement was issued to the press by Representative HARNESS, of Indiana, chairman of a committee in the House of Representatives, but not a member of the committee having charge of this bill. In the debate and in the statement it was clearly indicated that the express purpose of the language was to remove these two individuals. It would seem that that is an invasion of the executive authority by attempting by legislative action to remove executive officials without a hearing, and thus an invasion of the executive powers.

I desire to point out, I think the Senate should know, that the controversy out of which this question arises was before the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation bill for the Senate and before the subcommittee for the Interior Department appropriation bill for the House. The reclamation item was considered at length in both the Senate and in the House committees. The demand for the removal of these two individuals was presented to both these committees. The Senate committee, having heard a great deal of testimony, took no action and washed its hands of the matter.

It was understood, of course, that a House committee was going to proceed—not the committee having charge of the appropriation bill. The subcommittee of the House on the appropriation bill heard reams of testimony on the reclamation provisions of the bill, and heard Commissioner Straus at length. That committee did not report the amendment. It was offered upon the floor of the House, and was adopted by a vote of about 59 to 32, as I recall. In other words, a minority of the House acting upon an appropriation bill added a legislative rider, the purpose of which was to remove two individuals.

In the Robert Morss Lovett case, which was determined recently, the Supreme Court of the United States struck down a legislative rider in the form of a limitation on an appropriation bill which was directed against three specific persons mentioned by name, one of them being Mr. Lovett. The Supreme Court held that provision of the law to be unconstitutional.

The only difference between that instance and this one is that the individuals are not named in the law. They are not named in the amendment, but they are named in the records of the case. When the amendment was offered in the House it was specifically stated on the floor that its purpose was to effect the removal of those two individuals.

One may say, with a great deal of reason, that a Commissioner of Reclamation should be an engineer, or that a regional director should be an engineer, or that an assistant commissioner should be an engineer. But the fact remains that when the reclamation law was passed, Congress did not see fit to write that qualification into it. The law has been on the statute books for many years without that qualification. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate should know what it is proposed to do by legislative rider. We are confronted by a condition, by a fact, and not by a theory.

I know precisely what the disposition of the Senate will be. I know that my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, has the votes. So I do not intend to move the elimination of the provision; I do not want to do a futile thing; but I do ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the text of the minority views.

There being no objection, the text of the minority views was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

In the guise of prescribing qualifications for the persons who may perform the duties of Commissioner of Reclamation, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation, and regional directors, the provision of the bill beginning in line 20, page 41, and ending with the word "Reclamation" in line 5, page 42, is an unconstitutional attempt by legislative action to remove from office two persons regularly appointed and qualified under existing law as Commissioner of Reclamation and Regional Director of Reclamation.

The provision was originally inserted in the bill in the House of Representatives by a motion from the floor. It was not in the bill as reported by the House Committee on Appropriations. When it was presented it was frankly called legislation to remove Commissioner Michael Straus and Regional Director Richard Boke. The fact that the proviso prescribes qualifications for Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation and for all regional directors does not in any way alter the fact that the language was proposed for the expressed purpose of removing these two individuals. If there were any doubt upon this point, it was effectively removed on May 14 when the author of the amendment, Representative FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, issued a press statement bearing the headline "HARNESS asks removal of Commissioner Straus." The first paragraph of this statement reads as follows:

"Legislation which would have the effect of removing Reclamation Commissioner Michael Straus and Richard Boke, Director of the Bureau's Region 2 (California), from their present positions was recommended today by Chairman FOREST A. HARNESS (Republican, Indiana) of the House Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda."

This same purpose was revealed when the provision was offered and debated on the floor of the House. This debate is to be found on pages 6631–6632 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 27, 1948.

The removal of executive officials by legislative provisions has been uniformly condemned by the Supreme Court as an unconstitutional invasion of executive authority. The most recent case, *U. S.* v. *Lovett* (328 U. S. 303 (1946)), condemned a rider on an appropriation bill which provided that no part of any appropriation should be used to pay the salary or other compensation of three named persons, one of whom was Robert Morss Lovett.

The fact that the individuals were named in the legislative rider in the Lovett case but are not named in the present case does not take the present rider out of the rule, first, because the congressional intent to remove the two individuals was clearly set forth in the debate and in the press statement above quoted, and secondly, because in one of the early cases on this issue, *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333, 377 (1866)), the Supreme Court in condemning a Federal law as unconstitutional said on the issue of prescribing qualifications:

"The question in this case is not as to the power of Congress to prescribe qualifications, but whether that power has been exercised as a means for the infliction of punishment, against the prohibition of the Constitution."

It is clear from the facts in this case that the proviso here under discussion prescribes qualifications solely for the purpose of inflicting punishment on Commissioner Straus and Regional Director Boke.

The fact that the Senate committee has amended the House proviso by making it effective "after January 31, 1949," instead of at the beginning of the new fiscal year, July 1, 1948, as provided in the House version, does not affect in any way the unconstitutionality of the proviso.

This unconstitutional exercise of legislative power should not receive the approval of the Senate, and the proviso should be stricken from the bill.

CARL HAYDEN.
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he does not agree that the Senate has the right to establish qualifications for positions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Congress is constantly saying that some person, in order to qualify for a certain position, must be a doctor, or an attorney, or an engineer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt about that. I also feel, without any question, that if the Congress of the United States should adopt qualifications for any position and then, later on, some person is affected by changes in qualifications and should seek to sue to retain his position, such a suit would not lie. The distinction is that in this case the specific purpose was stated by those who offered the amendment, namely, to bring about the removal of these two individuals. I think that takes it into a different category.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Regardless of what was said on the floor of the House, I think the able Senator from Wyoming will also agree that there may have been Members of the House who felt, as a matter of judgment, entirely aside from personalities in the case, that a man occupying such a position should be an engineer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt that some may have felt that way. I know that some who supported the amendment have felt that it was not at all essential that the Commissioner should be an engineer. I think the Senator will agree with me on that point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that, particularly in the districts as well as in the Commissioner's office, the fact of the matter is that with only two exceptions Commissioners of Reclamation since 1902 have been engineers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. President, I desire to say that we all know of the pressure at the time the bill was reported. There is a drive on to adjourn Congress by next Saturday night in order that certain Members of this body may attend a certain important political convention in the city of Philadelphia. As a result of that great pressure Members were kept off the floor. That probably was also the case in the House. I know that at this very moment a subcommittee on the Army appropriation bill is holding a session on the floor below. I am a member of that subcommittee. I should like very much to be present, but because of the great drive to get bills passed Members necessarily are absent from the floor. I say that merely in connection with what the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has said.

The exact number of votes which were cast in the House is evidence, to me, of the fact that sufficient consideration has not been given to this legislative rider of removal.

Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator is not about to offer an amendment, I should like very much to proceed.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to take the floor in my own right, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am afraid we are taking too much for granted with regard to who is to be removed and who is not to be removed. If the amendment should be agreed to, neither the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] nor the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] will have to worry, because, if our friends on the other side of the aisle are correct in their dream that they may elect the next President, they are the persons who will have to worry about who will be Commissioner and who will be regional director.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the senior Senator from New Mexico that that statement is entirely correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, merely for the sake of accuracy of the RECORD, I absolutely deny that the purpose of the amendment is to secure the removal of Mr. Straus and Mr. Boke, happy as that event might be. The purpose of the amendment is to restore engineering leadership to the Bureau of Reclamation, to restore efficiency, economy, and ability to that great arm of the Government which is engaged in engineering construction. Unless Congress shall act otherwise, the law will henceforth provide a protection to the people of the United States in requiring men who are at the head of this great construction agency to be engineers adequate for the heavy responsibilities which these positions impose.

The Senator from Wyoming is one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate. I was somewhat surprised to hear him say that it should be noted that never before had such a law as this been passed. Of course not, Mr. President, because since the inception of the Bureau of Reclamation, with one slight exception, every President of the United States and everyone concerned with reclamation conceived it to be common sense to name eminent and distinguished engineers to that office. Yes, Mr. President, except for one slight exception, about which I shall speak later, Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents alike have named as chiefs of the Bureau of Reclamation engineers of 20 or 30 years' experience in the West, men knowing the West through long work and observation and construction experience there, men noted nationally and internationally in the engineering field. It was never conceived by Congress before this that it was necessary to specify that the head of the Bureau of Reclamation should be an engineer.

Congress has legislated that the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers shall be an engineer with the rating of major general, and every one of them has been for decades past noted internationally as an engineer. As a matter of fact West Point graduates are allowed to select the engineering field according to their scholarship and almost all the Army engineers come out of the 5 to 10 percent of the top-ranking graduates at West Point. They are given postgraduate training in private engineering schools and then are further seasoned by decades of work before they can hope to assume the position now held by Major General Wheeler, a man noted internationally for his engineering ability.

Yes, Mr. President, until Michael W. Straus was selected, a man who I believe had never been west of the Missouri River before his appointment as Assistant Secretary of the Interior, no one had ever conceived that there would be placed at the head of a great construction agency of the Government, a man not only totally without engineering training, but also without any administrative experience in engineering and reclamation.

I say therefore that when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming stated that no one had ever thought of Congress passing a law containing this kind of qualifications before, no one had ever conceived before that we would want anyone to head this great civilian construction agency except a man who was experienced in engineering and administration.

Mr. President, when I say that this provision of law is designed to restore engineering leadership to the Bureau of Reclamation, let me remind the Senate that it applies not alone to Michael Straus and Mr. Boke, it applies to everyone in the 10 positions in the present Bureau of Reclamation set-up and to any additional regional directors or assistant commissioners that may be created. So long as this law is upon the statute books, no one can be appointed to positions named in the amendment unless he is an experienced engineer.

I was also somewhat amazed, as my dearly beloved friend would say, that this case is very much like the Lovett case. If the human mind could conceive of a case more dissimilar than the Lovett case from this case I do not know what it could be. In the Lovett case Congress believed three men were guilty of communistic activities, and for that reason they passed a law pointing out that none of the three cited by name in the statute, should ever again draw pay from any appropriation from the Federal Government for any kind of employment under the Federal Government except, I believe, jury service and military service, or something of that kind. Under the provision they could not in the future hold any kind of a Federal job, they could not draw any Federal pay, unless they should thereafter be appointed by the President of the United States and be confirmed by the Senate. In other words Congress attempted to segregate out of more than 140,000,000 people three particular individuals and to apply to them a particularly harsh rule in relation to employment in the Federal service.

Very properly the Supreme Court struck that law down. It was special legislation. It was not due process of law. It was even designated by the Supreme Court as constituting a bill of attainder, to which, however, there were dissenting opinions.

In the instant case, however, the provision does not prevent Mr. Straus or Mr. Boke from holding any other kind of Federal job for which they have the proper qualifications. It does not prevent them becoming engineers, if they wish to and have the ability, and thereafter being appointed to one of these positions. It merely requires that everybody who hereafter shall be appointed to one of these positions shall have the qualification of being an engineer.

Mr. President, I have said that we have had as head of the Bureau of Reclamation since its inception in 1902 distinguished engineers, with one exception. In 1923 a Mr. Davis, a noted engineer, was head of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Work, at that time caused a reorganization in the Bureau of Reclamation and named for the office another Mr. Davis who was described by the New York Times as a politician and an unworthy man; at least he was not an engineer. Immediately a clamor went up over the Nation that an individual was being named as Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation who was not an engineer. As a result the successor, also a Mr. Davis, former Governor of Idaho, remained in office only a few months, and then again another great engineer was appointed to be head of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the man then named was a distinguished citizen of the State of Wyoming, from which my friend comes. He was Elwood Mead, who had not only a national, but an international reputation.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD certain excerpts from the New York Times of 1923 showing the conditions which developed when, for a

very short period of time, a man who was not an engineer was appointed to be the head of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Without further statement, I shall yield the floor, with a repetition of what I have already said, that the purpose of the amendment is a most reasonable and proper one, that is, again, to place in control of the Bureau of Reclamation experienced engineers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 8, 1923]

ASSAILS WORK'S AIM IN REMOVING DAVIS—WILLIAM DUDLEY FOULKE RENEWS CONTROVERSY OVER RECLAMATION SERVICE DIRECTOR—DECLARES POLITICS RULED—ASKS SECRETARY TO SHOW HOW COUNTRY IS BENEFITED BY THE CHANGE—SAYS LAW WAS IGNORED—CALLS FOR EXPLANATION OF APPOINTMENT OF A POLITICIAN TO SUCCEED AN ENGINEER

WASHINGTON, August 27.—William Dudley Foulke, president of the National Civil Service Reform League, has written to Secretary Work asking questions regarding the dismissal of Arthur Powell Davis as Director of the Reclamation Service and the appointment of D. W. Davis, which is said to be contrary to civil-service law.

Mr. Foulke questions the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to abolish an office in the classified civil service and to appoint to the same office, with a mere change of title, a man without civil-service status. The controversy over the dismissal of Arthur Powell Davis, which has agitated not only civil-service advocates, but thousands of technical men, will be the subject of investigation by the next Congress.

After going into the qualifications of Mr. Davis, the politician, as contrasted with those of Mr. Davis, the engineer, Mr. Foulke asks:

"Can you wonder that to many it seems that your statement of August 15 that the problems of water users could be best handled by a practical businessman, alludes rather to the business of politics than to any other business, and that there is a fear that the public interest will be sacrificed to the demand for men useful to the party, not only among the farmers and water users, but also in the next convention and campaign?

"You once stated to me that other things being equal, Republicans should be appointed to places under a Republican administration. Are you not now extending that principle so as to make it provide that a serviceable Republican politician should be appointed whether other things are equal or not?

"Was Mr. Davis' resignation voluntary or requested? Mr. Foulke asks in his letter. Was he not informed by you on June 16 that you had decided to give his place to another man, and did you not then request him to send in his resignation to take effect June 30?

"Did he not, accordingly, write you that in pursuance of your suggestion he so tendered his resignation, and did you not thereupon object to his statement that the resignation had been requested and say that you would prefer that it should appear that it had been initiated by himself and that surely he would not desire to advertise the fact that he had been 'fired'; and did he not answer that he desired the world to know the facts, whatever they were? Did he not afterward write you that he had reconsidered his decision to eliminate those words, concluding that he would thereby be making himself party to a public deception?

"If your reasons for his removal were wholly for the interest of the service and were not political, why did you wish thus to deceive the public?

"You say that no diminished construction program is anticipated, but rather an increased and accelerated construction, and that the same chief engineer now is at the head of the work. But if these vast projects are still before you, ought they not still to be under the direction of the experienced man who had begun them—a man who has then offered and is now earning in private employment far greater compensation than that received from a Government which he was patriotically serving to his own pecuniary loss?

"You say you offered him an appointment as consulting engineer. Was not this offer made on condition that he would omit the statement that his resignation as director was requested? And did you not warn him of the consequences to himself if he refused to omit that statement? Why did you do this? Did he not request of you a written statement of the reasons for his removal and did you not answer that he was not entitled to such a statement under the law?

"You say advice to the farmers was needed regarding the subdivision of large landholding, getting more settlers, securing industrial enterprises, more intensive farming and cooperation in handling and marketing products by men trained along these lines. Is not such service now being rendered by men trained along these lines in the employment of the Department of Agriculture?

"If you were looking for business qualifications, did you appoint a man who had been successful in business? Was the bank of which Governor Davis was the organizer and president markedly successful? Was it not rather to politics that his principal activities have been devoted? Had he not been a candidate for other Federal appointments?"

[From the New York Times of October 15, 1923]

CALLS FOR INQUIRY INTO DAVIS' REMOVAL—CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE REVIVES AGITATION OVER OUSTING OF RECLAMATION SERVICE HEAD—TO APPEAL TO CONGRESS—SECRETARY WORK'S FACT-FINDING COMMISSION IS EXPECTED TO BEGIN INVESTIGATION TODAY

WASHINGTON, October 14.—Agitation over the removal of Arthur Powell Davis as Director of the United States Reclamation Service is about to be revived. Engineering societies and persons protested when it was announced early in the summer that Mr. Davis had been displaced. There has been recurrent evidence of dissatisfaction, and it is becoming apparent that those behind the agitation intend to keep it up until Congress assembles in December and can institute an investigation.

The Reclamation fact-finding committee, appointed by Secretary Work to investigate conditions in the Reclamation Service, will meet at the Interior Department tomorrow. The enforced resignation of Director Davis was attributed by Secretary Work to complaints of unbusinesslike methods of the Reclamation Service under his administration, and there will be an inquiry into these methods by the fact-finding committee.

Arthur Powell Davis was succeeded as Director of the Reclamation Service by David W. Davis, former Governor of Idaho. The latter was appointed a member of the fact-finding committee, but he has resigned on the ground that, as the policies of himself and his predecessor will be inquired into, his presence on the committee might cause some embarrassment.

CHARGES POLITICAL SPOILSMANSHIP

Good Government, organ of the National Civil Service Reform League, will publish tomorrow an article in which it will call upon the fact-finding committee to investigate the removal of Arthur Powell Davis. Plain language is indulged in by Good Government. It will charge that Secretary Work has been guilty of a piece of political spoilsmanship of the worst order.

The removal of Director Davis is claimed to have been made without regard to the requirements of the civil-service laws. According to the article, it has shocked the friends of good administration and caused the friends of reclamation to fear for the future of the Reclamation Service.

A contrast of the records of Arthur Powell Davis and David W. Davis is made in the article. Arthur Davis entered the Government service as a topographer in 1882 at $720 a year and worked his way upward to the directorship. He is designated as "the greatest American engineer, with the possible exception of General Goethals." His removal, it is declared, has demoralized the Reclamation Service.

Good Government will say that David Davis is the first man without civil-service status to head the Reclamation Service since the latter was placed under the civil-service laws by President Roosevelt, soon after it was established.

CRITICIZES DAVIS, THE POLITICIAN

"Davis, the politician," Good Government remarks, "holds the position by virtue of an Executive order permitting his appointment without regard to civil-service requirements, which was issued August 17, one month and a half after he assumed office."

David Davis' achievements, Good Government will say, have been in the domain of politics. His principal business experience, the article will state, was as organizer of the First National Bank of American Falls, Idaho, which failed last February.

In the article is a statement of Arthur Davis which tends to clear up some of the mystery as to the manner in which he was removed. He tells of an effort made by Secretary Work to induce him to revise his letter of resignation, which contained the words, "In accordance with your suggestion," to make it appear that he was leaving the service voluntarily. According to Mr. Davis, he declined to do this on the ground that it would be a public deception.

[From the New York Times of October 17, 1923]

RECLAMATION AND POLITICS

In addressing the fact-finding commission to examine into the Nation's reclamation policy, Secretary Work implied that the administration of the Reclamation Service in recent years had left much to be desired. Whether this was an indirect attack on the former Director of the Reclamation Service, Arthur Powell Davis, who was dismissed last summer by Secretary Work after some 20 years of faithful service to the Government, the committee may be able to determine. The fact that Director Davis, a skilled engineer, has been replaced by former Gov. David W. Davis, a politician, aroused criticism which has not yet been stilled. Fortunately, the fact-finding commission which Dr. Work has appointed includes such men as James R. Garfield and Julius Barnes, as well as experts in farming and irrigation problems such as Dr. John A. Widtsoe, of Utah.

One of Secretary Work's complaints is that the reclamation of arid lands is failing as a business proposition and that several projects are facing bankruptcy. If the bulletins of the Reclamation Service issued last summer under the direction of the Secretary may be trusted, the trouble has the same origin as in the case of nonirrigated farm lands. Despite the fact that many irrigated lands

are more productive and have a higher intrinsic value than nonirrigated lands, the farmers on the reclaimed lands have not escaped the disasters which have attended falling prices and increasing costs. Although it is true that the irrigation farmers have an extra charge for water, out of which the Government is reimbursed for the expenses of building and operating the projects, this cost in most cases is compensated by the higher yields of the irrigated lands. There is no reason why irrigation farmers should show greater business sense than other farmers. The inefficient have lost heavily wherever they have been. Greater skill, in reality, is required to operate a farm under irrigation than otherwise.

The Government irrigation projects were expected to be sources of revenue. Mistakes in planning and in administration were doubtless made. The greatest of these was probably the most difficult to avoid—the failure to foresee the difficulties of the settlers in getting started. But the success of the general policy of reclamation is clear to anyone who has seen the transformations which it has wrought. In last Sunday's Times Mr. Alfred Holman, in the second of a series of articles on the Northwest, described the development of the State of Washington as a result of irrigation and told of a project to reclaim a tract of 1,000,000 acres in that State. In the Southwest the success of the irrigation system has been one of the causes for the widespread support of the project to develop new lands and water power from the Colorado River in seven States. Of all these projects the prime lesson appears to be that reclamation should be kept out of politics.

[From the New York Times of June 19, 1923]

D. W. DAVIS NEW RECLAMATION HEAD

WASHINGTON, June 18.—Sweeping changes in the Reclamation Service were indicated today in the announcement by Secretary Work of the abolition of the office of Director, held by Arthur P. Davis, of Illinois. D. W. Davis, former Governor of Idaho, will take charge of the Service with the title of Commissioner. Orders for the reorganization followed the Secretary's study of data gathered on his recent western trip. The program for the coming fiscal year will include the examination of more than a score of projects in a dozen States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee having charge of this matter, I wish to state that in what I am about to say I am sure I speak for the members of the subcommittee who dealt with the pending amendment, wherein a general provision is made specifying general qualifications for those who may be appointed to responsible positions in the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Lovett case and other matters were brought to the attention of the subcommittee and discussed, and as a result of the discussion I sent for the records and found that commencing in 1902 all the Commissioners of Reclamation had been engineers except Mr. David W. Davis, whom the Senator from California just mentioned, who filled the office from June, 1923, until April, 1924. All the others who had been Commissioners of Reclamation prior to that time had been engineers.

Therefore the committee felt that, important as the work is and has become because of the huge appropriations and the projects which have been authorized, certainly in the future we should be just as exacting as the appointing power had been in the past, and that those who filled the positions concerned should be engineers.

Mr. President, I ask that the table showing the appointments of the Commissioners, and the time they served, found at the bottom of page 12 of the Senate hearings, be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Directors and Commissioners of Reclamation

Name[1]	Title	Dates
Frederick H. Newell	Chief Engineer (hydrographer in charge, Hydrographic Branch, Geological Survey).	1902-7.
	Director of the Reclamation Service	1907-14.
Arthur P. Davis	Director and Chief Engineer	1914-23.
David W. Davis	Commissioner of Reclamation (banker, and former Governor of Idaho).	June 1923-April 1924.
Elwood Mead	Commissioner of Reclamation (civil engineer, University of Colorado).	1924-36.
John C. Page	Commissioner of Reclamation	1937-43.
	Acting	1936-37.
Harry W. Bashore	Commissioner of Reclamation	1943-45.
Michael W. Straus	do	1945-present.

[1] All of these are engineers except D. W. Davis and M. W. Straus.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to say that as for me, I was not at all attempting to direct legislation against an individual. I felt that Congress had the right to enact general legislation providing that those who should be appointed Commissioners, Assistant Commissioners, and regional directors of the Bureau of Reclamation, should be qualified as engineers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 41, lines 20 and 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Nebraska, the Acting Majority Leader. I notice on page 44 there is an appropriation of $5,100,000 for the Anderson Ranch Dam in Idaho.

In the House report there appears this language:

The committee has provided——

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator from Idaho wait until in due course we reach the amendment in which he is interested? When we come to it I shall be glad to have the Senator address himself to the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 2, after the word "least", to strike out "ten" and insert "five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 5, after the word "Reclamation", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not exceeding $45,341,615 of appropriations available for expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation during the fiscal year 1949 shall be used for administrative personal service and other personal services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 9, after the amendment above stated, to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the total number of employees in the Bureau of Reclamation holding a permanent, temporary, or other appointment in grades CAF-9 and P-3, or above, shall not exceed three thousand two hundred and fifty-one at any one time during the fiscal year 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General investigations," on page 42, line 25, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000, to remain available until expended"; on page 43, line 7, after the word "the", to insert "construction"; and in line 8, after the word "current", to insert "construction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contruction," on page 43, line 23, after the word "Unit", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 23, after the amendment above stated, to strike the comma and "and in addition thereto the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 2, after the word "division", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,650,000."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, we have now come to the provision to which I wish to address myself. Immediately following the amendment last stated there is an item of $5,100,000 appropriated for Anderson Ranch Dam. In the House report there appears this language:

The committee considered an estimate of $5,800,000 for continuation of construction of this project, and has provided $5,100,000 for such work, $139,444, for construction of a transmission line from Anderson Ranch power plant to Mountain Home, Idaho, being specifically disallowed by the committee.

There is nothing in the appropriation bill saying that. It is simply in the House report. The existing law provides that municipalities and cooperatives shall have preference to this power. Of course, if we cannot build a power line the power cannot be transmitted to where people can use it, and they cannot buy it. I was wondering whether it was the sense of the Senate subcommittee, of which I understand the Senator from

Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is chairman, that this provision should be disallowed?

Mr. WHERRY. The committee considered the bill for 5 days and 5 nights, that is until 11 o'clock at night, and because of the record made in the House from February until this time, 4,700 pages of record, we made the House report the basis upon which the Senate would work. If the Senator will turn to the justification by the House committee—the Senator does not have the fly sheet—he will find the language the Senator just quoted, and that is that the House committee considered an estimate of $5,800,000 for continuation of construction of the project, and provided $5,100,000 for such work. That was the recommendation made by the House committee.

When it came to the Senate, the Senate committee had this to say about the project:

> The committee considered an estimate of $5,800,000 for continuation of construction of the project, and has provided $5,100,000 for such work, $139,444 for construction of a transmission line from Anderson Dam Ranch power plant to Mountain Home, Idaho, being specifically disallowed by the committee.

It was disallowed by the House committee. We took the House recommendations because there was no other justification made for the sum being placed back into the appropriation bill. I think if the Senator will examine the matter closely he will find that $600,000 more money is available for expenditure this year than there was last year, and I think the House felt that that was a sufficient amount to continue the work at the rate it is intended to proceed with it this year.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are very happy to have the amount of money, but what I am worried about is the fact that the House specifically disallowed any money to be spent for a power line. Unless provision is made for a transmission line the Idaho power company will put in a line there, and receive all the power, and the cooperatives and the municipalities will not be able to get it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate committee did not disallow the amount. We simply ratified what the House had done. Of course there are many of these items, but as I remember in the justification there was no additional evidence adduced why the amount should be placed back into the appropriation. The fact that the project will have $600,000 more money than it had last year makes me believe that the Bureau was quite well satisfied with the amount allowed. If there is anything further the Senator would like to have by way of information from the committee I shall be glad to have it looked up. But there was no justification made for the additional amount.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is my understanding that in the appropriation bill ample funds are made available to the Bureau of Reclamation for this particular item. I have been advised that the Bureau is currently working on plans for the completion of the power plant at the site of the Anderson Ranch Dam. It will require some time after the completion of the power facilities to determine what shall be done with the power generated there. I think the Regional Office of the Bureau of Reclamation at Boise during the next 6 or 8 months will consider this proposal from every angle, and probably make a recommendation for inclusion in the appropriation bill which will be before this body a year hence. That is my understanding as a member of the subcommittee of this particular item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I asked the committee, through a communication and by witnesses, to insert on page 22 of the bill, line 22, dealing with the Wapato project—status unit No. 3, on the Wapato Indian Reservation—the additional right to enter into contacts not to exceed $400,000. The committee has given this project $100,000, but there exists the necessity of having the right to enter into contracts so that they may build the pumps, which would take some months to build. The committee, after hearing the matter, turned the suggestion down. I think they were wrong, but nevertheless they did so after full consideration. I think the RECORD ought to show at this point my reason for asking for this additional authority to enter into contracts, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAPATO PROJECT—SATUS UNIT NO. 3

On page 21 of the bill under appropriations for the Indian Service, the House has made $100,000 available for construction on Satus Unit No. 3 of the Wapato project. I recommend that your committee consider inserting at the end of line 20 the following or similar language: "And contract authorization for pumping equipment and related materials not to exceed $400,000."

The committee has already heard from a witness appearing before you in behalf of the Indians and other residents interested in this project. There are approximately 250 Indian families, including veterans of World War II, who have allotments within the area. Development of this area was promised to the Indians over 30 years ago.

The Department of the Interior presented to the Bureau of the Budget a supplemental request for $1,000,000 to complete this unit of the Wapato Indian Irrigation project on the Yakima Indian Reservation. I understand that the Bureau of the Budget did not approve this request—acting on the false assumption that this was a new project. Actually it is not a new project at all. It is merely a part of the Wapato development, the first unit of which was started in 1908.

The House committee considered the problem. Testimony will be found on pages 381 and 429 of part 2 of the hearing. The committee included $100,000, one-tenth of the amount needed to complete Satus Unit No. 3, despite the fact no formal request was contained in the President's budget. All of us know the House committee would not have taken this action had it not been thoroughly convinced that action should be taken now to redeem promises made to the Indians 30 years ago.

Satus Unit No. 3, when completed, will put water on some 9,000 acres of high-quality land on the Yakima Reservation. The proposed plan for development is the lifting of water from the Satus pumping canal approximately 100 feet, where it will flow by gravity to all portions of the area. Since pumping facilities are required and since a year or more will elapse between the time contracts are placed for materials and equipment and time of delivery, I am suggesting as a minimum that the Bureau be given a contract authorization of not less than $400,000, but am hopeful you will grant the full $1,000,000 needed to complete the project. In the event, however, you feel unable to go the full distance, I urge upon you the contract authorization. Such action by your committee will not increase this year's appropriation, but it will accelerate by at least one full year completion of Satus Unit No. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 44, line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am interested in two projects in Montana.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator about to speak of some Missouri River Basin projects?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. We have not reached that point in the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to discuss the lower Marias project and the Montana pumping project.

Mr. WHERRY. When we get to the Missouri River Basin, if the Senator will ask the question, we shall be glad to take it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 4, after the word "Idaho", to strike out "(for completing project)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 10, after the word "to", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$170,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 10, to insert:

> Palisades project, Idaho, the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $2,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 15, after the name "New Mexico", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,386,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 17, after "New Mexico-Texas", to strike out "$25,970" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 3, after the name "Utah", to strike out "$1,800,000" and insert "$1,980,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 4, after the word "division", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$1,347,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 6, after the name "Wyoming", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,810,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 8, after the word "fund", to strike out "$16,691,970" and insert "$19,229,650."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance", on page 45, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,312,880" and insert "$2,645,380."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 25, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$210,875" and insert "$250,000"; and on page 46, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$768,800" and insert "$860,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 8, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$210,000" and insert "$230,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$395,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$159,000" and insert "$180,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 4, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$85,000" and insert "$117,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 6, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$285,000" and insert "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 8, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$210,000" and insert "$224,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$1,690,000", and in line 18, after the word "thereto", to insert "and the payment to the school district or school districts serving Mason City and Coulee Dam, Wash., as reimbursement for instruction during the 1948–49 school year in the schools operated by said district or districts of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States living in or in the vicinity of Coulee Dam, in the sum of $25 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 5, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$330,000" and insert "$345,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "200,000" and insert "$212,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 12, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$92,000" and insert "$95,400"; and in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$56,000" and insert "$58,425".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 48, line 17, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$69,700" and insert "$84,700"; and in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$95,300" and insert "$114,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 48, after line 20; to insert:

REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT

For rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects $1,500,000: *Provided*, That, at the discretion of the Secretary, repayment may be scheduled after the completion of repayment of existing obligations of the water users' organizations concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 49, line 24, after the word "fund", to strike out "$30,604,997" adn insert "$37,308,855."

The amendment was agred to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General fund, construction," on page 50, line 9, after "Gila project, Arizona", to strike out $2,240,000" and insert "$2,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 10, after "Arizona-Nevada", to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$22,884,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 13, after "Arizona-California", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$234,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 13, to strike out:

Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $1,750,000; irrigation facilities, $30,080,000; irrigation distribution system, $1,000,000; power facilities, surveys, $20,000, Shasta power plant, $943,400, Keswick Dam, $1,500,000, Keswick power plant, $940,000; switch yards, $3,250,000; transmission line, Shasta to Delta (Tracy) via Oroville and Secramento, $500,000; substation, Contra Costa, $12,000; in all, $40,000,400, no part of which shall be available for examination and surveys in connection with power facilities in any State other than the State of California.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $1,965,000; irrigation facilities, $32,122,424; power facilities, $3,706,400; transmission lines, including switchyards and substations, $4,673,576; in all, $42,467,400: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance on June 30, 1948, of funds heretofore appropriated for this project shall be classified under and combined with these amounts subject to determination by the Comptroller General.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 8, after the name "California", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$45,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 9, after the name "Colorado", to strike out "$19,750,000" and insert "$20,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 11, after the name "Montana", to strike out "$8,100,000" and insert "$15,115,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 17, after the word "construction", to strike out "$133,632,400" and insert "$149,458,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fort Peck project," on page 52, line 5, after "(16 U. S. C. 833)", to strike out "$990,000" and insert "$1,980,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, earlier I discussed with the Senator in charge of the bill the possibility of having some transfers made in amounts without affecting the total amount. I understand from him that that can be accomplished in conference and that he would prefer not to have amendments offered here on the floor. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. The answer is yes. There are certain suggested amounts in the report. We took the House figures as the basis of the report. When we go to conference if there is any readjustment of projects, so long as the total amounts are not involved, if Senators have any suggestions to make to us, we can carry them to conference. I have told the Senator that we would do so. We already have the figures which he suggested to us for transposing from one project to the other.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to make a brief statement in support of my request.

In the report of the Senate Subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriations last year the Heart River project in my State was given $1,500,000. Shortly afterward, in a supplemental appropriation under flood control, this project was given another $400,000, or a total of $1,900,000. This year there will be spent on that project only $930,000. So to complete the project as originally scheduled, in 2 years, we had asked for a total amount of $3,500,000. The committee was very generous and gave us somewhat of a raise which was in line with raises granted to other States, but not enough to permit a new contract to finish in 2 years. So, Mr. President, I am asking that there be earmarked under the Cannon Ball North Dakota project the amount of $580,000, under the Heart-Butte project, $2,000,000, and under Dickenson's Dam project, $412,300. There will be no change in the total amount, but the fund will be earmarked to accomplish the best results for the money allowed in North Dakota. This arrangement has the approval of Governor Aandahl, the water commission, and the division engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation in our State. I hope that these funds will be earmarked to accomplish the best results and that these funds appropriated for North Dakota will remain for expenditure there.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his statement. It will be of help in conference committee, where we shall attempt to carry out his idea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] made a similar request relative to some projects in Montana. I think he was speaking for the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], who was absent from the Chamber.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The request has to do with the Lower Marias project in Montana.

Mr. WHERRY. On the floor of the Senate that amount was increased from $300,000 to $750,000, with the idea that construction would start. I should like to refer the Senator to page 6636 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where Mr. JENSEN, chairman of the House subcommit-

tee, was discussing this very appropriation. Mr. JENSEN said:

I am glad the gentleman brought that matter up. I must admit that it was an oversight.

He was referring to the same project which the Senator from Wyoming has brought to my attention in behalf of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]. Mr. JENSEN continued:

When we marked up the bill we meant to bring a certain portion of this money which we had approached in phase B for the Montana pumping item and also for the Lower Marias, to bring it out of phase B up into phase A, which is construction.

This is the question which the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] intended to bring up.

I have conferred with other members of the committee and we now recommend that such part of the amount allowed for these projects as may be necessary shall be available for phase A, or, in other words, construction.

That amount was allowed on the floor of the House. So I can say to both my distinguished colleagues from Montana and to the Senator from Wyoming that if the House conferees are still of the same opinion—which they will be—I am satisfied that the Senate conferees will concur, because we adopted the same amount of money for the some purpose as was in the bill as it come from the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator understands that of that $750,000, the contention is that $450,000 should be under phase A.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. That is why the amount was increased to place it in phase A, and still spend the $300,000 which it is necessary to spend in phase B.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, am I to understand that when this question goes to conference this matter will be corrected, so that the money will be available for construction?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate has already done exactly what Mr. JENSEN, chairman of the House subcommittee, said on the floor of the House should be done. If the House conferees are of the same opinion, we shall do exactly what is outlined, as I have suggested to the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missouri River Basin," on page 52, line 17, after the word "development", to strike out "$52,767,500" and insert "$56,275,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 21, after the word "agencies", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than three thousand seven hundred and sixty-six feet, unless and until such time as the waters above the Hebgen Dam have been completely utilized for irrigation purposes; or for or in connection with the construction of the power plant, power facilities, or transmission facilities in connection with the Canyon Ferry project, Montana, other than excavating costs in connection with the construction of the dam and foundation for a powerhouse.

The amendment was agreed to:

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 6, after the amendment above stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation may be used for surveys, design, or construction of the Glendo project, Wyoming, or any feature thereof to a greater capacity or for other purposes than set forth in Senate Document Numbered 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, without the specific authorization of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River development fund," on page 53, line 19, after "(54 Stat. 774)", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$900,000"; on page 54, line 2, after the word "the", to insert "construction"; and in line 3, after the word "current", to insert "construction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River Dam fund," on page 54, line 9, after the word "fund" to strike out "and the Secretary shall pay to the Boulder City school district, out of the Colorado River Dam fund, as reimbursement for instruction during each school year in the schools operated by said district of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States, living in or in the vicinity of Boulder City, the sum of $45 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary", and insert "including payments to the Boulder City school district in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 528, approved May 12, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Advances to Colorado River Dam fund," on page 56, line 6, after "(43 U. S. C., ch. 12A)," to strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$1,728,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 20, after the word "fund," to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,242,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River front work and levee system," on page 57, line 15, after "California," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no moratorium or stop order that may be issued by the President can abrogate in whole or in part the use of any appropriation for reclamation or flood-control projects as provided for in this legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, apparently the amendment beginning on page 57 runs over to page 59. I call up an amendment which I have at the desk, and which I wish to propose to the committee amendment. I ask that my amendment to the committee amendment be read.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, all those amendments are separate amendments. I think the Senator will find, if he will look closely, that they are separate. The first one end in line 2 on page 58. If we act on the amendments separately, I think that will be best; and I shall appreciate having that done.

Mr. WATKINS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 57, beginning in line 15, which has already been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue to state the committee amendments.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 18, to strike out:

ALASKAN INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations, and for reports thereon, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water power resources of Alaska, $150,000, which shall be available for, but not restricted to, services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rations and quarters for field parties while away from inhabited communities in which such facilities are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 2, to strike out:

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this or any prior act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 665 of title 31 of the United States Code.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 10, to strike out:

Interest heretofore or hereafter collected on sums invested in power or municipal water features of any project constructed or operated by the Bureau of Reclamation under the authority of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, shall be covered into the reclamation fund and shall not be allocated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 16, to strike out:

Not exceeding 6 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

No part of any construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, installation of machinery or equipment, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, or in those instances when no bids have been received in response to a public invitation therefor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 59, beginning in line 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "have been received in response to a public invitation therefor" and insert "or where extremely unsatisfactory bids have been received in response to a publication therefor, and the Commissioner of Reclamation shall report to Congress all instances where it is determined that bids received are extremely unsatisfactory."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I think the entire committee amendment, as it would be amended by the inclusion of my amendment to it, should be read, so that what is under discussion will be clearly understood. I shall attempt to read the committee amendment as I propose to have it amended:

No part of any construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, installation of machinery or equipment, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, or in those instances when no bids—

And I have proposed, by my amendment, to insert in the committee amendment at that point a further exception; namely, that when bids extremely unsatisfactory have been received, a further exception be made, with a certain safeguard, which is—

and the Commissioner of Reclamation shall report to Congress all instances where it is determined that bids received are extremely unsatisfactory.

I recognize the general proposition that reclamation projects should be constructed by contract; but there are times, particularly in these days of extremely high prices and when prices advance very rapidly and when there is a shortage of labor and materials, when often it is very difficult to obtain satisfactory bids. In the case of some of the projects, probably some of the smaller ones where the contracts are not very large, it is difficult to get anyone to bid; or if some do bid, they bid extremely high.

I have in mind a project in my State where we have a transmission canal which now has been largely constructed, but two or three sections remain to be completed. Two of the sections are to be concrete lined. Bids have been received. Those bids are approximately 400 percent higher than the prewar prices. The Bureau of Reclamation has gone into those two matters, and has made a study of them, and has determined that they can be built for 50 percent of the bid price.

Under the committee amendment, without my amendment to it, it would be impossible for the Bureau of Reclamation to go in and by force account build those two concrete-lined sections of the canal. The contractors know that the water users must have those sections finished, for they are a part of an existing canal which has been remodeled and enlarged under the reclamation project, and of course it is absolutely necessary to have the project completed in order to be able to furnish the needed water and save the crops.

If the amendment I have proposed to the committee amendment is adopted, the Bureau of Reclamation can build those two sections; but my amendment to the committee amendment provides a safeguard, by stipulating that the Bureau cannot take on a big project unless it has a good reason for doing so.

It seems to me that in ordinary justice to the farmers who are buying this water and are paying the high prices of today, this protection should be afforded them. In my judgment, it will cost the farmers at least $25,000 more if they have to proceed under the committee amendment, without the adoption of the amendment I have proposed to it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I sympathize with what the Senator from Utah seeks to do. I have tried to find language which would reach the situation he has pictured. Frankly, I have been unable to do so. The language suggested by the Senator from Utah would appear to me to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to disregard the general prohibition. The term "extremely unsatisfactory" can mean anything that the individual who is acting in such a case wants it to mean.

I realize that the Senator from Utah has most ingeniously placed some limitation, in that he requires a report to Congress. If there could be inserted language which would prevent a force account in cases where bids were too high, and if there could be a measure of the fact, I would support the proposed amendment to the committee amendment. But I am afraid that so far as this proposal is concerned, it does not meet the problem which confronts us.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator from Utah what was the estimated cost of the work he has in mind?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not have the figures before me at the moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Can the Senator state the approximate amount?

Mr. WATKINS. I investigated the general proposition with the Bureau of Reclamation's regional director in Salt Lake City. He told me that the bids are at least 400 percent higher than prewar and that the Bureau can build those sections, with the force it has, for 50 percent of the bid which has been offered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator whether he can give an approximate figure.

Mr. WATKINS. I said it probably would cost the farmers at least $25,000 more. I have a general knowledge of the canal. I have been on it; in fact, I was general counsel for it at one time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it a $200,000 job?

Mr. WATKINS. It may be, with those two sections of concrete-lined canal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator that he modify his amendment to the committee amendment so as to provide that in cases where the bids are less than $200,000, the proposal he has made may prevail. I am sure that would meet the criticism which was raised by the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon does not want to open the door. The Senator from Utah merely desires that force account may be employed where there is not a large contract.

So, if the Senator will write a limitation in the figures "$200,000," I am sure there will be no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. We might increase that to $250,000, so there would be no doubt about it.

I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon would be willing to accept that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to wait just a moment, please. I deeply appreciate the fact that the Senators are attempting to write in language that will suit one individual case. But as chairman of the subcommittee, I must say that I shall resist this amendment to the committee amendment. I admit there are exceptional cases, and of course we have a deep sympathy for what has happened in this case in Utah.

But generally speaking, during the past 2 years, as the Senator from Wyoming knows, our committee has worked long hours and hard to try to frame a proper amendment under which operations could be carried on and which would not permit the Bureau to do force account work, but to offer it for bids.

The language of the amendment appearing in the bill applies to all the work of reclamation, running into millions and millions of dollars. The same thing was done in connection with Bonneville. A reference to page 7 will show that the same restrictions were placed there as here.

I share the feeling that in exceptional cases possibly the Bureau might be able to do the work cheaper than if it were done by contract, but the study reveals that during the past 2 years it has been just the contrary.

The committee has gone into the matter most thoroughly, and I beg of the Senator from Utah to abide by the committee decision and by what the committee did last year, and what we are attempting to do this year. I think if one looked into all the different projects where force accounts were put into effect, where machinery was purchased, where it seems to me they went away beyond what could be done on private contract, it would be most revealing, and demonstrate that the policy pursued and as represented by the language of the committee is safe and sound. To make an exception where it is stated that the bid is extremely satisfactory, that opens up practically every contract. What is going to satisfy the Bureau of Reclamation? What are the standards? All the work could be done on force account, a thing we have been trying to eliminate.

I do not want to make a mountain out of a mole hill. We were very good, I think, to the Senator from Utah in the matter of appropriations. I have asked him not to press the amendment at this time. If the matter does not work out

satisfactorily, of course, if there is any language that can be adopted as a limitation, I would not object too much to that, if agreeable; but the amendment proposed by the Senator, it seems to me, opens up the whole book. As chairman of the committee, at least, I cannot accept the amendment. I hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with what the Senator has said. The amendment as offered by the Senator from Utah would open up the whole scope of the contracts. The Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Oregon have made, I think, a proper criticism. But the amendment which I have suggested to the Senator from Utah, which would place a limitation of $200,000 or $250,000 upon the contracts that could be handled by force account, I think would obviate every possible criticism the Senator mentions. I suggest to the Senator from Utah that he recast his amendment to make it read that it may be done where the expense involved will not exceed $250,000.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall be willing to accept that as my amendment. I want to get something that will in these very instances permit progress in the building of the canals without unduly penalizing the people who have to pay for them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want the floor in my own right, when the Senator has finished.

Mr. WATKINS. I have not finished. I desire to point out that when one sees the work itself in the building of these projects he gets a different idea from that obtained by sitting here in the Senate or in a committee room.

The proposals have been made time and time again, and the work continually increases, and goes on and on and on, under certain contractual arrangements, and it can be taken care of, not in many instances, but in enough of them to justify an exception of this kind, and to justify the adoption of the amendment, to permit these projects to proceed without penalizing the people who have to pay for them, as the costs have undoubtedly advanced. We are in a very trying period. I think sufficient heat has been turned on the Bureau of Reclamation on the question of contracts and of building and of other things that have been before the Congress recently, so that there is not the slightest danger of their trying to build all the big projects with force accounts. In the first place, they do not have the equipment. It takes much equipment. In the second place, they cannot get the men, because they are tied up by contract. For those reasons they would find it difficult to carry on a job of any size. So it is only the small ones that could possibly be taken care of. I know that from practical experience in the field, not from debate.

I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I appreciate the work the committee has done on the appropriation bill. I appreciate the generosity so-called that they have shown to the State of Utah. We very much appreciate it. I do not mean to be sarcastic about it when I say the amount we have asked for is so small that it gets into reclamation appropriations. Compared with others running into millions or many millions, as they do, the small amount Utah is asking is something to which we feel entitled. I thank the Senator. I should like a vote on the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the committee cannot accept the amendment. In the first place the Senator well knows that if we begin to amend the bill to satisfy every Senator, there will be many amendments proposed. I have a pocketful of amendments which might be offered. I hope and pray that in a matter so small as the Senator says it is, the work and study of the committee for 2 years will not be jeopardized, which study shows that the force account work has been more costly. The committee and the committee staff have studied the statistics connected with work in the field, furnished us by the Department, showing that what we contend is absolutely true.

I hope the Senator will withdraw the amendment. It strikes at a policy the committee has attempted to follow out fairly with the Department. It has cost more money to do it by force account in the majority of cases than it has by private contract. While there may be an exception here and there, yet the exception does not prove the rule. If there should be an exemption up to $250,000 the Bureau would do the work; a toe would be in the door and then something else would be done. We have worked for two solid years and operated under the provision practically all last year—the same language that is in the bill this year. I hope the Senator will not press the amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I appreciate the position the Chairman and the committee are in with respect to the amendment I propose. I wanted to explain, it was not only in behalf of the project in Utah, but there are others that have some of the same difficulties. However, in view of the fact that the committee is against it, and I can see that the amendment will not prevail, I shall graciously withdraw it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator. I deeply appreciate his action. If the project in his State does not get along this year, we shall see that it gets along next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 6, to insert:

The War Assets Administration or other Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or interest therein is hereby directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation without exchange of funds, the following-described lands, together with improvements, buildings, facilities, equipment, and interest.

A parcel of that section of the Grand Island Army Air Field, Grand Island, Nebr., lying west of First Road West, formerly known as the station hospital area, and described in detail as follows:

Approximately forty acres of land generally defined as the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 34, township 12 north, range 9 west. It is the desire to acquire all land abutting against lands presently owned by the city of Grand Island and including such portions of Road One West and right-of-way between Chapel Street and the point one hundred and eighty feet south of the intersection with Second Street South, to give continuous ownership in the east and west direction as between the United States Government (Bureau of Reclamation) and the city of Grand Island. The records show that all of this land was acquired from individual owners by the United States of America during August and September 1943, and the transfers are recorded with the registrar of deeds, Hall County, Nebraska, and the following buildings located in the hospital area numbered as follows: T–1112, T–1113, T–1114, T–1115, T–1116, T–1117, T–1118, T–1122, T–1100, T–1103, T–1104, T–1105, T–1107, T–1101, T–1102, T–1106, T–1108, T–1109, T–1110, T–1111, and T–1120, together with all roads, improvements, electric power lines, heating lines, water lines, sewer systems, Air-Temp units, steam boilers, and other appurtenances to the above-listed buildings, and all other facilities and equipment incident to said hospital area not heretofore disposed of.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 15, to insert:

The War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation unexpended balances of funds available for maintenance and protection of transferred property under the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act of 1947 (Public Law 478, 79th Cong.) to reimburse the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditures made for the maintenance and protection of the Yuma Army Air Base and such transfer shall be made hereafter for the maintenance and protection of the Yuma Army Air Base, pending its final disposition as contemplated in the Interior Appropriation Act of 1948 (Public Law 247, 80th Cong., 1st sess.).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 2, to insert:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, all of its right, title, and interest in and to a certain building and improvements under Defense Plant Corporation project, Plancor 1437, constructed on the War Relocation Center at the Heart Mountain Division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, that apparently concludes the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. I should like to call attention to one phase which I think should have the attention of the Senate.

In the first place, I want to congratulate the able chairman of the committee on the excellent work he and his committee have done, so far as the Bureau of Reclamation is concerned. Without depreciating in any way the value of the irrigation section covering the reclamation projects, I should like to call attention to the power projects which come under the heading of the Bureau of

Reclamation. My object, Mr. President, is to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter dated May 28, 1948, which I wrote to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] dealing with the important question of power.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CODY, WYO., *May 28, 1948.*

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Chairman, Subcommittee,
Interior Department Appropriations,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the immediate future, you will be considering the Interior Department Appropriations bill and in that bill the appropriations for works under the Bureau of Reclamation. I wish to appeal to the Committee for their very earnest consideration of an increase in the amounts passed by the House for some very vital projects in Wyoming.

There is a great and serious shortage of electric power all over Wyoming, and particularly in the northwest area. The demand is much greater than the capacity production, and today the word "capacity" contemplates every item of equipment operating at full overload, overpeaks, with no reserve whatsoever. So serious is the shortage that the Mountain States Power Co. is installing a 1,000 kilowatt Diesel power plant to help to temporarily relieve the pressure.

The demand for electric power is, of course, for almost every municipality, for the network of REA lines, which are fast reaching out to all farming communities, and the big load caused by the very extensive drilling operations for oil.

I therefore feel that the request for somewhat larger appropriations, not only because of local necessity, but to help meet the great national need for petroleum production, should receive your earnest consideration.

Most of the towns in this area have enormously increased in population. Some have doubled in size and are continuing to grow at an unbelievable rate. Immediate increase of power capacity is essential and preparation for continued capacity increase in the next few years is a very real problem, and the only method of accomplishing this and thus enable the development of the State to progress is the supplying of more and more power capacity.

The power situation with regard to generation in the Big Horn and Wind River areas of Wyoming has long been critical and power has had to be imported from the Kendrick project via Casper in order to supply the load requirements. With all generation in operation, there is only enough to supply a little over half of the area load requirements. The completion of the Heart Mountain plant of 5,000 kilowatts is expected by November of this year, in order to help carry the winter loads with as little power curtailment as possible, but the shortage in this area has become so critical that it has been necessary to appoint a power committee consisting of the power managers of the Big Horn and North Platte district power offices and the division manager of the Mountain States Power Co. to pass on accepting any load increase other than normal system growth.

There are a number of projects, some of which are in the House bill and which were reduced in the House, which I particularly desire to call your attention to, with a most urgent appeal that the figures that I give may, if at all possible, be accepted by your committee and recommended for passage by the Senate. These are almost entirely power projects, and in some cases with flood control features.

Clarksfork: Reconnaissance surveys in the Clarksfork Basin of Wyoming have revealed that four power sites, namely, Thief Creek, Sunlight, Bald Ridge, and Hunter Mountain, are capable of ready development to provide sorely needed power generation. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates the capacity of these sites as 122,000 kilowatts. The budget request for this project was $6,000, and this was cut by the House to $3,000. This project is purely power development. It has no reclamation or flood-control features. The Sunlight site is the most practical and feasible of the initial undertaking, and approximately $50,000 would be required in fiscal year 1949 for the necessary engineering investigations. Thief Creek comes second on the list as being practical and feasible, and $50,000 would be required in fiscal year 1949 for the necessary engineering investigations.

It is my opinion, in view of the serious power shortage in this area, and in view of the national and international situation, that it is in the public interest to push these engineering investigations as soon as possible as a prerequisite to construction, and I urge an immediate appropriation of $100,000 for this purpose, with the thought that the engineering investigation of Bald Ridge and Hunter Mountain sites be performed in fiscal year 1950–51, respectively.

Boysen Dam: Perhaps the key project in this set-up is the Boysen Dam. This is one of the key structures in the over-all flood control system of the Missouri Valley Basin and it is one of the urgent construction items in the comprehensive Sloan plan. Work has been proceeding at a most satisfactory rate and today the contractor is practically 1 year ahead of schedule. Six million dollars has been included in the House bill for fiscal year 1949. The prime contractor's actual program for fiscal year 1949, if the work is to be maintained, calls for an appropriation item of $10,250,000. The prime contractor's share of the $6,000,000 in the House bill would be around $3,000,000 and if the contractor continues at the same rate of operation as he has during 1948, his share of the $6,000,000, which would be roughly $3,000,000, would be exhausted by September 30, 1948. If this work should stop for lack of funds, there would not only be a delay in completion but considerable extra costs due to possibility of damage to partially completed construction such as diversion tunnel, spillway, etc., to say nothing of the disruption of the coordinated construction schedule.

In addition to being a key structure in the flood-control system of the Nation, Boysen's 15,000-kilowatt power plant is essential to meet the power load peak of 1951.

I urgently appeal to the committee to increase the Boysen appropriation from $6,000,000 to $10,250,000.

The power revenue from this dam makes this an attractive investment.

Riverton: I urge that the House bill appropriation of $1,750,000 be increased to the budget request of $2,011,500 so that the construction program can be carried forward and the land settlement program maintained. The failure to do this would involve the deferment of settling approximately 20,000 acres and 136 farm units on the Riverton project.

The reduction by the House committee of $6,800 for the Riverton operation and maintenance and the $4,850 reduction in the Riverton power operation and maintenance is unfortunate, as much of this system has been in operation for 25 years and various structures require extensive maintenance, replacement, and rehabilitation.

I hope the committee will see their way to reinstating these cuts.

Shoshone extension: The House allowance of $150,000 for the Shoshone extension unit is not sufficient to complete the preconstruction work necessary to enable the actual construction to start in fiscal year 1950. With an appropriation allowance for fiscal year 1949 of $250,000 to complete the preconstruction work, actual construction on the feeder canal from the Buffalo Bill Reservoir to the Oregon Basin Reservoir and the distribution system for the lands adjacent to the feeder canal could be commenced in fiscal year 1950. This is part of a 100,000-acre unit involving an over-all construction period of some 10 years, during which time it is hoped to open approximately 10,000 acres of land annually.

I strongly urge a $100,000 increase of the House allowance for Shoshone extension.

A very serious reduction which comes under the head of "Power Plant" is the reduction of the Shoshone power plant operation and maintenance to $95,300. This plant has a capacity of 7,500 kilowatts, and in view of the critical overloading of all power equipment in this area, I trust the committee will increase this sum to the budget estimate.

Big Horn Basin: The House committee's action in reducing the Big Horn Basin item from $80,000 to $40,000 has the effect of deferring into fiscal year 1951 the completion of plans for the general over-all development of the Big Horn Basin. These plans include the determination of available water supply, water-rights situation, arable acreage, engineering feasibility, power potental and requirements, together with coordination of these considerations with flood-control requirements, municipal and domestic water requirements. There are some 1,200,000 arable acres in the Wind River Basin, and 2,260,000 arable acres in the Big Horn Basin. It is desirable that these investigating plans be completed at the earliest possible moment so that the over-all future construction plans can be prepared. I urge that this item of $40,000 be increased to $80,000.

Wind River—DuNoir Dam near DuBois: It is possible in the Wind River that there may develop a water-supply problem which would necessitate expediting construction of the DeNoir Dam and Reservoir. The House committee cut the budget request from $20,000 to $15,000. At present drilling work on the suggested dam site is in progress, and it is suggested that the amount of $15,000 be increased to the budget request of $20,000 to enable this important work to be completed.

I ask the committee's urgent consideration of these very important appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

E. V. ROBERTSON,
United States Senator, Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey," on page 63, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and forty-six" and insert "one hundred and sixty-six, of which one hundred and forty-six shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 23, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$3,563,498" and insert "$5,000,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$505,000" and insert "$573,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 12, after the word "reports", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,750,000"; and in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$585,000" and insert "$600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 23, after the word "resources," to strike out "$3,034,800" and insert

"$3,496,700"; on page 65, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$265,000" and insert "$350,000"; and in line 10, after the word "That", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,361,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 13, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$243,400" and insert "$325,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed"; to strike out "$56,500" and insert "$65,725."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 21, after the word "maps", to strike out "$325,000" and insert "$547,050"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$477,950" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 7, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$675,000" and insert "$690,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 16, after "Geological Survey", to strike out "$11,456,998" and insert "$13,924,050."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines," on page 70, line 5, after the word "requirements", to insert "and not to exceed $16,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$145,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 4, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$140,000"; and in line 8, after the word "Interior", to strike out "$7,250,000" and insert "$9,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$20,000"; and in line 10, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 7, after the word "the", to insert "construction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 11, after the word "and", to strike out "investigation" and insert "investigations"; in line 12, before the word "made", to strike out "sum" and insert "sums."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I call attention to page 75, line 9. On this point I desire merely to remark that, in my opinion, the committee has made a mistake in not restoring the budget estimate for the investigation of coking coal. Coking coal is a deposit which is highly necessary in the industrial situation of the United States. The Budget Bureau made an estimate to enable the Bureau of Mines to conduct investigations and studies. The House refused to allow it. The Senate committee has made a small increase. I know, of course, that if we open the bill up for any amendment we should open it up for all; but I desire the RECORD to show that we are overlooking a very vital resource of the United States for the development of more steel. Coking coal is essential in the production of steel. The budget estimated amount should have been appropriated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "sixty" and insert "one hundred, of which ninety-four shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, after line 23, to insert:

The Department of the Army is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of a parcel of ten acres, more or less, from that portion of Fort Douglas Military Reservation in the county of Salt Lake, State of Utah, which lies immediately north of the site of the Bureau of Mines Intermountain Experiment Station and is situated between a line beginning at a point four hundred feet north of the northwest corner of the United States Bureau of Mines property granted by deed from the University of Utah May 21, 1938, said point being on the south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard and running thence south three hundred and twenty feet to the east-west boundary line between the University of Utah and Fort Douglas; thence east six hundred and four and five-tenths feet to the north-south boundary between the University of Utah and Fort Douglas; thence south along said north-south boundary four hundred and eighty feet to a line on the south boundary (extended) of the United States Bureau of Mines property above-mentioned; thence east two hundred and sixty-two feet; thence north nine hundred and fifty-two and six-tenths feet to the south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard; thence westerly along said south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard to the point of beginning, said enclosure embracing ten acres.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service," on page 82, line 5, after the word "including", to strike out "$87,500" and insert "$100,000"; and in the same line, after the word "binding", to strike out "$737,818", and insert "$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 8, after the word "offices", to strike out "$615,290" and insert "$715,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 14, after the word "Washington", to strike out "$3,658,163" and insert "$3,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 24, after the word "project", to strike out "$1,556,464" and insert "$1,690,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 4, after the word "agencies", to strike out "$273,495" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 12, after the word "binding", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 15, after the word "areas", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 8, after "(not to exceed $100)", to strike out "$774,150" and insert "$815,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 16, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$122,954" and insert "$152,954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 16, to insert:

Acquisition of lands: For the acquisition of privately owned lands or interests therein within the authorized boundaries of established areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including expenses incidental thereto and personal services in the District of Columbia, $200,000, to remain available until expended, of which $150,000 shall be available only for lands within Colonial National Historical Park; Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial and Gettysburg National Military Parks; Manassas National Battlefield Park; Badlands, Dinosaur, George Washington Birthplace, Joshua Tree, Petrified Forest, and Scotts Bluff National Monuments; and Big Bend parcel of land necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway 227; Glacier, Grand Canyon, Great Smoky Mountains, Kings Canyon, Lassen Volcanic, Mesa Verde, Mount Rainier, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, Sequoia, Yosemite, and Zion National Parks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, after line 8, to insert:

Parkways, National Park Service: The Secretary is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding a total of $2,680,000, for the construction of the Blue Ridge, Natchez Trace, George Washington Memorial, and Foothills Parkways.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 18, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$5,162,350" and insert "$4,762,350"; in line 19, after the word "including", to strike out "$3,210,000" and insert "$3,110,000"; and in line 23, after the word "and", to strike out "$1,952,350 and insert "$1,652,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "thirty" and insert "forty, of which twenty-eight shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fish and Wildlife Service, salaries and expenses," on page 88, line 25, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$247,470" and insert "$270,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 18, after the word "of", to strike out "aquarium" and insert "aquaria"; in line 19, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$1,800,525" and insert "$1,879,525"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,000"; and in line 22, after the

word "thereto", to insert "and not to exceed $35,000 for the construction and operation, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 19, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$1,025,000" and insert "$1,224,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 9, after the word "services", to strike out "$495,000" and insert "$525,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 25, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 16, after "(16 U. S. C. 631i)", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$69,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, line 22, after "Order No.", to strike out "9892" and insert "9802."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 17, before the word "of", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 10, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000"; in line 11, after the word "repair", to strike out "and painting" and insert "painting, and maintenance"; in line 12, after the word "buildings", to insert "and facilities"; and in line 15, before the word "and", to strike out "$1,210,000" and insert "$1,340,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 2, after the word "amended", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, after line 3, to insert:

California wildlife management areas: For the purchase or rent, and development, maintenance, and administration of wildlife management areas in the State of California, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1948 (Public Law 534), $300,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I ask unanimous consent to return to page 86. I have an amendment which involves no expenditure, but merely a change in the language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will return to the consideration of page 86 of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with reference to new language, let me say that the whole matter will be in conference, and if the Senator from Texas will give me his amendment I shall take it to conference and see if we can work it out. I do not want to accept the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course I should like to have the Senate adopt the amendment. All I desire to do is to insert a few words on page 86, line 4, after the word "land." I wish to insert the words "adjoining Big Bend National Park." The purpose is to identify the project.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question in on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have inquired how long we will remain in session tonight. I should like very much to consider the Government Corporations appropriation bill. I do not like to punish the Senate, but I am being punished, myself, and I should like to finish these two appropriation bills. If we can finish the Government Corporations appropriation bill tonight, I should be inclined then to recess until tomorrow. If we cannot finish this bill and the Government Corporations bill, I shall talk with Senators in charge of other legislation and let the Members know what the plan is. If we can finish those bills tonight, we certainly ought to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 10, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$9,226,979" and insert "$10,257,309."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal aid in wildlife restoration," on page 96, line 22, after the word "That", to strike out "not exceeding 35 percent of the amount allocated to any State shall be available for the construction of improvements" and insert "the requirement of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, that not exceeding 20 percent of the amount allocated to any State shall be available for the construction of improvements is hereby waived with respect to unobligated balances on June 30, 1948, from allotments to the States for the fiscal year 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, line 5, after the word "Service", to strike out "$9,226,979" and insert "$10,257,309"; in line 9 after the word "exceed," to strike out "$1,113,862" and insert "$1,130,112"; in line 13, after the word "exceed", strike out "fifty" and insert "eighty-six"; in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two" and insert "five"; in line 15, before the word "maintenance", to insert "hire,"; and on page 98, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1.50" and insert "$2.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories—Territory of Alaska," on page 99, line 19, after the word "grounds," to strike out "$62,785" and insert "$64,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 9, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$448,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 12, after the word "binding," to strike out "$8,500,000" and insert "$10,442,400"; and in line 18, after the words "total of," to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$13,904,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, line 11, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000"; on page 103, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,575" and insert "$15,000"; in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "$8,500" and insert "$9,000"; in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$25,000"; and in line 20, after the words "total of", to strike out "$6,700,000" and insert "$12,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Territory of Hawaii," on page 104, line 22, after the word "hire", to strike out "$25,600" and insert "$25,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government of the Virgin Islands," on page 105, line 14, after the name "Saint Croix", to strike out "$205,050," and insert "$213,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, after line 18, to strike out:

Municipal governments: For defraying the deficits in the treasuries of the municipal governments because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1949, municipality of Saint Thomas and Saint John, $15,120, and municipality of Saint Croix, $134,880; in all $150,000, to be paid to the said treasuries in monthly installments.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Municipal governments: For expenses of the government of the Virgin Islands in excess of current local revenues for the fiscal year 1949, municipality of Saint Thomas and Saint John, $194,400, and municipality of Saint Croix, $325,800; in all, $520,200, to be paid to the respective municipal treasuries in monthly installments; and the said municipal governments are hereby authorized to make purchases for their hospitals, schools, and other public institutions, through the Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions—Department of the Interior," on page 107, line 1, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$600" and insert "$1,100"; in line 2, after the figures "$100", to insert "Division of Geographic Names, $300"; in line 3, after the word "Management", to strike out "$300" and insert "$2,500"; and in the same line, after the word "Affairs", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500"; in line 4, after the word "Reclamation", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$7,500"; in line 5, after the word "Survey", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$7,500"; in the same line, after the word "Mines", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$6,000"; in line 6, after the word "Service", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500"; and in line 7, after the word "Service", to strike out "$1,750" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 109, line 17, after the words "total of", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, line 15, after the word "individuals", to insert "unless a higher rate is otherwise authorized or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, after line 17, to strike out:

TITLE II. SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION

Sums totaling $560,197 for construction of the Havre Shelby transmission line, Havre substation, Rudyard substation, Shelby substation, Milk River District, Fort Peck project, Montana, contained in the "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947," and the "Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948," under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation", are hereby carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). That completes the amendments of the committee. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask the Senator from Wyoming to offer the amendment he desires to present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, by instruction of the committee I offer the legislative amendment I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, line 25, after the word "Secretary", it is proposed to insert the following: "payments (not to exceed the average per pupil cost in the State where construction is in progress) to school districts as reimbursement, while projects are actually under construction, for the instruction of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and of contractors engaged on such projects: *Provided*, That a tuition charge of $25 per semester shall be charged and collected by the Bureau of Reclamation for each such dependent attending such schools."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, by reason of the large construction projects contained in the reclamation provisions of the bill, it is necessary for employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and employees of the contractors who are engaged in the construction to live in school districts which are not always equipped to handle the children. The children have to go to school in those districts. The districts do not have the tax resources with which to support the burden that is thus thrown upon them. This amendment merely provides that among the expenditures allowed for the Bureau of Reclamation will be an expenditure for tuition of children of the school districts in which they must go to school temporarily, but it also contains a provision that the Bureau must collect a tuition fee of $25 per pupil per semester.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Appropriations Committee for being fair on the whole, to the Bureau of Mines in funds necessary for important work in Pennsylvania and in functions of the Bureau which, though carried on elsewhere, vitally affect the steel and coal and other industries of Pennsylvania.

I want particularly to voice my approval of the funds carried in the Interior Department bill for such items as control of fires in inactive coal deposits, for coal-mine inspections and investigations, for anthracite investigations, for synthetic liquid fuels and secondary oil recovery under oil and gas investigations.

Mine fires are seriously threatening several important communities in Pennsylvania, among them Mount Carmel, Carbondale, West Wilmerding, Glassport, and areas of Pittsburgh and surrounding parts of Allegheny County, including Kennedy Township and Penn Township.

The Democratic chairman of Northumberland County, Mr. Ed Brennan, first called my attention to the mine fire on the Sayre Colliery tract menacing the Mount Carmel area. At my request, the Bureau of Mines immediately conducted a survey of the extent and character of the fire, with recommendations as to how it could be brought under control. I have a copy of the report here which I should like to have inserted at this point in the RECORD as one part of my remarks, since it describes in detail the nature of the problem and the difficulties involved in bringing these mine fires under control. Under this appropriation the Federal Government will be able to go in and carry out their own recommendations and end this threat to life and health and property in Mount Carmel, and will be able to attack similar fires elsewhere in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, and in some of the Western States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE MINE FIRE, ABANDONED STRIPPING, MOUNT CARMEL TOWNSHIP, NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY, PA., OCTOBER 17–18 AND 28, 1947

(By Charles F. Weber and W. S. Eltringham, coal-mine inspectors)

INTRODUCTION

A mine fire in an abandoned stripping cut in the Mammoth vein workings in Mount Carmel Township just east of the Mount Carmel Borough was investigated on October 17–18 and 28, 1947, by Messrs. Charles F. Weber and W. S. Eltringham of the Bureau of Mines.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The fire is on a tract now in possession of the county having been taken over on January 1, 1945, for taxes.

It adjoins the Richards Coal Mining Co., Inc., on the south and the Cass Coal Co. on the west whose mineral rights are in the Mount Carmel Borough.

Only property damage is involved at present by the fire; however, if the fire is not eliminated, fumes may present a definite hazard to residents in the vicinity of Fourth and Pine Streets, which block contains about 10 double dwellings immediately adjoining the fire area.

The fire started in an open abandoned stripping pit which years ago uncovered and mined the Mammoth vein, which in this area is approximately 38 feet thick, overlain by sandstone and clay ranging from 70 to 120 feet.

The area is in a broad basin dipping gradually to the south and west.

Numerous mine fires have occurred in the Mammoth vein in active mines in this section; however, the areas were either inundated or sealed, and no serious results are recorded.

STORY OF THE FIRE AND FIRE-FIGHTING OPERATIONS

Information gained from borough officials, the county engineer, and nearby residents points to the fire having started some time in October 1946 at a point in an old stripping cut wherein garbage and refuse was being disposed of by area residents, and the supposition is that the rubble was ignited by boys who used this means to smoke out rats which had infested the area, thus providing themselves target practice.

Apparently the stench from the fire was disagreeable to property owners adjoining the location, and upon complaint several days were spent by various parties of volunteer fire companies of Mount Carmel Borough using their equipment in an endeavor to extinguish the fire; however, since the location of the fire was not within the confines of the borough, an appeal to the Mount Carmel Township authorities for assistance did not meet with any cooperation, so apparently the whole effort was abandoned. This was a grievous mistake, for about January 1, 1947, the seriousness of the situation was realized and steps were taken to combat the fire.

Between January 1 and June 15, 1947, an excavating firm by the name of Martinez & Broderick undertook to stem the fire by digging a trench in Mount Carmel Township east of and parallel to the Mount Carmel Borough line.

The burning area was uncovered and work progressed within the limits of the equipment, which according to reports was not equal to the task at hand, and after the vein was exposed it was stated by residents that the isloation of the fire became secondary to the loading and stripping of coal, of which 122 railroad cars were recovered.

About this time the residents of the eastern end of Mount Carmel became incensed over the lax efforts being applied to control the fire and demanded relief from the fumes and fine red fly-ash which was constantly settling over the area, and after some desultory backing and filling work was suspended, leaving a considerable area of exposed coal as ready fuel.

It was stated that this venture cost the county approximately $50,000.

Considerable jockeying in ownership and receipt of royalty, it is stated by a reliable businessman, has been in progress the past several years.

The area involved was originally opened in 1858 and worked by independent operators until about 1900, when it was acquired by the Lehigh Valley Coal Co. Subsequently the area was partly stripped, and upon abandonment of operations in the western middle anthracite field by the Lehigh Valley Coal Co., the property was idle until October 1, 1938, when the Cullen Coal Co. leased what is known as the Kennedy tract from the Western Middle Field Coal Co., a subsidiary of the Lehigh Valley Coal Co., and began operations both underground and by pocket stripping.

The Western Middle Field Coal Co. sold on March 15, 1941, to the Cullen Coal Co., 84.57 acres which was part of the area this company had under lease. About June 1943 the Cullen Coal Co. leased this acreage to the Richards Coal Mining Co., Inc. The fire is now presumed to have ignited old workings in this acreage. The Richards Coal Mining Co., Inc., acquired the tract on May 27, 1947, and ceased operations about September 15, 1947.

An adjoining tract of coal consisting of 261.62 acres just west of the fire area wholly

within the Mount Carmel Borough was acquired by quitclaim deed from the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co. by the Cass Coal Co., on December 7, 1946, after the offer to purchase was refused by the Mount Carmel Borough. This area is presently not affected by the fire, but may at any time become ignited.

On October 15, 1947, in order to afford temporary relief from the fumes which have been permeating homes in the vicinity of Fourth and Pine Streets, the Penn Construction Co. commenced filling the abandoned strip cut where the coal is exposed in an effort to seal the openings and supposedly smother the fire.

The expense is being borne jointly by the borough and the county; however, due to limited funds it is doubtful whether the purpose will be accomplished, since to completely fill the void it is estimated that an expenditure of approximately $120,000 would be necessary.

In conjunction with the back-filling operations which are still in progress, it is also proposed to well-drill the area south and west of the fire area with the expectation of slushing the voids in the old workings, as shown on the mine map, to prevent the spread to valuable deposits still unmined.

It is the opinion of experienced mining men of the area and the Federal investigators that the only successful manner to combat this fire and to prevent its spread and ultimate destruction of thousands of tons of coal is to isolate the fire by uncovering and extracting the vein material, then backfilling the voids with noncombustible clay or other inert material.

A preliminary estimate of the cost of isolating the fire by means of two stripping cuts is as follows:

Handling 333,000 cubic yards clay and top rock	$175,000
34,000 gross tons of coal	34,000
Total cost of excavation	209,000
Cost of back-filling	20,000
Total	229,000
Estimated yield from coal	137,000
Estimated cost of work	92,000

Accompanying photographs and maps show the location and extent of the fire.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Work should commence immediately toward the absolute elimination of the fire by striping and back-filling with incombustible material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writers wish to acknowledge the courtesies extended and information given by Robert W. Weary, county engineer; Harry W. Jones, Mount Carmel Borough engineer; and the State mine inspectors of the area.

Respectfully submitted.

CHAS. F. WEBER,
W. S. ELTRINGHAM,
Coal-Mine Inspectors.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate has added $2,500,000 for synthetic liquid fuels, to bring this item up to the full budget amount of $9,750,000. As the Senate committee report points out, the House cut would prevent the Government from reimbursing the Koppers Co. for work it has already performed in connection with the synthetic-fuels program already under way. The new plant which the Government has just constructed near Pittsburgh, and which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] dedicated recently, marks a great step forward in our goal to assure adequate fuel supplies in coming years by converting some of our vast deposits of coal into liquid fuel.

Along the same lines, I wish to express my support of the secondary oil-recovery program provided for in this bill because it will help to make certain that our oil wells in western Pennsylvania and elsewhere will not be abandoned prematurely, with a tremendous wastage of oil which would be lost to us forever. Last year the Congress foolishly cut this item, as it did the synthetic-liquid-fuels program, only to discover that the economy involved in such cuts was false economy. Enabling legislation, in several cases not even necessary, was subsequently rushed through to make it look as if the Congress recognized all along the value and necessity of these programs which the same Congress had previously so brutally cut. I trust the lesson has been learned.

I should like to make one more reference which I consider appropriate, and it is to the gaging streams funds of the Geological Survey. Last year the House cut this activity out completely before learning much about it. The Senate helped to save part of the appropriation. I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD the statement I delivered before the Senate Appropriations Committee last year in reference to this item.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, 1947, IN RE 1948 INTERIOR FUNDS FOR GROUND-WATER INVESTIGATIONS, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Stopping this activity, as proposed by the House, at a so-called saving of $845,000 is another example of irresponsible "economy" at the expense of normal, traditional, necessary functions of Government. The House committee, in its wisdom, has proclaimed that this work is "not justified" and should be done by the States.

Mr. Chairman, shall we leave weather forecasting to the States? This proposal is no less nonsensical.

The Geological Survey has the trained manpower—which the States do not—and the equipment—which the States do not—to do a vast research job with little expense. In Pennsylvania, for instance, this function costs the Federal Government only about $15,000 a year which the State matches dollar for dollar, and together this sum represents the total working capital on a job which saves the Federal Government untold thousands of dollars in water costs at the Philadelphia Navy Yard alone.

In addition, the service provides Pennsylvania cities and industries with scientific data on underground water which is of vital importance.

Stopping the program now would bring to an abrupt end studies which have been going on since 1931 on water-level fluctuations in observation wells, studies essential in predicting future availability of ground water. In recent years the service has aided numerous communities in Pennsylvania to obtain essential data on their own ground-water supplies. A major cooperative program is now under way with Philadelphia and another with Pittsburgh. Both would stop.

The Philadelphia Planning Commission has urged me to enlist the committee's aid in restoring the appropriation, pointing out that without the essential data the city would be handicapped enormously in completion of plans for the industrial development of Philadelphia and its metropolitan area. The study now under way, this commission informs me, will be extremely valuable to industries seeking locations in or near Philadelphia, industries which require ground water for numerous reasons, chiefly involving chemical content of the water.

Should this work end now, the Philadelphia Commission reports, the money the city has already spent in behalf of the work would be money thrown away since no other agency exists to do the technical work.

The members of this subcommittee, I am sure, already know of the importance of the ground-water work in their own States, and, I think, will agree with me on the necessity for restoration of this very modest appropriation, modest in terms of the valuable services it brings to all of our people, and particularly to industry and to tax-supported agencies.

May I say in conclusion, after this very lengthy presentation, that I was amazed to find, in looking into the matters in this bill which I have discussed, how very diverse and important are many little-known functions of the Government in our own States.

The action of the House committee in cutting the Interior Department funds so substantially has brought home to me, and I think to many Senators, the real service we do receive from a host of Federal agencies providing technical and research assistance, agencies which go about their work quietly and unostentatiously and which we seldom appreciate until we are on the verge of having their functions eliminated.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the House this year, although not eliminating the item as it did last year, cut the budget for gaging streams by about $500,000, a cut which the Senate committee has wisely voted to restore. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a letter I received a few days ago from I. P. Davis, technical superintendent of the American Viscose Corp., at Marcus Hook, Pa., reporting that firm's experience with this work of the Geological Survey, which he credits with helping the corporation to avoid sudden shut-downs which would have thrown out of work more than 2,000 employees, and halted production of textile materials in short supply.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN VISCOSE CORP.,
Marcus Hook, Pa., June 2, 1948.

Hon. FRANCIS MYERS,
Senator From Pennsylvania,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: I am writing you in reference to an outstanding service which has been performed by the Division of Surface Water, Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior, in its activity in gaging streams.

The Marcus Hook plant of American Viscose Corp., the oldest rayon-producing plant in America, and the first rayon plant to receive the Army-Navy E in the late war, is situated on tidewater of the Delaware River. When the river flow decreases, due to dry weather in summer, or an ice jam in winter, the deficiency is replaced by sea water, the salt content of which makes the production of rayon impossible.

With adequate warning, steps can be taken to operate evaporating and demineralizing equipment to remove the offending impurity. Should the salt appear without warning, however, we would be in grave danger of finding operation impossible, throwing our over 2,000 employees out of work, and con-

tributing further to the shortage of textile materials and inflation in general.

To receive such warning, Mr. O. W. Hartwell, district engineer, United States Geological Survey, at Trenton, N. J., has been supplying us daily with the volume of Delaware River flow at Trenton. Based on past experience, we can from these flows anticipate the possibility of salt water and take proper steps to avoid an economic catastrophe to our company and employees.

I hope that you will see fit to bring these facts to the attention of those who evaluate the work of the above-mentioned Division.

Very truly yours,

I. P. DAVIS,
Technical Superintendent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6705) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WHERRY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. O'MAHONEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked how long it is proposed that the Senate shall continue in session tonight. If it meets with the approval of the Senate, I shall ask that the Senate continue in session until 10 o'clock. It is proposed that the bill providing appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies shall now be considered. If action on that bill cannot be completed by 10 o'clock tonight it is proposed to ask that it go over until tomorrow. The chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], is very optimistic, however, and feels that the Senate may be able to conclude action on the bill within an hour. If the Senate can conclude action on the bill within that time, I think it should be done, because it is important that that bill, as well as the one on which we have just completed action, shall go to conference tomorrow in order that the conferees representing both Houses may iron out the differences which exist between the two Houses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that is a reasonable suggestion, and I am sure Senators will stay here until 10 o'clock to see if we cannot complete action on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. House bill 6481, making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was reported to the Senate on last Saturday.

The committee has given careful consideration to the many requests for changes in the bill as approved by the House. Few changes have been made in the House bill. In most instances the House made minor reductions in the amounts for administrative expenses which should result in no impairment of functions should the administrative officials make a sincere effort to cooperate with the Congress in its desire for reduced expenditures.

The following summary gives the amounts provided for in the bill and other comparisons:

APPROPRIATIONS

Amount of bill as passed by House	$37,979,061
Amount of bill as recommended by the Senate committee	42,062,061
Net increase over the House bill	4,083,000
House allowance under budget estimates by	[1] 16,665,039
Senate committee allowance under budget estimates by	[1] 12,582,039

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

Amount of bill as passed by House	$68,933,600
Amount of bill as recommended by Senate committee	70,483,100
Net increase over the House bill	1,549,500
House allowance under budget estimates by	6,357,000
Senate committee allowance under budget estimates by	4,807,500

[1] Includes $5,000,000 contract authorization requested but denied by committee.

TVA STEAM PLANT

It will be noted that the appropriations in the bill as approved by the committee exceed those of the House bill by $4,083,000. This difference is largely accounted for by an allowance of a request for an appropriation of $4,000,000 to the Tennessee Valley Authority, with which to undertake the construction of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in this item. I hope the Senate will pay special attention to it. The subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its activities is being investigated at this time. Extensive hearings have already been held, and further hearings will be held upon the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It occurs to me that before we initiate expansion of that activity into an entirely new field, the generation of electricity through steam power plants, it would be very well, and I might say wise, for the Congress to wait until we see what the situation is before we appropriate $4,000,000 to start a new activity there. In other words the Public Works Committee of the Senate, which deals legislatively with the Tennessee Valley Authority is holding hearings at this time. Those hearings will continue. At the next session of the Congress the committee will be ready to report upon its findings with respect to the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and make recommendation concerning its activities.

Therefore I point out to the Senator that we would be starting upon an entirely new effort if construction of a stand-by and auxiliary steam plant is begun for the generation of electricity in the midst, I might say, of that inquiry. I suggest the thought that it might be quite the better part of wisdom to wait until the investigation and inquiry have been concluded before proceeding with an appropriation for a new endeavor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the chairman of the subcommittee is in the awkward position of coming to the floor with a report containing one item, the $4,000,000 just referred to, which he was against in the subcommittee, and again in the full committee. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia that it is ill-advised to start the expenditure on this steam plant, which will cost $54,000,000 when completed, and will cost in addition about $30,000,000 for lines and equipment, a total expenditure of from $83,000,000 to $84,000,000. This item represents merely the breaking of the ground. As I said, I am in the awkward position of coming here and presenting the bill, but having voted against the particular item now being discussed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is the steam plant for the purpose of firming up the TVA generating units, or is it to level off so-called high-peak generating capacity of the TVA units.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the evidence demonstrates that this plant will be used for future development in the Tennessee Valley. I am satisfied that the evidence shows that to be so. In other words, it is anticipated that next year there will come into this valley a number of industries, and the year after that, an additional number, and so on.

Mr. THYE. In view of the fact that the Senator says industries will be there, it simply means that there is no limit to what the demand will be if a steam-generating plant is built today. If the load is built up to the capacity of the TVA unit, plus the steam plant, it will be only a matter of a few years when the TVA authorities will come back and say the Government must build additional generating units in order to supply the demand that has been built up because the current was not available in sufficient amount.

I should say, Mr. President, that we are venturing upon a very dangerous precedent so far as the United States going into the business of erecting steam generating plants to generate current is concerned, because I can readily see that hydroelectric plants in connection with the impounding of water to control floods are a sound practice of Government; but when we go into steam generating plants to supplement that power, then I say the Government is going into business.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, may I ask if the bill is now open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The bill is not yet before the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN. I desire at the proper time to offer an amendment pertaining to this particular item which would strike out, on page 2, line 11, "$25,689,000" and restore the original figure; and in line 13, to strike out the words "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn."

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. I think it would be better to discuss the subject when the amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Connecticut that it is not necessary to move to strike out those items. They are in the bill by way of committee amendment, and the Senate can pass on the question by voting the committee amendments up or down.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Minnesota stated a while ago that the evidence showed that this power had reached its limit, and that the proposed appropriations were not for firming-up purposes. I differ with the Senator. All the evidence showed that it was for firming-up purposes. There is an immense amount of power produced by water from several rivers—the Tennessee, the Cumberland, and several smaller rivers tributary to those streams. Such a large amount of water power necessarily must be firmed-up by power manufactured by a steam plant.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. How many months out of the year is there water power going to waste because it is not possible in any sense to burden the unit with a load which would consume the current generated at the maximum generating period of water flow? How much actual water power is lost because there is no stand-by steam plant to take up the slack period?

Mr. McKELLAR. The slack period occurs in the fall of the year, when there is a very great lack of water power, and it is necessary to have steam power. It must be remembered that the private companies owned their own plants in Tennessee, just as they did in every other State. They voluntarily sold their private plants, both water plants and steam plants, to the Tennessee Valley Authority. They have their money, and they have departed from Tennessee. They do not now own plants in Tennessee. They have no plants of any kind, either water power or steam plants. All facilities are owned by the Tennessee Valley Authority. By voluntary act of the private power companies in Tennessee, they have all sold their properties. It is one concern. The Tennessee Valley Authority owns all the facilities. The sale was made entirely voluntarily. The private companies sold out at a big price—several hundred million dollars. The Government furnished the money to pay for those plants, and the power companies received the money.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. To whom did they sell?

Mr. McKELLAR. To the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, to the Federal Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Federal Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Federal Government really ran them out of business.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it did not. It depends on the way the Senator looks at it. The people of Tennessee do not look at it that way. There is a wonderful establishment down there.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire what is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. LUCAS. Then what are we talking about?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators are discussing House bill 6481, which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has not asked to have considered by the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it in order to get something before the Senate before we discuss it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from Michigan is in process of asking for the consideration of House bill 6481.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in order that we may have something before the Senate for consideration, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6481, making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think we might consider the first committee amendments.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. In order that my remarks to the senior Senator from Tennessee may not be misunderstood, I wish to say that I fully agree with him on the question of flood control and the hydroelectric units in connection with the impounding of water for flood control. I have been over the TVA project by plane, and have attempted to acquaint myself with the entire project. It is most commendable.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very glad the Senator has done so.

Mr. THYE. Another question comes to mind. When we commence to talk about supplementing a so-called flood-control electric-power project with steam, we are going in business as a Federal Government; and I must know definitely in my own mind, in order that I may make my position clear, whether we are attempting to firm up a unit in order to make it more economically sound, or whether we are merely trying to generate current to take care of an anticipated industrial demand. If we are trying to supplement power created by Muscle Shoals or TVA to supply industrial demands, then I say that I cannot go along with the Senator, because that is putting the Government into business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can understand the Senator's position.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator has asked a very appropriate question. I invite his attention to the testimony of Mr. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of TVA, in which Mr. Clapp stated:

> We have reached a point where, to get the most out of the hydro installations that we have been putting in in these last years, steam capacity is necessary to help firm up the otherwise seasonal power that we get from the hydro projects.

That is found on page 38. On page 45 we find this additional statement from Mr. Clapp:

> The virtue and the necessity for these steam plants, therefore, is to firm up and help make more useful the water power that we can generate from the river.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. THYE. Did Mr. Clapp state in his testimony specifically the amount of possible seasonal loss because he has not the steam plant to firm up his power? Did he give any indication of how many kilowatt-hours were lost by reason of the fact that he had an abundance of water in a few months of the year, and nothing

to supplement or firm up the power during other months of the year?

Mr. HILL. I cannot put my hands on that point.

Mr. THYE. That is the most important question that is before us, I must say, because anyone can see that it is desired to firm up the power; but the kilowatt-hours lost in the so-called flush rainfall season of the year is the information I must have in my mind before I can act intelligently on the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in reply to that question, I wish to read from page 13 of the House committee report:

> It appears equally clear from the testimony before the committee that there will be available from present and prospective generating facilities without the proposed steam plant an entirely adequate supply of power for the foreseeable demands of these preferred classes of customers. In other words, there is no necessity whatsoever for the installation now or in the foreseeable future of the proposed steam plant so far as the preferred class of customers is concerned. In fact, at the present time less than a third of the power generated by TVA is used by the preferred customers. The balance is sold to industrial users and private utility companies, including such companies as the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., Victory Chemical Works, Reynolds Metal Co., etc.

As I understand, the testimony showed that today there is in Memphis, Tenn., a steam plant that is not being operated, but which could be used to firm up any power. They do not need that power at the present time. They anticipate in the future large industrial developments in the Tennessee Valley, and they want to be ready by 1952, with this $54,000,000 plant, to furnish power to those new industries.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The question is very clearly this, in my mind: We are building for an anticipated load, in this particular area; but we know that we are striving and almost compelled to have brown-outs on the Pacific coast, for lack of current today, and we have had brown-outs in the New England area for lack of current.

If the Government is going to enter into business to firm up for an anticipated load, we had better first take care of our actual needs in the sections of our Nation where today we have a necessity for brown-outs, rather than to attempt to meet a future, anticipated load in the section referred to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota, if I may.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators will please take their seats so that the Chair can tell who is pitching and who is catching. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few moments ago the Senator from Minnesota asked about testimony that may have been given as to the amount of loss by reason of not having the power firmed up properly with additional steam generating units. I do not recall that at any time the number of kilowatt-hours was specifically stated; but I remember this testimony, which I think bears on the question the Senator from Minnesota asked: It was testified by all the witnesses that private concerns operating hydroelectric systems would have approximately 25 percent of their systems provided with steam-generated power in order to firm up their hydroelectric systems, but that in the TVA system that now amounts to only approximately 16 or 17 percent. In other words, it is far below what a prudent and economically operating private concern would have.

With reference to the matter the Senator from Michigan read from the House committee report, about having the generating capacity measure up, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Michigan and the attention of the other Senators to the fact that it was clearly brought out before the Senate Appropriations Committee that the House committee report was based on a set of charts which was presented to the House committee by Mr. Purcell Smith. I wish to read just one question which was put to Mr. Smith, and his answer. This question was propounded by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. He said, in talking to Mr. Smith:

> Then the truth is that these graphs that you have here really—it may not be your fault—but they do not present a true picture; do they?

And please listen to Mr. Smith's answer, and remember he was referring to the same set of charts on which the report from which the Senator from Michigan has read was based:

> Mr. SMITH. Certainly not, because we presented them on the basis that the reports made, and we said what they were.

He admitted there that when he talked about preferred customers, for instance, he did not include the power that goes to the United States Government and its various agencies, whereas according to the basic act of the TVA, the United States Government is No. 1 among its preferred agencies or customers. In other words, he was not including the power that was going to the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge. He was not including the power that was going to all the arsenals and war-material manufacturing plants down there—plants operated by the Government.

So I do not believe it is right or fair or proper to rest upon a report which, in turn, was based upon a set of charts which Mr. Smith himself, this $65,000 power lobbyist, admitted was not correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. What are the needs in the Tennessee Valley area that are not now supplied? What are the actual needs? In other words, is industry there starving for lack of current? Are the Rural Electrification Administration projects there in need of current?

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that they are not. They are trying to build for an anticipated load, whereas today we in the Middle West are hungry for current. Today there is a need for current in the brown-out States on the Pacific coast. The St. Lawrence seaway proposal was rejected last spring at a time when the New England area was shutting down for lack of current; but Congress could not even see fit to appropriate sufficient funds to make an intelligent study of the St. Lawrence seaway project. However, now we are asked to build a plant for an anticipated load 5 years from now. It simply does not make common sense, to my mind.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I answer the Senator?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that the St. Lawrence seaway project was not voted down with my help. I joined with the Senator from Minnesota in behalf of that project, just as I have in behalf of other power projects, in order to prevent the very thing the Senator has so ably pointed out. Of course, we cannot build all power projects all over the country at one time; we must take them as they come.

The Senator asks whether industry is starving in that area today. I shall not say it is starving today; but there is a normal load that is coming, and certainly it will take us 5 years to build for it. We have Rural Electrification area lines going out into the country, but of course a REA line is no good unless it is made "hot." We have the war plants down there, and I think the testimony throughout the hearings will show that if there were an emergency today, there would not be sufficient power in the Tennesee Valley to permit the operation of the war plants that are there.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I must call to the attention of the able Senators that there was enough current there to operate the plants during the war, and there is sufficient current there today; and last fall a new hydroelectric generating unit was added to the dam structure, to supplement that which was available at the time when the war was in its full progress.

Again I call attention to the fact that the testimony of Mr. Clapp tells us that we are trying to build for an anticipated load, rather than to build to meet the necessities of the demands upon it as of today.

On the other hand, we have in the United States other areas that we must take care of in order that we shall be strong enough to meet any emergency in the future; and the New England area is one, and the Pacific coast area is the other.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it seems to me that in adopting this committee amendment, we shall be making a very marked departure from what at

least I, as one American citizen had assumed, was the policy behind the Tennessee Valley Authority development. I had always supposed that in that valley or in those valleys we had the problem of a great potential of water power going to waste, and we also had a flood-control problem; and in order to deal with those two problems, I assumed that those appropriations of Federal funds were made from funds taken from the taxpayers all over the country, in order to create that marvelous public work—let me say that I am heartily in accord with that. If it is possible for the Government to do something there which private industry could not do, if it is possible for the Government to use its funds to develop a program which private capital cannot develop, it seems to me that is a highly desirable thing to do.

But what has happened, Mr. President, is this: Since that development has been put into operation during the course of the years, because of the cheap power in that particular area, new industries have been attracted there. I may say I am in accord with that. If by developing a natural resource our Government can attract new industries with cheap power, there is no reason under heaven why it should not do so. But this goes one step further and takes a vital, compelling step.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe I have the floor. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I was impressed by the Senator's statement that new industries had been attracted from other sections of the country to the valley. Can the Senator name any?

Mr. BALDWIN. I cannot name any; no. I am not familiar with them. I would hope some might be attracted there. But I want to develop further that point.

Mr. STEWART. There have been new industries developed there, but none have been taken from any other section of the country.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad of it and I am very glad that new industries can be developed there; but it seems to me that as a matter of policy these new industries should be allowed to develop there at public expense only by using the facilities nature has placed there in the rough, and that the Government has taken advantage of.

When we step in and use money from the Federal Treasury to install a steam plant to meet what might be the increased demand for power, because it is cheaper than it is in some other sections of the country, we are using Federal funds to develop this locality and gradually drawing from other parts of the country the industries which are there, industries which must remain there to support the populations in the other areas, and to provide the tax revenues to carry on their governments.

It seems to me, Mr. President, we must adopt here and now one of two policies: We have either got to say on the one hand that a natural resource can be developed, and when that resource is used to its utmost Federal funds can then be used to supplement it at public expense, or a policy can be adopted that we shall use and develop a natural resource with public funds to the point where it can be used by those who want to use it, but when we get to the point where the demand for its use increases beyond what naturally is there without supplementation, then we should move over to some other area with the public funds and develop it.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that is a marked division of policy. I am heartily against the committee amendment. I believe it does violence to a very fundamental principle, and I think it is unfair to other parts of the country that are willing and glad to support the Federal Treasury. But we ought not to support with their tax moneys programs which in the long run will make it impossible for them to continue their operations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD some evidence which was furnished to the committee by Charles A. Eaton, Jr., vice president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce. It has been argued here that one of the reasons why the Tennessee Valley Authority is anxious to install the steam plant is the cheapness of power. We all know that in the Tennessee Valley there has been a subsidy. For instance, a corporation in the State of Connecticut that furnishes power and makes a profit has to pay an income tax. It has to pay interest on its mortgage or bond money. It has to pay State and local taxes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am not only thinking of the point the distinguished Senator from Michigan has just made, but I am thinking of what goes further than that, because if industries are attracted away from New England and away from other parts of the country by this opportunity for cheap power provided at public expense, then we lose the employment that goes with those industries, which is vital to the maintenance of the States in our section of the country. So it goes far beyond the question of the power companies involved. It goes right back to our economy.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that. I had in mind that the power company must charge a certain rate in order to operate, and that if industries cannot operate as cheaply in Connecticut as they could with Federal power in the Tennessee Valley, they are going to move to the Tennessee Valley. That is why I want to place in the RECORD the letter Mr. Eaton sent to the committee, which reads:

> In answer to the question you asked me the other day when I testified on the TVA steam power plant proposal, I would like to submit the following information from the Federal Power Commission report R-36, entitled "Typical Electric Bills," published in April 1948.

That is the Federal Power Commission report.

> The rates given are as of January 1, 1948.

Commercial power service

Kilowatt-hours of billing demand	Kilowatt-hours	Rates per kilowatt-hour	
		Memphis	Jersey City
1½	150	$5.18	$7.52
3	375	11.50	17.55
6	750	20.13	32.91
12	1,500	31.63	60.73
30	6,000	89.70	190.42

That is why, as the Senator says—power cannot be furnished as cheaply in the other States, where it is necessary to have private power. As I see the picture, and as I saw it at the time of the hearing, certain power is available by virtue of flood-control operations and certain power by virtue of the use of navigable streams, and such power should be used. It should be supplemented by private or free-enterprise power rather than by Federal Government power. That is the whole question. The question is one of socialization. Should the Reynolds Metal Co. go into the Tennessee Valley and use the power which is provided from the dams, and then say: "We want to put in a extra plant, and therefore we demand that the Federal Government install a steam plant."

All over the country private enterprise has built private power plants. They do not demand from the Federal Government that power be furnished at Government expense. We face that question, which is one of policy, a question of what the taxpayers are willing to do. Yes, power derived from flood-control works should be used, and power generated from navigable streams should be used; but the question which I think we must solve is, Should ground be broken by the use of Government money to provide power to build up industry, and to provide for every industry that wants to go into the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. The Senator refers to the price at which the Authority sells its power. It sells it at a price per kilowatt which is not very much below the price charged by private industry. In other words, the Authority sells it for approximately 3.1 mills. Private companies sell it at approximately 3.78 mills packed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood that it was 3.4 and 3.7; but the Senator is probably correct.

Mr. BUCK. Is it not true that the appropriation will lead to an expenditure of $54,000,000 before the plant is completed?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and $84,000,000 for all of the connecting power lines, and so forth.

Mr. BUCK. Is it not proposed that the plant will produce approximately 250,000 kilowatts of power, which it intends to build up to approximately 1,000,000 kilowatts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should have to check that figure.

Mr. BUCK. I think it is correct. That is in addition to 2,500,000 kilowatts which

the Authority now produces, and it is planning to increase power from dams. I should like to point out to the Senator that it is my understanding that a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works will carry on an investigation of the TVA and report to Congress next year. I think that would be a very proper time to consider this additional expense.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have just been advised by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] that the Senator from Delaware is correct. The committee is making a study of the Tennessee Valley question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to say to the able Senator from Michigan that I did not realize I would precipitate the deluge of discussion which has occurred, but I am very delighted that it has occurred, because in the Senator's discussion he definitely brought out views upon other questions which are being inquired into in the present investigation into TVA, and, as stated by the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], that inquiry is proceeding, and it is expected that at the next session of Congress a report will be made to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works. We have been told time and again that the Tennessee Valley Authority was established for the development of the Tennessee Valley, for flood control, and for the use of the water for the generation of electricity. Apparently we would be told now that waterpower has been developed to its full extent, and we are asked to appropriate money to construct a steam power plant. That has not been done previously with Government funds, as I understand, in that particular valley. It is a new expansion of the activity of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a moment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator wants to give the facts, I am sure.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Certainly I do. It seems to me that the investigation could go into what is really there and what can be done. No step should be taken until that investigation is completed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator stated that there were no steam plants in TVA. There are steam plants there. The fact is that in the original construction of the first dam, the Wilson Dam, there was a large steam plant. Everyone who knows anything regarding electric power and its operation knows that if we are to have an economical, wise, and businesslike operation there must be steam plants to firm up the secondary interruptible power.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think I ought to answer the Senator from Alabama, in connection with the question of the use of power at the Muscle Shoals plant. Is that what the Senator had in mind?

Mr. HILL. I do not know of any limitation at all on the power there. I made the point that in the beginning, steam plants were erected. We bought steam plants. There are five large steam plants and some smaller plants in the power system.

Mr. FERGUSON. But there are some that are not being used at the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is it not a fact that the steam plants were purchased and turned over at the time, or shortly after, the construction of the Tennessee Valley power project; and is it not a fact, as we have been told, that so far as the use of steam plants is concerned, there is a steam plant available in or near Memphis?

Mr. FERGUSON. In Memphis.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is not being used at all, is it?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. I promised some time ago to yield to him.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I want to address myself to a phase of the question under consideration which I do not believe has been discussed. It is particularly in answer to questions which were asked by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] a few moments ago. I realize that some time and at some place the Congress must fix the limits of the powers and authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority and in the construction of steam plants, and for other purposes. I am cognizant of that fact.

But, Mr. President, I contend that we have not yet reached that time and place in determining whether this particular steam plant should be built. The questions which we must determine are first, whether there is legal authority to construct the plant, and second whether it is good policy to build the plant.

Speaking first to the question of legal authority I call attention to the fact that when the constitutionality of the TVA was determined the courts held that the TVA did have the authority and right to dispose of surplus power developed in its hydroelectric system.

This authority to dispose of surplus power is not restricted to the dams which are now in existence, but to dams which are now being or may be constructed in the system.

The power of TVA to dispose of all of the surplus power which may be developed by any dams which exist or may be constructed in the Tennessee Valley is limited, of course, by appropriations which Congress may make.

The courts have gone further and have said that the TVA has authority to market efficiently surplus power developed at the dams.

The courts have authorized the construction of transmission lines by the TVA, so that the Authority could efficiently transmit and sell its power. The point was raised that such action was unconstitutional. The courts held that the Tennessee Valley Authority could sell its surplus power, and could take action to sell it efficiently.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to finish.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Kentucky may finish.

Mr. COOPER. I repeat that the point has been settled that the TVA has not only the power to sell power from its dams but that it has the power to sell efficiently. I think everyone must admit that the efficient sale of power contemplates the construction of sufficient steam plants necessary to efficiently sell the power. Upon the basis of the decisions to which I have referred I make the point that the TVA has the legal authority to construct the Johnsonville steam plants if it is necessary to sell efficiently the surplus power developed by all the dams in existence or to be constructed by 1952, at which time the steam plant would be completed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am yielding to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Is the construction of this plant necessary to balance out the power developed at the dams? The testimony of Mr. Clapp at the Senate committee hearings indicated that the TVA is now producing 2,571,000 kilowatts and that the present production from steam plants is 450,000 kilowatts. Figures quoted in the hearings indicated the lowest ratio of kilowatts developed by steam as against water power of private companies in the area is 31 percent. The ratio in the TVA is much lower. If the Johnsonville Dam is built it will produce 375,000 kilowatts. I say that when it is built, the kilowatts produced, added to the kilowatts which are now being produced by steam plants, in the system will just be sufficient to enable TVA to balance out hydro power and to sell efficiently the power that will be developed at all the dams now in existence and those being constructed. Upon the basis of the testimony that was given, the legal authority to built the plant is present. I will speak later of the policy considerations which lead me to conclude that the plant should be built.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, my only reason for asking for recognition at this point was that the junior Senator from Kentucky more or less directed his statement to me at the outset. I wish to say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that he is entirely correct; I do not believe there is any question in the mind of any one of us as to the legal authority of the TVA. But I come right back to the question, whether we firm up the present power by the steam plant or not, that it would be perfectly sound if the load were there and there were a brownout in that area because there was not sufficient current available at all hours of the day to meet the demands. But when the current is available to meet all

the demands, and we are building with an anticipation of what the loads might be 4 or 5 years from now, and trying to balance off when there is steam standing available to meet any possible emergency of drought, then I say we are going too far as a Nation in building up for an anticipated load when we have so much else in the Nation demanding Federal appropriations, to assist in worthy projects such as flood control, which will involve hydroelectric generating in connection with flood control, as well as the domestic and the industrial needs, such as New England areas and the Pacific area have pressed not only on the Congress, but on the public utility units in existence in those localities. So I wish to say that the Senator from Kentucky is correct on the legal phase, but the load is not there demanding that the current be generated.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Michigan in yielding. I wish to take 2 minutes to lay a ghost here tonight, and the ghost I want to lay is the one that is raised by the Senator sitting just in front of me, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. From the depths of his soul he cried out in mental anguish lest some of the great industries of New England attracted by the mercenary desires for lower power rates might leave the sacred soil of New England and go to the South.

Perish the thought. It is improbable in my judgment. The perspicacity, the zeal, the admiration, the loyalty, and the advantages which accrue to the industries of New England from New England would prevent any one of them leaving there. New England, land of scenic splendor, land of great traditions, land of energy, courage, and high aspirations—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, each and all of them. There they stand. Cordially we say to industries in other parts of the country, come on in, the water is fine. Come from the South, come from the West, come from the North, but come to New England, land not only of scenic splendor, land of thrift and prudence, land that years ago gave the Nation the splendid manhood and womanhood that developed the United States into a Nation par excellence under God. Welcome to New England. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, could there be a finer moment for the Senate to adjourn?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is now past 10 o'clock, and with such an eloquent speech to go home and sleep on and dream about, I think we had better conclude the session.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I propose tomorrow to offer two short amendments to the bill, and I ask that they be received and lie on the table, and also that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendments were received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 3, line 7, strike out the figure "$4,840,000" and insert "$6,200,000."

On page 3, strike out the proviso beginning on line 20 and ending on line 1, page 4, which reads as follows: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public housing agency any contribution occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Public Housing Administration or its predecessor agencies."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The unfinished business is the long-range agricultural bill, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It has been temporarily displaced by the appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been temporarily laid aside for the consideration of House bill 6481. The Chair will point out that that bill is now open to the first committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been informed by several Senators that they would like to have the Senate go back and take up another bill on the calendar. I ask now whether, when the calendar is called between the hours of 11 and 1 o'clock tomorrow, the unfinished business will still be the long-range agricultural program bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not believe we can conclude consideration of the pending bill now, because the hour is too late.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not quite understand what the Senator said about the unfinished business. The bill now under consideration was taken up by motion.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes, it was.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the unfinished business?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The bill now under consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was advised that when the bill now being considered came before the Senate, inadvertently or otherwise, it was taken up by motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no objection to the motion, however. So it can be construed as unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand, Mr. President. How does the Chair know there was no objection? A vote was had, a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair was in the Chamber at the time and listened very carefully, and the present occupant of the Chair heard no objection whatever and no negative vote.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would so hold, in order to expedite the procedure of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph J. Hancock, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone, vice Bunk Gardner, retired; and

Howard C. Gilmer, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia, vice Frank S. Tavenner, whose term will expire June 5, 1948.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 11 o'clock, a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 15, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 14 (legislative day of June 1), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard M. Connell, of Missouri.
Joseph B. Costanzo, of New York.
Woodruff Wallner, of New York.

Albert E. Carter, of Tennessee, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

D. Chadwick Braggiotti, of Connecticut.
Richard I. Phillips, of California.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Henry W. Kassel
Edward K. Reid

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Malcolm J. Williams
Jerry W. Carter, Jr.
John C. Eberhart

PROMOTIONS

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Lee C. Watkins
William F. Ossenfort
Joseph O. Dean
Ivan W. Steele
Kenneth R. Nelson
Vane M. Hoge
Frank F. Thweatt, Jr.
Gilbert L. Dunnahoo
Eddie M. Gordon
Ralph Gregg
Edwin G. Williams
Gerald M. Kunkel
Harold D. Lyman
Frederick W. Kratz
John D. Lane, Jr.
Donald J. Hunt
Chapman H. Binford
John A. Trautman
Joseph A. Bell
Edward C. Rinck
Gordon A. Abbott
Sidney P. Cooper
George W. Bolin
Waldemar C. Dreessen
Noka B. Hon
Otis L. Anderson
Claude D. Head, Jr.
Mason V. Hargett
Cassius J. Van Slyke
Thurman H. Rose
Victor H. Vogel
Thomas B. McKneely
William G. Workman
Robert K. Maddock
Alfred B. Geyer
Robert H. Flinn
Roy E. Butler
Leland J. Hanchett
Richard C. Arnold
Austin V. Deibert
John L. Wilson
Leslie M. Smith
Llewellyn L. Ashburn
Oliver C. Williams
B. Oliver Lewis
Clifton K. Himmelsbach
John W. Oliphant
Seymour D. Vestermark
Hollis U. Maness
Leroy E. Burney
Charles R. Mallary
Michael J. Pescor
Don S. Cameron
George H. Hunt
Harry Eagle
Dean A. Clark
Norvin C. Kiefer
Myron D. Miller
George L. Fite
Arthur W. Newitt
H. van Zile Hyde
Robert H. Felix
Walter Griffey

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948:

Virgil J. Dorset
John R. McGibony
Robert F. Martin
Herman E. Hilleboe
Theodore L. Perrin
Harris Isbell
David J. Zaugg
Howard D. Fishburn
Rolla R. Wolcott
James F. Lane
John N. Bowden
Ralph B. Hogan
Waldo B. Edwards
Vernon B. Link
Norman H. Topping
James A. Grider, Jr.
Byron J. Olson
Harold R. Sandstead
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith
John A. Lewis, Jr.
Dale C. Cameron
Leo D. O'Kane
Jack L. James
Leon S. Saler
Thomas A. Hathcock, Jr.
Robert C. Dunn
Randall B. Haas
Charles G. Spicknall
Vernam T. Davis
Harold T. Castberg
Terrence E. Billings
James R. Shaw
James Watt
Edgar B. Johnwick
Lawrence W. Brown
Francis J. Weber
Thomas R. Dawber
Theodore F. Hilbish
Michael L. Furcolow
George E. Tooley, Jr.
Robert L. Zobel
Thomas F. Crahan
Raymond F. Kaiser
Glenn S. Usher
James V. Lowry
Harold M. Graning
Karl Habel
Francis T. Zinn
Robert T. Hewitt
Robert R. Smith
Murray A. Diamond
Max R. Kiesselbach
Weldon A. Williamson
Robert D. Wright
Joseph S. Spoto
Aaron W. Christensen
John P. Turner
Waldron M. Sennott
Benjamin Highman
Curtis G. Southard
Daniel J. Daley
James J. Griffitts
John B. Vander
Albert L. Chapman
George K. Massengill
Michael B. Shimkin
Lloyd S. Rolufs
Dorland J. Davis
Joseph C. Sturgell
Robert A. Hingson
Robert L. Griffith
Kenneth W. Chapman
James K. Shafer
Benno K. Milmore
John D. Porterfield
John T. Wright
Benjamin Wolfman
Allen B. Eschenbrenner
Ralph W. McComas
William J. Brown
Louis Jacobs
Bryan A. Dawber
Carl L. Larson
James A. Smith
Glen E. Ogden
George F. Ellinger
David B. Wilson
John F. Oesterle
James L. Southworth
Joe M. Chisolm
Clarence L. Hebert
Leslie W. Knott
Robert J. Anderson
William H. Stimson
William S. Baum
Albert N. Sarwold
William G. Budington
Kenneth M. Endicott
Samuel S. Spicer
James B. Donaldson
Jesse D. Harris
Malcolm J. Ford
Donald W. McNaughton
Edwin N. Hesbacher
James A. Finger
Robert Lincoln Smith
George E. Parkhurst
Arnold B. Kurlander
Stanley E. Krumbiegel
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Emerson Y. Gledhill
Clarence B. Mayes
Mark E. Myers
Daniel MacKillop
Ray H. Vanderhook
William J. McAnally, Jr.
Nunzio J. Carrozzo
Carl Enna
W. Clark Cooper
Robert W. Biach
Clarence Kooiker
Harold J. Magnuson
Jack C. Haldeman
Walter S. Mozden
Paul C. Campbell, Jr.
David E. Price
Charles L. Williams, Jr.
Charles C. Shepard
James L. Baker
Wayne W. Carpenter
Selwyn H. Drummond
Timothy J. Haley
Michael J. Clarke
Linden E. Johnson
James M. Hundley
Russell I. Pierce
Luther L. Terry

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948:

Richard H. Linn
Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.
Leland C. Burrill
Warfield Garson
Willie G. Simpson
Keith F. Farr
Norman C. Morgan
Robert E. Staff
John W. Smillie
Sidney Krohn
William P. Ramey
Leo J. Gehrig
Robert Leslie Smith
Arthur E. Rikli
Stuart H. Martel
David S. Citron
Leonard T. Kurland
Robert B. Shelby
Carl A. Boswell
William A. Himmelsbach
Thomas A. Burch
John G. Robinson
Andrew L. Hoekstra
Gordon B. Wheeler
Alan D. Miller
Charles L. A. Wehr
Louis B. Thomas
Leon T. Atlas
Harry E. Halden III
Martin M. Cummings
Robert B. Dorsen
John C. Wrye III
Albert V. Myatt
Frederic D. Regan
Gove Hambidge, Jr.
Lewis Francis
Kirkland C. Brace
Hans R. Huessy
Terrell O. Carver
Milton J. Miller
John H. Miller
Elroy G. Burgwald
Carl R. Reed
Carroll D. Savage
John P. Lombardi
Vincent E. Price
Frederick G. Germuth, Jr.
Daniel Shapiro
Robert H. Dysinger
Robert B. Neu
John J. Antel
Heinz R. Weisheit
Roy P. Lindgren
Edmund V. Cowdry, Jr.
Gleb A. Nedzel
Alton Meister
Clyde H. Dabbs, Jr.
Robert S. Weinhaus
W. Burton Haley
Ralph T. Behling
Marion F. Graham
LaVere G. White
Lindsay K. Bishop
Howard W. Halfman
Robert E. Greenfield, Jr.
Eugene A. Vaccaro
Clarence A. Velat
James R. Green
Maurice W. Peterson
Charles C. Griffin, Jr.
Robert D. Dooley
John S. McMillin
Kenneth W. Horne
Robert M. Farrier
Stuart M. Sessoms
James B. Dukes
Francis P. Nicholson
Robert A. Mattingly, Jr.
Robert C. Rodger
Luther E. Smith
Joseph Leighton
James J. Thorpe
Sheldon Dray
Donald Harting
Cornelius J. O'Donovan
C. Brooks Fry, Jr.
Robert E. Westfall
M. Lawrence Brockmyer
Donn G. Mosser
Henry D. Smith
Robert P. Ralls
Henry C. Savage
A. McChesney Evans
John L. Lightburn
Virgil Hanson
Raymond N. Brown
Raymond G. Halvorson

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

David Cooper
Fritz R. Jackson
John A. Hammer
James F. Lewis
Thomas L. Hagan
Ray P. Breaux
James S. Miller
Gordon G. Braendle
John M. Francis
Charles B. Galt
Robert A. Scroggie
Leland E. Weyer
Leonard R. Etzenhouser
Mark E. Bowers
Joseph J. Dunlay
Walter J. Pelton
Robert H. Moore
Frank E. Law

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948:

Charles H. Wright, Jr.
Howard J. Woodbridge
Francis A. Arnold, Jr.
William W. Calhoun, Jr.
George E. Waterman
William C. Neaf
Joseph G. Yount
Clovis E. Martin
Donald J. Galagan
Joseph E. Unsworth
James O. Blythe, Jr.
Fred D. Lewis, Jr.
Francis J. Walters
Vernon J. Forney

Assistant dental surgeons to be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948:

Richard P. French
Joseph W. Fridl
Charles P. White

Sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Ellis S. Tisdale
Omar C. Hopkins
Vincent B. Lamourexu
James H. Le Van
Franz J. Maier
Maurice LeBosquet, Jr.

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948:

Walter N. Dashiell
Mark D. Hollis
Frank E. DeMartini
Vernon G. MacKenzie
Gordon E. McCallum
Ralph Porges
James G. Terrill, Jr.
Richard T. Page
John S. Wiley
August T. Rossano, Jr.

Assistant sanitary engineers to be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948:

William W. Payne
Frank A. Butrico
Henry J. L. Rechen

Senior assistant engineers to be engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948:

Joseph E. Flanagan, Jr.
Lucian E. Renes

Assistant pharmacists to be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948:

Donald E. Wenschhof
Robert E. Jones
Henry L. Verhulst

Scientists to be senior scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Heinz Specht
G. Robert Coatney

Junior assistant nurse officers to be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective July 1, 1948:

Anne K. Buck
Mary F. Callan
Dorothy L. Connors
Rita A. Arzt
Vivian L. Gibson
Roberta C. Brave
Margaret M. Cahalan
Mildred K. McDermott
Mary B. Krause
Mary C. Larkin
Emilie S. Wilson
Mary E. Evans
Florence J. Ullman
Jennie H. Rakich
Janine A. Dziejowski
Anne Woudema
C. Vistula Lancaster
Virginia L. Roberts
Ruth I. Webb
Alice M. Driscoll
Nelle F. McCarthy
Elaine Felt
Pauline M. Gronas
Ann M. Zidzik
Elsie M. Pinkham

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Vincent William Bezich, O38457, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 3, 1948.

First Lt. John Thomas Monaghan, O38455, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 3, 1948.

First Lt. Philip Edward Dunn, O50379, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Colles Valentine, O50385, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 12, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Andrew Anderson, O50386, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 12, 1948.

×First Lt. Thomas Joseph Hurley, O50389, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 14, 1948.

First Lt. Fred Ernest Karhohs, O56540, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 14, 1948.

×Second Lt. James Polk La Croix, Jr., O41330, United States Army, with rank from May 16, 1948.

×First Lt. John A. Falkenburry, Jr., O41331, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 16, 1948.

First Lt. Vaughn Gradie Evans, O38460, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 17, 1948.

Second Lt. John Howard Tooles, O50392, United States Army, with rank from May 18, 1948.

×First Lt. Phil Riter Garn, O50395, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 19, 1948.

Second Lt. William Cloyde Jones, O50396, United States Army, with rank from May 19, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Healy Harrington, O56543, United States Army, with rank from May 9, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Mac Farlane, O38463, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 20, 1948.

First Lt. Lewis Vincent Posich, O50397, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 22, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Wilder Lewis, O50400, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Donald O'Connor, O38471, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 24, 1948.

First Lt. Fred Gordon Anderson, O38473, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 27, 1948.

First Lt. Harvey Dodson Hawley, O50402, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 28, 1948.

First Lt. Keith Francis DuBois, O50403, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 28, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph James O'Hare, Jr., O56560, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 30, 1948.

First Lt. Anthony Lavite, Jr., O38474, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from May 31, 1948.

First Lt. David Nell Bennett, O38475, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 2, 1948.

×Second Lt. Richard Dovey Harding, O56562, United States Army, with rank from June 2, 1948.

First Lt. Dwight Alban Riley, Jr., O27058, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Perry Catts, Jr., O27059, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Lochlin Willis Caffey, O27061, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Warren Robert Stumpe, O27062, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Lawrence Paape, O27063, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Andrew Gilligan Favret, O27065, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leonard Joseph Gilbert, O27066, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Norman Douglas Mallory, O27068, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Cyril Joseph Brown, O27069, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest Paul Braucher, O27070, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Henry Ugis, Jr., O27071, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Monroe Bush, O27072, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Fred Wharton Rankin, Jr., O27073, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ira Augustus Hunt, Jr., O27074, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Garland Sivley Landrith, Jr., O27075, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Wegley McBride, O27076, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Brockenbrough Taylor, O27077, Army of the United State (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Olivier Hero, O27078, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Carl Trefz, O27079, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Dorsey Taylor Mahin, O27080, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Colin McRae Carter, Jr., O27082, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William George Kratz, O27083, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Garrett Stewart, O27084, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph John Rochefort, Jr., O27085, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Whelan Fehrs, O27086, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. DeWitt Archibald Nunn, O27087, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Douglas Clark Atkins, O27088, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Carl Erickson, O27089, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Julius Heyman, O27090, Army of the United States (second lieutenand, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Luther West, O27091, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Philip Jarvis Dolan, O27092, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Roscoe Allen Barber, Jr., O27093, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wilbert Joe Kovar, O27094, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Amos Luther Wright, O27095, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Atlee Chidlaw, O27096, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Glenn Samuel Brunson, Jr., O27098, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Kirkpatrick Boyce, Jr., O27100, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Muir Nichols, O27101, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Severin Kristoferson, O27102, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Edward Wyatt, Jr., O27103, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Raymond Hylander, Jr., O27104, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Louis Barnes, O27105, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Russell Brownell, Jr., O27107, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Edward McConnell, O27108, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army) with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Alan Ekberg, O27111, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Charles Faulkner Carter, Jr., O27114, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Van Deusen Millman, O27115, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Delbert Marcom Fowler, O27117, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Harvey McMurray, O27118, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Henning Linden, O27119, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Mathew Mueller, O27121, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Erhard Mehner, O27122, Army of the United States (second lieuten-

ant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Clough Nelson, O27124, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Carleton Clymer, O27125, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clark Speer Campbell, O27126, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Phillip Tyler 3d, O27128, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry James Shaw, O27131, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Charles Gelini, O27132, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Spann, O27135, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Pringle Gardiner, O27136, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Joseph Nichols, O27138, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Scott Adler, O27139, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Hulbert Groves, O27141, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Albert Garman, Jr., O27142, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Madison Garrett 3d, O27143, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Carroll Edward Adams, Jr., O27145, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest Edward Lane, Jr., O27146, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Howard James Dager, Jr., O27147, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Everett Eugene Love, O27148, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Henry Wirries, Jr., O27150, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Walter Jerome Slazak, O27151, United States Army with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ernest Lauriston Hardin, Jr., O27154, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leon Arthur Cookman, O27156, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Marvin Louis Price, O27157, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edgar Douglas Kenna, Jr., O27158, Army of the United States (second lieutent, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Carter McAlister, O27159, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Edward Dowd, Jr., O27160, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James George Christiansen, Jr., O27161, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Ellis Dexter, O27162, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Charles LeRoy Reynoldsen, O27163, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Washington Graham, O27164, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Jackson Bowen, O27165, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Patrick O'Keefe Callahan, O27168, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harvey Cooper Jones, O27169, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Oscar William Portman, O27170, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Iszard McFadden, O27171, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest John Denz, O27172, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Vernon Wyatt Pinkey, O27174, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Clinton Musgrave, O27176, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. John James McCulloch, O27177, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Taylor Rhett, Jr., O27178, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Harold Johnson, O27179, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Sides Hartline, O27180, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Houghton Lohn, O27181, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Alvin LaBoon, O27183, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Archibald Vincent Arnold, Jr., O27184, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore F. Gerwin Adair, O27185, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lawrence John Klima, O27188, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Irving Kothrade, O27190, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Michael Michalak, O27191, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Philip Bertram Polak, O27193, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur Pancratius Hanket, O27194, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. John Ashley Noble, O27197, U. S. Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Richard Walter Paul Boberg, O27198, U. S. Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Benson Wier, Jr., O27200, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Monor Collins Mabry, O27201, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Jay Kohler, O27203, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore Hays McLendon, O27204, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Reynold Martin Eckstrom, O27207, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Thomas Neal, O27210, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Peter Berg, Jr., O27211, Army of the United States (second lieutenant U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Dean McNaughton, O27212, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leslie Sherman Ayers, O27213, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Albion Williamson Knight, Jr., O27216, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Frederick Holcomb, O27219, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William James Love, O27224, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Joseph Hesse, O27226, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Douglas Albert Lott, O27227, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Yates Bohn, O27228, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. George O'Neil Adkisson, Jr., O27229, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. James Alva Munson, O27230, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Donal Joseph Wolf, O27231, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Fred Eugene Jones, O27232, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Gibson Tomlinson, O27233, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Farquharson Muehlke, O27234, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Leslie Marben, O27235, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Cornelius William Wakefield, Jr., O27236, Army of the United States (second

lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Donald Edward Fowler, O27237, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Horace Abbott Macintire, O27238, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Norwood Robinson, O27239, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Keith Reierson, O27240, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Bates Cavanaugh Burnell, O27241, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Abram Vorhees Rinearson 3d, O27242, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marion Wiles Trotti, O27244, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Clarkson Crane, O27245, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George George Francis Smith, Jr., O27247, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Wallace Fye, O27248, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ira Burdette Coldren, Jr., O27249, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Keith Chandler Nusbaum, O27251, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Dale Earnest Lorkard, O27252, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Geoffrey Brooks Keyes, O27253, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nikitas Constantin Manitsas, O27254, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Palmer Scott McGee, Jr., O27255, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Stanley Gunnison Calder, O27256, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph Patrick O'Hanlon, O27257, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Dale Stanley Hall, O27258, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Dermont Sheppard, Jr., O27259, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Metcalf Hall, O27260, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Charles Bennett, O27263, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph George Hadzima, O27264, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Otis Collins Myers, Jr., O27265, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Richard Gorder, O27267, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kenneth Mason Moore, Jr., O27272, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Arthur Ruth, O27273, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Roland Ladensohn, O27277, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Robert Laurence Barr, O27279, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Putnam Waldner Monroe, O27282, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Higgins 4th, O27285, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Edward Fox, O27288, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Earl William Fuqua, Jr., O27289, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Philip Downing, Jr., O27290, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Eaton Kelly, Jr., O27291, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Oscar Dietsche, O27292, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Donald Horton Henderson, O27293, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wallace Kieth Wittwer, O27294, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Henry Norris, O27295, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Vincent McGuinness, Jr., O27296, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Lythgoe Black, O27297, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Philip Lewis Lansing, O27298, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Lavern Clark, O27300, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Louis Renshaw Fortier, O27302, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Thomas Nelson, Jr., O27303, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Cutter Gage, O27304, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Dorsey Nacy, O27308, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Mark Edmond Rivers, Jr., O27309, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Levin Barnett Broughton, O27310, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Arnett Steinhagen, O27312, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Fayette Loomis Worthington, O27318, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ward Winston Dworshak, O27320, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Chapman Carnes, O27321, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Mantey, O27323, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clarence Richard Driscoll, O27324, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rabun Watson Griffith, O27326, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Herbert Joseph McChrystal, Jr., O27327, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Amy), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Howard Arthur Baldwin, O27329, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Thaddeus Stewart, O27331, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Collingwood Hastie, O27332, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Kimball Vaughan, O27333, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Vernon Howard Harper Newman, O27336, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Louis Haley, O27342, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Bruce Olen McCracken, O27343, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Muir Cunningham, O27344, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Morris Webster, Jr., O27345, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Patrick William Powers, O27346, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Earl Hayes, O27347, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Thomas Everett Marriott, O27348, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Bernard James Wichlep, O27349, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Erlenkotter, O27350, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Almon Richard Roth, O27355, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Russo, O27356, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Lynn Henshaw, O27357, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Chester Lutz, O27359, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert James Mann, O27361, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Anson Churchill, O27362, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clifford Martin White, Jr., O27363, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Sylvan Edwin Salter, O27364, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Ricketts Batson, O27365, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Henry O'Brien, Jr., O27369, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Henry Elkey, O27370, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harle Hoyt Damon, O27371, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Francis Greer, O27373, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Francis Suelzer, O27374, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Fredendall Hoge, O27375, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Thure Forssell, Jr., O27376, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edmund Gus Heilbronner, O27378, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Edward Dingeman, O27380, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred William Klement, Jr., O27381, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rupert Watson Jernigan, Jr., O27382, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Burnham Nelson, Jr., O27383, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rupert Edward Hodges, O27384, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Roy Einsidler, O27388, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Neil Im Obersteg, O27389, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Glenwood William Flint, O27390, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Adorno Powers, O27394, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Greig Leghorn, O27395, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Park Wallsten, O27396, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Alfred Jess Price, O27397, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Clyde Loudermilch, O27398, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Hopkins Stites, O27399, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph Laird Woolley, O27400, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Benjamin Tanner, O27401, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore Franklin Wagner, O27403, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edward Stanley Saxby, O27404, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Wilbur Henry Vinson, Jr., O27405, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Guthrie, O27406, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Henderson Jones, O27407, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Robert Velie, O27410, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Thomas Frederick Tuttle, O27411, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Lawrence McCeney Jones, Jr., O27412, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Luther Clyde Campbell, Jr., O27413, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Allen Walker, Jr., O27415, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Arlington Daoust, Jr., O27416, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arthur Herbert, O27419, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Randall Upson Pratt, O27421, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg Starkey, O27422, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Bernard Edwin Johnsrud, O27423, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Orrien Truby, O27426, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Waldo Louis Carbonell, O27427, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Allen Stough, O27429, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph Collins Van Cleve, Jr., O27431, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Thomas Robert Gleason, O27432, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Claude Kitchin Josey, O27433, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Claude Monroe McQuarrie, Jr., O27434, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Markham Ferguson, Jr., O27436, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Warren William Cobb, Jr., O27437, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Arthur Hadley Lozano, O27438, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Henry Troxell, Jr., O27440, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Butler Graham, O27441, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Camillus Caruthers Sullivan, Jr., O27442, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth George Kochel, O27445, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joe Ignacio Martinez, O27446, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Reamer Welker Argo, Jr., O27447, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Doran Clark, O27448, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Perry Oldham Wilcox, O27452, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Edward Fitzpatrick, Jr., O27453, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Laurence Louis Heimerl, O27454, O27454, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Boyle Harrington, Jr., O27455, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert McKissen, Herron, 3d, O27457, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. John Bennington Bennet, Jr., O27458, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Joseph Parr, O27461, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Charles Williams, O27462, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Lewis Shadday, O27463, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edward Francis Gudgel, Jr., O27464, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Luther Kennedy, Jr., O27466, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leonard Alfred Humphreys, O27467, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Alfred Tolar, O27468, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Frank DeKay, O27469, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Joseph Vallaster, Jr., O27473, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Karl Raymond Llewer, O27474, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Lloyd Hayden, O27475, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Robert Harman, Jr., O27476, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Joseph Powers, Jr., O27478, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Combs Berger, O27479, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Frank Dubsky, O27480, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Maxwell Shilstone, O27481, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Wesley Gilland, O27484, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Harold Root, Jr., O27486, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Howard Johnston Hanson, O27487, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Searles Eneboe, O27488, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Oscar Miller, O27489, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Agnew Smith, O27490, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U .S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Anderson Daugherty, O27491, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Calvin Boleyn, O27492, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Fred Charles Parker 3d, A27493, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Oliver Amos, Jr., O27494, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Bernard Kusewitt, Jr., O27495, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Francis Tansey, O27496, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Gordon Hughes Shumard, O27497, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Strathmore Keith McMurdo, O27498, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Farrer Zeidner, O27499, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John James Briscoe, O27503, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harvey Stein Boyd, O27504, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Murray Ryan, O27507, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ross Walton Campbell, Jr., O27508, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alexander James Belmonte, O27509, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Claud Steward Hamilton, O27511, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Roy Wolfe, Jr., O27514, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Dale Wilson, O27515, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Eugene Myers, O27516, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Lucian King Truscott 3d, O27519, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Theodore Harding Halligan, O27520, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur William Fridl, O27522, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lamar Weaver, Jr., O27523, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Woodbury Carter, O27524, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army) with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edmund Randolph Preston, Jr. O27525, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Barton Waddington, O27527, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Tormin Adams, O27529, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Thomas Burke, O27530, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kincheon Hubert Bailey, Jr., O27531, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Taylor Kaye Castlen, O27535, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Francis Brown, O27540, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kenneth Russell Scurr, Jr., O27542, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Roy William Farley, O27543, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roland William McNamee, Jr., O27544, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Grant Conrad, O27545, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Boone Martin, Jr., O27550, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Clay Burgess, O27551, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948).

First Lt. Harold Francis Hogan, O27553, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Loren Goff, Jr., O27554, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Victor Calvert, O27555, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Magoun Wallace 2d, O27556, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Louis Henry Boettcher, O27558, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Leon Winthrop, O27560, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Morehead Alfonte, O27562, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rubin Siegel, O27563, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Harry Curtis, O27564, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Lawrence Wood, O27565, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jared William Morrow, O27566, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Robert Zeller, O27567, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hugh Clifford Oppenheimer, O27568, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Salley Jones 3d, O27569, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Edward McCarthy, O27570, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Fred Boiler, Jr., O27571, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Edward Stetekluh, O27575, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Augustus Raymond Cavanna, Jr., O27576, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clark Woods Burton, O27577, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Beeghly Tobias, Jr., O27578, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Trompen Harmeling, O27579, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Henry Holcombe, Jr., O27581, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Sumner Pierce, O27888, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Earl Caldwell Hardy, O27582, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Wingfield Morris, O27583, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Albert Jagiello, O27584, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Francis Myron, O27585, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Smith Barton Chamberlain, O27587, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lincoln Landis, O27588, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Fink, O27589, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard VanHouten, O27593, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest Scholten Ferguson, O27594, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Winslow Davis, Jr., O27595, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Milton Henry DeVault, O27597, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Gordon Allen, O27600, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Thomas Tierne, Jr., O27601, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Francis Borgia Kane, Jr., O27602, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wilfred Lee Rogers, O27603, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Franklin Holt, O27604, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rayburn Lester Smith, Jr., O27607, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Bert Frank Prentiss, O27608, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George William Casey, O27609, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Harlan Thomas, O27610, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Fred Kochli, Jr., O27611, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Asa Rasmussen, O27612, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. John Wahl, O27613, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Charles Bowman, O27614, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Bruce McCheane Barnard, Jr., O27616, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Joseph McDonald, O27618, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Everett Orville Post, O27619, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Adam Bruckner, O27622, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Anton VanHout, O27623, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Edward Melanson, Jr., O27624, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Vincent Ridenour, O27627, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Dudley Ingham, Jr., O27628, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U .S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jack Winslow Spiller, O27629, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edward Rexford McElroy, O27634, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Charles Tongue, O27635, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Herman Smith Napier, O27636, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frederick Carl Goeth, O27640, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Dale Eugene Mahan, O27642, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Evans Woods, O27643, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Senseny Eyster, Jr., O27645, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Milton Dolan, O27648, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jonas William Stuckey, O27649, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Thomas Scarborough, O27651, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Homer Shepherd Pitzer, Jr., O27652, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chester Craig Sargent, O27653, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Edward Glynn, O27655, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Brevard Hankins, Jr., O27656, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Neale Mackinnon, O27889, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rolfe Louis Hillman, Jr., O27661, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Bryant Nerdahl, O27664, Army of the United States (second lieutenenan, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harris Markham Findlay, Jr., O27666, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Cox, O27667, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Gordon Krebs, O27668, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ralph Moe Hinman, O27669, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Baker Carrington, O27670, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Albert Crowe, O27672, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James King Edwards, O27673, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James William Howe, O27674, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Walter Robert Adkins, Jr., O27675, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Lee Davis, O27677, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harold Gregory Moore, Jr., O27678, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William James Reidy, O27679, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Norman Lawrence Lasker, O27680, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur Bryan Greene, O27681, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Craig Stewart, Jr., O37682, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur Luke Doyle, Jr., O27684, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Uel Armstrong, O27685, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Bickford Edward Sawyer, Jr., O27689, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Melvin Eugene Gustafson, O27693, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Donald Volney Rattan, O27695, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Walter Joseph Cain, O27696, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Neil Joseph O'Donnell, O27697, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George DuComb Kahlert, O27698, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Tom Lomax Schwinn, O27699, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Keith MacArthur Stewart, O27700, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Armand Smith, O27701, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Locke Robson, Jr., O27702, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Wade Harvey Shafer, O27703, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Marshall Horan, O27704, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Eugene Zook, O27708, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert James Maris, O27711, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Echols Spragins, O27712, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Alfred Henry Herman II, O27713, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Lindsay Withey, Jr., O27714, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Henry Johnson, Jr., O27715, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Benson Crowell, O27719, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Charles Waring, O27721, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Colclough Geer, O27722, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edmund d'Autremont Pickett, O27723, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Michael Gilligan, Jr., O27724, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Henry Emmette Hutcheson, Jr., O27725, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lester Atchley Sprinkle, Jr., O27726, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Warren Wallace Drake, O27727, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Davison Drake II, O27728, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Oliver Perry, Jr., O27729, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas George McCunniff, O27732, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Cary Sibert, O27733, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Thurman Root, O27734, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Kelley Patchell, O27735, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Reynolds, O27736, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Fred John Archibald, O27737, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Russell Daniel McGovern, O27738, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Morris Forbes, O27739, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Hayden Hughes, O27740, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Robert Holland, Jr., O27741, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Earl William Bell, O27743, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Quentin Charles LaPrad, O27744, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Burton Oliver Lewis, Jr., O27745, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leon Curtis Byrd, O27746, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Erskine Smith, O27747, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Joseph Glunz, O27748, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Albert Wylie Childress, Jr., O27749, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Inman Thompson, O27750, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edwin John Gilmore, O27751, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Wiley Warren, O27752, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John James Wuchter, O27753, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Barney Groves Schneckloth, O27756, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Arthur Theodore Flum, O27759, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Edward Lee, O27760, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Louis Woodward, O27761, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Collins, O27764, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Angelo Lombardo, O27765, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Burt Hause, O27766, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Lee McDaniel, O27771, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Loxley Radford Scott, O27772, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Marcello Joseph Del Vecchio, O27774, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edmund David Poston, O27775, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Austin Stuart, Jr., O27777, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Ingersoll Starr, O27779, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Milton Dair Stone, Jr., O27782, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Schilling Senger, O27783, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Calvin Hamilton, O27785, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond J. McCarrell, O27786, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Austin Joseph Yerks, Jr., O27787, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John DeSales Murphy, O27789, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Henry Neff, O27790, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frank Ned Pavia, O27791, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Crosland Fee, O27794, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edwin Bartlett Kerr, O27796, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Northrup Ives, O27797, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Dick Longino 2d, O27798, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Ross Wheaton, O27800, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Eugene Joseph Gasior, O27802, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harold Dale Wolaver, O27803, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Donald Edwin Gross, O27805, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Louis John Schelter, Jr., O27806, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Howard Rehm, O27807, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jose Luis Carrion, O27809, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Stephen Albion Day, Jr., O27810, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frank Day McPeek, O27812, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Wilkinson Fletcher, Jr., O27813, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest Joseph Massari, O27814, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Edward Whittington, 3d, O27815, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Nelson Boehm, O27816, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Arthur Herbert Ringler, O27820, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Daniel Jackson, O27821, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Bernard Clark Dailey, Jr., O27822, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph Homer Hoffman, O27823, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Herbert Hamilton Price, Jr. O27825, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Charles Edward Knudsen, O27829, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harold Edwynne Curry, O27830, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Joseph Hughes, Jr., O27831, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Monroe Morris, Jr., O27833, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur Henry Truxes, Jr., O27834, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Arland Hertzog Wagonhurst, O27836, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Chapman Prescott, O27837, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph Chamberlain Hill, O27838, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Burton Crary, O27839, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Lyle Irving Edwards, O27840, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Victor McKerlie, O27842, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Lockett Malony, O27843, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Joseph St. Onge, O27844, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Howard Dallman, O27846, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Brock Maertens, O27847, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Adolphus Worrell Roffe, O27848, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Harold Jones, O27849, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Terrel Carley, Jr., O27852, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Charles Benson, O27853, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Orem Jett, O27856, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Van Dyke Ochs, Jr., O27857, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Stephen Pace, Jr., O27858, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lawrence James Fox, Jr., O27859, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Henry Devlin, O27860, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Clark Wood, Jr., O27861, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Blum Jr., A27862, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Delno Nelson, Jr., O27863, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Corbett McDonough, O27864, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Almon Leroy Shoaff, O27866, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Howard Reamy Bealmear, Jr., O27868, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph John Stanowicz, O27869, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Daniel Nathan Silverman, Jr., O27872, Army of the United States, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Carl H. Fischer, Jr., O27873, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kyran Martin Murphy 3d, O27874, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Milton Reese, O27875, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Everett Limpus, Jr., O27876, United States Army, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Burkhart Armstrong, O27879, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Paul Donovan, O27880, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Andrew John Gatsis, O27883, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kimball Sawyer Green, O38476, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 7, 1948.

Second Lt. Kenneth Dale Mertel, O38477, United States Army, with rank from June 8, 1948.

Second Lt. Clyde Luther Friar, O50410, United States Army, with rank from June 9, 1948.

First Lt. Peter George Olenchuk, O50411, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 9, 1948.

First Lt. Bion Quinton Shutts, O39472, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 10, 1948.

×First Lt. Leslie Edwin Shumway, Jr., O38478, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 11, 1948.

First Lt. Merle Francis Ormond, O38479, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 11, 1948.

Second Lt. Frank Durand Stevens, O56568, United States Army, with rank from June 13, 1948.

Second Lt. David J. Nicol, O38480, United States Army, with rank from June 14, 1948.

Second Lt. Howell Francis Stewart, O56571, United States Army, with rank from June 16, 1948.

Second Lt. Arthur Frederick Dorle, O56572, United States Army, with rank from June 16, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Oscar Collins, Jr., O50415, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 23, 1948.

+First Lt. William David Proctor, O38482, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 25, 1948.

Second Lt. Fiorenzo D. Losco, O56579, United States Army, with rank from June 26, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Frederick Staver, O50422, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 28, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Charles Yowell, O41335, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from June 30, 1948.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

First Lt. Forest Lee Neal, O38577, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 9, 1948.

Second Lt. Elnor L. King, O56774, Medical Service Corps, United States Army, with rank from June 20, 1948.

First Lt. John Hall Hunter, O38578, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 25, 1948.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

First Lt. Evelyn Louise Chadwick, N1159, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 18, 1948.

First Lt. Frances Aragon, N1486, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 15, 1948.

First Lt. Phyllis Hall, N1487, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 15, 1948.

First Lt. Janice Warrene Feagin, N1488, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 1, 1948.

First Lt. Murial Eva Eckelberg, N1490, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 8, 1948.

Second Lt. Marilynn Claire Stevens, N1491, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army, with rank from March 14, 1948.

First Lt. Gloria Frances Coradi, N1747, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 14, 1948.

First Lt. Bertha Grace Goodfellow, N1492, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 15, 1948.

First Lt. Maxine Miller, N1493, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 15, 1948.

First Lt. Bernadette Lucille Reider, N1494, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 15, 1948.

First Lt. Mary Margaret Breunig, N1495, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 15, 1948.

First Lt. Beulalys Masterson, N1498, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 15, 1948.

First Lt. Erin Eugenia Cannon, N1497, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 15, 1948.

First Lt. Audrey Pauline Atkinson, N1499, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 21, 1948.

First Lt. Rose Marie Ferrelli, N1500, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from March 29, 1948.

First Lt. Myra Jacqueline Hanlon, N1501, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from April 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Alma Ellen Virginia Wallsten, N1503, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army, with rank from April 16, 1948.

First Lt. Marian Waterhouse, N1619, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from April 23, 1948.

First Lt. Odessa Anna Falls, N1620, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from April 29, 1948.

First Lt. Clara Cotton Copeland, N1706, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from April 29, 1948.

First Lt. Golda LaWon Sloan, N1181, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 1, 1948.

First Lt. June Dorothea Harris, N1182, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 9, 1948.

First Lt. Jane Marilyn Valine, N1509, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 11, 1948.

Second Lt. Katherine Wilhelmina Schumacher, N1621, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army, with rank from May 12, 1948.

First Lt. Opal Thagard Cameron, N1510, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 13, 1948.

First Lt. Genevieve Annah Conners, N1183, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 14, 1948.

First Lt. Betty Mae Rasmussen, N807, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 14, 1948.

First Lt. Della Irene Murphy, N1622, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 15, 1948.

First Lt. Helen Sedor Comac, N1513, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 15, 1948.

First Lt. Mary Catherine Lachette, N1707, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 18, 1948.

First Lt. Olga Louise Chernak, N1514, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 19, 1948.

First Lt. Edna Fay Lichtenstein, N808, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 23, 1948.

First Lt. Jean Elaine Thompson, N1624, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from May 30, 1948.

First Lt. Ethel Marian Inglis, N1516, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 1, 1948.

First Lt. Ruth Evelyn Alexander, N967, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 6, 1948.

First Lt. Amy Louise Connors, N809, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 8, 1948.

First Lt. Evelyn Winnefred Lund, N968, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 14, 1948.

First Lt. Gisela Margaret Zernick, N1748, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 15, 1948.

First Lt. Evelyn Murray, N1184, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 15, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Eileen Sanford, N1185, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 16, 1948.

First Lt. Marian Frances Sindoni, N1518, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 18, 1948.

First Lt. Florence Marion Serbin, N1186, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 19, 1948.

First Lt. Betty Jane Walls, N1625, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 25, 1948.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

First Lt. Frances Mildred Davison, M10030, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from June 29, 1948.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Harry M. Berry	Phillip E. Hodge
Tommy F. Butler	Thomas M. Knoles III
John D. Cowgill	John R. Newton, Jr.
Raymond Goss, Jr.	Richard N. Rusk

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Thorvald A. Solberg, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy:

CAPTAINS

Lucien M. Grant
Lloyd Harrison
Roy T. Cowdrey

The following-named officer for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grade hereinafter stated, and to correct the spelling of the name as previously nominated and confirmed:

LIEUTENANT

Sherwood H. Werner

The following-named officer for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grade hereinafter stated:

LIEUTENANT

Charles V. Gardiner

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Francis J. McQuillen	Ben Z. Redfield
Luther S. Moore	Clifford H. Shuey
Harry S. Leon	Edward J. Dillon
Charles J. Schlapkohl	

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Ross S. Mickey	Henry Aplington II
Robert G. Owens, Jr.	Francis X. Beamer
Homer Sterling	George F. Waters, Jr.
Kenneth E. Martin	Richard I. Moss
John A. White	Lloyd G. Coutts

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Bennet G. Powers
Martin E. W. Oelrich
Jack F. McCollum

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Ralph E. Britt	Donald V. Anderson
Delmar M. Persinger	Donald T. Rohrabacher
James B. Carpenter, Jr.	George H. Hazel
John P. Lanigan	Henry W. Hise
Bernard McShane	Robert Floeck
Maurice H. Clarke	Frank S. Krasniewicz
Robert A. McCabe	Griffith B. Doyle
Richard J. Morrisey	John S. Reamy
Jack R. Munday	Alton P. Trapnell
Frank C. Thomas	

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Austin O. DeVol, Jr.	Woodrow B. Lewis
Jack W. Temple	Joseph A. Mitchell
Herbert A. Nelson	Tolbert T. Gentry
Warren R. Young	Neil Dimond
Sylvestus W. Holtzclawe	Henry D. Menzies
	Malcom C. Hagan
Anton N. Fassino	George G. Abadie
Elery G. Poppe	John L. Shearer
Walter P. Dean	George C. Henshaw
Robert G. Hayton	Walter L. Redmond
Ardell Ebel	Robert H. Barrow
William C. Doty, Jr.	Alvin J. Jensen

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Winslow E. Lewis	John K. Aller
Joseph S. Hall	Francis J. Field
Robert H. Piehl	Robert W. Barnes
Byron G. Genung	Jonee L. Helms
Cleon E. Nesbitt	Ermine L. Meeker
Frank R. DeNormandie	Ollie B. Porter
	Ernest C. Hargett
James C. Barr	James B. Oliver, Jr.
John A. Waters	Allen B. Clark
Raymond O. Ball	

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Harold E. Haught
Robert W. Wells

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 14 (legislative day of June 14), 1948:

POSTMASTER

The nomination of Willis R. Tapecott to be postmaster at Knox City, in the State of Missouri.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose glory is in all the world, make us keenly alive to the call of this day. Grant that the enactments of Congress may be wrought with calmness and directive wisdom, and that the bonds of understanding may grow stronger between all sections of our country.

Today we praise Thee for our national emblem, which stands for law and order, whose every thread was woven in sacrifice and honor, and whose colors will never run. Grant, O God, that the ideals which it represents may more and more obtain, and that it may never wave above anything that is sordid or disloyal or be handled save by those whose hands are clean and whose hearts are strong.

Turn the heart of our Nation away from mistrust and groundless murmurings into the realm of faith in our institutions and our way of life; these will be our best defense. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 12, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners in fee simple of the land leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California;

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint committee composed of members of the Senate and the House Public Lands Committee to make an investigation of our island possessions in the Pacific and trust territories and report back recommendations for legislation providing for civil government.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 1412. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone;

S. 1955. An act to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.;

S. 2322. An act to provide for the sale of a part of war-housing project No. Fla–8252–1 to the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida;

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2359. An act for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2460. An act to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and to transfer that retirement fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund;

S. 2730. An act to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment;

S. 2772. An act to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the service, and for other purposes;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations;

S. 2807. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for certain investigation reports in connection with insurance claims;

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes;

S. 2829. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators";

S. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution to change the name of the site of Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State to Chief Joseph Dam; and

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution welcoming the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States for its conference in Detroit, Mich., in May 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 19) entitled "An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that he will receive requests for extension of remarks but not for any 1-minute speeches.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CHALLENGE TO THE LEADERSHIP

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are getting fed up with double talk and verbal side-stepping.

If their sons are to be conscripted to police the world, surely the fathers and mothers are entitled to the truth.

They should be told in clear and simple language what our military policy is.

Is the United States military policy to enforce our ideas of government on every land in the globe outside of the boundaries of Russia? Then the boys who will die for that policy should be told that truth now.

If that sort of irreligious attempt to supplant God is not the policy, I challenge the leadership to state, in plain English, exactly what the so-called national defense does embrace. Until that statement is forthcoming the House should not even consider peacetime conscription.

I have sought the facts on this issue from Secretary of Defense Forrestal without constructive results.

I challenge the leadership to give us the truth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Post.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the fishing industry of Hawaii.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

I am advised by the Public Printer that one of the articles I wish to extend exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $110. Notwithstanding the excess, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include letters from the mayors of two Illinois cities.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an article from the Gary Postal Union, of Gary, Ind.

STATE DEPARTMENT POLICIES

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of June 13 contains an article by Mr. Constantine Brown entitled "State Department Rules as Top Policy Dictator." In my opinion, this is one of the most truthful articles ever published concerning our present State Department operations. I quote just one paragraph:

> It is within the province of the State Department, our foreign-policy framers say, to spend money, but it is not their job even to inquire where and how the money and materials are to be obtained from the 145,000,000 Americans who are called on now to support the rest of the world.

A realization that the State Department operates on this sort of phony philosophy helps us understand many of the amazing top-level policies and observations of the past few years.

I have placed Mr. Brown's article in the Appendix of the RECORD for posterity to study in its research into the strange customs and philosophies of our twentieth century.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday of this week following the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Senate; which was read by the Clerk:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 19) entitled "An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6758) making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 12, line 19, strike out all after "violence" down to and including "1947" in line 23.

Page 13, line 7, strike out all after "violence" down to and including "1947" in line 12.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DONDERO, ANGELL, WILSON of Indiana, McGREGOR, WHITTINGTON, LARCADE, and DAVIS of Tennessee.

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That subsection (b) of section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $35 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $12 per week: *Provided, however*, That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $12 per week, he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages.'

"SEC. 2. So much of subdivision (c) of section 8 of such Act, as amended, as precede paragraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Permanent partial disability: In case of disability partial in character but permanent in quality the compensation shall be 66⅔ per centum of the average weekly wages, which shall be in addition to compensation for temporary total disability or temporary partial disability paid in accordance with subdivision (b) or subdivision (e) of this section, respectively, and shall be paid to the employee, as follows:'.

"SEC. 3. Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Reasonable funeral expenses not exceeding $400.

"'(b) If there be a surviving wife or dependent husband and no child of the deceased, to such surviving wife or dependent husband 35 per centum of the average wages of the deceased, during widowhood, or dependent widowerhood, with two years' compensation in one sum upon remarriage; and if there be a surviving child or children of the deceased, the additional amount of 15 per centum of such wages for each such child; in case of the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or dependent husband, if there be one surviving child of the deceased employee, such child shall have his compensation increased to 35 per centum of such wages, and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased employee, to such children, in equal parts, 35 per centum of such wages increased by 15 per centum of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided*, That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ per centum of such wages. The deputy commissioner having jurisdiction over the claim may, in his discretion, require the appointment of a guardian for the purpose of receiving the compensation of a minor child. In the absence of such a requirement the appointment of a guardian for such purposes shall not be necessary.

"'(c) If there be one surviving child of the deceased, but no surviving wife or dependent husband, then for the support of such child 35 per centum of the wages of the deceased; and if there be more than one surviving child of the deceased, but no widow or dependent husband, then for the support of such children, in equal parts 35 per centum of such wages increased by 15 per centum of such wages for each child in excess of one: *Provided*, That the total amount payable shall in no case exceed 66⅔ per centum of such wages.

"'(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than $52.50 nor less than $18, but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased.'"

"SEC. 4. Subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 10 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) If the injured employee shall have worked in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, whether for the same or another employer, during substantially the whole of the year immediately preceding his injury, his average annual earnings shall consist of three hundred times the average daily wage or salary for a six-day worker and two hundred and sixty times the average daily wage or salary for a five-day worker, which he shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"'(b) If the injured employee shall not have worked in such employment during substantially the whole of such year, his average annual earnings, if a six-day worker, shall consist of three hundred times the average daily wage or salary, and, if a five-day worker, two hundred and sixty times the average daily wage or salary, which an employee of the same class working substantially the whole of such immediately preceding year in the same or in similar employment in the same or a neighboring place shall have earned in such employment during the days when so employed.

"'(c) If either of the foregoing methods of arriving at the average annual earnings of the injured employee cannot reasonably and fairly be applied, such average annual earnings shall be such sum as, having regard to the previous earnings of the injured employee in the employment in which he was working at the time of the injury, and of other employees of the same or most similar class working in the same or most similar employment in the same or neighboring locality, or other employment of such employee, including the reasonable value of the services of the employee if engaged in self-employment, shall reasonably represent the annual earning capacity of the injured employee.'

"SEC. 5. Subdivision (m) of section 14 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(m) The total compensation payable under this Act for injuries shall in no event exceed the sum of $11,000: *Provided*, That this subdivision shall not apply to cases of permanent total disability or death: *And provided further*, That in cases of disability compensable under paragraph (21) of subdivision (c) of section 8 the total compensation for such disability, and for any temporary total disability or temporary partial disability sustained in addition thereto, shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $10,000.'

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable only to injuries or deaths occurring on or after the effective date hereof."

And the House agree to the same.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
MAX SCHWABE,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH H. BALL,
IRVING M. IVES,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2237) to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the bill strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

(1) The House amendment contains the same schedule for permanent partial disability consisting of loss or loss of use of members of the body as does the Senate bill but eliminates the amendment to paragraph (22) of the schedule in the present act contained in the Senate bill, in order not to deprive persons who in addition suffer a period of temporary total or temporary partial disability of the full amount of compensation payable for such temporary total or temporary partial disability. The conferees have agreed to eliminate not only such paragraph (22) but all of section 2 of the Senate bill, with the exception of the introductory paragraph to section 8 (c) of the present act, which is to be amended so as to clarify the present law in accordance with existing interpretation of that law to provide for compensation for temporary partial disability as well as temporary total disability which is followed by a scheduled loss. Thus, with the exception of this clarification, the result is to leave section 8 of the present act unamended. This would be more favorable for most injured workers than the version of the Senate bill.

(2) The Senate bill would eliminate the present ceiling of $7,500 on aggregate total compensation for permanent total disability or death, and would increase the ceiling for other types of disability to $11,000, with a proviso that in cases arising under paragraph (21) of subdivision (c) of section 8 the total compensation in no event shall exceed $9,000. The House amendment eliminates this proviso. The conferees have agreed to restore the proviso but raise the total compensation therein specified from $9,000 to $10,000 and to clarify the proviso so as to make it clear that in any case coming within section 8 (c) (21) of the act the maximum total compensation of $10,000 is to include any compensation paid or payable for temporary total or temporary partial disability.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
MAX SCHWABE,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include in connection with my remarks an address made several years ago by the late Speaker Bankhead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at Riverside, Calif., starting on June 7 and ending on June 14, is being held the World Assembly of the Moral Rearmament Association, with distinguished delegates and representatives from 24 countries.

The meeting of the world assembly of this organization dedicated to the great work of moral rearmament or a return to God by individuals and nations, is a matter of world-wide importance.

This organization and its members recognize the source of the evils and the troubles of the world. Communicants and members of all creeds, they are uniting in a determined effort to get the world back on a sound pathway, which might well be termed "The Road of God."

We should convey to those attending the present world assembly our appreciation of their high motives and noble efforts. My brief remarks on this occasion are for this purpose. Also, that no matter how difficult the task may appear or how hard it may be to them that they will carry on with greater determination. Moral rearmament of all persons and all nations is the primary and real answer to the materialistic feelings and conditions so prevalent in the world of today. This period of materialism in my opinion will be followed by a long period of mutual faith on the part of the people of the world. History shows relapses from time to time but always followed by a recovery of spiritual truths and as a result the progress of mankind.

I congratulate those persons attending this world assembly. This work is not and will not be in vain.

On November 3, 1939, our late lamented Speaker, Hon. William B. Bankhead, in connection with the meeting at that time, held on December 1, 2, and 3 of 1939, of the world assembly of this association, made a beautiful and effective radio speech, prophetic in its

nature, which is most appropriate to refer to on this occasion and which I include in my remarks.

To this splendid association and its members I convey my congratulations and my best wishes, and the hope that they will carry on their work in the future with greater determination. Moral rearmament is the pathway to world stability, world happiness, and world peace.

THE RISE OF A NEW SPIRIT

(Address by the Honorable William B. Bankhead, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, over the National Broadcasting Co. Blue Network, November 30, 1939, inaugurating Moral Rearmament Week End, December 1, 2, 3)

I am glad tonight to inaugurate in the Americas the program for this first week end of December, when 100,000,000 people throughout the world will hear the challenge of moral rearmament.

There is a matter of even greater importance to America and to the world that the historic special session of Congress just concluded. For as nations cannot live without law, so law itself, whether national or international, depends for its force on the spirit in which it is enacted and obeyed. It is concerning the rise throughout the world—among the peoples of nations—of a new spirit that I wish to speak to you tonight.

For the past decide statesmen in many countries have been working for a harmonizing force within their borders, in order that political, racial, and industrial conflicts might be eased. A new search is being made for methods to insure honesty and confidence in business, a new fidelity and comradeship in home life, and a new hope in international relations. Enemies are becoming friends. Rivals are beginning to work together. Out of the materialism of the postwar years there has appeared the first flowering of a cultural renaissance. Most encouraging of all—a new type of citizen has emerged, who puts country before self, who is making the task of government easier and giving fresh dignity to the word "patriot."

HOPE FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE

Here in America, one effect of this rising tide of moral rearmament has been a renewed hope for industrial peace in those communities where it has formed a common meeting ground between capital and labor, and between opposing factions within the ranks of labor.

As for party politics, I myself have observed its effect in the Nation's Capital, where in these troublous times we are only too apt to think of ourselves as Democrats or Republicans, rather than as first of all Americans. Never in my long experience in Washington have I found anything on which all parties in both Senate and House have so thoroughly agreed as on America's need, and our own need, for this new spirit. It is making many of us realize that if we sincerely want national unity it is no use expecting the other party to make all the first moves; that our own party has possible faults which need correction in the national interest; and that it is a patriotic duty to have a spirit of national cooperation here at home.

Benjamin Franklin once warned the Continental Congress that they must hang together or they would hang separately. The alternatives today may not seem to be so sharply drawn; but considering the chaos of our times and looking forward in the perspective of history, they are not as wholly fantastic as they might appear. Certainly if any nation needs to learn how to work together, it is our Nation. No special social or political insight is required to point out that in national unity alone lies national strength.

CAUSE OF PAST FAILURES

Turning to the world situation, an old and loyal colleague of Woodrow Wilson like myself, may be forgiven for admitting that where we failed in our dreams for the original League of Nations was in not allowing for the fact that no international system, however nobly conceived, can endure without a new spirit in the nations which compose it. "Peace," Dr. Frank Buchman stated in a recent broadcast, "is not just an idea. It is people becoming different." Those words are worthy of serious consideration. They both point out the folly of the past, and chart a course for the peacemakers of the future.

After all, nations, like men, are much alike—responding to the same promptings of self-interest, nursing the same hates, haunted by the same fears. Each is jealous of her place in the sun—anxious to enlarge this place if feasible, to maintain it if possible, to relinquish it only if necessary. Most nations will accomplish these ends by fair means if they can; by other means if they must.

The essential condition of peace is a new spirit between nations. Without this new spirit no general settlement will be possible. A well-known columnist wrote recently that every nation is guilty, in that every nation has sinned. A frank recognition that all are responsible for the present situation, would go far toward bringing peace to Europe. Peace based on such a spirit could make both sides winners in this war. Otherwise the only winners are likely to be those forces of destruction, relentlessly at work in every land, for which a world conflict is the historic hour of opportunity.

A RACE WITH CHAOS

We stand today at a decisive moment in history. Forces of unmeasured strength are on the march. Is there a force which can rally the recuperative powers of mankind and win the race with chaos?

There is a force which can out-march all others and which, if we will, can shape the future. It is the mighty onslaught of a new spirit challenging men and nations to a change of heart. It is the cumulative effect of millions of people who listen to God and obey. Where we have been true to this spirit, man has prospered; where we have neglected it, nations have declined. Now is our chance to re-create for ourselves and for our children the way of true patriotism—the way of moral and spiritual force.

The call of the hour is a call to strength. Our country must look to her defense. But no material defenses can serve us long unless behind them there stands a united people, strong in spirit, conscious of a common mission, prepared for any sacrifice. Seventy-five years ago Abraham Lincoln wrote a warning which now we shall do well to heed: "At what point is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us, it must spring up among us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

A nation's first line of defense is the character of her citizens and the inspiration of her leaders. A country rich in land, in trade, in tradition, but poor in faith, declines. A country rich in faith is rich in everything. Restore character to a nation and you restore strength. Restore faith and you restore greatness. For character is wealth and faith is power.

The forces which cause war are not confined to the Old World. Working here in America are the same materialism, the same clash of interests, the same blindness to real issues, the same lust to acquire or hold power. The "haves" want to keep and the "have-nots" want to get. The way of sanity both in domestic and foreign policy is not to point the finger at the other party or the other nation. It is to start to remedy the world's ills where they most closely concern us—here in America.

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

The Pilgrim Fathers, whose first Thanksgiving Day we are celebrating as a nation, dedicated themselves and their future "to the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith." This is America's spiritual opportunity. To pursue it with every energy is America's first duty. If western civilization is to be preserved in the Americas, moral rearmament must become the mainspring of our national life and the touchstone of policy both at home and abroad.

All of us, whatever our race or creed, can apply this new spirit beginning with ourselves, our family, our business, our community. There must be an end to selfishness and ease. Every citizen must be mobilized to bring about that moral and spiritual preparedness which will enable America to stand secure.

If we can demonstrate that at last on this continent we have found the secret of unity and peace among men, then we can become the peacemakers of mankind—makers of the just peace that will be permanent. So prepared, we can decide aright the fateful issues of this hour. So prepared, America can face the future with confidence, and the world can face it with hope.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6777) to extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Social Security Act Amendment of 1948."

TITLE I—OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE AMENDMENTS

PART A—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Deposits in trust fund; annual report of Board of Trustees of the trust fund; refunds

SEC. 101. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 201 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "such amounts as may be appropriated to the trust fund" and inserting in lieu thereof "such amounts as may be appropriated to, or deposited in, the trust fund."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of such section 201 is amended by striking out "on the first day of each regular session of the Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than the first day of March of each year."

(c) Subsection (b) of such section 201 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such report shall be printed as a House Document of the session of the Congress to which the report is made."

(d) Subsection (f) of such section 201 is amended by inserting "(1)" before "The" at the beginning thereof, by striking out the last two sentences thereof, and by adding the following new paragraphs:

"(2) The Managing Trustee is directed to pay from the trust fund into the Treasury the amount estimated by him which will be expended during a 3-month period by the Treasury Department for refunds of taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to the taxes) under title VIII of the Social Security Act or the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and for interest on such refunds as provided by law. Such payments shall be covered into the Treasury as repayments to the account for refunding internal-revenue collections.

"(3) Repayments made under paragraph (1) or (2) shall not be available for expenditures but shall be carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury. If it subsequently appear that the estimates under either such paragraph in any particular 3-month period were too high or too low, appropriate adjustments shall be made by the Managing Trustee in future payments."

Amount of child's insurance benefits

SEC. 102. Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 202 of such act is amended to read:

"(2) Such child's insurance benefit for each month shall be equal to one-half of a primary insurance benefit of the individual with respect to whose wages the child is entitled to receive such benefit; except that if such individual has died there shall be added to the total of benefits for each month (beginning with the month in which such individual dies) to which children are entitled with respect to his wages an amount (to be divided equally if more than one child is so entitled) equal to one-fourth of such primary insurance benefit. If a child is entitled for any month to benefits with respect to the wages of more than one individual he shall be paid, and for purposes of this paragraph shall be deemed entitled to, only one such benefit for such month, such benefit to be the one based on the wages of the insured individual which result in the highest child's insurance benefit for such child for such month."

Widow's insurance benefits

SEC. 103. Clause (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 202 of such act is amended to read: "(C) has filed application for widow's insurance benefits or was entitled to wife's insurance benefits with respect to the wages of such individual for the month preceding the month in which he died,".

Mother's insurance benefits

SEC. 104. (a) The heading of subsection (e) of section 202 of such act is amended to read: "Mother's insurance benefits."

(b) Subsection (e) of such section 202 is amended to read:

"(e) (1) Every widow (as defined in section 209 (j) (1)) and every former wife divorced (as defined in section 209 (j) (2)) of an individual who died a fully or currently insured individual after December 31, 1939, if such widow or former wife divorced (A) has not remarried, (B) is not entitled to receive a widow's insurance benefit, (C) is not entitled to receive primary insurance benefits or is entitled to receive primary insurance benefits each of which is less than three-fourths of a primary insurance benefit of such individual, (D) has filed application for mother's insurance benefits, (E) at the time of filing such application has in her care a child of such individual entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit, and (F) in the case of a widow, was living with such individual at the time of his death or, in the case of a former wife divorced, such individual was furnishing, pursuant to agreement or court order, at least one-half of the amount of her support at the time of his death and the child referred to in clause (E) is her son, daughter, or legally adopted child, shall be entitled to receive a mother's insurance benefit for each month, beginning with the month in which she becomes so entitled to such insurance benefits and ending with the month immediately preceding the first month in which any of the following occurs: No child of such deceased individual is entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit, she becomes entitled to receive a primary insurance benefit equal to or exceeding three-fourths of a primary insurance benefit of such deceased individual, she becomes entitled to receive a widow's insurance benefit, she remarries, or she dies. In the case of a former wife divorced, benefits shall also end with the month immediately preceding the first month in which no son, daughter, or legally adopted child of such former wife divorced is entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit with respect to the wages of such deceased individual.

"(2) Such mother's insurance benefit for each month shall be equal to three-fourths of a primary insurance benefit of such deceased individual, except that, if she is entitled to receive a primary insurance benefit for any month, such mother's insurance benefit for such month shall be reduced by an amount equal to her primary insurance benefit."

(c) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 205 of such act is amended by striking out "wife, widow" and inserting in lieu thereof "wife, former wife divorced, widow."

Maximum of benefits payable to family

SEC. 105. Subsection (a) of section 203 of such act is amended to read:

"(a) Whenever the total of benefits under section 202, payable for a month with respect to an individual's wages, is more than $20 and exceeds (1) $85, or (2) an amount equal to 80 percent of his average monthly wage (as defined in section 209 (f)), whichever is the lesser, such total of benefits shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (d), (e), or (h), be reduced to such lesser amount or to $20, whichever is greater."

Receipt of remuneration for employment by beneficiaries

SEC. 106. Subsection (d) of section 203, of such act is amended to read:

"(d) Deductions, in such amounts and at such time or times as the Administrator shall determine, shall be made from any payment or payments under this title to which an individual is entitled, until the total of such deductions equals such individual's benefit or benefits for any month in which such individual:

"(1) rendered services in employment (including any services for a State, political subdivision, or instrumentality if the services of any of the employees of such State, subdivision, or instrumentality are included under an agreement made pursuant to section 211) for remuneration of more than $40; or

"(2) if a widow, entitled to a mother's insurance benefit, did not have in her care a child of her deceased husband entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit; or

"(3) if a former wife divorced entitled to a mother's insurance benefit, did not have in her care a child of her decreased former husband who is her son, daughter, or legally adopted child and is entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit with respect to the wages of her deceased former husband."

Receipt of remuneration by primary insurance beneficiaries

SEC. 107. Subsection (e) of section 203 of such act is amended by striking out "rendered services for wages of not less than $15" and inserting in lieu thereof "rendered services in employment (including any services for a State, political subdivision, or instrumentality if the services of any of the employees of such State, subdivision, or instrumentality are included under an agreement made pursuant to section 211) for remuneration of more than $40".

Overpayments and underpayments

SEC. 108. Subsection (a) of section 204 of such act is amended to read:

"(a) Whenever the Administrator finds that more or less than the correct amount has been paid to an individual under this title (including payments made prior to January 1, 1940, proper adjustment shall be made, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator, as follows: (1) With respect to payments of more than the correct amount, by, in the discretion of the Administrator, (A) decreasing any payments to which such individual is or becomes entitled under this title, or (B) decreasing any payments payable under this title, either before or after the death of such overpaid individual, to any other individual with respect to the wages which were the basis of the payments to such overpaid individual; (2) with respect to payments of less than the correct amount, by making to such individual payment of the amount owing or, if such individual dies before such adjustment has been completed, by making such payment (including the amount of any uncashed checks), in the discretion of the Administrator, either to the estate of such underpaid individual or to any other individual or individuals payment to whom the Administrator finds to be in accordance with the purposes of this act."

Wage records

SEC. 109. (a) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 205 of such act is amended by striking out ", or after his death shall inform the wife, child, or parent of such individual," and inserting in lieu thereof "or his survivor".

(2) Such paragraph (1) is further amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "No wages with respect to which a tax has not been assessed under section 1400 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be entered in such records except (A) in accordance with the final judgment of a court in an action under subsection (g) of this section, or (B) upon certification by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (or any officer or employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, including the field service, designated by the Commissioner for such purpose) that, at the time of filing an application for benefits or for a lump-sum death payment or a request for revision of wage records, involving such wages, a tax with respect to such wages was assessable under such section 1400; but the limitation in this sentence shall not apply to wages received during the 1 year immediately preceding the filing of an application for benefits or for a lump-sum death payment, involving such wages, if such wages are reported to the Federal Security Administrator by the employer, and shall not apply to wages with respect to which relief from the payment of the tax imposed by such section 1400 has been granted under the authority of section 3791 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is further amended by striking out paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(2) Prior to the expiration of 4 years and 1 month following any calendar quarter, the Administrator may revise his records of the wages paid to an individual in such quarter, and written notice of any such revision which results in a deletion or reduction of such wages shall be given to such individual or to his survivor if either of them has previously been notified of the amount of such individual's wages for such quarter, as shown by

the Administrator's records prior to such revision. After the expiration of 4 years and 1 month following any calendar quarter in which wages were paid or are alleged to have been paid to an individual, the records of the Administrator as to the wages paid to such individual in such quarter shall be conclusive for the purposes of this title, except as hereafter provided.

"(3) Prior to final decision upon an application for benefits or a lump sum death payment or upon a request for revision of his records of wages, the Administrator may revise his records of wages paid to an individual in a calendar quarter (A) if such application is filed within the 4 years and 1 month period immediately following the end of such quarter, or (B) if a request for revision is made within such period and it is alleged in writing by the individual or his survivor that the records of wages paid in such quarter are in one or more respects erroneous. Written notice of the Administrator's decision on any such request for revision shall be given to such individual or his survivor.

"(4) After the expiration of 4 years and 1 month following a calendar quarter, the Administrator may (A) delete or reduce wages entered in his records for such quarter if such entry is erroneous as the result of fraud or misrepresentation, or (B) revise any entry with respect to wages in such quarter or include in his records for such quarter any omitted item of wages (i) to conform his records to tax returns or portions of tax returns (including information returns and other written statements) filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act or title VIII of the Social Security Act or regulations made under authority thereof, and to information returns filed by a State, political subdivision, or instrumentality pursuant to an agreement under section 211 or regulations of the Administrator thereunder; (ii) to correct errors made in the allocation, to individuals or quarters, of wages entered in the records of the Administrator; (iii) to correct errors apparent on the face of the Administrator's records of wages; (iv) to transfer wage items to the records of the Railroad Retirement Board in the event such items were credited under this title when they should have been credited under the Railroad Retirement Act or to include items transferred by the Railroad Retirement Board which have been credited under the Railroad Retirement Act when they should have been credited under this title. Written notice of any correction or revision under this paragraph which results in a deletion or reduction shall be given to the individual whose wage record is involved or to his survivor if either of them has previously been notified of the amount of such individual's wages for such quarter, as shown by the Administrator's records prior to such correction or revision. No evidence may be introduced at any hearing on any change of records pursuant to this paragraph unless it relates to such change or the authority of the Administrator to make it. If any hearing is held on any action of the Administrator under this subsection, he shall make findings of fact and a decision based on the evidence adduced at such hearing and shall revise his records as may be required by such findings and decision. For purposes of this paragraph and paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection the 'survivor' of an individual means his surviving spouse, former wife divorced, child, or parent."

Definitions

SEC. 110. (a) Section 209 of such act is amended by striking out so much thereof as precedes subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 209. For purposes of this title—

"(a) The term 'wages' means—

"(1) remuneration paid prior to January 1, 1949, which was wages as defined in this section as in effect at the time the remuneration was paid; and

"(2) the first $3,000 of remuneration paid to an individual during any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1948, which is wages as defined in section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code as in effect at the time the remuneration is paid.

"(b) The term 'employment' means (1) any service performed prior to January 1, 1949, which was employment as defined in this section as in effect at the time the service was performed, and (2) any service performed after December 31, 1948, which is employment as defined in section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code as in effect at the time the service is performed."

(b) (1) Subsection (l) of such section 209 is repealed.

(2) Subsections (o) and (p) of such section 209 shall not be applicable with respect to services performed after December 31, 1948.

(c) Section 209 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof:

"(s) The Administrator shall not make determinations as to whether an individual has performed services which are employment by reason of subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code, the periods of such services, the amounts of remuneration for such service which constitutes 'wages' as defined in subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of such section 1426, or the periods in which or for which such wages were paid, but shall accept the determinations with respect thereto of—

"(1) in the case of remuneration included under such subsection (i), the United States Maritime Commission,

"(2) in the case of remuneration included under such subsection (j), the Bonneville Power Administrator,

"(3) in the case of remuneration included under such subsection (k), the Tennessee Valley Authority,

"(4) in the case of remuneration included under such subsection (l), the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and

"(5) such agents as such Commissioner, Administrator, Authority, or Secretary (as the case may be) may designate.

as evidence by returns filed pursuant to subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of such section 1426 and certifications made pursuant to this subsection. Such determinations shall be final and conclusive. Each agency and individual rereferred to in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), is authorized and directed, upon written request of the Administrator, to make certification to the Administrator with respect to any matter determinable for the Administrator by such agency or individual under this subsection, which the Administrator finds necessary in administering this title."

Quarter of coverage

SEC. 111. The last sentence of section 209 (g) of such act is amended by striking out "excepting any quarter in such year in which such individual dies or becomes entitled to a primary insurance benefit and any quarter succeeding such quarter in which he died or became so entitled" and inserting in lieu thereof "excepting any quarter in such year succeeding the quarter in which he died or became entitled to a primary insurance benefit."

Definition of wife

SEC. 112. Section 209 (i) of such act is amended to read:

"(i) The term 'wife' means the wife of an individual who either (A) is the mother of such individual's son or daughter, or (B) was married to him for not less than 3 years before the day on which her application is filed."

Definition of widow and former wife divorced

SEC. 113. Section 209 (j) of such act is amended to read:

"(j) (1) The term 'widow' (except when used in section 202 (g) means the surviving wife of an individual who (A) is the mother of such individual's son or daughter, (B) adopted such individual's son or daughter while she was married to such individual, (C) was married to such individual at the time both of them legally adopted a child, or (D) was married to such individual for not less than 1 year before the day on which he died.

"(2) The term 'former wife divorced' means a woman divorced from an individual who (A) is the mother of such individual's son or daughter, (B) adopted such individual's son or daughter while she was married to such individual, or (C) was married to such individual at the time both of them legally adopted a child."

Definition of child

SEC. 114. Section 209 (k) of such act is amended to read:

"(k) The term 'child' means (1) the child of an individual, and (2) in the case of a living individual, a stepchild or adopted child who has been such stepchild or adopted child for not less than 3 years before the day on which application for child's benefits is filed, and (3) in the case of a deceased individual, an adopted child or a stepchild who has been such stepchild for not less than 1 year before the day on which such individual died. In determining whether an adopted child has met the length of time requirement in clause (2), time spent in the relationship of stepchild shall be counted as time spent in the relationship of adopted child."

Military service in World War II

SEC. 115. Section 209 of such act is further amended by adding after paragraph (s) (added by section 110 (c) hereof) the following new paragraph:

"(t) (1) In the case of any individual who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 30, 1940, and prior to October 1, 1945, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of a disability or injury incurred or aggravated in service in line of duty, and who does not die during the period of 3 years immediately following his separation from the active military or naval service, all quarters which occur in such period and during any part of which he so served shall be disregarded in computing his elapsed quarters under paragraph (f) or (g) hereof.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not be applicable with respect to benefits payable for any month which occurred, or with respect to lump-sum death payments based on the wages of an individual who died, prior to the enactment of this section; nor shall it apply in the case of any monthly benefits payable, with respect to the wages of any individual, for any month after the month in which it is determined by the Railroad Retirement Board, the Civil Service Commission, or the Veterans' Administration that an annuity, compensation, pension, or other, benefit is payable by reason of the death, retirement, or disability, and by reason of past service which includes service referred to in paragraph (1), of such individual under the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, or under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration, as the case may be."

Agreements for coverage of State and local employees

SEC. 116. Title II of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Voluntary agreements for coverage of State and local employees

"SEC. 211. (a) The Federal Security Administrator shall, at the request of a State, enter into an agreement with such State, as provided in this section, for the purpose of extending the protection of the old-age and survivors insurance system to services performed by individuals as employees of such State or any political subdivision thereof, or of any instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, which are not included as employment under this title solely by reason of section 1426 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(b) Each such agreement may contain such provisions as the Administrator and the State shall agree upon, but shall provide—

"(1) that benefits will be provided for the employees whose services are covered by the agreement (and their dependents and survivors) on the same basis as though such services constituted employment as defined in section 209 of this act;

"(2) that the State will pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, at such time or times as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe, amounts equivalent to the sum of the taxes which would be imposed by sections 1400 and 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code if the services of employees covered by the agreement constituted employment as defined in section 1426 of such Code;

"(3) that the State will comply with such regulations relating to payments and reports as the Administrator may prescribe to carry out the purposes of this section;

"(4) that such agreement shall be effective with respect to services performed after a date specified therein, but in no case prior to January 1, 1949, or the first day of the calendar year in which such agreement is entered into, whichever is later;

"(5) that the State may terminate the agreement at the end of any calendar quarter in its entirety, or with respect to its own employees, or with respect to the employees of any political subdivision or instrumentality, upon giving 2 years' advance notice in writing to the Administrator, but only if the agreement with the State has been in effect for not less than 5 years prior to the receipt of such notice;

"(6) in case such agreement includes the services of any employees of the State, that the services performed in the employ of the State by all employees thereof, other than those whose services are excluded pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, shall be covered by the agreement;

"(7) in case such agreement includes the services of any employees of a political subdivision of the State, that the services performed in the employ of such subdivision by all employees thereof other than those whose services are excluded pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, shall be included under such agreement;

"(8) in case such agreement includes the services of any employees of an instrumentality of the State, or of a political subdivision thereof, or of an instrumentality of any two or more of the foregoing, that the services performed in the employ of such instrumentality by all employees thereof, other than those whose services are excluded pursuant to subsection (c), shall be included under such agreement.

"(c) (1) Any such agreement shall provide for the exclusion of services performed, by employees of the State or any political subdivision thereof, or of any instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, in positions covered by a pension, annuity, retirement, or similar fund or system which has been or is hereafter established by the State, or by such subdivision or instrumentality, prior to the effective date of such agreement with the State. Such exclusion shall be applicable to all services performed in positions which were covered by such fund or system on the effective date of the agreement.

"(2) Such agreement shall also provide, if the State requests it, for the exclusion, in the case of employees of the State or any political subdivision thereof, or of an instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, of services in any class or classes of elective positions, part-time positions, or positions the compensation for which is on a fee basis or of any services of an emergency nature.

"(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2), the Administrator shall, at the request of a State, modify the agreement with such State to include, in the case of employees of the State or any political subdivision thereof, or of any instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, services in any class or classes of elective positions, part-time positions, or positions the compensation for which is on a fee basis or any services of an emergency nature.

"(4) The Administrator shall, at the request of a State, modify the agreement with such State to include services excluded from the agreement (other than those excluded from the agreement pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) hereof) because it did not apply to employees of the State or because such services were performed by employees of a political subdivision or instrumentality to which such agreement did not previously apply.

"(5) Any modification or an agreement pursuant to paragraph (3) or (4) hereof shall be effective on a date specified in such modification, but in no case prior to January 1, 1949, or the first day of the calendar year in which such modification is agreed to by the Administrator and the State, whichever is later."

"(d) No agreement under this section with any State shall be effective with respect to the services of any employees of any political subdivision thereof unless (1) such subdivision has at least 10 employees, other than those whose services are excluded pursuant to subsection (c), or (2) the services of not less than one-fourth of the employees of all the political subdivisions of the State, other than those whose services are excluded pursuant to subsection (c), are included under the agreement.

"(e) If the Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State with whom he has entered into an agreement pursuant to this section, finds that the State has failed, or is no longer legally able, to comply substantially with any provision of such agreement, he shall notify such State that the agreement will be terminated in its entirety, or with respect to the services of employees of the State, of a political subdivision, or of an instrumentality, as may be appropriate, at such time, not in excess of 2 years from the date of such notice, as he deems appropriate unless, prior to such time, he finds that there no longer is any such failure or that the cause for such legal inability has been removed.

"(f) In case any State does not make, at the time or times due, the payments provided for under an agreement pursuant to this section, there shall be added, as part of the amounts due, interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date due until paid, and the Administrator may, in his discretion, deduct such amounts plus interest from any amounts certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State under any other provision of this act. Amounts equal to the amounts so deducted are hereby appropriated to the trust fund.

"(g) If any agreement entered into under this section between the Administrator and a State is terminated in its entirety or with respect to the services of the employees of the State, any political subdivision, or any instrumentality, the Administrator and such State may not again enter into an agreement pursuant to this section or may not thereafter modify such agreement to include the services of any employees of the State or such subdivision or instrumentality, as the case may be.

"(h) (1) All amounts received by the Secretary of the Treasury under an agreement made pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the trust fund.

"(2) If more or less than the correct amount due under an agreement made pursuant to this section is paid with respect to any payment of remuneration, proper adjustments with respect to the amounts due under such agreement shall be made, without interest, in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by regulations of the Administrator.

"(3) If an overpayment cannot be adjusted under paragraph (2), the amount thereof and the time or times it is to be paid shall be certified by the Administrator to the Managing Trustee, and the Managing Trustee, through the Fiscal Reserve of the Treasury Department, and prior to any action thereon by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment in accordance with such certification. The Managing Trustee shall not be held personally liable for any payment or payments made in accordance with a certification by the Administrator.

"(i) Regulations of the Administrator to carry out the purposes of this section shall be designed to make the requirements imposed pursuant to this section on States, political subdivisions, or instrumentalities the same, so far as practicable, as those imposed on employers pursuant to subchapter A of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(j) In the case of an instrumentality of two or more States, the Administrator is authorized to make such agreement to carry out the purposes of this section as may be satisfactory to all parties concerned. To the extent practicable, such agreement shall be consistent with the other provisions of this section and such provisions shall be applicable to the services included under such agreement.

"(k) The Administrator is authorized, pursuant to agreement with the head of any Federal agency, to delegate any of his functions under this section to any officer or employee of such agency and to otherwise utilize the services and facilities of such agency in carrying out such functions, and payment for such use shall be in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement.

"(l) For the purposes of this section the term 'employee' includes an officer of a State, political subdivision, or instrumentality."

PART B—AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ACT

Special refunds

SEC. 151. (a) Section 1401 (d) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (3), in the case of wages received during any calendar year after the calendar year 1948, the term 'wages' includes remuneration for services covered by an agreement made pursuant to section 211 of the Social Security Act, as amended; the term 'employer' includes a State or any political subdivision thereof, or any instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing; the term 'tax' includes, in the case of services covered by an agreement made pursuant to section 211 of the Social Security Act, as amended, an amount equivalent to the tax which would

be imposed by section 1400, if such services constituted employment as defined in section 1426; and the provisions of this paragraph shall apply whether or not any amount deducted from the employee's remuneration pursuant to section 211 of the Social Security Act, as amended, has been paid to the Secretary of the Treasury."

(b) Section 1401 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Claim for special refund: In accordance with regulations made under this subchapter, a statement from the Federal Security Administration of the wages paid an employee in any calendar year after the calendar year 1947 may be submitted by such employee and, together with such other proof as the Commissioner may require, shall be accepted in support of a claim for refund under paragraph (2) of this section with respect to such year."

Definitions

SEC. 152. That part of section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code which precedes subsection (a) thereof is amended by striking out "When used in" and inserting in lieu thereof "For purposes of."

Definition of wages

SEC. 153. (a) Section 1426 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively, and by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) Any payment made to an employee after December 31, 1948, and after the month in which he attains the age of 65, if he performs no service for the employer in the period for which such payment is made;."

(b) The paragraph of section 1426 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code herein redesignated as paragraph (5) is amended by inserting before the period "and which are made prior to January 1, 1949."

Definition of employment

SEC. 154. (a) That part of subsection (b) of section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code which precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended to read:

"(b) Employment: The term 'employment' means any service performed prior to January 1, 1949, which was employment as defined in this section as in effect at the time the service was performed; and any service, of whatever nature, performed after December 31, 1948, by an employee for the person employing him, irrespective of the citizenship or residence of either, (A) within the United States, or (B) on or in connection with an American vessel or American aircraft under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel or aircraft touches at a point in the United States, if the employee is employed on and in connection with such vessel or aircraft when outside the United States, or (C) while in transit outside the United States between points in the United States, except—."

(b) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended to read:

"(2) Domestic service performed in a private home; and domestic service in a local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority, performed by a student who is enrolled and is regularly attending classes at a school, college, or university;."

(c) Paragraph (5) of such subsection (b) is amended to read:

"(5) Service performed by an employee on or in connection with a vessel not an American vessel, or on or in connection with an aircraft not an American aircraft, if the employee is employed on and in connection with such vessel or aircraft when outside the United States;."

(d) Paragraph (8) of such subsection is amended to read:

"(8) Service performed in the employ of a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, if there is not in effect with respect to such service a waiver, filed pursuant to section 1433, of the exemption from taxes imposed by this subchapter;."

(e) Paragraph (10) of such subsection is amended by striking out subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) thereof and redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (B).

Definition of American aircraft

SEC. 155. Section 1426 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read:

"(g) American vessel and aircraft:

"(1) American vessel: The term 'American vessel' means any vessel documented or numbered under the laws of the United States; and includes any vessel which is neither documented nor numbered under the laws of the United States nor documented under the laws of any foreign country, if its crew is employed solely by one or more citizens or residents of the United States or corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

"(2) American aircraft: The term 'American aircraft' means an aircraft registered under the laws of the United States."

Definition of agricultural labor

SEC. 156. Paragraph (4) of section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "or, in the case of fruits and vegetables, as an incident to the preparation of such fruits and vegetables for market."

Certain employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority and of military instrumentalities

SEC. 157. Section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code is further amended by adding after subsection (j) the following new subsections:

"(k) Certain employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority: The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Tennessee Valley Authority (hereinafter referred to as the 'Authority') to be performed after December 31, 1948, by a laborer, mechanic, or workman, in connection with construction work or the operation and maintenance of electrical or other facilities of the Authority, as an employee performing service for the Authority, but shall not include any service performed by such a laborer, mechanic, or workman, to whom the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended, applies. The term 'wages' means, with respect to service which constitutes employment by reason of this subsection, such amount of remuneration as is determined (subject to the provisions of this section) by the Authority to be paid for such service. The Authority is authorized and directed to comply with the provisions of the internal revenue laws on behalf of the United States as the employer of individuals whose service constitutes employment by reason of this subsection.

"(l) Civilian employees of military instrumentalities: The term 'employment' shall include such service as is determined by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to be performed after December 31, 1948, by a civilian employee, not compensated from funds appropriated by the Congress, in the Army Exchange Service, Army Motion Picture Service, Naval Ship's Service stores, Marine Corps post exchanges, or other activities, conducted by an instrumentality of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of such Secretary, at installations of the National Military Establishment for the comfort, pleasure, contentment, and mental and physical improvement of personnel of such Establishment; except that such service shall not include (1) any service performed outside the United States by an individual unless such individual is a citizen or resident of the United States, or (2) any service performed by an individual to whom the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended, applies. The term 'wages' means, with respect to service which constitutes employment by reason of this subsection, such amount of remuneration as is determined (subject to the provisions of this section) by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, to be paid for such service. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are each authorized and directed to comply with the provisions of the internal revenue laws on behalf of the United States as the employer of individuals whose service constitutes employment by reason of this subsection."

Waiver of exemption by nonprofit organizations

SEC. 158. Subchapter A of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1433. Waiver of exemption by nonprofit organizations.

"(a) Waiver: Any person employing individuals whose services are excepted from employment by section 1426 (b) (8) may, subject to regulations made under this subchapter and the provisions of this section, waive the exception of such services from employment.

"(b) Services covered by waiver: Any waiver under this section shall be applicable to all services which, but for such waiver, would be excepted from employment solely by reason of section 1426 (b) (8), except that such waiver shall not be applicable to services performed by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the regular exercise of his ministry or service performed by a regular member of a religious order in the exercise of the duties required by such order.

"(c) Effect and withdrawal of waiver: A waiver pursuant to this section shall be effective with respect to services performed after the calendar quarter in which such waiver is filed with the Commissioner; but no such waiver shall be effective with respect to services performed prior to January 1, 1949. Any person making such a waiver, and the employees with respect to whose services such waiver is made, shall in all respects be subject to the provisions of this subchapter to the same extent as though section 1426 (b) (8) were not a part of this subchapter. Any such waiver may be terminated at the end of any calendar quarter upon giving 2 years' advance notice in writing to the Commissioner, but only if the waiver has been in effect for not less than 5 years prior to the receipt of such notice.

"(d) Termination of waiver by Commissioner: If the Commissioner finds that any person who has filed a waiver pursuant to this section has failed to comply substantially with the requirements of this subchapter or is no longer able to comply therewith the Commissioner shall notify such person that the waiver will be terminated as of the end of the calendar quarter specified by the Commissioner in such notice unless prior to the end of such quarter the Commissioner finds that there will no longer be any such failure or that the cause for the inability to comply has been removed. Proceedings under this subsection may be initiated by the

Commissioner upon his own motion or upon the request of the Federal Security Administrator. Termination of a waiver under this subsection shall be in addition to any other penalties which may be imposed pursuant to this subchapter for failure to comply with the requirements thereof.

"(e) No renewal of waiver: In the event a waiver made pursuant to this section by a person is terminated, no waiver may again be made pursuant to this section with respect to the services of his employees."

PART C—EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 191. (a) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 104 of this act shall be effective only with respect to applications filed under title II of the Social Security Act after December 31, 1948.

(b) The amendments made by section 103, 112, 113, 114, 154, 155, 156, and 157, and by subsections (a), (b) (1), and (c) of section 110, of this act shall be effective January 1, 1949.

(c) The amendments made by sections 102 and 105 of this act shall be effective with respect to benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for any month following the month in which occurs the date of enactment of this act.

(d) The amendment made by section 107 of this act and the amendment made in paragraph (1) of section 203 (d) of the Social Security Act by section 106 of this act shall be effective with respect to services rendered in any month following the month in which occurs the date of enactment of this act.

(e) The amendment made by section 109 (a) (2) of this act shall be effective with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1948.

(f) The amendment made by section 111 of this act shall be effective with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1947.

(g) The amendment made by section 108 of this act shall be effective with respect to errors found by the Administrator, under title II of the Social Security Act, after the date of enactment of this act.

(h) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203 (d) of the Social Security Act, as amended by section 106 of this act, shall be effective with respect to benefits to which an individual is entitled under title II of the Social Security Act after December 31, 1948.

(i) The amendment made, in section 201 (b) of the Social Security Act, by section 101 (c) of this act shall be effective with respect to reports filed under such section 201 (b) after the date of enactment of this act.

(j) The amendment made by section 101 (d) of this act shall be effective with respect to refunds paid after December 31, 1948.

(k) Any individual entitled to widow's current insurance benefits under section 202 (e) of the Social Security Act prior to January 1, 1949, who would, but for the enactment of this act, be entitled to such benefits for January 1949, shall be deemed to be entitled to mother's insurance benefits under such section, as amended by this act, to the same extent as though she became entitled to such mother's insurance benefits in January 1949.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Definition of employee

SEC. 201. (a) (1) Section 1426 (d) and section 1607 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code are amended by inserting before the period at the end of each the following: ", but such term does not include (1) any individual who, under the usual common-law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an independent contractor or (2) any individual (except an officer of a corporation) who is not an employee under such common-law rules."

(2) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall have the same effect as if included in the Internal Revenue Code on February 10, 1939, the date of its enactment.

(b) (1) Section 1101 (a) (6) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", but such term does not include (A) any individual who, under the usual common-law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an independent contractor or (B) any individual (except an officer of a corporation) who is not an employee under such common-law rules."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall have the same effect as if included in the Social Security Act on August 14, 1935, the date of its enactment, but shall not have the effect of voiding any (A) wage credits reported to the Bureau of Internal Revenue with respect to services performed prior to the enactment of this act or (B) wage credits with respect to services performed prior to the close of the first calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this act in the case of individuals who have attained age 65 or who have died, prior to the close of such quarter, and with respect to whom prior to the date of enactment of this act wage credits were established which would not have been established had the amendment made by paragraph (1) been in effect on and after August 14, 1935.

(c) (1) The Federal Security Administrator is directed to estimate and report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date (A) the total amount paid as benefits under title II of the Social Security Act which would not have been paid had the amendment made by paragraph (1) of subsection (b) been in effect on and after August 14, 1935, and (B) the total amount of such payments which the Administrator estimates will hereafter be paid by virtue of the provisions of paragraph (2) of subsection (b).

(2) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts reported to the Congress under paragraph (1).

Reports to Congress

SEC. 202. (a) Subsection (c) of section 541 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is repealed.

(b) Section 704 of such act is amended to read:

"Reports

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall make a full report to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, of the administration of the functions with which he is charged under this act. In addition to the number of copies of such report authorized by other law to be printed, there is hereby authorized to be printed not more than 2,500 copies of such report for use by the Administrator for distribution to Members of Congress and to State and other public or private agencies or organizations participating in or concerned with the social-security program."

Technical amendment

SEC. 203. Section 908 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939 is repealed.

Administrator substituted for Social Security Board

SEC. 204. (a) Subsection (h) of section 904 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "the Board" each time they appear and substituting therefor "the Administrator or the Social Security Board".

(b) Section 1106 of such act is amended to read:

"SEC. 1106. No disclosure of any return or portion of a return (including information returns and other written statements) filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under title VIII of the Social Security Act or the Federal Insurance Contributions Act or under regulations made under authority thereof, which has been transmitted to the Administrator by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or of any file, record, report, or other paper, or any information, obtained at any time by the Administrator or by any officer or employee of the Federal Security Agency in the course of discharging the duties of the Federal Security Agency relating to old-age and survivors' insurance, and no disclosure of any such file, record, report, or other paper, or information, obtained at any time by any person from the Administrator or from any officer or employee of the Federal Security Agency, shall be made except as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe. Any person who shall violate any provision of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both."

(c) The remaining provisions of such act are amended by striking out "Social Security Board" and (where it refers to the Social Security Board) "Board" and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrator", and by striking out (where they refer to the Social Security Board) "it" and "its" and inserting in lieu thereof "he", "him", or "his", as the context may require.

(d) Subchapter C of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended (except for subsection (f) of section 1606 thereof) by striking out "Social Security Board" and "Board" and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal Security Administrator," and by striking out (where they refer to the Social Security Board) "it" and "its" and inserting in lieu thereof "he," "him," or "his," as the context may require.

Administrator substituted for Children's Bureau

SEC. 205. Title V of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "Children's Bureau", "Chief of the Children's Bureau", "Secretary of Labor", and (in section 503 (a) and 513 (a)) "Board" and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrator."

Administrator defined

SEC. 206. Section 1101 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) The term 'Administrator,' except when the context otherwise requires, means the Federal Security Administrator."

Prior action valid

SEC. 207. No action taken under the Social Security Act prior to July 16, 1946, by the Social Security Board, the Secretary of Labor, the Chief of the Children's Bureau, or the Children's Bureau, and no action taken by the Social Security Board under subchapter C of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, shall be invalidated, or cease to be effective, by reason of the enactment of sections 204 and 205 of this act.

Penalties

SEC. 208. Section 208 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read:

"SEC. 208. Whoever—

"(a) makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any application for any payment under this title, or

"(b) makes or causes to be made and presented to the Federal Security Administrator, or to any officer or employee of the Federal Security Agency, any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document which is presented for use in determining rights to payments under this title, or

"(c) shall, with intent to defraud the United States, negotiate or cause to be negotiated, or willfully retain, any check in payment of any benefit under this title knowing that the payee of such check has no lawful right thereto, or

"(d) having made application to receive payments under this title for the use of another and having received such payments willfully expends them otherwise than for the benefit of such other person, or

"(e) shall transfer by sale, or otherwise, with intent to defraud the United States in any manner, an employee's social-security account number card, issued by the United States, or

"(f) willfully conceals or fails to disclose the occurrence of any event which he has agreed to disclose in an application for payments under this title, and thereafter receives and retains payments under title II as a result of such concealment or failure to disclose, or

"(g) shall, for the purpose of causing any entry of any item to be made in the wage records maintained by the Federal Security Administrator under this title or for the purpose of causing any revision in or deletion of any entry in such wage records, or for the purpose of causing any omission of any entry in such wage records, or for the purpose of preventing the correction or revision of any entry in such wage records, make or cause to be made any false statement or representation to the United States (including any false statement or representation in connection with any matter arising under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) as to the amount of any wages or remuneration paid or received, or the period during which earned or paid, or the person to whom or by whom paid,

shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

Furnishing of information

SEC. 209. Title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after section 211 (added by section 116 of this act) the following new section:

"Furnishing of wage record and other information

"SEC. 212. (a) (1) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized, at the request of any agency charged with the administration of a State unemployment compensation law (with respect to which such State is entitled to payments under section 302 (a) of this act) and to the extent consistent with the efficient administration of this act, to furnish to such agency, for use by it in the administration of such law or a State temporary disability insurance law administered by it, information from or pertaining to wage records, including account numbers, maintained by the Administrator in accordance with section 205 (c) of this act.

"(2) At the request of any agency, person, or organization, the Federal Security Administrator is authorized, to the extent consistent with efficient administration of this act and subject to such conditions or limitations as he deems necessary, to furnish special reports on the wage and employment records of individuals and to conduct special statistical studies of, and compile special data with respect to, any matters related to the programs authorized by this act.

"(b) Requests under subsection (a) shall be complied with only if the agency, person, or organization making the request agrees to make payment for the work or information requested in such amount, if any (not exceeding the cost of performing the work or furnishing the information), as may be determined by the Administrator. A State agency may make the payments for information furnished pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (a) by authorizing deductions from amounts certified by the Federal Security Administrator under section 302 (a) of this act for payment to such State. Payments for work performed or information furnished pursuant to this section, including deductions authorized to be made from amounts certified under section 302 (a), shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be requested by the Administrator, and shall be deposited in the Treasury as a special deposit to be used to reimburse the appropriation (including authorizations to make expenditures from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund) for the unit or units of the Federal Security Agency which performed the work or furnished the information.

"(c) No information shall be furnished pursuant to this section in violation of section 1106 or regulations prescribed thereunder."

Delegation of functions

SEC. 210. Title XI of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 1107 the following new section:

"Delegation of functions

"SEC. 1108. The functions of the Administrator under this act shall be performed by him or under his direction and control by such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as he may designate."

Joint Coordinating Committee

SEC. 211. There is hereby created a Social Security Coordination Committee composed of the Secretary of the Treasury the Federal Security Administrator, and the Attorney General. Any member of the committee may designate an alternate to act in his stead in the transaction of any business of the committee. It shall be the duty of such committee to consider and agree upon administrative procedures and policies designed to effectuate the contributory principles of old-age and survivors insurance through coordination of tax and benefit provisions.

TITLE III—AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1946

SEC. 301. Section 415 of the Social Security Act amendments of 1946 is amended, as of August 10, 1946, by changing "section 204" to "section 203."

TITLE IV—AMENDMENT TO FARM CREDIT AND FARM LOAN ACTS

SEC. 401. (a) Section 63 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 267; 12 U. S. C., 1138c) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such period the following: "; and except that Production Credit Associations shall be subject to the taxes imposed by section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1948, for employment after such date (other than service performed by any individual to whom the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended, applies)."

(b) The first paragraph of section 26 of The Federal Farm Loan Act (39 Stat. 380; 12 U. S. C., 931) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such period the following: ", and except, in the case of national farm loan associations, the taxes imposed by section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1948, for employment after such date (other than service performed by an individual to whom the act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended, applies)."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 102]

Abbitt	Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Hart	Norblad
Bell	Hartley	Norton
Bender	Heffernan	O'Toole
Boggs, La.	Hendricks	Peden
Bolton	Isacson	Pfeifer
Boykin	Jenkins, Pa.	Philbin
Brown, Ohio	Jennings	Phillips, Tenn.
Buckley	Johnson, Ill.	Ploeser
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Okla.	Potts
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Powell
Case, N. J.	Kean	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Kee	Regan
Chapman	Kefauver	Riehlman
Clark	Kennedy	Riley
Coffin	Keogh	Robertson
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Ross
Cooley	King	Sadowski
Corbett	Klein	Scoblick
Coudert	Lane	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Courtney	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Cravens	LeFevre	Smith, Maine
Cunningham	Lewis, Ohio	Somers
Dawson, Ill.	Ludlow	Stanley
Dolliver	Lusk	Stevenson
Dorn	Lynch	Stigler
Ellsworth	McDonough	Thomas, N. J.
Fisher	McGarvey	Towe
Fogarty	McMahon	West
Foote	Manasco	Wilson, Ind.
Forand	Meade, Ky.	Wood
Fuller	Michener	
Gallagher	Mitchell	
Granger	Morgan	
Gwinn, N. Y.	Morrison	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morton	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order the balance of this week to consider conference reports as they are submitted, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech and two editorials.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mr. BAKEWELL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an

article by Sam Pettengill entitled "Platform for Americans."

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two instances.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

LIQUOR

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the other day we read where an 18-months-old child had been picked up by police officers and found to be intoxicated. A few days later, according to the press, three old gentlemen, all past 70, died as a result of a drunken spree.

According to reliable reports every second person arrested in the United States for drunkenness is a woman.

These instances are natural results of the disgraceful conditions revealed in a recent report by the Department of Commerce. According to that report, last year we spent $9,600,000,000 for intoxicating drink. Assuming the population to be 144,000,000, this sum represents an outlay of $66.66 for liquor for every person living within the United States, or $103.22 for each of the 93,000,000 persons over 21 years of age.

This staggering amount of beverages, including taxes, was $140,000,000 more than in the previous year of 1946 and was an increase of $6,010,000,000 over the year 1939. These figures should be shocking to the conscience of every American, regardless of his or her personal attitude toward liquor.

SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, of course, but I want to serve notice on those Members of the House who want to call up bills that should come up in the regular way that for the remainder of the week I am going to be pretty stingy about unanimous-consent requests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ELSTON, CLASON, and SIKES.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS, 1948

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to pay tribute to the members of the Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee which has been handling H. R. 6777, and also to the full committee for the finest cooperation I have ever known since I have been here relating to any legislation in which I have taken part. I have never known a group to be more diligent in attendance at meetings.

I feel it is only fair to mention the names of those Members who constitute the subcommittee dealing with this extension of old-age coverage: Mr. ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan; Mr. ROBERT W. KEAN, of New Jersey; Mr. CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska; Mr. NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois; Mr. JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan; Mr. MILTON H. WEST, of Texas; Mr. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas; and Mr. WALTER A. LYNCH, of New York.

These men have given the most careful consideration and study to this matter and I can say without fear of contradiction that there has been no politics whatever involved. The only thought, apparently, of every member of the subcommittee and of the full committee has been to bring out a sound piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 6777 is to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors' insurance system, and to increase certain benefits payable under the system. The bill H. R. 6777 is presented by the Ways and Means Committee to the House after many weeks of arduous study by a subcommittee appointed by the full committee.

This proposed social-security legislation was reported to the Ways and Means Committee by a unanimous vote, and in turn was reported from the full committee by a unanimous vote.

Your subcommittee was authorized to deal only with title II of the Social Security Act. This relates only to old-age and survivors' insurance. Under title II all employers covered by the Federal insurance contributions law are required to pay a 1-percent tax on wages paid to employees, and each employee also pays a 1-percent tax on his pay. Neither employer nor employee is required to pay tax on that part of a worker's pay which is over $3,000 in any calendar year. If an employee does pay a tax on more than $3,000 because he worked for more than one employer, he may apply for a refund of excess tax at the end of the year.

I mention the fact that your subcommittee has jurisdiction only under title II, because so many aged persons have been laboring under the misapprehension that your subcommittee has been considering title I dealing with old-age assistance, under which Federal grants are made to the States for public assistance to needy old persons, provided the State plan for distribution of the aid has been approved by the Federal Government. All States and Territories cooperate in old-age assistance plans.

Under this plan of old-age assistance the Federal contributions for assistance to needy aged is $10 of the first $15 and 50 percent of amount between $15 and $45.

The point I wish to make is that the States can pay the needy old persons any amount they desire. There is no limit as to the amount each State can pay to its needy old persons. Most of the States have a surplus in their respective treasuries. The Federal Government has a debt of three hundred and sixty thousand million dollars, even after spending the OASI trust fund of almost ten thousand million dollars.

The States are now in a financial position to take ample care of their needy old out of the surplus of their treasuries.

Those who would play politics with social security are trifling with an explosive as dangerous to government as an atomic bomb. I make this statement in the light of history. To build a social-security structure on an unsound foundation is to invite disaster. We must not disregard the experience of other nations in dealing with this subject. It will be sufficient to demonstrate the necessity for caution in expanding the coverage of employed persons supported by compulsory pay-roll taxes to briefly call attention to the experience of other countries. The contributions made by the employer and the employee to insure old-age security must be safely guarded and wisely administered as a sacred trust fund for the beneficiaries under the system and for no other purpose, otherwise the ultimate consequences may be tragic as well as ruinous.

France, prior to its depression of 1786-89, was enjoying unparalleled prosperity. Its industries were running at capacity. The foreign trade was so extensive that it was not equalled again in volume for half a century. There was full employment. The French Government was heavily in debt and those in power were spending money lavishly on roads, palaces, and public buildings. Waste and extravagance were running riot.

A sudden calamity befell France—there was an almost total failure of crops during the years 1787 and 1788. The depression paralyzed all the processes of France. The huge national debt, the fixed charge for interest on the debt caused the Minister of Finance to turn to a fraudulent method of raising revenue. For years, in an effort to balance the budget, taxes had been increased time after time to meet the enormous expenses of the government. The citizens were in open rebellion against the crushing tax burden imposed upon them.

In the face of national insolvency the Finance Minister sought to borrow larger and larger sums. A part of each new loan was used to pay interest on the preceding loan.

To meet this fiscal extermity, a system of annuities was introduced in France to tempt out of the pockets of the people their little savings. The scheme worked. Annuities guaranteed by the government, paying from 8 to 10 percent, were an irresistible bait to get money. History records that fathers of families borrowed at 5 percent in the name of their

infants. It was claimed that at the end of 14 or 15 years the debt would be paid off, and the child would retain intact for the rest of its life the interest at 10 percent on a capital it had never possessed.

Here is what happened: The Finance Minister spent the money, so collected, for the running expense of the government. France went bankrupt. Terror and rage swept over the nation. Honest, thrifty citizens had been robbed of their savings which in most cases were pitifully small. "The government had betrayed them, and now its ruined creditors, the thrifty, hard-working, enterprising middle class became violent."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is extremely important. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count, [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, destruction of public property and pillage of private property ran riot as a result of an unsound system of social security. The Finance Minister in desperation turned toward the lands of the church. These were confiscated and this new asset was used to back issues of paper money. One issue after another of this steadily depreciating paper money was made. The ultimate consequences to the French people were almost too horrible to contemplate. The fury of a people defrauded by their government knows no bounds. No free government can survive the madness of great masses of swindled citizens at any time anywhere.

It will be recalled that after the people of France had been ground down by crushing taxes and by the squandering of their annuity funds by their government, that they were ready to follow any radical leader who held out hope of relief. Their new leader was Robespierre. He was given power to decree the execution of those who displeased him. It was by his decree, under this shameful authority, that he had 1,373 heads cut off in 49 days. It was not alone the people of Paris who suffered from the despotic rule of Robespierre, but the people of other cities and the country districts. This dictator and idol of the overtaxed and defrauded citizens of France organized and authorized 170 tribunals to try suspects. The trial tribunals were sent from town to town to pronounce death sentences on suspected persons. The convicted were executed on the spot.

Taine, the historian, records that—

> In the little town of Orange 331 persons were guillotined. * * * In the city of Arras 239 men and 93 women were guillotined. In the city of Lyons alone the revolutionary commissioner admitted to 1,684 executions. The total number of these murders has been put at 17,000 among whom were 1,200 women, of whom a number were octogenarians.

The victims were not "economic royalists" of the cities, for, of the total number of executions 4,000 were farmers and 3,000 were workingmen. The mob spirit once unleashed is no respecter of persons. Where did this blood bath end? Napoleon, with all his prestige as a conqueror, appeared and took control.

Social security, if not kept on an actuarial basis, can lead to devastating consequences to our Government. The approach of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Ways and Means to the problems of coverage considered under title II may not be as all-inclusive at this time as some persons would like to have it, but the action taken by the Committee does represent the majority opinion as to the wisdom of what the Committee believes to be a wise extent of coverage at this time. Other steps can be taken with safety after a thorough study of the problem relating to the extension of coverage under title II.

I assert without fear of successful contradiction that Social Security is the child of national solvency—not insolvency.

I do not hesitate to say that this is no time to play cheap politics with a social-security system. The administration of our own social security since its enactment in 1935 invites caution when expanding its coverage. Let me say here that at no point in the deliberation did the subcommittee or full committee give any consideration to the political aspects or implications of the proposed legislation. Every step taken in expanding the coverage under social security should be sound and well thought out. We know that the fund under OASI has been collected and spent by the Administration. This vast sum of nine thousand million dollars intended to pay old-age insurance benefits will have to be raised again by taxation. There is no doubt whatever that to sweep in 20,000,000 persons under OASI, increasing the benefits, and altering the entire concept upon which a sound system is predicated can lead only to confusion and a weakening of the entire system. More than this, to play politics with the trust funds of millions of citizens and ultimately to rob them of both their money and their security is to invite violence in its most destructive and revolting aspects.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-six Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, your subcommittee has approached the social-security problem with no thought of politics in mind, but rather to expand the coverage only so far and no further at this time than can safely be done without more study of the intricate problems involved. Our aim has been to improve the system without sacrificing such gains as have already been made.

Delicate and highly controversial problems are involved in dealing with the social-security system, and these, after full and fair discussion and with the aid of experts in this field of legislation, your subcommittee has sought to solve.

I may add further that the members of the subcommittee and the members of the full committee were ever mindful of what an unsound social-security system not only did to France, but what a departure from sound social-security principles did to Germany and to England. The disastrous consequences which befell Germany and also England are referred to by Wilford I. King in his recent book, The Keys to Prosperity, from which I quote:

> The lesson to be learned from England's experience is that spending by government to promote social reforms is likely to prove a roundabout but effective way of destroying the competitive, capitalistic free-enterprise system and the prosperity that is its offspring.
>
> A second reason why lavish public spending tends to block economic progress and lower the average family's scale of living is that governments which attempt to carry out a great variety of expensive reforms usually find that legitimate financial procedures fail to raise the required funds, hence they either print paper money or borrow from the banks, thus increasing the currency supply. This inflationary process slowly but surely lessens the real worth of money, bank deposits, notes, mortgages, bonds, life-insurance policies, annuities, and all other instruments payable in a fixed number of given monetary units. As people gradually come to realize that their accumulated savings are being filched away and may eventually disappear, thrift disintegrates and capital formation dwindles.
>
> * * * In most progressive nations the function of assuring individuals that, when old age or sickness arrives, the hunger wolf will not appear at the door has been largely taken over by government. As a rule, with the passage of times, the expenses connected with such social-security programs have expanded steadily, and more and more of the burden has been thrown upon the shoulders of the well-to-do, thus drying up the sources of new capital. There is, then, a distinct tendency for social-welfare programs to bring about the downfall of capitalism and the advent of statism.
>
> It seems evident, however, that, unless government intervenes, many of the sick and aged will suffer from lack of the necessities or conveniences of life. If it is a legitimate function of government to prevent such distress, it certainly seems better to take care of the incapacitated in a systematic orderly way than to distribute relief in a haphazard manner. But British and German experience indicates that following such a systematic orderly procedure tends to destroy capitalism and substitute for it either socialism or fascism. Here we have an apparent dilemma. Must we choose between social insecurity and statism?

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Recommended coverage changes: It is recommended that coverage be extended as follows:

First. State and local officers and employees. Coverage to be effected under voluntary compacts or agreements between the Federal Government and the several States and Territories, with the right reserved to each State or Territory to determine the classes of employees placed under such coverage. Each compact would include an agreement fixing the minimum coverage period at 5 years plus 2 years following the filing of a notice of intention to withdraw.

Second. Employees of nonprofit institutions: Coverage to be effected through voluntary waivers of the present employers' pay-roll tax exemption; such waivers to be filed by the individual employing unit, organization, or institution. The minimum coverage period would be 5 years plus 2 years following the filing of a notice to withdraw the waiver.

Third. Domestic service in college fraternal organizations and undergraduate college clubs.

Fourth. Employment in agricultural or horticultural organizations, now excluded under section 209 (b) (10) (B), Social Security Act, and exempt from Federal income taxes under section 101 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Fifth. Employment in voluntary employee beneficiary associations, now excluded under sections 209 (b) (10) (C), and (D), Social Security Act.

Sixth. Certain employment by the Tennessee Valley Authority as now provided for comparable employment by the Bonneville Power Administration.

Seventh. Employment by American-owned international air carriers on the same basis as employment on American-owned oceangoing vessels.

Eighth. Employment in farm-loan and farm-credit institutions.

Ninth. Employment off the farm in drying, packing, packaging, and in similar processing and handling operations of fruits and vegetables preparatory to marketing such produce.

Tenth. Civilian employment in military post exchanges, naval stores, ship stores, and similar instrumentalities of the armed forces.

Eleventh. Employment while in transit outside the United States while traveling between two points in the United States.

There has been much criticism of the provision which penalizes a person who retires under OASI at age 65 if he earns to exceed $15 per month in covered employment. H. R. 6777 liberalizes this work clause by permitting the retired worker to earn $40 per month without penalty. This $15 limitation ought never to have been a part of the social-security law. As pointed out by the eminent economist, Willford I. King, in rather vigorous language:

> Persons cannot receive old-age pensions as long as they continue regular employment. This provision of the law was evidently inserted by economic illiterates who believed that the number of jobs in the Nation was fixed, and that it was unfair for a man having a pension to take away another man's job. They did not realize that their action not only condemned the aged to poverty but also reduced the national income by cutting off the goods which the elderly could and should produce.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 10, 1948.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

At the annual meeting of the National Health and Welfare Retirement Association held today the following was adopted:

"*Resolved,* That on behalf of 2,024 member organizations of the National Health and Welfare Retirement Association representing 21,000 individuals in 247 communities and 43 States we urge the immediate adoption of the bill H. R. 6777, as introduced by Representative DANIEL A. REED, providing for inclusion of nonprofit organizations under old-age and survivors insurance on a voluntary basis. We are convinced that there is great need for this legislation in the interest of public welfare."

HENRY BRUERE, *Chairman.*
MILTON H. GLOVER, *President.*

XCIV——513

FREEZING MILITARY SERVICE—EXAMPLE OF OPERATION

First. Mr. X, who became 21 on May 6, 1939, had no coverage upon entering the armed forces October 1, 1940, at age 22. He was honorably discharged on October 1, 1945. Thus he spent 20 calendar quarters in active military service. He entered covered employment January 1, 1946, and continued in such employment for 4 years, earning $200 every month until his accidental death on December 15, 1950. Thus he acquired 20 calendar quarters of coverage—the quarter in which he died being counted as a quarter of coverage under H. R. 6777—under the old age and survivors insurance program.

Under existing law, he would be held to be a currently insured individual and his survivors—that is, widow and children—entitled to benefits derived from his primary insurance benefit. His primary benefit under existing law would be computed, however, on the basis of total earnings in covered employment—total taxable wages—averaged over the number of calendar quarters elapsing from May 6, 1940—when he became 22—to the end of the quarter in which he died—December 31, 1950. Thus his average monthly wage would be $95.08 and his primary benefit, $25.70.

By virtue of the provisions of section 115 of H. R. 6777, the period spent in active military service would be disregarded in making these computations. Thus, instead of averaging his income over a period of 42 calendar quarters it would be averaged over a period of only 19 quarters, resulting in an average monthly wage of $210.53 and a primary monthly benefit of $37.80. Thus in this case, which represents close to the maximum benefit that could be derived from this provision, the primary insurance benefit would be increased by 43 percent.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS IN H. R. 6777 WITH RESPECT TO STATE AND LOCAL EXPLOYEE COVERAGE

It has been said that H. R. 6777 would discriminate against municipal employees by permanently excluding them from participation in the old-age and survivors' program under title II of the Social Security Act. This statement is not true. The bill does not exclude any State, county, municipal, or other local public employees from the opportunity of coverage if the State makes arrangements for such coverage and enters into an agreement with the Federal Government for that purpose. The bill does, however, exclude such employees who are members or participants in any local retirement, pension, or any similar retirement plan. The reason for this is that a difference of opinion exists which could not be resolved at this time, with respect to the inclusion of such employees.

Fears were expressed that the agreements provided for in the bill, if they embraced employees now under local retirement plans, would impair the integrity of such plans or systems. The committee did not wish to do anything that would jeopardize local retirement systems. It was, therefore, decided that pending agreement on mutually satisfactory provisions for the integration of local retirement systems with the social security insurance program, the wise thing to do would be to exclude such employees in the provisions of the bill related to coverage of State and local employees generally.

It has also been said that the bill discriminates against cities and municipalities having less than 10 employees. This is not literally true although the bill provides that cities and municipalties having less than 10 employees are not eligible for coverage unless 25 percent of all employees of all political subdivisions of the State are included in the State-Federal compact. This means that if the employees of all political subdivisions of the State, including counties, cities, and towns, total, for example, 80,000, and the State arrangements for the coverage of 20,000, then cities and municipalities having less than 10 employees may also be brought within the provisions of the compact.

The reason for this restriction is to prevent the possibility of adverse selection of risk. Another reason is to provide an incentive for the broadest possible coverage. As a practical matter, the restriction is not believed to be undoubtedly burdensome. In most States the 25 percent of total employees of political subdivisions will be reached quickly by inclusion of employees and one or two of the largest municipalities or counties. Critics of this provision apparently have misunderstood its application.

It is also said that the bill is defective by requiring all dealings between municipalities and the Federal Government to channel through the States. Obviously this must be done. Otherwise an impossible administrative burden would be placed upon the Federal Security Agency in dealing with hundreds of thousands of individual communities, instrumentalities, and other agencies of the State. This does not violate the principles of home rule within the States since it is anticipated that the States will make satisfactory arrangements on a basis similar to the State-Federal compact. The whole effort to cover State and local employees would be disrupted and defeated if the Federal Government were compelled to reach agreement with each individual employing unit within every State.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Which one of these extensions are on a voluntary basis, or are they all on a voluntary basis?

Mr. REED of New York. No. The first two. All of the nonprofit organizations, and also the State compacts are on a voluntary basis. The others are compulsory.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, of course, the subcommittee was unanimous in its desire to bring out a bill that covered as many of those who had not heretofore enjoyed the benefits of the Social Security Act as was possible.

But to claim that we were unanimous tells only half of the story. We are not today unanimous in the procedure which is being followed because it deprives the membership of this House of even an opportunity to exercise the right and privilege of voting upon a motion to recommit.

That motion would have really brought out some pertinent and very effective, as well as desirable, amendments, liberalizing the entire act, and it was intended to bring out only such liberalizing provisions in the motion to recommit as were really and in fact noncontroversial; but the majority has seen fit by this last-minute maneuver to deprive the House and particularly the minority of the privilege to submit for the consideration of the House a motion to recommit. Obviously, they feared the result; thus, this parliamentary trick at the last moment. This in my estimation is reprehensible. The House is entitled to vote on the alternative program. The minority expected to and was entitled to exercise its right to offer a motion to recommit, but the majority did not dare put it to the test.

The gentleman from New York said, and I quote:

> I have said enough to emphasize the importance of caution in extending coverage.

That is the entire philosophy behind this move here today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a feeble, futile effort of the Republican Eightieth Congress to leave the false impression that it is interested in social legislation. The hostility of the majority party even to such a basic program as social security cannot, however, be so easily camouflaged.

The record of Republican opposition to social security dates back to 1935—when a Democratic Congress responded to the appeal of President Roosevelt to "place the security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first," by safeguarding "against misfortunes which cannot be wholly eliminated in this man-made world of ours."

Even then the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means challenged its constitutionality. The present chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota, said it would not work and, as if to make certain that this would be the result, urged that social security be made an additional responsibility of the Veterans' Administration. Yes, I said the Veterans' Administration.

With this backward beginning, it was probably too much to expect progress in the field of social security—but even too optimistic to expect to hold our own in the present Congress.

Oh, yes; the gentleman from New York, chairman of the subcommittee said, "Let us move along," and Chairman KNUTSON echoed, "Let us move along"; but we have moved along in reverse.

What is the record of the Eightieth Congress on social security?

First. In the closing days of the last session two bills were passed. The first was H. R. 3818, which again froze the rate of social-security taxes in order to forestall demands for increased benefits. The second was the Gearhart bill to reverse a court decision holding that certain news vendors employed by Mr. Hearst out in San Francisco were entitled to protection. To his great credit, President Truman refused to sign this bill and it did not become law.

Second. What has happened in social security in 1948?

First, the news vendors fell before the persistent pressure of a powerful lobby. H. R. 5052 was enacted over the veto of the President.

Second, House Joint Resolution 296, to reverse still another court—the United States Supreme Court—and to take away coverage granted by Congress in 1935 to 750,000 workers, was passed.

The Senate supplied a shiny veneer of a slight increase in aid to States for public assistance, in an apparent effort to make it embarrassing for the President to veto the bill.

Third, in order to take no chances on ultimate enactment of the pernicious Gearhart House Joint Resolution 296, the majority have now incorporated it in the otherwise fairly respectable raiment of the bill now before us. Even so, the President may, because of the violence done to the social-security structure, have to veto this otherwise desirable bill.

Finally, not content with stalling and subtle backsliding in social security coverage, the majority membership of the House tried to make certain that the Social Security Administration was wrecked by depriving it of funds for necessary research and assistance to the Congress, as well as by removing from it essential functions and responsibilities. Fortunately, the other body repaired some of the damage.

The present bill, H. R. 6777, must be considered in these sordid surroundings of opposition to social security. The wholesome provisions for extension of coverage to employees of State and local governments and nonprofit institutions, as well as to less numerous groups not now covered, are rare and shiny apples among several rotten barrels. But for these provisions the majority deserve no special credit, for the problem of coverage of employees of States and of religious and educational institutions has been in the process of solution over a period of years. Because of its complexity, and the fundamental and earnest belief on the part of sincere and well-meaning people that compulsory coverage of employees of religious institutions might be an infringement upon the essential tax-free status of the organized churches of the Nation and a step toward wedding of church and State, it has been necessary to work out definite safeguards over a period of several years. That function has at last been reached. It is not the result of Republican effort, but of patient and painstaking cooperation of legislative representatives of the principal church groups with members of the Ways and Means minority, who have always assumed the initiative in social-security advancement.

As for State and local employees, the correspondence of every member of the Ways and Means Committee will bear out my statement that they have been trying for years to break down the barriers to their inclusion in social security.

In either instance it is not a question of forcing these employees into the system, but of eliminating hazards and clearing away barriers. However, the work of the committee in this respect deserves commendation.

I shall support the bill on final passage, in spite of its bad features and the fact that it contains so little when so much that is noncontroversial could have been included to alleviate the strain and economic insecurity of millions of people.

The President on May 24 repeated his urgent call for enactment by this Congress of the following program of social security:

First. More adequate benefits under old-age and survivors' insurance, to compensate for the 65 percent cost-of-living increase since 1939, when the present benefits were fixed.

Second. Extended coverage for old-age and survivors' insurance.

Third. Extended coverage for unemployment insurance.

Fourth. Insurance against loss of earnings due to illness and disability.

Fifth. Improved public assistance for the needy.

The basic research for such a legislative program has already been completed both in the House and Senate. The Calhoun report to the Committee on Ways and Means in 1946 and the recent reports of the Senate Advisory Council on Social Security present strikingly strong support for the recommendations of the President.

For a number of years I have introduced a bill which liberalizes and expands the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. I first introduced this bill in 1943, again in 1945, and again in 1947 and 1948. The present bill which I have introduced, H. R. 6099, follows very closely along the lines recommended by the Senate Advisory Council. I believe that my bill offers a sound basis for immediate legislative action.

My bill would extend coverage to about 20,000,000 jobs now excluded from the insurance program. In addition to bringing into the system persons working for nonprofit organizations, for States and localities and certain other small groups, such as would be covered by the subcommittee's bill, my bill would extend social-insurance protection to the self-employed—such as farmers, small-business men, and professional people—to farm workers, to persons in domestic service, and to the men and women in our armed forces.

H. R. 6099 would establish a new and important kind of protection for workers who become totally disabled for more than 6 months. Monthly benefits similar to retirement benefits would be paid to these individuals for as long as their disability continued or until they reached age 65 and became eligible for regular retirement benefits.

My bill would reduce the retirement age from 65 to 60 for women employees, widows, wives, and mothers. Since wives usually are at least 5 years younger than their husbands, they cannot in many instances draw benefits under the present law for 5 years after their husbands are forced to retire.

Both H. R. 6099 and the subcommittee bill would increase the amount of earnings which a beneficiary may receive without loss of his insurance benefit from $14.99 to $40 a month. However, my bill makes more liberal provision for retired persons by providing that beginning at age 70 the benefits are payable irrespective of the amount an individual earns in covered employment.

My bill would provide for a lump-sum burial payment equal to 6 months' insurance benefit in all cases where a worker dies insured. Since the present law provides for such a payment only in case no monthly benefits are payable, many families find that the unusual expenses of death cannot be met from the family's available resources.

H. R. 6099 provides that a disabled husband or widower 65 years of age or older who has been dependent on his spouse may draw benefits on her wage record. It also provides for the continuation of monthly benefits to a child of a retired or deceased person after the child reaches age 18 if it is permanently disabled.

H. R. 6099 provides greater protection for children in other ways. It gives a wage earner's adopted children protection similar to that of his natural children. It liberalizes the definition of a child's dependency to enable children who are in fact dependent on foster parents to draw benefits on their wage records in the event of their death. Like the subcommittee bill, in order to insure adequate family income for the wage earner's children, it provides benefits for the divorced wife of a wage earner who has not remarried, who has his child in her care, and who has received at least one-half of her support from the wage earner. The provision for paying the first child three-fourths of the worker's primary insurance benefit instead of one-half also is included in both bills.

My bill, recognizing that the present average retirement benefit of $25 per month is wholly inadequate to meet present living costs, would liberalize very substantially the amount of the monthly insurance benefits. It would increase the minimum monthly insurance benefit payable to a man and his wife to $30 and would raise the maximum monthly insurance benefits payable to a retired beneficiary and his family or his survivors from the present maximum of $85 to $150. This change would aid large families where there are three or more children. In this connection H. R. 6099, like the subcommittee bill, would eliminate the requirement that total family benefits may not exceed twice the primary insurance benefit of the wage earner.

The heart of the benefit-liberalization provisions in my bill is a change in the method of computing the primary insurance benefit. This benefit would be calculated at 40 percent of the first $75 of the worker's average monthly wage (instead of the present $50) and 15 percent of the remainder up to $400 (instead of the present 10 percent of the remainder up to $250). The subcommittee bill makes no change in this respect.

The first $4,800 of a covered individual's earnings would be taxable under my bill, instead of the present $3,000. This increase corresponds to the increase since 1939 in the earnings of persons covered by the program. In addition to increasing the revenue of the program, it would enable the higher paid worker to obtain a benefit more closely in proportion to his real income than at present. Again the subcommittee bill is silent on such a change.

Enactment of the Forand bill on public assistance and of my bill on old age and survivors', disability, and unemployment insurance would, in my opinion enable the Eightieth Congress to say with well-earned satisfaction that progress in social security has been made.

The prospect, however, is not bright. An opportunity would have been provided by the motion to recommit which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] was prepared to offer. The alleged supporters of social security were afraid to stand and be counted on this motion. The authors of all the bills to expand social-security coverage and to increase benefits were afraid to demonstrate their sincerity or insincerity on this great issue. In short, they were asked to "put up" or "shut up," and they have chosen to do the latter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, before discussing the provisions of the bill under consideration I desire again to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who served as chairman of the subcommittee which produced H. R. 6777.

In the few years I have been a Member of this body I know of no one who has been fairer or more statesmanlike in the conduct of hearings than the gentleman from New York. It was a great pleasure to serve with him. In view of the instructions of the full committee that its subcommittee continue its efforts, I am looking forward to a longer period of service with him on the subcommittee, although perhaps not under his leadership. Maybe somebody else will be chairman next year.

The gentleman from New York has pointed out to you the features of the bill that pertain to coverage. In the limited time he had, however, it was impossible for him to cover other sections of the bill. I might say that there appeared to be no objection in the committee to the provisions of the bill other than the one dealing with the clarification of employment relationships.

I do not mean to say that everybody was satisfied with the bill. Many members of the committee were not quite satisfied because the committee did not go completely across the board and cover everybody under title II. The committee desired to take those groups under coverage now who are perfectly willing and agreeable to coverage, but not to force upon others who are not yet willing to have coverage the compulsory obligations of paying the tax.

I say there was some argument about the provision of the bill having to do with clarification of employment relations. You will remember that the House passed a short time ago House Joint Resolution 296 by a vote of approximately 5 to 1. At the time the subcommittee prepared this bill it was not certain that measure would pass the Senate, so the subcommittee deemed it advisable to restate the feeling of the committee in the present bill regarding that point. This is in the bill now. We carried the subject a little further than we did in 296, however. We provided in this bill that no one shall be eligible for benefits whose wages were not taxable. The Members of the House I am sure are aware of the fact that there have been quite a number of recipients under title II for whom no tax has ever been paid on their wages. Under this provision there must be a tax liability in order for anyone to receive benefits under title II. We safeguard the rights of a number of people about whom you have heard a lot by saying that if benefits have already accrued for them, those benefits shall not be taken away by this bill.

There is another feature of the bill that has not been mentioned. We liberalized the benefits in one very significant respect. It was called to our attention that widows with large families have not been faring so well under the benefit provisions of existing law. We increase the benefits for widows with a family of more than two children by providing approximately $6.50 a month more for the first child, and by other provisions give them additional benefits.

Let me refer to another significant provision in the bill. Under existing law a person must not receive more than $15 under covered employment. If he does, he loses his right to benefits, even though he may be eligible on the basis of age. We have raised that to $40, so that one can now earn under the provisions of the bill as much as $40 under covered employment and still receive benefits. In spite of the fact that the provisions of the bill may not go so far as some desire, I hope and trust that the House will by the necessary two-thirds vote agree to the passage of the bill. It is a step in the direction of the ultimate goal which all of you have in mind.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of praise for this bill now before us. I call attention to the fact that the House is being denied the opportunity to vote for a real constructive social-security measure.

I gave notice to the House on Thursday and on Friday last that I would present a motion to recommit in which motion to recommit I have embraced provisions which the administrators of 48 of the State social-security systems have endorsed unanimously. But the House is

being denied an opportunity to vote on that subject. Also, my motion to recommit would have embraced increases in the old-age and survivors insurance benefits which have been studied since 1939 and which have been unanimously endorsed by the Senate Advisory Council on Social Security. This is an outside committee composed of the leading businessmen, economists, and labor representatives of the country insofar as social security is concerned. They unanimously endorsed the principles in my bill. So, the House cannot really this morning pass an adequate social-security bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that the United States Chamber of Commerce has gone along on this enlarged social-security program as have practically all representative groups in this country?

Mr. EBERHARTER. There was no objection from any source in the country that I know of to the provisions that I embraced in my bill, and which I am prepared to offer as a substitute. The Congress is away behind the country, Mr. Speaker, in passing this type of legislation this morning without providing any increase whatsoever in old-age insurance benefits and without giving any increase whatsoever in public assistance. We are paying the same now in old-age and survivors insurance benefits as we did in 1939, before the 70-percent increase in cost of living, and that is not right. The old-age and survivors insurance fund contains at least $10,000,000,000, and the little increase that is endorsed by everybody who has studied the subject is being denied, and the right to vote on that question by the Members of the House is being denied. People are actually drawing more from relief than they could get under the present schedule of benefits under old-age and survivors insurance. Other provisions in my bill, which I am confident the House would have voted for had the Republican leadership not been afraid to put it to the test, are the following:

First. Coverage: My bill would extend coverage to all workers included in the committee bill, as well as the self-employed, including small-business men and professional people, domestic servants, and men and women in our armed services. The total number of workers whose families would thus become entitled to social-security protection would be approximately 11,000,000.

Second. Retirement age for women: My bill would reduce the retirement age from 65 to 60 for women employees, widows, wives, and mothers.

Third. Disability insurance: In line with the recommendation of the President and the Senate Advisory Council on Social Security, I have included a program of disability insurance to cover the hazards of unemployment from sickness or other disability.

Fourth. Financing: The tax rate upon self-employed persons covered by my bill would be one and one-half times the rate paid by employees. This agrees with the Senate Advisory Council recommendation.

Fifth. Public assistance: My bill would provide Federal aid for all needy persons on a basis ranging from 50 to 75 percent of total costs, depending on the relative per capita income of the States. Standards of assistance would be left to the States without maximum limitations specified by the Federal Government. Present limitations upon receipt of public assistance by the aged, blind, and dependent children would be eased in the interest of an adequate Nation-wide system of public assistance.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide a program under which beneficiaries of old-age and survivors insurance can really survive, and recipients of old-age assistance can, at least, exist. It is my hope that the bill will be enacted.

The bill that we are voting on this morning has some good features, I will say, but there is a provision in here that is going to throw, in my opinion and in the opinion of the best legal minds of this country, the whole Social Security System into chaos and confusion. It narrows the definition of "employer" and "employee," and it will take the courts at least 4 or 5 years to determine what the Congress meant by the provisions contained in this bill. We passed a bill to that effect, known as House Joint Resolution 296. It is at the White House now. Perhaps it will be vetoed. I would suggest that the President veto House Joint Resolution 296 because, Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that we are removing as many, perhaps, as a million and a half salesmen and their dependents from under the protection of social security, that is what you are doing in this bill; a million and a half persons now under the law. You are taking them out if you pass this bill. There are some good things in it. But you do not increase public assistance and old-age benefits. All you do in this bill is to take in the municipal and State employees on a voluntary compact basis, as I understand it, and grant voluntary coverage to employees of nonprofit institutions. But you also take a million and a half salesmen out of coverage and do not give an increase in social security benefits at all.

In my opinion, the following amendments are necessary if the bill is, on balance, to contribute toward a more adequate system of social security:

First. Section 201 of the bill, which is the one depriving 750,000 persons of employee status should be deleted.

Second. A new section should be added to provide that the employees who would be covered by the bill may become fully insured after 20 quarters or 5 years of coverage—within the 40 quarters or 10 years before death or retirement. Under H. R. 6777, a person under the age of 58 would have to work every quarter for at least 10 years to become fully covered.

Third. Another amendment which should be made in behalf of the newly covered employee is to change the method of computing benefits so as not to average in the time since 1937 during which they were legally ineligible for coverage.

Fourth. Section 116 of the bill should be amended to enable State and local governments to supplement their own civil service or pension plans with voluntary compacts for social security coverage of their employees.

Fifth. Since the hazards of old age and unemployment are universal, the so-called voluntary coverage of groups of employees should be held to the minimum required to maintain the constitutional guaranties. The bill should be amended to limit voluntary coverage to State and local employees and employees of religious institutions.

Sixth. Section 109 of the bill should be amended to prevent delays in the payment of benefits in the case of employees whose employers are resisting imposition of the employment taxes.

Mr. Speaker, at least six amendments I have mentioned are required if the good in this bill is to outweigh the bad. I asked Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Administrator of Federal Security, for his views on H. R. 6777, as reported to the House. In a letter that I received recently, he says:

> Even though the present bill is so limited in its objectives, I should be happy to recommend its enactment if it were not for the provisions which, as I have indicated above, appear to me on careful consideration to have harmful effects. My views may be summarized as follows: The deficiencies in this bill in its present form so far outweigh its limited advantages that I cannot favor its enactment.

I think it is an outrage, honestly, that the membership is forced into this parliamentary position. The powerful Committee on Ways and Means should bring the bill here under the rules and let the House pass its opinion on social security. I think we are taking a backward step, and I am going to vote against the bill in protest of this procedure.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is my intentions to support this bill because it is a step in the right direction but does not go far enough. When I first came to Congress in 1939 there was talk of amending the Social Security Act. While it is true that some minor changes have and are being made in the law, yet we are still just talking about the major amendments that will bring needed relief to millions of recipients of earned social-security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, since 1939 we have heard the excuse that delay is necessary in order that certain committees should study the subject. We have had the excuse that a board of actuarial experts similar to those employed by insurance companies should study the financial structure of the social-security funds and the possible impact of such amendments.

We have been told in the name of economy it has been necessary to postpone liberalization of benefits under the Social Security Act. This waiting policy has long run its course and the American people are sick and tired of such dilly-dallying over a matter that concerns the health and welfare of millions of our citizens.

We, in the Congress of the United States, should be ashamed of our actions in pouring out billions of dollars to foreign nations while we turn our backs to the needs of our fellow Americans who, by the sweat of their brows, have made this Nation possible. These same American citizens contributed to the prosperity of our Nation only to witness it being dissipated by international hand-outs to foreign nations without any hope of a dollar ever being repaid.

Approximately 2,000,000 are receiving benefits under the Social Security Act. There are 875,000 retired workers over 65 years of age who get approximately $25 a month. Two hundred and seventy thousand of thier wives receive a half allowance, or about $13 a month. Thus, a man and wife receive about $38 monthly.

There are 135,000 widows with young children who receive $20 monthly; 165,000 aged widows of deceased workers get $20 a month; 10,000 aged dependent parents receive about $13.50 a month; 525,000 children of deceased workers get $13 a month.

If you consider the average retired couple in your congressional district, you will find that they are receiving on an average of $38 monthly. Let us ask ourselves, in all sincerity—Could my mother and father exist on $38 a month in the face of present living costs? The answer is so obvious that even a school child of tender years can reply to such a question.

It is a known fact that social security is here to stay and that it is intended to provide elderly citizens with a means of livelihood in their declining years. Yet we seem to forget, in viewing earned social-security benefits, that the formula used in computing them has never been changed since the law was first passed. Meanwhile, the cost of living has soared to the point where it has doubled itself. Since 1933 the cost of living index has increased from 89.7 to 169.3 percent. It is common knowledge that persons gainfully employed are having a difficult time in making both ends meet.

The Congress of the United States has ignored the elderly citizens of America, who, by their labor and taxes, built this great Nation. Yes, we have forgotten them in turning our attention to world problems. Hardly a day passes that we have not heard on this floor of the poor unfortunate people abroad. When you pick up your daily newspaper it is not uncommon to find full-page advertisements directing your attention to the needs of millions of persons abroad. But there is not one word said in defense of millions of our own American citizens who are on starvation diets and restricted in many instances to one scanty meal a day.

Let us examine, for a moment, the amount of financial assistance we have given to the peoples of the world. According to the United States Department of Commerce, from March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1946, in the form of lend-lease aid alone, the American taxpayers contributed $50,243,996,159. In addition, we have contributed toward world recovery since May 1, 1945, the sum of $23,076,995,818, which has been allocated as follows:

Contributions to:	
United Nations	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World Bank	3,175,000,000
Lease-lend	2,163,000,000
Advances to foreign nations:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain and the Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Greek-Turkish loan	400,000,000
Liquidation of lease-lend	500,000
Relief, war-devastated areas	350,000,000
International Relief Organization	71,073,000
Military relief in occupied areas	600,000,000
Interim-aid bill, 1947	597,000,000
Total	23,076,995,818

With the recent passage of the European recovery program, we have obligated ourselves to expend $17,000,000,000 more as a starter in bailing out Europe from its financial mess. When you add together all of these sums for foreign aid, you have the almost unbelievable total of $90,000,000,000, which includes ERP, which is estimated to cost $17,000,000,000, but which may well exceed that sum.

In other words, since this Nation was founded in 1776 until 1933—a period of 157 years—we spent, in conducting the affairs of government, less than $90,000,000,000. Yet, in 7 years we have sent abroad over $90,000,000,000, which should not be such a bad record in the eyes of foreigners for a Nation that has been called repeatedly a "race of Shylocks."

Let us recognize the fact that all groups in America have received some recognition with respect to the increased cost of living. Virtually all employees in Government and industry have received wage increases. Yet, little attention has been given to the plight of our elderly citizens receiving old-age assistance and no attention has been given to those who earned retirement benefits under the Social Security Act.

For example, in the State of Pennsylvania in 1947 the minimum figures for bare existence of an individual amounted to $20 for food, $4 for clothing, shelter maintenance, $25, and incidentals, $4, or a total of $54.

The cost of living in Pennsylvania is typical of conditions in the United States. Yet in Pennsylvania in 1947 the average old-age assistance paid was $23.52 per month. At the same time, retired employees under social security received an average monthly benefit of $25 with $13 additional if married or a total of $38 monthly.

In 1946 old-age assistance payments in the United States on an over-all average amounted to $32.15 monthly for each recipient. This figure includes Federal and State aid, but it is only an average figure. In some States many recipients of old-age assistance received $10 to $15 a month and are told to live on such an allowance. According to statistics recently compiled, there were 3,140,819 old-age pensioners, dependent children, and the blind, who, in 1946, received an average payment each month of $12.75.

Yet, at the same time, Great Britain has been paying, by comparison, $33 monthly to each needy person. Our gifts to the British Socialist Government in recent years have averaged $1,500,000,000 annually; and, in dispensing money under the European recovery program, Great Britain will receive approximately one-third of the money that American taxpayers are contributing to support the so-called Marshall plan. It is a ridiculous situation to realize that American taxpayers are doling out billions of dollars to foreign nations and permitting them to pay to the needy nearly three times the amount we expend for our own elderly citizens.

Even though we approved legislation to enable States to increase old-age assistance $5 monthly, is there anyone in the United States that when he reaches age 60 can be expected to live on $12.75 monthly, $25 monthly, or $38 if married? The answer is so apparent that it is an insult to question one's intelligence to even ask such a ridiculous question. Yet, that is exactly what we have been asking the elderly citizens to do the past several years.

Yesterday we spent the greater portion of the day talking about the displaced persons of Europe and finally concluded by approving legislation in their behalf.

Last week we spent a full day in discussing the rehabilitation of the nations of Europe and feeding the world.

As I look around this Chamber I see a lot of my colleagues who have spent many hours fighting for the European recovery program and for displaced persons. This applies to both sides of the aisle. Why are you silent today? Have you no regard for the plight of the elderly citizens of this Nation?

We need more than an expansion of coverage, and an increase in the amount a person may earn who is retired and still be eligible for earned social-security benefits. We especially need to change the formula of computing present benefits so that all recipients under the Social Security Act will receive an immediate increase.

We are speaking of adjourning here this month. How in the name of common sense can we adjourn this Congress without providing adequate relief to the senior citizens of America. I am wholeheartedly opposed to adjourning the Eightieth Congress until we discharge our obligations to these elderly citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I may be criticized and held up to ridicule for making this statement but I am determined to refrain from voting for any more appropriations designed to aid the peoples of foreign nations until we take care of our own American people. I refuse to be a hypocrite and shed tears over people in other lands while our own American people are victims of poverty at the hands of a Congress that has turned a deaf ear to their pleadings.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

FORTY MINUTES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am amazed to find that the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives have invoked an extraordinary rule of parliamentary procedure which prohibits a Member of this body from offering an amendment or a substitute bill to the one reported out by the Ways and Means Committee. Under the existing rules of procedure, only 40 minutes is being allowed today for consideration of one of the most important problems facing our Nation, namely, the revision of the Social Security Act; this in spite of the fact that the present leadership of the House and Senate have had 2 years to consider this matter.

It is quite obvious that the reason for this gag-rule procedure is to prevent the country from getting a decent revision of the social-security system. The leadership is afraid to let the Members amend the bill of the Ways and Means Committee because they know that the overwhelming sentiment of the country is in favor of writing a strong and realistic social-security law.

This Republican bill, H. R. 6777, is an inadequate and incomplete bill in three major respects. First, the bill would only extend coverage to from one-half to three and one-half million people—depending on how many employers elect on their own initiative to pay social-security taxes. Twenty to twenty-five million employed persons, over a third of the working force, still would remain out of the system.

My second criticism is that the bill ignores completely the fact that the average beneficiary cannot begin to subsist on present day payments. The Congress by its action last week has for the second time since the beginning of the war raised the level of payments to needy individuals on public assistance although these payments will still fall below actual needs. It has at this session again increased benefits for retired civil-service workers and railroad employees. Yet it has failed to raise an initially inadequate scale of benefits for two and one-half million of our older men and women and our dependent children receiving social-insurance payments, even though the cost of living for these people has increased 70 percent since the law was amended in 1939. Retired workers cannot live on $25 a month and the average widow or child of a deceased worker cannot be fed, clothed, and housed on $20.50 or $12.84 a month, the respective amounts being paid to these persons. Such sums are ridiculously low, and even the protection of these small insurance payments are denied to a third of our population. I deeply regret that the bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee does not correct this basic defect in the social-security law.

My third criticism of this bill is that it does not extend benefit protection to workers who become permanently and totally disabled. This leaves the United States as the only major Nation having an old-age insurance system that does not also have some form of insurance protection for total disablement.

We have the assurance of the Committee on Ways and Means that H. R. 6777 is based on an intensive study, covering several months, yet the bill only scratches the surface of problems that should be solved by this Congress. The committee's staff in its 1946 report and the recent report of the Advisory Council on Social Security of the Senate strongly recommended immediate extension of coverage to almost every field of employment. Both reports recognize the need for providing minimum yet adequate benefits. In addition all representative groups from the United States Chamber of Commerce to the CIO agree that the old-age and survivors insurance program should be extended to almost all types of employment. All agree that the program should provide for at least the minimum economic needs of the average beneficiary. In the face of this unanimity among the experts and the public, and in direct contradiction of its own pledges, is the Congress content to let the social-security program cover only two-thirds of the working force and content to pay $25 a month retirement benefit while the average old-age assistance recipient now receives $38 a month?

Several bills have been introduced in this session and previous sessions which would improve the old-age and survivors insurance system. I introduced such a bill in October 1945. I have brought it up to date and have reintroduced it in February of this year.

My bill, H. R. 5356, extends coverage to several groups left out of the program by H. R. 6777. My bill covers farmers, independent businessmen, people in the professions, persons in all types of domestic service, and men and women in the military services. It would bring into the program eighteen to twenty million persons instead of the one-half to three and one-half million that might be covered by H. R. 6777. I would like to point out that my bill, H. R. 5356, unlike the bill we are voting on today, H. R. 6777, would permit a State the option of covering or excluding members of State and local retirement systems. If they so desired, States could then adjust an existing retirement plan to supplement the basic OASI benefits. This action would give the employees of States continuous OASI protection if they shifted to private employment and of even greater importance it would enable the States to provide larger survivor and retirement benefits under the combined plans then they could finance through a State plan alone.

There are long standing retirement systems in my own State of Washington. Many of our cities have maintained plans for their employees for the last several years. Our plan for firemen and policemen is an old one providing for disability as well as retirement benefits. The plan for teachers of the State covers most of the men and women in that profession and provides a retirement benefit of $100 or more. In 1947 the legislature established two State-wide retirements plans, one for State and local employees and one for local employees alone. It is obvious, therefore, that most governmental employees in my State could be or are covered under some existing State or municipal plan. H. R. 6777 would, in effect, exclude these people from old-age and survivors insurance. This would work a hardship on them in the several ways that I have indicated. Employees who shifted from one retirement plan to another or to private employement might either lose their protection or have it seriously reduced. Furthermore, many of the plans do not provide monthly benefits for survivors, a protection available to employees under old-age and survivors insurance. And finally, if the retirement plans were made supplemental to old-age and survivors insurance the total retirement benefits payable might be larger than under the staff plans alone.

The State of Washington has long recognized the desirability of extending old-age and survivors insurance coverage to State and local employees. In 1941 the legislature enacted a law giving the State authority to cover under the Social Security Act all State employees and officials and all employees of its localities and its instrumentalities at such time as the Federal Government should amend the Federal insurance law to make such action possible. In 1945 the legislature transmitted a memorial to the Congress asking that old-age and survivors insurance protection be extended to States, cities, towns, and all the other local units of Government.

Three other States have passed legislation to bring their employees under old-age and survivors insurance at such time as Congress permits and many States and Territories of Alaska and Hawaii have sent resolutions or memorials to Congress asking for coverage of all their employees. I understand also that two States have established old-age and survivors insurance systems closely modeled after the provisions of title II of the Social Security Act. They plan to adjust these systems with the Federal law as soon as Congress acts to extend coverage to them.

It is the expressed desire of the States that they be given the option of covering members of their retirement systems under old-age and survivors insurance. It is my bill rather than H. R. 6777 which would give them that privilege.

My bill, also adds insurance protection in case of permanent and total disability. At any one time about 1.6 million persons age 14 to 64 are kept out of the labor market by a disability that has lasted 6 months or more. My bill would give benefits similar to retirement benefits to totally disabled workers and their families. This change would also remove certain inequities in the existing old-age and survivors insurance provisions. At the present time individuals who become disabled prior to reaching age 65 may either lose their insurance protection entirely or have their benefits greatly reduced, because of prolonged disability. I have proposed that these unfair and unjust provisions be corrected by eliminating periods of disability from the computation of retirement benefits. The Senate Advisory Council on Social Security has recommended a system of

disability insurance. H. R. 6777, however, does nothing at all for our totally disabled workers.

Nor does it modify the insured status provisions of the present law. This would mean that workers 65 years of age who are brought under the law for the first time would have to be steadily employed for 6 years in order to be eligible for benefits. Workers that were slightly younger would have to have up to 10 years of covered employment before they could draw benefits. My bill, unlike H. R. 6777, would enable newly covered workers to acquire a fully insured status for death or retirement benefits within a more reasonable period of time. Anyone having 20 quarters of coverage within the 40 elapsed quarters prior to death or retirement would be fully insured.

H. R. 6777 also fails to make any adjustment in the average wage provisions in the present law. A newly covered worker who retired after 10 years of employment under the law would receive a relatively small benefit because his average wages would be calculated on the entire elapsed time since 1937. In other words, if this man had actually earned $200 in wages, the average on which his benefit would be computed would be $90. Benefits computed under my bill could be based on the actual wages earned after the date of its enactment. This would insure a full benefit for newly covered workers.

My bill would increase benefits for aged persons, widows, and fatherless children in other ways, to make them reasonably adequate to meet minimum needs. It raises the minimum retirement benefit from $10 a month to $50 a month for a single man and from $15 to $75 a month for a man and wife. The maximum total of monthly benefits payable to a family is increased from the present $85 a month to $150 a month. It would permit men and women forced out of employment at age 60 to start drawing benefits.

The bill which I have introduced liberalizes and broadens the law in several other respects, all of which are designed to make our social-insurance program a real measure of security against destitution. It would greatly reduce our relief rolls. At present our relief load costs the Federal Government and States over $1,500,000,000 a year and the rate is rapidly increasing. It would enable people to get an insurance benefit based on their own contributions without the humiliation of undergoing a means test.

Some such measure as my bill should be enacted by the Congress. There are those who give lip service to the need for a strong social-insurance program to strengthen our free democratic system. Yet when the time comes for action it is said that we must take another year or two to study what is needed. And while this goes on, people are expected to exist on $25 or less a month.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the pending bill, because I believe it is an improvement on the present law. It may not go as far as some would like it to go. I presume, however, that further study will be given to this subject with a view toward extending coverage where found practicable, and increasing benefits where found necessary. This bill reflects the mature judgment of both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Subcommittee on Social Security, headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members so desiring may extend their remarks on this bill at this point in the RECORD, and that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of this House were in this chamber all through last week, including all day Saturday, waiting for this bill to come before the House under a rule permitting a total of 3 hours of debate. Although we knew the rule precluded amendment to the bill, it did not preclude a motion to recommit with instructions to amend the bill in accordance with the recommendations of every administrator in the 48 States, and so as to prevent the emasculation of social security by unfair limitations and exclusions.

I had intended to speak in support of and to vote for the proposed motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], in order to cure the defects of the bill.

It is nothing less than shameful to attempt to dispose of a matter of this kind in 40 minutes. The bill is pages long. The reports are 37 pages long.

I will vote for this bill only because it is so important to obtain the benefit of the few good things in it. No one can object to voluntary coverage, nor extension of coverage to various other groups, nor to liberalization of benefits.

The majority leaders of this House are denying us the right to point out the defects, and to attempt to remove them. We can expect before the day is out the 40 minutes so graciously allowed us for this important measure will be whittled down to possibly 10 minutes on some other, and by the time we get back here tomorrow they will be giving us no time at all to discuss important measures.

The democratic process is certainly taking an unmerciful beating.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this bill, H. R. 6777, is brought up under suspension of the rules, as it gives no opportunity to offer amendments or to move to recommit with amendments. If the rules would permit, I would move to substitute H. R. 16 for this bill. There are many good provisions in H. R. 6777 and some that are objectionable. However, under the rule we must vote it up or down. The social-security program does not give even decent care for the old folks of America. I want to take this opportunity to compare the social-security program with the provisions of H. R. 16. Those of us who are urging its enactment have done everything in our power to secure a vote on it in the Eightieth Congress, but without avail. We filed a petition to discharge the committee and bring it on the floor for a vote, but we have not been able to secure the 218 signatures.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress for some 10 years, I have been deeply interested in old-age and disability security, and am the author of H. R. 16, which has for its purpose the providing of equal basic Federal retirement annuities to United States citizens over the age of 60, and with some benefits for certain dependent widows, children, and disabled persons.

We in America can be justly proud of our achievements in the development of our industrial enterprise system under mass machine production which enables us to stand in the forefront of all nations in the ability to produce food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities of life in abundance, not only for our own people but to help other nations in need. This was a major factor in winning the war. However, with machine labor and mass production, we have found that the elderly people of America, by reason of the very success we have achieved in production, are outcasts and have been deprived of remunerative employment in their declining years.

Existing social and economic conditions force upon us the complex question of security for the individual in our modern industrial civilization. Since 1919 the number of self-employed individuals in the United States, including farmers, has remained fairly constant at about nine or ten million. During the same period the number of employees in the American labor force has risen from 32,600,000 to 50,700,000, an increase of 18,000,000, or about 60 percent. Since population has been increasing during this entire period, the percentage of self-employed persons in the United States has declined from about 22 percent in 1919 to about 16.6 percent in 1946. In other words, we are facing an age-old problem under rapidly changing conditions.

The young and vigorous are on the pay rolls of this machine age and the elderly citizens are relegated to the side lines. As a result of this maladjustment, we find the aged unemployed increasing in numbers and in want, and we are faced with the problem of social security to meet the needs for livelihood of this large group.

To meet this problem the Congress passed Public Law 271 in the Seventy-fourth Congress, setting up a social-security program not only for the aged, but for the blind, dependent, crippled children, and with certain assistance to maternal and child welfare and public health. The Seventy-sixth Congress made extensive amendments to the law, and as a result we now have two major programs governing social security—title I providing grants to State for old-age assistance, and title II setting up a program for Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits. For almost 10 years now these laws have been in operation and we find that they fail, in many important particulars, to meet the problems we are seeking to solve in providing adequate social security for the aged and disabled.

The Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance has just made its report and recommendations. This Council consists of 18 outstanding leaders representing practically all segments of our industrial and social life. Their recommendations are significant in that they point out the deficiencies of the existing program for social insurance. The Council finds three major deficiencies in this old-age and survivors insurance program which I quote verbatim:

1. Inadequate coverage—only about three out of every five jobs are covered by the program.
2. Unduly restrictive eligibility requirements for older workers—largely because of these restrictions, only about 20 percent of those aged 65 or over are either insured or receiving benefits under the program.
3. Inadequate benefits—retirement benefits at the end of 1947 averaged $25 a month for a single person.

In order to remedy these deficiencies, this Advisory Council recommends that the coverage be extended to include the self-employed, farm workers, household workers, employees of nonprofit institutions, Federal civilian employees, railroad employees, members of the armed services and employees of State and local governments, all of which are now excluded from the benefits of the act. The Council further recommends extending greater liberality in eligibility and increased benefits and survivors' protection. The findings of this Council clearly disclose that the present social-security program is basically inadequate and must be completely overhauled or supplanted by a more effective program.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 100 bills pending in Congress proposing changes in the social-security law. Seventy seek to increase old-age and survivors' insurance. Forty-one urge increases in old-age assistance. Thirteen deal with aid to dependent children.

These all point to the inadequacy of the present system and the need for drastic changes or the enactment of a new plan. I will discuss some of the failings of the present system of old-age security and compare it with the proposal embodied in H. R. 16.

A COMPARISON OF THE TOWNSEND PLAN WITH THE PRESENT OLD-AGE SECURITY LAW

The problem of caring for the aged, the disabled, and dependent children, as seen today in the eyes of proponents of the Townsend plan, and others, is that there are millions among us who are not now, and cannot in the future, be cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security. Under this system, millions of old people receive either no support or hopelessly inadequate support. The system which has been set up is extremely complicated. To correct this legislation has been proposed in the Congress embodied in my bill, H. R. 16.

Mr. Speaker, I will analyze this proposal, together with a comparison of it with the existing system under the Social Security Act.

TOWNSEND PLAN

In the Eightieth Congress, several bills identical in language, propose the Townsend plan. They are H. R. 16, ANGELL; H. R. 2476, PETERSON; S. 57, LANGER; and S. 1510, PEPPER.

This is a self-financing noncontributory retirement system under which beneficiaries will receive an annuity as a matter of right without reference to need or prior contribution. It is a pay-as-you-go system. Annuities will be paid currently out of currently raised revenues. Sums received by annuitants must be spent within 30 days. The existing system of old-age and survivors' insurance and old-age assistance is abolished, together with the pay-roll tax for financing old-age and survivors' insurance.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE, OASI

United States Code title 26, section 1400–1432; title 42, section 401–410a: OASI is a self-financing contributory Federal retirement system under which the insured and their dependent survivors receive an annuity as a matter of right in an amount which depends on the length of the period of membership in the system, and the amount of wages received by the insured during such period. It is a system under which a reserve is built up against the accumulating liabilities for persons who will retire in later years. The reserve, however, is more in the nature of a contingency reserve than a full reserve. Individual accounts are kept for each worker.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

United States Code, title 42, sections 301–306, 601–606, 1201–1206 contain provisions corresponding to those provided under the Townsend proposal.

This is a noncontributory State system, aided by Federal grants, under which payments are made to beneficiaries on a basis of need in an amount fixed by State law. The State programs, though they must conform to the requirements of title I of the Social Security Act, differ widely in type from State to State.

PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

The philosophy and objectives of the Townsend proposal as compared with the philosophy and objectives of the existing system have much in common, but there are marked differences. The Townsend proposal would give recognition to the past labors of the aged and would offer them dividends from the wealth they helped to create. It would give this as a matter of right without any direct relation to specific monetary contributions. The existing old-age and survivors' insurance program gives benefits as a matter of right but ties them to a principle of insurance—something that each prospective annuitant and his employer buys as he participates in the productive processes of the country. Finally, old-age assistance is provided to the aged who, because of the lateness of starting the program of old-age and survivors' insurance or because of inadequate coverage or benefits, are in need and should be helped.

Townsend plan: Annuities should be offered with neither the stigma of charity nor the aroma of poverty. They should be offered as a matter of right as dividends from the national wealth the aged have helped to create. The system should be one to replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of the existing law. It should be one which will have a stimulative effect upon our economy and one which will make available jobs to all the young who will replace the aged as the latter move into retirement at a decent standard of living.

Old-age and survivors insurance: The advocates of this program claim that pensions should be offered as a matter of right and related to the past participation of the pensioner in the productive processes of the country. The costs of an adequate system are very great. To reduce the future cost, a compulsory contributory system is set up under which pensions will be paid which bear some relation to the customary wage standard of the pensioner. Such a system, its proponents claim, is in harmony with individual incentive within a democratic society.

Old-age assistance: Only noncontributory pensions will meet the needs of those now grown old who are in need because of past neglect in providing an adequate contributory retirement system. Since at the time the system was adopted most of the States were financially unable to assume the burden of so many aged who moved on to Federal relief rolls, it was deemed proper to continue to provide Federal aid to States to provide relief to those aged who were in need.

BENEFICIARIES UNDER THE VARIOUS PROGRAMS

Much of the argument in support of the Townsend plan stems from the limited coverage and inadequate benefits of the present system. For example, most of today's aged who are not working left the labor force before they could build up rights to benefits under OASI. And even among the young and still employed, under the present OASI system, there is no coverage for jobs in agriculture, domestic service in private homes, Federal, State, and local government employees, and workers in religious, charitable, and certain other nonprofit organizations, the self-employed, and others as well. About one-third of the workers engaged in employment are not covered by the system; and of the 75,500,000 living persons with OASI wage credits at the beginning of 1947, about 34,100,000 were neither fully nor currently insured on the basis of their wage records, and hence were not protected under the programs. In the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Administration, Annual Report, 1947, section 1, pages 7, 18, 39, it is said:

Under our present provisions it would be possible for an individual to work at some time during the course of his working life in jobs covered by Federal old-age and survivors' insurance, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Civil Service Retirement Act, and the retirement plan of a State or locality. According to the length and timing of such employments, he might become eligible to receive retirement benefits under one or more or all of these plans. Another man, with similar earnings under several of the programs, may go through a working life without ever acquiring retirement rights under any. Conceivably the survivors of a worker who dies might be eligible for benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system as well as under a State workmen's compensation law and under general veterans' legislation. Another family, equally

in need of income to replace the father's earnings, may have had no opportunity to gain protection under any of these programs.

No Federal provision is made to care for the disabled other than the needy blind. In the same report, pages 21 and 22, it is said:

The United States is unique among major industrial nations in its lack of a general disability insurance system. Compensation for wage loss due to incapacity is confined in this country to work-connected accidents or diseases in industry and commerce, to service in the armed forces, and to employment in the railroad industry or by government. Two States provide benefits for temporary disability under arrangements similar to unemployment insurance and with the same coverage. In June 1947 these special systems, in the aggregate, reached very few of the 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 persons disabled on an average day and recently in the labor force, who but for their incapacity would be working or seeking work.

The Social Security Administration in this report, pages 1 to 63, concedes the limitations of the present law and strongly urges extension of coverage. The present law was and continues to be considered simply as a cornerstone of a structure which was to be expanded. Approach has been piecemeal and dictated by practical considerations. There has been the fear that in attempting to accomplish too much all would be lost.

COVERAGE

The present coverage and proposed extensions are as follows:

Townsend plan: Every citizen over 60 years of age, every citizen between 18 and 60 who is disabled for a period longer than 6 months, and every mother who is a citizen and who has the care of one or more children under 16 years of age. Annuities will not be paid to employed persons or persons engaged in any occupation, business, or other activity, other than collecting interest, rents, or other revenues from his own investments.

Old-age and survivors' insurance: Wage and salary earners in private industry and commerce who worked in covered jobs, their families, and survivors of certain World War II veterans. Pensions are paid without the necessity of showing need. Retirement benefits are payable to a wage earner when he is 65 or older and has stopped work, his wife when she is 65, and his unmarried children under 18. Survivors' benefits are paid to children under 18, a widow caring for a child entitled to benefits, a widow of 65 without a child in her care, dependent parents, and survivors of certain World War II veterans. Nineteen hundred and forty-eight proposals of the Social Security Administration extend coverage of all gainfully employed, and reduce the qualifying age of women beneficiaries from 65 to 60.

Old-age assistance: Under public-assistance programs, aid is given to the needy aged over 65, dependent children, and the needy blind. Payments are made only on a showing of need.

Townsend plan: Approximately twenty to twenty-one million persons are over 60 or dependent. The figures below on which this estimate is based show the total population in the various categories without reference to their citizenship or eligibility under this proposal. Since the proposal applies only to citizens, deduction would have to be made for aliens and others not eligible.

Persons over 60	16,500,000
Widows with dependent children	1,600,000
Disabled persons	3,000,000 to 4,000,000

Old-age and survivors' insurance: 1,903,351 monthly benefits were paid out in September 1947. This is about 16 percent higher than in September 1946. As of January 1, 1947, about 75,500,000 million living persons had wage credits. Of these, 41,400,000 had worked a sufficient length of time in covered employment to have acquired insured status. The other 34,100,000 had some wage credits, but not sufficient to acquire an insured status.

Old-age assistance: 2,332,006 persons received old-age-assistance payments in December 1947. This is about 8 percent higher than the average of the last 10 years. Aid was also granted on behalf of 1,059,944 dependent children, and 81,149 needy blind.

AMOUNT OF BENEFITS PAYABLE

A major defect in the present system is the smallness of individual payments, and their inadequacy in providing a decent standard of living. I quote from the speech of Senator DOWNEY, July 30, 1946, in which he said:

Mr. President, the old-age insurance system is allegedly based, in respect to the payments to the recipients, upon the contributions made by the workers, the employees. A vast actuarial scheme has been set up, requiring the attention and deliberation of highly trained actuaries. Great shelves are being filled with volumes of statistics, weighted averages, median lines, maximums, minimums, involved and intricate forms. At the end, what happens? At the end, the average worker comes out with about $24 a month, far less than he would get if he were under the old-age assistance program. Mr. President, this plan actually contemplates that these actuarial calculations will become effective against a boy 16 years of age who is in a covered occupation, and that for 50 years, until he is 65 years of age, the Social Security Board will keep track of his employers and of the tax payments made from his wages; also of his wife, his children, his job, and his compensation; and then, as a result of those calculations, it will determine what that young man will receive 50 years from now. In other words, these actuarial calculators are now calculating whether 50 years from now that boy will get $10.50, or $12.13, or $19, or $20.

Mr. President, in the next 10 or 20 years we are going to have crisis after crisis; what these crises may be, no one can readily predict; but certain it is that many of them will bring widespread economic dislocation. And here is a group of men who solemnly assert that by means of this actuarial system they are at this time determining how much workers will be paid 10 to 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 or even 100 years from now. The sad and pathetic aspect of it is that these payments will amount to only approximately $10 a month, which is the minimum, or up to approximately $60 a month, which is the maximum. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, these payments are so meager and so low that they nauseate and sicken the human heart. I have already submitted for the RECORD a statement of the average payment made to these beneficiaries by each State, showing an average payment of approximately $24 a month (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, 1946).

Subject to particular attack has been the fact that the average payments under public assistance, for which a showing of need is required, exceed on the average payments under OASI toward which the beneficiaries have actually made payments.

See monthly data on public assistance published in Social Security Bulletin, for example, November 1947, pages 34 to 36, and annual data on old age and survivors insurance in Social Security Bulletin, for example, October 1947, page 33. It is also pointed out that it is rash to attempt to fix by statute and provide through reserves the payments that will be paid many years hence. Changes in the purchasing power of the dollar are so great that attempts of one generation to set minimum decent standards of living for succeeding generations cannot but prove fruitless and just waste motion. It is not possible to estimate definitely the per capita annuity that would be available under the Townsend proposal should it be enacted. The tax formula could be changed by the Congress from time to time to meet the existing needs. Some estimates of the benefits that would be paid as well as data on payments under existing law are as follows:

Townsend plan: Amounts payable under the Townsend plan will be found by subtracting administrative costs from tax receipts and diving by the number of beneficiaries. Proponents of the Townsend plan have variously estimated the benefits that would be payable monthly as follows: $60, $75 to $90, $100, $122.06—House Ways and Means Committee hearings on amendments to the Social Security Act, 1946, part 6, pages 645, 692, 727, 745, and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, 1946, page 10434.

Old-age and survivors' insurance: The amount of benefits payable under OASI depends upon the worker's average monthly wage—and thus his contribution through taxes to the system—plus an additional amount for each year of covered employment. Upon retirement, the record kept of each worker's wages will determine the size of the benefits. To be fully insured for life a worker must have 40 calendar quarters of covered employment. Minimum benefits for a worker are $10 a month, and $15 for a worker and his wife. Maximum benefits currently paid are $44.40 for a worker, and $66.60 for a worker and his wife. Average payments as of June 1947 were $24.10 for a worker—male and female—and $39.20 for a man and his wife. The corresponding figures for June 1946 were $23.80 and $38.80—most data cited are from the Social Security Bulletin, October 1947, page 33. By 1976, when workers will have had credit for 40 years of coverage, the maximum for a worker with an average monthly wage of $250 will be $56, and $84 for a worker and his wife. The maximum payment on any one account at any time is $85.

Old-age assistance: Assistance payments to the aged as of December 1947 averaged $37.42. This was an all-time high. Two million three hundred thirty-two thousand and six aged persons received $87,270,336 in Federal, State, and

local funds during that month. There is little uniformity, however, in the payments made in the several States. For example, in December 1947 they ranged from high of $84.72 in Colorado to a low of $15.87 in Mississippi. These are preliminary figures as compiled by the Statistics and Analysis Division of the Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration. Data for September appear in the Social Security Bulletin, November 1947, page 34.

Payments for the 416,190 families—1,059,944 children—receiving aid in December 1947 averaged $63.01. They ranged from a high of $105.57 in California to a low of $25.61 in South Carolina. Payments for the 81,149 needy blind receiving aid in December 1947 averaged $39.58. They ranged from a high of $72.65 in California to a low of $18.43 in Kentucky.

FINANCING THE PROGRAMS

The OASI program is currently financed by a 1-percent tax on employees for wages received and 1 percent on employers for wages paid. The public-assistance program is financed by direct appropriation of Federal, State, and local funds without direct reference to any particular tax. To finance pensions under the Townsend proposal, a tax of 3 percent on gross receipts is proposed. In greater detail, these methods are outlined as follows:

Townsend plan: Proposes a tax of 3 percent on gross income. It applies to personal incomes in excess of $100 per month. Exemption is allowed to gross receipts of nonprofit organizations. Revenues are credited to an account in the Treasury. After deducting for administrative costs, such fund will be available for paying pensions. No reserve is to be set up. No other congressional appropriations are contemplated.

Old-age and survivors' insurance: Employers and employees each contribute 1 percent of the first $3,000 of wages or salaries received by, or paid to, each employee. The rate is to increase to 1½ percent in 1950 and 1951, and to 2 percent thereafter. Tax receipts go into the general fund, but then Congress appropriates out of the general fund to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund an amount equal to the taxes collected. The fund's assets as of December 31, 1947, amounted to $9,360,000,000. Benefits are paid out of this fund in accordance with individual wage record accounts and statutory provisions and limitations. Congress has also authorized further appropriations out of general fund if contributions from the pay-roll tax prove to be inadequate. No such appropriation has yet been made.

Cumulative status of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, including the railroad retirement account

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year ended—	Investment in Treasury bonds	Investment in certificates of indebtedness and Treasury notes	Interest on investments	Benefit expenditures to date	Cost of administration of programs	Balance in fund and account	Total OASI trust fund [1] and unemployment trust fund [2]
June 30, 1937	[3] 0	[3] 267	[3] 2.3	[3] 4.0	[3] 18.3	[3] 310	[7] 622
June 30, 1938	[3] 0	[3] 728	[3] 19.1	[3] 85.2	[3] 40.9	[3] 845	[7] 1,730
June 30, 1939	[3] 0	[3] 1,244	[3] 48.3	[3] 204.9	[3] 64.9	[3] 1,263	[7] 2,544
June 30, 1940	[4] 0	[4] 1,817	[4] 86.0	[4] 333.8	[4] 92.9	[4] 1,836	[7] 3,561
June 30, 1941	[4] 0	[4] 2,454	[4] 151.5	[4] 519.4	[4] 127.3	[4] 2,485	[7] 4,769
June 30, 1942	[4] 68	[4] 3,224	[4] 225.6	[4] 755.9	[4] 167.3	[4] 3,332	[7] 6,482
June 30, 1943	[5] 193	[5] 4,221	[5] 318.9	[5] 1,035.7	[5] 195.9	[5] 4,463	[7] 8,835
June 30, 1944	[5] 643	[5] 5,083	[5] 431.9	[5] 1,354.7	[5] 230.5	[5] 5,779	[7] 11,658
June 30, 1945	[2] 1,238	[5] 5,808	[5] 570.9	[2] 1,735.9	[5] 274.8	[5] 7,129	[7] 14,444
June 30, 1946	[6] 1,638	[6] 6,567	[6] 738.6	[6] 2,208.4	[6] 316.1	[6] 8,317	[7] 15,766
June 30, 1947	[6] 1,638	[6] 7,909	[6] 916.2	[6] 2,807.3	[6] 370.5	[6] 9,623	[7] 17,492
Dec. 31, 1947	[8] 1,956	[8] 8,577	[8] 948.4	[8] 3,158.3	[8] 400.4	[8] 10,763	[8] 18,887
Consensus of actuaries' estimates for 1960						[9] 33-50	[9] 43-62

[1] Including railroad retirement account.
[2] Including railroad unemployment insurance account.
[3] Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures and Balances of the U. S. Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1939, pp. 578-581.
[4] Ib. for fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, pp. 610-613.
[5] Ib. for fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, pp. 638-641.
[6] Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury, Dec. 15, 1947, pp. 16-18.
[7] Total of column No. 6 of table 1 and column No. 7 of table 2.
[8] Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury, Jan. 15, 1948, pp. 12-14.
[9] Billions.

Old-age assistance: Public assistance payments are financed through congressional and State—and sometimes local—appropriations. No special Federal levy is made to finance the Federal share. Payments are actually made by the States. The Federal contribution for payments to the aged and blind is two-thirds of the first $15 plus one-half of the next $30. It is two-thirds of the first $9 for each child, one-half of the next $15 for the first child and one-half of the next $6 for each additional child. The maximum Federal contribution is $25 for the aged and blind, $13.50 for the first dependent child, and $9 for each additional child.

SPENDING THE ANNUITY

Under the Townsend plan, each installment of the annuity received must be spent within the United States by the end of 30 days after its receipt. The proceeds from the sale of real property acquired through the use of money received as an annuity must be spent within 6 months. The purpose of this is to keep the money in circulation, stimulate the economy, stabilize production, and the like. There is no comparable provision applicable to payments under OASI or public assistance.

ADMINISTRATION

Complications involved in the administration of old-age and survivors insurance are frequently pointed to as one of the arguments against that system. "Illusory," "sheer fraud," "swindle" are favorite epithets for attacking the reserve. See the discussion in Legislative Reference Public Affairs Bulletin No. 46, 1946, Financing Social Security, pages 41-61. A more recent further attack has been made by John T. Flynn in his Our Present Dishonest Federal Old Age Pension Plan, Reader's Digest, May 1947. This is reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 5, 1947, page 4485.

The great objection to the public assistance programs is that, being State-administered, amounts paid vary greatly not only as between States but also as between localities within the same State. So far as the Townsend proposal is concerned, none of the foregoing would present a problem, but the proposal would have some problems of its own to be worked out. Some of the foregoing points I will now consider in further detail.

Townsend plan: The Bureau of Internal Revenue is to collect the tax under the proposed law. Every person having a personal income in excess of $100 a month, and all other persons, corporations, and so forth, having any gross receipts would be required to make monthly returns. Of course much of this work of collection could be eliminated if some method of collection at the source were devised. Another administrative problem would be the sending out of the checks each month to the pensioners. A similar problem is now being met under the Social Security Act.

Old-age and survivors insurance: The Social Security Administration in the Federal Security Administration administers the payment of benefits, while the Bureau of Internal Revenue does the collecting of the tax. The cost of administering this program is now running around $42,000,000 per year. Total costs to date have been about 15 percent of benefits paid out and a little more than 2 percent of total receipts—taxes plus interest on assets. For the fiscal year 1947, administrative costs were 2.5 percent of receipts and 9.6 percent of benefits payments. Part of the administrative chore is keeping the wage records of 75,500,000 living persons and determining the amount of benefit each—and his family—is entitled to if and when he or they becomes eligible for a benefit payment.

Old-age assistance: Though public assistance programs are State administered, the Federal Government contributes to the administrative costs. The contribution is 5 percent of the grant for old-age assistance and one-half the cost of administering aid to dependent children and the blind. The total Federal and State administrative costs in the fiscal year 1947 ran approximately as follows: Old-age assistance, $50,026,000; dependent children, $21,289,000; needy blind, $2,396,000.

PROPOSED GROSS INCOME, GROSS RECEIPTS TAX

The tax proposed to finance the Townsend plan is a gross income tax. In the language of the bill itself, it proposes a tax on gross receipts received as "compensation for personal services and the

gross receipts of the taxpayer derived from trade, business, commerce, or the sale of tangible or intangible property, and including interest, dividends, discounts, rentals, royalties, fees, commissions, bonuses, or prizes or any other emoluments however designated and without any deductions on account of the cost of property sold, the cost of materials used, labor costs, taxes, royalties, interest or discount paid, or any other expenses." An exemption up to $100 a month is allowed for personal incomes. The tax is not to apply to money received for deposit or custody. Exemptions are also granted to fraternal benefit societies, religious and charitable institutions, and other nonprofit organizations.

Practically every argument that can be raised against this tax can be raised against nearly every other tax in force today. Two strong counterarguments, however, do exist against the so-called regressive nature of the proposed tax. The first is that no tax should be considered apart from the use to which the revenues derived are to be put. While sales taxes are objectionable the laudable purpose of this tax overcomes the objections. Second, experience demonstrates that the people of more than half the States have sales taxes dating back to the depression of the thirties. But to return to the first argument, it is apparent that persons in low income groups will receive annuities in their old age at small cost. Persons in upper and high income brackets will have paid more for their annuities than the low income groups. Yet, all will receive the same annuity. Therefore, instead of being regressive, the tax is in effect progressive. And further, it is not improper to suppose that the burdens of the tax—to the extent they are not dissipated by the positive stimulus that currently paid annuities will have on the economy will be borne willingly by all in the realization that by paying a tax today they will guarantee themselves an honorable and just annuity when they too are disabled or reach the age of 60. All wages in excess of $100 a month would be taxed 3 percent. There would be no other deductions. The tax on wages and other income would be justified by this direct benefit of an annuity to every taxpayer upon qualifying.

Opponents of the proposed tax make a better case against the existing payroll tax which is used to finance old-age and survivors' insurance than they do against this proposal. The proposal levy avoids much of the inequity that exists in the present system, because it at least allows an exemption of $1,200. Incidentally, this is the same exemption that is currently allowed a man and wife under the present income tax. Thus, analysis dispels most of the objections raised against the tax on wages. Furthermore it benefits all instead of a select few as under the Social Security Act and protects the wage earner against the hazards of old age and disability.

On whom the burden of this proposed tax would fall it is not easy—or perhaps even possible—to say with assurance of being right. The incidence would vary with changing economic conditions. Doubtless there would be some price rises. It is almost certain that at times merchants and manufacturers would willingly or unwillingly absorb some of the burden or pass it back to their employees in lower wages. There are times when merchants and manufacturers must take what they can get for their product. On the other hand, taxes may be regarded as an expense of doing business, and in the long run business must recover its expenses or cease operations.

No proof has been—or perhaps can be—given to show that the proposed tax would increase the cost of living by an extreme and inconceivably unjust amount, and, as indicated above, no tax should be considered apart from the purpose to which the revenue obtained is to be put. It is not too much to hope that the continuous flow of consumer purchasing power which would arise from the spending of the annuities will so stimulate and stabilize production and provide full employment that business profits over the long run will so increase that they can absorb a large share of the tax. In any event, it is most likely that the tax would be widely diffused throughout the whole economic system with little chance of real burden on anyone. Further, any price rises that did occur would be insignificant as compared with price rises that have occurred without any such tax over the last few years. For example, food prices have gone up more than 100 percent since 1939, all retail prices are up more than 60 percent, wholesale prices of farm products have tripled, grain and raw materials are up two and one-half times, while building materials and semimanufactured articles are almost doubled. The disadvantage to small business and the stimulus to monopoly and big business are advanced as arguments against this proposed tax. However, big business operates on a smaller margin of profit and small business might be placed in a stronger competitive position by this tax.

Whatever merit there is to the objection raised, it must be remembered, however, that in a vast number of instances no such problems arise. There would be but a single turn-over in the matter of services, such as those furnished by physicians, barbers, mechanics, and so forth; and, so far as integration is concerned, and so far as the tax might tend to promote monopoly, then it becomes the function of the Department of Justice and other Government agencies to take such steps as will prevent undesirable mergers and consolidations.

It is claimed that other consequences to business of the proposed tax would be to promote uneconomical forms of doing business, geographical discrimination, and make virtually impossible operations on the stock and commodity markets. The tax would tend to be the important factor which would determine the method of business operations. Business would adjust itself to the necessities of the changed conditions.

It is perhaps impossible to devise a tax system that does not hurt one group more than another. Certainly our present system is replete with such instances. For example, the small unincorporated business is not taxed as a business at all. Each partner pays a tax only on his shore of the earnings. On the corporation, on the other hand, a tax is imposed on the income of the corporation and later, when dividends are distributed, the owners—stockholders—pay a further tax on their share of the earnings. It is not improbable that small business might benefit as a result of the changed methods of operation that would result—if we assume for the moment that changes would result. They would no longer have to have large sums tied up in inventory and goods in process. All these costs would be borne by the larger firm on whose goods the smaller firm worked. On the geographical discrimination argument, it is not the function of a tax system to provide equality in competition. As for the effect on stock and commodity market operations, to the extent that the tax curtailed gambling on the exchanges and the forcing up of prices through dealings in futures (as is commonly alleged), the tax would have directly beneficial effects upon the economy.

Proponents of the Townsend plan believe that the economy of the Nation will benefit by reason of the expenditure of the annuity within 30 days after its receipt. According to the bill—

(a) The annuity shall be spent within the confines of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

(b) Each installment of the annuity shall be spent by the annuitant within 30 days after the time of its receipt.

(c) An annuitant shall not engage in any occupation, business, or other activity from which a profit, wage, or other compensation is realized or attempted, except that nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit an annuitant from collecting interest, rents, or other revenues from his own investments. No annuitant shall support an able-bodied person in idleness except a spouse. * * *

(e) Any sum received by an annuitant which represents the proceeds of a sale of any real property acquired through the use of money received as an annuity under this title shall be expended by the annuitant within 6 months after the receipt of such proceeds of such a sale.

The thought behind this proposal is that in the years before the war people in general tended to hoard their earnings. Consumption did not keep pace with the ability of the economy to produce. The result was that we had underproduction, under-consumption, and unemployment. To remedy this, it is proposed that a tax be imposed which will be paid largely out of savings. There will be no incentive for elderly people of limited income to hoard their meager earnings as the haunting fear of old age and destitution will have been removed. The proceeds of the tax will go to people who will move out of employment. They will be required to spend the proceeds of their annuity within 30 days. This will stimulate production, production will promote employment, the young will move into jobs vacated by the aged, and we will have prosperity. Some economists, however, deny this and contend that on the whole the plan will have directly the opposite effect from that

contended for. Such contentions seem to be untenable.

The great bulk of the tax that would be paid to meet the proposed levy would come from savings that would not have been spent or invested for productive purposes. Another but somewhat similar argument is currently being offered as an argument for reduction of income taxes. It is contended that the income tax is inflationary because much of the tax comes from money that would have been saved and not spent. But going to the Government as taxes, it is spent, thus increasing inflationary pressures. For example, personal savings in the last 6 years have totaled $145,000,000,000—the economic report of the President transmitted to the Congress, January 1948, page 111. During the war period, it was of course desirable that funds such as these should have been saved when so much of the productive resources of the country were devoted to producing implements of war. But with the restoration of peace and the end of a postwar boom, it is important that consumers buy the products of industry to promote employment for all. To the extent this tax forces savings into circulation, it promotes this result.

CONCLUSION

The old-age and survivors insurance program, being a contributory plan based upon contributions by both employers and employees, each paying a tax of 1 percent of the first $3,000 of wages, to be increased to 1½ percent in 1950–51 and 2 percent thereafter, is, in effect, a tax on production and a burden on all citizens. The plan gives inadequate relief to those covered and is unjust to those not covered. These taxes go into what is called a trust fund which, on December 31, 1947, amounted to $9,360,000,000. The Government spends the trust funds as received for the regular expenses of government, and replaces the funds with Government securities bearing interest paid by the Government, which encourages deficit spending. It follows that when these funds are needed, in lieu of the bonds the Government will be obliged to levy another tax on all taxpayers to meet the demands upon the fund. Notwithstanding this huge balance in the trust fund on December 31, 1947, there had been paid to beneficiaries under the program up to that date, only a little over $3,000,000,000. The cost of administering this program is now running approximately $42,000,000 a year. The total costs to date have been about 15 percent of the benefits paid out and a little more than 2 percent of the total receipts. For the fiscal year 1947 administrative costs were 2½ of the receipts and 9.6 percent of the benefit payments. A major part of the heavy administrative work is in keeping the wage records of 75,500,000 living people and determining the amount of benefits each—including his family—is entitled to if and when he becomes eligible for benefit payments. To be fully insured for life a worker must have 40 calendar quarters of covered employment. Minimum benefits for a worker are $10 a month, and for a worker and his wife, $15. Maximum benefits currently paid are $44.40 for a worker and $66.60 for a worker and his wife. The average payments as of June 1947, were $24.10 for a worker and $39.20 for a man and his wife. This old-age and survivors' insurance plan contemplates these actuarial calculations would become effective for a boy 16 years of age in a covered occupation and that for 50 years or until he is 65 years of age, the Social Security Board will keep track of his employers' and his tax payments made from his wages and other essential data covering the case, and based thereon will determine what he will receive in benefits 50 years from now which, according to present average payments, would be about $24 a month. With the ups and downs in the economic condition of our Nation and the fluctuation in the value of the dollar, it is at once apparent that the whole scheme is unworkable and, in fact, offers little social security to our workers. These workers who, with their employers have been taxed through the years, and who are now receiving only an average payment of $24 a month, are receiving less than many of the old-age beneficiaries who pay no tax to the fund. In the meantime, the Federal Government is piling up a huge so-called "reserve fund" which, in reality, is only a paper fund as the actual moneys are expended as received by Government bureaus, and only I O U's are left in the fund.

All of these difficulties would be avoided by the enactment of legislation of the type we propose in H. R. 16 which, as I have said, is a pay-as-you-go plan and is financed from current receipts to which all contribute who come within the tax formula. Particularly, it would eliminate the unsound "reserve fund," the bureaucratic spenders' paradise for inflation and deficit spending. Furthermore, our proposal would be elastic so that monthly annuities necessary to enable the recipient to maintain himself in decency and health, would be determined currently, based on existing conditions and tax revenues collected, and which would be adequate to meet necessary living expenses.

The old-age assistance program under the present social security law is also wholly inadequate to provide a decent annuity to the old people of our Nation who come within its provisions. This program is financed through congressional and State appropriations without any contributions from the annuitants. No special Federal levy is made to finance the Federal share. The distributions are made by the States which receive direct grants from the Federal Government. Federal contribution for payment to the aged and blind is two-thirds of the first $15 plus one-half of the next $30. There is a similar graduated payment for children eligible for assistance. The maximum Federal contribution, however, is $25 for the aged and blind and $13.50 for the first dependent child and $9 for each additional child. Assistance payments to the aged under this program, as of December 1947 averaged $37.42 per month each. It is a starvation allowance. Many old-age annuitants are suffering from malnutrition, which means starvation. Recently in my own home city the following news item appeared:

OLD-AGE PENSIONER FOUND CRITICALLY ILL

Leonard Dow, 79, Lind Hotel, old-age pensioner who was found seriously ill in his room Friday, was taken to the emergency hospital. Attendants said he is suffering from pneumonia and malnutrition.

He later was admitted to Permanente Hospital, where his condition is reported critical. Dow is the third elderly person found this week in need.

There is little uniformity, however, in the payments made in the several States. For example, in December 1947, they ranged from a high of $87.42 in Colorado to a low of $15.87 in Mississippi. When we consider that the average payment of old-age assistance under this program is only $37.42, and running as low as $16, it is evident that the program is wholly insufficient to provide even a minimum for these elderly people to maintain themselves in decency and health, in view of the high prices prevailing at this time.

If we are to preserve the American way of life and our economic and democratic processes under free enterprise, we must find a solution not only for our unemployment problems but also for the problems of providing adequate care for the aged and disabled. With an accelerating advance in technology in the postwar era, and with the discovery of atomic energy presaging more rapid transitions in mass production, the social risks and hazards of unemployment and old age are increased. Rather than see workers pushed from the active labor force, hit or miss, the logical policy to follow is one of selection. The older group has earned retirement. Many of them are now covered by the Social Security Act. By covering the entire group, the whole process of business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will provide continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand, and will help to provide mass consumption without which our mass-production economy cannot function successfully. It will lead the way to greater prosperity in our Nation.

It was by reason of these deficiencies in the old-age security program that those of us in the Congress interested in the problem introduced the "Townsend" legislation, which is embodied in my bill, H. R. 16. The aged, through no fault of their own, through the fiat of industry, are denied a part in production. They toiled the longest in production and should not, when old, be deprived of taking part in consumption. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. Society owes a duty to these old folks, and it can only perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system providing aganst the hazards of old age and disability. There are now millions among us, 60 years of age and over, who are not now being cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security, and are receiving no support or hopelessly inadequate support. Our plan would replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of the

existing law. It is financed by a transaction tax in which all participate. It is a pay-as-you-go system, and annuities will be paid currently each month out of currently raised revenues, and the sums so received by annuitants must be spent within 30 days. Under the plan the existing system of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance will be abolished and a new program substituted therefor. This proposal gives recognition to the past labors of the aged and would offer them dividends from the wealth of American industry which they helped to create. These annuities are provided for these self-respecting American citizens, as a matter of right, without reference to need or prior contribution, and with neither the stigma of charity nor the aroma of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that H. R. 16 be put on final passage and enacted into law before the Eightieth Congress adjourns.

EXTENDING SOCIAL SECURITY TO HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, briefly I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for the inclusion of the provision extending social security coverage to hospital employees. This is a most valuable addition to the entire social-security program and has been long sought by the employees and others interested in our hospitals. It was my privilege to present this proposal in the form of a bill endorsed by the American Hospital Association and to appear before and work with the Social Security Subcommittee in support thereof. The entire subject is most complicated and heretofore the difficulties have been so overwhelming that no satisfactory proposal was ever presented. I congratulate and thank the subcommittee, and particularly the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] for presenting this proposal to assist in solving this very troublesome problem. The committee has labored continuously on this and other problems for the past 18 months, have held lengthy hearings, and I believe they have produced a very meritorious measure.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, although I favor more adequate over-all benefits under the present Social Security Act and changing the age limit from 65 years to 60 years, I am pleased to support this legislation for three reasons, in particular.

Many of my constituents have appealed to me to have State, county, municipal, and certain agricultural employees included in the social-security law. I am happy to say that this legislation permits such employees to be so included. However, many State and local employees have their own pension systems and this bill does not extend its coverage to include participants in any existing pension or retirement system under State or public auspices. I believe this to be sound legislation.

Under the present law, an individual drawing retirement benefits may earn not more than $14.99 per month without loss or reduction of his benefit payments. The present bill allows a beneficiary to earn as much as $40 per month in addition to his benefits. I am sure that this provision will be very helpful to many families and that it will also encourage useful services.

The present law does not provide sufficient protection for children of deceased workers. This bill liberalizes certain family allowances and extends benefits to all children in the family. Also the insurance benefits of the first child are increased from 50 percent of the primary insurance to 75 percent of that amount.

This legislation most certainly improves our Social Security Act.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 of this year, the old-age and survivors' insurance fund contained a balance of $9,982,900,000. Furthermore, the records of the past year show that this fund has been increasing at the rate of more than $3,000,000 a day, $100,000,000 a month, and about one and one-fourth billion dollars a year. It is now a certainty that this present fund will contain at least $15,000,000,000 by 1955.

This enormous $10,000,000,000 fund, built up by the withholding taxes of the workers, is constantly being raided and confiscated by the Federal Government to meet its current expenses. The very existence of a ten or fifteen billion dollar surplus fund is, therefore, a constant invitation to the Government for easy borrowing. Such easy borrowing inevitably leads to governmental waste and extravagance—to spendism—that is as great, or nearly as great a danger to the solvency of the American economy as is communism.

In the fiscal year 1947, total receipts of the old-age and survivors insurance fund were $1,623,000,000 and disbursements were only $466,400,000 of which $425,600,000 were paid out in benefits and $40,800,000 went for administration costs. In short, of every $1 collected in withholding taxes, 26 cents were paid out in benefits, 2½ cents went for operation costs and 71½ cents went into the reserve trust fund.

There is no need to build reserve upon reserve until the trust fund reaches astronomical proportions. While they may have some advantages, these advantages, if they exist, are far outweighed by the disadvantage that exists in the threat of continued wasteful spendism which such reserves involve.

The $10,000,000,000 of reserves which already have accumulated in this fund and the certainty that we soon will have a $15,000,000,000 fund is proof that the fund is sufficiently large to justify increased pensions to all those covered by old-age and survivors' insurance.

Furthermore, this Congress repeatedly has gone on record as favoring larger pensions to retired persons.

Early in this session we passed, by an overwhelming vote, the Stevenson Retirement Act, which gave increased pensions to all Federal employees.

Just last week we voted unanimously to increase railroad workers' pensions by 20 percent and again last week, without a dissenting voice, we approved a $187,000,000 appropriation to grant a $5 a month increase in pensions to those who receive old-age assistance in the States.

Yet neither by this bill or by any action of Congress have we granted a cent of increase in pensions to any of those 30,000,000 workers who come under old-age and survivors' insurance. We have not granted these 30,000,000 any pension increase despite the fact that they have in 11 years paid in to their pension fund reserve $10,000,000,000 more than they have drawn out in benefits. We have not granted these 30,000,000 any pension increase despite the fact that their pensions today are lower than those of any pensioned group under any system in existence in this country. Despite the fact that they pay 2 percent of their wages into a pension fund, their pensions in many States are lower—much lower—than those who get old-age assistance toward which the beneficiaries make no direct tax contribution whatever.

The United States News of today says that the average income of the unskilled worker is $1,800 a year.

Let us consider the case of this $150 a month worker covered by old-age and survivors' insurance. He and his employer pay $1.50 each or together $3 a month or $36 a year for this worker's old-age pension protection. In 40 years this $1.50 a month worked will pay in withholding taxes 40 times $36 or $1,440.

Had this man put $36 every year for 40 years into Government bonds, postal savings or other investments he would have earned at least 2 percent interest, compounded semiannally on that money. Over the 40 years this $150 a month man's savings of $36 a year at 2 percent compounded semiannually would have earned $1,996 in interest. He would would have had his $1,440 principal plus $1,996 in interest or $3,436.

Now what will this $150 a month man after intrusting over a period of 40 years this $3,436 to his Government get in return at age 65?

He will get for his $3,436 a pension of exactly $42 a month.

If he had been in a noncovered employment and had never contributed one single cent toward a pension fund, he would, if in need, in 16 States and one Territory, Alaska, get more than $42 from old-age assistance administered by the States.

For example he would, without having paid a cent in withholding taxes, get the following:

In Colorado	$60.58
In California	57.07
In Washington	56.51
In Massachusetts	54.90
In New York	49.89
In Nevada	48.43
In Connecticut	48.21
In Wyoming	48.13
In Arizona	47.75
In Utah	46.75
In Missouri	45.60
In Alaska	43.42
In Oregon	43.30
In Minnesota	42.89
In Oklahoma	42.41
In New Jersey	42.30
In Iowa	42.12

We have two choices. We can have an old-age pension system based upon the sound principle of old-age and survivors' insurance, the sound principle that the citizen shall in the earning years of his youth pay into a compulsory insurance fund from which he may in later

life, when his earning power has declined, draw a monthly pension.

Or, if we do not have that kind of pension system, we surely will have more and more old-age assistance such as we now have and the cost of which will be defrayed by all the people through increased taxes, instead of being financed by those who receive the benefits.

Old-age pensions are here. They are here to stay.

We cannot escape the pension problem by pretending it does not exist. We are going to have an old-age pension system for the care of our elder citizens. We are going to have a good sound workable system or we are going to have an unsound and an unworkable one.

It is the responsibility of Congress to constantly seek to better and improve the old-age and survivors' system we now have by widening its coverage and increasing its benefits and then constantly correcting and wiping out the injustices in this system which time and experience reveal.

A GENUINE SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems of our society is the age-old problem of social security, and it becomes the responsibility of the Congress to revise and extend existing social-welfare laws to provide genuine economic security for all the people.

As that great humanitarian, the late President Franklin Roosevelt once stated, among the basic rights of American citizenship is "the right to adequate medical care and opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment." Certainly this is a worthwhile ideal, and I am convinced that the realization of this objective is one of the great tasks of our democracy, and a sacred obligation of government.

The problem of social security involves three basic human needs: First, the need for adequate medical care as protection against sickness and disease; second, the need for economic security for our senior citizens; and third, the need for adequate protection against the danger of unemployment.

Since the question of revision of the Social Security Act is up for consideration today, I wish to analyze each of these separate but related problems in turn, and suggest what I believe to be practical proposals for their solution.

HEALTH FOR THE PEOPLE

First. Let me examine the question of providing security against sickness and disease. I know that you will agree that he who is blessed with good health is indeed fortunate—that health is a priceless possession essential to human happiness. Yet when one investigates the health problem of our country, we discover that our Nation has not yet won the battle against sickness and disease. A few well-established facts will demonstrate the seriousness of this problem.

According to the United States Public Health Service, more than 23,000,000 Americans are suffering from physical defects or chronic disease, or about one person of every six. The average worker is absent from work over 2 weeks out of every year on account of sickness and accident, which adds up to a loss of 600,000,000 man-days per year. Illness and accidents together cost this Nation $8,000,000,000 every year—and nearly 3,000,000 persons are incapacitated by illness during every day of the year—about 2 percent of our total population.

During World War II the Army Medical Corps discovered that 40 percent of the youth of draft age—8,000,000 out of 22,000,000—were unfit for military service. One out of every six of those rejected by the Army had defects which could be remedied by proper medical care, and many of the others could have been remedied had the defects been discovered in time.

What are the reasons for this unhappy state of affairs? It is most certainly not the lack of medical science and skill. American doctors are the best trained and most competent in the world. Our hospitals are modern, up-to-date and well-staffed, where hospitals exist.

The major reason for our failure to give adequate medical care to our people is economic. People do not obtain medical care because they cannot pay for it under the present individual-fee system. Statistics reveal that there is a direct relationship between income levels and poor health. The lower income groups have poorer diets and lower living standards, which means that they are sick more often and for longer periods of time. It is estimated that families with incomes under $2,000 per year have twice as much sickness as those in the $5,000 per year bracket and on up.

Yet it is those in the low-income groups who are least able to purchase medical and hospital services. According to the committee on the cost of medical care, and I quote:

> Each year nearly one-half of the individuals in the lower income groups receive no professional medical care or dental attention of any kind.

Over one-third of the most serious cases of sickness have no physician's care, and nearly half of the disabling illnesses go unattended by doctors. To make a long story short, adequate medical care is beyond the reach of 80 percent of our people's pocketbooks.

In view of the great human suffering involved in widespread sickness, and the terrific economic losses which accompany ill health, there is a need for Government action to remedy the situation. I am convinced that a Federal prepaid health insurance program is the only answer—a program of health for the people.

A bill providing for such a program has already been introduced in this Congress. More than a year ago, on May 20, 1947, Senators MURRAY and WAGNER introduced S. 1320 which is referred to as the National Insurance and Public Health Act.

In brief, the Murray-Wagner bill provides a comprehensive Federal health insurance program to cover all workers, with voluntary coverage for the farmer and the self-employed and with free choice of physician and dentists. In addition, Federal funds would be available to the States to help improve their public health services and their hospitals.

The Murray-Wagner bill has the approval of the former Surgeon General, Thomas Parran, and recent public-opinion polls show that an overwhelming majority of the American people favor some plan similar to this one. I am convinced that it is a sound plan which would provide adequate medical, dental, and hospital care to our citizens at a minimum cost, and I shall continue to urge that it be put into effect at the earliest possible date.

Yet in spite of the demonstrated need for this legislation, it has remained, blocked in committee throughout the Eightieth Congress, and it is clear today that the Republican majority has no intention of bringing it to a vote

OLD-AGE SECURITY

Let me turn now to the subject of old-age security, an equally pressing problem which has been completely ignored thus far by the Eightieth Congress.

The problem of protecting our senior citizens from economic insecurity and poverty during their retirement years is of major importance, and the Nation has a Christian duty to work out a solution. There are today nearly 10,000,000 persons in America who are 65 years of age or over. But only 2,000,000 of them are receiving pension payments under the present Social Security Act, with an additional 2,000,000 eligible for old-age assistance. About half a million persons are receiving pensions from private retirement plans, and from the Railroad and Civil Service Retirements Acts.

Conservatively speaking, only about 50 percent of our senior citizens are eligible for some kind of a pension. Millions of people are today ineligible for old-age assistance because of State property qualifications such as the Minnesota Lien Law, which are forms of cruel discrimination.

Furthermore, pension payments under the Social Security Act are at present entirely too low to allow for a decent standard of living. Annuities range from $10 to $85 per month, while the national average for old-age assistance payments is $35 per month. In my own State of Minnesota the average is only $41. Such a miserly pittance means poverty and substandard living conditions for old people who are dependent upon these pensions alone. The present high cost of living has made their condition even more critical.

My position on the question of old age pensions is well known. I favor a comprehensive, uniform, and liberal pension system for America. By comprehensive I mean that pensions should be available to every person of retirement age in the United States. By uniform pension system is meant that citizens in one State have a right to the same amount of monthly pensions as the citizens of every other State. By a liberal pension I mean that the monthly payment should be at least $100 per month as a bare minimum.

The time has come for the Congress to recognize that funds for honorable old-age annuities should be a part of our national budget. This belief prompted me to cosponsor H. R. 16, which was intro-

duced by Congressman ANGELL early in this session, and I regret that the suspension of the rules prevents me from offering this bill as an amendment to the measure now under consideration by the House.

It was my hope that this amendment could have been favorably considered, in order that every man and woman in America could look forward to retirement on a secure pension of at least $100 per month when he reaches the age of 60.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

A third pressing problem is the protection of our citizens from the hazards of involuntary unemployment. While we have made a start along this line, unemployment compensation payments under the present Social Security Act are far from adequate, and coverage of the program is not complete. Workers in plants having less than eight employees are excluded, as are agricultural, domestic, and Government workers and merchant seamen.

Payments under the unemployment compensation program range from $1.50 in North Carolina to $25 in the highest State. The national average for the number of weeks of eligibility is about 15. Minnesota provides maximum payments of $20 per week for a 20-week period.

I maintain that unemployment compensation should be extended to cover every worker in America, and that payments should be in the amount of $25 per week for a 26-week period as a minimum. Such a program would eliminate many of the fears and insecurity that the threat of a depression brings.

The program which I have outlined today, based on the Murray-Wagner health insurance bill, a comprehensive, uniform, and liberal old-age pension system and the liberalization of the unemployment insurance system to give 100-percent coverage and $25 per week for 26 weeks—would go far to achieve the goal of protection of our people against sickness and disease, against insecurity in old age, and against the fears of unemployment. This is what I mean by social security, and toward the achievement of this objective I pledge my continued effort.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 6777

Against this program let me place the only answer of the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress—this bill we have before us today, H. R. 6777. To the American people who ask for health insurance, for old-age pensions, for more adequate unemployment compensation, the GOP majority offers a bill which makes a few minor changes in the Social Security Act of 1935.

In my opinion, the legislation before us today represents one of the grimmest jokes ever presented to the Congress. It is nothing more than a meaningless gesture toward the millions of economically insecure persons struggling to make ends meet in these days of high prices and rising rents—to the aged and the sick and those who may lose their jobs in a future depression. The fact that this measure is offered as a substitute for a broad and comprehensive program of social security indicates the bankruptcy of the Republican Party and its callous disregard for the welfare of the American people.

A brief examination of the provisions of the measure now under debate will demonstrate its inadequacies, and show that it does little to change the present social-security system. In short, the bill provides the following:

First. It extends the coverage of the existing old-age and survivors insurance system to certain groups of employees, such as domestic workers in college fraternal and undergraduate clubs, workers in agricultural or horticultural organizations, and in voluntary employee beneficiary associations, and agricultural workers employed in drying, packing, processing, and handling of fruits and vegetables, some 8,000 employees of the TVA, and national farm loan and production credit associations.

Second. It adds employees of State and local governments on a voluntary compact basis.

Third. Title II of the Social Security Act is amended to liberalize benefits for children and widows.

Fourth. The bill would permit old people to earn $40 per month in covered and employment in addition to their annuities instead of the present $14.99; and

Fifth. By providing a statutory definition for the word "employment" the bill automatically excludes some 750,000 workers from the benefits of the social-security law. These workers, who are covered at present, include insurance solicitors and those employed by contract logging firms, and so forth.

Now, I am most certainly in accord with those provisions which extend the coverage of social security legislation, liberalize widow and children's benefits, and which allow old people to earn more wages in addition to their security payments. But I must sharply disagree with that section which excludes from its coverage some three-quarters of a million workers. I must criticize the bill for its failure to increase the pitifully small security payments now being doled out to those who are already covered. I must condemn the Republican majority for their failure to extend social security to the 15,000,000 farm workers, domestic servants, and the self-employed.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this measure, since I believe that it represents a slight improvement over the existing social-security laws. In so doing, I want to go on record as saying that this so-called revision of the Social Security Act is wholly inadequate and unsatisfactory.

If the Congress were actually interested in providing economic security for all Americans, the House Committee on Ways and Means would have reported a measure to provide a broad and comprehensive program of social security for all people.

In my opinion, Congress should adopt the Murray-Wagner health insurance bill to provide security against sickness and disease. We should pass H. R. 16 to provide adequate old-age pensions for our senior citizens. We should extend the Social Security Act to cover all workers and the self-employed as insurance for future old-age security. We should extend unemployment compensation laws to cover all workers, and liberalize their provisions to provide compensation for all workers, and liberalize their provisions to provide compensation of $25 for 26 weeks. This is the type of social -security program that the American people want and need, and one which will receive my full support.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, though I feel that we should have gone further in broadening the social-security system than we do here, I am supporting this bill as a start in the right direction.

Last February I introduced a bill whose provisions included what I thought should be done now. My bill extended coverage not only to the three and a half million included in this bill, but to approximately twenty million.

However, though many members of the committee agreed with me in favoring broader extension than is provided in this bill, discussions soon brought out the question as to the advisability of including new large segments of our population, a great majority of whom did not seem to wish to be included. It seemed to some, therefore, that it might be wiser to take action step by step in order to have a bill now which everyone could favor.

We are never going to get a satisfactory system with proper benefits unless the system is made comprehensive. Workers keep changing from covered to noncovered employment and many never receive any benefits from contributions which they have made.

It is estimated that though there are about eighty million who have paid social-security taxes on their wages, only about forty-two million are currently insured. Such a system is inadequate.

The largest group who are not included in the System today is our farm population. If we could once get the farmers willing and anxious to enter the System, probably all other groups would follow along without any trouble.

Those from the farm areas say that most of the farmers do not want to come in. They should be sold on the System, for I think if they knew what was happening to them they would insist on coming in.

In the first place, every time a farmer buys anything made by industry, he is paying someone else's social-security tax in added cost of the goods which he purchased without reaping any of the benefits himself.

In the second place, where there is little covered employment—as in our most rural States—the elderly people who have not been able to put aside a competence must rely on the old-age assistance program with its distasteful means test.

Though it is true that the Federal Government has gradually been creeping up year by year in assuming more and more of the load of old-age assistance, as witness the three-to-one ratio on the first $15 provided for in the bill now on the President's desk, the great bulk of these payments are still on almost an even matching basis.

Thus, there is a heavy burden on the farm States to pay their share of old-age assistance and, of course, it is the

farmers themselves who are most heavily taxed for this purpose; while in the more industrial States, to a large extent, their elderly people are taken care of under the contributory old age and survivors insurance system.

It seems to me that the farmers are catching it coming and going. I hope they will soon wake up to this fact and insist on being brought into the System. I should think that the governors of the farm States would get together and demand this.

I believe that the attitude of our farm population is the key to the whole situation and that when it is possible to include them we may then build that comprehensive system which we should have had from the start.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have at least some of my suggestions made part of this bill. If my constituents see fit to send me back here for the next session, I will keep on trying to build up our Old Age and Survivors Insurance System into a system of which we can all be proud.

AGE LIMIT

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that H. R. 6777 came up under suspension of the rules. This limits debates to 40 minutes and prevents amendments.

I had prepared and intended to offer an amendment in order to reduce the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 years of age to 60 years of age, but of course, was precluded from offering this amendment.

It is 2 years ago that I introduced a bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress for the same purpose, which was reintroduced in the present Congress.

Two years ago the reserve fund under social security had reached the staggering amount of $7,000,000,000. In the meantime it has increased so that now I am informed it has nearly $10,000,000,000. This in itself shows that the benefits are not commensurate with the premiums charged under this survivors' fund, and that there should be a liberalization of benefits.

I am informed that 702,000 persons are currently receiving old-age benefits. Approximately 880,000 additional persons are eligible but they have not chosen to accept retirement benefits. A lowering of the age limit to 60 would make an addition of approximately 1,000,000 men and women eligible for old-age benefits.

It seems to me that the lowering of the age limit is something that should have been done a number of years ago. The above figures would at least indicate that there is very little abuse of the system, and that on the contrary, the majority of people continue to work even though they could stop and draw benefits.

On the other hand, we are finding throughout the country that in many employments men and women are often worn out and become incapacitated for work between the ages of 60 and 65. Many pass 60 but do not reach 65. It seems grossly unfair that the Government should profit by and build up such a large fund without giving the last-mentioned classes the benefits they are really entitled to on the basis of premiums paid.

The amendment would not require anyone to retire at the age of 60. Those who prefer could continue their employment as is done by the nearly million cited above. But on the other hand, the many who are engaged in industries which are very exacting with respect to physical strength, such as the mining of coal, work in steel mills and other heavy industries, to whom it is a great injustice, should be able to retire if they feel they cannot continue their regular occupation after 60.

Although no opportunity was given for amending the Social Security Act in the above respect, I believe that the Congress should give this immediate and serious consideration at the earliest possible date.

We cannot, with a free conscience, continue this injustice to the aged when they have actually paid for the remedy which they deserve.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, although I am not in agreement with all the provisions of H. R. 6777, and believe the committee might safely have gone farther than they have in broadening the base and increasing the benefits, on the whole I feel this bill deserves support. It is a comprehensive measure embracing a number of needed changes and containing important amendments to the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.

I know of the conscientious effort which has been devoted to this problem by the chairman of the subcommittee, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], and the other members of his committee. They are to be commended for this step which they have taken to improve the existing law.

Particularly, I am happy to observe the inclusion within the coverage of State and local employees not now benefited by any pension system and also the estimated 1,000,000 employed by charitable or nonprofit corporations or institutions as well as some 300,000 in various other occupations who are now excluded from the beneficent provisions of this law.

The correction of the inequity relating to dependent children which militates most seriously against those with large families who are in the greatest need is particularly praiseworthy, as is the provision increasing the benefits for the first child by approximately $6.50 per month.

It is perhaps only natural that my principal interest in this legislation should arise from the fact that in section 106 by amendment of subsection (d) of section 203 of the act the committee has incorporated the provisions of my bill, H. R. 2952, introduced on April 3, 1947. By this amendment one receiving benefits may earn up to $40 in any one month instead of the existing limit of $15 without losing his monthly stipend. Although concededly there should be some limit, it is simply not realistic, in view of present or foreseeable living costs, to deprive a recipient of benefits when he earns in some months the insignificant sum of $15.

Furthermore, the effect of the present limitation is to discourage our older citizens from taking steps to assist themselves, which is not only economically unsound, but is also unfair and cruel to them. They do not like to feel they are has beens. They want to continue to make their contributions to our over-all economy. They should be encouraged to do so. It was because I felt this keenly that I introduced this measure and have urged its favorable consideration. I am happy indeed that the Committee on Ways and Means shared my feelings in this regard.

This amendment should have the effect not only of raising the standard of living for these deserving elder citizens, but also of perhaps greater importance helping them to lead a happier and fuller life by permitting their participation without penalty in active and worthwhile endeavors.

It is my hope that the study of improvements in the social-security law will continue and that serious and favorable consideration will be accorded many of the other recommendations recently made by the bipartisan Senate Advisory Council containing impartial experts drawn from the ranks of labor, management, agriculture, and the impartial public.

Although I would have been happy to see more of their recommendations incorporated in this bill, I feel it is certainly legislation headed in the right direction and that it merits the enthusiastic support of the membership.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Social Security Act was passed more than a decade ago, both national parties have promised the people that the social security system would be broadened and strengthened so that its benefits would embrace the overwhelming majority of American citizens who live on their own earnings.

Various proposals have been discussed under which, either on a voluntary basis or through collection of the necessary taxes at the source, thousands not now covered would be brought under the act's protection. These proposals, which are entirely aside from the extension of health benefits proposed under long-standing legislation, were intended to make it possible for agricultural workers, professional people, public employees in other than the Federal Government, small businessmen, and others for whom no provision was made in the original act to obtain the benefits of the system at equitable rates.

H. R. 6777 NOT AN HONEST BILL

The House Committee on Ways and Means reported a social security revision bill to which I have strong objections on two important counts.

The first is that it is not honestly presented. It is represented as the long-awaited general revision of the Social Security Act, when as a matter of fact it is a very mild liberalization which extends coverage to limited categories of employees under restrictions which make it unlikely that their numbers will ever

reach the three and one-half millions claimed in the committee report, and the increased benefits hardly meet with the terrifically increased cost of living.

The second and still stronger objection is that practically a million workers are taken out of coverage by the act in language which is bound to result in a great deal of confusion and dislocation, in individual hardships, and in discrimination against some employers.

This is the section of the act which specifically exempts from tax contributions salesmen who are construed to be independent contractors.

This is not only unfair to thousands upon thousands of salesmen and to many of their employers, but it is another instance of the undesirable practice of overthrowing reasonable Supreme Court decisions by legislative fiat in a mood of defiance.

Frankly, I would like to preserve the desirable parts of this bill, limited though they are in scope, while completely eliminating the language of section 201 of title II of the bill here before us.

CONFUSION AND HARDSHIP BOUND TO RESULT

I recognize that in this bill, unlike that vetoed by the President, some effort has been made to avoid marked injustices and abrogation of the contracts already entered into between Government, employer, and employee.

However, at the very least the utmost confusion is going to result. Salesman already covered under the act, whose employers are paying contributions regularly, will be working side by side with new men not covered, who will feel discriminated against.

Employers who abide by the spirit and the letter of the law will operate at a competitive disadvantage against those who will be cutting corners and trying to bar from the benefits of the act hard-working salesmen who would like to have a feeling of security equal to that of other workers.

I include in my remarks a telegram from Louis A. Capaldo, of New York, president of the National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, speaking for more than 1,500,000 wholesale salesmen, who are among America's highest paid individuals, which clearly expresses the salesmen's point of view.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 4, 1948.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 6777 approved by House Ways and Means Committee contains rider substantially same as House Joint Resolution 296 now before Senate. This rider is inimical to the best interests of America's 1,500,000 wholesale salesmen, denying a substantial number social-security coverage, which otherwise would be theirs by Supreme Court decision. National Council of Salesmen's Organizations in behalf of all salesmen urge you use your good offices to assure elimination of this rider or an open rule vote on bill for full debate on floor.

LOUIS A. CAPALDO,
President, National Council of Salesmen's Organizations.

GEARHART BILL IN SAME CLASS

I am also including an earlier release issued by the Democratic State Committee of New York on a related measure, House Joint Resolution 296, the so-called Gearhart bill, which the President has vetoed and which we will have to act on again in a few minutes.

It is my hope, if not my expectation, that the President's veto will be sustained overwhelmingly, and that in the other body the bill we are now discussing, H. R. 6777, will either be amended to remove its inequities or allowed to die. While I certainly would like to preserve such assets as the present bill has, it would be better, in my opinion, to let the measure lie dormant until the next Congress, when, without the heat of a national political campaign, we can have some hope of framing a measure which will meet the needs of the people.

MAY 13, 1948.

Undercover but consistent and well-organized Republican attacks on social security must be defeated, Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Democratic State Committee, declared today, appealing to Democratic members of the Senate Finance Committee to expose a House-approved resolution denying benefits to untold thousands of salesmen.

The State of New York is concerned, Mr. Fitzpatrick pointed out to Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky, minority leader, and to Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, not only for the tens of thousands of insurance, automobile, tobacco, liquor and real estate salesmen, but the 35,000 wholesale salesmen in New York City alone, and as the "home office" for many of the 1,500,000 traveling salesmen throughout the Nation.

"Pretending to preserve the status quo pending extension of social security," he said, "the Gearhart resolution (H. J. Res. 296) would actually deprive millions of salesmen in all levels of our distributing system down to door-to-door workers of benefits they now enjoy, and would open the door to even greater injustices."

Millions of these salesmen, Mr. Fitzpatrick continued, have been on social security rolls under a Supreme Court decision last year which broadened the definition of "employee" to include those "dependent as a matter of economic reality" upon the business to which they render service. The Gearhart resolution would restrict the word to a "narrow, legalistic master-and-servant" relationship, Mr. Fitzpatrick pointed out, not only depriving salesmen of old-age benefits, but of unemployment compensation, and furthermore "might tempt unscrupulous employers to deprive still others by a stroke of reclassification."

"This is not the first onslaught on social security," Mr. Fitzpatrick reminded the Senate Democratic leaders, "and it will not be the last. Witness exemption of news vendors, passed over President Truman's veto when he pointed out it was an entering wedge at the very basis of all social security. Witness the drastic 80 percent slash in appropriations for the Social Security Administration which threatens to reduce the entire program to impotency. Moreover, Representative GEARHART is reported already drafting a new flank attack, to continue this whittling away of the social gains of a decade under Democratic administrations, violating the Republicans' own pledges to extend social security benefits.

"It is up to the Democratic minority to force this snide campaign into the open, and stop the reactionary Republicans and their self-seeking allies in their tracks."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. In the first place, he stated that this bill would take over a million people who are entitled to benefits out of coverage under this definition. That is absolutely not true and the record shows it is not true.

Another point I wish to make is that here he is trying to extend benefits without a tax, which means you would have to go down into the trust fund and rob the people of money they have already paid in. So that is eliminated from it.

We had no jurisdiction whatever as a subcommittee to go outside of title II.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this proposal will extend the benefits of the old-age and survivors' insurance provision of our social-security program to about 3,500,000 people. I shall support the measure.

Earlier in the Eightieth Congress I introduced two bills pertaining to this part of our social-security program. One of those bills would extend this old age and survivorship insurance to public employees. That proposal of mine is incorporated in this bill before the House today. It calls for a voluntary participation on the part of the State. This measure authorizes the Federal Security Administrator to enter into compacts with the State for the coverage of employees of State, municipalities, and instrumentalities of the State. The Federal Government agrees to treat these employees who are covered the same as other employees and in turn the State agrees to pay a sum equivalent to the employer's tax and to collect the employee's tax and transmit same to the Federal Government.

If this bill, which is passing the House today, is finally enacted, and the State of Nebraska elects to come under it, it will mean that a great many public employees can have the benefit of social security. It would cover the employees of our State who work on the highway, in hospitals, in other institutions, offices, and elsewhere. It would include clerks, typists, bookkeepers, nurses, janitors, cooks, dietitians, laborers, and employees of all kinds. Likewise it would make possible the extending of social security to employees of counties, cities, and other governmental subdivisions. At the present time the men who do manual labor for a town or city cannot secure social security, yet it is given to the officers of every corporation. This would correct that.

In Nebraska we also have our public power and irrigation districts. These, being instrumentalities of the State, are denied social security at the present time. Many of these workers have some social-security credit. This bill opens the way for them again to receive the benefits of the old-age and survivors' insurance program. I know that the employees of the Central Nebraska public power and irrigation district, the Loup River district, the Platte Valley public power and irrigation district, and the Consumer's Public Power District have many employees who are interested in this.

The other social-security bill that I introduced was to extend the old-age and survivors' insurance to the self-employed

on a voluntary basis. This program should at least start on a voluntary basis. It involves many problems of accounting in small individual businesses and enterprises, and it involves the question of whether or not they should pay the employee's tax and the employer's tax or a compromise. My bill would have made these many millions who provide their own jobs eligible to get this coverage if they wanted it. It would have been a benefit to the owners and operators of small businesses, professional men, farmers, and others who create their own jobs. The administration, through the Social Security Administrator, was opposed to my bill. It is not incorporated herein. This bill is confined to those things which are more or less noncontroversial.

An examination of the proposal before us today will reveal that it does extend coverage to a few other groups small in number, all of which appears to be desirable.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that the provisions contained in the gentleman's bill were embraced in the President's message, and also represent the recommendation of the Senate Advisory Committee on Social Security?

Mr. CURTIS. Some of them, in changed form.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the figures set forth by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] stating that 1,500,000 people were deprived of their benefits, he is entirely correct. The best evidence before the committee is that this section, this sugar-coated poison pill, House Joint Resolution 296, which will take out about 750,000 or upward of 750,000 from coverage, if multiplied by the least possible factor of two, one dependent for each individual covered under the plan, will make 1,500,000. There is just no argument about it. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that we are taking out 750,000, plus their dependents, and that totals easily 1,500,000 individuals. We are doing this in the face of the action of previous Congresses. I had the privilege of serving at the time the bill was drawn up. I know what the Congress intended. I know what the committee intended. The Supreme Court was entirely right in its interpretation. This Congress, this committee, and this subcommittee have nullified the action of the Congress, or intends to do so by this provision of the act. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the excuses that the proponents of this particular provision make. In the first instance, they said the Supreme Court covered too many people. They say, "We want to correct the definition of employer and employee." Well, the only purpose was to cut out these salesmen and industrial home workers entirely from the benefits under the act.

Mr. DINGELL. I think the argument set forth by the majority here today explains fully the underlying philosophy that they have. These are the same people who attacked the original passage of the Social Security Act and condemned it, voted against it, and issued a minority report. Some Members filed a minority report warning the Nation as to what this social-security abomination would do, and even went so far as to try to put the social-security system under the Veterans' Administration. The biggest thing in Government today, the biggest thing for the welfare of the people, they wanted to make a tail of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the colloquy that we have just been listening to as to what the Congress meant in the first place when they passed this social-security bill, and the interpretation placed upon that action of the House by the Supreme Court is a very interesting argument.

SOME SOCIAL-SECURITY PROBLEMS THAT MUST BE SOLVED

Mr. Speaker, are news vendors employees or are they private contractors from the standpoint of social-security coverage? If employees, for whom do they work? They have stands on street corners, usually sell several different newspapers and magazines, so who really is their employer?

Are insurance agents, who work strictly on a commission basis and receive no salary, employees of the insurance company, or are they self-employed? These are only two of the many troublesome questions that have confronted the Ways and Means Committee as a result of recent Supreme Court decisions. These questions must be answered by specific legislation that clearly defines these occupations as either coming within the provisions of the Social Security Act, or not coming within the provisions of the act.

Mr. Speaker, when the Social Security Act was passed by Congress in 1935 it was based upon the common-law concept of master and servant relationship that had been in vogue, and accepted quite generally, for hundreds of years in all Anglo-Saxon countries. Guided by the language of the act, the congressional debates, and the committee reports as to the intent of the Congress when it passed the act, the Social Security Board established certain regulations and procedures concerning coverage under the act, collection of taxes under the act, and the payment of the benefits provided for by the act. These regulations and procedures have been in operation for 12 years, and have been generally quite satisfactory.

Now the United States Supreme Court in a series of court decisions has upset the status quo of the Social Security Board's regulations and procedure, saying, in effect, that the Congress, when it passed the Social Security Act did not intend to limit the concept of employer and employee to the generally accepted common-law definition of that relationship, but really intended to provide a broader concept of the employer-employee relationship than the common-law concept.

The implications of these court decisions are twofold: First, they suggest that the Social Security Board was in error when it placed the limited construction upon the concept of employer-employee relationship, thereby illegally curtailing coverage under the act. Second, that because of the action of the Social Security Board some 750,000 people had been left out that should have been covered under the act; and, although no social-security taxes had been collected from them, they were entitled to benefits under the act even if they had not paid for those benefits.

Last September, in order to conform to the decisions of the Supreme Court, the Social Security Board issued a new set of regulations to govern the operation of the Social Security Act. The House Ways and Means Committee thereupon requested that the new rules and regulations be held in abeyance until the Congress could act to clear up the misconception that the Supreme Court was laboring under as to the real intent of Congress when it passed the act 12 years ago. This the Congress is now attempting to do in a series of amendments to the Social Security Act.

In order to clear up the status of news vendors, the gentleman from California, Representative GEARHART, introduced H. R. 5052, an act to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code. This bill passed the Congress, was vetoed by the President, and was then passed over his veto in both branches of the Congress by overwhelming votes.

In order to make clear the intent of Congress when it passed the Social Security Act, the gentleman from California, Congressman GEARHART, introduced House Joint Resolution 296, to maintain the status quo in respect to certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage. This resolution was approved by the Ways and Means Committee, and has passed the House and Senate. The resolution simply restates and reiterates the fact that the Congress did intend to limit coverage under the Social Security Act to those workers who come under the common-law concept of employer-employee relationship. When that resolution is signed by the President it will nullify the Supreme Court decisions and restore the status quo that has prevailed ever since the Social Security Act was placed in operation.

Mr. Speaker, a social-security subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee has been working for weeks preparing a comprehensive amendment to the Social Security Act to extend coverage to certain groups not now covered. It is proposed in H. R. 6777 that coverage under the Social Security Act be extended to include the following:

A. VOLUNTARY COVERAGE

First. All State, municipal, and local public employees may be covered on a voluntary State compact basis when a State legislature authorizes the same.

Second. Employees of nonprofit institutions, such as hospitals, clubs, fraternal societies, private schools, church or religious organizations may be taken in only if they voluntarily elect to come in.

B. COMPULSORY COVERAGE

First. Employment in farm-loan and farm-credit organizations.

Second. Employment off the farm in drying, packing, packaging, or processing of fruits and vegetables ready for marketing.

Broadening the social-security base will tend to lower the cost rather than to increase the cost of social security. It will not affect present social-security rates.

Mr. Speaker, in order to nail down and make clear for all time just what the intent of Congress was at the time the Social Security Act was first passed, so that it never again can be questioned by the Supreme Court, the Ways and Means Committee states specifically, in the report on H. R. 6777, that the common-law meaning of the term "master and servant" shall prevail and be accepted as the definition of "employer and employee," for the purpose of social security. In effect, H. R. 6777 declares that to have been the intent of the Congress when the social-security law was first passed, and that it remains the intent of Congress. H. R. 6777, now before the House for consideration, should be passed.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be what I think is a misunderstanding between the distinguished Member from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] on our side and the distinguished Member from New York [Mr. REED] on the other side. The difference is one that should be explained clearly for it is a very important matter of difference. I think the facts are these. There is, of course, a very important difference between taking people out from under the protection of the act who are now protected and preventing them from coming in. The principal reason for the introduction of the bill we are considering was to include within the protection of the law additional groups. It was not the intention to remove one single person from the protection of the social-security law that is now included. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] to clarify this situation if he will, and if it is not true that this bill does not take anybody out who is now protected.

Mr. REED of New York. No person has been taken out. If they had any rights, they have not been taken out. They have to pay a tax in order to get in, and whatever the Supreme Court did, they had no right to put people in who had never paid a tax. During the cross-examination in committee in the other body, the social-security people had to admit that nobody had been deprived of his rights by the Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill be passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REED of New York) there were—ayes 237, noes 2.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. House Resolution 640, without objection, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to interrogate the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. It would appear to me that we have progressed in this program far enough at this time so that the gentleman from Indiana should let us know what bills are going to be brought up under suspension today. Many Members are very much interested.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have stated to a number of Members that two bills from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, one having to do with increased pay for gold-star widows and dependents, the other having to do with an increase in dependency payments and disability payments for service-connected disabilities, will be called up next.

There are a number of bills on which rules have been granted, on which we may move to suspend the rules. There are other measures on which rules have not been granted, on which we may move to suspend the rules. I do not have a complete list. I want to be fair with the gentleman, and I intend to be. We have some conference reports that are pressing for action. How far we will proceed with matters that may be taken up under suspension of the rules I do not know.

I would not want this list to be considered as exclusive of others, because many Members have talked to me. The gentleman has been in the position in which I find myself, and he knows the difficulties involved.

There is a bill called the water pollution bill, on which a rule has been granted (H. R. 8418).

There is House Joint Resolution 363, on which a rule has been granted, having to do with certain lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians.

H. R. 4462, on which a rule has been granted, having to do with lands in Park County, Wyo.

House Joint Resolution 150, to provide for the rebuilding of the Francis Scott Key Monument.

There are two bills from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, having to do with shipbuilding assistance and maintenance of the merchant marine, as to which there have been insistent requests that they be considered under suspension of the rules.

There have been suggestions to me that a bill having to do with the international labor organization. Senate Joint Resolution 117, should be called up under suspension.

H. R. 5053, which has to do with the creation of a memorial park in Philadelphia.

There is a bill, S. 1260, having to do with the creation of a commission to investigate certain claims of certain motor carriers.

I do not know whether we can call up all of those bills or whether all of them should be called. I am confident we will have another suspension day later in the session.

Mr. RAYBURN. There are, of course, a great many of those bills that are not very significant, but I hold in my hand one which is, S. 2376, an act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that the Committee on the Armed Services handed me a list of bills they think should be disposed of by unanimous consent, and some four that it is suggested should be handled under suspension. I have discussed this question not only with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], who is chairman of the committee, but with certain Members on our side and with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is the ranking Member on the gentleman's side.

I was careful to suggest that these bills I have read off do not make an exclusive list.

The bill to which the gentleman has referred, having to do with the revolving fund which as I understand is a fund to expedite the shipment of fibers such as cotton and wool to Japan to be processed there into materials, is a bill in which I know there is very much interest and which I understand is urgently desired by certain people.

Mr. RAYBURN. Also I have in my hand the bill (S. 1949) to provide additional compensation for employees in the postal service. I should like to know what the gentleman thinks of the chances of getting that bill up?

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, let me say to the gentleman from Texas that the matter of a pay raise for postal employees has been under active consideration for some time now and is, of course, presently under consideration. I might suggest to the gentleman, and I am quite sure the gentleman understands me, that there have been numerous questions from his side. Some speeches have been made undertaking to criticize the Republican side of the House for not bringing those bills up. I suggest that the gentleman get out the report not only on the postal pay increase, but on the over-all increase for Federal employees. He will find there adverse reports from the Budget Bureau saying that those increases are not in keeping with the President's program; hence, are not approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Now, before—and I am sure the gentleman will understand me——

Mr. RAYBURN. I can make a political reply too, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. HALLECK. Mine is not a political statement because, after all, we are trying to do our job up here, and, of course, we have had a lot of vetoes. I do not

know whether with this report from the Budget Bureau these measures would be vetoed or not; but, certainly, it can be fairly said that in contemplation of those measures the Congress ought to take into consideration that the President, speaking through the Bureau of the Budget, has recommended against them. That is not to say that the matter of postal pay is not under consideration and my opinion about it is that action will be taken in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is it the opinion of the gentleman, then, that the House will be given an opportunity to pass on the bill for the revolving fund and for the raise in pay for at least some Federal workers before the week is over?

Mr. HALLECK. I would say to the gentleman that that is my best judgment about what will transpire in the balance of the week.

In response to the gentleman's question I would say to him that my best opinion at the moment is that there will be opportunity in the House to consider those matters.

Mr. RAYBURN. One thing further. I did not know until just now that the leadership on the Republican side looked upon the budget estimates as sacrosanct or anything like that. May I ask the gentleman if he intends to bring before the House this week the housing bill?

Mr. HALLECK. That is another matter which is under consideration. What will happen I do not know.

Mr. RAYBURN. And what will happen to the tax bill?

Mr. HALLECK. That is not a tax bill, if I understand the gentleman correctly. That bill has to do with revision of the Internal Revenue Code. I understand, although I may be in error, that a rule has been granted. Whether or not that measure will come up for consideration in the days remaining here I am not prepared to say at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial in each instance.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO WIDOWS AND OTHER DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2825) to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans, with an amendment I send to the desk and shall ask the Clerk to read, which amendment is to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the provisions of H. R. 3748 containing amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following rates of compensation are hereby established for surviving widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of the World War I or World War II whose deaths are the result of service in such wars, or the results of contingencies provided for in United States Code, title 38, sections 501a, 501a–1, and paragraph 4, part VII, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended:

Widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $115, with $20 for each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, $50 with $20 for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $75; dependent mother and father, $40 each.

SEC. 2. Such compensation shall not be diminished by reason of other benefits allowed by other provisions of law.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or veterans regulation, for the purpose of payment of compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, one parent whose annual income does not exceed $1,800, or two parents whose annual income does not exceed $3,000, shall be deemed to be dependent. In determining annual income any payments made by a parent for expense of last illness of the veteran and such expense of burial of the veteran as exceeds the amount of the allowance authorized by Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, shall be excluded and any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered nor shall life-insurance payments from any other source, including income therefrom in an amount less than $3,000 received in any 1 year, be considered.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on the first day of the second month following the date of its enactment; *Provided,* That no compensation shall be reduced or discontinued by the enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 3748.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3748 was reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on July 24 of last year. I think every Member here is overjoyed that it has at last come to the floor of the House for action. I doubt if the Members want to debate it. There is not a Member here that does not want to have the dependents and orphans of World Wars I and II receive an increase in their compensation. These are service-connected-disability cases.

The purpose of H. R. 3748 is to increase rates of compensation presently paid to surviving widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of World War I or World War II whose deaths were the result of service in such wars. The following table shows the increases provided by this bill:

	Existing law	H. R. 3748
Widow but no child	$60.00	$75
Widow with 1 child	78.60	115
Widow with 2 children	93.60	135
Widow with 3 children	109.20	155
Widow with 4 children	124.80	175
Widow with 5 children	140.40	195
No widow but 1 child	30.00	50
No widow but 2 children	45.60	70
No widow but 3 children	57.60	90
No widow but 4 children	69.60	110
No widow but 5 children	81.60	130
Dependent mother or father	54.00	75
Dependent mother and father, each	30.00	40

It is believed that existing rates to widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans are inadequate, especially in view of prevailing economic conditions and the high cost of living.

Section 3 defines a dependent parent as one whose annual income does not exceed $1,800 or $3,000 in the case of two parents. In determining annual income, the following items in addition to those not now counted would be excluded: Payments made for the expense of last illness of the veteran and expense of burial over and above the amount ($150) provided by Veterans' Administration regulations; and commercial life insurance including income therefrom in an amount less than $3,000 received in any 1 year. This income definition will simplify the adjudication of claims of dependent parents and provide a clear and definite rule for determining dependency.

It is estimated that the bill will affect dependents of 76,000 World War I veterans at a cost of $19,219,000; dependents of approximately 249,000 World War II veterans would be affected at a cost of $80,277,000, making a total cost for the first year of $99,496,000.

Does any Member wish any time or does the House wish to vote on it immediately?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, the author of the bill and the chairman of the subcommittee that reported out the bill.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 10 minutes unless it is necessary. I would like to expedite the business of the House. I think most of the Members are familiar with the provisions of this bill. I shall be very glad to try to answer any questions in the minds of the Members.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I merely wish to say that I think this is the one piece of veterans' legislation which ought to be passed at this session above all others, when you look at the over-all picture so far as giving justice is concerned. I certainly want to congratu-

late the gentleman on bringing the bill out and the committee for reporting it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentleman should tell the House just exactly what the bill does and explain what class of dependents it affects and the amount of increase.

Mr. MATHEWS. I will be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

The bill now before us, H. R. 3748, is designed to increase compensations for widows, children and dependent parents of veterans of World War I and World War II whose deaths are the result of service in those wars, or attributable to an injury or aggravation of an existing injury as a result of having submitted to an examination or as the result of training, hospitalization or medical or surgical treatment awarded under existing law or Veterans Regulations, or the result of the pursuit of a course of vocational rehabilitation as provided therein.

In brief, it raises a widow from her present amount of $60 per month to $75 per month, and increases the compensation to a widow with one child from the present amount of $78 to $115. For a widow with two or more children, there is granted $20 for each child subject to apportionment regulations.

Where the deceased veteran leaves no widow but one child, the amount is raised from the present $30 to $50, with $20 added for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided. Where the deceased veteran leaves a dependent mother or father, the present allowance of $54 is increased to $75 and where there are two dependent parents, from $30 to $40 each.

It must be understood that the payment of $20 for each child is not a net increase, but only the total amount to be paid. Actually as in the case of a widow and two children, the increase for the additional child is $13.20, where there are three children $10.25, where there are four children $8.80, and where there are five children $7.92. Likewise, where there are two children but no widow, the increase is $12.20 for the additional child, where there are three children, it is $10.80, where there are four children $10.10, and where there are five children $10.68.

This Congress established payment for dependents in the cases such as covered by this bill in 1917. The first amount fixed was gradually increased to the present figure of $60 for widow and $78 for the widow with one child. At the time of the last increase (1943) the cost of living index as published by the Department of Commerce was 125.1 for all items and 143.0 for food in the month of May of that year.

The cost of living index in 1917, when this policy was first established was 97.8 for all items and 125.4 for food.

In January of this year—1948—the cost of living index was 168.8 for all items and 207.7 for food.

One of the main reasons for this bill, therefore, is to assist widows and other dependents of veterans who actually have given their lives in wartime service to their country, or as a result of injuries received in wartime service, or under the circumstances set forth above, to meet this high living index.

It may be asked how the figures of H. R. 3748 were reached, or indeed how the original figures in 1917 or the presently existing figures were reached. So far as I know there is absolutely no scientific method of fixing compensation for the loss of a husband, a father, a son or daughter. If there is any Member of this House who knows of any way to scientifically, adequately compensate anyone for such losses I wish he would tell this House and the whole world.

Even in legal suits for damages in death cases there is no scientific method. And in the case of an individual who has been used by the Government, which means by the people of the United States of America, in the defense and preservation of that Government and those people and all the ideals and institutions which we hold so dear, particularly is there no scientific yardstick. The only reasonable and practical method to attempt any compensation for such cases is by cash payment, but there is not enough cash in the whole Marshall plan which would be an adequate substitute for a husband, father, son, or daughter.

It is interesting to note that even the Veterans' Administration, which has heretofore opposed practically every bill for increased benefits for veterans since I have been a Member of this House, approves the principle involved in this bill but suggests an increase of $6 for the first child, $1.32 for the fifth, and nothing whatsoever for the widow. This seems to be more an insult than a benefit.

The bill also provides an income limitation of $1,800 for one parent, or $3,000 for two parents, under which they would be deemed to be dependent, and provides that in determining this annual income, payments made for expense of the last illness of the veteran and such expenses of burial of the veteran as exceeds the amount authorized by Veterans Regulation 9A as amended shall be excluded from the computation, and any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered, nor shall life insurance payments from any other source, including income therefrom, in an amount less than $3,000 received in any one year, be considered.

Veterans' Administration statistics on the cost of this bill take into consideration no reduction for death of veteran recipients of service-connected compensation.

Furthermore, widows die and remarry, dependent parents die, children either die or inevitably become 18 years of age, after which they are not eligible for these benefits. The Veterans' Administration figures on remarriage show as follows:

	Percent
For the fiscal year 1945	3.5
For the fiscal year 1946	8.4
For the fiscal year 1947	17
For the fiscal year 1948 (estimated on first half of year)	12

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, as a friend and neighbor of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS], may I take just a moment to say to the House that the gentleman will not be with us after the end of the session. Notwithstanding the fact that several months ago he concluded not to seek reelection, the House must have observed that he has been pursuing his work with all of his usual diligence.

The veterans' legislation, which the gentleman is now handling, is his own. He is the author of the bills and chairman of the subcommittee which reported them, and they are, as all will agree, excellent bills. They will redound to his everlasting credit in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has devoted a lifetime in the interest of veterans. He is a former State commander of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, and a distinguished lawyer in New Jersey. I know the House joins with me in the regret that we will not have the benefit of his efforts next year, and joins with me likewise in wishing him all success and happiness in his future undertakings.

Mr. MATHEWS. I sincerely thank my kind colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, let us heed the words of our first and probably greatest Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, when he told us to take proper care of him who has borne the brunt of the battle, his widow and his orphan.

I am not and never was a hero. I cannot honestly say I wish I had died gloriously on the field of battle.

But, Mr. Speaker, when I think of those heroes who have so died, and I look about me and see communism and other strange isms creeping all over the world—yea, even into our own beloved country—when I hear the cries from this group and that class of our citizens for more money and more benefits from both private and public sources, the claims for economic security for everybody who possesses American citizenship by birth or naturalization whether or not they have or will contribute anything to the welfare and true progress of our Nation, and the wails for government, particularly the Federal Government, to relieve people from this or that burden of life, take over this or that individual responsibility, invade this or that phase of private activity, I am reminded of a few words of the poet Coleridge.

The Ancient Mariner has stopped one of three guests on their way to a wedding party. He insists upon telling the story which weighs upon him and drives him to unburden himself. He describes how he looked about him on that deck where all the boards did shrink into the staring, glassy eyes of 4 times 50 dead bodies of his shipmates for whose deaths he feels he is responsible because he shot the albatross. And he says, according to my memory:

> The many men so beautiful
> And dead they all did lie,
> And a thousand thousand slimy things
> Lived on, and so did I.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I first want to add my word to what has been said about the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS], who is quitting the Congress voluntarily.

I have never met a finer American in this House or outside of it than the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

The Members on our side are in favor of this bill because we realize that our first duty is to our disabled veterans and their dependents. For 16 years I was chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. I took that position at all times. My predecessor, Hon. Royal Johnson of South Dakota, who has now passed to the great beyond, took the same position. It is our desire to render all the services possible to these veterans and their dependents, without bringing about any ill effect, such as the so-called economy bill that was passed in 1933, that took the bread from the mouths of many of our disabled veterans and their widows and orphans.

When we first entered this war, I served notice that we were going to pay the men in the armed forces a base pay of $50 a month. I carried out that promise by forcing through an amendment to raise the base pay to $50.

I have on the Clerk's desk discharge petition No. 14, to bring out a bill that will clarify the unfortunate situation in which we find ourselves with reference to the veterans of this last war. It provides an adjusted compensation of $4 a day for men serving on the other side and $3 a day while serving in this country, and at the same time permits the deduction of those amounts that have been expended on some of these veterans, for instance, for unemployment money or educational benefits. In other words, it puts the servicemen all on one plane and treats them all alike. I have been surprised that more Members of Congress have not signed that petition to bring that measure to the floor of the House and pass it at this time, before you finish giving America away—all we have—to foreign countries through ERP, UNRRA, and other similar expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there is no opposition to this measure on the Democratic side, and I am going to reserve the balance of my time in order that I may yield to my colleagues who desire to discuss the measure at this time.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. I thank the distinguished former chairman of the Veterans' Committee for his kind remarks, and wish to compliment him for his activity and interest in veterans' affairs on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. RANKIN. What I said about the gentleman from New Jersey was an expression of my convictions which have grown out of intimate association with him, because the gentleman has sat by my side on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the last 2 years, and I know how he feels.

Mr. MATHEWS. That has been a great pleasure to me.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been a great pleasure to your humble servant also.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I listened with pleasure to the reference that the gentleman from Mississippi made to our late friend, Royal Johnson. Royal Johnson, as those who served with him know, was one of the finest men who ever lived. He was chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation when the Republicans were in control. He was one of the best friends the veterans ever had, and they owe him a debt of gratitude and should never forget his memory. He was one of the fairest legislators, as well as one of the ablest men, who ever served in this body. I am glad that the gentleman from Mississippi referred to him, because he recalled to our memory a great man, and I am prompted, Mr. Speaker, to make these observations so that they will appear in the RECORD and carry on the memory of a great man. I also strongly favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. Royal Johnson gave his life for his country. He died as a result of battle wounds received in the last war. The American Legion had his picture painted and presented it to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The Members met and paid tribute to him. The remarks they made at that time were inserted in the RECORD and checked over carefully. They were submitted to Mr. Johnson. He read them with tears in his eyes. The morning those remarks appeared in the permanent RECORD, he died suddenly on his way to his office. He had a son in this war, who for a long time we thought was lost. I am glad to say, however, that that boy was finally found uninjured and he has returned to the United States. I hope he follows his father's footsteps.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that a more patriotic man never served in the House of Representatives than Royal Johnson, of South Dakota.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this legislation which provides for an increase in pensions for the widows, orphans, and dependent parents of our servicemen who made the supreme sacrifice in defense of our flag. There is no doubt that the Congress of the United States has gone all out in an attempt to provide for the veterans of World War II, although there are instances evident in the RECORD which indicate a lack of complete understanding as to the most equitable and fair way of doing this which the intent would indicate.

Those of us who are veterans of the last war are in agreement to the extent that we, if we had been numbered among those not fortunate enough to return to the land we love, would have been very concerned about the provisions made by our Government to provide for our widows and children. We appreciate all that has been done for us who have returned, but we would have appreciated much more that which would have been done for those we left behind had we not have been fortunate to return. This measure which is now under consideration will help to compensate the widows, orphans, and dependent parents for the great increase in the cost of living which has placed such a severe hardship on the dependents of our fallen comrades.

There are many things that have been done and are being done for the servicemen who returned from the recent conflict in an able-bodied condition. Many of these efforts are laudable and should be continued, but we must never forget that our first obligation is to those who did not return, to their dependents, and to those who came back in such condition as to impair their ability to make a living for themselves and their dependents. In passing this measure which is presently under consideration we will in part take care of our obligation to those who did not return and to their dependents.

The measure which we are about to consider is one which will, in a greater degree, take care of those who came back in such condition as to impair their ability to provide for their dependents by increasing the compensation for those veterans who are 60 percent or more disabled. A line had to be drawn somewhere and it was decided by the committee that 60 percent was a fair and equitable place to draw the line. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to go on record as being in complete accord with the two measures which we are now and will shortly consider in this regard.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I commend the gentleman from Mississippi for the position he has taken on legislation for veterans, and particularly with reference to this bill. I am heartily in accord with the bill, and am happy that it has been brought up so that we may act on this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. We have always tried to keep politics out of veterans' legislation.

Mr. ANGELL. I know that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, commend the gentlemen of the committee for bringing this bill out and particularly the chairman of the committee, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, on reporting this meritorious measure. I want to second what the gentleman from Oregon has just said concerning the gentleman from Mississippi. He has been ever mindful of our veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman from Mississippi well knows the interest I have always had in veterans' affairs and also knows that I, too, was once a member of the Committee on World War Veterans'

Legislation. While it may not sound in keeping with some of the remarks that have been made up to now, may I say that, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I, of course, am conscious of the duties of that position. I wonder, while we cannot measure our duty to these folks in dollars, whether the gentleman can give us any idea what additional moneys will be involved in this particular bill, so that we may formulate future plans.

Mr. RANKIN. That is with reference to this particuular bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I cannot tell you that. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It will cost $99,000,000 additional.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the House should bear those figures in mind when we are considering other matters relating to the budget.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. The $99,000,000 figure was presented by the Veterans' Administration. They figured high in order to be sure to cover the entire possible cost. One other organization figured $50,000,000, which was too low. I asked them to refigure that, because I personally believe it would cost between $70,000,000 and $75,000,000.

The organization refigured on the basis of the Veterans' Administration statistics and came out with $71,000,000. I think the real figure will be somewhere around that.

Mr. RANKIN. Even at that, it is a mere bagatelle compared with the money we have sent abroad.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mrs. ROGERS] and the entire membership of the committee for reporting out this bill. It is much needed legislation and should have been passed months ago. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for his introduction of the so-called adjusted compensation bill. I am heartily in favor of it. I was the fifth Member of the House to sign discharge petition No. 14 on that bill. Although it is now too late to pass it at this session, I hope we can get that bill through at the next session of the Congress because it is fair and the veterans deserve and need it.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think the gentleman will also agree with me that this is in keeping with the traditional policy of all Congresses of the United States, which was stated by Abraham Lincoln—

For him who has borne the battle and for his widows and orphans.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course we are for this bill, but what is the gentleman's opinion as to whether we will be able to make like compensation if we draft our young men and engage in this third world war? Will we be able to take care of that group of disabled veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. I am afraid not, if we continue to spend the taxpayers' money on foreign countries.

But if we will build the strongest Air Force on earth and keep a supply of atomic bombs on hand, we can forever protect this country without such a draft.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I know that the House desires to give time to all this legislation which the majority leader told us he wanted to put through today, but I cannot refrain for a moment to say something about this bill, and also to pay tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

I have had the pleasure of serving with FRANK MATHEWS during the time he has been here. He was a member of the Census Committee which I headed, before the Reorganization Act. I have been with him during the past 2 years on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It has never been my privilege to work with a finer gentleman, and a more conscientious legislator than FRANK MATHEWS. I admire him very much and regret to see him voluntarily retire from Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this bill covers a group that is close to the hearts of all of us, the widows and children of the deceased veterans. We all want to help them, and everybody is unanimous on this bill. We owe this to them. I have championed this legislation a long time.

I call attention to the last paragraph of the bill which raises the ceiling limit from $1,000 to $1,800. That is very necessary and is very timely. The cost of living has increased, making this increase necessary. This entire bill is one of the most worthy ever reported out of my committee.

One other thing I want to say in this closing moment, and that is about housing for veterans. Some of us have been pounding away for a long time to get some housing for veterans, and up to this moment in the closing week, almost at the closing hours of this session of Congress, we do not know that we are any nearer veterans housing than we have been. The Veterans' Affairs Committee has reported out a comprehensive housing bill to provide housing for veterans. I am sorry to say that that bill is still locked up in the Rules Committee, and we do not know yet whether we will have a chance to vote on that bill for housing for the veterans. I hope, Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn that that veterans' housing bill will be considered.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. I notice in the report it mentions Spanish-American War widows. Does this bill cover Spanish-American War widows, as well as World War II?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the chairman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The other bill covers the Spanish-American War.

Mr. BRADLEY. They are not covered in this bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish to agree with the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] and others who have spoken, relative to the splendid work that has been done by our colleague on this side, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] who is retiring from Congress.

It was my privilege also to serve with him on one of the former committees relative to veterans' legislation. He truly has done masterful work for the veterans and I honor him at this time. I certainly am in accord with this legislation and congratulate the committee on bringing it out.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has a fine war record in both world wars and who is past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana, who has always been the champion of the veteran. Along with the names of ROGERS, MATHEWS, and RANKIN, should be mentioned also the name of ALLEN.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I certainly thank my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mrs. DeVan, the executive secretary of the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans, who has done a great deal of work on legislation for war widows, lives in my district. That organization has been working for a bill extending GI rights to war widows, and this should be done. I am sure they also would want the bill before the House passed. I would like to add my appreciation to the committee. I would also like to state that the majority leader in particular and the House leadership are to be complimented for the courtesy with which they received Mrs. DeVan and Mrs. Nelson of the organization mentioned, and for bringing out this very deserving bill which is now before us and which I very much favor.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I merely wish to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] was at one time a member of our committee. He always worked in the interest of the veterans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that this is probably the most important veterans' legislation that will

come before the House or has come before the House at this session.

Also, I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]. In addition to helping them we are discharging an obligation to these disabled veterans and to their widows and children. Of course we want to help them, but as a matter of fact, we are simply discharging an obligation that we owe these people.

Let me say further, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and have signed his discharge petition No. 14. I think his bill for adjusted compensation is based upon sound principles and I do hope that at the next session of Congress it will be passed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair advise me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has 15 minutes remaining.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 3748, to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain deceased veterans of World War I or World War II.

This legislation was introduced in the first session of the Eightieth Congress while I was serving as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and as a member of that committee I gave it my full support. I had the opportunity to vote in favor of it twice as a committee member, the first time when it was considered by the subcommittee of which I was a member and then later when it was approved by our full committtee.

I am also going to give my support to another bill which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will bring to the floor this afternoon and I urge its favorable consideration by my colleagues in the House. I refer to H. R. 5588, to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World War II and Spanish-American War with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

H. R. 3748 defines as dependent any parent whose annual income does not exceed $1,800, and for two parents, $3,000. It will increase the present inadequate pensions and remove many inequalities in the present system of payments. Under its terms a widow will receive $75 instead of $60; widow with one child, $115 instead of $78; with two children, $135 instead of $93.60; three children, $155 instead of $109.20; four children, $175 instead of $124.80; and five children, $195 instead of $140.40.

Provisions for dependent children, but no widow, under this act run $50 instead of $30 for one child; $70 instead of $45.60 for two children; $90 instead of $57.60 for three; $110 instead of $69.60 for four; and $130 instead of $54 for five.

A dependent mother or father, $75 instead of $54; or a dependent mother and father, each, $40 instead of $30.

H. R. 5588 provides additional compensation for World War I and II and Spanish-American and peacetime—combat or extra hazardous service—veterans who are 60 percent or more disabled, depending upon the number of dependents.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a real honor and privilege to be a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee which originally considered and recommended favorable committee action on these measures, under discussion, to provide increased compensation to certain disabled veterans and to the widows and dependents of those veterans who gave up their lives in the service of their country.

There never was a more appropriate time for this country to demonstrate its gratitude by adequately providing for its seriously disabled veterans and the families of our deceased veterans. The additional compensation provided for in these measures, will be just rewards for the sacrifices our veterans made. My convictions here are based upon what the Government, by implication, bound itself to do in return for the services of all veterans, particularly husbands and fathers, when it called them to the defense of their country. One of these bills is specifically proffered in behalf of the really forgotten families of America.

Under existing legislation the provisions made for the widows and dependents of those men who made the greatest sacrifice in giving their lives have not been overgenerous. Continued disregard for their welfare is the kind of negligence which promotes lack of confidence in our Government. These widows and dependents must not be denied the advantages and opportunities that would have been provided by the veteran had he lived.

The existing provision of law gives the average widow with one child a pension of but $78 a month. It is unnecessary for me to say that this paltry sum cannot, in any sense, compensate them for their loss. No earthly amount of money could do that, but these courageous women desire and deserve the opportunity to help themselves. In the great majority of cases, the widow who suddenly found herself in the position of having to provide for herself and children, to determine her own future, is in great need of help. She faces just as difficult problems of readjustment as ever faced the returning servicemen.

No veteran's child should have to be without an adequate amount of mother's attention and care. Mothers frantically working, trying to run a home, attempting to be both father and mother to their children, cost of living beyond control, and anxiety of consequent neglect of the children—these are demands that must be alleviated.

The veteran who is seriously disabled must be enabled and encouraged to take care of himself and his family in the same fashion as he would proudly have done had he not been grieveously disabled by his war service.

Approval of this legislation is not a matter of making a contribution, it is not a matter of making a gift, it is a simple matter of assuming a just obligation that we owe to the veteran and his family. Medals, posthumous awards, Memorial Day services, and fine speeches offer beautiful opportunity for emotional expression, but these must not be mistaken for the practical meeting of the recognized debt and obligation; I earnestly urge you, my colleagues, to meet our moral duty and approve these bills without further delay.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my voice in support of H. R. 3748, which provides for an increase in compensation to widows and children of our deceased veterans.

Living costs have soared and continue to soar. Really, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how the beneficiaries under this legislation have managed to get by on the compensation which they presently receive. The increase provided by this bill is sorely needed and I am glad that we are given the privilege of voting for same—surely no one will vote against it.

I understand that following consideration of this bill, we will be afforded the privilege of voting on H. R. 5588, which will provide increased compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

I also favor passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and am sure it will overwhelmingly pass the House.

I desire to congratulate the members of the Committee of Veterans' Affairs for bringing these bills to the floor. They are worthy pieces of legislation. They will have my support.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to pay my deep respects and give my deep gratitude to the gentleman from New Jersey for his untiring work on these bills. I believe no Member has worked harder in the study of these bills or given more real service to the veterans even before he came to Congress than the gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS. He sat down with veterans' organizations as well with the Veterans' Administration and as members of the subcommittee and worked and worked to bring out these bills. Judge MATHEWS was a great soldier; he is a great American, as his record in Congress shows.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, during this entire session there has been no legislation that I can endorse more heartily than H. R. 3748, introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] who has worked so long and tirelessly in veterans' affairs.

I did, in fact, introduce H. R. 4900, which contains within its more comprehensive scope the identical amounts of pension increase to widows, orphans and dependent parents of men killed in war provided in H. R. 3748.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have been able to accumulate a detailed knowledge of the problems facing the people for whose benefit this bill is designed.

Hearings at length before our subcommittee, during which the four major veterans' organizations endorsed the provisions of H. R. 3748, terminated in a favorable report by unanimous opinion of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Provision for the welfare of dependents of our war dead has long been inadequate. It has resulted in many cases of severe hardship. According to the Bureau of Labor the cost of food alone has risen to 202.3 over the 1935–39 base of 100. Pensions have remained at depression-level.

A minimum annual budget for a family of four is today indicated by the Bureau of Labor to be $3,458. What kind of existence must this mean for a widow and three children who receive a yearly pension of $1,310.40—less than a dollar a day each?

We must remember that war death pensions are not a matter of charity, nor are they a gift. They represent only this great Nation's effort to assume the obligations of the men who fought and died for it. That obligation must be assumed. The problem facing us has only been how and to what extent.

The most practical solution is in increasing pensions to conform more equitably with economic reality, thereby diminishing their present deflated condition. Such action faces the problem squarely, and at the same time maintains equity within the group affected.

The extent of H. R. 3748 is neither unwise nor unaffordable. An estimate of the total annual cost of the bill for the first year was originally submitted by the Veterans' Administration—Report No. 1068, July 24, 1947—to be $100,072,000. This estimate was corrected on April 28, 1948—Report No. 1068, part 2—to $99,496,000. On May 12, 1948, in reporting on an identical bill in the Senate—S. 2651—the Veterans' Administration submitted an approximate estimate of $97,841,000. Assuming the absolute accuracy of this estimate, it is indeed a small portion of an annual Veterans' Administration budget of $8,000,000,000—of which $2,386,352,047 was spent in 1947 on the veterans' training and education program alone—Annual Report, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, 1947.

In 1948 we have faced and dealt with many of the stark remnants of the last great war. We are making strides in repairing devastation; we have extended America's helping hand to people displaced; we have furthered and guarded the rights of the veteran; we have been considerate of material war damage suffered by private individuals and enterprise.

But the greatest damage of all, the greatest suffering, the greatest sacrifice, is undeniably suffered by those who watched and waited in vain. To those whose loved ones will never come back we owe a debt supreme beyond our ability to pay.

I commend again Judge MATHEWS for his forthright leadership in the subcommittee and wish him well in his new endeavors wherever the road of life may take him.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my best wishes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS], who has indicated his desire to return to private life as he has left with the Congress a notable record of service. It was a pleasure to serve with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and to support such necessary legislation he has sponsored and fought for such as H. R. 3748, to increase service-connected death rates of compensation for widows, children, and dependent parents of World Wars I and II veterans.

I have sponsored legislation to extend educational benefits to the war widows and children of our deceased servicemen but I know the immediate necessity of increasing the pensions payable to these dependents at this time. With present high prices, the problems a war widow faces in trying to provide food and shelter for herself and child appeared impossible of solution on just $78 per month compensation. Therefore, we have a great obligation to fulfill here and now to provide for the widows, children, and dependent parents of our deceased servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that as an indication of our good faith to take care of those who gave so much during the last wars that we approve of H. R. 3748 unanimously and that we consider this a step in the right direction to make ample provisions for their education and welfare in the next Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATTHEWS] I wish to offer my congratulations on the fine work he has done in bringing H. R. 3748 through committee and to the floor of the House. I am sorry that he will not return to the House during the coming Congress. This legislation I heartily endorse, and in my opinion it contains two main thoughts—a correction of some inequalities and the adjustment of rates of compensation paid widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans whose death resulted from service to their country. I am happy to support this bill and feel confident that it will pass practically unanimously.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member would like to speak on this bill today. It is very humanitarian. But we have other legislation to come up and I think many Members would rather extend their remarks and pass the bill as soon as possible than to talk at length.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will have the approval of the House. It has two main purposes, one to correct inequalities, and the other to adjust the rates of compensation paid to widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans whose deaths were the result of their service to our country.

I am glad to have an opportunity to vote for this bill, for it carries out a promise I made in a public statement issued the day following the surrender of Japan. That statement was in part as follows:

At the close of the surrender ceremonies Saturday night, General MacArthur made a short concluding speech. He said in part:

"Today the guns are silent. A great tragedy has ended. A great victory has been won. The skies no longer rain death; the seas bear only commerce; men everywhere walk upright in the sunlight. The entire world lives quietly at peace. The holy mission has been completed and in reporting this to you I speak for the thousands of silent lips, forever stilled among the jungles and the beaches and in the deep waters of the Pacific which marked the way. I speak for the unnamed brave millions homeward bound to take up the challenge of that future which they did so much to salvage from the brink of disaster * * * I report to you that your sons and daughters have served you well and faithfully with the calm, deliberate, determined fighting spirit of the American soldier and sailor * * * They are homeward bound—take care of them."

General MacArthur's words "they are homeward bound" bring joy to the heart of every American and become a challenge to all of us to speed their return home in every possible way. Certainly our first obligation is to those who, on the far-flung battlefields of the world, have faced the dangers of war and won a glorious victory. I cannot feel that the war is over until they are safely home again.

Along with them we should start homeward bound the millions of others who, through the fortunes of war, were held in this country and were not given the privilege to engage in combat. They, too, have contributed in good measure to our victory and should be returned home as rapidly as military necessity and orderly demobilization will permit.

General MacArthur's final words were "take care of them," referring to the boys now homeward bound. That is an appeal we must answer—that is a challenge we must accept. We must, to the full extent of our ability, to the utter limits of the capacity of a grateful people, take care of those who went forth and offered their lives in defense of our country in an hour of national peril. They are the children of the Nation and as such should have and receive the honors, the attention, the consideration and the care, now and hereafter, which their services rightfully entitled them to. They must be promptly provided with suitable employment, with attractive business and educational opportunities, with the facilities for securing a home and enjoying the blessings and benefits they have been fighting to preserve.

Many will return broken in body or in mind. They must have that tender care necessary to restore them to sound health and be rehabilitated and returned to a normal and useful place in our national life.

And many can never return. They gave all that you and I might live and be free. Our last service to them can be the return of their bodies to those loved ones who request it. But appreciation of their supreme sacrifice requires that proper care and provision be made for those dependent ones they loved and left behind.

May we keep ever fresh in our minds and hearts these final words of General MacArthur: "They are homeward bound—take care of them."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, before we dispose of H. R. 3748 I, too, would like to compliment the Members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the outstanding service they always render to veterans.

To be sure, I am in full accord with the provisions of the present bill and only wish that we might further liberalize compensation to widows, orphans, dependent mothers and fathers of veterans.

In my judgment, the more liberal we are with dependents of veterans the surer we may be of sufficient military strength for any future war or emergency.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I should like to direct the attention of the House to the great need for additional laws or liberalized regulations in hospitalization of veterans who have succumbed to the awful habit of excessive drinking.

Several times cases have come to my attention where honorably discharged veterans were denied admission to veteran hospitals when they were helpless and sick as alcoholics. Last week I received a letter from a fine mayor of one of my leading cities, telling me of an unfortunate veteran who was frequently in the city jail because of drunkenness. I believe that a country which spends $9,600,000,000 for liquor, as we did last year, using every method to promote the sale of liquor, should make some effort to care for these unfortunate veterans and seek to cure them of this awful habit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 0, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—361

Abernethy	Brophy	Crow
Albert	Brown, Ga.	Curtis
Allen, Calif.	Bryson	Dague
Allen, Ill.	Buchanan	Davis, Ga.
Allen, La.	Buck	Davis, Tenn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Buffett	Davis, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Bulwinkle	Dawson, Ill.
Andresen, August H.	Burke	Dawson, Utah
Andrews, Ala.	Burleson	Deane
Andrews, N. Y.	Busbey	Delaney
Angell	Butler	Devitt
Arends	Byrne, N. Y.	D'Ewart
Arnold	Byrnes, Wis.	Dingell
Auchincloss	Camp	Dirksen
Bakewell	Canfield	Domengeaux
Banta	Cannon	Dondero
Barrett	Carroll	Donohue
Bates, Ky.	Carson	Douglas
Bates, Mass.	Case, N. J.	Durham
Beall	Case, S. Dak.	Eaton
Beckworth	Chadwick	Eberharter
Bender	Chelf	Elliott
Bennett, Mich.	Chenoweth	Ellis
Bennett, Mo.	Chiperfield	Ellsworth
Bishop	Church	Elsaesser
Blackney	Clason	Elston
Bland	Clevenger	Engel, Mich.
Blatnik	Cole, Kans.	Engle, Calif.
Bloom	Cole, Mo.	Evins
Boggs, Del.	Colmer	Fallon
Boggs, La.	Combs	Feighan
Bonner	Cooley	Fellows
Boykin	Cooper	Fenton
Bradley	Corbett	Fernandez
Bramblett	Cotton	Flannagan
Brehm	Cox	Fletcher
Brooks	Cravens	Fogarty
	Crawford	Folger
	Crosser	Forand
Fuller	Kunkel	Ramey
Fulton	Landis	Rankin
Gamble	Lanham	Rayburn
Garmatz	Larcade	Redden
Gary	Latham	Reed, Ill.
Gathings	Lea	Reed, N. Y.
Gavin	LeCompte	Rees
Gearhart	Lemke	Reeves
Gillette	Lesinski	Regan
Gillie	Lewis, Ky.	Rich
Goff	Lewis, Ohio	Richards
Goodwin	Lichtenwalter	Riehlman
Gordon	Lodge	Rivers
Gore	Love	Rizley
Gorski	Lucas	Rockwell
Gossett	Lyle	Rogers, Fla.
Graham	Lynch	Rogers, Mass.
Granger	McConnell	Rohrbough
Grant, Ala.	McCormack	Rooney
Grant, Ind.	McCowen	Ross
Gregory	McCulloch	Russell
Griffiths	McDonough	Sabath
Gross	McDowell	Sadlak
Gwynne, Iowa	McGregor	Sadowski
Hagen	McMahon	St. George
Hale	McMillan, S. C.	Sanborn
Halleck	McMillen, Ill.	Sarbacher
Hand	Mack	Sasscer
Hardy	MacKinnon	Schwabe, Mo.
Harless, Ariz.	Macy	Schwabe, Okla.
Harness, Ind.	Mahon	Scott, Hardie
Harris	Maloney	Scrivner
Harrison	Manasco	Seely-Brown
Hart	Mansfield	Shafer
Harvey	Marcantonio	Sheppard
Havenner	Martin, Iowa	Short
Hays	Mason	Sikes
Hébert	Mathews	Simpson, Ill.
Hedrick	Meade, Md.	Smathers
Herter	Merrow	Smith, Kans.
Heselton	Meyer	Smith, Ohio
Hess	Michener	Smith, Va.
Hill	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Wis.
Hinshaw	Miller, Conn.	Snyder
Hobbs	Miller, Md.	Spence
Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.	Stefan
Hoffman	Mills	Stockman
Holifield	Monroney	Stratton
Holmes	Morgan	Sundstrom
Hope	Morris	Taber
Horan	Muhlenberg	Talle
Huber	Multer	Taylor
Hull	Mundt	Teague
Jackson, Calif.	Murdock	Thomas, Tex.
Jackson, Wash.	Murray, Wis.	Thompson
Jarman	Nicholson	Tibbott
Javits	Nixon	Tollefson
Jenison	Nodar	Trimble
Jenkins, Ohio	Norblad	Twyman
Jenkins, Pa.	Norrell	Vail
Jensen	Norton	Van Zandt
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien	Vinson
Johnson, Ill.	O'Hara	Vorys
Johnson, Ind.	O'Konski	Vursell
Jones, Ala.	O'Toole	Wadsworth
Jones, N. C.	Pace	Walter
Jones, Wash.	Passman	Weichel
Jonkman	Patman	Welch
Judd	Patterson	Wheeler
Karsten, Mo.	Peterson	Whitaker
Kearney	Phillips, Calif.	Whitten
Kearns	Pickett	Whittington
Keating	Plumley	Wigglesworth
Kelley	Poage	Williams
Kennedy	Potter	Wilson, Tex.
Kerr	Poulson	Winstead
Kersten, Wis.	Powell	Wolcott
Kilburn	Preston	Wolverton
Kilday	Price, Fla.	Wood
King	Price, Ill.	Woodruff
Kirwan	Priest	Worley
Klein	Rains	Youngblood

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—69

Abbitt	Gallagher	Ludlow
Barden	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lusk
Battle	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGarvey
Bell	Hall, Leonard W.	Madden
Bolton	Hartley	Meade, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Mitchell
Buckley	Hendricks	Morrison
Celler	Isacson	Morton
Chapman	Jennings	Murray, Tenn.
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Peden
Clippinger	Johnson, Tex.	Pfeifer
Coffin	Kean	Philbin
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Phillips, Tenn.
Coudert	Keefe	Ploeser
Courtney	Kefauver	Potts
Cunningham	Keogh	Riley
Dolliver	Knutson	Robertson
Dorn	Lane	Scoblick
Doughton	LeFevre	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Fisher	Lemke	Simpson, Pa.
Foote	Smith, Maine	Towe
	Somers	West
	Stanley	Wilson, Ind.
	Stevenson	
	Stigler	
	Thomas, N. J.	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Foote with Mr. Stanley.

Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall with Mr. Heffernan.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Towe with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Stevenson with Mr. Peden.

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Coffin with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Battle.

Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Isacson.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Morton with Mr. Riley.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Somers.

Mr. LeFevre with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Courtney.

Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Madden.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.

Mr. Kean with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. West.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Potts with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Philbin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address delivered by President Truman on June 5.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Star.

INCREASES OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS WHO HAVE DEPENDENTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates

for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered I (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following amounts:

(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

(a) has a wife but no child living, $30;

(b) has a wife and one child living, $50;

(c) has a wife and two children living, $65;

(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $80;

(e) has no wife but one child living, $20;

(f) has no wife but two children living, $35;

(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $50;

(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $25 for each parent so dependent.

(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 percent, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

SEC. 2. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

SEC. 3. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, and veterans regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, and ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Mississippi for 20 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very much needed bill. The amount that the badly disabled veterans receive is but a mere pittance when considered in connection with the increased cost of living, but the bill H. R. 5588 provides increases of compensation to veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents and whose disability is rated at least 60 percent or more.

It applies to veterans of Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, and to peacetime veterans whose disability is the result of extrahazardous duty or conditions simulating war.

Under the terms of this bill, while rated totally disabled, the veteran would receive the following additional amounts for dependents:

Wife but no child living	$30
Wife and one child living	50
Wife and two children living	65
Wife and three or more children living	80
No wife but one child living	20
No wife but two children living	35
No wife but three or more children living	50
Mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, for each parent so dependent	25

Veterans rated partially disabled—60 percent or more—would be entitled to additional compensation in amounts having the same ratio to the amounts specified for total disability as the degree of disability bears to the total disability. A veteran rated at 60 percent disabled, for example, and having a wife and no child would receive as additional compensation 60 percent of $30 or $18.

This additional compensation would not be payable to a veteran during a period in which he is receiving an increased rate of compensation or subsistence allowance because of dependents under any other law; however, he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

The administrative definitive and penal provisions of Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, are made applicable to this bill. The bill would be effective from the 1st day of the second calendar month following enactment.

The estimated cost of the bill—I am using Veterans' Administration figures—Mr. Speaker, is $60,428,000 for 131,230 veterans.

This bill has the support of the veterans' organizations. They have worked hard for it as did the Veterans' Administration in the preparation of the bill. I would like to pay tribute to the aides to the committee for their splendid research work and help in the preparation of bills. I have spoken many times of the fine cooperation of the committee members and my pleasure in working with them.

I am still hopeful that the Veterans' Homestead Act will pass before Congress adjourns.

In our earnest desire to solve the housing shortage let us not lose sight of the preferential order of the importance of our housing problems. The veterans' problem is still the most acute, and its treatment must command our first attention until it is completely solved.

I would like to call your attention to the all-important fact that the preference in occupancy provided in the Housing and Rent Act, and the preference in occupancy provided under title VI of the National Housing Act, is a mere sham and delusion unless the veteran is also provided with an effective preference in his attempt to finance his purchase. Today only the GI bill stands to offer the veteran any such financial preference. It obviously means nothing to tell our veterans that they may have first call on new homes if they do not have at least equal financing resources to compete with nonveterans. But we all recognize that our young veterans who were called away from their jobs and their education during the war cannot be expected to compete on equal terms with those who stayed home and accumulated savings during the war years.

In a nutshell, if we hope to tackle our most important housing problem first, we must provide preferential home-financing aids to veterans.

The so-called T-E-W bill fails completely to solve this all-important first problem. The net practical effect of the combined provisions of that bill is to nullify and destroy the last vestiges of financial preference to veterans of World War II that still remain in the housing picture. To do so in the face of facts published by the Bureau of the Census, that as late as April 1947 there were 14 veteran families overcrowded for every 4 nonveteran families overcrowded, would be an unpardonable repudiation by the Congress of the obligation of their Government to those veterans. This is accomplished through devious twistings of statutes, the meaning of which is already so obscure as to preclude the Members of this Congress from taking time to appropriate adequately their significance. When hearings were held in the Senate on a bill containing similar provisions to title VI of the T-E-W bill Gen. Omar Bradley, then the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wrote in part as follows:

It is believed that the enactment of those sections into law would accomplish results immediately and positively prejudicial to veterans in that—

(1) The substantially increased advantages to leaders embodied in the proposed changes will channelize lending under title I and title II of the National Housing Act, and thus divert or stem the flow of credit now participating generally in lending under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, with the result that the veteran will be compelled to accept loans on terms substantially less advantageous to him than of the terms which govern the GI loan.

(2) They will stimulate the ability of nonveterans to compete with the veteran for the purchase of housing in the lower-to-medium cost brackets. This will further inflate the price of new housing to the prejudice of each prospective veteran purchaser.

It might be further pointed out that those of the proposals which are designed to inject further credit into the single-family housing field seek to attack the housing problem from almost the sole angle at which it is at least deficient. There is general agreement that the supply of financing under present legislation is more than adequate. The real need is to supply more materials and more labor and to translate those factors into more building at lower cost. To approach the problem by providing additional stimulants to credit expansion may result in further price inflation.

The consequences that General Bradley correctly foresaw and feared are even more real and fearsome in view of the elaborated layering of credit support on credit support which is sandwiched into the various titles of the T-E-W bill.

The attention of the Members of this House is drawn to the fact that despite the lapse of the insuring authorization of title VI of the National Housing Act, builders are proceeding with new home construction on an unprecedented scale. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that in April of this year 90,000 new dwelling units were started, with prospects that in May the number may possibly reach the 100,000 level. In the face of such performance and on the record of prior months, it appears that the combination of conventional loans plus the GI bill and FHA's title II will attract and provide ample production credit to keep the home-building industry at full steam. The Federal Housing Administration has liberalized their valuation standards for homes built under title II so that for practical purposes builders have about the same benefits as under the old title VI.

Rather than a rejuvenation of title VI, which is available to veterans and to nonveterans as well, the critical need of our home-hungry veterans is for a distinct plan whereby they may help themselves and under which we may be assured that a fair proportion of our none-too-large supply of construction materials and labor will be available to them. Precisely such a plan, clear and simple of operation, has been provided in the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, H. R. 4488. This bill was reported out by the Veterans' Affairs Committee unanimously. I would emphasize this unanimous endorsement of the veterans' homestead bill after very extensive hearings, because it is in focal contrast to other recent developments in this field.

Accordingly, in justice to our debt to the veterans of World War II, I urge you again to give the most careful consideration to the provisions of the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, H. R. 4488. The bill has the whole-hearted support of the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs who is the most indefatigable worker for veterans I ever knew, and to all members of that committee, and especially to the members of my subcommitteee, my most appreciative thanks for the work they have done and the help they have given on this bill and the other bills.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 5588, is designed to remedy what appears to me and many others to be a discrepancy long existing with regard to the amounts paid for compensation for service-connected disabilities.

At the present time the amount paid for total disability to veterans not entitled to statutory awards is $138 per month. Statutory awards have been granted for certain specific disabilities and combinations thereof in additional amounts.

The $138 is paid regardless of whether a veteran is unmarried, married, has one child, several children, or a dependent parent or dependent parents. Neither his legal nor moral obligations are affected by the fact that he has been given this compensation from the Federal Government.

The present bill provides that in cases of total disability the veteran shall receive in addition to the flat award, compensation in the amount of $30 if he has a wife, but no children; $50 if he has a wife and one child; $65 if he has a wife and two children; $80 if he has a wife and three or more children. If he has no wife and one child living, he would get $20 additional; no wife but two children living, $35 additional; or no wife but three or more children living, $50 additional; and if he has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then he gets $25 additional for each parent so dependent.

If the veteran is rated not less than 60 percent disabled he would receive an amount having the same ratio to the amounts above specified as the degree of his disability bears to total disability.

The act covers persons entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in, or aggravated by, active service in World War I and World War II, Spanish-American War, actual participation in the Philippine Insurrection or Boxer Rebellion and to veterans who were disabled while performing extra hazardous peacetime service under conditions simulating war.

The bill specifically provides that this additional compensation shall not be payable to a veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration, except that he may elect to receive whichever amount might be greater.

The Veterans' Administration has estimated the total increased cost for the first year of this bill at $62,447,290. It is reasonable to suppose that this estimate is not only a maximum but probably higher than the maximum, for the reason that the Veterans' Administration must estimate the amount which will surely cover the cost of the bill, so that any appropriation asked for will not fall short of the needed funds.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will pass the House unanimously.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as an increase in benefits to service-connected Spanish-American War veterans have been mentioned it may be well for the gentleman to make mention of the fact the increase does not apply to pension benefits now being received by Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. MATHEWS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. It does not apply to pension benefits, but it does apply to veterans of the Spanish-American War who have service-connected disabilities of 60 percent or more. Does that answer the question?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It does.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. If the gentleman's last statement is so, it seems to me the title of the bill should be amended.

Mr. MATHEWS. The title has been amended. If the gentleman will look at the bottom of the last page he will see these words: "Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans' ", and so forth. Does that answer the question?

Mr. KEARNEY. That answers the question.

Mr. MATHEWS. If there are any further questions I shall be glad to answer them. If not, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this measure is justified by the increased cost of living. I have pointed out time and time again the vast discrimination between the men in the rank and file and the retired emergency officers. My objection to this bill is that it should apply to all service-connected cases according to the percentage of the disability.

But under the rules of the House we cannot amend it now because it comes up under a motion to suspend the rules, which eliminates any possibility of an amendment.

These are service-connected disabilities. These are real war casualties. These are men who received their disabilities in line of duty, and this increase is none too much in the light of the increased cost of living. As I said, my only objection is that it does not increase the compensation of every service-connected disabled veteran. In my opinion the service-connected men should have been increased all the way down the line, and even then they would be getting a small amount in comparison with many retired emergency officers who never got closer to the battlefront than the Pentagon Building.

So, I say, from every standpoint this measure is justified; and if the Senate should amend it to reduce that percentage of disability I, for one, would support the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I shall support H. R. 5588 wholeheartedly as I supported H. R. 3748. We should certainly give more help to disabled veterans and their dependents and the widows and other dependents of veterans, in view of what has happened to prices. The rising cost of food and clothes and rent and utilities, and everything else has made it impossible for all those on fixed incomes to maintain an adequate standard of living. Disabled veterans and veterans' widows and children will still be hanging onto the ropes even after we pass these bills. We are not doing anything substantial for the veteran and his family when we pass them. What we are doing is easing our own conscience because we have failed to do anything about the high cost of living.

Now, I point out again, pleadingly, that this legislation is an example of our failure to check inflation. H. R. 3784 will involve the spending of about $90,000,000. I do not know how much money is involved in H. R. 5588; but these bills are necessary if the disabled veterans

and their dependents are not to starve. This Congress, through its failure to act to curb prices, is directly responsible for the spending of this money.

We have students that we have helped a little bit, but in my office, and I am sure in your offices, we have letters showing that students all over the country are dropping out of school. They cannot stay in school and bridge that gap between what they get and what it costs them to support a wife and baby. Even the single men are finding they have to drop out.

In order to try to stay in school, veterans must add to the Government allowance by obtaining piecemeal work if they can find it. Every day prices go higher and every day their problems become greater.

What is true of the veterans is also true of Federal workers and postal employees. All over the country postal employees are having to find supplemental jobs to bring their salaries up to where they can buy food and clothing and pay the rent. This is also true of teachers throughout the country.

It is shameful to me that Congress ignores the strain and the anxiety that the great masses of American people are experiencing in their day-to-day struggle for existence.

The cost of living is hard on all of us, but just think what it means to people living on meager pensions. Does this Congress propose to adjourn without passing a decent national pension that would really allow our fathers and mothers to retire into old age free from want and worry?

This high cost of living is not only wrecking us at home, but wrecking the world today. It is undermining our whole foreign policy of rehabilitation. It means that when countries buy food they buy it at increasingly higher prices all the time. We are destroying ourselves by letting our own economy get out of hand.

In this last war roughly a thousand billion dollars worth of goods and wealth was destroyed. For example, we dug up the Mesabi Range here in this country and used up three-fourths of its iron ore—the purest iron ore in this country. We burned up men and cities and raw materials. We cannot go on now as though nothing had happened. The most important factor contributing to the trouble in Europe today is the destruction of goods and wealth. There is a shortage of goods all over the world. We cannot go on and behave as though nothing had happened, or we are really going to lose this peace and not only make more veterans but destroy our whole civilization.

I know it is unrealistic, Mr. Speaker, to suppose now that the Members will do anything about price controls in this last week. If we get the housing bill through it will be a miracle. But I beg the Members, Mr. Speaker, when they go to their convention as Americans dedicated to the building of a peaceful world, to look realistically at the inflation that now engulfs our economy and agree on a program of action to check that inflation so that we may insure the future.

We are losing the peace daily because we will not use some self-control and some self-discipline; because we will not face the facts. The facts are that our runaway economy is robbing us of the very thing we want most in the world, which is peace.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I understand that on Saturday the gentlewoman supported the farm-price-support program. I should like to be very logical on it, because I was against it at this time as not being necessary for the protection of the farmers. I should like the gentlewoman to be logical and tell me how she can support a program which keeps prices up for consumers, and then talk against the high cost of living today, and make this change only between Saturday and Monday?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman, for whose intelligence and ability I have a high regard, knows when he asks me that question that it is a phony question. The price-support program does not operate at all unless prices fall and food piles up on the farms. What you are doing is saying, "If we get into trouble, then you will have this program." I hope the gentleman has read my remarks in the RECORD. I could not obtain time on the floor. As usual, we are short of time. We have plenty of time to discuss irrelevancies but we never have time to discuss the basic issues on which the success or failure of winning the peace must be founded. Just read my remarks and see what I said this Congress should be thinking about. It should be thinking about high prices. I hope the gentleman is not going to use the parity-support program as an excuse in his district for high prices. The reason for passing the farm price-support program at this time is that farmers must plan ahead for their crops and, although it is perfectly true that at present prices the Government would never aid the farmer, he has to know that when he sows a crop he is not going to go broke. So all it means is that you take out insurance for the farmer. The gentleman from Pennsylvania certainly is intelligent enough to understand that. And the gentleman surely knows that even if we did not have a parity program prices would not only remain where they are, but would continue to rise unless Congress acted to check them, as was done in Canada.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentlewoman think that potatoes at $3.25 a bushel are phony?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce to the House again what I have announced many times, that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported out an extremely fine bill which would provide houses at low cost to veterans. It is an all-veterans bill. We introduced it at the request of the Legion, and we are fighting for its passage before the adjournment of the Congress. The general housing bill contains practically nothing for the veterans in regard to housing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSS], who has done an outstanding piece of work in the committee and has worked valiantly to secure passage of the bill H. R. 5588. Everything that he does he does well and thoroughly.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which I hope and believe will pass the Congress by a unanimous vote.

I want to congratulate and commend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions, for their hard and tireless work in bringing this measure and the bill which passed the House a few minutes ago before the House.

Notwithstanding some of the remarks which have just been made, both of these bills are good bills. H. R. 3748, which the House just approved without a dissenting vote, provides additional compensation to widows and orphans and dependent parents of deceased veterans of World War I or World War II. The measure now under consideration, H. R. 5588, will provide increased compensation for certain disabled veterans of World Wars I and II who have dependents.

I am in agreement with the statement made here a little while ago—that our first duty is to disabled veterans and dependents and war widows and orphans. By the enactment of these two bills here today, we will provide the means which will help these deserving groups to meet the increased cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Massachussets [Mrs. ROGERS], the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for her fine work in behalf of the veterans of America. Nothing is as close to the heart of our chairman as the comfort, rehabilitation, and general welfare of all veterans, and particularly is this so of the disabled veterans and widows and orphans of servicemen. Considering the many and complex problems which have been presented this Congress, I believe time will prove to the Veterans' Affairs Committee, in the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to be a great chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I also want at this time to express my regret at the retirement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS]. I have come to know the gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, as a friend and I have formed a great admiration and respect for him because of his sympathetic, intelligent, and sound approach to all veterans' legislation coming before our committee, and because of his earnest and sincere interest in, and understanding of, legislation affecting the national interest. Not only will the veterans of the country suffer a great loss upon his retirement, for he has truly been a friend and champion of the veteran, but every constituent in his district, as well as the Congress, will suffer a genuine loss. The gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, has sponsored a large number of meritorious measures for the benefit of our veterans.

With respect to these two bills, I think he should be given full credit, for he is almost solely and entirely responsible for

their being brought before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate, Judge MATHEWS' retirement will mean a great loss to the Congress and to the country. I do hope that at some future date he will change his mind and return to this body where he has done his work so well.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to vote for the preceding bill, which was authored by the gentleman from New Jersey, and I certainly shall vote for the bill now under consideration. But I am concerned about a discrimination which the bill seems to practice against the veteran who has a disability of less than 60 percent. May I ask the gentleman from New Jersey, author of the bill, who I am sure has no intention of practicing a discrimination against any veteran or group of veterans, why the dividing line was placed at 60 percent? Why is there no increase for a veteran, with dependents, who has less than a 60-percent disability.

Mr. MATHEWS. I am very happy to answer the gentleman as best I can. The reason is that one bill introduced did not provide any dividing line. When we came to consider that and carried it all the way down the line to veterans who received the minimum rating of 10 percent, the cost of the bill would have been enormous, and also there seemed to be little reason for a man receiving 10 percent or 20 percent disability to receive this additional allowance for his dependents because, it would seem, he was still, with his disability, able to make his own living.

May I say we tried to strike a point at which we could say generally above that point a man is entitled to the percentage given here to assist him, because he has that much disability. Below that point he should not get it because he should be able to earn his own living.

May I say further, this bill as it stands today, with this percentage, has the full support of all four of the large veterans' organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS. The Disabled American Veterans are strongly in support of this bill as it stands.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does not the gentleman anticipate that the veterans with disabilities of less than 60 percent would feel that they are being discriminated against by this bill?

Mr. MATHEWS. No matter where you draw the line, you would have somebody come in and say he was being discriminated against.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the point I am trying to make. As long as we pass veterans' legislation which draws a line, benefiting one group and omitting the other there will always be a feeling that those just under the line were discriminated against. In this instance I think they are. Therefore, I believe it would have been much better if this legislation had provided that increased benefits be granted to all veterans with dependents and graduate the benefits upward in proportion to the degree of disability.

I fear there will be some question raised by those whose disabilities are under 60 percent. I think we will be right back here later to correct it. I wish that it might be done now but under present rules the bill is not subject to amendment.

Mr. MATHEWS. What the gentleman says is perfectly true as a theoretical matter, but, as a practical matter, there is some point at which a man's disability does not seriously interfere with his making a living. You might say the same discrepancy takes places because the Veterans' Administration rates a man at either 20, 30, 40, or 50 percent. It does not rate him at 55 or 62 or 71 percent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand that.

Mr. MATHEWS. So that is arbitrary. This is not a hard and fast thing. This is not a scientifically exact matter. It is a matter for the application of common sense. After we studied it out, we came to the conclusion that the proper point was 60 percent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I appreciate the gentleman's observation, and I am certain he and the committee endeavored to work out something that is fair to all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my colleague whose name is affixed to more legislation in behalf of the veteran than any man ever to serve in Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with my colleague from Mississippi that this rate should have been a percentage increase, and should apply to all service-connected disabilities.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The increase should be in proportion to the degree of disability that the veteran has sustained.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. As I said awhile ago, it is not subject to amendment under suspension, but if the Senate should amend it to that effect, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I shall also. I want to make myself clear. I make these observations not in criticism of anyone. I am sure all members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee endeavored to report out a bill that would be fair to all concerned.

Mr. RANKIN. I am sure that is right. In 1928 they brought in a bill to pay an emergency officer, who had 30 percent disability, 75 percent of his base pay, whether he recovered or not. If these boys were emergency officers and had had 30 percent disability at any time, they would be getting 75 percent of their base pay. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that the criticism is going to come from that vast number of men who have service-connected disabilities ranging from 10 to 60 percent. If the Senate amends it to that effect, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, having in mind those veterans with statutory allowances, as the results of loss of an arm or a leg. I believe they are not rated 60 percent but around 50 percent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand the majority of them are rated at less than 60 percent; considerably less.

I thank both gentlemen for their observations.

What I have said in regard to this legislation was not in criticism of anyone. I am simply endeavoring to be helpful and avoid discriminations against all veterans as I know each of you want to avoid. I know how difficult it is to work these matters out in absolute perfection. I was privileged to serve on the Veterans' Committee for 2 years and worked hard on many bills in behalf of our worthy veterans. Discriminations would creep in here and there. I know they are difficult to avoid.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the first order on all veterans' legislation should be to take care of those men who returned bearing the scars of battle and to provide for the widows and children and dependent parents of those servicemen who failed to return. I am in support of H. R. 5588 without reservations as it provides dependency allowances for the loved ones of those veterans of World Wars I and II who are 60 percent or more disabled.

These veterans are the ones who are so seriously disabled that most of them have had to completely readjust their lives and to seek new employment in fields of other endeavors. Their ability to earn a living has been impaired, yet they have the responsibility to provide for their families and have found this problem increasingly more difficult to solve during these periods of high prices.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of H. R. 5588 by the Members of this House and hope that it is approved unanimously.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in consideration of legislation relating to veterans I feel that our first concern should be for those who in the service of their country suffered disabilities which interfere with their gainful employment and for the widows and dependent parents and children of those who gave their lives in order that the rest of us might live in freedom. In our praiseworthy and necessary effort to protect the public purse, we must not permit ourselves to forget these heroes who in the hour of our Nation's peril did not forget us, nor deal in a niggardly fashion with their beloved ones for whom they can no longer provide.

I was happy, therefore, to vote a few moments ago for the passage of H. R.

3748, providing compensation more nearly in line with economic realities to the widow and dependent parents and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II. For the same reason I enthusiastically support and urge the passage of the measure now before us which will increase the compensation of those suffering service-connected disability, who have a wife, children or parents dependent upon them for support.

In the cases to which the bill is limited where the disability is at least 60 percent the earning capacity of the veteran has usually been greatly impaired. Under existing law no distinction is drawn between such a veteran without or with dependents.

Although the additional allowances provided by this measure for the dependents of such a permanently wounded or disabled veteran are modest, they should go a long way toward helping him to meet his living expenses.

I hope this bill, seeking to alleviate the lot of those to whom we owe more than mere dollars can ever compensate, will receive the hearty support of the membership.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, my thoughts on this bill, H. R. 5588, are the same as on the previous bill just passed by the House. This bill is designed to remedy a discrepancy with reference to amounts paid as compensation for service-connected disabilities. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, it was with a great deal of satisfaction that I supported the passage of the bill through committee, and now support it on the floor of the House. The benefits under this bill are war benefits—real war casualties—and received by men in the line of duty. The increase is surely not excessive in view of the high cost of living. In my opinion the bill is a worthy one and should receive the hearty support of the membership.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill. In my opinion legislation to increase compensation for disabled veterans is long overdue. However, I do sincerely regret that this bill, which under the present rule cannot be amended, did not include veterans with disability of less than 60 percent. I very definitely feel that each veteran who sustained a disability as a result of his service to our country is entitled to consideration in proportion to his disability. With the cost of living what it is today, I do not feel that at any time in the past or future would this increase be of more assistance.

As I have stated, I am going to vote for this bill and give it my wholehearted support, and feel that this legislation is greatly needed. However, I sincerely hope that when this measure reaches the Senate that the provision will be made to grant substantial increases in compensation to all disabled veterans.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MATHEWS) there were—ayes 156, noes none.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

AMENDING VETERANS REGULATIONS RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED TROPICAL DISEASES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3889) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "hypertension", insert "myocarditis."

Page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike out "functional disorders of the nervous system;" and insert "encephalitis lethargica residuals."

Page 2, line 12, strike out ", amebic or bacillary."

Page 2, lines 12 and 13, strike out "fungus diseases; lieshmaniasis" and insert "leishmaniasis."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "oracontiasis (or dracontiasis)" and insert "dracontiasis."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "relapsing fever."

Page 3, line 10, strike out ", amebic or bacillary."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "fungus diseases."

Page 3, line 12, strike out "oracontiasis (or dracontiasis)" and insert "dracontiasis."

Page 3, line 13, strike out "relapsing fever."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER AT LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6716) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, line 1, after "any" insert "oil, mineral or."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN HOUSE BILLS LAID ON THE TABLE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 637, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3748) to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans; House Resolution 648, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5588) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, H. R. 3748, to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans, and H. R. 5888, to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 117 providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives by Public Resolution No. 43 of the Seventy-third Congress authorized the President to accept membership for the Government of the United States of America in the International Labor Organization and the President, pursuant thereto, accepted such membership on August 20, 1934; and

Whereas such membership in the International Labor Organization has proved of benefit to the people of the United States; and

Whereas the International Labor Organization provides a unique international forum in which representatives of employers and workers join together with those of governments in formulating conventions and recommendations which serve as international minimum standards for labor and social legislation and administration within member countries; and

Whereas extensive revision of the constitution has been undertaken to enable the Organization to meet changed conditions, to strengthen the application of conventions and recommendations, with careful provision to meet the constitutional rules and practices of Federal States, and to operate as a specialized agency in relationship with the United Nations; and

Whereas the constitution of the International Labor Organization instrument of amendment of 1946 was adopted unanimously on October 9, 1946, with the entire delegation of the United States to the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor Conference supporting this instrument of amendment: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept for the Government of the United States of America the constitution of the International Labor Organization instrument of amendment adopted by the twenty-ninth session of the International Labor Conference on October 9, 1946.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

(a) such sums, not to exceed $550,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, as apportioned by the International Labor Conference in accordance with article 13 (c) of the constitution of the Organization: *Provided, however*, That the annual United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the Organization shall not be greater in proportion than the United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the United Nations; and

(b) such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

SEC. 3. No person shall serve as representative, delegate, and alternate from the United States until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and no citizen of or resident in the United States shall participate in any session, conference, or meeting, or other work of the International Labor Organization or of any subordinate committee or organization thereof without the consent of the Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] If not, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MRS. LULA WILSON NEVERS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 710)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers.

The bill directs the payment of the sum of $10,100.43 to Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of a rental agreement entered into by her with the Iowa ordnance plant and the Kansas ordnance plant of the War Department, for the rental of one crawler crane.

It appears that Mrs. Nevers entered into equipment rental agreement No. 75 for the lease of one Linkbelt crawler crane, model K–44 (1933), to A. Guthrie & Co., Inc., a Minnesota corporation, and Al Johnson Construction Co., a Delaware corporation, co-adventurers and prime contractors for the United States, under Government contract No. W 6978 qm–1, for the construction of the Iowa ordnance plant near Burlington, Iowa. The lease provided for the payment of a rental of $600 per month, placed a valuation of $20,000 on the equipment leased, and contained a recapture clause providing that when the total amount of rental paid by the lessee should equal the value of the equipment, plus 1 percent each month of rental, the title to the equipment should be vested in the Government. The lease further provided that all necessary repairs to the equipment should be made by the lessee without cost to the lessor.

When the need for the crane at the Iowa ordnance plant was terminated, Mrs. Nevers was notified promptly and her agent inspected the crane and requested that the constructing quartermaster authorize certain repairs. The agent was notified that such repairs could not be authorized until the machine had been inspected and a determination made as to its condition when it was first received. The construction quartermaster declined to permit the crane to be taken from the premises unless Mrs. Nevers signed a conditional release of the lessees and the Government from any claim based on the rental contract in question. Mrs. Nevers signed such a release and then requested that the crane be shipped to Parsons, Kans., where she had been negotiating for a new rental contract of the crane for use on the Kansas ordnance plant. At the time that the release was executed the Government had a recapture equity in the crane in the amount of $2,000, which was relinquished by the Government in consideration for the release.

When received at Parsons, Kans., the crane was found to be not in good operating condition and Mrs. Nevers was requested to make the necessary repairs at her own expense prior to the execution of a new rental agreement. Certain parts were purchased and repairs made, but upon completion, the crane was still found to be unacceptable and was finally rejected by the authorities at Parsons. It was necessary for Mrs. Nevers to remove the crane at her own expense, and it was released to her upon reimbursement to the Government for the freight charges entailed in shipping the crane to Parsons.

A claim in the amount of $20,298.67 for rental, repairs, parts and labor, freight, loss of rental, loss due to forced sale, and other items, was submitted to the General Accounting Office but was rejected by the Comptroller General, in a decision dated March 28, 1944. The decision was apparently based on the ground that the release executed by Mrs. Nevers was a valid one, and by its provisions removed from the Government any liability to pay for the repairs which were found necessary after the execution of such release. The Comptroller General further stated that, inasmuch as no rental agreement was entered into with the Kansas ordnance plant, the Government could not be considered liable for any loss of rental arising out of the unacceptable condition of the crane.

The facts in the case do not disclose that the losses suffered were sustained through the fault or negligence of any officer of employee of the Government. Accordingly, I am unable to lend my approval to the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may have permission to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Procurement and Buildings of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House tomorrow and Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AIR SECURITY AND DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6247, to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized and established the composition of the Air Force required to maintain the air supremacy essential to the preservation of the security and defense of the United States, its Territories, possessions, and occupied areas wheresoever located and to overcome and overwhelmingly to retaliate against any aggressive act imperiling the peace and security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The United States Air Force and the supplemental Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States shall consist of not less than the required number of organizational units, with their necessary supporting elements, including tactical support, administrative, logistic, air transport, and training, needed to maintain the minimum requirements of the Air Force for air supremacy. All such units, with their necessary

supporting elements, shall be furnished with aircraft, spares, spare parts, equipment, and personnel necessary to fulfill the requirements for all such units and supporting elements: *Provided*, That the organizational units of the United States Air Force shall consist of 70 Regular Air Force groups and 72 separate Regular Air Force squadrons supplemented by such forces of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States as may be required to accomplish the mission of the Air Force, including 27 National Guard air groups, 34 equivalent Air Reserve groups, and their auxiliary units.

SEC. 3. The authorized active duty strength of the Air Force of the United States shall consist of 70,500 officers (of which number 40,000 may be Regular officers), 4,800 warrant officers, and 426,700 enlisted persons, which numbers shall be exclusive of military personnel of the Department of the Army rendering direct and indirect support to the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That any military personnel authorizations hereafter transferred from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Air Force by the Secretary of Defense, under the National Security Act of 1947, or such additional military personnel authorizations as the Secretary of Defense may deem necessary to discharge functions, powers, or duties hereafter transferred by him from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Air Force under such act, shall be in addition to the numbers hereinbefore set forth: *Provided further*, That the Department of the Air Force is authorized to employ such civilian personnel as may be deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946" (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.), with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees.

SEC. 4. The United States Air Force is hereby authorized 24,000 serviceable aircraft or 225,000 air frame tons aggregate of serviceable aircraft, whichever amount the Secretary of the Air Force may determine is more appropriate to fulfill the requirements of the Air Force for aircraft necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized, within such total air craft or air frame tons authorization, to procure annually 5,200 aircraft or 42,500 airframe tons, whichever amount the Secretary of the Air Force may determine is more appropriate to fulfill the requirements of the Air Force for aircraft necessary to replace unserviceable aircraft and to maintain a state of modernization which will insure an Air Force that can effectively perform its mission: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Air Force is further authorized to procure the guided missiles deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of this act and any numbers of guided missiles so procured shall not be considered to reduce either the numbers or weight of aircraft herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to procure the necessary spares and spare parts, equipment (ground, air, and otherwise), facilities, and other requirements necessary for the maintenance and operation of aircraft and guided missiles herein authorized and to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized and directed to intensify and further Air Force research and development projects, including those related to aircraft guided missiles, and all other phases of aerial warfare, to insure that the United States maintains the preeminence and supremacy essential to fulfilling the purposes of this act, and to procure the necessary equipment, facilities, personnel, and other requirements to effectuate the accomplishments of such projects.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force, such sums of moneys as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That any moneys appropriated to carry out the purposes of sections 4, 5, and 6 of this act shall remain available for obligation during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the four succeeding fiscal years thereafter.

SEC. 8. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Air Force Act of 1948."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, before the word "components", strike out the word "Reserve" and insert in lieu thereof the word "reserve."

On page 2, line 14, after the word "the" and before the word "components", strike out the word "Reserve" and insert in lieu thereof the word "reserve."

On page 2, line 16, after the words "twenty-seven" and before the word "National", insert the word "Air."

On page 2, line 17, before the word "groups", strike out the word "air."

On page 2, line 17, after the word "Air" and before the word "Reserve", insert the word "Force."

On page 5, after line 13, add a new section 8 as follows:

"SEC. 8. Section 8 of the Act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 780) as amended by section 1 of the Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 555), and all other laws or parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with this Act are hereby repealed."

On page 5, line 14, strike out "8" and insert in lieu thereof "9."

On page 5, line 19, strike out "9" and insert in lieu thereof "10."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 3, line 13, after "civilian personnel" insert a comma and the following: "within appropriations therefor."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that this amendment I offer would make the bill conform to the objections I raised when the bill was called on the Consent Calendar the other day.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 11, after the colon, strike out the balance of the paragraph.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the bill as originally submitted took the Department of the Air Force out from under the civilian personnel ceiling fixed by the Rees and the Byrd laws. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota would leave it as it is, but provide that it make the appropriation itself the ceiling. My amendment would strike that part of the bill which takes the civilian personnel of the Department of the Air Force out from under the Rees and the Byrd law ceilings. If you permit that, then the Departments of the Army and the Navy and practically every other department will come in here and ask to be taken out from under the ceiling of the Byrd and the Rees laws.

Let me explain what I mean. I am repeating what I said on the floor when the appropriation bill was under consideration last year. At that time my committee tried to cut 74,000 civilians off the War Department pay roll. The other body would not go along, but we finally cut off 58,000. We cut them off the Budget, but did not take one person off the pay roll. They had $50,000,000 fat left, and 22,000 civilian employees, after we had cut them the 58,000.

As the bill passed we have a double safeguard. One is the earmarking and limiting the amount of appropriations for personnel other than industrial, so they can use their money only for civilian personnel. The other is the Rees law and the Byrd law limit as to numbers. If they have more money than the personnel ceiling allows them to have, they cannot add personnel. It is a double safeguard. We found that the ceiling set by the Byrd law and the Rees law was the most effective thing we had to cut down the ceiling on useless civilian personnel. All my amendment does is to strike out that part of the bill which would take the Department of the Air Force out from under the Byrd and the Rees laws. It leaves the law just as it is now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may know the exact situation, I should like to read the language in the bill on page 3. The whole question that is involved here is how far you want to go in limiting the civilian personnel in the Air Force. The bill as reported from the committee reads as follows:

Provided further, That the Department of the Air Force is authorized to employ such civilian personnel as may be deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees.

The House has already adopted the amendment which I offered, which inserted the words, "within appropriations therefor," after "civilian personnel," on line 13. That is, as the matter now stands, without the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, we would lift the limitations of the Byrd-Rees personnel ceiling to the extent that we would say civilian personnel in the Air Force shall be controlled by the appropriations therefor.

I objected to the consideration of the bill on the call of the Consent Calendar the other day for two or three reasons, but principally because it lifted all personnel ceilings and seemed to undo what the House itself had done only a few days before.

When we had the military appropriation bill up this year, at the instance of the gentleman from Michigan and on his very firm fight to place an effective ceiling upon civilian personnel, we sorted out all the appropriations for civilian personnel and found that they came in the Air Force to about $325,000,000. We said, "That is too large," so we placed a limitation of $300,000,000 on the amount that might be expended for civilian personnel, exclusive of that used in the industrial or manufacturing end of the Air Force.

Therefore, the amendment which I offered brings the proposed law within what we had already done on the military appropriations bill. That was to put a dollar limitation upon civilian personnel.

The reason we took that action in the appropriation bill was that last year we found that money which was appropriated to some general branch of the War Department which might have been used for matériel was being applied to personnel or vice versa. They were shifting it back and forth. But by ear-marking the civilian personnel money, we made it impossible for them to transfer or use it for any other purpose, my amendment preserved that action.

Now then, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan goes further and strikes out this entire proviso as amended by my amendment and places the 70-group air force that is authorized by the bill as a whole, back under the limitations of the Byrd-Rees law which limits personnel by numbers as well.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Is there any reason why the Air Force should not have the same personnel ceiling law applied to them that the Navy now has and will have and that the Army will have? I think they should be uniform. I want to see that doubly safe-guarded.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is logic to that argument, of course. The answer I would suggest, however, is that this bill sets up the 70-group air force, and that consistently with the large procurement program provided in the deficiency bill to set up an enlarged Air Force, there might be some tight spots which could not be foreseen and which would not apply to the older services.

I would suggest, therefore, that while giving some flexibility we do maintain a real safeguard by the limitation of dollars on personnel in the appropriation bill, as now recognized by the amendment already adopted.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is not accepted, would it not be practicable for the Air Force to greatly increase the personnel by keeping down the salaries of its civilian employees?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I suppose that could be done, but I have never found that tendency. The tendency generally is to raise ratings under the Classification Act and thereby to increase the salaries rather than to increase personnel to absorb unspent money. When, in other instances and other legislation, we have sought to effect that by legislation on numbers, they have kept the top salaried brackets rather than the lower salaried brackets and have asked for the same or increased amounts of money.

Personally, I believe that the device of limiting personnel increases by putting a ceiling on the dollars which can be spent for personnel will be effective. It is the device worked out by the gentleman from Michigan, as the result of his studies this year, and I can see no great danger in trying it out.

At least, the amendment already adopted gives us that protection and that some protection was in order, is evident. The debate which is taking place justifies my request, the other day, that the bill be passed over on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the one subject that has caused the most worry about the establishment of this 70-group air force was their ability to employ civilian technicians. This proviso the gentleman from Michigan would strike out leaves the Air Force with the power to employ those technicians, as the gentleman from South Dakota has said, within the appropriations made by Congress.

I think it would be a horrible mistake to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I do not think it would do any good whatsoever and at the same time it might prevent our Air Force from employing the technicians they so badly need, and are going to need from now on, because—and do not forget this—if we have another war, it will be an atomic war. The airplane and atomic bomb will be the two instruments that will decide the destiny, perhaps, of civilization and mankind.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The technicians of the Air Corps personnel come under the Rees law, and they are fixed by the budget under that law and are flexible.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but this proviso gives them some latitude that they vitally need.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It leaves the law as it is right now.

Mr. RANKIN. It gives them some latitude here that they not only need now, but they are going to need more from now on.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The present law gives them latitude to employ people.

Mr. RANKIN. I saw the gentleman yesterday strike out an appropriation for construction of a short outlet from Oak Ridge to the sea, as well as a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to Oak Ridge, in the face of urgent recommendations of the Army engineers. His unjustified action in that case might mean the difference between victory and destruction in case of another war.

I am not willing to follow the distinguished gentleman from Michigan in striking out this power of the Air Force to employ technicians that they will need; because, as I said, the next war will be decided by the Air Force and the atomic bomb. Do you want to wait until the people of our cities are weakened by the terrible music of bursting bombs, until Detroit, Mich., is burnt to a crisp, or until Pittsburgh, Pa., and Washington, D. C., and other great cities are burnt to a crisp? I say we need the finest technicians on earth, and this proviso in this bill gives the Air Force the right to employ those technicians.

I am opposed to any amendment that would strike out that proviso or in any way hamper the Air Force in employing the kind of men they need to build and maintain an Air Force that would adequately protect this country at all times.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment is voted down.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 97, noes 50.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote, on the ground that there is no quorum present. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-four Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH RELATING TO DENTAL DISEASES AND CONDITIONS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6726) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after "cancer", insert "heart,"

Page 2, line 14, strike out all after "by" down to and including "by" in line 17.

Page 2, line 17, strike out "406" and insert "415."

Page 2, line 19, strike out " 'Part B" and insert " 'Part C."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "411" and insert "421."

Page 2, line 25, strike out "412" and insert "422."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "413" and insert "423."

Page 4, line 10, strike out "412" and insert "422."

Page 4, line 14, strike out "414" and insert "424."

Page 4, line 17, strike out "of the Public Health Service Act."

Page 5, line 2, strike out "414" and insert "424."

Page 5, line 8, strike out "412" and insert "422."

Page 6, line 10, strike out "413 (b)" and insert "501 for carrying out the purposes of this part."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "415" and insert "425."

Page 7, line 5, strike out "416" and insert "426."

Page 7, line 12, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)."

Page 8, line 24, after "Council", insert "the National Advisory Heart Council."

Page 9, line 4, after "Health", where it appears the second time insert "Heart."

Page 9, line 10, after "Council", where it appears the second time insert "members of the National Advisory Heart Council."

Page 10, line 3, after "Council", insert "or, with respect to heart diseases, recommended by the National Advisory Heart Council."

Page 10, line 12, after "Council," insert "or, with respect to heart diseases, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Heart Council."

Page 10, after line 16, insert:

"RESEARCH FACILITIES

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $2,000,000 for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable and adequate site or sites, selected on the advice of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, in or near the District of Columbia for such buildings and facilities, and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities. The amount authorized to be appropriated in this section shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, supervision of construction, and other administrative expenses incident to the work: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Agency shall prepare the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts, and supervise construction."

Page 10, line 18, strike out "5" and insert "6."

Page 10, line 20, strike out "(1)" and insert "(m)."

Page 10, line 21, strike out "(m)" and insert "(n)."

Page 10, line 22, strike out "(m)" and insert "(n)."

Page 10, line 24, strike out "(n)" and insert "(o)."

Page 11, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive.

Page 11, line 8, strike out "(d)" and insert "(b)."

Mr. BREHM (interrupting the reading of the Senate amendments). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

All of the amendments except one are technical in nature. The only amendment that does anything at all to change the bill, as it passed the House, is the one providing for the erection of a research building. This bill has the endorsement of the American Dental Association and there is really no opposition to it. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask just one question. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly, I believe. I was interested in one question with reference to the bill and that is whether the bill as it comes back here prohibits any grants-in-aid to institutions other than State universities.

Mr. BREHM. No, it does not. It provides for private grants-in-aid. This simply coordinates research and we welcome research from any source, public or private. At the present time schools and colleges do not have adequate facilities to utilize the funds available for research purposes and this bill simply puts it all under one head or rather one roof.

Mr. PRIEST. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. These are only perfecting amendments.

Mr. BREHM. That is all. I want to assure the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] that both the American Dental Association and I deeply appreciate their assistance in behalf of this legislation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether or not the language on page 9 in lines 16, 17, 18, and 19 were in the bill as it passed the House where they provide for $50 per day plus expenses.

Mr. BREHM. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Was it in the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. BREHM. That is correct. It was.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with further reading of the Senate amendments?

There was no objection.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio to concur in the Senate amendments?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if this bill as presented from the Senate includes $2,000,000 for a building, I object to its consideration.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, the bill is useless without a building because that is for coordinating the research now being carried on. We cannot conduct dental research out in a pasture field or in a pup tent. As previously stated the twenty-odd schools and colleges engaged in research are handicapped by lack of facilities to do an adequate job. It is foolish to waste funds in this manner. Either research is necessary and essential to benefit mankind in this instance, or it is not necessary. If it is essential as I maintain then let us have a decent building and equipment so that we can do a decent job.

Furthermore the gentleman from Kansas withdrew his reservation to object just a moment ago when I answered his question regarding the $50-per-day provision contained in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kansas that it is too late to object to the consideration of the bill.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio to concur in the Senate amendments?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP IN FURTHERANCE OF NATIONAL SAFETY AGAINST ACCIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6411) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in furtherance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That in furtherance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to issue, as soon as practicable, a special postage stamp of the denomination of 3 cents and of such design and for such period as he may determine.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF FRANCIS SCOTT KEY MANSION

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 84 to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to construct, furnish, operate, and maintain upon the plot of ground owned by the United States known as lot 807, in square 1183, lying between M Street, the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, the Francis Scott Key Bridge, and Thirty-fourth Street NW., in the District of Columbia, a replica as nearly as may be practicable of the house in which Francis Scott Key lived from approximately 1808 to 1828, using such portions of the existing house as may be feasible, now located approximately 100 feet west of the entrance to the Francis Scott Key Bridge at M Street: *Provided*, That the plans for the construction herein authorized and for the landscape treatment and development of the grounds, before being carried into effect, shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 2. The said premises shall constitute the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, which is hereby established and set apart for the preservation of the historical associations connected with Francis Scott Key, author of the National Anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner, for the benefit and enjoyment of the people. The said national memorial shall hereafter be administered by the National Park Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the provisions of the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 666). The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States for installation in such national memorial, articles which may be offered as additions to the memorial.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $65,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

SEC. 4. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent a similar joint resolution (H. J. Res. 150) was laid on the table.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, Francis Scott Key, author of our national anthem, was an active civic leader in the National Capital. He owned his home on old Bridge Street, now M Street, in Georgetown, D. C., about 100 feet west of the bridge to Virginia named after him. It was his residence in 1814 at the time he was held aboard a British battleship during the bombardment of Fort McHenry in Baltimore, when he wrote the stirring lyrics of the Star-Spangled Banner.

He purchased the property in 1805. A part of the original home still stands but it will be demolished in order to carry out highway plans for the approaches to the Key Bridge. It is the purpose of House Joint Resolution 150 to authorize removal of the old house to a new location on the east side of the approach to the bridge. The project has the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts, the National Park and Planning Commission, and the district engineer of the United States Engineer Corps.

The Committee on Public Lands unanimously approved the measure but amended it to make the restored Francis Scott Key home a national memorial rather than a national monument.

It will become a place of great interest to the thousands of school children who constantly are coming to Washington for knowledge and patriotic inspiration.

PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5053) to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of preserving for the benefit of the American people, as a national historical park, certain historical structures and properties of national significance located adjacent to or near Independence Hall and Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa., and associated with the American Revolution and the founding and growth of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept by donation, or to acquire by purchase or condemnation, any property, real or personal, within the following-described areas, such park to be fully established as the "Philadelphia National Historical Park" when title to all of the lands and interests in lands within the described areas, subject only to such exceptions as the Secretary of the Interior may determine to be not inconsistent with the purposes of this act, shall be vested in the United States:

Project A: An area of three city blocks bounded generally by Walnut Street, Fifth Street, Chestnut Street, and Second Street, but excluding the new United States customshouse at the southeast corner of Second and Chestnut Streets, as described in the report of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, dated December 29, 1947.

Project B: A memorial thoroughfare, or mall, extending generally from the south side of Walnut Street to the north side of Pine Street, as described in the report of the Commission.

Project C: The site of the residence of Benjamin Franklin, and related grounds, comprising a 100-foot-wide strip, extending southward from Market Street 300 feet between Third and Fourth Streets, and encompassing Orianna Street, as described in the report of the Commission.

Project D: The site of the house in which Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, situated at the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets, as described in the report of the Commission.

Project E: Certain land and buildings immediately adjacent to Christ Church, situated on the west side of Second Street, and north of Market Street, as described in the report of the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct upon a portion of the land described in section 1 of this act, or upon other land that may be donated for such purposes, which property he is hereby authorized to accept, such offices and administration buildings as he may deem advisable, together with a suitable auditorium for the interpretation of the historical features of the national historical park. Any property donated for the purposes of this section shall become a part of the park, following its establishment, upon acceptance by the United States of title to such donated property.

SEC. 3. The park shall be developed in accordance with the report of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission to the Congress of the United States, dated December 29, 1947.

The administration, protection, and development of the park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U. S. C. 1–4), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of acquiring the property described in section 1 of this act, including expenses incidental to acquisition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $5,500,000.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purpose of preserving for the benefit of the American people as a national historical park certain historical structures and properties of outstanding national significance located in Philadelphia, Pa., and associated with the American Revolution and the founding and growth of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, following the consummation of agreements with the city of Philadelphia and the Carpenters' Company of Philadelphia as prescribed in section 2 of this act, is authorized to acquire by donation or with donated funds, or to acquire by purchase, any property, real or personal, within the following-described areas, such park to be fully established as the Independent National Historical Park when, in the opinion of the Secretary, title to sufficient of the lands and interests in lands within such areas shall be vested in the United States: *Provided*, That the park shall not be established until title to the First United States bank property, the Merchants' Exchange property, the Bishop White house, the Dilworth-Todd-Moylan house, and the site of the Benjamin Franklin house, together with two-thirds of the remaining lands and interests in lands within the following-described areas, shall have been vested in the United States:

"(a) An area of three city blocks bounded generally by Walnut Street, Fifth Street, Chestnut Street, and Second Street, but excluding the new United States customhouse at the southeast corner of Second and Chestnut Streets, identified as project A, as described in the report of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, dated December 29, 1947;

"(b) A memorial throughfares, or mall, extending generally from the south side of Walnut Street to the north side of Pine Street, identified as project B, in the report of the Commission;

"(c) The site of the residence of Benjamin Franklin, and related grounds, comprising approximately a 100-foot wide strip, extending southward from Market Street approximately 300 feet between Third and Fourth Streets, and encompassing a portion of Orianna Street, identified as project C in the report of the Commission;

"(d) Certain land and buildings immediately adjacent to Christ Church, situated on the west side of Second Street, and north of Market Street, identified as project E in the report of the Commission: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior first enter into an agreement with the proprietor or proprietors of said property (Christ Church), said agreement to contain the usual and customary provisions for the protection of the property, assuring its physical maintenance as a national shrine, without any limitation or control over its use for customary church purposes."

"SEC. 2. In furtherance of the general purposes of this act as prescribed in section 1 hereof, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the city of Philadelphia to assist in the preservation and interpretation of the property known as the 'Independence Hall National Historic Site,' and with the Carpenters' Company of Philadelphia to assist in the preservation and interpretation of Carpenters' Hall, in connection with the Independence National Historical Park. Such agreements shall contain, but shall not be limited to, provisions that the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, shall have right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property now within Independence Hall National Historic Site and to Carpenters' Hall for the purpose of conducting visitors through such buildings and grounds and interpreting them to the public, that no changes or alterations shall be made in the property within the Independence Hall National Historic Site, including its buildings and grounds, or in Carpenters' Hall, except by mutual agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the other parties to the contracts.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to construct upon a portion of the land described in section 1 of this act, or upon other land that may be donated for such purpose, which property he is hereby authorized to accept, such offices and administration buildings as he may deem advisable, together with a suitable auditorium for the interpretation of the historical features of the national historical park. The Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to accept donations of property of national historical significance located in the city of Philadelphia which the Secretary may deem proper for administration as part of the Independence National Historical Park. Any property donated for the purposes of this

section shall become a part of the park, following its establishment, upon acceptance by the United States of title to such donated property.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to establish a suitable Advisory Commission of not to exceed 11 members. The members of the Advisory Commission shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, with 3 members to be recommended by the Governor of Pennsylvania, 3 by the mayor of Philadelphia, and 1 each by the Carpenters' Company of Philadelphia and the Independence Hall Association.

"The functions of the Advisory Commission shall be to render advice to the Secretary of the Interior from time to time upon matters which the Secretary of the Interior may refer to them for consideration.

"SEC. 5. The administration, protection, and development of the park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U. S. C. 1–4), as amended and supplemented, and the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C. 461–467).

"SEC. 6. For the purpose of acquiring the property described in section 1 of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $4,435,000. Funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for any expenses incidental to acquisition of property as prescribed by this act, including the employment of the necessary services in the District of Columbia, and including, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Interior, the employment without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of such experts and other officers and employees as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act efficiently and in the public interest."

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELCH to the committee amendment: Page 5, line 13, strike out "Pine Street," identified as "project B" and insert in lieu thereof "Manning Street," identified as part of project B."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of satisfaction that I support wholeheartedly H. R. 5053 which will provide an appropriate and fitting memorial to an important segment of our country's history in the birthplace of liberty—the city of Philadelphia.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman HARDIE SCOTT, and the Committee on Public Lands for their perseverance and concerted efforts on behalf of this deserving legislation. Much can be said about the merits of this bill now, but this will be for those future Americans of posterity—this to me is a sacred obligation we have fulfilled today.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5053 provides for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park for the purpose of preserving for the benefit of the American people as a national historical park certain historical structures and properties of outstanding national significance located in Philadelphia, Pa., and associated with the American Revolution and the founding and growth of the United States.

It is, in reality, the birthplace of this Nation and is America's shrine. Members of the Philadelphia National Park Shrine Commission appeared before the Committee on Public Lands in behalf of this bill. Full and exhaustive hearings were held both by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Public Lands with a resultant unanimous committee report.

Many members of the committee, including the chairman, visited Philadelphia. We visited Independence Hall, which contains the Liberty Bell; Carpenters' Hall, Christ Church where George Washington worshiped; the Old Pine Presbyterian Church where John Adams and Benjamin Rush worshiped; Mikveh Israel Congregational Burial Grounds where Haym Solomon, patriotic financier of the Revolution is interred. We visited St. Mary's Church and churchyard where Commodore John Barry, Revolutionary naval hero, and where several signers of the Declaration of Independence worshiped and are interred.

Many business buildings and factories surround this old cemetery. One of these buildings was badly damaged by fire. In extinguishing the fire they nearly drowned out the old cemetery. Water flooded the cemetery and moved some of the old headstones marking the graves of the founding fathers.

Christ Church and churchyard, where a number of the founding fathers are interred, are also surrounded by several commercial and light industrial buildings. The site where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence of the United States is now occupied by a little one-story building and an automobile parking lot. It is necessary to have a guide to find the site of the home where Benjamin Franklin lived and his printing shop across the way.

Independence Hall, Carpenters' Hall, and the Liberty Bell are visited daily by scores of school children who go on excursions. Those buildings, where everything we represent here was created, are surrounded largely by old, dilapidated buildings in what is now known as Old Philadelphia.

In the past I have visited Versailles where the surrounding grounds and fountain displays are beyond description. I visited the tomb of Napoleon, and I also visited Westminster Abbey. When I returned a few weeks ago to America's Shrine, having first visited it 40 years before and in the meantime having observed what France, Britain, and other nations have done by architecture and landscaping to commemorate their history, I felt ashamed and returned to Washington more convinced than ever that Congress should carry out the recommendation of the splendid Philadelphia National Park Shrine Commission by removing the eyesores surrounding the real cradle of our liberty.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5053 is complementary to a report of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission appointed pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress approved the 9th day of August 1946, entitled "An act to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, and for the purpose of conserving historical objects and buildings therein" and to the provisions of joint resolution approved March 7, 1947, Public Law 9, Eightieth Congress.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire four tracts of land in the city of Philadelphia in the immediate vicinity of Independence Hall, and to provide for Federal participation in the preservation and commemoration of historic buildings closely associated with the American Revolution and the birth and early formation of our Government.

The area to be acquired is in the old part of Philadelphia and at the time of the American Revolution was the principal business and residential section of the city. With the progress of time, the city has expanded westwardly and the area has now become antiquated. Many of the buildings standing at the time of the American Revolution are still in existence but are surrounded by more recent structures, many of which have now passed their usefulness but which are in many cases not only unsightly but also present a definite fire hazard to the older historic buildings.

No site in America is more closely identified with the creation of our Govenment as it exists today. No site in America is of greater historic interest than the area referred to in this bill. There are now over 100 historic sites under the supervision of the National Park Service. It is only fitting that this, our most important historic site, should be incorporated within our Government.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, no place in America attracts more devoted pilgrims than the shrine of American freedom, Independence Hall. For a long time a group of devoted and patriotic Philadelphians, headed by the Honorable Edwin O. Lewis, judge of the court of common pleas of Philadelphia, have with perseverance and enthusiasm developed plans for the preservation of the Independence Hall area as a national monument. These plans came none too soon, as the growth of a city tends to engulf the ancient and worthy mementos of our historic past.

I congratulate my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HARDIE SCOTT] upon the successful outcome of his efforts to secure passage of this important legislation by this body. He and Mr. McGarvey, a member of the Independence Hall Commission, together with the members of the Public Lands Committee, have closely cooperated with the interested citizens in Philadelphia and

the Nation to preserve a priceless and irreplaceable heritage. The continuing efforts and encouragement of the distinguished chairman of the Public Lands Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], has been invaluable and without his aid progress to a successful conclusion could not have been achieved. All of the people of America will benefit from the establishment of this national-shrine area, and I think it but fitting that I should here set down some expression of appreciation for the teamwork evidenced by these able and distinguished gentlemen, which comes to fruition, so far as this House is concerned, by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, no spot of ground in the United States is dearer to the hearts of freedom-loving Americans than the portion of Philadelphia known as the Old City. The famous author, Weir Mitchell, once called this part the Red City, because of its rows and rows of brick dwellings and its famous old brick public buildings. I need not repeat that it was here in Independence Hall, or the State House as it was then called, that Robert Henry Lee, of Virginia, moved that "these colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States." In a house nearby Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence that was signed in that hallowed building. The bell in its tower pealed out the first clarion call for democratic freedom in the modern world. We all know its inscription proclaims freedom throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof. The sound of that bell was stilled in tolling for the death of John Marshall, the greatest Supreme Court justice.

Here, too, it was that General Washington brought together leaders of the young country in order to form a more perfect union. It was here that James Madison kept his journal of the proceedings which are our record today of how our Constitution was created. It was here that Benjamin Franklin said "We shall hang together or we shall hang separately." These injunctions, these words of yesterday are still guideposts by which the civilized world conducts its public affairs.

Philadelphia was not like New York City, geographically, it could spread out as it grew in all directions. The Old Red City was left behind. In one respect this was fortunate because it saved our precious buildings; the buildings that gave shelter to those who made our heritage. At the same time these fine old structures were surrounded by dwellings and business houses that had out-lived their usefulness. After the city expanded outward on all sides, the old city settled down to very genteel decay. In the years that followed the city of Philadelphia and citizens of Philadelphia preserved the national shrines. But these buildings belong to the people of the United States and even to the free peoples of the world. Philadelphians and Pennsylvanians should not be asked to handle the whole burden of preserving as a national shrine these places that are visited each year by hundreds of thousands of visitors from other States.

The time has come to make this a national historic park. The time has come to take the old city and as Baron Hauptmann did in Paris, we must tear away the nondescript and dilapidated structures that hem in our shrines. We must restore to the surroundings of our public buildings some of the atmosphere that William Penn called the "Greene Countrie Towne."

We have provided for this in this measure. It has been a privilege for me to be associated with Judge Edwin O. Lewis, of the Historic Committee and with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HARDIE SCOTT], coauthor with me of this bill.

CITY OF MACON, GA.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 4663, to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners in fee simple of the land leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga., with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 11, page 2, and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render monetary judgment upon the several claims (1) of the city of Macon with respect to lands owned by the city and leased by the said city to the United States for use by the Army as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga., for damages for the breach, if any, of its leases to the United States and (2) of the owners in fee simple and the owners of leasehold interests, except the city of Macon, in and to lands leased by them to the city of Macon, Ga., and subleased by the city to the United States for such use. In the determination of the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and of leasehold interests in lands leased by them to the city of Macon and subleased by said city to the United States, the damages allowed, if any, shall be limited to the amounts to which such owners would have been entitled under the terms and provisions of their leases to the city of Macon: *Provided*, That claims of fee owners and leasehold owners, excepting the city of Macon, relating to the same property shall be joined in one action and the amount of damages allowed, if any, shall not exceed the amount that could have been recovered had all the interests in such property been vested in one party. The claims of the city of Macon with respect to lands owned by it shall be determined under the terms and provisions of its leases of such lands to the United States. This act shall be construed to waive the lack of privity of contract between the United States and the said fee owners or between the United States and the said leasehold owners; to waive the requirement of such leases to the city of Macon of notice by the lessors to the city in order for claims of restoration to be asserted, and to waive the immunity from suit of the United States in favor of the parties and with respect to the claims described in this act, but not otherwise to affect any rights of the parties."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN PARK COUNTY, WYO.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4462) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I consulted with the majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and with the minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and both have authorized me to say for them that they have no objection to the present consideration of the bill.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands.

This bill authorizes the conveyance to the State of Wyoming of 80 acres of school section 36 in the Elk Basin oil field, in recognition of our compact with the State and of equities of the State to this land. A rule has been granted.

Wyoming has, since 1890, been in possession of this land. It issued an oil and gas lease thereon on October 15, 1915. This lease as renewed is still in force. No Government lease or permit has ever been issued on this 80 acres. The balance of section 36 was leased by the Government and its lessees are not affected by this bill. In 1917, oil was first discovered on the land and Wyoming has received royalty continuously since. The Geological Survey had notice of these facts and raised no objection. The records in that office showed this land to be Wyoming school land until very recently. Moreover, the Secretary of the Interior, in a report to the Senate in 1930, stated in effect that Wyoming has always had possession of the land. They have leased it and get the royalty from the oil produced on that land and have since 1917. It would be inequitable to say now that we are going to take that 80 acres away from the State of Wyoming.

The record on the section in question is as follows: The General Land Office wrote Wyoming officials in March 1892

inquiring if the State desired to have this land surveyed. The State immediately requested the survey. The United States ordered the survey. It was made in August 1892. It was approved by the Commissioner of the General Land Office in December 1892. Wyoming was advised of all these facts and relied thereon. In 1944 the State was advised that one corner of the section had not been marked under the 1892 survey. Even so, from that time to this, there can be no question as to the exact location of the land from markers then placed on the ground.

In August of 1914, a complete survey was made in the field marking that corner and reposed in the Government office in Cheyenne for 16 months thereafter. It was approved on December 9, 1915, and forwarded to Washington, where it again reposed for seven more months before being accepted by the Commissioner and then became technically complete. In 1929 the Washington office advised Wyoming that the land had been included in President Wilson's petroleum withdrawal order of December 6, 1915, and that, by reason of that fact, legal title was claimed to be in the United States because the 1914 survey had not been technically accepted until July 1916.

The controversy over the title to this land has extended over a quarter of a century. In 1944 suit was instituted in the Supreme Court against the State of Wyoming and its lessee. On June 2, 1947, the Court decided that the lands belonged to the United States. As a matter of right, justice and equity the State is entitled to the entire section but because of conflicting and intervening rights of lessees of the United States the State has agreed to an amendment limiting its rights to only 80 acres of said section. The committee adopted the amendment and so the bill refers only to the east half of the northeast quarter of said section.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is this land now held by a church or church mission?

Mr. BARRETT. No. Title to the land is in the United States.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I hope that the gentleman will withhold this bill until we can become more familiar with it.

Mr. BARRETT. That is quite agreeable with me, Mr. Speaker.

INCREASES IN SALARY OF DISTRICT SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6878) to authorize granting increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, all employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 shall receive in addition to the compensation already provided for under such act additional compensation at the rate of $200 per annum.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and any appropriations for the public schools of the District of Columbia for personal services are hereby made available for the payment of the increased salaries authorized by this act.

SEC. 3. This act shall not take effect unless the Congress, during the second session of the Eightieth Congress, shall pass legislation granting pay increases to substantially all Federal employees.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "employees", insert "whose rates of compensation are increased by the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this matter was handled first by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and I am sure he would like to say a word about it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for a temporary increase of $200 per annum in the school teachers' salaries for the District of Columbia. Last year, as we all recall, we had a very exhaustive study and survey made of all teachers' salaries not only here in the District but all over the country. We reported out a bill which revised the whole salary schedule. We felt that we did a good job then and we still feel the same way about it as do the school authorities. Of course, a bill of this kind does not satisfy every segment of public employees, whether teachers or some other groups. There was general satisfaction with the salary increase that was passed and approved and enacted into law last year. Everything, no doubt, would have been well if it had not been for the fact that Federal salary increases are to be considered this year. The teachers feel that they ought to take part in the general salary increase of Federal employees which would be reflected in the District employees. So, to that end, having in mind that the salary bill of a year ago was predicated in large part on the increased cost of living, over a 10-year period, we feel that the increase in the cost of living which has taken place since last year up to the present could be adjusted on the basis of $200 average flat increase for all the teachers of the District of Columbia. We feel that this is a very fair bill and will only become law if and when the general Federal increase bill is passed and enacted into law this year.

I trust that the bill will be approved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT TO FIX AND REGULATE SCHOOL SALARIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6874) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and others employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 11 of title 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947, be and the same hereby is amended by striking out the following words and figures:

"CLASS 13—PRINCIPALS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WITH 16 OR MORE ROOMS, AND PRINCIPALS IN AMERICANIZATION SCHOOLS

"A basic salary of $4,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,300 per year is reached."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CLASS 13—PRINCIPALS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND PRINCIPALS IN AMERICANIZATION SCHOOLS

"A basic salary of $4,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,300 per year is reached."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (ap) of section 6 of title III of said act is hereby amended by inserting the following at the end of said paragraph: "No longevity increases for placement as provided in this paragraph shall be granted to any probationary or temporary teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, or instructor in the teachers colleges appointed after June 30, 1948, to group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in article I of title I, unless credit for such increases is based upon approved teaching or other service rendered after the master's degree had been conferred upon the appointee: *Provided*, That this limitation on placement credit shall not apply to appointments made from current eligible lists effective on July 1, 1948."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of title III of said act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph to be lettered "(ar)" and to read as follows: "Every permanent and probationary teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, and instructor in the teachers colleges in the employ of the Board of Education on June 30, 1947, who either possessed a master's degree on June 30, 1947, or shall have received a master's degree during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and whose salary during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, was less than $3,500, shall be entitled to receive in lieu thereof a salary of $3,000 per annum plus longevity increases for placement in group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in article I of title I, of $100 for each year of like service in the public schools of the District of Columbia acceptable to and approved by the Board of Education, including military leave and educational leave with part pay, subsequent to probationary appointment and prior to July 1, 1947, but for not more than the fifth year of

such service, to be effective as of July 1, 1947, or on the first of the month immediately following the date on which the master's degree was conferred, whichever is later, and shall be entitled to receive annual increases thereafter in accordance with the provisions of sections 5 and 7 of this act. The provisions of this paragraph shall not operate to reduce the amount of annual compensation of any teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, or instructor in the teachers colleges, below the amount of annual compensation received by him during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948."

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (b) of section 21 of title V of said act is hereby amended to read as follows: "After the effective date of this act, the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of the public-school teachers in the District of Columbia,' approved August 7, 1946, shall apply to permanent employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed by this act, and all references in said act to the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, shall be interpreted to apply to this act. Nothing in this subsection shall require the recomputation of the annuity of any person retired under the act of August 7, 1946, prior to the effective date of this act, or of any person retired prior to the effective date of the act of August 7, 1946, whose annuity is computed in accordance with the provisions of that act."

(b) This section shall be effective as of July 1, 1947.

SEC. 5. This act except as otherwise provided herein shall become effective on July 1, 1948.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKING LOTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 421) to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study in order to determine (1) charges imposed for parking on parking lots in the District of Columbia, (2) services supplied by the operators of such parking lots, and (3) how such charges and services compare with charges and services of operators of parking lots in other cities.

(b) The Commissioners shall make a report to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives not later than January 2, 1949, the results of such investigation and study, together with such recommendations as they may deem advisable.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR-VEHICLE PARKING FACILITY ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2642) to amend the District of Columbia Motor-Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(f) The power to lease on competitive bids for terms not exceeding 50 years, any property acquired pursuant to this act, or any other property heretofore or hereafter acquired by the District if no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired, and to stipulate in any such lease that the lessee shall erect at his or its expense a structure or structures on the land leased, which structure or structures and property shall be used, maintained, and operated for the purposes of this act, including purposes incidental thereto, subject to regulation as provided in paragraph (d) of this section, except that the rates for use of space in parking facilities covered by any such lease shall be fixed and regulated by the Commissioners so as to allow to the lessee a fair return, as fixed by the Commissioners, on the cost of such structure or structures, together with an amount sufficient to amortize within the term of any such lease the cost of such structure or structures. Every such lease shall be entered into upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioners shall impose including, but not limited to, requirements that such structure or structures shall conform with plans and specifications approved by the Commissioners, that such structure or structures shall become the property of the District upon termination or expiration of any such lease; that the lessee shall furnish security in the form of a penal bond or otherwise to guarantee fulfillment of his or its obligations, and any other requirement which, in the judgment of the Commissioners, shall be related to the accomplishment of the purposes of this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALCOHOLIC-BEVERAGE INDUSTRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6451) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object, as I have informed the gentleman from Illinois. I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withdraw the bill for the present, Mr. Speaker.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN PARK COUNTY, WYO., TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4462) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER], who requested that I withhold the consideration of the bill. I have discussed the bill with him and he has directed me to inform the House that he has no objection to the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue an unrestricted patent to the State of Wyoming for section 36, township 58 north, range 100 west, of the sixth principal meridian in Park County, Wyo.: *Provided*, That title to said land shall be held and considered to have been vested in the State of Wyoming on July 10, 1890.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "an unrestricted" and insert "a."

Line 5, after "for", insert "the east half of the northeast quarter."

Line 8, after "Wyoming", insert "subject to any existing lease or leases."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 643 was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (EXCLUSIVE OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION) APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5883) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 31 and 37.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 34, 36, 39 and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,074,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,416,533"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,966,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,204,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,787,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,689,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 13, 15, 33, 35, 41 and 42.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
CLYDE M. REED,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 is reported in disagreement.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946

Amendment Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 appropriate a total of $13,850,000 for all purposes under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, instead of $12,000,000 as proposed by the House and $15,200,000 as proposed by the Senate, earmarked by major purposes in the bill as follows: For payments to States, Territories, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations, the House proposed $2,500,000, the Senate $4,000,000, the conferees recommend $3,250,000; for research on utilization and associated problems the House proposed $3,000,000, the Senate $4,800,000, the conferees recommend $3,900,000; for cooperative research other than on utilization of agricultural commodities and products thereof the House proposed $1,500,000, the Senate $2,400,000, the conferees recommend $1,950,000; for marketing research the House proposed $5,000,000, the Senate $4,000,000, the conferees recommend $4,750,000.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment Nos. 7 and 8 appropriate $2,074,500 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor, instead of $2,024,500 as proposed by the House and $2,124,500 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $1,416,533 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $1,403,033 as proposed by the House and $1,430,033 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $1,988,500 for economic investigations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics instead of $1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment Nos. 10 and 11, relating to the appropriation for the Extension Service under Section 23, Title II (the Bankhead-Flannagan Act of June 6, 1945): The House provided an increase above the Budget of $2,000,000 toward the final increment of $4,000,000 under the Act referred to; the Senate increased the House amount by an additional $2,000,000, or the full amount of the $4,000,000 increment. The conferees have agreed upon $3,000,000.

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Amendment Nos. 12 and 13 are reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Amendment No. 14, relating to the limitation on personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $651,700; the Senate, $1,218,000. The House recedes. Of the amount provided, $56,000 is for nondepartmental meat inspection personal services.

Amendment No. 15 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 16, Virus Serum Toxin Act: The Senate provided an increase of $25,000, restoring the House cut of the same amount. The House recedes.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Amendment No. 17, Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation: The Senate provided an increase of $45,000 for the development and evaluation of slow-acting, high-analysis, synthetic nitrogen fertilizers, and an increase of $13,000 for the replacement of worn-out equipment. The House recedes.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Amendment No. 18, insect investigations: The Senate provided an increase of $3,500. The Senate recedes. This item was added by the Senate for the express purpose of continuing certain research previously carried on in Arizona. By inadvertence the amount was included under the appropriation for insect investigations. It should have been included in the appropriation for soils, fertilizers, and irrigation. Under conference rules, the item could not be transferred from insect investigations to the item for soils, fertilizers, and irrigation. The conferees feel that the amount needed is slight and that money for the purpose desired can be found by the Department for continuation of the work at Yuma from funds allocated in amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, or 17; and that the matter can be discussed further in a future budget.

Amendment No. 19, control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases. The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate, $1,750,000; the House recedes.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Amendment No. 20, agricultural chemical and naval stores investigations: The Senate provided an increase of $25,000 to continue research on naval stores at the present level. The House recedes. The Senate also provided an increase of $10,950 for cucumber-pickling work at Raleigh, N. C. The House recedes. The Senate provided an increase of $9,050 for microbiological research of Salmonella organisms in dried eggs. The House recedes.

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 21, national forest protection and management: This amendment divides into 6 parts. Part 1, fire control: The Senate provided an increase of $100,000. The conferees have agreed upon $50,000. Part 2, timber and forest product sales: The Senate provided an increase of $199,825; the conferees have agreed upon $150,000. Part 3, range use—allocation and issuance of grazing permits, supervision of range use by

domestic livestock: The Senate restored $75,000 of the House cut of $125,000; the conferees have agreed upon $37,500. Part 4, for protection and management of addition to Shasta National Forest: The Senate appropriated $50,000; the House recedes. Part 5, Lake Tahoe Recreation Area, Nevada: The House appropriated $15,000; the Senate, $50,000. The conferees have agreed upon $32,500. Part 6, recreational facilities, Payette National Forest, Idaho: The Senate appropriated $15,000; the conferees have agreed upon $10,000.

Amendment No. 22, forest and range management investigations: This amendment divides into 2 parts. Part 1, forest management: The Senate restored the House cut of $50,000. The conferees have agreed upon $25,000. Part 2, watershed management and protection: The Senate restored the House cut of $25,000; the conferees have agreed upon $12,500.

Amendment No. 23, forest products: The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate, $1,250,000; the conferees have agreed upon $1,125,000.

Amendment No. 24, forest resources investigations: The Senate restored the House cut of $72,000; the House recedes.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

Amendment Nos. 25 and 26, forest highways: The House appropriated $5,000,000; the Senate, $5,300,000; the House recedes.

FLOOD CONTROL

Amendment No. 27: The Senate inserted a provision allocating $2,070,500 of the appropriation of $6,000,000, for preliminary examinations and surveys. The conferees have agreed upon $1,800,000.

Amendment No. 28: The Senate inserted the word "necessary" to qualify the designation "work projects" of the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds. The House recedes. The following is a clarification of the intent of the conferees of both the House and the Senate respecting the work on these watersheds:

"As indicated by the discussions in the House hearings, the works of improvement authorized to be installed by this Department in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds are not adequate to control the movement of water from watershed lands until it reaches the points where the Corps of Engineers takes over and to obtain such control the installation by this Department of channel improvement, stream bank stabilization, structural control of gullies, and other sediment and water control measures in addition to those which could be installed under the approved survey reports is necessary. The insertion by the Senate of the word "necessary" is to be construed by the Department as an intention to eliminate any doubt that might arise that the Congress intends that the funds appropriated and allocated for use on the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds may be used for the installation of all measures necessary to control the movement of water from the watershed lands until it reaches the points where the Corps of Engineers takes over, even though such measures may not have been contemplated by the approved survey reports."

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 29, soil conservation research: The House appropriated $1,048,000; the Senate, $1,548,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 30, soil conservation operations: The House appropriated $44,000,000; the Senate, $43,500,000; the House recedes.

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

Amendment No. 31, personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $29,001; the Senate, $38,000; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 32, general expenses: The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate, $1,250,000; the conferees have agreed upon $1,125,000. It is the view of the managers on the part of the House and Senate that with regard to much of the submarginal land, the operation of which is provided for in this appropriation, the Government should dispose of such land by sale in order that it may go back into private ownership. Therefore, the managers suggest to the Department that it give concerted and continuing attention to the matter of recommending the adoption of such legislation as may be needed to authorize the Government to dispose of such land through sale.

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 33, authorizing the amount of the program for the crop year 1949: This amendment is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34, limiting the amount payable to any one participant: The House provided $500; the Senate, $750. The House recedes.

EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Amendment No. 35 is reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Amendment No. 36: The House provided $65,000,000; the Senate, $75,000,000; the House recedes. The amount provided includes $10,000,000 presented to the Congress in the pending supplemental estimate for the National School Lunch Act.

MARKETING SERVICES

Amendment No. 37, personal services in the District of Columbia: The House provided $2,187,827; the Senate, $2,197,827; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 38, Market News Service: The Senate appropriated an increase of $25,000; the conferees have agreed upon an increase of $22,500, which is to provide an equal amount of $7,500 for each of the following projects:

(1) For extending the Market News Service covering Florida livestock markets reported through the Thomasville, Georgia, Market News Office. It is understood the Florida State legislature will make an appropriation of not less than $5,000 to supplement this amount.

(2) For strengthening the Market News Service at Boston, Massachusetts.

(3) For maintenance of the Market News Service on dairy and poultry products and fruit and vegetable products at existing offices at Seattle and Yakima, Washington. Supplemental funds made available from sources within the State will be required to carry on this service on a full-year basis.

Core Testing of Wool: The core testing of wool for wool producers requesting such service has been held in abeyance by the Department since early in March. The reason for the suspension of this service was the receipt by the Department of a letter, under date of March 10, from the House Agricultural Subcommittee questioning the wisdom of the Department's plans to equip and staff a laboratory for a wool-testing service when there are a number of private laboratories already in existence which are competent to perform the tests and are anxious to have the work.

The suspension of the Department's activities looking toward the supplying of this much-needed service to wool growers was, presumably, for the purpose of affording the Senate Agricultural subcommittee the opportunity of making known its position in the matter and, eventually, to permit the two subcommittees to reach, if possible, some common ground. The report of the Senate committee contains the following:

"Evidence before the committee strongly supports the use of funds already available for core testing and scouring of wool and the committee is of the opinion that the program is desirable."

From the discussion of this matter in the Senate hearings (pages 977–979), the following quotation is noted:

"Mr. NEWELL. Of course, we will be governed, Senator, by the wishes of Congress.

"Senator BROOKS. The wish of Congress is there in the law; is it not? If you are going to have a conflict between two committees, you follow the law until the law is changed."

The House committee can have no quarrel with the position of the Senate committee, as above outlined. However, an examination of the law by the House committee and by the Department discloses (1) it is the declared policy of Congress that "a sound, efficient, and *privately operated system* [italics supplied] for distributing and marketing agricultural products is essential to a prosperous agriculture," and so forth; (2) That the Secretary is given the utmost freedom to supply marketing services such as that of wool testing through the negotiation of contracts (for a maximum period of four years and without requirement to advertise for bids) with private firms for the laboratory processing of such tests; and (3) that no additional authority or additional funds are required in the pending appropriation bill to enable the Secretary to negotiate and carry out a contract of the kind just described in connection with the core-testing of wool.

The foregoing statement of the law is not questioned by the Department. Accordingly, the House committee hereby supplements its letter of March 10, as follows:

The committee will expect the secretary to explore thoroughly forthwith the possibility of negotiating and effectuating a contract with a private laboratory or laboratories for the core testing of wool within the framework of the law as it now exists. Under such a contract, the laboratory, its equipment, and its staff would, of necessity, be subject at all times to inspection and supervision by the Department, and the results of the tests would be promulgated by the Department and would thus enjoy the same prestige in the market and in the courts as would obtain if the laboratory were Government-owned and Government-operated.

Meanwhile, immediate service should be extended by the Department to wool growers now needing such tests. The committee has the assurance of the Department that in the furnishing of such immediate service to the growers no steps need or will be taken which will prejudice the contract negotiations with private laboratories.

It is the feeling of the House committee that the law intends; first, that a privately operated system of marketing is to be sought, in preference to a Government-operated system; and, second, that it is the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture to prosecute a bona fide effort, within the framework of the law, to have the wool core testing done by privately owned laboratories, under contracts which adequately protect the public interest and the interest of the wool growers.

The Senate conferees have agreed to the foregoing statement on the core testing of wool with the addition of the following: "Meantime, the Department is free to use the funds at its disposal to carry on the program it has initiated for the core testing and scouring of wool."

The House conferees have no objection to the addition of the foregoing language but it is understood that the language will not be construed to weaken the mandate of the House conferees that the Department make the effort indicated to negotiate a favorable contract with privately owned laboratories under the funds now at its disposal.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 39, production and subsistence loans, title II: The House appropriated $60,000,000; the Senate, $75,000,000; the House recedes.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 40, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $5,000,000; the Senate, $5,450,000; the House recedes.

Amendments Numbers 41 and 42 are reported in disagreement.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 1, relating to language authorizing the Secretary to employ not to exceed 10 persons at salaries not in excess of $15,000 per annum: The Senate struck out the provision. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendment No. 12, relating to payments to States, etc., under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act for experiment stations: The House proposed $2,661,268; the Senate proposed $2,861,268, and inserted language relating to a transfer to a special Alaskan appropriation account. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 13, relating to a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur, the figure in question being directly related to Amendment No. 12.

Amendment No. 15, relating to the Federal meat inspection service: The Senate proposed an appropriation of $11,500,000, and also inserted language which repeals and covers into the general fund of the Treasury the unobligated balance of the special meat inspection fund established in the 1948 agricultural appropriation act; The House had not provided any general fund appropriation for the service. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 33, relating to the authorization for formulation and development of a 1949 agricultural conservation program: The House proposed a ceiling of $225,000,000 on the amount of the program; The Senate proposes a ceiling of $300,000,000. The managers on the part of the House will move to insist.

Amendment No. 35, relating to the use of Section 32 funds: The Senate inserted language limiting to $500,000 expenditures from Section 32 funds for payments in connection with the manufacture of insulation products. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 41, relating to certain activities of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation: The Senate inserted language providing that the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the corporation to reenter an area or region where economic emergency or production disaster has occurred. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 42, relating to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: The Senate inserted language authorizing the use, during fiscal year 1949, of the unobligated balance of the 1948 administrative appropriation to complete the orderly liquidation of the 1947 and prior crop year programs. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

The undersigned managers on the part of the House have signed the conference report and statement. However, we feel it desirable to call attention to what we think is an important consideration in connection with the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5, and particularly with the agreement on these amendments in the conference. The Marketing Research Act of 1946 was definite in its terms and its intent, when it passed the Congress. It was not intended then, nor do we believe it to be the intent of the Congress now, that money, voted with such liberality under this act, should be used to implement research already carried on by established research sections of the Department of Agriculture. We submit, from our own knowledge of the original bills, and the testimony that the Congress intended to encourage research in marketing, to balance the research in production already emphasized strongly by the Department. Consumption is the purpose of production; therefore, to avoid gluts and under-consumption of agricultural production the specific emphasis should be clear and specifically on marketing. It certainly was never the intention of the Congress that this money should be used, in any amount, to replace cuts made by the Congress in any appropriation items in the budget of the Department. Finally, we are equally convinced that there was no intent, and that there should be no intent, to equalize the amounts given the several sections of the Act, as represented by the amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5. Each section should stand on its own merits. The expenditures and the requests for each section should be studied separately and carefully. The money should be appropriated on the basis of study and decision for each section. There appeared in the conferences to be, first, a feeling that additional money could be put in the appropriation without regard to duplication, or implementation, or the work of long established sections, and second, there was an indication of a desire to equalize the money for each section, without regard to the justifications, the past experiences, or the future plans. These concerns on our part are not serious at the moment, nor in this budget, but it would be serious to establish the attitudes, to which we refer, as a policy of the Congress, and for that reason we submit this supplementary statement, for the information of the House.

WALT HORAN.
JOHN PHILLIPS.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: On page 3, line 25, strike out line 25 and on page 4, strike out lines 1 to 6.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that when the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture came before it some months ago, there was included language to make it possible for the Department of Agriculture to engage and retain experts and to pay somewhat in excess of the classification salaries scheme. This was done on the importunities of the Secretary of Agriculture, knowing very well that before the calendar year 1948 would have elapsed, he probably would lose a dozen or 15 qualified people who could scarcely be retained but who were receiving such attractive and fancy offers from private industry that it was simply impossible to keep them in Government. We debated the matter for a long time, knowing of course that perhaps there should be some general legislation on this matter. That is the view of the Budget Bureau and that is the view of the other body. I should be the first to admit that there is some force and persuasiveness in that view. We find also, that there is some precedent for the action that the House took. In a recent bill in relation to researches in heart disease proposed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, specific provision is made for positions where the salaries are well beyond the present salary range. In the case of the Army and Navy, I think altogether 45 civilian positions were allowed where the existing salary scale could be disregarded. So there is a precedent for the action that the House took, and for the position that it maintains now. Manifestly, we can go along and agree that there ought to be general legislation on this subject so that there will be a uniform policy for all the departments and all the bureaus of the Government. But on the other hand, if we relinquish this opportunity now, these people will surely leave and there will be real difficulty in replacing them. I for one am rather reluctant to relinquish a position that we took at that time, and I do hope the House will sustain the position of the committee so that we may further insist on it or contrive a compromise or secure relinquishment of the position that the other body has taken.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: On page 18, line 8, strike out "$2,661,268" and insert "$2,861,268, of which amount not to exceed $316 shall be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation 'Research on agricultural problems of Alaska,' without matching requirement."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 18, line 18, strike out "$7,161,268" and insert "$7-361,268."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 13 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 21, line 25, insert:

"Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, $11,-500,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate both took formal action some weeks ago to restore meat inspection to the status it enjoyed during the last fiscal year. So the money that is involved here is necessary in pursuance of that action.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: On page 48, line 19, strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 33.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to recede to the disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 33 and concur therein.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the House recede from its disagreement?

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the motion to concur be amended as follows: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate No. 33 with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $300,000,000 inserted by said Senate amendment, insert "$262,500,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the bill left the House, the amount included therein for soil-conservation payments was $225,000,000. That amount was also recommended by the Senate Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture appropriations and by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. On the Senate floor the bill was amended; $225,000,000 was stricken and $300,000,000 was substituted, and it carried by 3 votes.

We endeavored to make a compromise with the Senate the other day but somehow it failed. However, I am confident, after the discussion we had, that an agreement will be quickly reached on the amount that is in the concurring amendment.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are spending vast sums of money to rehabilitate European farmers and European farms we are quibbling here about a comparatively small amount asked by the American farmer to bring the appropriation for soil conservation up to the amount of the budget estimate.

The farmers ask it, the farm papers ask it, the farm organizations ask it, and the United States Senate asks it But the House managers refuse it. I trust the House will go along with the farmers instead of the managers and vote to invest in the preservation of our own farms a very small part of the money already voted to European farmers to build up European farms.

Mr. Speaker, this is fundamental. Soil conservation is our greatest single agricultural problem. We must have fertile land to feed and clothe the Nation. Beginning with the excessive depletion of our soils in the First World War, we have lost millions of acres of our most productive land through erosion. And although we have checked the washing of top soils into the rivers which carry it to the sea, our richest farm lands are still being leached and washed away at a truly alarming rate.

The Kansas State College of Agriculture, situated in the center of the wheat-producing areas of the continent, reports that "the soils of our bread-producing plains are on a fearful trend downward." Nothing could be more ominous not only for our farmers but for the Nation's consumers. Unless the farmer can preserve his land, he cannot indefinitely produce the food required by our rapidly increasing population. This appropriation is for that purpose. The purpose of this appropriation is to save our farms and our farm products for future generations.

The methods provided by these soil-conservation appropriations have been very effective in the few years they have been in operation. For example, here is an editorial from last week's St. Louis Star-Times:

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYS

Soil conservation pays in Missouri. Impressive evidence of this fact may be found in the report of the United States Soil Conservation Service on the Cedar Creek project near Fulton. There are 12,839 acres in the project in Callaway and Boone counties. The land became submarginal early in the twenties and remained impoverished until the project was set up in 1939.

In the 9 years since the Soil Conservation Service took over, about 10 percent of the land has been fully restored and another 10 percent is partially improved. Some of the land has been turned into pasture and other portions have been reforested.

On land rented from the Government, 83 farmers are now making a living, taxes received by the counties have more than doubled, and fish and wildlife have increased. The additional grazing on the restored land resulted in the production of an extra 246,970 pounds of beef last year, and 1,000 head of cattle and horses are now grazing where there were no pastures a decade ago.

Commenting on the progress that has been made, the Soil Conservation Service's report says: "The agricultural economy in the Cedar Creek area has improved materially. Farmers have not only improved the use of land rented in the project, but they have adopted soil and moisture conservation practices on their own farms. Continued improvement on the part of farmers will establish this once questionable area with a well-balanced system of livestock production."

What has been accomplished in the Cedar Creek area is an example of what can be done all over this State in restoring and conserving our land resources.

Mr. Speaker, here are the visible results of the application of the funds supplied by this appropriation. Here is the practical demonstration of what can be accomplished through soil conservation. Due to the rehabilitation of these hopelessly eroded acres we have in 1 year a quarter of a million pounds of beef which the consumer would not have had; we have a thousand head of livestock on pastures where otherwise there would have been no pastures at all. What more convincing evidence is required of the need for the full amount asked by the farmers and voted by the Senate? What more sobering demonstration could be given of the importance of voting this money and preserving our land, not merely for present production, but for the use and sustenance of our children and our children's children?

Mr. Speaker, we are told in Holy Writ that "If any provide not for his own household he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

Mr. Speaker, while we are caring so solicitously for the nations and people and farmers abroad, cannot we make just a minimum provision for those of our own household?

I trust the House will vote down the amendment and by voting down the amendment make certain we will have the full budget estimate of $300,000,000 for soil conservation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Soil Conservation is extremely important to our national welfare. The question is increasingly important. I urge the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CANNON] which would provide the $300,000,000 requested by the President for the Soil Conservation payments. I shall vote for the motion and I shall vote against the motion which would provide for a lesser sum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as most of you know I have been a member of this subcommittee for several years and have had the privilege of leading the fight for the soil-conservation program both in the committee and in the Congress. During the last few years we have been calling on the American farmers to produce and to even use the fence corners in the production of agricultural products. Our farmers have produced as no nation in history has produced. They have to a large extent fed the world. Yet, while they have produced the greatest amount of food and fiber that any nation has ever produced, they have done so at the expense of wearing out our soil. Also, in many areas, bad farm practices had become the general practice, erosion had set in. Any loss in fertility of the Nation's soil makes our Nation that much poorer. Thus we all have an interest, even unborn generations have an interest, both in saving the fertility of our soil and also in restoration of the Nation's wasted and eroded lands. It is expensive to restore land; frequently it takes years for such investment to pay any dividends whatever to the owner. Recognizing this fact we started the soil-conservation program in an effort to retain what rich soil we have and to reclaim and redeem that which has been destroyed. Today this program is not relief for farmers, it is not a program for send-

ing Government checks to farmers for their use.

This program says to the American farmer that the Nation has an interest in the soil, in retaining and restoring it. We also have an interest in our farmers' farm practices that will protect the soil in the future. Under this AAA payment program we say to our farmers, "If you will spend $3 out of your pocket in restoring and retaining our fertile soil, the Federal Government will pay one-third of the cost. All is spent toward that end, that which we put up and that which the farmer puts up.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has to announce the year's program around November of the preceding year. They have to list the practices for which the Government will help pay the expense. The Department of Agriculture cannot tell how much work will be done in advance or what the contribution of the Federal Government may be. This being true, a consistent program, year to year, is highly important to the American farmers, to the American Republic, and to the Department of Agriculture. Only that way can we derive the maximum benefit from expenditures for the program.

I have always believed in a very strong program because I believe the situation is acute. In fact, I am in favor of a $300,000,000 program. I think that is not too great an amount for the Government to contribute if the farmers spend twice that amount. However, it is better to have a consistent $262,500,000 program on a year-to-year basis, one on which the farmer can depend, than to have a $150,000,000 program one year and a $300,000,000 program the next. I am privileged to say, I believe, that when this matter was before the committee I expressed a willingness to accept a $262,500,000 program when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], a member of the committee on the other side, a man who recognizes the need for a consistent program, agreed that he too would work with me in an effort to keep the program on a consistent basis. I expect to vote for the $300,000,000. I am glad to have the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota who, incidentally, I understand, will be chairman of this subcommittee next year if his party retains control of the House, that he agrees with us that this soil-conservation program should be kept on a reasonable level, on a consistent year-to-year basis, so that the Department of Agriculture can work this matter out and the Nation reap the maximum benefits. As I stated, personally I expect to vote for the $300,000,000 program. The assurance of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and some others that they will go along with us in an effort to keep a consistent program in effect will mean much. I think it should be kept consistent. That is more important than to have it on a high level one year and on a low level the next.

While I expect to support the $300,000,000 amount, I must say, however, that I am highly gratified that we have the support of the gentlemen on the Republican side for the $262,500,000 figure, for I remember what a hard fight we had last year to get the $150,000,000 for this year's program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two. Unfortunately I was not available at the time this bill was under conference, for which I apologize to the chairman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman has been indeed a devoted, diligent, and valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman. What was the amount of the budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Budget estimate as it came to us in January was $300,000,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What reduction did the committee make in committee before it presented the bill to the House?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars, an increase of $75,000,000 over fiscal 1948, and $75,000 below the budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And when it went to the Senate it was what?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senate subcommittee and the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the House figure of $225,000,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And what is the present proposal?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might add one further step. On the Senate floor it was increased to $300,000,000 by a majority of three votes. It subsequently went to conference and the conferees indicated that they would bargain on $262,500,000, which is a halfway split, and the amendment to recede and concur before the House now is $262,500,000, and I trust it will find favor and grace with the membership.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to thank the gentleman. I suppose it will be the policy of the committee to keep normal procedure in operation in the years to come.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Insofar as the level is concerned, so as not to disturb the existing farm program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, this item is a matter of discussion in all parts of the country. I do not think the impression should be left on the floor, by virtue of some statements made by previous speakers, regarding the Soil Conservation Service and the work done by it in the improvement of contours and the preservation of the soil, that such work comes under this item. That is the Soil Conservation Service, a separate item, a separate agency in the Department. There are many farmers in the United States who do not feel that the money we are talking about now should be increased, nor do they feel that the money is being spent for the soil-conservation projects which were discussed on the floor and used as an argument for increasing this amount. I think it should be said that I was one of those who favored the $225,000,000. I feel, however, that the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, supported by the gentleman from Minnesota, is a good amendment in view of the little time left in this session, and I hope that it will receive the support of the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, all authorities agree that this job cannot be completed for less than $300,000,000, the amount the farmers have had each year up until the last 2 years.

No witness who appeared before the committee in the hearings suggested that the program for soil conservation could be carried out for $262,500,000. All were of the unanimous opinion that the full $300,000,000 would be required.

So, Mr. Speaker, a vote for this amendment is not only a vote against the full estimate, but it is a vote against full preservation of the soil. It is a vote to let the land wash away. It is a vote for future generations to go hungry.

Regardless of whether the House and Senate conferees finally agree on the full appropriation of $5,300,000,000 or the House cut of $1,700,000,000 for European aid, we have already voted to donate fertilizer for the European farms as a gracious gift. We have already voted to buy tractors and send them to European farmers; we have voted to send farm machinery to be paid for out of the United States Treasury to preserve and restore European farms. We are giving fertilizer and seed and machinery and tractors to farmers across the sea to build up farms across the sea. But we refuse to give the farmer at home enough to keep his farm from washing away.

Let no one mistake the purpose of this amendment. It is to curtail the farmer's efforts to save his land. It is to reduce the amount of food our farms will ultimately produce. It is to increase the price of food to the consumer by reducing the fertility of the soil and reducing the amount of food on the market.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that it will be understood that a vote for this amendment is a vote against $300,000,000. If this amendment is voted down then automatically the House will agree to the Senate amendment for the full estimate needed to preserve America's greatest and most indispensable natural resource.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out that the integrity and the nobility of the American farmer is expressed mostly in his faith and in his desire to have the Soil Conservation Service and its work enlarged. He is not as much in love with this gift of a generous rain of checks as a lot of people might lead you to believe. I concur with the thoughtful husbandman who wants his faithful acres removed from politics. I personally hope to see the whole Nation under an effective land-policy act by next session. I hope the Jensen bill passes. It will effect much progress in this direction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to get this thing straight, there are between six or seven million farmers in the United States. With this amount of $262,500,000 it is easy to figure out that it amounts to around $35 or $40 per farmer. In the past one of the greatest troubles in connection with these payments has been the fact—with all the crocodile tears that we have had about the poor people—that they have lined the pockets of the big landowners, and the little farmer, by the thousands, has had $20. One farm outfit down in Mississippi, the Oscar Johnson farm has had $816,000 of this money for either growing something or not growing it, or for not obtaining enough in the market place when he got ready to sell it, or for some other reason. We have one wheat farmer out in Montana, Mr. Campbell's outfit, that has had practically a quarter of a million dollars. If this is a farm-fertility program, let us apply fertilizer to the farms. I want to compliment the committee for at least getting down to a $750 basis so that more of the money really goes to the average farmers. It can really be used for more soil conservation. Year after year we are pulling the economic rug out from under the livestock industry. With all this protestation about interest in the soil, we see cattle numbers reduced 6,000,000 cattle. We see sheep numbers reduced by 37 percent. We have seen the present administration lower milk cow numbers to a point below the 1935 numbers. If you are realy interested in conserving the soil of this country, and I realize there is between $100,000,000 and $200,000,000 of fertility going to be shipped out of the country this year, let us get it down to a practical basis, let us get it down to the man who lives on the farm, and let us put it on the basis of common sense.

The fact is that the fertility of the land of the United States is less today than 10 years ago today, and less every single year since 1620. It is time we quit subsidizing soil-depleting crops and really conserve the soils of the Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious by now that with the exception of our esteemed friend from Missouri the committee is about unanimous on the amount that is carried in the amendment to the bill. I hope, like a good, repentant sinner, he will hit the sawdust trail and go along with us.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the statement is hardly correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is nearly correct.

Mr. CANNON. Nearly correct and correct are two different things.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just so there is no misapprehension, I have talked with one or two of my friends on the committee on the other side, and this amount is not unacceptable; so I hope I have a resounding majority, and that the amendment to make this amount $262,500,000 will carry.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 191, nays 179, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—191

Allen, Calif.	Gillette	Miller, Conn.
Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Miller, Md.
Andersen, H. Carl	Goff	Miller, Nebr.
	Goodwin	Mitchell
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Morton
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Muhlenberg
	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa	Nicholson
Angell	Hagen	Nixon
Arends	Hale	Nodar
Bakewell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patterson
Barrett		Phillips, Calif.
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Plumley
Beall	Hand	Potter
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Potts
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Poulson
Bishop	Heselton	Ramey
Blackney	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley	Holmes	Rees
Bramblett	Hope	Reeves
Brehm	Horan	Rich
Brophy	Jackson, Calif.	Richlman
Buck	Javits	Rizley
Buffett	Jenison	Rogers, Mass.
Burke	Jenkins, Ohio	Rohrbough
Busbey	Jenkins, Pa.	Ross
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Ill.	Sadlak
Canfield	Johnson, Ind.	St. George
Carson	Jones, Wash.	Sanborn
Case, N. J.	Jonkman	Sarbacher
Chadwick	Judd	Schwabe, Okla.
Chenoweth	Kean	Scott, Hardie
Chiperfield	Kearney	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Church	Kearns	
Clason	Keating	Scrivner
Clevenger	Keefe	Seely-Brown
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	Shafer
Cole, Mo.	Kilburn	Sheppard
Corbett	Knutson	Simpson, Ill.
Coudert	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Crawford	Landis	Smith, Ohio
Crow	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Lewis, Ky.	Snyder
Dague	Lewis, Ohio	Stockman
Davis, Wis.	Lichtenwalter	Stratton
Dawson, Utah	Lodge	Sundstrom
Devitt	Love	Taber
Dirksen	McConnell	Taylor
Eaton	McCowen	Tibbott
Elliott	McCulloch	Tollefson
Ellis	McDonough	Twyman
Ellsworth	McDowell	Vail
Elsaesser	McGregor	Van Zandt
Elston	McMahon	Vorys
Engel, Mich.	McMillen, Ill.	Vursell
Fellows	Mack	Wadsworth
Fenton	Macy	Weichel
Fletcher	Maloney	Welch
Fuller	Mason	Wigglesworth
Fulton	Mathews	Wolcott
Gamble	Merrow	Wolverton
Gavin	Meyer	Woodruff
Gearhart	Michener	Youngblood

NAYS—179

Abernethy	Bennett, Mo.	Buchanan
Albert	Bland	Bulwinkle
Allen, La.	Blatnik	Burleson
Andrews, Ala.	Bloom	Byrne, N. Y.
Arnold	Boggs, La.	Camp
Banta	Bonner	Cannon
Bates, Ky.	Boykin	Carroll
Battle	Brooks	Case, S. Dak.
Beckworth	Brown, Ga.	Chelf
Bell	Bryson	Combs
Cooley	Hollifield	Pace
Cooper	Huber	Passman
Cotton	Hull	Patman
Courtney	Jackson, Wash.	Peterson
Cravens	Jarman	Phillips, Tenn.
Crosser	Jensen	Pickett
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Poage
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, N. C.	Powell
Dawson, Ill.	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Deane	Kee	Price, Fla.
Delaney	Kelley	Price, Ill.
Dingell	Kerr	Priest
Domengeaux	Kilday	Rains
Donohue	King	Rankin
Doughton	Kirwan	Rayburn
Douglas	Klein	Redden
Durham	Lanham	Regan
Eberharter	Larcade	Richards
Engle, Calif.	LeCompte	Rivers
Evins	Lesinski	Rockwell
Fallon	Lucas	Rogers, Fla.
Feighan	Lusk	Rooney
Fernandez	Lyle	Sabath
Flannagan	Lynch	Sadowski
Fogarty	McCormack	Sasscer
Folger	McMillan, S. C.	Schwabe, Mo.
Forand	MacKinnon	Short
Garmatz	Mahon	Sikes
Gary	Manasco	Smathers
Gathings	Mansfield	Smith, Va.
Gordon	Marcantonio	Somers
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Spence
Gossett	Meade, Ky.	Stefan
Gorski	Meade, Md.	Talle
Granger	Miller, Calif.	Teague
Grant, Ala.	Mills	Thomas, Tex.
Gregory	Monroney	Thompson
Griffiths	Morgan	Trimble
Hardy	Morris	Vinson
Harless, Ariz.	Morrison	Walter
Harris	Multer	Wheeler
Harrison	Mundt	Whitaker
Hart	Murdock	Whitten
Havenner	Norblad	Whittington
Hays	Norrell	Williams
Hébert	Norton	Wilson, Tex.
Hedrick	O'Brien	Winstead
Hendricks	O'Hara	Wood
Hobbs	O'Konski	Worley
Hoeven	O'Toole	

NOT VOTING—60

Abbitt	Gallagher	McGarvey
Auchincloss	Gwinn, N. Y.	Madden
Barden	Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Tenn.
Bolton		Peden
Brown, Ohio	Hartley	Pfeifer
Buckley	Heffernan	Philbin
Celler	Herter	Ploeser
Chapman	Hinshaw	Riley
Clark	Hoffman	Robertson
Clippinger	Isacson	Scoblick
Coffin	Jennings	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Smith, Maine
Colmer	Johnson, Tex.	Stanley
Cox	Kefauver	Stevenson
Cunningham	Kennedy	Stigler
D'Ewart	Keogh	Thomas, N. J.
Dolliver	Lane	Towe
Dondero	Lea	West
Dorn	LeFevre	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Lemke	
Foote	Ludlow	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Stanley against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Riley against.

Mr. McGarvey for, with Mr. Chapman against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Isacson against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Cox against.

Mr. Coffin for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Foote for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Peden against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Madden against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. West.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Colmer.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Stevenson with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Lemke with Mr. Ludlow.

Mr. MCMILLEN of Illinois and Mr. ELLIS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

PROVIDING FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 671, Rept. No. 2339) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill (H. R. 6401) it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2655, and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 6401 as passed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (EXCLUSIVE OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION) APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 51, line 22, insert the following:

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"Not to exceed $500,000 of the appropriation made available by section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), shall be used to pay any subsidy, benefit, or indemnity to manufacturers of or dealers in insulation products."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 59, line 10, insert the following: "*Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to reenter an area or region where an economic emergency or production disaster has occurred, in conformity with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (title 12, U. S. C., 1148)."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 63, line 4, insert the following: "together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for fiscal year 1948 which shall be available to complete the orderly liquidation of the 1947 and prior crop-year programs."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the House recede and concur in amendment No. 42.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the total appropriation for the Department of Agriculture and also loan authorizations for the fiscal year 1949.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Summary of appropriations and borrowing authorization in Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1949, compared with 1948, House bill, 1949, and Senate bill, 1949 [1]

Item	Appropriations and borrowing authorization, 1948	Budget estimates, 1949	House bill, 1949	Senate bill, 1949	Bill as finally passed	Bill as finally passed	
						Compared with House bill (+) or (−)	Compared with Senate bill (+) or (−)
Direct appropriations in agricultural appropriation bill	$632,526,651	$636,412,090	$545,533,453	$580,400,278	$577,546,952	+$32,013,500	−$2,853,325
Permanent appropriations	160,351,057	65,327,127	146,327,127	146,327,127	146,327,127		
Total, direct appropriations	792,788,708	701,739,217	691,860,580	726,727,405	723,874,080	+32,013,500	−2,853,325
REA borrowing authorization	400,000,000	300,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000		
Total, appropriations and borrowing authorization	1,192,877,708	1,001,739,217	1,091,860,580	1,126,727,405	1,123,874,080	+32,013,500	−2,853,325

[1] Excludes salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Administration, contained in the Government corporations appropriation bill, 1949, pending final congressional action.

Prepared by: Office of Budget and Finance, Division of Estimates and Allotments, Estimates Section, June 14, 1948.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I know particularly in the rural areas when the time comes to get around to the hustings and meet the voters, you will want some information with respect to what the second session of the Eightieth Congress did on agricultural appropriations.

The bill as finally passed, making adjustments for the amounts that were in conference, would indicate that the direct appropriations for the fiscal year 1949 for the Department of Agriculture will be $577,000,000 plus. Those are direct annual appropriations. In addition thereto, there are permanent appropriations of $146,000,000. Those are appropriations over which the committee has no control whatsoever. They are permanent. They are indefinite. They are provided by law, and our profane hands cannot be placed thereon. So when you add the direct annual appropriations to the permanent appropriations, the total in the bill before us now will be $723,000,000. In addition thereto the borrowing power of REA will be $400,000,000 for the next fiscal year, making a total of loans and direct and permanent appropriations of $1,123,000,000. You see, agriculture has come to be a pretty good sized industry in this country, and well over the billion-dollar mark. These appropriations will be $32,000,000 over the House figure and $2,800,000 under the Senate figure. That might indicate to you that your House conferees have not been good bargainers. Of course, the upper House comes by its traditional name also by virtue of the fact that it ups many of our appropriations and then our part is always to hold them in line and to develop what we think are agreeable and acceptable compromises. So the final figure is $32,000,000 above the House figure and nearly $3,000,000 below the Senate figure.

This, then, concludes our deliberations on the Department of Agriculture appropriation. I can only express the hope that agriculture thereunder will profit and prosper. But I would be rather remiss, I think, if I did not say this to the Congress: More and more it becomes apparent that we become special pleaders, and that goes for me as well as for anybody else. I find that I plead special, sectional, local causes every now and then. It seems to be in the air. How many speeches begin in the well of this

House: "Now, in my congressional district." And the minute you put that provincial limitation upon your thinking, you have lost your national perspective and your national viewpoint. More and more, as we deal with agricultural policy, I hope we may forget corn and soybeans and hogs in my own district and fruits and vegetables in other sections, and cotton, tobacco, rice, eggs, chickens, and peanuts in other sections, and think less sectionally and less provincially, and be thinking about agriculture and the impact of agriculture upon the economy of the whole country. Out of that there is likely to come a better agriculture policy than we have had. There must be a restoration of national perspective. I confess my derelictions and my sins to you in that respect, in the hope that perhaps you can reexamine your own thinking and your own course in the past, and it may lead to something better and more durable and more fruitful for all farmers in all areas of the land.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the various votes by which action was taken was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS (H. DOC. NO. 711)

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, House Joint Resolution 296, to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage.

Despite representations to the contrary, sections 1 and 2 of this resolution would exclude from the coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance and unemployment-insurance systems up to 750,000 employees, consisting of a substantial portion of the persons working as commission salesmen, life-insurance salesmen, piece workers, truck drivers, taxicab drivers, miners, journeymen tailors, and others. In June 1947, the Supreme Court held that these employees have been justly and legally entitled to social-security protection since the beginning of the program in 1935. I cannot approve legislation which would deprive many hundreds of thousands of employees, as well as their families, of social-security benefits when the need for expanding our social-insurance system is so great.

Furthermore, if enacted into law, this resolution would overturn the present sound principle that employment relationships under the social-security laws should be determined in the light of realities rather than on the basis of technical legal forms. In so doing, it would make the social-security rights of the employees directly excluded, and many thousands of additional employees, depend almost entirely upon the manner in which their employers might choose to cast their employment arrangements. Employers desiring to avoid the payment of taxes which would be the basis for social-security benefits for their employees could do so by the establishment of artificial legal arrangements governing their relationship with their employees. I cannot approve legislation which would permit such employers at their own discretion to avoid the payment of social-security taxes and to deny social-security protection to employees and their families.

It has been represented that the issue involved in this resolution is whether or not the legislative branch of the Government shall determine what individuals are entitled to social-security protection. This is not the issue at all. The real issue is whether the social-security coverage of many hundreds of thousands of individuals should be left largely to the discretion of their employers. On this issue the proper course is obvious.

The expressed purpose of the sponsors of this resolution is to exclude from the coverage of the Social Security Act persons who have the status of independent contractors, rather than that of employees. But no legislation is needed to accomplish this objective. Under present law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, only persons who are bona fide employees are covered by our social-security system.

When all of the considerations regarding sections 1 and 2 of the resolution are sifted, two basic facts remain unrefuted. Hundreds of large employers are assured of an exemption from social-security taxes, while hundreds of thousands of employees and their families are equally assuredly prevented from receiving the social security protection which the Supreme Court in June of last year clearly indicated was justly theirs. These two facts were minimized by the sponsors of the resolution who would have us believe, for example, that a traveling salesman who devotes full working time in the service of one company and depends completely upon that company for his livelihood is not an employee of that company but is an independent businessman and does not need social-security protection.

Instead of clarifying the distinction between independent contractors and employees, which is a difficult legal issue in many cases, this resolution would revive the confusion which has plagued the administration of the Social Security Act for so many years. Benefits which are now payable to thousands of persons would have to be withheld pending final determination of the new and complex legal problems raised by this resolution.

Moreover, the resolution purports to preserve the past coverage of employees who have already made contributions under this system. But in fact, under the terms of the Social Security Act, such coverage would expire in a few years, and previous contributions would be made worthless.

It has been asserted that it would be difficult for employers to keep the necessary records and meet other requirements of the law with respect to the employees affected by this resolution. This is reminiscent of the objections made in opposition to the original Social Security Act in 1935. If such objections had prevailed in 1935, our social-security program never would have been enacted. To allow them to prevail now would threaten the very foundation of the system. I cannot believe that the mere convenience of employers should be considered more important than the social-security protection of employees and their families.

It has also been urged that without this resolution some persons would receive credit toward old age and survivors benefits for three or four past years during which contributions were not collected. If the elimination of these credits had been the real purpose of the resolution, it could readily have been achieved without permanently excluding anyone from social-insurance protection.

If our social-security program is to endure, it must be protected against these piecemeal attacks. Coverage must be permanently expanded and no employer or special group of employers should be permitted to reverse that trend by efforts to avoid a tax burden which millions of other employers have carried without serious inconvenience or complaint.

Section 3 of this resolution contains provisions—completely unrelated to sections 1 and 2—for additional public assistance of $5 per month to the needy aged and blind, and $3 per month to dependent children.

These changes fall far short of the substantial improvements in our public-assistance program which I have recommended many times. Nevertheless, I am strongly in favor of increasing the amount of assistance payments. Were it not for the fact that the Congress still has ample opportunity to enact such legislation before adjournment, I would be inclined to approve the resolution in spite of my serious objections to sections 1 and 2. Speedy action on public-assistance legislation is clearly possible. I note that section 3 of this resolution was adopted as an amendment on the floor of the Senate, and passed by both houses in a single afternoon. Accordingly, I am placing this matter before the Congress in adequate time so that the public-assistance program will not suffer because of my disapproval of this resolution.

At the same time, I urge again that the Congress should not be satisfied at this session merely to improve public-assistance benefits—urgent as that is. There are other equally urgent extensions and improvements in our social-security sys-

tem which I have repeatedly recommended. They are well understood and widely accepted and should be enacted without delay.

Because sections 1 and 2 of this resolution would seriously curtail and weaken our social-security system, I am compelled to return it without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 14, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the bill and message ordered to be printed.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the limitation of time, and for that reason I will confine myself to merely stating the ultimate facts in relation to this resolution. Some time ago the Supreme Court of the United States rendered two decisions in what are known as the Silk and Gray Van cases, cases which involved the question whether or not certain persons were employees, and therefore covered by social security, or whether they were independent contractors.

In each of these decisions the correct result was reached by the Supreme Court, applying, as they should, the ancient common-law definition of employment. However, there crept into these decisions a little of what lawyers call obiter dicta; that is, some words which were quite unnecessary to the result. These words were to the effect that, for purposes of social security, the Social Security Administration was not necessarily bound in extending social-security coverage, by the ancient common-law definition of master and servant, or employer and employee, as you may choose to call it, but that they could take into the system as employees any persons who were dependent upon a business in the light of economic realities, thereby throwing into the entire system a confusion which required immediate legislative attention.

The Social Security Administration and the Treasury proceeded immediately to prepare a departmental regulation to carry that obiter dicta definition into effect. If this Congress had not interfered, tens of thousands of people in America who never dreamed they were employed by anybody and never for one moment thought they were covered by social security or subject to pay-roll taxes would have found that they had been swept into the social-security system by bureaucratic ukase. In other words, they would suddenly have found that they had more employers than a dog had fleas. So, to end this confusion, this Congress acted promptly, and, after thoroughgoing debate, and by a vote of nearly 7 to 1, proceeded by legislation to put the matter in order once again by restoring the ancient doctrine of the common law defining the relation of master and servant, employer and employee.

There is another reason why the passage of this resolution is very, very important, and that is, the preservation of the integrity of the social-security fund into which some 30,000,000 people at considerable sacrifice have paid pay-roll taxes, some of them ever since this system was inaugurated. Under the loose definition which the inept statement of the Supreme Court inspired, innumerable persons would receive benefits from the social-security fund who never paid anything into it whatsoever, thereby placing in jeopardy the right of these 30,000,000 people, whose contributions in pay-roll taxes had created the fund, to receive the annuities they had purchased upon their reaching the age of 65.

This resolution passed the House by a vote of 7 to 1 after careful discussion by its Members. The measure then went to the other body, where, after careful discussion, the resolution was amended so as to restore the integrity of the social-security fund by authorizing Congress to appropriate moneys from the general fund to the social-security fund to replace moneys which had been paid in as pay-roll taxes and illegally paid out by the Social Security Administration to persons who had never contributed anything to it.

The Senate further amended the resolution by providing that an additional $5 per month should be paid to every needy, aged person who is now receiving benefits under title I of the Social Security Act; by providing that every blind person in the United States should receive an additional $5 a month, and, by providing that every dependent child should receive an additional $3 per month.

So the bill comes back to us now from the White House as a bill which will restore the integrity of the social-security fund, carrying, in addition, new benefits for the needy old people of the country, this to the extent of $5 per capita; $5 additional for each blind person, and $3 additional for each dependent child.

These benefits, which this resolution will make available are in no sense of the word inconsiderable, for, indeed, these increased benefits which will go to the aged, the blind, and the dependent children, will involve a Treasury expenditure of $185,000,000 a year.

So, Mr. Speaker, the resolution under consideration is a very, very important one, from the standpoint of many of our deserving fellow citizens, dependent, in a large degree, if not entirely, upon the integrity of our social-security system.

The arguments of the President, which are contained in his veto message were presented to this Congress in a pocket veto last year. They were thoroughly considered and painstakingly weighed by the Members of this Congress when this resolution was before the House earlier in the year, and again later when it was before the Senate. In each instance those arguments were rejected as fear arguments, arguments unworthy of the attention of a legislative body. In view of the Chief Executive's poverty of argument, his utter inability to advance anything worthy of our attention, I ask that the resolution be passed, the objections of the President nothwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, early in the day I agreed to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] time equal to that which I have consumed in this debate. Therefore, I now yield the gentleman from Michigan 6 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that because of a misunderstanding we have not been able to arrive at a more equitable distribution of time. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] desired some time, but, unfortunately, I could not get the gentleman from California to yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I will be very happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. May I say to the gentleman and to the House that I voted against the passage of House Joint Resolution 296 when it passed the House. It is my intention to vote today to sustain the veto of the President. The passage of House Joint Resolution 296 will have the effect of overturning a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and will deprive about 750,000 people of their rights and benefits under the social-security program. The passage of this joint resolution will reestablish all the confusion and uncertainty that made it necessary for the Supreme Court to decide the question, and that confusion will continue until the Court again has to decide the question if this resolution is passed. All of those who are sincerely in favor of a social-security program should vote to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the veto of House Joint Resolution 296 reflects the refusal of President Truman to subordinate principle to politics in the field of social security. The President has repeatedly asked the Eightieth Congress to expand social-security coverage and to liberalize benefits.

The Republican response has been to pass legislation this very morning under suspension of the rules and to exclude from social-security protection roughly 750,000 workers and their families to whom the Supreme Court has ruled the Democratic Seventy-fourth Congress intended to grant coverage in 1935. Passage of this bill is convincing proof that the original Republican opposition to social security is not yet dead. We may soon expect a revival of Chairman KNUTSON'S recommendation that social security be made an appendix of the Veterans' Administration.

The NAM lobbyists who pressured House Joint Resolution 296 through Congress were so eager that they also arranged to have the same provision included in H. R. 6777—the social security revision bill just passed by the House.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman from California made quite a point of the fact

that this resolution now contains by virtue of an amendment coming from the other body a certain amount of increase in the benefits for the aged, blind, and children. If they are sincere in their desire to provide these increases, there is no reason in the world why the other body cannot insert the same provision in the bill that passed the House this morning.

Mr. DINGELL. I intend fully to cover that point.

The sponsors of this plan to reverse the Supreme Court and the Seventy-fourth Congress tried in each instance to sugar-coat the bitter pill. House Joint Resolution 296 went to the White House with a Senate amendment providing for a slight increase in the Federal share of public-assistance payments made by the States.

H. R. 6777—the Reed bill—combines this restriction of coverage, to make it palatable, with two commendable provisions extending protection on a voluntary basis to State and local employees and employees of churches, schools, and other nonprofit institutions.

House Joint Resolution 296 would affect others than the 750,000 employees directly deprived of coverage. The technical, legalistic definition of an "employee" under the bill would be an open invitation to employers to rig up fictitious contracts to avoid liability for social-security taxes. Confusion and delay in payment of both taxes and benefits would result until the Supreme Court could pass on the new language.

All loyal and sincere supporters of a strong system of social security, in my opinion, must vote to sustain the veto of House Joint Resolution 296. They cannot allow the people on relief to be used as hostages to deprive 750,000 workers and their families of unemployment and old-age and survivors' insurance. It took less than 24 hours for the public-assistance rider to pass both Houses. When the veto of House Joint Resolution 296 has been sustained, the public-assistance provision of the resolution can be just as promptly passed by enactment of H. R. 6837, now in the Committee on Ways and Means, which contains the identical language of the rider to House Joint Resolution 296.

A vote to sustain the veto of the President will be the test in this Congress of the advocates of a sound and adequate program of social security, and especially of the sincerity of Members who have introduced bills to expand the social-security system.

House Joint Resolution 296 is vicious and inexcusable.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill does not pass, the President's objections notwithstanding, these mythical 750,000 people, who are yet to be identified, will become charges against the social-security fund, into which they have never paid a red penny—not a nickel of pay-roll taxes. These free riders will take whatever is paid to them from that fund and thereby impair the rights of the 30,000,000 people who have at great personal sacrifice created and built up the fund out of which they hope to receive their retirement annuities when they reach age 65.

Ours, Mr. Speaker, is a great responsibility. This is the choice we must make.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will vote to sustain the President's veto on House Joint Resolution 296.

House Joint Resolution 296, in its present form, should not be allowed to become law.

The specific purpose of sections 1 and 2 of the resolution is to prevent 500,000 to 750,000 persons from building up wage credits under the old-age and survivors' insurance and unemployment insurance systems. The right of these thousands of persons to their social security protection was confirmed last year by a decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Silk case.

A vote to override the veto is a vote to prevent these thousands of persons from having the social security protection to which they are rightfully due.

A vote to sustain the veto is a vote to protect the social security rights of these thousands of persons. A vote to sustain the veto will mean that hundreds of aged persons, widows, and orphans will be able to draw benefits during the coming months.

A vote to override the veto is a vote against the interests of these people. A vote to override means that you are taking social security benefits away from widows and orphans.

Various legal and technical reasons have been given by those in favor of the passage of the resolution. The arguments made in behalf of the resolution are complicated, confusing, contradictory, and unsound.

The argument against the resolution and in support of the veto is very simple, very clear, very compelling.

It all comes down to this very simple proposition: Are you for social security or against it?

Do you favor taking social security protection away from thousands of persons? Do you favor denying benefits to widows and orphans which are payable under the terms of the United States Supreme Court decision?

Let us be clear about this one point: If you vote to override the veto it will be interpreted as a vote against social security.

I urge you to consider this fact very carefully. Do not vote against social security. Vote to sustain the veto.

Those who wish to vote for the additional $5 for the aged and the blind and the additional $3 for dependent children, which is part of the resolution, can do so by passing a separate bill for this purpose. I have already introduced such a bill. There is plenty of time to do this. But the first step is to sustain the veto. Then we can quickly pass a bill for the additional money to the aged, the blind, and dependent children.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in vetoing this resolution, the President made it unmistakably clear that he is not opposed to the increase in public assistance provided therein for the aged, the blind and dependent children. In fact he recommends that these or even more liberal public assistance provisions be enacted prior to the adjournment of this Congress.

What the President could not tolerate in this legislation, and the part which, I fear, escaped the attention of many Members of this Chamber, is the fact that it puts the social-security protection of hundreds of thousands of employees and their families almost completely at the mercy of their employers, and would thus deprive millions of people of protection against the hazards of old age, unemployment, and premature death of the breadwinner of the family.

When this resolution was originally considered by the House, it was represented to be a harmless piece of legislation that merely prevented the Federal Security Agency from going out of bounds in its efforts to expand coverage. It was also held out as an appropriate measure to prevent a large number of individuals from getting wage credits without paying contributions into the fund.

Since that time, however, the real purpose of the resolution has become increasingly clear.

In June of last year, the Supreme Court finally declared that technical common law rules had no place in a social-security system. The Court, in effect, held that common sense, rather than common law, should determine whether an individual is an employee or an independent businessman. These decisions of the Supreme Court finally brought order out of the confusion which had theretofore prevailed under the social-security laws. Prior thereto the lower courts were split wide open on the question whether common law or common sense should govern their determinations. Many of the courts had gone to the extent of holding, for example, that a traveling salesman was a covered employee if he worked on a salary plus commission basis, but was not entitled to social-security protection if he were paid straight commissions.

It was that sort of condition that the Supreme Court remedied last June, and it is that very condition which this resolution would restore.

Do not for 1 minute, believe that this legislation will clarify the status of individuals under the social-security program. Since the Supreme Court's decisions last June the lower courts have had no trouble whatever in applying the test of realities, or as I call it, common sense. Under this legislation, the status of the individual would first depend on whether his employer put him on a salaried basis or a commission basis and thereafter would depend on whether the court is willing to elevate substance above form.

A lot has been said about the free wage credits which employees will receive if this resolution is not enacted. No one, however, has yet come forward with the suggestion that the Treasury Department might collect the back taxes with respect to those wages. The period of limitations is open just as long for the assessment of taxes as it is for the posting of benefit credits. Why has not someone upbraided the Treasury Department for not having assessed back taxes for the last 4 years in this newly covered area of employment? That would prevent any of the "free rides"

that have so concerned all of us. I will tell you why—the main purpose of this resolution is to guarantee a continued tax exemption for many large industrial and commercial organizations which, the Supreme Court last June, and many lower courts since then, have held, are no longer able to avoid their share of social-security contributions by mere artificial arrangements.

What is more important, however, is the fact that up to 750,000 employees and their families will be deprived of the social-security protection which the Supreme Court declared is rightfully theirs.

I do not object to legislation preventing the accrual of free wage credits but I do object to a deliberate effort to deprive these hundreds of thousands of salesmen, piece workers, truck drivers, miners, branch managers, and others of their opportunity to make future contributions and to continue their present coverage under the program.

I agree wholeheartedly with the President and am proud of his statesmanlike stand on this resolution.

I am in favor of increasing public assistance to the aged, the blind and dependent children much higher than is proposed in this resolution and will do all in my power to have such legislation enacted before we adjourn. Yet, I am gratified and proud that the President was able to discern the serious damage which the other sections of this resolution would have on our social-security program.

I sincerely hope that at least the Members on my side of the aisle will also recognize this resolution for what it really is. Stripped of its masquerade, it is nothing but special-privilege legislation. It is a tax exemption for hundreds of large established concerns which can well afford to pay their share of social-security contributions; but more significantly, it is a tax exemption which results in the denial of social-security protection to hundreds of thousands of individuals and their families who are now entitled to such protection.

The danger inherent in this resolution, as the President has pointed out, lies in the fact that the main considerations on which it seems to be based are the same as those offered in opposition to the original Social Security Act in 1935. I cannot believe that most of the Members of this Congress consider that the mere convenience of employers is more important to our country than the protection of employees and their families against the hazards of old age, unemployment, and premature death. It is obvious, however, that such is the attitude of the sponsors of this legislation.

Accordingly, unless this Congress wishes to go on record with a precedent which might well result in the destruction of the whole social-security program as we now know it, I beseech you to sustain the President's veto of this legislation.

I am not unmindful of the fact that this resolution carries with it increased benefits for the needy. I am also well aware of the desperate plight of these individuals because of the constantly rising cost of living.

However, if the House can take the time it is now taking to debate a resolution which is designed only to grant a tax exemption to a small group of employers, it can certainly spare the time to enact separate legislation on public assistance before adjournment.

Therefore, I repeat, we should vote down this piece of special-privilege legislation. As the President said, we are not forced to accept it merely because of its public-assistance provisions.

On voting it down, we should make every effort to enact public-assistance legislation before adjournment. We shall then see more clearly just how sincerely interested the majority leadership of this Congress is in its efforts to aid the needy individuals who are on the public-assistance rolls.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Those who wish to override the President's veto will vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Those who wish the bill to become law will vote "yea."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 298, nays 75, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—298

Abernethy	Chenoweth	Graham
Albert	Chiperfield	Grant, Ala.
Allen, Calif.	Church	Grant, Ind.
Allen, Ill.	Clason	Gregory
Allen, La.	Clevenger	Griffiths
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, Kans.	Gross
	Cole, Mo.	Gwynne, Iowa
Anderson, Calif.	Colmer	Hagen
Andresen, August H.	Combs	Hale
	Cooley	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Andrews, Ala.	Corbett	
Andrews, N. Y.	Cotton	Hall, Leonard W.
Angell	Coudert	
Arends	Cox	Halleck
Arnold	Cravens	Hand
Bakewell	Crawford	Hardy
Banta	Crow	Harless, Ariz.
Barrett	Curtis	Harness, Ind.
Bates, Mass.	Dague	Harris
Battle	Davis, Ga.	Harrison
Beall	Davis, Wis.	Harvey
Beckworth	Dawson, Utah	Hays
Bennett, Mich.	Devitt	Hébert
Bennett, Mo.	D'Ewart	Hedrick
Bishop	Dirksen	Hendricks
Blackney	Domengeaux	Heselton
Boggs, Del.	Donohue	Hess
Boggs, La.	Doughton	Hill
Bonner	Eaton	Hoeven
Boykin	Elliott	Hoffman
Bradley	Ellis	Holmes
Bramblett	Ellsworth	Hope
Brehm	Elsaesser	Horan
Brooks	Elston	Hull
Brophy	Engel, Mich.	Jackson, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Fallon	Jenison
Bryson	Fellows	Jenkins, Ohio
Buck	Fenton	Jensen
Buffett	Fletcher	Johnson, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Folger	Johnson, Ill.
Burke	Fuller	Johnson, Ind.
Burleson	Gamble	Jones, Ala.
Busbey	Gary	Jones, N. C.
Butler	Gathings	Jones, Wash.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gavin	Jonkman
Camp	Gearhart	Judd
Canfield	Gillette	Kean
Cannon	Gillie	Kearney
Carson	Goff	Kearns
Case, N. J.	Goodwin	Keefe
Case, S. Dak.	Gore	Kennedy
Chadwick	Gossett	Kerr
Kersten, Wis.	Mundt	Schwabe, Okla.
Kilburn	Murdock	Scott, Hardie
Kilday	Murray, Wis.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Knutson	Nicholson	
Kunkel	Nixon	Scrivner
Landis	Nodar	Seely-Brown
Larcade	Norblad	Shafer
Latham	Norrell	Sheppard
LeCompte	O'Hara	Short
Lemke	O'Konski	Sikes
Lewis, Ky.	Passman	Simpson, Ill.
Lewis, Ohio	Patman	Smathers
Lichtenwalter	Patterson	Smith, Kans.
Lodge	Peterson	Smith, Va.
Love	Phillips, Calif.	Smith, Wis.
Lucas	Phillips, Tenn.	Snyder
Lyle	Pickett	Stefan
McConnell	Plumley	Stockman
McCowen	Poage	Stratton
McCulloch	Potter	Sundstrom
McDonough	Potts	Taber
McDowell	Poulson	Talle
McGregor	Preston	Taylor
McMahon	Price, Fla.	Teague
McMillen, Ill.	Priest	Thompson
Mack	Ramey	Tibbott
MacKinnon	Rankin	Tollefson
Macy	Redden	Trimble
Mahon	Reed, Ill.	Twyman
Maloney	Reed, N. Y.	Vail
Manasco	Rees	Van Zandt
Martin, Iowa	Reeves	Vinson
Mason	Regan	Vorys
Mathews	Rich	Vursell
Meade, Ky.	Richards	Wadsworth
Meade, Md.	Riehlman	Weichel
Merrow	Rivers	Wheeler
Meyer	Rizley	Whitten
Michener	Rockwell	Whittington
Miller, Conn.	Rogers, Fla.	Wigglesworth
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Williams
Miller, Nebr.	Rohrbough	Wilson, Tex.
Mills	Ross	Winstead
Mitchell	Russell	Wolcott
Monroney	Sadlak	Wolverton
Morris	St. George	Wood
Morrison	Sanborn	Woodruff
Morton	Sarbacher	Worley
Muhlenberg	Schwabe, Mo.	Youngblood

NAYS—75

Bates, Ky.	Forand	Lusk
Bland	Fulton	Lynch
Blatnik	Garmatz	McCormack
Bloom	Gordon	Mansfield
Buchanan	Gorski	Marcantonio
Byrne, N. Y.	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Carroll	Hart	Morgan
Chelf	Havenner	Multer
Cooper	Heffernan	Norton
Courtney	Hobbs	O'Brien
Crosser	Holifield	O'Toole
Davis, Tenn.	Huber	Pace
Dawson, Ill.	Isacson	Powell
Deane	Jackson, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Delaney	Jarman	Rayburn
Dingell	Javits	Rooney
Douglas	Karsten, Mo.	Sabath
Durham	Keating	Sadowski
Eberharter	Kee	Sasscer
Engle, Calif.	Kelley	Somers
Evins	King	Spence
Feighan	Kirwan	Thomas, Tex.
Fernandez	Klein	Walter
Flannagan	Lanham	Welch
Fogarty	Lesinski	Whitaker

NOT VOTING—57

Abbitt	Foote	Murray, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Gallagher	Peden
Barden	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pfeifer
Bell	Hartley	Philbin
Bender	Herter	Ploeser
Bolton	Hinshaw	Rains
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins, Pa.	Riley
Buckley	Jennings	Robertson
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Scoblick
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Clark	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Clippinger	Keogh	Smith, Ohio
Coffin	Lane	Stanley
Cole, N. Y.	Lea	Stevenson
Cunningham	LeFevre	Stigler
Dolliver	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Dondero	McGarvey	Towe
Dorn	McMillan, S. C.	West
Fisher	Madden	Wilson, Ind.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Auchincloss and Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Dondero and Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Cole of New York and Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. McGarvey and Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Foote and Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Additional general pairs:

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Coffin with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Stevenson with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Riley.

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Cunningham with Mr. West.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.

Mr. GORE changed his vote from nay to yea.

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from nay to yea.

Mr. DONOHUE changed his vote from nay to yea.

Mr. LANHAM changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the bill just passed, that they may have five legislative days within which to do so, and that their remarks be printed prior to the roll call.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

AMENDING RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 577, Rept. No. 2341), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That rule IV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by inserting at the beginning thereof "1." and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"2. Whenever a Member presents a question of privilege for the purpose of offering a motion to strike from the RECORD the remarks of another Member, the Speaker shall recognize such latter Member before he shall entertain a motion to move the previous question, and shall grant him time in opposition to such motion equal to the time allowed the Member offering such motion."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that we continue with certain suspensions which, as we now contemplate, will include the stream pollution bill, S. 581, the shipbuilding assistance bill, House Joint Resolution 412, maintenance of the merchant marine, House Joint Resolution 413, and assistance for local school agencies, H. R. 6527.

Mr. Speaker, a number a Members have asked me whether or not the Consent Calendar will again be called. After consultation with the Speaker and with other leaders, I want to announce that we would like to call the Consent Calendar on Wednesday next.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call the Consent Calendar on Wednesday.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the Speaker whether the gentleman's request includes the power to suspend?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has not asked for that authority.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the suspensions which the gentleman announced be taken up in the order in which he announced them?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. Of course, that is subject to the determination of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Have the leaders come to any agreement as to the time of adjournment tonight?

Mr. HALLECK. I should say at about 5:30. We have quite a heavy day coming up tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana, that the Consent Calendar may be called on Wednesday.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman, if you are postponing that until Wednesday—what is coming up tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. I was just about to announce the rest of the program.

Mr. RICH. If you are doing that in order that you may bring up the draft bill tomorrow, then I will object, because I think those who are opposed to the draft bill ought to have more time than tomorrow to do that.

Mr. HALLECK. May I point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that whether or not we call the Consent Calendar on Wednesday has nothing to do with the programing of the selective-service bill, or the resolution making it in order. In view of that fact, I am quite sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not object to the call of the Consent Calendar on Wednesday.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if we are having the draft bill tomorrow and not giving those who are opposed to that bill an opportunity to get amendments ready for the bill on Wednesday, then I do object. If you are not going to call up the draft bill tomorrow, then I do not object.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit me, I had expected to pursue the announcement of the program within such limits as I can now foresee.

It is proposed to call up the Selective Service bill tomorrow. I may say to the gentleman that, as far as I am concerned, I do not intend to preclude fair and proper consideration of the bill by the House of Representatives. I do not see that the call of the Consent Calendar on Wednesday will in any way preclude a proper consideration of the selective-service bill, and I am sure the gentleman will concur in our request on that assurance.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. HALLECK. I made the request, Mr. Speaker, that it may be in order on Wednesday next to call the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I think I am still proceeding under the 1 minute that was granted me, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is tolerant.

Mr. HALLECK. Permit me to make one further statement. The Private Calendar is in order tomorrow. The Private Calendar will be called immediately upon the convening of the House tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the vote comes on the so-called selective-service or conscription measure, will the opponents be given an opportunity to vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hope so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And so do I.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 418) to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health

and welfare by the abatement of stream pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research to devise and perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes which are not susceptible to known effective methods of treatment, and to provide Federal technical services to State and interstate agencies and to industries, and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities, in the formulation and execution of their stream pollution abatement programs. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator) and the Federal Works Administrator shall have the responsibilities and authority relating to water pollution control vested in them respectively by this act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or adopt comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance and improving the sanitary condition of such interstate waters and tributaries thereof. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this subsection the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may deleteriously affect such waters.

(b) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; encourage the enactment of uniform State laws relating to water pollution; encourage compacts between States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; collect and disseminate information relating to water pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof; support and aid technical research to devise and perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes which are not susceptible to known effective methods of treatment; make available to State and interstate agencies, municipalities, industries, and individuals the results of surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments relating to water pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof conducted by the Surgeon General and by authorized cooperating agencies; and furnish such assistance to State agencies as may be authorized by law.

(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and abatement of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

(d) (1) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, is hereby declared to be a public nuisance and subject to abatement as herein provided.

(2) Whenever the Surgeon General, on the basis of reports, surveys, and studies, finds that any pollution declared to be a public nuisance by paragraph (1) of this subsection is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution and shall advise the water pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate of such notification. This notification may outline recommended remedial measures which are reasonable and equitable in that case and shall specify a reasonable time to secure abatement of the pollution. If action calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified is not commenced, this failure shall again be brought to the attention of the person or persons discharging the matter and of the water pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate. The notification to such agency may be accompanied by a recommendation that it initiate a suit to abate the pollution in a court of proper jurisdiction.

(3) If, within a reasonable time after the second notification by the Surgeon General, the person or persons discharging the matter fail to initiate action to abate the pollution or the State water pollution agency or interstate agency fails to initiate a suit to secure abatement, the Federal Security Administrator is authorized to call a public hearing to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Administrator, who may be officers or employees of the Federal Security Agency or of the water pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate (except that at least one of the members of the board shall be a representative of the water pollution agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate and at least one shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Federal Security Agency). On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing the board shall make its recommendations to the Federal Security Administrator concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

(4) After affording the person or persons discharging the matter causing or contributing to the pollution reasonable opportunity to comply with the recommendations of the board, the Federal Security Administrator may, with the consent of the water pollution agency (or of any officer or agency authorized to give such consent) of the State or States in which the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(5) Before or after any suit authorized by paragraph (4) is commenced, any person who is alleged to be discharging matter contributing to the pollution, abatement of which is sought, may, with the consent of the water pollution agency (or of any officer or agency authorized to give such consent) of the State in which such matter is discharged, be joined as a defendant. The court shall have power to enforce its judgment against any such defendant.

(6) In any suit brought pursuant to paragraph (4) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

(7) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the board and a copy of the board's recommendation; and may receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require. The jurisdiction of the Surgeon General, or any other agency which has jurisdiction pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall not extend to any region or areas nor shall it affect the rights or jurisdiction of any public body where there are in effect provisions for sewage disposal pursuant to agreement between the United States of America and any such public body by stipulation entered in the Supreme Court of the United States. While any such stipulation or modification thereof is in force and effect, no proceedings of any kind may be maintained by virtue of this act against such public body or any public agency, corporation, or individual within its jurisdiction. Neither this provision nor any provision of this act shall be construed to give to the Surgeon General or any other person or agency the right to intervene in the said proceedings wherein such stipulation was entered.

(8) As used in this subsection the term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, a State, municipality, and a political subdivision of a State.

SEC. 3. The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water-pollution agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view to recommending a solution of such problem.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General shall prepare and publish, from time to time, reports of such surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments made under the authority of this act as he may consider desirable, together with appropriate recommendations with regard to the control of water pollution.

SEC. 5. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized, subject to the provisions of section 9 (c), to make loans to any State, municipality, or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequatedly treated sewage or other waste into interstate waters or into a tributary of such waters, and for the preparation (either by its engineering staff or by practicing engineers employed for that purpose) of engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. Such loans shall be subject, however, to the following limitations: (a) No loan shall be made for any project unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General, and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this act; (b) no loan shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator, or in an amount exceeding $200,000, whichever amount is the smaller; (c) every such loan shall bear interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum, payable semiannually; and (d) the bonds or other obligations evidencing any such loan (1) must be duly authorized and issued pursuant to State and local law, and (2) may, as to the security thereof and the payment of principal thereof and interest thereon, be subordinated (to the extent deemed feasible and desirable by the Federal Works Administrator for facilitating the financing of such projects) to other bonds or obligations of the obligor issued to finance

such project or that may then be outstanding.

SEC. 6. (a) The Surgeon General and the Federal Works Administrator, in carrying out their respective functions under this act, shall provide for the review of all reports of examinations, research, investigations, plans, studies, and surveys, made pursuant to the provisions of this act and all applications for loans under section 5. In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving loans in connection therewith, consideration shall be given to the public benefits to be derived by the construction thereof, the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for the loan for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof.

(b) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board to be composed as follows: The Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be Chairman of the Board, a representative of the Department of the Army, a representative of the Department of the Interior, a representative of the Federal Works Agency, and a representative of the Department of Agriculture, designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Federal Works Administrator, and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively; and six persons (not officers or employees of the Federal Government) to be appointed annually by the President. One of the persons appointed by the President shall be an engineer who is expert in sewage and industrial-waste disposal, one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of wildlife conservation, and, except as the President may determine that the purposes of this act will be better furthered by different representation, one shall be a person representative of municipal government, one shall be a person representative of State government, and one shall be a person representative of affected industry. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States shall be entitled to receive compensation at a per diem rate to be fixed by the Federal Security Administrator, together with an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while engaged on the business of the Board. It shall be the duty of the Board to review the policies and program of the Public Health Service as undertaken under authority of this act and to make recommendations thereon in reports to the Surgeon General. Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed the sum of $20,000,000 for the purpose of making loans under section 5 of this act. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, the sum of $1,000,000, to be allotted equitably and paid to the States for expenditure by or under the direction of their respective State water pollution agencies, and to interstate agencies for expenditure by them, for the conduct of investigations, research, surveys, and studies related to the prevention and control of water pollution caused by industrial wastes. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended, shall be allotted by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Security Administrator, and shall be paid prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed $800,000 to enable the Federal Works Administrator to erect and to furnish and to equip such buildings and facilities at Cincinnati, Ohio, as may be necessary for the use of the Public Health Service in connection with the research and study of pollution of interstate waters and the training of personnel in work related to the control of pollution of interstate waters. The amount authorized for this purpose shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, supervision of construction and other administrative expenses incident to the work: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Agency shall prepare the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts and supervise construction. Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed the sum of $1,000,000 to enable the Federal Works Administrator to make grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of engineering, architectural, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of projects approved by the appropriate State water pollution agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General. Grants made under this subsection with respect to any project shall not exceed whichever of the following amounts is the smaller: (1) $20,000, or (2) 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost (as determined by the Federal Works Administrator) of the action preliminary to the construction of such project. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, such sum (not to exceed the sum of $2,000,000) as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, such sum (not to exceed the sum of $500,000) as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

SEC. 9. (a) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, the appointment of engineer and scientist officers may be made under the provisions of section 208 (b) (1) of the Public Health Service Act, in addition to the appointments authorized by such section 208 (b) (1); but not more than five such additional officers shall hold office at the same time.

(b) The Federal Security Administrator, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the Federal Government, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(c) (1) Upon written request of the Federal Works Administrator, from time to time submitted to the Federal Security Administrator, specifying (a) particular projects approved by the Surgeon General, (b) the total estimated costs of such projects, and (c) the total sum requested for loans which the Federal Works Administrator proposes to make for such projects, the Federal Security Administrator shall transfer such total sum (within the amount appropriated therefor) to the Federal Works Administrator for the making of loans for such projects pursuant to section 5 hereof. In making such loans, the Federal Works Administrator shall adhere to the order or sequence of priority for projects established by the Surgeon General and shall take such measures as, in his judgment, will assure that the engineering plans and specifications, the details of construction, and the completed treatment works conform to the project as approved by the Surgeon General; and the Federal Works Administrator shall furnish written reports to the Federal Security Administrator on the progress of the work.

(2) The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized (a) to hold, administer, exchange, refund, or sell at public or private sale any bonds or other obligations evidencing loans made under this act; and (b) to collect, or provide for the collection of, interest on and principal of such bonds or other obligations. All moneys received as proceeds from such sales, and all moneys so collected, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) The Surgeon General and the Federal Works Administrator are each authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out their respective functions under this act.

SEC. 10. When used in this act—

(a) The term "State water pollution agency" means the State health authority, except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency;

(b) The term "interstate agency" means an agency of two or more States having powers or duties pertaining to the abatement of pollution of waters;

(c) The term "treatment works" means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial waste of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alterations thereof;

(d) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands;

(e) The term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, State boundaries; and

(f) The term "municipality" means a city, town, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

SEC. 11. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] for 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand, for the information of the membership, the question is to suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 418, with an amendment; and that amendment is to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, for 16 or 18 years there has been before various Congresses of the United States the subject of stream pollution. The Eightieth Congress has had before it about four different bills.

At this time I should like to pay my respects to the authors of those bills: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]; the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]; the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]; and two gentlemen in the other body, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], coauthors of the bill S. 418. These gentlemen appeared before our committee and were really of great benefit in the drafting of this legislation. And I personally appreciate the untiring efforts of my colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman ELSTON.

The bill S. 418, Mr. Speaker, does not do everything all of us would like to have done so far as stream pollution is concerned, but the reason we have not had any legislation in 16 years is the fact that we could not reach an accord or agreement on a program—no one seemingly wanted to compromise. One group seemed to oppose the suggestions of the other group with the result nothing was done on stream pollution legislation, at least no legislation was passed.

S. 418 does three things: It is limited to interstate streams only; it safeguards States' rights; and it promotes the study and we hope ultimately the solution of problems of stream pollution.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. PICKETT. I am interested in the gentleman's statement that this bill is limited in its application to interstate streams only. As I understand the bill it provides:

> The term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, State boundaries.

But in section 2 (d) (1) the following language is used:

> The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters).

It looks to me as though we are getting very far afield from what is actually an interstate stream for practical purposes when we have that language in the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman has brought up a very important point. It was discussed by the committee many times but the committee feels that the wording in the bill definitely establishes the fact that we are only dealing with interstate streams.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. In answer to the gentleman from Texas, I might call his attention to the fact that in the New River case it was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States that any stream which is susceptible of being made into a navigable stream comes within the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

Mr. PICKETT. If the gentleman will yield, in view of that New River case just cited by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] does not the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] think we ought to be very careful in prescribing the limits of participation in this program under the interstate definition here?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am in complete accord with the gentleman's suggestion, and again may I say that we discussed that fully in the committee. We feel we have safeguarded that very situation in this legislation. We do not consider this as a bill containing everything which everybody wants, but we do consider this is a piece of legislation in the right direction. At least it is a start.

It might be said that this is a compromise bill, a bill that would enable the States and their political subdivisions to enter into a stream pollution program with the aid of the Federal Government and yet retain their own rights.

The bill before us for consideration—

(a) Authorizes to be appropriated an expenditure of $20,000,000 per year for 5 years for loans.

(b) Grants $1,000,000 per year for 5 years for expenditure by Federal Security Agency, or by direction of State water pollution agencies, for conduct of investigation, research, etc.

(c) Authorizes to be appropriated to Federal Works Agency $800,000 per year for 5 years to erect, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities at Cincinnati, Ohio necessary for use of the Public Health Service in connection with research and study of pollution, and so forth.

(d) Authorizes to be appropriated $1,000,000 per year for 5 years to Federal Works Agency to make grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in cost of making necessary surveys, and so forth, preliminary to construction of projects approved by the appropriate State water pollution agency and by the Surgeon General. Such grants are not to exceed $20,000 or 33⅓ percent of the cost of the action preliminary to the construction of the projects.

(e) Authorizes to be appropriated administrative expenses of Federal Security Agency, $2,000,000 per year for 5 years; and authorizes to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency $500,000 per year for 5 years to enable it to carry out functions of this act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], chairman of the subcommittee who drafted this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of S. 418 the subcommittee members were governed by three primary motives: First, to confine the measure to interstate streams only; second, to safeguard States rights so that they would be free from undue interference on the part of the Federal Government; and, third, to promote as much as possible the study of the problem of stream pollution, and to encourage its abatement.

The bill provides that the Surgeon General shall encourage a comprehensive program for the control of stream pollution between the States and to secure their cooperation in combating this evil. If, in the opinion of the Surgeon General stream pollution exists in interstate waters he shall notify the offending parties and ask that they take steps to abate the pollution. If they do not take the necessary steps within a reasonable time he shall again call their attention to the situation and request their cooperation, and if after a reasonable time has ensued following the second notification and no action has been taken, he may request the Federal Security Administrator to call a hearing to be held by the Stream Pollution Board set up for that purpose. The Board shall go into all aspects of the immediate problem and make its recommendations to the Federal Security Administrator. If its recommendations are not acted on within a reasonable time the Federal Security Administrator may, with the consent of the State in which the pollution is discharged, request the Attorney General to bring suit to bring about the abatement of the nuisance.

It will be seen by this procedure that every opportunity is given to the offending parties to correct the situation, and it is only as a last resort that the Federal Government will step in with the use of mandatory power.

A Water Pollution Control Advisory Board is set up in the Public Health Service with the Surgeon General as chairman, which will review the policies of the Public Health Service and make recommendations from time to time. This bill carries authorizations in the sum of $25,300,000 a year for a period of 5 years, which makes a total of $126,500,000. Of this total sum, $100,000,000 is in the form of loans and the balance, $26,500,000 in outright grants. No loan will be made to any one project for more

than one-third of the cost of construction of stream-pollution abatement, or $200,000, whichever is the less, and grants are made on the same basis to the different States for the following purposes:

Research, $1,000,000 per year for 5 years.

Cost of plans for pollution-control plants, $1,000,000, provided that no grant shall be more than one-third of the cost of the plans, or $20,000, whichever is the less.

Grant for the construction and rehabilitation of the Stream Pollution Laboratory now located in Cincinnati, Ohio, $800,000 a year for 5 years.

A grant to the Federal Security Agency of $2,000,000 and to the Federal Works Agency of $500,000 for administration purposes.

The committee feels that this bill is a step in the right direction and will provide a solid basis on which to build for the future.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have a great admiration for the gentleman who just left the floor, and I sincerely wish that today I could appear before you as a supporter of the legislation which he supports, because I have spoken in this well for 10 years in behalf of clean streams legislation. Unfortunately, I am candid to confess that I do not believe S. 418, as amended, will correct America's pollution problem.

It will be recalled that on one occasion this House took a great constructive step forward in clean streams legislation by voting to incorporate a provision called the Mundt amendment which would stop new sources of pollution from being injected into streams. S. 418, as amended, does not even stop new sources of pollution from being injected into streams which are presently clean, to say nothing of its failure to outlaw and prohibit prevailing pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much this legislation is brought up in the manner it is at this time. I know that some of the Members who speak in support of the legislation also are regretful it has to be brought up under these conditions which do not provide for the offering of amendments. A suspension of the rules is a gag rule supreme insofar as offering amendments is concerned. All amendments are completely barred.

Unfortunately, the condition here today also does not permit of a careful study of this bill. If a careful study of S. 418, as amended, were permitted I am sure it would not secure a hundred votes of the Members of this House, because, in the first place, we find that the most active people who have been advocating clean streams legislation in America for the past 12 years are opposed to this bill. You even find some people who have been engaging in pollution are opposed to it because of the wasteful manner in which it spends public money without even quarantining the pollution problem to its present boundaries in a realistic effort to keep the epidemic from becoming worse.

I feel that today a member of the Appropriations Committee should be speaking here instead of I, because, certainly, here is a chance where you can save the taxpayers' money without jeopardizing the peace, without reducing foreign assistance, or without endangering any particular project in anyone's home community. Here is a place where a vast amount of public money is to be spent with no conceivable possibility of it achieving its announced objective of eliminating pollution.

Let me put it in this form: I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], or any of the other good economy-minded Members of the House, and that should include all of us these days, would vote to appropriate a hundred million dollars, for example, to start building a factory, while one wing of that factory was still on fire and before you called the fire department to put out the fire. In other words, before you had done anything whatsoever to stop the spread of the flames would you appropriate money to put the carpenters to work to put up a new building? Of course, you would not, but today in this bill you are being asked to do exactly that in the expenditure of public funds.

Because of the haste of the moment and the inadequate time to study the bill, we have the Senate bill as amended by the House bill, which proposes to spend well over a hundred million dollars to correct the pollution problem while in no single sentence or paragraph is pollution condemned or stopped. In other words, it does not prevent the problem from growing worse. It just puts the carpenters to work rebuilding a house which is burning without even calling the fire department.

Mr. Speaker, we plead with the committee, we urged it to incorporate a simple amendment which this House had previously approved by roll-call vote to stop new outlets of pollution from being injected into interstate waters while we are spending vast sums of the public money trying to correct the problem. We simply begged the committee to so legislate that the conditions of pollution could not steadily grow worse while we are spending money trying to make them better. The committee objected to that and by ingenious device it has transferred to the shoulders of the American taxpayer and the Federal Government virtually all of the potential costs and responsibility of pollution correction because by skillful language appearing in the House version, which does not appear in the Senate bill, they have transferred to the Federal Government the necessity of making research, the responsibility of finding correctives, and even the responsibility of financing the corrective steps and construction.

Let me read you the language on page 17 to show how ingeniously this bill loads onto the backs of the American taxpayer virtually not only the responsibility of pollution correction, but also much of the cost. On page 17, lines 12 to 16, is this very clever language that some polluter schemed up one night and is now trying to saddle onto the taxpayers of your district. I hope you members of the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will listen to this:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress * * * to provide Federal technical services to State and interstate agencies and to industries, and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities, in the formulation and execution of their stream pollution abatment programs.

I suggest that this bill be defeated so that the next Congress can write a clean legitimate antipollution bill, which will produce reasonable dividends in clean streams for the vast expenditures which somebody must eventually make to save America's waters from becoming permanent cesspools and flowing sewers.

Mr. Speaker, if I could find one ray of hope in S. 418 as amended which would cause me to believe that the net result of this legislation would be to hurry the day when America's streams and interstate waters might be rescued from the menace of greedy pollution, I would be happy to support this bill even in its toned-down and milk-toast approach to the pollution problem. But, sir, I very much fear that S. 418 is a step backward away from a correct solution to the pollution problem rather than a step forward toward cleaner and more wholesome streams.

Insofar as it spends public funds studying a problem which has already been studied, and surveyed, and analyzed for nearly a century without making one single, solitary, definite, and effective provision against either stopping new sources of pollution from becoming operative or toward reducing the huge amounts of prevailing pollution which industries and municipalities are now vomiting into America's waters, I feel that S. 418 is a backward step.

Insofar as S. 418 tends to transfer from the offending industries and municipalities the responsibilities for correcting this pollution practice and for sustaining research activities for reducing the deleterious effects of their own pollution, I fear this legislation is a backward step.

Insofar as S. 418 places on the statute books a law calling itself a Water Pollution Control Act but failing to include among its provisions an iota of control by which the Federal Government can require the abatement of pollution, I fear it is a backward step since this red herring will henceforth make it more difficult to have effective legislation written into law.

It is eloquently noticeable, Mr. Speaker, to those of us who have long labored in favor of adequate and effective legislation, that S. 418 has the blessing and the approval of America's worst polluters. It should mean much to many of you to observe that the polluters' lobby which has successfully beat back all our efforts across the past decade to enact adequate and effective antipollution legislation is strangely silent and conspicuously absent today. Mr. Speaker, these polluters know a red herring when they see one and S. 418 is the long-awaited answer to the polluter's prayer. It will not

stop pollution. It will not outlaw or prevent new sources of pollution. It will not even protect what virgin streams and clean waters there remain in America. But the polluters believe and I believe that this legislation will work to stop new attempts to write effective legislation, that it will protect present pollution practices, and that it will buy polluters additional time to practice their pagan program without being subjected to a workable formula for eliminating unjustifiable pollution.

Mr. Speaker, just this month the State division of the Izaak Walton League of South Dakota, of which I am proud to be a member, held its convention in Webster, S. Dak., and as one of its resolutions opposed the passage of S. 418 as amended, for the reason I have set forth here this afternoon. Mr. Kenneth A. Reid, conservation director of the National Division of the Izaak Walton League has pointed out the fallacies and the futility of S. 418, as amended, and has voiced the League's opposition to such a sham attack upon the shameful practice of pollution. To many reasonable legislators, it would seem that when the conservationists of America and its clean-streams advocates oppose a bill, erroneously labeled a "Water pollution control act," and when the polluters of America favor that bill, there must be good cause to question the efficacy and the adequacy of such a legislative proposal.

It is with reluctance that I am forced to vote against legislation bearing the antipollution label, Mr. Speaker, after having crusaded for a proper and a positive pollution-control bill for 10 years in Congress and for many other years outside of Congress. But Mr. Speaker, a bill must be judged by its text and its provisions, by its supporters and its opponents, by its contents and its conclusions. The label on the bill is not sufficient. Pollution cannot be cured in America by a headline or a title or by the label on an act of Congress. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, until and unless we have an opportunity to vote on legislation which moves positively forward toward the correction of this country's very serious pollution problem, I shall vote against measures which speak loudly but carry a bent twig in their attack on pollution. I shall do so in the hope that some day Congress may have before it a measure which will really deal effectively with a problem which has already been too long neglected.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that Members are too preoccupied with other matters in these closing hours of Congress to devote careful and sustained attention to this pollution problem. Even if every Member now on the floor voted against S. 418, it could still be approved by the votes of those who will not hear the arguments against it, due to their having to be absent from the floor for important committee duties in these crowded times. Consequently, while I shall vote against this proposal, I shall not detain the House by demanding a yea-and-nay vote. I realize full well that today I am engaged in a futile task of opposition. I do however want the record to show these arguments against S. 418, as amended by the House, with the hope that the Senate may insist on its original legislation and that, regardless, in the next Congress we can correct the manifold inadequacies of the pending legislation, which when clearly understood can bring little solace or comfort to anybody other than the pollution forces of America.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I respond to the argument of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] who has spoken in opposition to this bill by saying, first, that the bill he introduced, H. R. 3990, provided—and listen to what I say—for authorization for appropriations not to exceed $100,000,000 annually for an indefinite time. The testimony before our committee showed that the cost of stream pollution would probably aggregate $1,600,000,000 to $4,000,000,000. If the gentleman advocates economy, it strikes me that he certainly should favor the pending bill, because the pending bill limits the appropriation that may be made over a period of 5 years to a total of approximately $126,000,000.

Secondly, he states that the pending bill does not prevent new sources of pollution. That is one of the vices of the bill that the gentleman himself introduced this session. He has introduced previous bills. I know that he is for the improvement of our streams, for fishing and conservation and so am I, but for my part and the part of the committee we decided that if in any State a municipality wanted an outlet, whether that municipality be large or small, if there was to be a small or large new industry, they should not have to come to Washington and get permission to establish a new outlet. He has very correctly stated that we decided to leave the matter of a new outlet where it belongs, to wit, to the stream-pollution and the sanitary or public-health boards of the States. We have enough bureaucracy requiring citizens to come to Washington for Federal approval for local works. He complains that this bill provides for Federal construction at Federal expense. Whether the gentleman has refreshed his memory or not, the very bill that he introduced would have provided a loan of the entire amount of the construction by the Federal Government or for a grant without any probability of it being repaid, of millions and millions of dollars, to many municipalities. This bill says that that proposal is unsound. This bill says that the primary trouble in the matter of pollution is not in the intrastate streams controlled by the State boards but in the interstate streams like the Ohio River, and I give you that as an example, where, if the city of Cincinnati undertakes to provide sewerage, a city in West Virginia or in Kentucky, across the river, might endanger that disposal that has been made. This bill for the first time treats this problem constructively and undertakes to provide so that we may have the example to go by in the years to come, for assistance to States, for assistance to municipalities and other public bodies, in further providing sewage disposal, on interstate streams.

I call your attention to this. Under the gentleman's bill, the steel companies or the big industries of the United States could have come to Washington for a loan. We have stricken that in this bill.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will yield, that is not in my bill. It may be in somebody else's bill, but it is not in mine.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is in the gentleman's bill. I mean loans to industries. There are no grants to industries in the gentleman's bills, but I repeat there are loans to industries. I have the comparison here. It provided for loans to industries and as I have stated it did not provide for grants to industries.

I have studied this problem. Bills have been introduced for years with respect to pollution. All of us are against pollution, just as all of us are against sin. But when you come to look into this matter, it has resolved itself into these two propositions: First, whether or not the local municipalities and public bodies shall construct their sewage systems, and the handling or treatment of sewerage is pretty well perfected. Secondly, whether industry shall be required under the regulations in the States to construct their own industrial disposal plants. We have provided in this bill for a laboratory. There are colleges and universities that are providing for studies for the disposal of industrial waste, which is the big problem, and for other waste. The solution has been perfected with respect to sewerage disposal, but when it comes to the disposal of industrial and other waste and especially sewerage disposal in interstate waters, we have here provision for a laboratory, already established and to be continued at Cincinnati. We have provided an authorization of $800,000 a year, so that the Government will not go into this matter blindly, but that we may have the laboratory and the experiments conducted there, and they may be made available to the municipalities of the United States. Information will be distributed to them to enable them to construct their programs.

Another thing, we provide for loans in this bill, but we provide that those loans shall be one-third of the cost, in no case to exceed $200,000. Do you know that some cities in the United States have gotten $15,000,000 to $18,000,000 for the construction of their sewage systems in the war and WPA days? They are better able to construct them than the Federal Government. We say to cities like Cincinnati and other great cities in this country, "You are better able to construct your city disposal plant than the Federal Government." But they say, "If we do, the small towns up the river may not make similar arrangements." We provide for loans and aid to those small towns for one-third of the cost of their projects, one-third of the cost of preparing the plants and for supervision, not to exceed $200,000.

Pollution bills have been introduced every session. They have kept a good many people employed or interested in the United States. We are all interested

in the preservation of our streams. No man likes to fish or hunt more than I. But you have to choose often whether you are going to fish or build a plant. You have to choose whether the Federal Government is going to provide city disposal or whether the municipalities will provide it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is constructive and in the right direction, to solve the general problem of stream pollution.

I extend to say stream pollution bills have been introduced in practically every session of the Congress since 1897. Bills to approve compacts among the States to prevent pollution have been passed. Bills have been reported. The Barkley-Vinson bill, as I recall, was passed by the House in 1936 and died in the Senate. About 10 years ago a stream pollution bill introduced by Senator BARKLEY and Representative Fred M. Vinson, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President because the budgetary provisions of the bill were inadequate, in the view of the President.

Hearings have been repeatedly conducted by the committees of the House and the Senate. During the Eightieth Congress bills were introduced in the Senate by Senator TAFT, Senator BARKLEY, and in the House by the gentleman from South Dakota, Representative MUNDT, the gentleman from Kentucky, Representative SPENCE, and the gentleman from Ohio, Representative ELSTON. Hearings before both the House and the Senate committees are available.

The Mundt bill was H. R. 3990. The Taft-Barkley bill passed by the Senate was S. 418. The House Committee on Public Works gave most careful consideration and finally decided to report as a substitute for S. 418 the bill under consideration. It provides for striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the House bill.

Stream pollution arises largely from sewage disposal and industrial waste. The bill as passed by the Senate provided for no grants to States, cities, or other public bodies. The Mundt bill provided for grants. Both the Senate and the Mundt bill provided for loans to States, municipalities, and public bodies. The Mundt bill did not restrict the amount, while the Senate bill provided for loans of one-third of the estimated cost. Both the Senate and the Mundt bills provided for loans to industrial enterprises. Both bills provided interstate compacts.

PENDING BILL

I suggest that the Members of the House read the report of the committee. There is an excellent analysis of the substitute bill and a careful statement as to the changes made by the House in the Senate bill.

I summarize by saying:

One. The Senate bill authorized appropriations amounting to $100,000,000 per year. The House substitute authorizes loans of $20,000,000 annually for 5 years. Loans to any one agency are limited to $200,000.

Two. There is an authorization for investigations and research to the States amounting to $1,000,000 annually for 5 years. There are authorizations for grants for $1,000,000 for 5 years for engineering and planning. The bill is confined to interstate streams and the tributaries of such streams as they affect States other than those in which the tributaries are located.

Three. The bill authorizes no loans or grants to private citizens, or to industry.

THE PROBLEM

First. The problem of stream pollution is important. The treatment of city disposal has been fairly well perfected. The bill contemplates that all cities shall provide their own disposal plants. Their indebtedness is less than that of the Federal Government. For needy cities a maximum loan of $200,000 is provided.

Second. The bill contemplates that all industries provide their own disposal plants.

Third. A laboratory at Cincinnati is to be maintained. The information as a result of the studies will be available to public bodies and to industry, on interstate streams.

Fourth. Grants are authorized to assist public bodies in making plans.

Fifth. Stream pollution is a problem for the States. The bill, therefore, is limited to interstate streams, as defined. While the Senate bill would have authorized appropriations of $100,000,000 annually for an indefinite period, the pending bill, as a constructive solution of a difficult problem, authorizes approximately $126,000,000 over a period of 5 years, primarily for loans and for administration. There is a limit to the authorization.

Research has done much to remove and prevent pollution and industrial waste. Chemicals do pollute. Mines pollute. Pollution should be eliminated whenever and wherever possible. While means of treatment for sewage disposal have been perfected, the methods of preventing industrial waste is still being perfected. Today on some streams it is either industry with its pollution eliminated as far as possible, or the streams without industry.

The bill is constructive. The problem is with the States, municipalities, and public bodies. The Government will cooperate to prevent and to eliminate pollution where local public bodies are unable to eliminate. If the problem is solved on interstate streams, it can later be extended to other streams. The bill is a safe approach, and if successfully administered, the program may be extended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

May I ask the gentleman to yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as has been correctly stated, this bill does not undertake, as did the bill of my delightful friend from South Dakota, to exercise any jurisdiction over any intrastate streams, except those streams that may be tributaries to interstate streams like the Ohio River. It is up to the Administration to decide how far up those streams, whether 5 or 10 or 15 miles, their influence extends.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are told in the book of Genesis:

> In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.

God created the waters before He created the light. Nature has furnished man a pure supply of water ever since that time. But man has polluted that water, and in many cases made it unfit for human consumption. For 16 years I have endeavored to have some constructive legislation put upon the statute books to control pollution. The only piece of legislation that has been put on the books is that authorizing a compact between the eight States in the Ohio Valley to make agreements to control pollution in that section. In those 16 years, there is not a section, a sentence, or a word attempting to commence the process of giving relief to those people affected by water pollution. I want to tell you why I am interested in this, and I think it is characteristic of many other sections of the United States. The Ohio River is locked and dammed for the purpose of navigation. In the summer time, these pools do not consist of running water. They are stagnant cesspools. They are the outfall sewers of all the cities on the Ohio River. That pool which extends from about 4 miles below Cincinnati to Coney Island, about 8 miles above the city, takes the domestic sewage and industrial waste of that great section, the domestic sewage of 800,000 people at least, and the industrial waste of a section which might be called the Ruhr of America. Out of that pool comes the water supply of the people. That condition exists, not alone in that section, but in other sections of the United States, where they are afflicted in the same way. It is a dangerous source of disease and epidemics. It is horrible to contemplate that that is the source of water of the people along that great river. Thomas Jefferson once said it was the most beautiful river in the world. Now its value in many respects is practically destroyed by pollution. Wild life no longer seeks it. Fish and all aquatic life have either been destroyed or made unfit for human consumption. Men have always sought to make their habitations upon sites near the river, but in many sections I do not think they would now seek the Ohio for this purpose.

Cincinnati is a rich town. It has a great waterworks system and a great filtration plant. It can in a sense protect itself against the pollution of that river. Yet with new industries you can distinguish a difference in the taste of the water. But on the Kentucky side of the river there are many small towns. They have no money to build filtration plants, and they do not have the great waterworks system that they have in the great cities. They dig a deep well, pump the water into the tank, chlorinate it, and use it. It has been demonstrated

that these subterranean waters because of percolating waters from the river are highly polluted.

This is not a political question. This is a question that affects every man, woman, and child who is dependent upon this river for water. It is a question to which you should give very careful and sympathetic consideration.

I know there have been quibbles as to where the responsibility is, whether it is on the Federal Government or on State, county, and city. I think there is a joint responsibility, but we cannot have this pollution controlled unless the Federal Government steps into the picture. The States and local subdivisions could no more control pollution of the river than they could control the rivers for purposes of navigation or flood control. It is necessarily a national question. The Public Health Service is greatly interested in the passage of this bill. They have done a great work. Some years ago I introduced a bill providing for a pollution survey of the Ohio Valley.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SPENCE. That survey has been made. It is pioneer work in that field. It consists of three great volumes. They now know the pollutive substances that are in that river. They know how to treat them. I believe if you put this bill upon the statute books, it would be at least a commencement in the cleaning up of the river. If it needs amendment, we can amend it in the future.

I hope you will vote for the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the legislation that is before the House today is the culmination of more than 50 years of work. On many occasions stream pollution bills have been introduced in Congress. One of these bills was passed and was vetoed for a budgetary reason; one died in conference; and at our last session we were unable to complete the then pending bill.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] apparently is the only one who is raising any objection to this legislation. If we had an opportunity to examine the bill that he introduced and the bill before us today, we would find that substantially there is only one real difference and that concerns new outlets of pollution.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be absurd to compel a new industry to indicate in advance that it may pollute a stream. You might as well expect a new industry to indicate in advance that it is not going to violate the antitrust laws or any other laws.

If there are any outlets of pollution from new industries, they can be taken care of the same as existing pollution would be handled under this bill.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] made a point that there had been a survey of the Ohio Valley. That survey cost $600,000 and was authorized by Congress. What the gentleman did not mention, because of lack of time, was that the report indicated that the Ohio River is polluted to such an extent that 30 public sources of water supply serving about 1,660,000 people are endangered.

I think it is important to consider, so far as enforcement is concerned, that nine States in the Ohio Valley have entered into a sanitation compact. They have agreed to be sued, to make their States and their subdivision susceptible to mandamus, injunction, specific performance, or any remedy that might be exercised in the courts, all with a view to eliminating water pollution.

The pending bill does not have a semblance of bureaucracy about it. There is not a single step that is taken under the pending bill that is not first authorized by some State agency, either by the public-health service of the State or some agency that may be designated by the State's public-health authority. Only in the final analysis, after it has been impossible for the States to enforce the law, is the Attorney General of the United States authorized to bring action in the United States court, and he cannot act without the consent of the State.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does this take all actual responsibility away from cities and States and place it in the Federal Government?

Mr. ELSTON. Not at all; not at all.

This bill authorizes the appropriation of $126,000,000 over a period of 5 years; $100,000,000 of this amount is in the form of loans to the States and their subdivisions at 2-percent interest. So it results in no cost to the Federal Government except the $26,500,000 over a period of 5 years. When, therefore, the gentleman from South Dakota talks about huge appropriations I hope you will bear in mind that those loans are repayable to the Federal Government.

It was pointed out by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] how impossible it is for some of the smaller cities and towns to provide sewage disposal plants. The city of Cincinnati is today ready to spend more than $20,000,000 for a sewage disposal plant, but the money will be wasted if the cities across the river, with a population of approximately 175,000 people are unable to finance sewage disposal plants:

I say therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is long overdue. This bill has been thoroughly considered by the Committee on Public Works of the House and by the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] is a member, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] is chairman. The Committee on Public Works voted unanimously for this bill and the subcommittee that reported this bill voted unanimously for it. The gentleman from South Dakota was heard before the committee, and all persons were heard who wantted to be heard, both the proponents and the opponents of the bills under consideration. After full and careful review of all of the evidence submitted this bill is the result. It amends the Senate bill in some respects, but not to an appreciable extent. The Senate bill passed that body unanimously.

On a number of occasions I have urged favorable action upon bills to eliminate water pollution. I heartily endorse the pending bill. Further delay in the passage of legislation on this subject will seriously endanger the health of millions of people.

Many Members are familiar with the history of stream-pollution legislation. Water pollution control bills were first introduced in the Fifty-fifth Congress in the year 1897. Continuously since that time efforts have been made to obtain this much-needed legislation without success, during all of which time water pollution has become more aggravated until today only a miracle prevents a serious epidemic in many areas of the country. Perhaps no area has been jeopardized more than the Ohio Valley. At times legislation has been imperiled because of the failure of all groups interested in the elimination of water pollution to agree on enforcement methods. These groups having now arrived at an understanding, I sincerely trust there will be no difficulty in obtaining favorable House action on the bill now pending.

From the standpoint of economy the cost of this legislation is negligible as compared with the great good it will accomplish. Only by the passage of legislation of this kind can the health of the Nation be safeguarded. Under the provisions of the pending bill two-thirds of the cost of sewage-disposal plants erected by public bodies must be assumed by local communities before a loan from the Federal Government can be obtained. No outright grants-in-aid are provided for and private industries cannot even make a loan from the Government. Under the terms of the bill before us, out of the total of $25,300,000 authorized to be appropriated per year for 5 years, $20,000,000 per year is in the form of loans which must be repaid with interest at 2 percent.

State laws alone are inadequate to deal with the situation. Because of the navigation dams in the Ohio River which retard the natural flow of the water the river has become a series of cesspools, particularly near the larger cities. It is near one of these cesspools that Cincinnati, Ohio; Covington, Newport, Bellevue, Dayton, and Ludlow, Ky., across the river from Cincinnati, obtain their water supply. It has been demonstrated that there are times when fish cannot survive in this pool. The city of Cincinnati has spent a large sum of money on a modern waterworks, and is ready to spend more than $20,000,000 additional for an improved system. But I submit that there is a limit beyond which sewage cannot be treated. Moreover, it is almost useless for Cincinnati, or any other city, to spend large sums on sewage-treatment works if neighboring cities are unable to cooperate. In many

places in the Ohio Valley the safety limit is being exceeded. As an example, a survey showed that along the 90-mile stretch between Pittsburgh, Pa., and Wheeling, W. Va., the average coli count was 125,000 to the pint. At one place it was as high as 405,000. The limit of safety is 100,000. Below Louisville the coli count has ranged from an average of 320,000 to a maximum of 1,200,000. Every conceivable effort has been made to deal with the subject and great progress has been made. Whereas there were only two disposal plants in the Ohio Valley Basin in 1900, by the end of 1930 there were 200, with 300 more being added during the next 10 years. I am informed that in the Ohio River Valley municipal sewage has been treated as much as 74 percent in the State of Illinois; 62 percent in the State of Indiana; 23 percent in Kentucky; 73 percent in New York; 47 percent in Ohio; 17 percent in Pennsylvania; and 8 percent in West Virginia. But it is obvious that this is far from enough. As I have pointed out, it is useless for one city to operate a sewage-treatment plant if nearby cities fail to do so. Only by the enactment of legislation of this kind can real results be accomplished. Tragic consequences may be the price of delay.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the report of the Ohio River committee dated April 20, 1943, upon a survey of the Ohio River and its tributaries for pollution control. This was an exhaustive survey, carried on by virtue of an appropriation of Congress, and the report was submitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers of the War Department. It was referred to by the Chief of Engineers as the most complete and comprehensive examination ever made into the sanitary conditions of a major river and its tributaries. About 5 years were required to obtain and analyze the voluminous field data necessary for a sound study of the complicated problems involved, to consider the technical, financial, and other associated questions, and to develop a plan for remedial improvements. The Corps of Engineers and the Public Health Service were in full collaboration at all times on this comprehensive pollution report. I would particularly direct the attention of the committee to the first part of syllabus 1 of that report wherein it was pointed cut that practically all streams in the Ohio River Basin are polluted by domestic and industrial wastes; that the Ohio River proper is polluted to such an extent that 30 public sources of water supply serving about 1,660,000 people are endangered. In this connection it should be remembered that the streams of the Ohio Basin furnish water for 7,000,000 people and it is used for the disposal of sewage by 8,500,000 people.

It should be borne in mind that the construction of sewage-disposal plants is not beneficial solely to the municipalities or other public bodies erecting them. Benefits necessarily accrue to all persons living along the stream and within an area which would be affected if such treatment works were not built. In this connection the attention of the House is directed to the fact that much of the contamination of the Ohio River is due to the system of locks and dams constructed and maintained by the Federal Government. By retarding the natural flow of the water, conditions are greatly aggravated. The Ohio River as a navigable stream is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government so far as the regulation of commerce is concerned. Contamination of the river is obviously detrimental to transportation on the river. It could scarcely be contended that the general health of the Nation or any large segment thereof is purely a local problem. Under the circumstances the clearing of our navigable waterways is primarily an obligation of the Federal Government.

I believe it is just as essential that the Federal Government make some contribution toward the elimination of water pollution as it is for the Federal Government to contribute to the building and maintenance of highways and of locks and dams on navigable streams. In each case there is a service to the general public. As to highways and locks and dams the contribution is in the interest of transportation and commerce and the safety and convenience of the traveling public. As to the elimination of stream pollution the contribution is in the interest of public health. I submit that as between the two classes of cases public health is the more important.

Of particular significance in connection with the pending bill is the fact that the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Compact entered into between the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Virginia has now been adopted by all of these States. Under this compact each of the signatory States pledges to each other faithful cooperation in the control of future pollution and in the abatement of existing pollution from the streams in the Ohio River Basin. Each agrees to enact necessary legislation to enable each such State to place and maintain the waters of the Ohio Basin in a satisfactory sanitary condition.

A commission made up of representatives from the 9 States appointed by their respective Governors is empowered, among other things, to give notice to any municipality, corporation, or other entity discharging pollution into a stream to discontinue the practice. If the order of discontinuance is not obeyed provision is made to enforce compliance by going into any court of general jurisdiction or into the United States district court in any of the signatory States. Such courts shall have jurisdiction by way of mandamus, injunction, special performance, or other form of remedy to enforce any abatement order.

The adoption of this compact will go a long way toward the elimination of pollution from streams in the Ohio Basin. In the Potomac Valley there is a similar compact and other areas will no doubt follow.

The enforcement provisions of these compacts, plus the general laws of the States and municipal ordinances, as well as the enforcement provisions contained in this bill, should be assurance that pollution abatement is now certain. Particularly is this true in view of those provisions of this act which provide for loans to municipalities or other public bodies unable to finance and maintain sewage treatment or disposal works.

This proposed legislation is long overdue. It is the final step toward the solution of an increasingly serious problem concerning the health of the Nation.

In order that the House may be more fully advised with respect to the activities of the Public Health Service, I ask, Mr. Speaker, for unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a letter from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, dated June 11, 1948:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES H. ELSTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELSTON: This is in reply to your inquiry regarding the development and use of the Water and Sanitations Investigation Station at Cincinnati, Ohio, especially with reference to housing and equipment.

This field laboratory station was established in 1913 for the purpose of conducting essential research in the fields of water supply, sewage treatment, and water pollution. The public health aspects of these problems have been emphasized. The laboratory was developed to meet the request for assistance from States and industries. The Cincinnati station is the only Federal facility of this type in existence. Since its establishment the laboratory has been housed in the old Marine Hospital building, a converted residence of about 15,000 square feet, at East Third and Kilgour Streets. These ill-suited quarters, inadequate from the start, have seriously handicapped research and investigations. Since 1935 inadequacies in space and equipment have been such that only the more pressing problems presented by States and industries could be handled. Practically all of the much needed basic research work at the Station had to be suspended. As additional exigencies devolved upon the Public Health Service, it has been necessary to resort to makeshift laboratory space at other cities throughout the country.

In 1938 the inefficiencies resulting from lack of adequate quarters and facilities became sufficiently acute to warrant the attention of the Congress, and resulted in the inclusion of funds for a basic research unit in the Public Buildings Administration appropriation. Legal difficulties in site acquisition prevented inauguration of construction prior to the prewar emergency. These difficulties have been resolved. The proposed site is Government-owned, and preliminary plans have been completed. The current Public Buildings Administration construction estimate for the facility is approximately $4,000,000. Construction of a suitable facility would permit consolidation of the present widely dispersed staff in a properly designed building to do a much more effective job.

At the present time treatment processes for many of our more important industrial wastes have not been developed. For example effective and practical treatment still has to be worked out for wastes resulting from the manufacture of synthetics (notably plastics), products of nuclear fission, and even the wastes from such a common and extensive industry as food canning. In instances where treatment costs of industrial byproduct wastes are exorbitant, it is often possible in working with industry to reclaim waste products for beneficial use. A striking

example is the work done with distilleries where reclaimed products from wastes are used for stock feeds.

Pollution problems relating to irrigation water, shellfish production, and bathing and recreational facilities are dependent upon laboratory and field investigations for their satisfactory solution. There is some question of the soundness of present standards governing controls in these fields.

The existing responsibilities of the Public Health Service in the fields of water, sewage, industrial wastes, and milk and food require a research facility of the type proposed. Such a center is an absolute necessity to the successful prosecution of a comprehensive water pollution control program. For instance the Public Health Service, through the Cincinnati station, regularly works with the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, on pollution and water-use problems in multipurpose reservoir developments. The Ohio River Survey (H. Doc. No. 266) is an example in point. Work is in progress in the Gulf Coast States on control of water hyacinths and other disrupting aquatic vegetation. Several programs are under way with the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri and Columbia River Basins. The Cincinnati laboratory does the technical surveys and work on industrial pollution for the International Joint Commission with Canada. Applied research in septic-tank design for rural and suburban nonsewered areas is now under way for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Technicians at the station are working with the Atomic Energy Commission on problems relating to radioactive wastes. Investigations on pollution of shellfish in the New England States are currently being made. Similarly, assistance is provided industrial establishments such as the recently completed industrial-waste guides covering more than 15 major-type industries. However, the paucity of space and equipment materially restricts the degree of assistance that can be rendered. Further, little is being done on basic work where additional knowledge is essential.

The Public Health Service has approached this entire problem with a view of conducting research and investigations that are generally beyond the resources of the individual States. Public Health Service work is supplemental to, rather than a substitute for, the work carried on by the respective State pollution-control agencies.

In carrying out its responsibilities in water-pollution control, the Public Health Service proposes to approach the problem by major watersheds. In cooperation with the proper Federal and State agencies concerned, the plan is to catalog the main stream and its tributaries as to total water use, establish stream standards for the various segments, and work with the State agencies in effecting corrective measures. The success of this program will be largely dependent upon the quality, character, and extent of research and technical field-service activities which are being developed at the Cincinnati station.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. SCHEELE,
Surgeon General.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a letter from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.)

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate bill S. 418 as amended in the House Committee on Public Works. From the earliest days the rivers and streams of this country have been among its greatest assets. We not only depend upon the larger streams for transportation, but an unpolluted stream, whether large or small, is a source of pleasure, convenience, and to a certain extent a source of wealth, to every landowner whose land abuts on the stream. These streams provide moisture for crops in the lowlands, drinking water for cattle and stock, provide fishing and wildlife for the area, and boating, swimming and other recreational facilities which add much to the pleasure and comfort of the community. On the other hand a polluted stream not only does not furnish these pleasures, comforts, and conveniences, but it is actually a nuisance of the worst sort, and a source of annoyance as well as disease, and instead of being an asset to the adjoining landowner, it actually detracts from the value of his land, and becomes an abomination.

It is evident that the means and instrumentalities which have heretofore been relied upon to deal with stream pollution have not been adequate, and have failed to control it. Instead of being reduced, stream pollution, I believe, is on the increase. One of the unfortunate features of stream-pollution control under present conditions is the fact that where one municipality, one county, or one section, may apply itself diligently to the problem, another community or area either up the stream or down the stream may fail to refuse to take action, and this failure or refusal to take action, nullifies all the good work which may be done by one or more forward-looking cities or communities on the banks of a particular stream. I believe the general scheme of this bill is to encourage cooperation in the control of stream pollution throughout the entire length of a stream. It not only provides for the control and elimination of stream pollution insofar as interstate waters are concerned, but includes tributaries of such interstate waters, and that means that the aid provided for in this bill will be available for pollution control and elimination, for instance, not only of the Chattahoochee River in Georgia, but also of its tributary streams, and of streams that flow into the Flint River and the Apalachicola River.

The bill deals with the subject of stream pollution as a matter relating to the public health and welfare, and to a large extent, and I think wisely so, places the control and administration of the program under the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. This bill deals with stream pollution by discharges of sewage, industrial waste, or other substances which may deleteriously affect the waters into which such substances are discharged.

Provision is made for the appropriation over a 5-year period of approximately $120,000,000 to finance the program. Under section V of the bill the Federal Works Administrator is authorized, subject to the provisions of section IX (c) of the bill, to make loans to States, municipalities, and other municipal subdivisions—which in my opinion includes counties—up to the sum of $200,000, for the construction of the necessary treatment works, to prevent the discharge by such State or municipal subdivision of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into interstate waters or into a tributary of such waters, and also for the preparation of engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

I believe that this bill will effectively encourage the elimination of stream pollution throughout the entire length of a stream, and will encourage elimination of stream pollution by smaller cities and towns, which in the past, may have found the burden too large to be carried by themselves alone. I believe that it will produce returns throughout the entire country in the form of increased good health, increased sanitation, increased recreational facilities, increased land values, and all these items will add up to increased pleasure, satisfaction and contentment on the part of our people. In my opinion this is a very meritorious bill, and one which deserves our wholehearted support.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, for many years, since I have been a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and recently the Committee on Public Works, a number of bills have been introduced each year on this subject. Long hearings were held on four bills which were presented this year. They were considered together and the committee was able to work out the bill which we present to you here for consideration.

I think, generally speaking, this is a good bill and urge the Members of the House to vote for it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question. I have not had an opportunity to go fully into this bill. Is provision made for loans to industry that are charged with polluting streams, as well as to municipalities?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; no provision is made for loans in the pending bill to industry. Provision is made only for municipalities and other public bodies.

I wish to say further in answer to the gentleman's question that under the Mundt bill provisions were made not for grants but for loans to industry, and the same provision was in the other bills introduced before our body.

Mr. COLMER. A further question, if the gentleman will permit: Where an industry is charged with pollution of a stream, what is the remedy?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The remedy is that before they can operate they have got to comply with the State board of health requirements or with sanitary boards' requirements of the several

States; and according to the hearings conducted over a long period of time there seems to be no desire on the part of industry generally to evade its responsibility.

Mr. COLMER. In other words the procedure would be the same for it as for a public body except there is no provision for loans.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is right.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Except public bodies are given grants in amounts for preparing their plans and specifications and industries are not, but they are furnished information which will be helpful.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. What is the distinction between municipalities or cities as to those which can get a loan under the bill and those that are not eligible?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is no distinction between any municipalities at all. All municipalities as defined by the laws of the several States of the Union are eligible.

Mr. BONNER. I understood the gentleman to say that Cincinnati would not be eligible for aid under this bill but that other cities across the river would be eligible.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I stated Cincinnati would not be eligible for a loan of sixteen or eighteen million dollars so that it could take up substantially one-fifth or one-tenth of the entire authorization. We limit the amount that may be loaned to $200,000 so the large municipalities may be able to construct their own sewage disposal work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, stream pollution has proceeded in our country to a point where something has to be done about it. The pending bill does not go as far as I would like to see it go but it is a good beginning and I shall support it. Legislation on the subject is long overdue. I express the hope that with this beginning, inadequate as I believe it is, we will be launching a program that in time will stop stream pollution and restore the beauty and usefulness of our waterways, large and small.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the members of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works who handled this legislation have done a superior job on the subject they are working with. This bill, if we must have such a law enacted, is far superior to anything I have seen suggested either in this body or the other body. But I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the simple fact that there is no new remedy provided in this legislation for correction of the ills that are confronting places in this country where there is stream pollution except the remedy of financial aid from the Federal Government, so far as I can tell.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Do we not give a remedy in here by giving the facilities of research of the Federal Government to those interested?

Mr. PICKETT. There is not any question that you provide for research; however, you do not provide any remedy except authorization for Federal money. You may enlarge on the scope of activities by the Federal Government to any extent desired, within the limits of the Constitution. You cannot escape the results of such an enlargement; some of which are to increase bureaucracy, the number of employees required to discharge the functions authorized, additional influence and intrusion by the Federal Government through its departments on the affairs of States and local communities and compound the intrusion of bureaucracy into the everyday functions of State and municipal government and the citizens of the United States. If that is what the Congress desires to do, it can be accomplished by the majority.

The hearings on the several bills introduced in the House, which took place last year, occurred before it was my privilege to be a member of the committee. Nevertheless I have studied the various proposals and given more than passing attention to the hearings. Let me call your attention to the fact that on page 142, and the following, there is a table showing what States have enacted laws relative to water pollution control. The table gives other pertinent information. According to my count, 38 of the 48 States in the Union have enacted laws directed toward the control of water pollution and have designated agencies to supervise the work. Thirty-seven of the thirty-eight States permit the issuance of orders and court action under the law. In only 14 of those 38 States is it indicated the law has any deficiency. Most of the criticisms of the various State laws are directed toward the penalty provided for the violation of them. Therefore, at least half the States of the Union have State laws dealing with the water pollution problem that are found to be satisfactory.

It is my information that one of the most serious areas of stream pollution in the United States is the Ohio River. I am also informed that an interstate compact for eight States which the Ohio River and its tributaries border or flow through has been authorized for a number of years, but the States have effected no adequate remedy. There is some indication, therefore, that the several States involved have recognized the existence of a problem, but have failed to supply the remedy because of their own inaction. Could the reason be that notwithstanding we have heard from some of the Representatives of some of those States an expressed opposition to Federal intrusion into State affairs and Federal bureaucracy to control them, those States have been awaiting the opportunity to seek a remedy from the Federal Government?

The hearings on the bills pending before the House Committee on Public Works are replete with evidence that those who spoke for a number of the groups who expressed favorable interest in Federal legislation on water pollution, as well as official representatives from some of the States who appeared before the committee, have no interest in or desire for Federal legislation on this subject unless it authorized a Federal grant-in-aid or some other subsidy. This bill does not satisfy such seekers. I am glad it does not.

I think the bill does go a little further than it should in some respects and does not limit the scope of Federal activity sufficiently in other respects. I shall not discuss all of the objections. One of the major ones of concern to me is the failure of the legislation to limit specifically the extent of activity that may be carried on under the definition of "interstate waters." A number of suggestions can be made to effect the purpose. One of them, to provide that the term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters, and their tributaries, that flow across or form a part of, State or international boundaries; not including tributaries which flow entirely within the boundaries of a State. Then follow that definition by a definition of "intrastate waters" to mean all rivers, lakes, and other waters, or any tributary thereof, which drain or drains an area lying within the boundaries of a State.

The definitions so limiting the meaning of "interstate waters" would eliminate from Federal intrusion and supervision such streams as the Brazos, Colorado, and Trinity Rivers in Texas. Likewise, it would prevent Federal encroachment into the efforts of many of the other States whose antipollution laws are deemed to be satisfactory.

The remedy for pollution lies in the enactment and active enforcement of State laws, as well as the enactment of interstate compacts designed to give aid in the solution of the problem. The remedy is through the legislatures of the several States rather than from Washington. That is aside from the fact that under the laws now in existence a remedy is provided by proper court proceedings for an aggrieved party to file suit and establish his need for relief in a proper forum where it can be secured.

I am sorry time does not permit me to discuss the matter fully. I close with the observation that once the door is open it is far too easy to get this or some succeeding Congress to enlarge greatly upon the purpose of this law and ultimately permit outright Federal control through bureaucratic dictatorship. Such an enlargement on the authorization could result in nothing other than the appropria-

tion of several billions of dollars like that which would be possible if the last Mundt bill were to be enacted into law.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill, S. 418, as completely amended by the House committee, in my opinion, suffers from two major defects: First, it is inadequate; and, second, it is very expensive. I must associate myself with the remarks just made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. He seems to be of the same opinion and suggests, as I do, that this bill lie over until we can get a law with real teeth in it and at far less expense.

The question is, Are we going to provide for the prevention of pollution, both in streams or on ocean shores—which is also important—or are we going to say, as this bill does, that whatever remedy we do attempt to provide is provided by the old familiar remedy of spending more Government money? It seems to me the way to stop pollution in coastal areas and interstate waters is to prohibit it, and to put the burden on those who are polluting it to devise means to stop the damage they are doing. That is certainly not the method adopted by the pending bill.

My own bill, H. R. 5266, I believe to be the sounder approach. To the best of my knowledge, it has not been given real consideration by the committee, and I believe the committee opposes it, or at least parts of it. I shall, nevertheless, continue to press for it at the first opportunity. My bill is endorsed by the National Coast Antipollution and Conservation League and others who are vitally interested in preventing further pollution. It is necessary to take a stronger line against pollution—a menace to our national assets and resources.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think I can assure the gentleman from Texas that this bill will not be such a tremendous boon to anyone, especially to the small cities along the rivers. In my own district, which runs about 150 miles along the Ohio, there are several small communities that will have to struggle to the very limit to meet the terms of this bill. I have, as other gentlemen have indicated here, been very much interested in this legislation for years. We have had it before the committee of the House in some form or another for years. We have done practically everything in the world in our endeavor to clean up these streams. While this is a tremendous undertaking, we must not lost sight of the fact that the results will be tremendously important if we can do what should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this opportunity to support this legislation.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. It is a fact, is it not, that if a municipality under this bill makes a loan, it can only borrow one-third of the amount it proposes to expend?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; and these small municipalities along the Ohio River will have difficulty in meeting that situation.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the chairman of this committee whether or not there is anything in this bill, or how the language can be interpreted, concerning the setting up of State compacts.

Mr. McGREGOR. Under this legislation we are not interfering with that in any way.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But there is no grant except for the making of surveys, studies, research, and so forth.

Mr. McGREGOR. Let me refer to page 19, line 7:

> The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. My only other question is whether or not there is any direct grant except for surveys and studies.

Mr. McGREGOR. There is not, except for research, which includes, of course, surveys and studies. The rest of it is in loans.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me regrettable that this bill (S. 418) is being brought up at this time under suspension of the rules. The whole subject of water pollution is of the greatest interest and concern to my State. I had no notice that this bill was coming up this week. I have had no opportunity to give it study and no opportunity to communicate about it with the public authorities in my State or with interested individuals.

It may be that this measure is quite as unobjectionable as its advocates contend. However, it is a complicated piece of legislation in a field where legislation cannot be easy and where State, municipal, and private interests are involved, as well as the Federal interest, and there should be an apt apportionment of burdens and responsibilities under any legislation. I cannot tell from a casual study whether this bill does aptly apportion the burdens. Therefore, I feel constrained to vote against it. It should certainly have come here under a rule in the normal way, or else it should not come at all. There is no immediate emergency which requires the passage of this bill. It could easily go over till the next Congress.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MUNDT) there were—ayes 138, noes 14.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

House Joint Resolution 641 was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered at Otterbein College a week ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include quotations and various authorities in opposition to the draft.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "The Taft-Hartley Law Maks a Hit."

Mr. LEA (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I arise today in support of more adequate provisions for the aged of our land. There are many many thousands who are now dependent upon the old-age assistance program for their livelihood, and I fear that it is a sorry dependence at best.

I have pending before this Congress bills to liberalize the present program and to establish an actual old-age pension program for our aged American citizens. They were introduced early in the session. But I am not pleading for passage of my bills. I am pleading in the cause of the aged who need help. I shall be glad to see any measure enacted which achieves the purposes of which I speak.

Some months ago an effort was made to secure united action by the authors of pending old-age pension bills. Originally there were 11 of us. All had introduced bills to help the aged. Since then there have been other introducers, and I am confident that a majority of the Congress recognizes the need for a more adequate program of aid for the aged and desires an opportunity to help the aged. I sincerely hope that Congress will not continue to overlook those who need our help so much. We can afford to take a little time to better provide for those who are facing the sunset of life.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore

entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

ARMY HOUSING COSTS IN ALASKA

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated and that I be permitted to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain tables and studies I have prepared, in the form in which they are submitted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives passed an Army-Navy construction authorization bill recently, authorizing the expenditure of $416,000,000 for that purpose.

I am firmly convinced that the Army needs more housing. However, there never was a time during the 14 years I have served in Congress, 12 of which I have served on the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, when I thought that the taxpayers were getting a dollar's worth of housing for the tax dollar. For some months past I have been studying Army housing in Alaska and other overseas areas. Other work on the Appropriations Committee has prevented my finishing the work I began. However, I have progressed far enough in my studies of Army housing in Alaska to make a preliminary report of costs and to give some of my ideas of what we can do about it.

Alaska is today the key position to our national defense. We have to have adequate housing for troops as well as individual housing in Alaska. However, costs as they are today are almost if not prohibitive even when we take into consideration the importance of the program. I shall confine my remarks today entirely to Alaska and shall take up other phases at a later date. I want to discuss the subject in the following order:

First. What is the construction program in Alaska?

Second. Are construction costs, particularly housing costs too high in Alaska?

Third. If so, just why is the cost of such housing too high?

Fourth. Just what, if anything, can we do about it?

WHAT IS THE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN ALASKA AND WHERE ARE THE FUNDS COMING FROM?

The Army proposes to spend $164,533,000 for construction of all kinds in Alaska, of which $88,957,000 is now available. Of this amount $68,519,000 has been spent up to January 31, 1948. This leaves a balance of $20,438,000 out of the $88,957,000 available after January 31, 1948. Of course considerable of this balance has been spent since that time. It also leaves a balance of $75,576,000 out of the $164,533,000 to be appropriated for if the program is to be carried out. The following is a break-down table:

Costs, construction only

	Cost to Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
Completed items	$13,304,000		$13,304,000
Active items	25,454,000	$28,566,000	54,020,000
Supplemental bill items	15,186,000	31,867,000	47,053,000
Deferred items	14,575,000	35,581,000	50,156,000
	68,519,000	96,014,000	164,533,000

WHAT IS THE SOURCE AND AMOUNT OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALASKA CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM?

The following table gives the amount and source of funds now available for Alaska construction program. Exhibit A gives a statement of funds available.

Source and amount of funds available for Alaska construction program

FISCAL YEAR 1946 FUNDS	
From Military Appropriation Act, 1946, approved July 3, 1945—Public Law 126. (Released from budgetary reserve May 1946)	$25,000,000
Withheld for contractors' fees and design costs	1,293,000
Fiscal year 1946 net for construction	23,707,000
From de-obligated fiscal year 1946 ESA funds—for construction	23,045,000
Value of Government-furnished materials	1,749,000
Fiscal year 1946 funds	48,501,000
FISCAL YEAR 1947 FUNDS	
From Military Appropriation Act, 1947, approved July 16, 1946—Public Law 515. Received August 1947	$46,900,000
Withheld for contractors' fees, design costs, permafrost investigations and cost of supervision and administration of construction	6,444,000
Fiscal year 1947 net for construction	40,456,000
FISCAL YEAR 1948 FUNDS	
Funds borrowed from Military Appropriation Act, 1948—Public Law 267, approved July 30, 1947	$2,500,000
Withheld for supervision and administration of prior years' construction program	2,500,000
Fiscal year 1948 net for construction	0
Total funds available for construction	88,957,000

ARE CONSTRUCTION COSTS TOO HIGH IN ALASKA?

I shall give the Congress the facts as to construction costs in Alaska. The Members can then determine for themselves whether I am right when I say that such costs are excessive and extremely high.

I shall give you costs of constructing family housing units at Fort Richardson and at Ladd Field. Fort Richardson is on the ocean side of the mountain range while Ladd Field is on the other side of the range some 400 miles distant. The Alaska Railroad, owned by the Government, connects the two locations. Costs given herein include every cost, such as transportation, building of temporary camps for workers, and so forth. This includes construction only up to and within 5 feet of the building foundation. The following are the costs taken from the tables attached hereto as exhibits A to D. At Fort Richardson—on ocean side of mountain range—we are now building—

CONSTRUCTION ONLY, 1947 FUNDS

(a) Fifty-six noncommissioned officers' family quarters at a total cost of $2,632,000, or an average cost of $47,000 per family unit.

(b) Forty-man bachelor officer quarters at a total cost of $767,000, or an average cost of $19,175 per officer.

(c) Thirty-four civilian quarters at a total cost of $2,012,000, or at an average cost of $59,000 per family unit.

(d) Two enlisted men's barracks for 500 men each or for 1,000 men for the two barracks, $13,257,000, or at an average cost of $13,257 per enlisted man.

(e) Sixteen family quarters for noncommissioned officers, total cost $748,000, or $46,700 per family unit.

(f) Officers' mess for 400 officers at a total cost of $644,000, or an average cost of $1,610 per officer.

(g) Civilian mess for 400 men, total cost, $453,000, or an average of $1,130 per man.

CONSTRUCTION ONLY, 1947 FUNDS

(h) Bachelor noncommissioned officers' quarters, 4 buildings for 40 men each or for a total of 160 men, total cost, $1,856,000, or an average cost of $11,600 per man.

(i) Bachelor noncommissioned officers' quarters, 1 building for 40 men, total cost, $465,000, or an average of $11,560 per man.

(j) Civilian family quarters, 45 buildings to accommodate 2 families each or a total of 90 families, total cost, $4,899,000, or $54,400 per family unit.

(k) One enlisted men's barracks to accommodate 500 men, total cost, $6,733,000, or $13,466 per man.

(l) Bachelor civilian quarters, 2 buildings to accommodate 40 men each or a total of 80 men, total cost $971,000 or an average of $12,100 each.

(m) Family quarters for 24 company officers, total cost $1,266,000 or $52,700 per officer.

(n) Family quarters for 12 field officers, total cost $739,000 or an average of $61,600 per officer.

LADD FIELD CONSTRUCTION, 1946 FUNDS, ACROSS MOUNTAIN RANGE

(a) Thirty-two family quarters for noncommissioned officers, total cost of $1,798,000 or an average cost of $56,200 per family unit.

(b) Twenty-four civilian family quarters total cost $1,424,000 or an average of $59,400 per family unit.

(c) Forty bachelor officer quarters, total cost $634,000 or an average of $15,850 per bachelor officer.

(d) One enlisted men's barracks for 500 men, total cost $7,765,000 or $15,530 per man.

(e) Bachelor civilian quarters for 40 men, total cost $772,000 or $19,300 per bachelor.

(f) Twenty-three noncommissioned officers' quarters, total cost $1,293,000 or an average of $56,200 per family unit.

LADD FIELD, 1947 FUNDS

Fifty-six noncommissioned family quarters at a total cost of $3,136,000 or at an average cost of $56,000 per family unit.

Family quarters for 72 civilians at a total cost of $4,039,000 or $56,000 per family unit.

Bachelor civilian quarters for 80 men with club, $1,655,000.

Family quarters for 60 company officers, total cost $3,764,000 or at an average cost of $62,700 per family unit.

Family quarters for 28 field officers, total cost $2,076,000, or an average cost of $74,100 per field officer.

The above are actual housing costs within 5 feet of the foundation; utilities, roads, and so forth are not included. Cost of utilities, roads, and airports are practically along the same lines.

JUST WHY IS CONSTRUCTION COST IN ALASKA HIGH?

In order to determine just why construction cost is high in Alaska one must analyze such cost item for item. I started with the foundation cost and tried to carry through to the final paint job. Let us take material cost first and then labor cost.

COST OF MATERIAL

To build a house one must first make the excavation for the foundation. That is purely labor and machinery work. The first material is concrete. We have the water and gravel on site but have to buy the cement. I asked the Chief of Engineers of the Army "Where did you buy your cement?" "What did it cost per ton at the source of supply?" "What did it cost you on the building site?" "Who got the difference?" I asked General Wheeler to give me the same information on the cost of each item of material which goes into the building.

I am attaching hereto exhibit B which gives the cost of each item at the source of supply and the cost at destination on site. It also gives each increase of cost between the two points. Let us take a few items:

Cement: Cost $15.90 a gross ton at Billingham, Wash., and $60.61 at Ladd Field. This is four times the cost at point of origin.

Fabricated structural steel: Cost at San Francisco, $185 per ton. Cost at Ladd Field $294 per ton.

Black steel pipe: Cost at Pittsburgh, Pa., $128 per ton. Cost at Ladd Field $240 per ton.

Cast iron pipe: Cost at Birmingham, Ala., $52.30 per ton. Cost at Ladd Field $107.14 per ton.

Plumbing fittings: Cost at Pittsburgh, Pa., $245 per ton. Cost at Ladd Field $384.15 per ton.

General builders hardware: Cost at Chicago $955 per ton. Cost at Ladd Field $1,177.32 per ton.

Reinforced steel: Cost at Emeryville, Calif., $107 per ton. Cost at Ladd Field $187.74.

Seventy-two pound railroad rail: Cost at Seattle $50.40 per ton. Cost at Ladd Field $115.69 per ton.

Steel roof decking: Cost at Seattle $336 per ton. Cost at Ladd Field $421.79.

LUMBER

During the war the Army engineers attempted to obtain lumber at lower cost by rebuilding a sawmill at Wrangell, Alaska, in cooperation with the owner. The Government has billions of feet of very fine hemlock and spruce in Alaska. The Army had furnished approximately $389,000 in cash and equipment, of which $137,000 was cash and the balance was Army and Navy surplus. The Army also paid the owner $152,000 for installation. The total investment we now have is approximately $541,000. It will cost $150,000 to complete the mill. The owner was to furnish the Army 25,000,000 feet of lumber at various prices averaging $52.50 per thousand board feet. The end of the war came and the deal was not completed. The Army is now trying to enter into an agreement with the owner whereby the mill will be completed and Alaska lumber furnished the Army. If this deal goes through we will obtain by contract 225,000,000 board feet at prices considerably below present cost. I have a detailed statement of the proposed prices in my file too long to insert into the RECORD. The following will give a good picture. These prices include an increase over the proposed prices several years ago:

Kiln-dried lumber including flooring, siding, and so forth. Cost at Wrangell, Alaska, $100 per 1,000 feet, board measure. Freight to Seward, $19 per 1,000 feet, board measure. Total cost at Seward, $119 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

Other southeast Alaska mills cost including freight to Seward, $170 per 1,000 feet, board measure, of which $19 is freight to Seward.

Seattle mill cost is $170 per 1,000 feet, board measure, at Seward, Alaska, including $30 freight.

Common lumber: Cost at Wrangell mill, $57 per 1,000 feet, board measure; freight to Seward, $19 per 1,000 feet, board measure. Total cost at Seward, $76 per 1,000 feet, board measure, as against $99 for other southeast Alaska mills and $105 for Seattle mills.

Weighted average cost of all lumber if deal is completed will be $80.30 for Wrangell mill as against $106 for other Alaska mills and $111.50 for Seattle mills. If we can obtain the lumber through this agreement with the Wrangell mill owners we can reduce lumber costs from $26 to $31 per 1,000 feet, board measure, or from 25 to 30 percent. Ten dollars per thousand of this cost will be a reduction of freight costs.

TRANSPORTATION COSTS

One of the items of cost is transportation. The difference in the cost of cement between the point of purchase and Ladd Field is $45 per ton or three times the purchasing price. Of this amount $17 is ocean freight from Seattle to Seward and $20.60 is freight from Seward to Fairbanks, Alaska, at Ladd Field. Cast-iron pipe, for instance, cost $52.30 at Birmingham, Ala. The rail freight from Birmingham to Seattle is $29.90 a ton, the ocean freight from Seattle to Seward is $25 a ton, and the total ocean-rail freight is $106.10 per ton or more than twice the f. o. b. cost at Birmingham. The same is true with regard to practically every other item. Seventy-two-pound railroad rails cost $50.40 a ton at Seattle, Wash. The ocean freight from Seattle to Seward, Alaska, is $25 a ton or 50 percent of the original cost. The ocean-rail freight from Seattle to Anchorage is $48.60 a ton or almost the cost of the rails at Seattle. The ocean-rail freight from Seattle to Fairbanks is $58 a ton or $7.60 more than the cost at Seattle.

FREIGHT RATE ON LUMBER

Ocean freight rate on lumber and similar items is on the basis of measurement ton instead of weight. Forty cubic feet of space is a measurement ton. Forty cubic feet or a measurement ton equal 477 board feet of rough lumber, 600 board feet of finished lumber including flooring, siding, and so forth. Nine hundred square feet of ½-inch plywood make a measurement ton and approximately 1,280 square feet of plasterboard equals a measurement ton. Ocean-rail freight from Seattle to Fairbanks, Alaska, per measurement ton is $33.80 on No. 1 and No. 2 lumber—$67.80 per thousand board feet; $66 per measurement ton or $110 per thousand board feet on hardwood flooring, and $47.20 per measurement ton or $52 per thousand square feet on plywood.

Thus it will be seen that freight rates and particularly ocean transportation is responsible for a large part of the increased cost of construction in Alaska. I am attaching hereto exhibit D which gives a complete break-down on costs of material showing who got every cent of cost from the time the item was purchased at the source of supply until it was delivered on the building site in Alaska. It is my thought that we should scrutinize each item of increased cost carefully with a view of possible reduction of cost.

NEW PORT AT WHITTIER, ALASKA

The freight rate over the Alaska railroad it seems to me is extremely high. In fact the freight rate from Seward to Fairbanks is approximately $20 a ton or $5 more a ton than the cost of cement at the source of supply. I have never been to Alaska. However, I am informed that the railroad bed is in very bad condition. In fact it has never been completed. Due to slides the upkeep is very high. Snow and ice removal cost is almost prohibitive. This is undoubtedly responsible for at least a part of the high freight rate. The Army is building a new port at Whittier, Alaska, which is on the Alaska railroad and an ocean port. It is hoped that when this port is completed it will result in some reduction in the freight rate over that railroad to Fairbanks.

LABOR COSTS

Labor costs are extremely high in Alaska for many reasons. Among the reasons are the cost of recruiting and

transportation. Labor is recruited by the Army mostly from the Seattle area. The minute a worker signs up, his pay starts on a 40-hour a week basis and continues without actual work being done until he is actually on the job in Alaska. Delays due to obtaining a number of men for shipment and delays in transportation are some of the items that add to the cost. The Army estimates the cost of recruiting and transporting a worker to Alaska is $380. The worker must at the end of his contract be returned to the United States. He receives pay from the time he signs up until he arrives on the job and from the time he leaves the job until he arrives at the place of recruitment. All of which cost is paid for time during which the worker does not produce, through no fault of course of his own. The Navy recently testified before our committee, that it cost $1,000 to recruit a worker and get him to the job in Alaska and another $1,000 to get him back to the United States after he had completed his contract. These costs include wages for which no actual work was performed.

I recently asked the Army engineers to send an expert to Alaska and make a complete report on labor costs in Alaska. I specified in detail just what information I wanted. I am attaching this report as exhibit E. The Army engineers estimate that—

(a) Additional cost for recruitment, transportation to and from the job site, overtime work, and housing and mess subsidy, $9,911,500.

(b) Additional cost resulting from inefficiency of submarginal workers among Stateside hires, $1,011,888.

(c) Additional cost due to inefficiency of outside workers during extreme winter of 1946–47, $827,590.

Total, $10,750,978.

There is no question but what we obtain many inefficient workers in Alaska because of the fact that work at good wages is plentiful in the United States and the average worker does not want to leave home and friends to work in the far north. Contractors cannot work a full crew the year around and 6 to 7 months constitute the average work season in the area of Alaska where the Army is now doing work.

There is little I can add to the report made by the Army analyst attached hereto as exhibit D. A careful study of this report should result in greater efficiency methods both as to recruitment and as to efficiency.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

While my studies of the Alaska construction costs are not complete, I desire to make a few tentative preliminary recommendations.

TRANSPORTATION

(a) In view of the high ocean freight rates I recommend that the Army transport system operate one or more LST or transport ships for the transportation of army supplies and building material to ports of Alaska from the United States mainland and between ports in Alaska. The Panama Railroad, a Government-owned corporation, has for many years operated successfully three ships for the transportation of both personnel and freight from New York to Panama. The Navy is now transporting building material and supplies of all kinds with LST's from the United States to Adak, Alaska.

(b) For reasons of national defense and because of its location, building in Alaska should be of reinforced concrete wherever possible. Concrete is not as susceptible to destruction by atomic attack as wood construction. Concrete consists of cement, gravel, and sand. Gravel and sand are, of course, very plentiful in Alaska. Cement is a small percentage of the construction mass in a building—approximately one-sixth. Concrete lends itself to the use of machinery and requires much less labor—which is scarce in Alaska—than does wood construction. Above all, it gives much better protection to human life against atomic attack.

(c) Rail freight rates should be carefully studied with a view of obtaining a better classification and better rates both within the United States and Alaska.

The best defense of Alaska is the development of Alaska. The development of Alaska depends upon transportation, including rail, air, and highways. This problem should be studied as a whole. The Alaska Railroad should be gone over thoroughly with a view of permanent repairs and relocation if possible to bring down the terrific operating cost. Its efficiency must be increased. I may have further recommendations along this line later.

BUILDING MATERIAL

Alaska building material should be used wherever possible to save the high rail-ocean freight cost and to develop the building industry. We have billions of feet of hemlock and spruce in Alaska which should be used wherever possible. First for public construction, second for private construction, and third for export to the United States where the lumber supply is dwindling. Approximately $11 per thousand board feet can be saved in freight over Seattle lumber.

LABOR

A study of the exhibits hereto attached should satisfy any reasonable person that labor costs are too high. Among the reasons are:

(a) Loss of time paid for going and coming from and to Alaska.

(b) The fact that the working season is only 6 or 7 months when the majority of the workers are returned to the United States and recruited again the following spring. According to Army estimates it costs $1,000 to recruit and take a worker to Alaska and bring him back. This includes pay during the transportation time.

(c) Because of the high employment in the United States it is difficult to induce workers to go to Alaska and we obtain a larger percentage of inefficient workers.

(d) Overtime pay, giving 70 hours' pay for 60 hours' work. Experience has shown that the worker produces best on a 40- to 48-hour week basis or an 8-hour day with 1 day rest.

It is suggested that the following tentative recommendations be carefully considered:

First. Operating a dual construction program, one in Alaska and one in the Pacific. We might take Okinawa where we are now doing some construction work as an example. Let us assume for the sake of illustration that we have a crew of 1,000 men working on the Okinawa job and another 1,000 men on the Alaska job. Ordinarily the Okinawa crew would work 12 months while the Alaska crew with some exceptions would work 6 to 7 months in a year and then be returned to the States. We would then have to recruit another 1,000 men the next spring, ship them to Alaska to work another 6 months. It cost according to Army estimates $1,000 per man for recruiting, transportation to and from Alaska, and pay while on the way. It is suggested that instead of following this plan we work the entire crew of 2,000 men in Alaska during the 6 months' construction season, fly them to Okinawa and work them the second 6 months of the year at that place. We would in that way produce the same amount of construction in Okinawa and approximately twice the construction in Alaska at the same or less cost. Some workers could of course be used the year around in Alaska for inside work.

Second. My second suggestion is to organize working battalions similar to the Seabees the Navy had during the war. I would recruit civilian workers both skilled and unskilled and pay them civilian wages. The Air Transport Command could fly them in Army planes and make a considerable saving. These men would be operating under civilian engineers, paid from the construction pay roll, all under supervision and control of the Army engineers. It would be the same set-up as the Navy Seabees excepting that the workers would be civilians. Instead of depending upon the high-cost labor market of Seattle where there is a great shortage of labor, we could recruit these people from various sections within the United States. The operation of a dual 6-month program in Alaska and the Pacific would, I believe, induce many efficient young men skilled and unskilled to volunteer for this work. Six months' summer work in Alaska and 6 months in the Pacific ought to appeal to the young man looking for experience, travel, and adventure. The men would of course have to be carefully screened for efficiency, skill, and loyalty.

These are just a few of the preliminary recommendations that I want to make. In making these recommendations it must be borne in mind that I have never been to Alaska and have depended upon the information furnished me by others who have been there. The entire development of the Alaskan national defense as well as the development of Alaska itself depends upon a solution of the high-cost construction and living problems in Alaska.

EXHIBIT A

Funds analysis, fiscal year 1946, military construction program, Alaska, exclusive of Government costs (as of Jan. 31, 1948)

Priority	Item	Percent complete	Status	Costs, construction only		
				To Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
	FORT RICHARDSON, 1946					
	Rehabilitation and relocation of existing buildings	100	Complete	$2,180,000		$2,180,000
	Clearing and grubbing	100	do	55,000		55,000
	General site grading	100	do	10,000		10,000
	Site drainage	100	do	3,000		3,000
	Storm sewer outfall	100	do	160,000		160,000
	Railroad grading for warehouse spur	100	do	2,000		2,000
	Railroad track work for warehouse spur	100	do	17,000		17,000
	Civilian recreational facilities	100	do	108,000		108,000
	Total, completed items			2,535,000		2,535,000
0	Utilities to serve complete and active items	25	Active	2,480,000	$3,162,000	5,642,000
2	Warehouse, 1 at 180 by 420 feet	60	do	1,338,000	560,000	1,898,000
4	Aircraft gasoline storage, 48,000 barrels, initial phase	0	do	276,000	470,000	746,000
7	Family quarters, noncommissioned officers, 56 families	32	do	1,784,000	848,000	2,632,000
8	Bachelor officers' quarters, 40 men	24	do	431,000	336,000	767,000
9	Family quarters, civilian, 34 families	28	do	840,000	1,172,000	2,012,000
10	Addition to main power plant (procurement only)	20	do	170,000	84,000	254,000
12	District engineer office building	90	do	1,365,000	101,000	1,466,000
	Total, active items			8,684,000	6,733,000	15,417,000
0	Utilities for items listed in supplemental bill	0	Supplementary bill	0	163,000	163,000
21	Enlisted men's barracks, 2 each 500 men	11	do	4,397,000	8,860,000	13,257,000
36	Condenser cooling water, central power plant	0	do	0	159,000	159,000
	Total, supplemental bill items			4,397,000	9,182,000	13,579,000
0	Utilities to serve deferred items	0	Deferred	0	2,421,000	2,421,000
24	Water-supply mains	0	do	373,000	262,000	635,000
26	Fuel-oil storage and distribution (80,000 barrels)	0	do	428,000	440,000	868,000
30	Tiedowns and static grounds	0	do	34,000	8,000	42,000
31	Telephone system	0	do	28,000	214,000	242,000
33	Water-treatment plant	0	do	121,000	92,000	213,000
34	Remodeling gravity water intake	0	do	107,000	8,000	115,000
35	Fire-alarm system	0	do	60,000	321,000	381,000
38	Family quarters, noncommissioned officers, 16 families	0	do	313,000	435,000	748,000
39	Mess, officers, 400 men	0	do	109,000	535,000	644,000
40	Mess, civilian, 400 men	0	do	153,000	300,000	453,000
	Drainage, walks, and roads [1]	30	do	1,823,000	77,000	1,900,000
	Total, deferred items			3,549,000	5,113,000	8,662,000
	Total, all categories, Fort Richardson			19,165,000	21,028,000	40,193,000
	LADD FIELD, 1946					
	Removal of existing buildings and utilities	100	Complete	42,000		42,000
	Clearing and grubbing	100	do	11,000		11,000
	General site grading	100	do	67,000		67,000
	Rehabilitation and relocation of existing buildings	100	do	845,000		845,000
	Totals, completed items			965,000		965,000
0	Utilities to serve complete and active items	30	Active	3,692,000	5,025,000	8,717,000
5	Family quarters, noncommissioned officers, 32 families	31	do	780,000	1,018,000	1,798,000
6	Family quarters, civilian, 24 families	13	do	715,000	709,000	1,424,000
11	Addition to main power plant (procurement only)	10	do	382,000	38,000	420,000
13	Bachelor officer quarters, 40 men	93	do	570,000	64,000	634,000
14	Expansion hospital facilities	81	do	395,000	49,000	444,000
15	Warehouse, 1 only of 2 authorized, 120 by 220 feet	8	do	477,000	429,000	906,000
16	Diesel power plant, 1,500 kilowatts	0	do	258,000	233,000	491,000
17	Power plant switch gear for new feeders	0	do	95,000	55,000	150,000
	Total, active items			7,364,000	7,620,000	14,984,000
0	Utilities for items listed in supplemental bill	0	Supplementary bill	0	786,000	786,000
18	Enlisted men's barracks, 1 each, 500-man	24	do	4,197,000	3,568,000	7,765,000
19	Warehouse, 1 only of 2 authorized, 120 by 220 feet	8	do	343,000	429,000	772,000
22	Bachelor civilian quarters, 1 building, 40-man	11	do	588,000	44,000	632,000
	Total, supplemental bill items			5,128,000	4,827,000	9,955,000
0	Utilities to serve deferred items	0	Deferred	0	2,800,000	2,800,000
27	Sewage treatment plant	0	do	121,000	145,000	266,000
28	Water treatment plants	0	do	111,000	78,000	189,000
29	Telephone system	0	do	53,000	96,000	149,000
32	Fire alarm systems	0	do	77,000	144,000	221,000
37	Family quarters, noncommissioned officers, 23 families	0	do	505,000	788,000	1,293,000
	Drainage, roads, walks, and railroad work [1]	30	do	2,002,000	38,000	2,040,000
	Total, deferred items			2,869,000	4,089,000	6,958,000
	Total, all categories, Ladd Field			16,326,000	16,536,000	32,862,000
	MILE 26, 1946					
	Clearing and grubbing	100	Complete	21,000		21,000
	General site grading	100	do	5,000		5,000
	Rehabilitation of existing buildings for enlisted men's housing	100	do	77,000		77,000
	Enlisted men's barracks, 16 each, 63 men	100	do	1,636,000		1,636,000
	Mess, enlisted men	100	do	124,000		124,000
	Total, completed items			1,863,000		1,863,000
0	Utilities to serve complete and active items	30	Active	1,131,000	1,486,000	2,617,000
3	Aircraft gasoline storage	70	do	191,000	344,000	535,000
	Total, active items			1,322,000	1,830,000	3,152,000

[1] Additional work to be performed with troop labor using materials furnished by district engineer. Portion now completed is usable.

Funds analysis, fiscal year 1946, military construction program, Alaska, exclusive of Government costs (as of Jan. 31, 1948)—Con.

Priority	Item	Percent complete	Status	Costs, construction only		
				To Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
	MILE 26, 1946—continued					
0	Utilities to serve deferred items	0	Deferred		$298,000	$298,000
20	Warehouse 1 each, 120 by 220 feet	2	do	$228,000	627,000	855,000
23	Operations hangar 300 by 300 feet (procurement only)	50	do	1,094,000	531,000	1,625,000
	Roads and parking aprons [1]	30	do	635,000	3,000	638,000
	Total, deferred items			1,957,000	1,459,000	3,416,000
	Total, all categories, mile 26			5,142,000	3,289,000	8,431,000
	NOME AIRFIELD, 1946					
	Rehabilitation of bachelor officers quarters	100	Complete	290		290
	Rehabilitation of temporary family quarters	100	do	187		187
	Rehabilitation of crash truck station	100	do	184		184
	Rehabilitation of utilities	100	do	89		89
	Total, completed items			750		750
	Total, all categories, none			750		750
	WHITTIER PORT, 1946					
	Rehabilitation of existing buildings	100	Complete	386		386
1	Rehabilitation of cold storage warehouse	0	Active	24	25	49
	Total, all categories, Whittier Port			410	25	435

[1] Additional work to be performed with troop labor using materials provided by district engineer. Portion now completed is usable.

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1946 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Cost to Jan. 31, 1948		$41,793,000
Cost to complete "active" items		16,208,000
Reserve for contingencies		200,000
Total proposed		58,201,000
FUNDS		
Original funds		23,707,000
Additional funds authorized ($13,200,000 less $155,000 to headquarters building)	$13,045,000	
	1,600,000	
	1,600,000	
	6,800,000	
		23,045,000
Value of Government-furnished materials		1,749,000
Funds available to date		48,501,000
Additional funds requested		9,700,000
Total funds received and requested		58,201,000

SUMMARY

CONSOLIDATED TOTALS

	Costs, construction only		
	Costs to Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
Completed items	$6,499,000		$6,499,000
Active items	17,394,000	$16,208,000	33,602,000
Supplemental bill items	9,525,000	14,009,000	23,534,000
Deferred items	8,375,000	10,661,000	19,036,000
Total	41,793,000	40,878,000	82,671,000

EXHIBIT B

Effect of shipping charges on the cost of construction materials in Alaska

Line	Commodity	Portland cement	Fabricated structural steel	Black steel pipe	Cast-iron pipe	Plumbing fittings	Plumbing fixtures
1	Unit of measure	WT	WT	WT	WT	WT	MT
2	Point of purchase	Bellingham, Wash.	San Francisco, Calif.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Birmingham, Ala.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Seattle, Wash.
3	F. o. b. cost	$15.00	$185.00	$128.00	$52.30	$245.00	$180.00
4	Rail freight to Seattle	1.71	25.00	27.80	29.90	35.40	None
5	Transportation tax	.05	.75	.83	.90	1.06	None
6	Cost at Seattle	16.76	210.75	156.63	83.10	281.46	180.00
7	Packing and crating	None	1.00	1.00	1.00	6.50	15.45
8	Cost ready for export	16.76	211.75	157.63	84.10	287.96	195.45
9	Seattle wharfage charge	.50	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
10	Seattle handling—loading charge	.87	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
11	Cost on ship at Seattle	18.13	213.55	159.43	85.90	289.76	197.25
12	Ocean freight to Seward	17.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
13	Transportation tax	.51	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75
14	Wharfage—handling at Seward	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15
15	Seattle to Seward	20.66	28.90	28.90	28.90	28.90	28.90
16	Cost on ship at Seattle	18.13	213.55	159.43	85.90	289.76	197.25
17	Cost at Seward	38.79	242.45	188.33	114.80	318.66	226.15
18	Ocean-rail freight, Seattle to Anchorage	27.80	48.60	48.60	48.60	56.00	60.00
19	Transportation tax	.84	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.68	1.80
20	Unloading and handling to job site	3.75	2.75	2.75	2.75	3.75	3.00
21	Seattle to Fort Richardson	32.39	52.81	52.81	52.81	61.43	64.80
22	Cost on ship at Seattle	18.13	213.55	159.43	85.90	289.76	197.25
23	Cost at Fort Richardson	50.42	266.36	212.24	138.71	351.19	262.05

Effect of shipping charges on the cost of construction materials in Alaska—Continued

Line	Commodity	Portland cement	Fabricated structural steel	Black steel pipe	Cast-iron pipe	Plumbing fittings	Plumbing fixtures
24	Ocean-rail freight, Seattle to Fairbanks	$37.60	$76.20	$76.20	$76.20	$88.00	$98.00
25	Transportation tax	1.13	2.29	2.29	2.29	2.64	2.94
26	Unloading and handling to job site	3.75	2.75	2.75	2.75	3.75	3.00
27	Seattle to Ladd Field	42.48	81.24	81.24	81.24	94.39	103.94
28	Cost on ship at Seattle	18.13	213.55	159.43	85.90	289.76	197.25
29	Cost at Ladd Field	60.61	294.79	240.67	167.14	384.15	301.19
30	Ratio:						
30a	Cost at Seward to cost at Seattle	2.31	1.15	1.20	1.38	1.13	1.26
30b	Cost at Fort Richardson to cost at Seattle	3.00	1.26	1.36	1.65	1.25	1.46
30c	Cost at Ladd Field to cost at Seattle	3.62	1.40	1.54	2.01	1.36	1.67

Line	Commodity	Wallboard	Lumber, Nos. 1 and 2 common	Treated piling	General builders' hardware	Millwork
1	Unit of measure	MT	MT	WT	WT	MT
2	Point of purchase	Southward, Okla.	Everett, Wash.	Coos Bay, Oreg.	Chicago, Ill.	Seattle, Wash.
3	F. o. b. cost	$28.57	$40.00	$31.74	$955.00	$235.00
4	Rail freight to Seattle	25.60	1.60	9.80	41.80	None
5	Transportation tax	.77	.05	.29	1.25	None
6	Cost at Seattle	54.94	41.65	41.83	998.05	235.00
7	Packing and crating	6.46	None	None	49.00	15.69
8	Cost ready for export	61.40	41.65	41.83	1,047.05	250.69
9	Seattle wharfage charge	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
10	Seattle handling—loading charge	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
11	Cost on ship at Seattle	63.20	43.45	43.63	1,048.85	252.49
12	Ocean freight to Seward	17.00	14.00	10.40	25.00	17.00
13	Transportation tax	.51	.42	.31	.75	.51
14	Wharfage—handling at Seward	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15
15	Seattle to Seward	20.66	17.57	13.86	28.90	20.66
16	Cost on ship at Seattle	63.20	43.45	43.63	1,048.85	252.49
17	Cost at Seward	83.86	61.02	57.49	1,077.75	273.15
18	Ocean-rail freight, Seattle to Anchorage	33.40	26.20	26.20	73.60	43.80
19	Transportation tax	1.00	.79	.79	2.21	1.31
20	Unloading and handling to job site	3.50	5.00	2.00	4.25	4.50
21	Seattle to Fort Richardson	37.90	31.99	28.99	80.06	49.61
22	Cost on ship at Seattle	63.20	43.45	43.63	1,048.85	252.49
23	Cost at Fort Richardson	101.10	75.44	72.62	1,128.91	302.10
24	Ocean-rail freight, Seattle to Fairbanks	47.20	33.80	33.80	120.60	66.00
25	Transportation tax	1.42	1.01	1.01	3.62	1.98
26	Unloading and handling to job site	3.50	5.00	2.00	4.25	4.50
27	Seattle to Ladd Field	52.12	39.81	36.81	128.47	72.48
28	Cost on ship at Seattle	63.20	43.45	43.63	1,048.85	252.49
29	Cost at Ladd Field	115.32	83.26	80.44	1,177.32	324.97
30	Ratio:					
30a	Cost at Seward to cost at Seattle	1.53	1.47	1.37	1.08	1.16
30b	Cost at Fort Richardson to cost at Seattle	1.84	1.81	1.74	1.13	1.29
30c	Cost at Ladd Field to cost at Seattle	2.10	2.00	1.92	1.18	1.38

Line	Commodity	Plywood	Hardwood flooring	Wool bat insulation	Pipe covering—insulation	Electrical fixtures
1	Unit of measure	MT	MT	MT	MT	MT
2	Point of purchase	Seattle, Wash.	Seattle, Wash.	San Francisco, Calif.	Emeryville, Calif.	Chicago, Ill.
3	F. o. b. cost	$180.00	$100.48	$11.75	$110.00	$108.00
4	Rail freight to Seattle	None	None	41.60	25.40	81.00
5	Transportation tax	None	None	1.25	.76	2.43
6	Cost at Seattle	180.00	100.48	54.60	136.16	191.43
7	Packing and crating	6.46	18.23	3.48	12.98	24.48
8	Cost ready for export	186.46	118.71	58.08	149.14	215.91
9	Seattle wharfage charge	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
10	Seattle handling-loading charge	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
11	Cost on ship at Seattle	188.26	120.51	59.88	150.94	217.71
12	Ocean freight to Seward	17.00	17.00	17.00	25.00	25.00
13	Transportation tax	.51	.51	.51	.75	.75
14	Wharfage—handling at Seward	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15
15	Seattle to Seward	20.66	20.66	20.66	28.90	28.90
16	Cost on ship at Seattle	188.26	120.51	59.88	150.94	217.71
17	Cost at Seward	208.92	141.17	80.54	179.84	246.61
18	Ocean-rail freight, Seattle to Anchorage	33.40	43.80	48.60	48.60	85.20
19	Transportation tax	1.00	1.31	1.46	1.46	2.56
20	Unloading and handling to job site	4.50	4.00	3.75	3.75	4.00
21	Seattle to Fort Richardson	38.90	49.11	53.81	53.81	91.76
22	Cost on ship at Seattle	188.26	120.51	59.88	150.94	217.71
23	Cost at Fort Richardson	227.16	169.62	113.69	204.75	309.47

Effect of shipping charges on the cost of construction materials in Alaska—Continued

Line	Commodity	Plywood	Hardwood flooring	Wool bat insulation	Pipe covering—insulation	Electrical fixtures
24	Ocean-rail freight, Seattle to Fairbanks	$47.20	$66.00	$76.20	$76.20	$140.40
25	Transportation tax	1.42	1.98	2.29	2.29	4.21
26	Unloading and handling to job site	4.50	4.00	3.75	3.75	4.00
27	Seattle to Ladd Field	53.12	71.98	82.24	82.24	148.61
28	Cost on ship at Seattle	188.26	120.51	59.88	150.94	217.71
29	Cost at Ladd Field	241.38	192.49	142.12	233.18	366.32
30	Ratio:					
30a	Cost at Seward to cost at Seattle	1.16	1.40	1.48	1.32	1.29
30b	Cost at Fort Richardson to cost at Seattle	1.26	1.69	2.08	1.50	1.62
30c	Cost at Ladd Field to cost at Seattle	1.34	1.92	2.60	1.71	1.91

Line	Commodity	Ric-Wil pipe	Reinforcing steel	72-pound railroad rail	Electrical panels and gear	Steel roof decking
1	Unit of measure	MT	WT	WT	MT	WT
2	Point of purchase	Barberton, Ohio	Emeryville, Calif.	Seattle, Wash.	Seattle, Wash.	Seattle, Wash.
3	F. o. b. cost	$760.00	$107.00	$50.40	$770.40	$336.00
4	Rail freight to Seattle	29.60	15.00	None	None	None
5	Transportation tax	.89	.45	None	None	None
6	Cost at Seattle	790.49	122.45	50.40	770.40	336.00
7	Packing and crating	1.50	1.00	1.00	32.00	1.00
8	Cost ready for export	791.99	123.45	51.40	802.40	337.00
9	Seattle wharfage charge	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
10	Seattle handling—loading charge	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
11	Cost on ship at Seattle	793.79	125.25	53.20	804.20	338.80
12	Ocean freight to Seward	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
13	Transportation tax	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75
14	Wharfage-handling at Seward	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15	3.15
15	Seattle to Seward	28.90	28.90	28.90	28.90	28.90
16	Cost on ship at Seattle	793.79	125.25	53.20	804.20	338.80
17	Cost at Seward	822.69	154.15	82.10	833.10	367.70
18	Ocean-rail freight, Seattle to Anchorage	48.60	48.60	48.60	95.20	68.60
19	Transportation tax	1.46	1.46	1.46	2.86	2.06
20	Unloading and handling to job site	3.25	2.75	2.75	5.00	4.50
21	Seattle to Fort Richardson	53.31	52.81	52.81	103.06	75.16
22	Cost on ship at Seattle	793.79	125.25	53.20	804.20	338.80
23	Cost at Fort Richardson	847.10	178.06	106.01	907.26	413.96
24	Ocean-rail freight, Seattle to Fairbanks	76.20	58.00	58.00	140.40	76.20
25	Transportation tax	2.29	1.74	1.74	4.21	2.29
26	Unloading and handling to job site	3.25	2.75	2.75	5.00	4.50
27	Seattle to Ladd Field	81.74	62.49	62.49	149.61	82.99
28	Cost on ship at Seattle	793.79	125.25	53.20	804.20	338.80
29	Cost at Ladd Field	875.53	187.74	115.69	953.81	421.79
30	Ratio:					
30a	Cost at Seward to cost at Seattle	1.04	1.26	1.63	1.08	1.09
30b	Cost at Fort Richardson to cost at Seattle	1.07	1.45	2.10	1.18	1.23
30c	Cost at Ladd Field to cost at Seattle	1.11	1.53	2.30	1.24	1.26

EXHIBIT C

Funds analysis, fiscal year 1947, military construction program, Alaska, exclusive of Government costs (as of Jan. 31, 1948)

Priority	Item	Percent complete	Status	Costs, construction only		
				To Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
	FORT RICHARDSON, 1947					
	Removal of existing structures	100	Complete	$1,000		$1,000
	Clearing and grubbing	100	do	5,000		5,000
	General site grading	100	do	3,000		3,000
	General site drainage	100	do	1,000		1,000
	Storm sewer outfall	100	do	100,000		100,000
	Rehabilitation and relocation of temporary hospital	100	do	23,000		23,000
	Drainage, walks, and roads [1]	100	do	1,409,000		1,409,000
	Totals, completed items			1,542,000		1,542,000
0	Utilities to serve complete and active items	30	Active	720,000	$2,054,000	2,774,000
13	Bachelor noncommissioned officers' quarters, 4 buildings, 40-man	29	do	717,000	1,139,000	1,856,000
19	Addition to main power plant (procurement only)	20	do	65,000	165,000	230,000
	Totals, active items			1,502,000	3,358,000	4,860,000

[1] Additional work to be performed with troop labor using materials provided by district engineer. Portion now completed is usable.

Funds analysis, fiscal year 1947, military construction program, Alaska, exclusive of Government costs (as of Jan. 31, 1948)—Continued

Priority	Item	Percent complete	Status	Costs, construction only		
				To Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
	FORT RICHARDSON, 1947—continued					
0	Utilities to serve items in supplemental bill	0	Supplemental bill		$330,000	$330,000
13	Bachelor noncommissioned officers' quarters, 1 building, 40-man	29	do	$180,000	285,000	465,000
14	Family quarters, civilian, 45 buildings, 2 families	17	do	1,427,000	3,472,000	4,899,000
19	Addition to main power plant (erection only)	0	do	65,000	750,000	815,000
25	Fire truck station, 1 each, 3-stall	9	do	148,000	375,000	523,000
26	Enlisted men's barracks, 1 each, 500-man	10	do	1,933,000	4,800,000	6,733,000
51	Condenser cooling water, central power plant	0	do	48,000	82,000	130,000
	Total, supplemental bill items			3,801,000	10,094,000	13,895,000
0	Utilities to serve deferred items	0	Deferred		1,775,000	1,775,000
28	Bachelor civilian quarters, 2 buildings, 40-man	0	do	299,000	672,000	971,000
29	Water supply mains	0	do	146,000	120,000	266,000
37	Family quarters, company officers, 24 each	0	do	416,000	850,000	1,266,000
39	Family quarters, field officers, 12 each	0	do	235,000	504,000	739,000
41	Crash-truck station, 1 each, 5-stall	0	do	156,000	187,000	343,000
42	Remodeling gravity water intake	0	do	39,000	8,000	47,000
43	Water-treatment plant	0	do	47,000	150,000	197,000
45	Telephone system	0	do	6,000	107,000	113,000
47	Fire-alarm system	0	do	23,000	160,000	183,000
48	Obstruction lighting	0	do	9,000	7,000	16,000
	Total, deferred items			1,376,000	4,540,000	5,916,000
	Total, all categories, Fort Richardson			8,221,000	17,992,000	26,213,000
	LADD FIELD, 1947					
	Removal of existing buildings	100	Complete	$3,000		$3,000
	Clearing and grubbing	100	do	5,000		5,000
	General site grading	100	do	14,000		14,000
	Rehabilitation of theater	100	do	44,000		44,000
	Drainage, walks and roads [1]	100	do	384,000		384,000
	Totals, completed items			450,000		450,000
	Utilities for complete and active items	25	Active	1,382,000	1,422,000	2,804,000
11	Power plant switch gear for new feeders	0	do	52,000	5,000	57,000
12	Family quarters, noncommissioned officers, 56 each	44	do	678,000	2,458,000	3,136,000
15	Gasoline and oil storage	0	do	128,000	190,000	318,000
16	Diesel power plant, 1,500 kilowatts	0	do	137,000	108,000	245,000
20	Addition to main power plant (procurement only)	20	do	130,000	77,000	207,000
	Total, active items			2,507,000	4,260,000	6,767,000
0	Utilities to serve items in supplementary bill	0	Supplemental bill		425,000	425,000
20	Addition to main power plant (erection only)	0	do		1,250,000	1,250,000
21	Family quarters, civilians, 72 each	12	do	984,000	3,055,000	4,039,000
22	Warehouses, 2 each, storehouses	8	do	177,000	324,000	501,000
35	Bachelor civilian quarters, 80-man with club	17	do	535,000	1,120,000	1,655,000
	Total, supplemental bill items			1,696,000	6,174,000	7,870,000
0	Utilities to serve deferred items	0	Deferred	0	3,954,000	3,954,000
30	Sewage-treatment plant	0	do	66,000	145,000	211,000
31	Water-treatment plant	0	do	61,000	78,000	139,000
36	Family quarters, 60-officer, 60 each	0	do	848,000	2,916,000	3,764,000
38	Family quarters, field officer, 28 each	0	do	482,000	1,594,000	2,076,000
40	Infirmary	0	do	106,000	135,000	241,000
44	Telephone system	0	do	29,000	96,000	125,000
46	Fire-alarm system	0	do	42,000	144,000	186,000
	Total, deferred items			1,634,000	9,062,000	10,696,000
	Total, all categories, Ladd Field			6,287,000	19,496,000	25,783,000
	MILE 26 AIRFIELD					
	Clearing and grubbing	100	Complete	5,000		5,000
	General site grading	100	do	10,000		10,000
	Runway, asphalt paving	100	do	4,732,000		4,732,000
	Rehabilitation of existing buildings for enlisted men's housing	100	do	9,000		9,000
	Equipment shop	100	do	57,000		57,000
	Total, complete items			4,813,000		4,813,000
0	Utilities for complete and active items	15	Active	426,000	2,135,000	2,563,000
1	Warehouses, 3 each, 60 by 200 feet; 1 each, 48 by 80 feet	77	do	362,000	118,000	480,000
2	Heated vehicle storage, 25,000 square feet	80	do	186,000	119,000	305,000
3	Enlisted-men barracks, 24 each, 63-man	95	do	788,000	95,000	883,000
4	Mess, enlisted-men, 1,500-man	97	do	116,000	12,000	128,000
5	Bachelor officers quarters, 10 each, 40-man	98	do	596,000	19,000	615,000
6	Mess, officers, 400-man	97	do	115,000	3,000	118,000
7	Air Force operations building	57	do	122,000	115,000	237,000
8	Nose docks, 4 each of 10 authorized	77	do	386,000	566,000	952,000
10	Service stations (storage and truck fill stands)	30	do	4,000	5,000	9,000
17	Repair shop, type B	34	do	115,000	166,000	281,000
	Total, active items			3,218,000	3,353,000	6,571,000
0	Utilities to serve items in supplemental bill	0	Supplemental bill		98,000	98,000
18	Runway and marker lights	10	do	10,000	1,279,000	1,289,000
24	Base headquarters building	21	do	69,000	187,000	256,000
57	Railroad buildings	95	do	8,000	1,000	9,000
58	AC supply and local issue	79	do	77,000	25,000	102,000
	Total, supplemental bill items			164,000	1,590,000	1,754,000

[1] Additional work to be performed with troop labor using materials provided by district engineer. Portion now completed is usable.

Funds analysis, fiscal year 1947, military construction program, Alaska, exclusive of Government costs (as of Jan. 31, 1948)—Continued

Priority	Item	Percent complete	Status	Costs, construction only		
				To Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
	MILE 26 AIRFIELD—continued					
0	Utilities to serve deferred items	0	Deferred		$298,000	$298,000
23	Nose docks, 6 each of 10 authorized		do	$223,000	1,680,000	1,903,000
27	Operations hangar (erection only)		do	655,000	4,067,000	4,722,000
32	Post exchange, 8,000 square feet		do	30,000	1,832,000	1,862,000
33	Fire stations		do	25,000	187,000	212,000
34	Parachute shop		do	98,000	296,000	394,000
49	Obstruction lighting		do	43,000	1,000	44,000
50	Borings for ground temperature studies	41	do	6,000	16,000	22,000
56	Railroad signal system		do	4,000	1,000	5,000
	Roads, railroad work and taxiways [1]	50	do	1,613,000	11,000	1,624,000
	Total, deferred items			2,697,000	8,389,000	11,086,000
	Totals—all categories—mile 26			10,892,000	13,332,000	24,224,000
	WHITTIER PORT					
9	Intransit warehouse and dock	40	Active	833,000	1,387,000	2,220,000
	Totals—active items			833,000	1,387,000	2,220,000
0	Utilities	0	Deferred	71,000	706,000	777,000
52	Laundry and dry-cleaning plant	0	do	18,000	310,000	328,000
53	Motor pool facilities	0	do	20,000	263,000	283,000
54	Central heating and power plant	0	do	71,000	1,600,000	1,671,000
	Total, deferred items			180,000	2,879,000	3,059,000
	Total all categories, Whittier port			1,013,000	4,266,000	5,279,000
	STATION ABLE					
61	Initiation of construction, VHB runway and technical facilities	0	Deferred	313,000	50,000	363,000

[1] Additional work to be performed with troop labor using materials provided by district engineer. Portion now completed is usable.

SUMMARY

CONSOLIDATED TOTALS, FISCAL YEAR 1947

	Costs, construction only		
	Costs to Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
Completed items	$6,805,000		$6,805,000
Active items	8,060,000	$12,358,000	20,418,000
Supplemental bill items	5,661,000	17,858,000	23,519,000
Deferred items	6,200,000	24,920,000	31,120,000
Total	26,726,000	55,136,000	81,862,000

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1947 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Cost to Jan. 31, 1948	$26,726,000
Cost to complete "active" items	12,358,000
Reserve for contingencies	1,372,000
	40,456,000

FUNDS

Original funds for mainland construction	34,988,000
Transfer from Adak	3,737,000
Value of Government-furnished materials	1,731,000
Funds available to date	40,456,000
Additional funds requested	
Total funds received and requested	40,456,000

CONSOLIDATED TOTALS, FISCAL YEARS 1946–47

	Costs, construction only		
	Costs to Jan. 31, 1948	To complete	Total
Completed items	$13,304,000		$13,304,000
Active items	25,454,000	$28,566,000	54,020,000
Supplemental bill items	15,186,000	31,867,000	47,053,000
Deferred items	14,575,000	35,581,000	50,156,000
Total	68,519,000	96,014,000	164,533,000

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1946–47 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Cost to Jan. 31, 1948	$68,519,000
Cost to complete "Active" items	28,566,000
Reserve for contingencies	1,572,000
Total funds received and requested	98,657,000

FUNDS

Original funds, fiscal years 1946 and 1947		$58,695,000
Additional fiscal year 1946 funds authorized ($13,200,000 less $155,000 to headquarters building)	$13,045,000	
	1,600,000	
	1,600,000	
	6,800,000	
		23,045,000
Transfer fiscal year 1947 funds from Adak		3,737,000
District engineer expenses in connection with Government furnished materials		3,480,000
Funds available to date		88,957,000
Additional funds requested		9,700,000
Total		98,657,000

MAY 20, 1948.

EXHIBIT C

ANALYSIS OF WAGES, SALARIES, AND RELATED COSTS, ALASKA MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (BIRCH, JOHNSON & LYTLE CONTRACT W 112-ENG-1000), MAY 1946 THROUGH JANUARY 1948

1. The remote location of Alaska relative to any major source of construction labor, combined with the long period of adverse winter weather, introduces a number of factors not common to construction work in the continental United States. Chief among these factors are:

(a) The need for recruitment at points remote from the site of employment.

(b) Necessity for offering overtime work to increase the weekly take-home pay to compensate for the absence of normal recreational and living facilities.

(c) Necessity for abnormal secondary labor benefits which increase the labor cost, including subsidy of operation of camp, mess, recreational, and medical facilities.

(d) Loss due to recruitment and transportation to the site and subsequent discharge of unsatisfactory employees.

(e) Inefficiency of outside workers during the adverse winter season.

(f) Short favorable working season, causing incurment of full labor mobilization and demobilization charges for a few months of work.

2. Enclosure 1 shows the effect of 1a, 1b, and 1c, above, on the cost of manual labor and a comparison with similar average continental United States costs. The added costs for overtime work, abnormal secondary labor benefits, and transportation to and from the job site actually resulted in an average increase of 49.3 percent above the straight-time wage rate for all manual workers employed. This increase is highest in the case of Stateside hires because of the cost of transportation to and from job site.

3. The average labor cost in Alaska (inclosure 1) is 44.3 percent above the average rate for continental United States even though the straight-time rate in Alaska is 3.7 percent below the average continental United States rate.

4. A similar analysis relative to nonmanual workers was not made because of the more complicated wage structure in this field and because of the similarity of the two groups with respect to these benefits.

5. Extending these costs to the total labor cost through January 31, 1948, the increased cost amounts to $8,911,500 on a total pay roll of $29,027,600.

6. Enclosures 2, 3, and 4 show the development of the figures summarized in enclosure 1.

7. The costs resulting from the employment of and transportation to the job site of employees who later prove unsatisfactory are made up of two major components:

(a) Expenses incurred in recruiting and transportation to the job site.

(b) Inefficiency of workers during the period of employment.

The natural tendency is to delay the discharge of these employees while efforts are made to adjust them to the Alaskan conditions because of the expenses already incurred in recruitment and transportation.

8. The excess of recruiting and transportation expense for unsatisfactory workers during 1947 is estimated to be $595,751. This cost is a part of the $8,911,500 shown in paragraph 5. It is based on the following analysis:

(a) Average time of employment of unsatisfactory employees, 2.7 months.

(b) Cost of recruitment and transportation, $380.

(c) Cost of recruitment and transportation per month for unsatisfactory employees, $140.74.

(d) Cost per month if full contract term had been served (12 months), $31.67.

(e) Excess cost per month, $109.07.

(f) Unsatisfactory State-side hires, 1947, 2,023.

(g) Loss equals 2,023 (workers) by $109.07 (less per month) by 2.7 (months), $595,751.25.

9. The loss due to the inefficiency of these unsatisfactory employees is estimated to be $1,011,888. This is based on the following:

(a) Estimated efficiency of submarginal employees (satisfactory employees considered 100 percent), 65 percent.

(b) Period of employment, 2.7 months or 11 weeks.

(c) Loss equals 2,023 (employees) by 11 (weeks) by 129.92 (average weekly wage) by 0.35 (35 percent), $1,011,888.

10. The total of the above, paragraphs 8 and 9, is $1,607,639.25.

11. The inefficiency of outside workers due to the severe winter conditions which exist from November to May, at least 26 weeks, resulted in an abnormal loss during the winter of 1946–47. This was due to the exertion of the maximum possible preparatory effort in order to permit maximum accomplishment during 1947. This loss is estimated to be $827,590. The basis of this estimate is:

(a) Average number of manual workers, 1,633.

(b) Average percentage employed outdoors, 30 percent.

(c) Number employed outdoors, 490.

(d) Average efficiency loss, 50 percent.

(e) Loss equals 490 (workers) by 26 (weeks) by 129.92 (average weekly wage) by 0.5 (50 percent), $827,590.40.

12. The major loss resulting from the short favorable working season is due to reduced return received from the cost of recruiting and transporting the satisfactory laborers. This loss, during 1947, is estimated to be $452,498. This is part of the $8,911,500 shown in paragraph 5. It is based on the following analysis:

(a) Average term of service of satisfactory employees, 5.48 months.

(b) Cost per month for recruiting and transportation (380 divided by 5.48), $69.34.

(c) Cost per month for contract period (12 months), $31.67.

(d) Excess cost per month, $37.67.

(e) Satisfactory Stateside hires (4,215 minus 2,023), 2,192.

(f) Loss equals 2,192 (workers) by 37.67 (loss per month) by 5.48 (months), $452,498.07.

13. The total attributable to the factors listed in paragraph 1, omitting the duplications in paragraphs 8 and 12, is:

(a) Additional cost for recruitment, transportation to and from job site, overtime work, and housing and mess subsidy, $8,911,500.

(b) Additional cost resulting from inefficiency of submarginal workers among Stateside hires, $1,011,088.

(c) Additional cost due to inefficiency of outside workers during extreme winter of 1946–47, $827,590.

(d) Total, $10,750,978.

Four enclosures:

1. Comparison of manual wage rates; 2. Average hourly manual work wage; 3. Cost of contractor's personnel facilities; 4. Cost of transportation to and from job site.

Comparison of manual wage rates, military construction, Alaska, 1947

	Alaska			Average continental United States [1]
	Alaska hires 47 percent	State-side hires 53 percent	All manuals, 100 percent	
1. Straight-time wage rate (40 hours per week)	$1.840	$1.840	$1.840	$1.91
2. Benefits accruing to worker:				
(a) Increase in hourly wage rate due to overtime work at 50 percent higher pay rate	0.311	0.311	0.311	----------
(b) Hourly rate equivalent of housing and mess subsidy	0.420	0.420	0.420	----------
3. Cost not benefiting workers, hourly rate equivalent of transportation to and from job site	----------	0.351	0.186	----------
4. Gross wage equivalent	2.571	2.922	2.757	1.91
Ratio to average continental United States rate	1.346	1.530	1.443	1.0
Ratio gross wage equivalent to straight-time wage rate	1.397	1.588	1.493	1.0

[1] Bureau of Labor Statistics, average of 7 basic trades in 75 cities.

Average hourly manual work wage, military construction, Alaska, 1947

[Based on 1 week from each of the 5 months from the 5 projects]

	Ladd Field			Eielson Air Force Base			Fort Richardson		
	Number of men	Man-hours	Labor cost	Number of men	Man-hours	Labor cost	Number of men	Man-hours	Labor cost
April	628	36,323	$70,367.34	309	19,226	$40,218.64	1,196	68,238	$133,008.92
July	1,134	68,892	150,600.14	878	50,556	113,283.96	1,833	100,920	223,434.31
August	1,749	118,145	258,297.86	1,478	99,927	220,742.55	2,166	129,162	274,159.12
October	1,008	53,722	112,031.64	1,765	127,424	284,155.57	1,299	75,427	160,769.16
December	258	9,953	20,874.17	154	6,943	14,293.50	331	13,284	27,568.01
Total	4,777	287,035	612,171.15	4,584	304,076	672,694.22	6,825	387,031	818,939.52

SUMMARY

	Number men	Man-hours	Labor cost
Ladd Field	4,777	287,035	$612,171.15
Eielson Air Force base	4,584	304,076	672,694.22
Fort Richardson	6,825	387,031	818,939.52
Grand total	16,186	978,142	2,103,804.89

Average number of man-hours per week, 60.43 hours.

Equivalent hours straight-time pay per week, 70.64 hours.

Actual time, 60.43 hours.

Straight time, 40 hours.

Overtime, 20.43 hours.

Straight time equivalent of 20.43 hours overtime, 30.64.

Straight time, 40.

Total, 70.64.

Actual pay per hour worked (2,103,804.89 divided by 978,142), $2.151.

Straight-time pay rate (2.151 by 60.43 divided by 70.64), $1.840.

Increase in hourly rate due to overtime, $0.311.

COST OF CONTRACTOR'S PERSONNEL FACILITIES, ALASKA MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1946–47 (BIRCH, JOHNSON & LYTLE CONTRACT)

1. This analysis covers the cost of the following facilities operated for the personnel of Birch, Johnson & Lytle and the subcontractors operating under their jurisdiction.

(a) Housing facilities in construction camps.

(b) Mess facilities.

(c) Hospital and medical facilities.

(d) Recreation facilities.

2. The cost of the buildings and equipment (investment) for these services has been $3,004,472. It is estimated that 30 percent of this amount will represent the residual value available for subsequent programs at the completion of the active portion of the fiscal year 1946–47 programs. Thus $2,131,300 is written off against the active fiscal year 1946–47 programs.

3. Total labor to January 31, 1948, was:

(a) Manuals, 195,689 man-weeks.

(b) Nonmanuals, including warehouse, camp, and mess hall labor, 71,832 man-weeks.

(c) Total, 267,521 man-weeks.

4. Anticipated labor February 1, 1948, to completion of the active fiscal year 1946–47 program is estimated to be:

(a) Actual through April 8, 1948, 16,985 man-weeks.

(b) 25 weeks at average of 3,500 men, 87,500 man-weeks.

(c) 17 weeks at average of 500 men, 8,500 man-weeks.

(d) Total, 112,985 man-weeks.

5. Total man-weeks for completion of active fiscal year 1946–47 program is 267,521 plus 112,985 equals 380,506 man-weeks.

6. The cost per man-week for this service is:

(a) Write-off of cost of buildings and equipment, $2,131,300 divided by 308,506, $8.59.

(b) Operating cost to date, $7,129,439 divided by 267,521 equals $26.28.

(c) Total, $34.87.

7. Loss to the Government is:

(a) Cost per man-week, $34.87.

(b) Less payment by employees, $10.50.

(c) Net loss, $24.37.

8. Hourly rate equivalent of housing and mess subsidy for manual workers, based on average work week of 58 hours, is $0.420 (24.37 divided by 58).

COST OF TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM JOB SITE, ALASKA MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, 1947

1. Based on analysis of 4,000 cases:

(a) Medical examinations, transportation to Seattle, transportation from Seattle, transportation to Alaska, transportation from Alaska, per diem and travel expense, $1,004,268.68.

(b) Excess baggage and tools, $56,680.

(c) From transfer statement in the accounting department obtain gross travel time

paid prior to departure from Seattle for each of these 4,000; total, $239,525.91.

(d) Add 1 day's travel pay for time from Seattle to job, $60,560.

(e) Add 3 days' travel pay, on same basis to compensate for time returning from the job to Seattle to point of hire, 40.9 percent, percentage returns, $74,307.12.

(f) Medical rejects or fail to process, actual accumulated total cost of medical rejects from January 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948, divided by total State-side hires, same period, times 4,000, $29,688.

(g) Seattle transient camp, in lieu of per diem, $53,200.

Total cost 4,000 State-side hires, $1,518,229.71.

Average cost of a State-side hire, $379.56.

Average cost per man, $379.56, at $0.3512 per hour.

Average months service from 4,000 cards multiplied by 4⅓ multiplied by $60.43, $1,080.70.

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following contract between the United States of America and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, entered into on October 8, 1947, pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483), is hereby ratified by the Congress, to wit:

"CONTRACT

"This contract of purchase, by and between the United States of America entered into in its behalf by J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, acting by William A. Durant, Principal Chief of the Choctaw Nation, and Floyd E. Maytubby, Governor of the Chickasaw Nation, pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483), and for the purpose of carrying out the terms and provisions thereof, it is mutually agreed between the parties hereto, as follows:

"1. Subject to the approval of this contract by a vote of the living enrolled eligible voters of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and its ratification by the Congress of the United States, the United States agrees to pay to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations agree to accept, the sum of $8,500,000 in full payment for all of their right, title, and interest in the lands and mineral deposits reserved from allotment in accordance with the provisions of section 58 of the Supplemental Agreement of 1902 (32 Stat. 641), and in full and final settlement of any and all claims for damages against the United States for any failure on the part of the United States, its officers, agents, or employees, to sell such properties in accordance with the terms of the supplemental agreement, or for any other failure alleged to have occurred in connection with the sale, lease, and administration of such properties by the United States, its officers, agents, or employees.

"2. Upon approval of this contract as provided by section 1 hereof, and its ratification by the Congress, the amount of the purchase price, when appropriated by the Congress, shall be placed to the credit of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations on the books of the Treasury of the United States, and shall be distributed as hereinafter set forth.

"3. When the purchase price herein agreed upon shall have been appropriated, the Principal Chief of the Choctaw Nation and the Governor of the Chickasaw Nation shall execute a conveyance or conveyances, satisfactory in form and substance to the Secretary of the Interior, vesting in the United States all of the right, title, and interest of the said Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, in and to such lands and mineral deposits, and releasing all claims for damages against the United States for the failure of the United States, its officers, agents, and employees, to sell such properties in accordance with the terms and provisions of said Supplemental Agreement of 1902, or for any other failure alleged to have occurred in connection with the sale, lease, and administration of such properties.

"4. The purchase price when appropriated shall be allocated three-fourths (¾) to the Choctaw Nation and one-fourth (¼) to the Chickasaw Nation, and shall be distributed per capita by the Secretary of the Interior to the enrolled members of said nations, exclusive of persons enrolled as freedmen, who, under the Atoka Agreement (30 Stat. 495), are not entitled to share in thi distribution. The share of a deceased member shall be distributed to his heirs or devisees determined in conformity with the law applicable at the date of the death of the deceased member, or the date of the death of his heirs or devisees.

"Before payment is made to the heirs of any deceased member, proof of death and heirship satisfactory to the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes Agency must be made, and the finding of said Superintendent upon such proof shall be final and conclusive. Such per capita payments shall be made directly to such members, or their heirs or devisees, any restrictions of law to the contrary notwithstanding, except that payments due to adults under legal disability, or to minors, may be made, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Indian Affairs may prescribe, to legal guardians or curators of such adults or minors, or to natural guardians where legal guardians or curators have not been appointed.

"No expenditure of any kind or character shall be allowed the United States as an offset or claim for reimbursement against the proceeds from the sale of such lands and mineral deposits.

"5. All proceeds from the sale of any of the properties mentioned herein made subsequent to the date of this contract, and prior to the appropriation of the purchase price, shall be credited on the purchase price. All royalties from any coal, asphalt, oil, gas, or other minerals mined from the herein mentioned properties, until the first of the month in which the purchase price shall be appropriated, the balance of the purchase price of any sales made prior to the date of this contract, and such other moneys as may be due the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations from said properties, shall, when paid, be placed to the credit of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations on the books of the Treasury of the United States.

"6. This agreement shall not be binding upon the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations until it has been duly approved by a majority of the living enrolled eligible voters of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations voting at a special election called for such purpose pursuant to the act of June 28, 1944, and shall not be binding upon the United States until ratified by the Congress of the United States.

"In witness whereof, the representatives of the parties hereto do hereunto affix their names this the 8th day of October 1947.

"J. A. KRUG,
"Secretary of the Interior.
"WILLIAM A. DURANT,
"Principal Chief of the Choctaw Nation.
"FLOYD E. MAYTUBB,
"Governor of the Chickasaw Nation."

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 363) was laid on the table.

House Resolution 642 was laid on the table.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 203.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6028) to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, giving due consideration to the temporary nature of the requirements therefor, is authorized to make such provision as he deems to be necessary and in the public interests for the education of dependents of persons employd on the actual construction of projects or features of projects, by the Bureau of Reclamation, in any cases in which he finds that by reason of such construction activity, an undue burden is, or will be cast upon the facilities of the public-school districts serving the areas in which construction is being undertaken, and to pay for the same from any funds available for the construction of said projects: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into cooperative arrangements with local school districts wherein such features are situated to contribute toward covering the cost of furnishing the educational services required for such dependents, or for the operation by those school districts of Government facilities, or for the expansion of local school facilities. Such cost incurred hereunder shall be charged to the project concerned and shall be repayable in the same manner and to the same extent as are its other costs of construction.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall furnish to the Congress each year, on or before the 3d day of January, a report on all activities undertaken during the preceding fiscal year pursuant to the provisions

of this act, together with such recommendations with respect to problems relating to it as he shall think appropriate."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF REGULAR ARMY AND REGULAR AIR FORCE OFFICERS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 13, after "list", insert "shall be furnished written notice of the pendency of any proceedings for his removal, shall be afforded reasonable time for the preparation of his defense,".

Page 6, line 18, strike out all after "be", down to and including "therefrom" in line 20 and insert: "in a grade determined by the following schedule: Officers with less than 3 years of service for promotion purposes shall be appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; those with 3 or more, but less than 7 years of such service, shall be appointed in the grade of first lieutenant; those with 7 or more, but less than 14 years of such service, shall be appointed in the grade of captain; those with 14 or more, but less than 21 years of such service, shall be appointed in the grade of major; those with 21 or more, but less than 28 years of such service, shall be appointed in the grade of lieutenant colonel: *Provided*, That (a) those with more than 28 years of service for promotion purposes who are under 60 years of age shall be appointed to the active list in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel and—

"(A) shall until June 30, 1953, be eligible for selection to the permanent grade of colonel; and

"(B) if not selected and promoted to the grade of colonel or retired under any other provision of law on or before June 30, 1953, shall on such date be retired in the highest grade to which he is entitled under any provision of law; or

"(C) if promoted to the grade of colonel on the active list prior to such date, shall be retired under the laws applicable to the elimination and retirement of permanent colonels; and

"(b) Those with more than 28 years of service for promotion purposes who are 60 years of age or over shall be advanced on the retired list to the grade of colonel, and shall be entitled to receive the retired pay to which they would have been entitled if they had not been removed from the active list under the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), but had been retired while serving in the permanent grade of colonel at the completion of 28 years of service for promotion purposes. Each officer restored to the active list, and appointed in a grade as prescribed in this section, shall have his name placed on the appropriate promotion list among the officers of his grade in the same seniority standing as would have existed had such officer been continued on the active list. For promotion purposes and initial grade determination each officer so restored to the active list shall, upon appointment, have credited to him all service which he would have had if he had not been removed from the active list pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606)."

Page 7, after line 18, insert:

"(d) Each officer of the Regular Army heretofore removed from the active list pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), who on the date of such removal was (a) eligible for voluntary retirement under any provision of law then in effect, or (b) shall be determined by retiring board action to have been eligible for retirement for disability on such date, shall upon application therefor be placed upon the retired list in the grade and with the retired pay and other benefits to which he would have been entitled if he had been so retired: *Provided*, That no officer restored to the active list pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be retired pursuant to the provisions of this subsection."

Page 8, line 4, after "repealed"' insert ": *Provided*, That all rights and benefits accrued under such laws prior to the date of enactment of this title shall hereafter remain in full force and effect."

Page 9, line 21, after "year", insert ": *Provided further*, That for the purpose of determining years of service credited for longevity pay in the case of a general officer, such service shall be that which would be credited to such general officer if he were on the promotion list and serving in the grade of colonel."

Page 9, line 23, strike out "or" where it appears the first time, and insert "or of any reserve component of the Army of the United States, and each commissioned officer of."

Page 9, line 23, after "Force", insert "or of any reserve component of the Air Force of the United States,".

Page 9, line 24, after "retired", insert "or granted retirement pay."

Page 10, line 1, after "grade", insert "in which he served."

Page 10, line 2; strike out "held by him" and insert "for not less than 6 months while serving on active duty."

Page 10, line 7, after "grade", insert "*Provided*, That retired pay of such highest grade shall be without credit for service on the retired list."

Page 11, line 9, after "him", insert "while serving on active duty."

Page 11, line 13, after "grade", insert "at the time of retirement."

Page 11, line 18, strike out "immediately upon his retirement" and insert "effective upon the enactment of this title or upon his retirement, whichever is later."

Page 11, line 21, after "amended", insert "each female dietitian or physical therapist appointed pursuant to the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1072), each female officer appointed pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324), and each member of the Army Nurse Corps or Women's Medical Specialist Corps appointed pursuant to Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress (61 Stat. 41)."

Page 11, line 22, strike out "Nurse Corps."

Page 11, line 25, after "satisfactorily", insert "on active duty."

Page 12, line 13, after "him", insert "while serving on active duty."

Page 12, line 16, after "law", insert "for his length of service at the time of retirement."

Page 12, line 21, strike out "immediately upon his retirement" and insert "effective upon the enactment of this act or upon his retirement, whichever is later."

Page 12, after line 21, insert:

"(f) Each commissioned officer of the Regular Army or of any reserve component of the Army of the United States, and each commissioned officer of the Regular Air Force or of any reserve component of the Air Force of the United States, retired or granted retirement pay under any provision of law on or after August 7, 1947, but not later than January 1, 1957, while serving on active duty in a temporary grade not higher than that of major general shall be advanced on the applicable officers' retired list to such grade, and shall receive retired or retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law, computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such higher grade: *Provided*, That computation on the basis of pay of such highest grade shall be made without benefit of longevity credit for retired list service. No officer shall be ordered to active duty or promoted to any higher temporary grade solely for the purpose of entitling him to retirement in advanced grade pursuant to this subsection."

Page 12, strike out all after line 21, over to and including line 16, page 13, and insert:

"SEC. 204. Enlisted men and warrant officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force hereafter advanced to commissioned rank or grade on the retired list pursuant to section 203 (c) or 203 (e) of this title, shall, if application therefore is made to the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force within 3 months from the date of approval of this title or within 3 months after the date of the advancement to commissioned rank or grade on the retired list, whichever is the later, and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, be restored to their former retired enlisted, or warrant officer status, as the case may be, and shall thereafter be deemed to be enlisted or warrant officer personnel, as appropriate, for all purposes."

Page 13, line 24, after "law", insert "No back pay or allowances prior to the date of enactment of this title shall accrue to any person by reason of the enactment thereof."

Page 15, line 16, strike out "satisfactorily."

Page 15, lines 16 and 17, after "performed", insert "satisfactory."

Page 15, line 17, after "service", insert "as defined in this section."

Page 15, line 24, after "thereof", insert "or the United States Coast Guard, including the reserve components thereof."

Page 16, lines 2 and 3, strike out "if he fulfills any of the requirements enumerated below."

Page 16, strike out lines 4 to 8, inclusive.

Page 16, strike out lines 9 to 15, inclusive.

Page 16, strike out lines 16 to 22, inclusive.

Page 16, strike out all after line 22, over to and including line 4, page 17.

Page 17, strike out lines 5 to 11, inclusive.

Page 17, strike out lines 12 to 16, inclusive.

Page 17, line 17, strike out "subsection" and insert "section."

Page 17, line 20, strike out "of the service to which application is made for retirement."

Page 18, line 5, after "component", insert *: Provided further*, That no person who was a member of a reserve component on or before

August 15, 1945, shall be eligible for retirement benefits under this title unless he performed active Federal service during any portion of either of the two periods beginning April 6, 1917, and ending November 11, 1918, and beginning September 9, 1940, and ending December 31, 1946."

Page 18, after line 5, insert:

"(b) Subsequent to the enactment of this act, a year of satisfactory Federal service, for the purposes of this section only, shall consist of any year in which a person is credited with a minimum of 50 points, which points shall be credited on the following basis:

"(1) One point for each day of active Federal service;

"(2) One point for each drill or period of equivalent instruction, such drills and periods of equivalent instruction to be restricted to those prescribed and authorized by the Secretary of the respective service for the year concerned, and to conform to the requirements prescribed by other provisions of law;".

Page 18, after line 5, insert:

"(3) Fifteen points for membership in a reserve component for each year of Federal service other than active Federal service."

Page 18, after line 5, insert:

"(c) Each year of service as a member of a reserve component prior to the enactment of this act shall be deemed to be a year of satisfactory Federal service for the purposes of this section, subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of section 306 of this act."

Page 18, line 6, strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)."

Page 18, line 10, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

Page 18, line 18, strike out "to—" and insert "to."

Page 18, line 19, strike out "(i)."

Page 18, lines 24 and 25, strike out "sum of the number of years of his active Federal service; plus" and insert "number of years and any fraction thereof (on the basis of 360 days per year) which shall consist of the sum of the following:

"(i) All periods of active Federal service;

"(ii) One day for each point credited pursuant to subparagraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b) of section 302 of this act, but no more than 60 days shall be credited on this basis in any 1 year for the purposes of this section:".

Page 19, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.

Page 19, line 7, strike out all after "further", down to and including "year" in line 12 and insert "That for each year of Federal service, other than active Federal service performed as a member of a reserve component prior to the date of enactment of this act and credited in accordance with subsection (c) of section 302 of this title, such member shall be credited with 50 days for each of such years, for the purposes of this section."

Page 19, line 13, strike out all after "304." down to and including "status" in line 25 and insert "As soon as may be practicable after the effective date of this title, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy shall, by regulations not inconsistent with this or any other act, prescribe (a) appropriate standards and qualifications for the retention or promotion of members of reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, and the United States Navy and the Marine Corps, respectively, and (b) appropriate and equitable procedures under which the compliance by each member of each such reserve component with such standards and qualifications shall be determined periodically. Whenever any member of any such reserve component thereafter shall fail to conform to the standards and qualifications so prescribed he shall be transferred to an inactive reserve status if qualified for such status, retired without pay if qualified for such retirement, or his appointment or enlistment shall be terminated. Such action".

Page 20, line 2, strike out "effect" and insert "affect."

Page 20, line 2, after "that", insert "such action shall have been taken with respect to."

Page 20, line 3, strike out "was placed in an inactive status."

Page 20, line 16, after "Reserve.", insert "No period of service otherwise creditable in determining the eligibility of any person to receive, or the amount of, any annuity, pension, or old-age benefit payable under any provision of law on account of civilian employment, in the Federal Government or otherwise, shall be excluded in such determination because such period of service may be included, in whole or in part, in determining the eligibility of such person to receive, or the amount of, any retired pay payable under this title."

Page 21, line 4, strike out "includes" and insert "shall consist of."

Page 21, line 14, after "Corps", insert "and the Enlisted Reserve Corps prior to the enactment of Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress, approved March 25, 1948."

Page 21, line 15, strike out "the Enlisted Reserve Corps" and insert "the Organized Reserve Corps."

Page 22, strike out line 11 and insert "component; and

"(16) the Coast Guard Reserve."

Page 22, line 23, strike out "the" and insert "an."

Page 22, line 24, strike out "the" where it appears the second time and insert "an."

Page 23, line 4, after "Naval", insert "and Marine Corps."

Page 23, line 4, strike out "Reserve" and insert "Reserves."

Page 23, strike out lines 6 to 22, inclusive.

Page 23, line 23, strike out "308" and insert "307."

Page 24, line 6, strike out "309" and insert "308."

Page 24, line 9, strike out "in the discretion" and insert "by the direction."

Page 25, strike out lines 1 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 309. Service as a member of a reserve component shall be subject to the requirements of the military services and appropriations available therefor from time to time. No person shall be ordered to active Federal Service for the sole purpose of qualifying for retirement benefits under this title."

Page 25, line 13, strike out "311" and insert "310."

Page 25, line 16, strike out "312" and insert "311."

Page 26, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 312. The provisions of this title shall become effective for each of the services concerned when directed by the cognizant Secretary, but not later than the first day of the seventh month following the date of enactment."

Page 26, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 313. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 2744.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDING MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 412) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 501 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission for a construction-differential subsidy to aid in the construction of a new vessel to be used in the domestic or foreign commerce of the United States. No such application shall be approved by the Commission unless it determines that (1) such vessel is required to promote the water-borne commerce of the United States; (2) the construction thereof will aid in carrying out the purposes and policy of this act; and (3) the applicant possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications necessary to enable it to operate and maintain the vessel under normal competitive conditions, including replacement of worn-out or obsolete tonnage with new and modern ships. Any construction subsidy contract entered into pursuant to the provisions of this title shall not restrict the lawful or proper use or operation of the vessel."

SEC. 2. Section 501 (c) is hereby amended by striking out "exclusively used on a service, route, or line in the foreign commerce of the United States, determined to be essential under section 211 of this act" and by inserting in lieu thereof "used in the domestic or foreign commerce of the United States."

SEC. 3. Section 504 is hereby amended by striking out the last sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof "Such vessel shall be documented under the laws of the United States as provided in section 503 of this title."

SEC. 4. Section 506 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. Section 511 (b) is hereby amended by inserting "or acquisition" and "and terminal facilities" so as to make the initial clause read "For the purposes of promoting the construction or acquisition of vessels and terminal facilities." The subsection is hereby further amended by inserting "or for other purposes authorized in this section" after the words "for the construction or acquisition of new vessels."

SEC. 6. Section 511 (c) is hereby amended by inserting the following sentence after the second sentence: "In the case of earnings from the operation of vessels documented under the laws of the United States or in the case of receipts with respect to amounts previously deposited and remaining in the fund, if the taxpayer deposits all or part thereof in a construction reserve fund estab-

lished under subsection (b), the sums deposited shall not be recognized as income in the computation of Federal income and excess profits taxes." The subsection is hereby further amended by striking out "and" between the two exceptions for the general requirement for deposit within 60 days, and by inserting at the end of the sentence a third exception to read as follows: ", and (3) in the case of earnings from the operation of vessels documented under the laws of the United States, the deposit may be made not later than the prescribed date of filing for the taxpayer's Federal income-tax return and if such deposit is made on or before such date it shall be considered to have been deposited on the last day of the period covered by the tax return."

SEC. 7. Section 511 (d) is hereby amended by inserting "or terminal facility" after the words "new vessel" in both instances where the words appear in the subsection. The subsection is hereby further amended by inserting ", earnings, or receipts" and "for tax purposes" so that the final clause reads "which represents gain, earnings, or receipts not recognized for tax purposes under subsection (c)."

SEC. 8. Section 511 (e) is hereby amended by inserting ", earnings, or receipts" both after the words "if any deposit consists in part of gain" and after the words "in the proportion that the part of the deposit consisting of gain."

SEC. 9. Section 511 (g) is hereby amended by inserting the following after "in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed jointly by the Commission and the Secretary of the Treasury,": "within three years from the date of such deposit or in the case of the construction or acquisition of a new vessel within such time as hereinafter provided in this subsection, for any of the following purposes:

"(1) reimbursement to the depositor for losses incurred in any taxable year subsequent to December 31, 1947, in operation of vessels documented under the laws of the United States;

"(2) liquidation of purchase money indebtedness on vessels;

"(3) capital expenditures in the reconditioning or reconstruction of vessels, provided such expenditures receive the prior approval of the Commission;

"(4) acquisition of terminal facilities directly connected with shipping operations: *Provided, however,* That such acquisitions shall require the prior approval of the Commission on the basis of consistency with the policy set forth in title I of this act, or (5)."

The subsection is hereby further amended by striking out "2 years" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "3 years." Finally, the subsection is further amended hereby to correct the numbering occasioned by these amendments: Strike out "(1)" and "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(A)" and "(B)," respectively; strike out "(A)" and "(B)" and insert "(i)" and "(ii)" respectively.

SEC. 10. Section 511 (h) is hereby amended by adding the following proviso at the end of the subsection: *"Provided, however,* That a general extension shall be granted for 3 years for all funds on deposit under this section on September 30, 1948."

SEC. 11. Section 511 (i) is hereby amended by inserting ", earning, or receipt" after the word "gain" in each instance where it appears in the subsection.

SEC. 12. Title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 511 a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 512. Any citizen of the United States who owns in whole or in part any vessel of not less than 2,000 gross tons documented under the laws of the United States and operated without the aid of an operating-differential subsidy under title VI may amortize the cost of such vessel, including the cost of capital improvements thereon, in such manner as he deems appropriate, and for the purposes of Federal income and excess-profits taxes shall be entitled in each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1947, to a deduction of the portion of the cost so amortized in such taxable year: *Provided, however,* That not more than one-fifth of such cost may be amortized in any one taxable year. The amount to be amortized in any taxable year shall be irrevocably determined by the taxpayer not later than the close of the day prescribed for the making of the return for such taxable year. Such deduction shall be in lieu of the deduction for wear, tear, and obsolescence in the case of any vessel in respect of which an amortization deduction is allowable under this section. The cost or portion thereof that may be amortized under this section shall be the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of the vessel under the Federal income-tax laws. If any mortgage indebtedness to the United States is unpaid and outstanding with respect to any such vessel, the taxpayer, pursuant to rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Commission shall accelerate payments on the mortgage indebtedness covering such vessel to the extent of the amount of amortization deduction taken on the vessel in each taxable year."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in passing the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Congress stated that it was to further the development and maintenance of an adequately well-balanced American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States and to aid in the national defense. That was 12 years ago. Since that time the experiences of peacetime operation were swiftly carried into those of war and the second time we experienced how inadequately we were prepared to protect our national security. Some $21,000,000,000 were hurriedly spent to build and operate merchant ships for the emergency.

These war experiences have caused your committee to continually give thought and study to these matters, especially during the past year. Hearings have been held on the subject covering these problems, and as to what steps should be taken to protect the national security. While the matter is of a particular nature, the committee has thoroughly surveyed the requirements to make our merchant marine one that will protect our national security as well as protect our leadership in maintaining the peace of the world.

The legislation strengthens the principle of the Merchant Marine Act adopted by the Congress calling for a privately owned American merchant marine.

The legislation provides that American flag operators may make application for construction differentials for the building of ships in American yards so that American-flag ships might be built here at home to compete with those built under the lower standards of living in foreign countries; that earnings might be deposited in a tax-deferred fund and used for the construction of ships in American yards; that the time is extended for 3 years whereby such funds on deposit might be invested in American-flag ships and facilities, and that owners of American-flag ships would be able to amortize the ship on an accelerated basis as now used by competing foreign-flag ships.

And further, that the Government pay for national-defense equipment including speed and for such features required by our Government and not required by foreign governments on competing foreign ships; that the fixed construction differential of 50 percent of the American cost for ships constructed in the United States is extended to June 1, 1951; that the debt liability on passenger ships is limited to the ship itself; that the interest rate on ship loans is reduced from 3½ to 3 percent; and that the law requiring the Maritime Commission to fix manning rates and minimum wages is repealed.

It clarifies the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and covers what should be done in the light of our experiences during the past 12 years. This will further the making of a strong merchant marine and the enabling legislation for an American Merchant Marine to protect our national security.

The need for further legislation to protect the national security was well put by Secretary Sullivan of the Navy speaking for the Secretary of Defense in his appearance not only before your committee but before the committees of the Senate and House dealing with national security.

We can take the words of Admiral Louis Denfeld, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, who says that the American merchant marine must maintain the great effectiveness that it exercised during the war. Without such a merchant marine our national security is in danger and the strongest United States Navy conceivable would be crippled without the backing of an adequate merchant marine and that the American people should realize that our merchant fleet and our national existence are inseparable. The admiral further stated that in the last two wars our country had to salvage its maritime strength by a combination of "Eleventh-hour fast thinking, gigantic labor, and a lot of good luck."

Mr. Speaker, the need for an adequate merchant marine to maintain our national security has been suggested by the President and by the Congress and it is supplied by this legislation which your committee unanimously approved for passage.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, since 1921, I have been trying to do something to aid the American merchant marine, to build up the American merchant marine. I have done that because I am firmly convinced that if we had had an adequate merchant marine in 1914 we would never have gotten into that war. I am more than ever convinced that if we had had an adequate merchant marine before the last war we would not have been drawn into that struggle.

Today I feel that in presenting these bills we are asking for that instrumentality which will aid the Air Force, aid the Navy, and be of immeasurable consequence in determining the policies of this Government in the future.

The chairman of the committee has called on all of the different interests to appear before us. He has given as full and fair hearings as it was possible to give. We have had careful consideration by a subcommittee, and tried to meet all of the objections. The action of the Merchant Marine Committee was unanimous, and I hope that the action will be approved by the House.

I am not going to take the time of the House at this late hour, when you are tired and when I am tired, to go into an analysis of this bill, but based upon my experience and service on this committee since 1921 I am satisfied that if we had a full and fair opportunity to go over all of the provisions of the bill, it would meet with your hearty support.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bills now before the House are absolutely essential if we are to build up an efficient United States merchant marine. To do so is important not only from the standpoint of our national economy and furtherance of our foreign trade, but also from the standpoint of national security.

A strong and efficient merchant marine is so important that we cannot afford to treat it in any other way than one of prime importance in time of peace as well as in war. Two wars have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the necessity for an up-to-date merchant marine cannot be ignored.

Twice we have entered world wars with an inefficient and inadequate merchant marine. This has necessitated our entering upon tremendous ship-building programs. This has proven costly and a great strain upon our available manpower. We have been fortunate in the past to meet and overcome these handicaps. If we have learned anything from past experiences, it is that we should be prepared and not again depend upon meeting the emergency by building ships in a last minute and desperate effort.

While our shipbuilding workers proved equal to the task in both World Wars I and II, yet it is neither wise nor safe to assume that conditions will exist in the event of another emergency that will enable them to do so again. Time may be against us in the next conflict, if there should be one.

As I have said time and again, you cannot build a shipbuilding force overnight. Shipbuilding requires more trained and skilled craftsmen than any other industry in the Nation. It is important to keep this trained personnel in service. The building of ships, so necessary to meet the competition of foreign shipping interests, is the only sensible way to keep our shipbuilding workers intact.

The report of the President's Advisory Committee on Shipping recognizes the importance of the shipping industry and the necessity to give it new life. It recommends a program of ship construction. It leaves no doubt as to the necessity for such a program.

Other countries, even the very ones that are seeking financial and other relief from us are engaged in shipbuilding programs. As an illustration, Great Britain and Ireland, as reported by Lloyd's Shipping Register, were building more than half of the 3,846 656-ton total of new shipping under construction throughout the world on June 30 last. British shipyards at that time had under construction merchant ships totaling 2,062,949 gross tons—53.6 percent of the world trade. This figure marked the greatest activity in British shipbuilding since 1922.

At the same time as the British yards were showing this shipbuilding activity, the United States was constructing only 183,236 tons, about 9 percent of the British construction program.

The figures of ship production in other European countries when compared with our own are likewise disturbing. Sweden, France, Holland, Italy likewise exceed our total tonnage of construction. Merchant tonnage under construction in British Dominions likewise exceed our own. Our construction exceeded only that of Denmark and Spain. This presents a sorry picture.

The American merchant marine must have a subsidy. There is not a man or woman in this House who disagrees with that. I will vote for whatever subsidy is necessary to give us the strongest merchant marine in the world. On the same basis that we vote direct subsidies to farmers to carry out price-support programs the merchant marine ought to have a direct subsidy to the operators so they can build ships, pay the wages that the American seamen ought to have, and keep the American flag flying over the seven seas.

These bills should have the unanimous support of the Congress.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

AMENDING THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 413, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 215 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by striking out all appearing in the parentheses and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(excluding any construction-differential subsidy and the cost of features paid by the Commission pursuant to section 502 (a))."

SEC. 2. Section 301 of such act is amended (1) by repealing subsection (a), and (2) by striking out "(b)" appearing at the beginning of the present subsection (b) thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 501 (c) of such act is amended by adding a sentence at the end thereof reading as follows: "The owner of any reconstructed or reconditioned vessel may have the life expectancy of such vessel recomputed by the United States Coast Guard as of the date of completion of such reconstruction or reconditioning without regard as to whether or not financial aid was granted under this subsection. The life expectancy determined by the United States Coast Guard with respect to the reconstructed or reconditioned vessel may be used by its owner in determining an allowance for depreciation for the purpose of Federal taxes."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 502 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Concurrently with entering into such contract with the shipbuilder, the Commission is authorized to enter into a contract with the applicant for the purchase by him of such vessel upon its completion. The purchase price to be paid by the applicant shall be the amount of the bid of the shipbuilder constructing the vessel, minus the following amounts which shall be paid by the Commission—

"(1) the cost, as determined by the Commission, of any features incorporated in the vessel for national defense uses (including, but not limited to, excess speed and other features deemed necessary by the Department of the Navy), if and to the extent that such features do not have a commercial utility, or if and to the extent that their cost is disproportionate to their value for commercial purposes;

"(2) the portion, as determined by the Commission, of the construction cost that is attributable solely to compliance with health, sanitation, safety, and other standards for vessels of the United States, including, but not limited to, standards for crew quarters, prescribed in laws or regulations of the United States, if and to the extent that such standards are higher than those prescribed by international convention or by representative foreign countries whose vessels are in substantial competition with vessels of the United States;

"(3) the amount of the construction-differential subsidy."

(b) The first sentence of section 502 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The amount of the construction-differential subsidy may equal, but not exceed, the excess of the bid of the shipbuilder constructing the proposed vessel (excluding the cost of features which are to be paid for by the

Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section) over the fair and reasonable estimate of cost, as determined by the Commission, of the construction of the proposed vessel if it were constructed under similar plans and specifications (excluding the features whose cost is paid by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section) in a foreign shipbuilding center which is deemed by the Commission to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of vessels of the type proposed to be constructed."

(c) The second sentence of section 502 (b) is amended—

(1) by striking out the matter in the parentheses therein, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(excluding the cost of features whose cost is paid by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section)"; and

(2) by changing the period to a colon and adding following proviso: *"Provided, however,* That during the period between June 1, 1948, and July 1, 1951, the construction-differential subsidy shall be 50 percent of the construction cost of the vessel (excluding the cost of features which is to be paid by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section)."

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 502 (c) and 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and sections 4 (b) and 9 (b) (3) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, interest payable to and receivable by the Commission in accordance with any of such sections shall be at the rate of 3 percent per annum as to payments thereof due on or after (but not prior to) July 1, 1948.

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 502 (g) of such act is amended to read as follows: "Upon the agreement of an applicant under this title to purchase any vessel acquired by the Commission under the provisions of section 215, the Commission is authorized to sell such vessel to the applicant for the fair and reasonable value thereof, but at not less than the cost thereof to the Commission, less depreciation based on a 20-year life expectancy from the date of completion, excluding the cost of features paid for by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section, less the equivalent of any applicable construction-differential subsidy as provided by subsection (b), such sale to be in accordance with all the provisions of this title."

SEC. 7. The third sentence of section 503 of such act is amended to read as follows: "At the time of delivery of the vessel the applicant shall execute and deliver a first preferred mortgage to the United States to secure payment of any sums due from the applicant in respect to said vessel: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the payment of sums due under a contract of purchase for a passenger vessel shall be secured only by a first preferred mortgage on said vessel and the obligation of the purchaser under the contract shall be discharged by the surrender of the vessel and all right, title, and interest of the purchaser therein to the Commission, such vessel upon surrender to be delivered in class and in as good order and condition, ordinary wear and tear excepted, as when acquired by the purchaser, and free and clear of all liens and encumbrances whatsoever except the lien of said preferred mortgage, except that any deficiencies with respect to class, condition, and freedom from encumbrances may, to the extent covered by valid policies of insurance, be satisfied through the assignment to the Commission of the claims of the purchaser under such policies of insurance, and if the purchaser shall have complied with all provisions of the mortgage other than those relating to the payment of principal when due, the sole recourse against the purchaser under such contract shall be limited to repossession of the vessel and the assignment of such insurance claims: *Provided further,* That all contracts of purchase under the preceding proviso and every mortgage securing the obligation of the purchaser under such contracts shall, in addition to such provisions as the Commission may deem to be necessary or proper for the protection of the mortgage security, contain provisions making applicable thereto sections 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, and 810 of this act, and if the vessel is to be operated by a company which is a parent of the purchaser or is affiliated or associated with the purchaser, dividends shall not be paid by the purchaser to or for the benefit of such operating company except with the approval of the Commission."

SEC. 8. The second and third sentences of section 504 of such act are amended to read as follows: "If the Commission considers the bid of the shipyard in which the applicant desires to have the vessel built fair and reasonable, it may approve such bid and become a party to the contract or contracts or other arrangements for the construction of such proposed vessel and may agree to pay a construction-differential subsidy in an amount determined by the Commission in accordance with section 502 of this title, and for the cost of features which are to be paid for by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of section 502. The construction-differential subsidy shall be based on the lowest responsible domestic bid; payments for features whose cost is to be paid by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of section 502 shall be based on mutual agreement between the parties, or, failing agreement, on the lowest responsible domestic bid."

SEC. 9. Section 509 of such act is amended (1) by amending the third sentence to read as follows: "The Commission shall pay for the cost of features which are to be paid for by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of section 502," and (2) by amending that part of the fourth sentence preceding the proviso to read as follows: "In case the vessel is designed to be of not less than 3,500 gross tons and to be capable of sustained speed of not less than 14 knots, the applicant shall be required to pay the Commission not less than 12½ percent of the cost of such vessel, and in the case of any other vessel the applicant shall be required to pay the Commission not less than 25 percent of the cost of such vessel (excluding from such cost, in either case, the cost of features which are to be paid for by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of section 502), and the balance of such purchase price shall be paid by the applicant within 20 years in not to exceed 20 equal annual installments, with interest at 3 percent per annum, secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessel sold and otherwise secured as the Commission may determine: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the balance of the purchase price of a passenger vessel constructed under this section shall be secured only by a preferred mortgage on such vessel, and the obligation of the purchaser under such contract shall be discharged by the surrender of the vessel and all right, title, and interest of the purchaser therein to the Commission. The sole recourse against the purchaser under such contract shall be limited to repossession of the vessel by the seller:".

SEC. 10. Section 510 (a) of such act is amended by striking out the word "seventeen" in clause (B) of subparagraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twelve."

SEC. 11. Section 510 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The allowance for an obsolete vessel shall be the market value thereof for operation in the world trade or in the foreign or domestic trade of the United States. If the owner of the obsolete vessel uses such vessel during the period of construction of the new vessel, the allowance shall be reduced by an amount representing the fair value of such use."

SEC. 12. Section 601 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission is authorized to consider and, subject to the provisions of this act relating to operating-differential subsidy, to approve the application of any citizen of the United States for financial aid in the operation of one or more passenger vessels, over an essential trade route in the foreign commerce of the United States, and the Commission is further authorized to enter into separate operating-differential-subsidy contracts to cover the operation of such vessel or vessels without regard to whether the applicant already possesses an operating-differential-subsidy contract or contracts covering similar or other services over the same or other route."

SEC. 13. Section 603 (b) of such act is amended by striking out all appearing in the parentheses and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(after deducting therefrom any estimated increase in such items necessitated by features incorporated in the vessel and paid for by the Commission under subsection (a) (1) and (2) of section 502)."

SEC. 14. Section 603 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the last paragraph. The Commission is hereby authorized to modify existing operating-differential-subsidy contracts to conform to this amendment.

SEC. 15. Section 605 (b) of such act is amended by changing the period to a colon and adding a proviso reading as follows: *"Provided,* That in the case of a vessel whose life expectancy has been extended as provided in section 501 (c), this subsection shall not preclude the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for the life expectancy of said vessel as so extended."

SEC. 16. The second sentence of section 607 (b) of such act is amended by amending that part thereof, preceding the proviso, to read as follows: "In this fund the contractor shall deposit, annually or oftener, as the Commission may require, an amount equal to the annual depreciation charges on the contractor's vessels on which the operating differential is being paid, such depreciation charges to be computed on a 20-year life expectancy of the subsidized vessels, except that depreciation charges in the case of a subsidized vessel whose life expectancy has been extended pursuant to section 501 (c) of this act shall be computed on the life expectancy of said vessel as so extended:".

SEC. 17. Section 905 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) The term 'passenger vessel', when used in sections 503, 509, and 601 (c) of this act, means any vessel documented under the laws of the United States which (1) is not less than 3,500 gross tons, (2) has a designed speed required by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense, (3) has accommodations for 200 or more passengers, and (4) the anticipated revenues from which, as determined by the Commission, will be derived primarily from the carriage of passengers."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia for 20 minutes.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that this bill carries out the policy of House Joint Resolution 412 just passed. Both are necessary in order to build up the passenger ships and service that is needed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to ask an interpretation of section 4 (a) (2) of this bill, page 3, beginning at line 8.

It is my interpretation that the portion of the cost of compliance with health, sanitation, safety, and other standards that is to be paid by the Commission, shall be determined by comparison of United States standards with those prescribed by international convention only if vessels of foreign competitors meet such standards; and that where foreign-flag vessels in substantial competition with vessels of the United States are not constructed in compliance with the international convention, it is the actual standards of such competitors that will be employed, even though there may be an international convention on the subject.

Is that interpretation in accord with that of the committee?

Mr. BLAND. I do not recall that that came before the committee. It is certainly my interpretation, and I think that will be the interpretation of the administrative body.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absense was granted to Mr. MADDEN, on account of official business, to attend the Indiana Democratic State Convention.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 29. An act to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1412. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1955. An act to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2322. An act to provide for the sale of a part of war-housing project No. Fla-8252-1 to the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2359. An act for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2460. An act to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2730. An act to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2772. An act to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2807. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for certain investigation reports in connection with insurance claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2829. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2830. An act to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution to change the name of the site of Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State to Chief Joseph Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution welcoming the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States for its conference in Detroit, Mich., in May 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 238. An act for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction;

H. R. 239. An act to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey;

H. R. 945. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and cost of jurors;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis;

H. R. 2766. An act to amend section 2 of an act, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725);

H. R. 2867. An act to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rice Talbot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb;

H. R. 3007. An act for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of the estate of John Deiman;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4244. An act to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities;

H. R. 4298. An act for the relief of Henry Hill;

H. R. 4455. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4566. An act for the relief of William Nally;

H. R. 4659. An act to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States;

H. R. 4964. An act to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier;

H. R. 5036. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22, to September 25, inclusive, 1948;

H. R. 5272. An act relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks;

H. R. 5330. An act for the relief of W. W. DeLoach;

H. R. 5655. An act confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing one hundred and thirty-nine and sixty-two one-hundredths acres;

H. R. 5820. An act to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 602), and for other purposes;

H. R. 5889. An act to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 5936. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5957. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6188. An act to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6239. An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 6246. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6289. An act to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

H. R. 6339. An act to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title;

H. R. 6766. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1675. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature;

H. R. 238. An act for the extention of admiralty jurisdiction;

H. R. 239. An act to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey;

H. R. 945. Relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and cost of jurors;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis;

H. R. 2766. An act to amend section 2 of an act, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725);

H. R. 2867. An act to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rice Talbot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb;

H. R. 3007. An act for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of the estate of John Deiman;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4244. An act to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities;

H. R. 4298. An act for the relief of Henry Hill;

H. R. 4455. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4566. An act for the relief of William Nally;

H. R. 4659. An act to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States;

H. R. 4964. An act to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier;

H. R. 5036. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948;

H. R. 5272. An act relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks;

H. R. 5330. An act for the relief of W. W. DeLoach;

H. R. 5655. An act confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. B–690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing 139.62 acres;

H. R. 5820. An act to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes;

H. R. 5889. An act to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 5936. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5957. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Company stockade, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6188. An act to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6239. An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 6246. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6289. An act to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital;

H. R. 6339. An act to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title; and

H. R. 6766. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES BECAUSE OF NATIONAL-DEFENSE-INCURRED ENROLLMENTS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, with amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to make, in the same manner as heretofore authorized, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance that (a) are still overburdened with school enrollments caused by war activities and the transition from war to peacetime conditions and have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, Federal contributions administered by the Federal Works Administrator for the operation and maintenance of their school facilities, or (b) have become overburdened with defense-incurred enrollments as the result of the reactivation or expansion of any defense establishment or the operation of any new defense establishment.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out this act, including administrative expenses therefor, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, not to exceed the sum of $6,000,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York for 20 minutes.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of the Lanham Act. One hundred and forty-four schools need help next year in 31 States. Five schools where the Defense Plant Corporation had made payments of taxes to school districts and then plants were turned over to the Navy. Thirteen school districts are added because of the reactivating of the air forces for defense operations which amounts to $1,000,000. Fourteen other Air Force places need help. These places require $413,000.

The total amount required is $6,400,000. This bill calls for $6,000,000. This does not include Alaska where they are building new installations.

The Federal Government has certain obligations as soon as the Federal Government creates the problem in a community by taking property off of the tax rolls or by building Federal installations, and it should provide sewers, water, and schools.

The Atomic Energy Commission meets their problem. The Army meets their problem of their own forces but not of the contractors' employees who live on these reservations. The Corps of Engineers helped school districts.

Everyone feels that temporary housing should be taken down as soon as possible, but the condition of the country in the construction industry, the cost of housing, the uncertainty of people who live in those areas as to whether they should acquire a permanent home and whether the Federal activity will remain, makes it pretty difficult to set a uniform policy. Each year collections of local and State money have been going up, but, of course, they have increased costs.

This bill asks for $6,000,000. Last year we had a similar bill and it took care of some school districts and kept some of the schools open for more than 5½ or 6 months. If it had not been for a similar bill last year some of our schools would have only lasted 6 months.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing in this bill. There were quite a number of districts in my congressional district, and I am sure that is true in almost every district in the United States, in which these schools are located. We have a number of them that will not be able to continue. They are a direct obligation of the Government by reason of the fact they are an outgrowth of the war.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. Many of us on our side of the aisle have had occasion to study this problem and we appreciate the action of the Committee on Education and its chairman in bringing this bill out for consideration and approval of the House. I know of some districts that are in an extremely severe situation financially. Without this aid they could not provide school service for the children of war workers and others who have moved to these congested areas. I have studied the report. I believe the bill is in proper form and that it is a conservative approach to the problem. Without this aid we would have an extremely urgent situation in many localities. I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Can the gentleman give the House any idea of how long it is going to be necessary to continue this activity?

Mr. LANDIS. As long as the Government owns these houses and does not sell them back to the people or turn them over to the State, we will always have the problem with us. The Government collects the rents from these housing projects and we have no way of getting the money from these people to pay the taxes in order to run the schools.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. For two consecutive years the agency in charge of this activity has come before my committee and stated it wanted to fold the activity up.

Mr. LANDIS. Yes; the agency would like to do that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is 3 years now since the war ended.

Mr. LANDIS. We are building new defense plants, we are building more houses today; we have these air bases established. We have about 28 air bases and air plant installations which have been rejuvenated and you have a bigger problem today than you ever had, a whole lot bigger than last year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In the defense areas these homes and houses are not publicly taxed?

Mr. LANDIS. No.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In all places where this money is to be allocated?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Many of them are taxed and the communities have taken over the assessment of those properties.

Mr. LANDIS. This does not apply to those that have been taken over.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that this is a small problem in education. What is facing this country in the next 4 or 5 years are 7,000,000 additional children over what we have in the schools this year. It will require a building program involving a minimum of $5,000,000,000, it will take a million school teachers to teach these children. We will have a real problem facing the country in the next 5 years.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I hope the chairman will make it plain that in connection with these housing projects theoretically they were supposed to pay the taxes, but they do not pay the taxes. The school districts and the rest of the areas are up to their constitutional taxing limit and do not have the money to carry on these facilities in the various areas.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The bill that the House is presently considering is one for maintenance only, and not for construction.

Mr. LANDIS. Yes. This does not deal with construction.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In further answer to the gentleman from Ohio, is it not true that the Federal Works Agency has made a survey and has given the gentleman this estimate?

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The Federal Works Agency has been before our committee for 2 years telling us that this year should be the last year for this operation. Now I am wondering why we have this reversal of form.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three additional minutes.

I would like to answer the gentleman from New York. The Government still owns these houses. As long as it owns

the houses and collects the rent there is a problem that these people do not have to pay into the States; and the second problem is that we have added 28 new defense areas to the situation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that one of the reasons for the necessity of extending this bill again is due to the fact, because of this defense program that we now have, that many of these fields throughout the country are being reactivated, with civilian employees working for the Army moving back in, and in addition to the ones that are being reactivated, additional ones are being built in connection with our defense program.

Mr. LANDIS. That is exactly right.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman does not wish to give the impression that the equivalent of taxes is not being paid on this property, is he?

Mr. LANDIS. I would not say that.

Mr. MACKINNON. Well, they are. It is a fact that every one of these properties pays an amount of money equivalent to taxes, which was agreed on with the local authorities.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. With further reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana regarding these defense establishments, I understand from the bill here that this applies only to those that were receiving payment the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, is that correct?

Mr. LANDIS. No; we broadened it. It covers all the defense areas that have been added. Twenty-eight have been added, and eight or nine more which are secret.

Mr. GOFF. I think it is a good measure, and I intend to support it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Notwithstanding the fact whether a city is mentioned in this list in the report, if the Federal Housing Authority is still renting housing property that is Government-owned, then the schools will be eligible under this fund.

Mr. LANDIS. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the gentleman will yield, in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, is it not also a fact that many of these communities were built outside existing city limits?

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about that.

Mr. MONRONEY. While some payments in lieu of taxes on residential property might be paid, the vast industrial establishments, which take up a large portion of that school district, in many cases are absolutely tax-free, so that we have no industrial taxation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, compared with what we have done today this bill is peanuts, but there is a principle involved and a far-reaching principle, and I hope the Members will give consideration to what is embraced in this bill.

This is give-away legislation of the worst sort and should be defeated. Year after year, and always in the closing days of the session, this matter has come to the floor and always before, and this is particularly significant, the bill has been accompanied with a promise that the current year would be the last. No such promise comes this year. If you vote this bill now before you, you are setting a pattern for future years.

There is another feature of significance this year. The amount has been less and less in each of the recent years, but this year you are turning the corner. You are authorizing $1,000,000 more this year than last. What the future will bring no one can prophesy, except that the amount will doubtless be greater. This bill sets the stage.

The bill this year has had a peculiar genesis and history.

The Federal Works Agency thought Congress meant what it said last year, and I read you what Commissioner Field wrote on May 11 as contained in the report:

> I have not wanted to encourage any school district to think that there was any possibility of extension of legislation similar to Public Law 317.

That was the law passed last year.

> Therefore, we do not have an accurate estimate of the needs for each school.

The sponsor of the bill, however, apparently thought he would like to give away some money, so without any request from the Agency he asked the Agency some time along in April how much money it wanted. This was like asking a duck if he wants water. Letters were sent out over the country asking representatives of the Agency to determine if there were any schools which could use some loose money. Of course they could, $7,000,000 worth.

Then, although there was opposition in the subcommittee, the bill was approved in the subcommittee, without a quorum being present. When the bill came up in the whole committee, it was reported by a divided vote. The vote was taken at a time when the House was in session. I have been bitterly opposed to the bill right along, but I assumed that when a committee meeting was called for 10 o'clock, and when a session of the House was called for 10 o'clock, the session of the House would take precedence. It did not in this case, and I missed my opportunity to argue and vote on the bill in committee. Of course the hearings have not been printed and Members of the House have had no opportunity to learn therefrom the nature of the testimony for and against the bill.

Let us examine where sponsors claim this money is needed. No. 1, they claim that it is needed in areas where there are Army, Navy, and Air Force installations. I ask you, what would be the attitude of any community now having an Army or Navy or Air Force installation if there were a sudden decision to take that installation away? Every mayor and every chamber of commerce and every city council would come here begging with tears in their eyes that the installation be left undisturbed. Yet, important as the installation is to them, as important as it is to their storekeepers and their automobile dealers and all their other businessmen, they are not willing to tax themselves a sufficient amount to support the schools to educate the children the installations bring.

Of course, as far as Army installations are concerned, the Department of the Army does pay a hundred dollars each year for the education of every child who lives on Government property.

The second category in which it is claimed this money is needed are those localities where Lanham Act houses still stand and are still being rented. Of course, you know, just as I know, that any Lanham Act houses still standing are a blessing to their community. There were some wartime barracks in my community. They were converted into housing to accommodate four or five hundred families. I wish there were double or treble the number. All would be quickly rented. Yet the city of New York has not come to the Federal Government saying, "We have some houses full of families here, and we cannot educate the children. We want the Federal Government to give us money for this purpose." We are perfectly delighted to have those houses. We have waiting lists containing hundreds of names. Of course, with all Lanham Act houses, payments are made in lieu of taxes. Thus, in either category, there is no valid reason for asking the Federal Government to hand out money for education.

Every city, State, county, and community has benefited from these housing installations. Beneficiaries are obligated, and they should be glad, to educate the children who are involved.

Let us examine for a moment the proud, rich States who are among those who receive hand-outs under this bill. We see the States of California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, and New York. The State of New York has not come to the Federal Government asking for money with which to educate its children. It does not need such money. Neither, in my opinion, does any other State. The States have had 3 or 4 years in which to appropriate money to take care of this problem. If they have not done so, they have only themselves to blame.

Now let us examine some of the rich cities which will participate if this bill is enacted into law.

Listed are Phoenix, Ariz., Pocatello, Idaho, La Porte, Ind., Wichita, Kans., East Detroit, Mich., Tonopah, Nev., Rome, N. Y.; Cleveland, Ohio, Portland, Oreg.; Sewickly, Pa., Rapid City, S. Dak.; Amarillo and Fort Worth, Tex., Seattle, Wash.

These cities, Mr. Speaker, can educate their own children. There is only one course, Mr. Speaker, which should be followed by anyone who favors putting an end to useless spending in the Federal Government. This bill should be voted down.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I notice in Massachusetts we do not require anything. We have defense plants and have always had them. As far as I know, we have never asked anybody to educate the children who came in there during the war and who stayed there. It seems to me we cannot keep appropriating money this way. For instance, I understand that sewage and water are involved in these things.

My question is, Why should we be appropriating money to take care of children in these cities when you have the big State of New York asking for nothing, and the State of Maine next to me getting $1,100, and my State getting nothing out of it.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman's question answers itself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I would like to ask the gentleman what he would tell the school districts everywhere in the United States when they inquire what the Federal Government is going to do, and what the Federal Government would pay in lieu of taxes on property within the school districts where there are school children living on Government land, and houses belonging to the Federal Government where the school is being operated by State funds. Do you think it is fair for the Federal Government to hold property within the school district, and yet require the State to educate the children who live on that property?

Mr. BUCK. In view of the great advantages that come to these localities through these installations, in view of the fact that education has always been regarded as a State function, in view of the further fact that the States have had 3 or 4 years to take care of this situation, it seems to me it is the obligation of the States to provide sufficient money to provide this education.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I appreciate the viewpoint of the gentleman, but the point posed by my colleague from Texas [Mr. LUCAS] I think has some bearing. We do need some legislation to clarify this situation and clean up these ragged instances, but that legislation has not been forthcoming. Would the gentleman try to close these schools until Congress acts?

Mr. BUCK. Of course not. I cannot conceive of the great State of Washington letting children within its boundaries go without education.

Mr. HORAN. We have Government projects in the State of Washington that have been built entirely on Federal reservations; public housing, built by the Federal Government, and the rents are not based upon aid to education. Those people living there have told me themselves that they wished they could adjust that so that they could pay taxes and have their own schools; but the laws are in the way.

Mr. BUCK. Which law?

Mr. HORAN. I do not know.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have been interested for a long time in these facilities for educating the children on our military reservations, but the question I would like to have answered is the very question the gentleman asked. That is with regard to payments that are being made in lieu of taxes. What are they being made for and how much is being paid?

Mr. BUCK. As I understand, these payments are supposed to be the equivalent of taxes which would be paid were these housing units in private hands.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is precisely the situation. I would like to have that cleaned up.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman states the situation precisely. These properties, owned by the United States Government, pay an amount of money annually in lieu of taxes that is equal to the amount of money that would be paid if the properties were actually taxed. The sum paid in lieu of taxes is fixed by individual agreement with each local community where these properties are located.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right, and has been since the days preceding the war.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman is right in every particular.

Mr. BUCK. Which is a sufficient sum of money to provide education.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And for other expenses, including that of police, highway expenditures, and so forth. I know that is true.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Of course the gentleman is not in a position to state, and I do not think anybody who has addressed himself to this subject today is in a position to state, that the equivalent of the amount of taxes that would be collected has been paid. We all know, as a matter of fact, that when the representative of the agency goes to a community, he gets the best deal that he can, and the representative of the community is figuring he is going to get something anyway, so each of them makes the best trade he can, and it is not on the same basis as other taxes.

Mr. BUCK. Will the gentleman answer a question for me?

Mr. COLMER. I was simply making an observation.

Mr. BUCK. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Would he like to have this housing taken away? Would he like to have the Government installations taken away from his State?

Mr. COLMER. I would like to answer that if the gentleman will give me sufficient time to answer it.

Mr. BUCK. I would be glad to.

Mr. COLMER. It is going to take a little time.

Mr. BUCK. How long? It only took a half a minute to ask it.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman asked the question. Let me answer it. It so happens that I live in a little community of 6,000 population, normally, which was built up to 40,000 during the war. The Federal Government, after having constructed many times as many houses in that community as were there before the war, has helped maintain those houses. Those people have stayed there. They are there today.

Mr. MACKINNON. What is the population today?

Mr. COLMER. The population today is roughly somewhere in the neighborhood of 25,000.

Mr. MACKINNON. And they are not now engaged in the occupation for which these projects were originally subsidized; are they?

Mr. COLMER. A large percentage of them still are, because these houses were built there to house shipyard workers who were building ships during the war. Ships are now being built to some extent for the Maritime Commission.

Mr. BUCK. All of which has brought great wealth to the community.

Mr. COLMER. Just a moment. This little community has taxed itself to the constitutional limit of the State of Mississippi. Are you going to say to those people who come in there and those people who are still there that you are going to deny them the opportunity for an education?

Mr. BUCK. Of course not, but why should not the legislature do something about the situation rather than come to the Federal Government?

Mr. COLMER. The legislature did not build the houses; the Federal Government built them there; and the people are still there.

Mr. BUCK. But the legislature is glad to have the industry and the houses there, I am sure.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from New York will yield, again I should like to ask the gentleman

from Mississippi to tell the Members of the House how much the Government actually pays into that town in lieu of taxes and what do they pay it for?

Mr. COLMER. I am not of course prepared to answer that in terms of dollars and cents. The only thing I can tell you is that a large portion of that municipality today consists of Government-owned houses. A large percentage of the children attending these schools—and bear you in mind and make the most of it, if you will—are attending schools that were built by the Federal Government. The buildings themselves were constructed by the Federal Government. A large percentage of the children who are attending those schools come from this housing project—better than 50 percent, say.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What I should like to know is why we are making payments in lieu of taxes and then these States and municipalities come in asking us to appropriate money as they do in this bill. What are they doing with the money?

Mr. COLMER. Because the Government is not able to pay that community.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What are you doing with that money? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. COLMER. That money goes to help operate these schools.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the State governments should educate the children. We own the school buildings, we employ the teachers.

Mr. COLMER. That is right.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course we are not paying all, but a very large part.

Mr. COLMER. That is not the point. If the Federal Government will take those buildings and schools out of there and let us go back to the little peaceful community that we were before, then we would not ask the Federal Government for anything.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman wants the Federal Government to do that, does he?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I wish to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

I will tell the gentleman that the Federal Government is not paying the money it is supposed to pay in lieu of taxes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But they are paying an equivalent sum in lieu of taxes.

Mr. RIVERS. They do not do that. They send a fine-looking, high-sounding report up here to Washington, showing what a large pay roll they have that is supposed to be paid for by the Federal Government, but they do not give the communities the equivalent in taxes. If they did we would have no complaint. Here we have the hideous specter of the Government coming and taking our property off the tax rolls and under the constitutional limits of the respective States we cannot raise enough taxes to operate the facilities of government imposed upon those little communities. We do pay the school teachers but we need more money to operate the schools.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What do you do with the money?

Mr. RIVERS. We do not get it. They send great reports in to Washington of how big the pay rolls are and what it costs to operate, but we do not get the money.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am glad to hear from the gentleman from South Carolina but we ought to be hearing from the committee.

Mr. RIVERS. You are hearing from somebody who knows what he is talking about.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We hear reports that in lieu of taxes on these housing projects the rental of which is very low that they are requiring additional amounts of rent for the sole purpose of supporting the schools. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. BUCK. I am sure the chairman of the committee has information on that and I will ask him to answer.

Mr. LANDIS. Most of the communities have levied taxes to the legal limit set by the law.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am not talking about taxes now. I am talking about an addition to the rent. The Federal Government charges a very low amount of money on these projects. Is it not a fact that a sum is simply added to the rent to bring it up and not yet to a normal rent, but an additional amount, and that they use that for the education of the children?

Mr. LANDIS. I will say there were a few, but even then, the taxes will not pay for the schools.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I have a little knowledge of this matter acquired in my work last fall when I was chairman of the Government Corporations Subcommittee on Appropriations and this matter came before the subcommittee.

To begin with nobody could live in those houses after the war, at least, unless they earned less than a certain amount of wages. Since that time the wage level has gone up and regardless of how much the tenants make or earn they can still live in those houses. The fact is that the tenants who live in those houses could afford to pay from 25 to 50 percent more and they would gladly do it if the Government would ask them to. Then you could get plenty of money for taxes to take care of this tax matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a considerable amount of misunderstanding respecting this proposed legislation.

Most of the schools under this bill are war casualties. The Government owns the land and the houses. I am not here to argue whether the Government ought to rent these houses or sell them. The fact is the Government owns them.

Out near Wichita, Kans., in my district, the Government during the war period built approximately 3,000 units in one place. They are about 10 miles from the town and were built near the Boeing airplane factory for the employees who turned out the thousands of airplanes during the war.

As a matter of fact, the Boeing Airplane Co. is going back into the business of making airplanes for the Government and is employing men and women by the thousands. These houses, I have said, are out in the country. This installation has a population of 13,000 people. Approximately 2,500 students were enrolled in school during the last year. It takes $350,000 to carry on the operation of the schools.

Someone has suggested that the communities where these schools are located are asking the Government for a handout. Nothing can be further from the truth.

Give me your attention for just a minute and I will tell you why. Those 3,000 units rent for approximately $35 per unit. The Government collects $1,260,000 a year rental. That money goes into the Federal Treasury. Now then, all we are asking you to do is to permit a small share of that fund to be paid to the school district to defray the expense of the school operation. Attention has been called a number of times to the amount of money that is being paid on the basis of tax valuation. That is true—the Government does contribute, but the fact is that the valuation under consideration is just the value of a temporary house and the land where it is located. You do not have taxes as you would in a city because you do not have taxes on utilities and you do not have taxes on personal property that amount to anything. The situation is different from that of an ordinary city. For example, a home in an ordinary city is worth from $5,000 to $10,000 and taxes are collected thereon. These buildings and the houses are valued at from three to four hundred dollars per unit.

Something was said about contributions from the community. I call your attention again to the Planeview district where personal taxes are collected in the sum of $11,000. The State and the county contribute more than $96,000 to carry on the operation of these schools. They even collect fees and tuition amounting to $6,000, so you see local authorities have done everything they could to contribute to the expense of these schools.

I agree that if they would increase the rent on these properties by 10 percent and let us use it for carrying on the expenses of our schools we would not be asking for the additional sum we are requesting here today.

Let me call your attention to another thing and that is that most of these

homes are occupied by veterans and their families. They have been given priority for the occupancy of these homes. As I said a moment ago, a number of them are now going to work in defense plants to turn out munitions of war. I also want to add that I have two other war installations in my district. One of them is Beechwood, where there are 250 units and where there are approximately 200 children in school. These units produce an income to the Federal Government amounting to $93,000 a year and the Government contributes less than 2 months' rent to the carrying on of the schools in that district.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to know and I want this House to know that we are doing everything we can in our school districts, in our counties, and in our State. We are not asking for a hand-out; we are only asking you to kickback a little of the money, a little of the profit the Government is now collecting on account of the ownership of these homes. There certainly is nothing unfair about that. Because some States do not have these installations is no excuse why anyone should oppose it. If you want these homes sold or torn down, that is a different story. But right now the Government owns them and rents them at a profit. All we ask is that you return a part of that profit for the use of the community so it may educate its children.

We are doing the best we can in Kansas, so far as our counties, our school districts, and the State are concerned. We are not asking you for anything. We are asking you only to kickback a little of that money. That is all there is to it. There is nothing unfair about that. Just because the gentleman from Massachusetts does not have that sort of thing in his district does not change the picture any.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the basis of payment in lieu of taxes is on the basis of the land, plus the cost of the building?

Mr. REES. Yes; but the buildings, because they are temporary, are valued for $300 or $400 each, and the land at very little. You see, there are no homes of value, as in the cities. There are no utilities and other property to produce additonal taxes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If that is so, that is the assessed value of the property, and the return is on that basis. If that be so, why are you asking us for more money? I think that question ought to be checked up. In that case we are paying double taxes.

Mr. REES. The property value is not there, but the families, including the children, are there.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. He is a member of the committee that reported this legislation and has given it a great deal of thought and study.

Mr. BREHM. It seems to me this thing can be summed up in one sentence. It is either a case of put up or shut up. The Federal Government owns it, we have to continue to put up, or else shut up the houses.

Mr. REES. That is right. If the Government wants to pay what is fair and equitable, fair enough. This is not a hand-out, insofar as the installations are concerned. You may think these properties should be destroyed and the families evicted, but the fact remains the war plant is again in operation building planes for the Government. And again let me reiterate the Government is presently collecting rental in the sum of more than $1,200,000 from these properties. Here is one place where the Government is really making a profit on its investment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am in complete agreement with what the gentleman from Kansas has said. Instead of asking Uncle Sam for a handout we, who have these tiny small districts that are trying to do a job of educating the children that are there because of war activities, are simply asking Uncle Sam not to expect a complete free ride on these small communities. It is a very small pittance compared to what the local communities are paying for this big load.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURKE. We have a condition here and not a theory, it seems to me. These communities have grown enormously. We have Wright Field in Montgomery County, Dayton, Ohio. The Government has taken all this land, even for golf courses and all that sort of thing, very valuable land, $200 and $300 to the acre, which they have taken away from the rolls of the school district.

Mr. REES. The Government is collecting in my district $1,200,000 a year. It goes into the Treasury somewhere; I do not know where. All we ask is a little kick-back. A small share of what the tenants pay to the Federal Treasury for the use of these temporary houses.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, my community is not asking our Government for one thin dime or a handout, and I want the Appropriations Committee of this House to get this, these two installations are paying into the Federal Government at the rate of $1,200,000 a year. All we are asking is that you return a small share of that fund so we can use it, together with all the money we can raise, to help pay the expenses of carrying on the education of the youngsters in those areas. If the Government would turn back only a small share of the profits it is collecting on this temporary housing, we would not have to ask for this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, 1 minute is very little time, and yet I know you are in a hurry. Let me just say this with respect to Texas. I can give you a little illustration at Orange, Tex., where a large naval installation, shipping concerns and other war industries, some of a temporary nature, were put in, and a number of people came to live in that small city. Some of the industries closed long ago but those temporary houses are now occupied by ex-servicemen, many of whom work many miles away from there, but their families have to live there. First of all, the State of Texas puts up $55 toward education for each one of the children housed in those temporary units. Do not think we are asking the Federal Government for everything. The city of Orange taxes itself to the limit, but the little pittance that comes in in lieu of taxes on a shack of a building is nothing. It amounts to about $10 per pupil. It costs $110 a child to educate him. Texas is putting up $55 per pupil, and the city of Orange is levying taxes to the limit.

But this is not enough to operate the Orange School for the normal period, and take care of these hundreds of children, many of them temporary residents, living in these federally owned housing projects. The people of Orange did not bring about this situation. But they will continue to do their best to give every child the privilege of good schooling. Two other communities in our section, French school district and Vidor, have much the same problem.

Except for the funds authorized by this bill these children cannot be educated. This condition obtains in many places throughout the Nation. I do hope this bill will be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure a minute is enough so that I can emphasize what has already been said here. First, these communities are war casualties. The war is not over so far as they are concerned. It is all right for the gentleman from New York or from some other great metropolitan center or State with a great urban population to say they will take care of the situation. But, if you will turn this legislation down here today you are saying to these thousands of displaced children that you are going to deny them the benefit of an education. Now that is what it amounts to, in substance.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who, if fully familiar with some of the situations that would be relieved by this bill, including the gentleman from New York—because I know his sense of fairness—would not support this bill. It is absolutely sound

in principle. It was the Federal Government through its Congress, not the States, that declared a state of war to exist and built war plants which caused the removal of hundreds of thousands of people. The camps are now deactivated. The ordnance factories are no longer operating in most instances, but the families remain and they have to remain because there are no houses for them to go elsewhere. Our situation in Arkansas is like that of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS]. We levy 18 mills tax on our property for education and we have a 2-percent sales tax. We pay for schools, per capita, double the national average, and yet we cannot proceed without this kind of help. It is imperative that this bill pass if the schools operate in a normal way. It is a Federal obligation.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this legislation. I appreciate very much the difficulties facing these communities. I well recall the establishment of many of these war agencies and the building up of our air fields and naval establishments throughout the country. I took a very important part in the early days preceding the war in making available the payments in lieu of these taxes, and it was my impression that the assessed value of the land plus the fair value of the property should be made the basis for those payments. This bill provides additional payments. My only purpose in rising here today is to see if the committee cannot explore into this matter during the intervening period before the bill comes up again next year and reconcile those conditions so that we shall not be making these payments in lieu of taxes and then coming in and asking the Government to make these direct payments for the education of these children. The thing ought to be all leveled off.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 103, noes 16.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order so that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BUCK. I will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, if it is determined that a quorum is not present, the vote may go over until tomorrow, to be the first order of business then.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. I renew my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Chair will state that there will be no further business tonight, a quorum not being present. The only motion now in order is the motion to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 15, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. Senate Joint Resolution 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam; with amendments (Rept. No. 2335). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2286. An act to provide for nonreimbursable allocations on the Carlsbad Federal reclamation project; without amendment (Rept. No. 2336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 2338). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 671. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6401, a bill to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2339). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6888. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 577. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to motions to strike from the RECORD the remarks of Mem'ers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2341). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on full investigation pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 2342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5201. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton; without amendment (Rept. No. 2345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 2346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2343. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 6914. A bill to forbid certain interferences with interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 6915. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, part III; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6916. A bill to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6917. A bill to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 6918. A bill to prevent further price increases and to reduce present prices to price levels consistent with a stable economy, and to allocate and control production and distribution to the extent necessary to distribute equitably commodities in short supply and to maintain stable prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain Indian lands by the United States from the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution to establish fair hearing procedures for congressional investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACY:

H. Res. 672. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for salary increases for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 6919. A bill for the relief of Joseph Gerald Flynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6920. A bill for the relief of Oscar and Frederick Neustadt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6921. A bill for the relief of Beno Demenyi and Margit Demenyi, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6922. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Efstraliou Moustakeas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2096. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 19 members of the Golden Rule Class of Cabot Methodist Church, Cabot, Pa., in opposition to the Towe bill, H. R. 4278, and urging prohibiting the sale of beer to trainees, especially those under the age of 21 years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2097. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Howard G. Miller and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate increase in postal basic salaries of not less than $800 per annum; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2098. Also, petition of New York Teachers Chapter, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the discharging of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2099. Also, petition of UOPWA-CIO, Local 39, Chicago Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the endorsement of H. R. 6099 and H. R. 6777; to the Committee on Ways and Means.